

## PART 2: THE ANTICHRIST REVEALED

- Chapter 1: Some Principles of prophetic interpretation
- Chapter 2: The Johannian Epistles - Amidst “many antichrists,” can the Roman Catholic Pope be fairly described as “The Roman Antichrist”?
- Chapter 3: The Johannian Epistles - Does the Roman Antichrist fulfil all the types of issues associated with the Antichrist foretold by the Apostle John?
- Chapter 4: How should we deal with the Roman Catholic Pope in spiritual matters?
- Chapter 5: The Gospels and Johannian Epistles - Does the Roman Antichrist meet all the descriptors of the Antichrist foretold by Christ in the Gospels and the Apostle John?
- Chapter 6: Is the Antichrist of II Thessalonians 2:1-12 a devil, a philosophy, or a man?
- Chapter 7: A trilogy showing that the Roman Antichrist is *the* Antichrist of II Thessalonians 2:1-12
- Chapter 8: The Antichrist is guilty of “shewing” “that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).
- Chapter 9: The Antichrist’s coming is “with the working of Satan” (II Thess. 2:9).
- Chapter 10: The *mystery of iniquity doth already work* (II Thess. 2:7): justification by works.
- Chapter 11: The Antichrist’s *iniquity* (II Thess. 2:7; I Tim. 3:16; 4:1-4).
- Chapter 12: The Antichrist’s *sin* (II Thess. 2:3).
- Chapter 13: The Antichrist’s *sin*:  
Blasphemy by “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3).
- Chapter 14: The Antichrist’s *sin*: The short Pontificate of John-Paul I and the long Pontificate of John-Paul II.
- Chapter 15: The Antichrist’s *sin*: “with all deceivableness”(II Thess. 2:3,10).
- Chapter 16: The Antichrist’s *sin*: “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” “with all deceivableness”(II Thess. 2:3,7,10): the sin of cremation.
- Chapter 17: The Antichrist is a “strong delusion” for those “who believed not the truth” (II Thess. 2:11,12)
- Chapter 18: The Antichrist’s defeat.
- Chapter 19: Historical Protestant recognition of the Pope as the Antichrist.

Chapter 20: Some Points of Intersection between the description of Antichrist in the Synoptic Gospels, Pauline Epistles, and Johannian Epistles.

Chapter 21: Summary and Conclusion.

## CHAPTER 1

### Some Principles of prophetic interpretation

Before considering Antichrist prophecies, it is important to understand some general principles of prophetic interpretation. OT prophecies about the Messiah are sometimes misunderstood because the reader fails to recognize that the OT is using a prophetic type which partly fulfils the prophecy, but whose incompleteness shows that it is a Messianic prophecy pointing to the Messiah. E.g., the famous Messianic Prophecy of Isa. 7:14. Isa. 7 is set in the context of the Syro-Ephraimite War (c. 732-731 B.C.). Ahaz stood at the aqueducts and was given this prophecy by Isaiah. Isaiah gives a prophecy that a child will be born, and before he is old enough to know good and bad, the enemy will be defeated in Isa. 7:14-16. "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

This had an immediate fulfilment in the prophetic type of Isaiah's son, for in Isa. 8:3,4 the prophet Isaiah says, "And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then said the Lord to me, Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz, for before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria." Ahaz hired the king of Assyria who came and destroyed Israel's enemies (II Kgs 16:5-9), thus partially fulfilling this prophecy. But Isaiah's son: was not born of "a virgin" (Isa. 7:14) as we are specifically told that Isaiah "went unto the prophetess" (Isa. 8:2); he was not called "Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14) but rather "Maher-shalal-hash-baz" (Isa. 8:3), even though he pointed to "Immanuel" (Isa. 8:8); and he did not meet the description of Isa. 9:6 as, e.g., "The Mighty God." Therefore, Maher-shalal-hash-baz must have been a messianic type pointing forward to the Messiah or "Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14; 8:8), and the deliverance of Israel from Damascus a prophetic type of a much greater deliverance of God (echoed in "O Immanuel" and "God is with us," Isa. 8:8,10). That deliverance was met in Christ who in accordance with Isa. 7:14 was born of "a virgin," was called "Emmanuel" (Matt. 1:23), and in harmony with Isa. 9:6 was "the Mighty God," for he is called "the Lord" in Matt. 3:3; which quotes from Isa.40:3 where "Lord" means "Jehovah" (ASV).

Likewise, Christmas cards (and traditional religious art,) sometimes show the three wise men as three kings, sitting on camels, as a white European, brown Asian, and black African. Those who do not understand relevant prophetic principles have sometimes questioned the accuracy of this, since they could not find such details in the Gospels. But this picture is built up from OT prophecy, the *Table of Nations* (Gen. 10), and Matt. 2. It is concluded that there were three wise men because "they presented" three gifts, one giving "gold," another, "frankincense," and another "myrrh" (Matt. 2:11). In OT prophesy these Gentiles were prophetic types at Christ's First Advent, of those who are to come at his Second Advent, and so in order to be types, like them must have come on "camels" (Isa.

60:6), and been three “kings” of the “Gentiles” from European “Tarshish” (white Japhethite, Gen. 10:4), Asiatic “Sheba” (brown Semite, Gen. 25:3), and African “Seba” (black Hamite, Gen. 10:7), and bring such gifts as “gold” and “incense” e.g., frankincense (Ps. 72:10,15; Isa. 60:3,6,9), and so also have access to myrrh, a gum resin used in incense<sup>1</sup>. Understandably then, the first reading at Morning Prayer for the *Feast of Epiphany* in the Church of England’s *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), is Isaiah 60, and the Gospel reading at Communion is Matt. 2:1-12.

Or when Jonah was swallowed by a great fish, he was “in the belly of the fish three days and three nights,” and in his prayer to “the Lord,” he says God heard him when he “cried” from “the belly of hell” (Jonah 1:17; 2:2). But it would be too much to say that being “in the belly of the fish” was the same thing as being in “the belly of hell,” and so Jonah must here be a messianic type pointing forward to the Messiah, who would be “in the belly of hell” and come out after “three days.” Christ’s atonement was completed on the cross (John 19:30; Heb. 13:20), and so as symbolized on earth by the veil into the Most Holy Place being ripped in two, he entered the presence of God the Father and the heavenly Most Holy Place on Good Friday (Luke 23:43,45,46; Heb. 9). This “sign of the prophet Jonas” (Matt. 12:39,40) was fulfilled when Christ’s spirit then left Paradise, and descended into hell (on what I consider was a triumphal march through “the lower parts of the earth,” Eph. 4:9; Col. 2:12-15); and then rose with a resurrection body on Easter Sunday. And King David is first referred to in Ps. 16, but it would be too much to say that his “soul” was ever “in hell,” or that his body did not “see corruption” (Ps. 16:10), and so he too must be a symbolic type of the Messiah (Acts 2:27,29,31; Luke 24:45,46). Yet after the Messiah experiences “death” and the “grave,” Isaiah says “he shall prolong his days,” a fact requiring his resurrection from the dead (Isa. 53:9,10). “Thus it is written” in the OT, that “Christ” was “to rise from the dead the third day” (Luke 24:46).

While there are numerous other examples, e.g., the Book of Hebrews recognizes that the whole sanctuary system of sacrifices pointed to Christ, “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29); nevertheless, these examples suffice to show the general principle of using a prophetic type that partially fulfils the prophecy, and which points to the greater prophetic fulfilment. E.g., “it is not possible that the blood of bulls and

---

<sup>1</sup> In Hebrew “Ham” is *Cham* which is like *chom* (heat), that is, being burnt and thus black. In Assyrian (Gen. 2:14; 10:22) *ippatu* means “white” (like Japheth) and *samu* “olive coloured” (like Shem). In Egyptian (Gen. 10:6) Ham is like the word “black” in the Hieroglyphic’s *kem*; Demotic’s *kemi*; Thebes’ *keme*; or Memphises’ *kheme*; and in Arabic, *ahamm*, fem. *hamma* means “black.” The Anglican Canon, Andrew Fausset refers to the classic Hebrew lexicon, “Gesenius” in saying “Japheth” comes “from *yaphah* ‘to be fair,’ from the fair complexion of Japheth and his descendants” (cf. Hebrew *yapha* “shine,” and *yiph`ah* “brightness”), and so e.g., “Japhet” means “father of *fair* descendants” (Fausset, A.R., *Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, pp. 269 & 328). Likewise, T.G. Pinches says “Shem means ‘dusky,’” “Japheth ‘fair,’” and “Ham ‘black’” (*International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, 1929, Hendrickson, USA, reprint 1996, 2:1324, 3:1568, 4:2759). The fact that only some of Ham’s descendants were black, indicates this word-play is a broad-brush impressionistic picture. Therefore while Sunday School children may be given pictures of Noah’s three sons that they colour in white, brown, and black, it should be explained to teenage children and adults that this is a God given artistic summary, and in the more detailed picture not all Hamites are black, whereas Australoid Shemites via Elam are.

of goats should take away sins” (Heb. 10:4), and so we look “to Jesus” and “the blood” “that speaketh better things” (Heb. 12:24). Clearly this is relevant when considering the issue of Antichrist prophecies, for example, the apostle John says that from NT times one there are “many antichrists” who type the Antichrist (I John 2:18).

*Specific application of general prophetic principles to the Antichrist.*

Scripture teaches there are “many antichrists” who in some way type *the* “Antichrist [who] shall come” (I John 2:18). Such symbolic antichrists pointing forward to the coming Antichrist include some unnamed New Testament antichrists who denied Almighty God his proper place by attacking the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (I John 2:22; 4:2,3; II John 7-9). But it would be too much to say that these and other New Testament antichrists were, e.g., brought to an end by the Second Advent (II Thess. 2:8). Thus they were symbolic types pointing forward to *the* Antichrist who we are told will “exalt himself above every ... god” (II Thess. 2:4, NASB; quoting Dan. 11:36) or “exalteth himself against all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4; ASV; quoting Dan. 11:36) or “exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4; AV; quoting Dan. 11:36); rule through a political division in some way divided first into ten and then into seven (Dan. 7:7,8,20; Rev. 13:1; 17:7); hold a position of political power that would allow him to persecute the saints for 1,260 days of years (Dan. 7:25; Rev. 13:5 cf. Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6), although in some parts of this domain the period was to “be shortened,” lest “there should no flesh be saved” (Matt. 24:22); perform miracles in association with a false prophet (Rev. 13:11-17); ultimately be worshipped by “everyone whose name hath not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain” (Rev. 13:8, ASV); and finally be destroyed by Christ at his Second Coming (Dan. 7:26,27; 12:1-4; II Thess. 2:8; Rev. 17 and 18).

Therefore in this commentary, both a prophetic type of the Antichrist, and also the ultimate fulfilment in the Antichrist, will be considered when prophecies are examined.

## CHAPTER 2

### **The Johannian Epistles - Amidst “many antichrists,” can the Roman Catholic Pope be fairly described as “The Roman Antichrist”?**

At the time of the Protestant Reformation, the Presbyterian *Second Scotch Confession* (1580) (also known as *The National Covenant*) refers to the Roman Catholic Pope as “that Roman Antichrist.”<sup>2</sup> Likewise, the term “Roman Antichrist” has been used as the designation for the Roman Pope in a number of works, including, for example, John Knox’s (circa 1514-1572) *The history of the Reformation ... after defection from the truth ... by that Roman Antichrist*<sup>3</sup>; or *Roman Antichrist* (1612) by Andrew Helwig (Irenochoraeus /

---

<sup>2</sup> *Westminster Confession of Faith*, With a Foreword by Alexander McPherson, Free Presbyterian Publications, Glasgow, Scotland, 1994, pp. 347-9 to the “Amen” in the second paragraph at p. 349 is the confession of 1580, thereafter at pp. 349-54 is the amended additions of 1638-9. The *Second Scotch Confession* (1580) can also be found in Philip Schaff’s *Creeeds of Christendom*, 1877,1905,1919, Baker, Michigan, 1966, 1969.

<sup>3</sup> Knox’s *History of the Reformation of religion within the realm of Scotland: containing the matters manifested unto this realm, after that horrible and universal defection from truth which came by means of that Roman Antichrist*. Other works include Fuke, W., *A Sermon Preached at Hampton Court on Sunday 12 November 1570*, wherein is plainly

Irenechoreaus) (*circa* 1572-1643). Can this description of the Pope of Rome as the “Roman Antichrist” be justified? The Greek word *anti* means “in the place of” or “instead of.” E.g., in Matt. 2:22 we read that “Archelaus did reign” “in the room of” (AV) or “in place of” (NASB) (Greek *anti*), “his father Herod.” Thus an antichrist is one who while claiming to acknowledge Christ in fact puts something other than Christ *in the place of* Christ. This has two forms, either one who puts an unBiblical Christ *in the place of* the true Biblical Christ, or one who puts himself *in the place of* Christ. For example, in New Testament times there were some heretics “who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.” This denial of the incarnation and Christ’s humanity (John 1:1-14), meant that they were putting a false and unBiblical Christ *in the place of* the true Biblical Christ, and so any such person was “a deceiver and an antichrist” (II John 7). (The *Athanasian Creed* also expresses the Biblical teaching that those who deny Christ’s full humanity are hell-bound heretics.)

The first century gnostics denied Christ’s humanity because they considered human flesh was intrinsically evil. Hence they denied that Christ had a real human body or was fully human. This failed to recognize that as “perfect man” (*Athanasian Creed*), Jesus had the human nature of Adam before the Fall, and so human nature is not intrinsically evil, although after the Fall all human beings, Christ alone excepted, are born with a sinful nature due to original sin. Since he who denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is an “antichrist” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), these gnostics showed themselves to be “antichrists” and so types of *the* “Antichrist” who was then clearly still future (I John 2:18).

Unlike these Asiatic gnostics of the first century A.D., the African gnostics of the second century A.D. in Egypt claimed that Christ was a composite of two persons, namely, the man Jesus (human), and the Son of God (Divine). They claimed that the Divine person entered into the human Jesus when he was baptized by John the Baptist, and then departed from him when he was seized by the Jews. Since he who denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is an “antichrist” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), these gnostics showed themselves to be “antichrists,” and so types of *the* “Antichrist” (I John 2:18).

The Apollinarians also denied Christ’s full humanity. Apollinarians were trichotomists who divided man into spirit, body, and soul, and claimed that whereas a human being has a soul (spirit + body + soul = man), Christ had the Divine Logos (spirit + body + Logos = Christ)<sup>4</sup>. This denial of Christ’s full humanity was condemned by the *Council of Constantinople* in 381 A.D. . In Scripture, man is a dichotomy of body and soul *or* spirit, i.e., “soul” and “spirit” are used interchangeably (soul / spirit + body =man) (Ps. 139:14-16; Matt. 10:28; I Cor. 7:34). The orthodox position that man is a dichotomy, of relevance in, among other things, rejecting the Apollinarian heresy, is found in the *Athanasian Creed*, which rightly says, “that a rational soul and body is one man,” and “we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity; and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body.”

The Nestorians also deny Christ’s humanity. They deny that the incarnate Christ was both fully God and fully man, by denying that the Son of God took humanity into himself

---

proved Babylon to be Rome (Rev. 14:8), printed by John Awdely, London, 1574, p. 8; Leahy F.S., *The Roman Antichrist*, or A Study in II Thessalonians 2:3-8, The Protestant Truth Society, London, 1957.

<sup>4</sup> Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 191-5.

from the time Mary “conceived” him (Matt. 1:20). They claim that the Son essentially possessed or took over a pre-existing human being after his conception i.e., something like a devil who devil-possesses a man. Thus they deny that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2), saying that Mary was a man-bearer but not the God-bearer (*Theotokos*<sup>5</sup>) contrary to Scripture (see “God” and “bear” in Isa. 7:14; 9:6, AV & NKJV<sup>6</sup>), for we read in Matt. 1:23 that Christ was “God” (Greek *Theos*) “with us,” and the virgin Mary did “bear” (NKJV) (Greek *texetai*, i.e., *tikto*) him. This heresy was condemned by both the *Council of Ephesus* in 431 A.D. and *Council of Chalcedon* in 451 A.D. which rightly refer to Mary as the “God-bearer” (Greek *Theotokos*).

The Nestorian Church continues to exist in Iraq, Iran, and Syria, and in more recent times has spread to e.g., America and Australia. It is known variously as the *East Syrian Church*, the *Assyrian Church*, or *Assyrian Church of the East*. It is sometimes wrongly thought to be an Oriental Orthodox Church, however, Oriental Orthodox Churches reject the Nestorian heresy condemned by the *Council of Ephesus* (431), while embracing the heresy of monophysitism condemned by the *Council of Chalcedon* (451). Liturgically, the Nestorian Church uses the *East Syrian Rite* (as opposed to the *West Syrian Rite* also known as the *Antiochene Rite*, liturgically used by the Oriental Orthodox *Syrian Orthodox Church*). The spiritual head of the Nestorian Church, is the *Catholicos Patriarch* (and he claims apostolic succession from the Apostle Thomas), also known as the *Patriarch of the East* (even though in more recent years he has resided in San Francisco, California, USA). This is a hereditary office passed from uncle to nephew. Since he who denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is an “antichrist” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), the Nestorian Patriarch of the East Syrian Church may be reasonably called the *East Syrian Antichrist*, and from ancient times such Patriarchs have showed themselves to be “antichrists” who thus are types of the “Antichrist” (I John 2:18).

The Monophysitists also deny that Christ was both fully Divine and fully human, claiming instead that he had only one nature which was Divine. Thus the Monophysitists clearly put a false Christ *in the place of* the true Christ. This heresy was condemned by the *Council of Chalcedon* in 451 A.D., though continues to be embraced by monophysitist Oriental Orthodox Churches (e.g., the Armenian Orthodox Church, Syrian Orthodox Church, and Coptic Orthodox Church). Hence I have previously noted that as “represented by *The Egyptian Antichrist* - the Coptic Orthodox Pope, Coptic Orthodoxy denies Christ’s humanity via the monophysitist heresy<sup>7</sup>.” Since he who denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh”

---

<sup>5</sup> *Theotokos* is from Gr. *Theos* (God) and *tokos* (*tikto*). *Tokos* (*tikto*) is used in Hosea 9:11, LXX, “Ephraim has flown away as a bird, their glories from the birth (*tikon*), and travail, and the conception.”

<sup>6</sup> In the Greek Septuagint, Isa. 7:14 says, “a virgin shall conceive” and bear (*texetai*, root *tikto*, from *teko* meaning “to bear”); and his name “Emmanuel” (Isa. 7:14, LXX) is explained in Isa. 8:8 (LXX) as “God” (*Theos*) with us.”

<sup>7</sup> McGrath, G.B. ,“Soteriology: Adam and the Fall,” *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 49, 1997, p. 263. I formerly supported a form of theistic macroevolution. But my thinking changed and I am now an old earth creationist, rejecting macroevolution and supporting separate species creation though allowing for microevolution within the limits of a taxonomical genus. See McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Intelligent Design from an Old Earth Creationist Perspective,” *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith* (PSCF), Vol. 58, No. 3 (Sept. 2006), pp. 252-253; “The Gap [School] ...,” PSCF, Vol. 59 (Dec. 2007), pp. 318-319); “Old Earth Creationists,”

is an “antichrist” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), the monophysitists have showed themselves to be “antichrists” and so types of *the* “Antichrist” (I John 2:18).

The Apostle John first refers to those “who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.” He then says, “he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 7,11). This means that anyone who gives a spiritual recognition to a person claiming to be a Christian, who denies the humanity of Christ by the monophysitist heresy or some other heresy, is deemed by God to be a “partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 11), i.e., deemed to also deny “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (II John 7), even if he personally believes in the incarnation. That is because, by giving a spiritual greeting to such a Trinitarian heretic, he fails to do what he can to neutralize his influence. Notably then, one way that the Popes of Rome have come to deny “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (II John 7) in the post *Vatican II Council* era, is by their practice which “biddeth” “God speed” to monophysitist heretics, by which they thus become “partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 11). In 1970, the Roman Pope, Paul VI, and Armenian Orthodox Patriarch, Vasken I, signed a “Joint Declaration on Unity.” Here we read that the Pope and Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of the Armenian Orthodox Church, “thank the Lord for permitting them to pray together, to meet and to exchange the kiss of peace.” Their “common quest and collaboration must be based on the reciprocal acknowledgment of a common Christian faith,” between” the [Roman] Catholic Church and” “Armenian [Orthodox] Church” as a “truly Christian brotherhood<sup>8</sup>.”

Furthermore, in 1984, the Pope of Rome formally greeted another monophysitist heretic, this time the Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of the Syrian Orthodox Church. In 1984, John-Paul II and the Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Zacca I, signed the *Common Declaration between the Roman Catholic Church and the Syrian Orthodox Church concerning the definition of the Council of Chalcedon*<sup>9</sup>. This *Common Declaration* (1984) was a continuation of “our profession of common faith” made by the Roman Catholic “Pope Paul VI and” a predecessor of Zacca I’s, “Patriarch” “Jacob III” “in 1971.” In this *Common Declaration* (1984), the Roman Pope and Syrian Patriarch state, “We find” “no real basis for” “divisions and schisms” “between us concerning the doctrine of incarnation;” and “we confess the true doctrine concerning Christ our Lord, notwithstanding the differences of interpretation of such a doctrine which arose at the time of the Council of Chalcedon.” Thus once again, the Pope of Rome “biddeth” a monophysitist “God speed,” and “is partaker of his evil deeds,” for they “confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist” (II John 7,10,11).

In the seventh century A.D., the Nestorian heretics and Monophysitist heretics were flourishing under the Mohammedans in the Middle East. It seems that the Mohammedans who denied Christ’s Divinity had a special sympathy for those apostate “Christians” who denied Christ’s full humanity. For example, the Nestorians had made a treaty with both Mohammed and later Omar, giving them special privileges. For instance, in Persia the Mohammedans employed Nestorians in important government positions; and in Syria and

---

*English Churchman* (7779) (6 & 13 Nov. 2009), p. 2; “Old Earth Creation,” *English Churchman* (7782) (18 & 25 Dec. 2009), p. 2; “Hebrew Genealogies,” *English Churchman* (7788) (12 & 19 March, 2010) p. 2.

<sup>8</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 533-4.

<sup>9</sup> See the *Common Declaration of Pope John Paul II and Zacca I* ([www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/pont.../rc\\_pc\\_christuni\\_doc\\_198410623\\_jp-ii-zakka-i\\_en.htm](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pont.../rc_pc_christuni_doc_198410623_jp-ii-zakka-i_en.htm)).

Egypt the Monophysitists also held high positions. In 630 A.D. the Eastern Roman Emperor Heraclius, desirous of bringing both the Nestorians and Monophysitists back, held a conferences in 622 and 629 from which came the Monothelite formulae, “that in Jesus Christ there was, after the union of the two natures, but one will and one operation.”<sup>10</sup>

Thus the monothelite heretics denied that Christ was fully God and fully man by denying his full humanity in claiming Christ had only “one Divine-human operation or will.” If Christ was not fully human then he could not be the Second Adam and Saviour of the world (Rom. 5:14; I Cor. 15:45). Moreover, how could he who was both fully God and fully man be said to have “learned” (Heb. 5:8), or as he aged to have “increased in wisdom” and “favour with God” (Luke 2:52)? Only by recognizing, in the words of the *Third Council of Constantinople* (681), that he had a human will or “will of the flesh” which he “subjected to the Divine will,” that is, he had “two natural wills in him and two natural operations, without division, without change, without separation, without partition, without confusion,” with “his human will following his Divine and omnipotent will, not resisting it nor striving against it, but rather subject to it,” for Christ “himself says, ‘I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of the Father that sent me’ (John 6:38).” (Though it condemnation of the monothelite heresy was correct, this *Council of Constantinople III* incorporated error elsewhere.) Or as stated in Homily 2, Book 2, (Part 2), of Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, “Constantine, Bishop of Rome [708-715 A.D.], assembled a Council of bishops in the West Church, and did condemn ... the heresy of the Monothelites, not without a cause indeed, and very justly.” Since he who denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is an “antichrist” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), the Monothelites showed themselves to be “antichrists” and so types of *the* “Antichrist” (I John 2:18).

In debates over the preceding centuries culminating in the *Fourth Lateran Council* of 1215 A.D., the transubstantiation heretics also deny Christ’s full humanity. On the one hand, since Christ is fully God, he is spiritually omnipresent and so can, for example, be interpersonally present with believers whenever and wherever they meet (Matt. 18:20). But on the other hand, since Christ is fully human, his natural human body can only be present in one place at one time. Thus after his resurrection, Jesus said to “tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there they shall see me” (Matt. 28:10), or at his ascension “he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of” “sight” “into heaven” (Acts 1:9,11); and at his Second Advent he shall “so come in like manner” from “heaven” (Acts 1:11). Thus Christ’s human body is in heaven between the time of his ascension and the time of his Second Coming (Acts 1:9-11). But though it is contrary to the truth of a person’s humanity that a human being can be bodily present in more than one place at once; and though it is further contrary to the truth that Christ’s human body is in heaven till the Second Advent; nevertheless the doctrine of transubstantiation claims Christ’s very body and blood are brought down from heaven to earth, and are present in many places at once wherever the Roman Mass is celebrated. Thus the Romish doctrine of the Mass effectively denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John. 4:2), that is, it denies his full humanity, and since this is the official teaching of the Roman Church since its *Fourth Lateran Council* (1215) presided over by the authority of the Roman Pope, and reiterated in its *Council of Trent* (1563) also presided over by the authority of the Roman Pope, it follows that the Pope of Rome constitutes the *Roman Antichrist* and is

---

<sup>10</sup> See Mosheim, J.L., *An Ecclesiastical History*, translated by Archibald Maclaine, Blackie & Sons, Glasgow, Scotland, UK, 1831, Century 1, chapter 5, section 6; Century 2, chapter 5, section 10; Century 5, chapter 5, section 9; Century 7, chapter 5, sections 3,4,12; Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 305-308.

one of those “deceivers “who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,” and so “is a deceiver and an antichrist” (II John 7).

The denial of Christ’s full humanity in the transubstantiation heresy of Roman Catholicism, was recognized by the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury (1533-1556), the Marian martyr, Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556). Concerning “transubstantiation,” Cranmer rightly said in 1550, “the Papists ... say that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ ... is ... really, substantially, corporally, and naturally, in or under ... the sacramental bread and wine.” “But the true” Christian “faith, grounded upon God’s most infallible Word teacheth us, that our Saviour Christ (as concerning his man’s nature and bodily presence) is gone up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and there shall he tarry until the world’s end, at which time he shall come again ..., as he saith himself in many Scriptures: ‘I forsake the world’, saith he, ‘and go to my Father’ [John 16:28]. And in another place he saith: ‘You shall ever have poor men among you, but me you shall not ever have’ [Matt. 26:11]. ... And St. Peter saith in the Acts, ‘That heaven must receive Christ, until the time that all things shall be restored’ [Acts 3:21]. And St. Paul, writing to the Colossians, agreeth ... saying, ‘Seek for the things that be above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of the Father’ [Col. 3:1]. And St. Paul, speaking of the very sacrament, saith: ‘As often as you shall eat this bread and drink this cup, show forth the Lord’s death until he come’ [I Cor. 11:26]. ‘Till he come,’ saith St. Paul, signifying that he is not there corporally present.” “And although Christ in his human nature substantially, really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly, be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present.” This is clearly a symbolic view of the Lord’s Supper, comparable to that of Ulrich Zwingli’s.

Moreover, Cranmer’s recognition of this element of the transubstantiation heresy was adopted, and this heresy formally condemned (on the advice of John Knox), by the (Anglican) *Church of England* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1552) and *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) in the rubric at the end of *The Communion Service*. The 1552 rubric says: “it is not meant” by “kneeling” at Communion, “that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there” “of Christ’s natural flesh and blood.” For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ’s natural body, to be in more places than one, at one time.” The 1662 rubric modified this wording, but stated the same basic truth. The 1662 rubric says: “That ... no adoration ... ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood.” For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances, and therefore must not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (emphasis mine). (Louis Berkhof also notes with respect to “the two natures in Christ,” that the “person of Christ” “can be regarded as omnipresent” in his Divine nature, “but also as being limited at any particular time to a single place” in his human nature)<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Cranmer’s *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood*, 1550, in Wright, C.H.H. (Editor), London 1907 reprinting from *The Remains of Thos. Cranmer*, collected and arranged by Rev. Henry Jenkyns, Oxford

The rubric in both 1552 and 1662 clearly condemns Romish transubstantiation (also adhered to by the semi-Romanist Eastern Orthodox Churches). Concerns historically isolated in the Anglican 39 Articles include the fact that this denies the completed atonement of Christ (Heb. 9:25-28; 13:20). Thus Article 31 says, “The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is one other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

But the change in this rubric from “of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” in the 1552 Edwardian prayer book to “any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” in the 1662 Caroline prayer book, was a change from condemning just transubstantiation (1552) to condemning both transubstantiation and consubstantiation (1662). This occurred as Restoration Anglicans wished to close off for all time their former permissive view towards a small number of Anglicans who followed Luther’s consubstantiation. This followed as a consequence of their bad experience of Laudianism, in which Archbishop Laud and those in the Laudian circle had first adopted Luther’s consubstantiation, but then did with it that which neither Luther nor the Lutherans ever did, and used it as a mechanism to try and “justify” their adoration of the so called “corporeal presence” of Christ “in, under, and around” the consecrated elements. (This wickedness was revived by Puseyites and their semi-Puseyite spin-offs from the 19th century.) This 1662 rubric condemns both this Laudian circle practice of consubstantiation “adoration,” as well as Roman Catholic transubstantiation “adoration,” as “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.” But the Rubric simultaneously condemns extremist Puritans such as Samuel Rutherford, saying, “Whereas it is ordained in this Office ... of the Lord’s Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order it well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ ..., and for the avoiding of ... profanation and disorder ...;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity,” e.g., some of those under Rutherford’s spell; “or out of malice and obstinacy,” such as is the case with Rutherford himself, “be misconstrued and depraved: it is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and body. For ... that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians ... .” Thus the Rubric is both anti-Laud and anti-Rutherford, and regards both of these key persons from the civil war era of the 1640s and 1650s as undesirable extremist figures.

This anti-Laudian Final Rubric therefore qualifies the 1662 prayer book’s Office of *King Charles the Martyr* in that it puts a distance between King Charles I and Archbishop Laud. I.e., while Anglicans were prepared to stand by King Charles I as the lawful king who died for the Biblical teaching of such passages of Scripture as Matt. 22:21 and I Peter 2:17, and hence died as a specifically Christian martyr in 1649; they did not do so in a way that was uncritical of him, or that doubted that at times he was unwise. In particular, this Rubric makes it clear that they did not endorse or support the actions of Archbishop Laud, and considered his teachings of “adoration” to be nothing less than “idolatry.” This type of

sentiment is also seen in the later modifications to the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* which from 1689 also included celebrating William of Orange's arrival on 5 Nov. 1688; and associated Acts of Parliament that stopped future monarchs from marrying Roman Catholics, the way both Charles I and Charles II had. (Thus the traditional Reformed Anglican view of Charles I, maintained since the 19th century by traditionalist Low Church Evangelical Anglicans, is to be distinguished from the much later Puseyite view which badly distorts and misuses Charles I's Day so as to promote their shocking apostasy from Protestant principles.)

In reiterating its transubstantiation teaching, the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent* (1563) claimed, for example, "in the sacrament of the" "eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of" "Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ" (Session 13, Canon 1). But the transubstantiation heresy which denies Christ's full humanity, has also been endorsed beyond Roman Catholicism by Eastern Orthodoxy. The Eastern Orthodox Churches (e.g., Greek Orthodox, Rumanian Orthodox, or Russian Orthodox), like the Roman Church and unlike the monophysitist Oriental Orthodox Churches, theoretically believe in Christ's humanity since they claim to believe in the *Council of Chalcedon* (451). But in 1672, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus, convened the *Synod of Jerusalem* to which sixty-eight Eastern Orthodox bishops and clergy came. Philip Schaff is surely correct when he says the *Synod of Jerusalem* "is the most important in the modern history of the Eastern" Orthodox "Church, and may be compared to the" Roman Catholic "Council of Trent." That is because, both the *Council of Trent* (1545-63) (Roman Catholic) and *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672) (Eastern Orthodox), were principally summoned in order to condemn the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation. In the case of the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), this followed the conversion to Protestantism of an Archbishop of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar (1572-1638), and subsequent largely unsuccessful attempts by him to Protestantize the Greek Orthodox Church<sup>12</sup>.

Among other things, this *Synod of Jerusalem* claimed: man is justified by a combination of faith and works (Article 13); seven sacraments (Article 15); baptismal regeneration (Article 16); the doctrine of purgatory although the term "purgatory" is avoided (Article 17); that the canon of Scripture includes the Apocrypha (Question and Answer 3); and the worship of the saints, particularly Mary the mother of Jesus, whom it said is the object of *hyperdulia* as distinct from the normal *dulia* worship of the saints, and also the *worshipful veneration* of, for example, crosses and images of Christ and saints (Question and Answer 4). And as Schaff observes, it claimed in Article 17 that "the eucharist is both a sacrament and sacrifice, in which the very body and blood of Christ are truly and really" "present under the figure and type" "of bread and wine." Thus "the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation" "is taught as strongly as words can make it."<sup>13</sup>

This *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672) met in the Patriarchate of the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Jerusalem* and included, for example, Russian Orthodox representatives. In, for example, the Russian Orthodox *Longer Catechism* of 1839, approved by the Russian Orthodox Governing Synod, we read in the section "On the Communion," that "At the

---

<sup>12</sup> See the discussion of Lucar in my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), at "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," in section "2) The Monastic legacy" (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at "Commentary on the Received Text").

<sup>13</sup> Schaff, P., *The Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1877 (3 volumes), Volume 2, p. 136; Schaff, P., *A History of the Creeds of Christendom*, with translations, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1877, pp. 61,64-7.

moment of this act” (the words of institution), “the bread and wine are changed, or transubstantiated, into the very body of Christ, and into the very blood of Christ” (Section 339). “How are we to understand the word *transubstantiation*? In the exposition of the faith by the Eastern Patriarchs, it is said ... transubstantiation is ... that the bread truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true body of the Lord, and the wine the very blood of the Lord ... . In like manner John Damascene ... writes thus: ‘It is *truly that body*, united with Godhead, *which had its origin from the Holy Virgin* ... because the bread and wine themselves are changed into the body and blood of God’ .<sup>14</sup>”

But as already observed, though it is contrary to the truth of a person’s humanity that a human being can be bodily present in more than one place at once; and contrary to the truth that Christ’s human body is in heaven till the Second Advent; nevertheless, the Eastern Orthodox adoption of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation claims Christ’s very body and blood are brought down from heaven to earth, and are present in many places at once wherever the Eastern Orthodox Eucharist is celebrated. Thus the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of transubstantiation effectively denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John. 4:2), that is, it denies his full humanity. This means that the various Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs are antichrists, being among those “deceivers “who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” and so they each constitute “a deceiver and an antichrist” (II John 7).

Thus, for example, the Russian Orthodox *Patriarch of Moscow*, whose church is second in numerical size, exceeded only by that of the Roman Catholic Church, may be fairly described as the *Russian Antichrist* or *Moscow Antichrist*. Or the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople in Istanbul, Turkey, may be fairly described as a *Constantinoplean Antichrist*. Notably, because the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople started The Great Schism when he broke with Rome in 1054, he has a position of unprecedented historical importance in Eastern Orthodoxy and is also known as the *Ecumenical Patriarch* of Eastern Orthodoxy. He is regarded by other Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs as *the first among equals* i.e., this is a ceremonial honour given to him by autocephalous Eastern Orthodox churches which brings with it no accompanying jurisdictional power in their churches.

Or the Bulgarian Orthodox Patriarch constitutes the *Bulgarian Antichrist* and the Archbishop of Constantia the *Cypriote Antichrist*. Then there is the Rumanian Orthodox Church, which is the largest ecclesiastically independent church in the Balkans of Eastern Europe, and the Church that most Rumanians belong to. The Eastern Orthodox Patriarchate of Rumania (or Romania) was formed in 1925 from the Rumanian dioceses of Moldavia, Walachia, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and Transylvania. This Patriarchate thus includes Transylvania. But like the sinister fictional form of Count Dracula from Transylvania who is under the influence of devils as symbolized by the “unclean” “bird” of the “bat” (Lev. 11:19; Rev. 18:2); there are even more bats in the belfry of Transylvania. For in the “spirit of antichrist” and under the influence of a “spirit that confesseth not” “that Jesus Christ is come

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61; *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church*, Examined and Approved by the Most Holy Governing Synod, and published by Order of His Imperial Majesty, Synodical Press, Moscow, 1839 in: Schaff’s *Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches*, *op. cit.*, Volume 2, pp. 445,495,497-8 (my emphasis on Damascene’s words). Cf. similar transubstantiation statements in the Confession of Peter Moglias, Russian Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiaff, Question & Answer 56, approved by the *Synod of Jerusalem* in 1672 (*Ibid.*, pp. 275,335-6); or the Eastern Orthodox *Synods of Constantinople* (1672 & 1691) (Schaff’s *History of the Creeds of Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 67).

in the flesh,” (I John 4:2,3), there lurks in the dark spiritual shadows of Transylvania and other places of Rumania, the very real *Rumanian Antichrist*, the Patriarch of the Rumanian Orthodox Church, surrounded by invisible but real devils who may be artistically conceptualized as bats (Deut. 14:18; Rev. 18:2).

Thus even in our own day and time, we have a spectacular, dazzling, and disturbing array of what the Apostle John calls “many antichrists” (I John 2:18). For through reference to the denial of Christ’s humanity in the Nestorian heresy we discover that the *Catholicos-Patriarch* of the *East Syrian Church* constitutes the *East Syrian Antichrist*. Through reference to the denial of Christ’s humanity in the Monophysitist heresy, we find that all the Patriarchs of the monophysitist Oriental Orthodox Churches are antichrists<sup>15</sup>, for example, the *Egyptian Antichrist* of the Coptic Orthodox and Ethiopian Orthodox Churches, or the *West Syrian Antichrist* of the Syrian Orthodox Church (which liturgically uses the *West Syrian Rite* as opposed to the *East Syrian Rite* of the Nestorian *East Syrian Church*). Then through reference to the denial of Christ’s humanity in the transubstantiation heresy, we find that all the Patriarchs of the Eastern Orthodox Churches are antichrists, e.g., the *Russian Antichrist* of the Russian Orthodox Church, or the *Constantinoplean Antichrist* of the Greek Orthodox Church. And then through reference to this same transubstantiation heresy which denies Christ’s full humanity, we find that the Western Patriarch of the Roman Catholic Church, the Roman Pope, constitutes the *Roman Antichrist*. Nevertheless, since the transubstantiation heresy was first formally adopted by the Roman Church’s *Fourth Lateran Council* (1215), and then reiterated in its *Council of Trent* (1563), with the Eastern Orthodox Churches formally adopting this Romish notion much later in their *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), and since the Roman Catholic Church is far larger and more influential than any (monophysitist) Oriental Orthodox or (Chalcedonian) Eastern Orthodox Church, I think it reasonable at this point of the analysis to keep the focus on the *source* antichrist for the transubstantiation heresy, namely, the *Roman Antichrist*.

Thus on the one hand, there is an area of agreement between Roman Catholic (and Eastern Orthodox) teaching on the Holy Trinity and the true teaching of the Holy Trinity taught by orthodox Protestants. The Protestant Reformers recognized that the creedal doctrine of the 380 Nicene Fathers and 150 Constantinoplean Fathers, Trinitarian, and anti-Pelagian doctrine in the four General Councils of the Church Fathers’ Era (post New Testament to 451), namely, Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451) was Biblically sound. Furthermore, while Protestants make more qualifications of the fifth (Constantinople II, 553) and sixth (Constantinople III, 681) General Councils, they uphold their Trinitarian teachings and clarifications on monophysitism (condemned at Chalcedon in 451) in their condemnation of the monothelites<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> The *Oriental Orthodox* Communion of Churches includes: the Armenian Orthodox Church (Armenian Apostolic Church); the Coptic Orthodox Church (Coptic Orthodox Church of Alexandria); the Eritrean Orthodox Church (Tewahedo Church); the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (Tewahedo Church); the Malankara Orthodox Church of India (or Indian Orthodox Church, or Orthodox Syrian Church of the East, or Syrian Jacobite Church in Malabar); and the Syrian Orthodox Church (the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch, or the Syrian Jacobite Church).

<sup>16</sup> Thus the condemnatory “anathema” of the fifth General Council of Constantinople II (553) against those who rightly rejected the teaching of an “ever-virgin Mary” (contrary to e.g., Matt. 1:25; 12:46-50); or the unBiblical claim of the sixth General Council of Constantinople III (681) to Divine “inspiration” for general councils as possessing “God-

These are areas of agreement between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. E.g., the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530) (1:1) upholds the “Nicene Synod,” recognizing the “three Persons of the same essence and power, who also are coeternal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” “They condemn all heresies which have sprung up against this,” such “as the Manichees, who set down two principles, good and evil<sup>17</sup>; in the same manner the Valentinians<sup>18</sup>, Arians<sup>19</sup>, Eunomians<sup>20</sup>, Mohammedans<sup>21</sup>, and all suck like. They condemn

---

inspired fathers” (Greek *Theopneuston pateron*) (contrary to the teaching that prophets existed only in Bible times e.g., Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20); are examples of where these 5th and 6th Councils taught error, i.e., “when” “General Councils” “be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God” (Article 21, *39 Articles*). However, their Trinitarian teaching was correct, though it only has “strength” and “authority” because “it may be declared that” it was “taken out of holy Scripture” (Article 21, *39 Articles*).

<sup>17</sup> Manicheism (Manichaeism) was founded by Mani of Persia (216-c. 276). As known to us in Christian Church history, the Manichees (Manicheans / Manichaens) were a religious syncretism that included elements of Christianity, Buddhism, and Zoroastrianism. It was a dualistic religion that regarded the world as a fusion of spirit and matter manifesting good and evil respectively. Such thinking is clearly antithetical to the doctrine of the incarnation, i.e., the Son of God “taking humanity into [his] Divinity” (*Athanasian Creed*), since it considers God (“good” “spirit”) cannot take into himself human flesh (“bad” “matter”); and thus denies that *Christ is fully God* as stated by the Nicene Council. E.g., the Carthage Manicheans denied that Christ had a body. While Manicheism Proper was a non-Christian religion, when a syncretism occurred between it and the Christian religion, such as occurred among the Manichean Cathars of Albi that the Roman Church falsely tried to confuse in people’s minds with the orthodox Waldensians of Albi under the generic name of “Albigenses,” then this semi-Manichean group constituted perpetrated a specific Christian heresy of Manicheism. E.g., Augustine of Hippo, who in time would become a church father and one of the four doctors of the (Western) Church, was as a young man ensnared by such Manichean heretics at Carthage for just under 10 years, before, by the grace of God, escaping from their evil clutches - see “DOCTRINAL PRINCIPLES USED IN THIS COMMENTARY (Optional Reading),” section, “Broad Reformation Protestantism. First and Second Stages of the Reformation,” at “(6) Federalist Reform.”

<sup>18</sup> Valentinus of Alexandria (2nd century) in north Africa, established Valentinian schools at Rome and Alexandria. His Docetist syncretism of Christianity and Gnosticism included a religious dualism that adopted a pagan Greek notion of matter or flesh being the sphere of evil and corruption. Their heresy, known as Defeatism, (from the Greek, *doeskin*, to appear), therefore denied that the Son of God took upon himself human flesh, claiming that he had an unreal *appearance* of one who “is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2).

<sup>19</sup> The Arian heresy denies the Divinity of the Son, and is named after Aries of Alexandria (c. 250-336) in North Africa. It has many variations and includes semi-Arians who attribute a lesser Divinity to the Son. This heresy again emerged some years after 1530, with the anti-Trinitarian Socials who under Faustus Oscines (1539-1604), founded the Social Church of Poland in the late 1570s. When that church was closed in 1638, the Socials spread their errors to Transylvania, and parts of Western Europe. Socialism was an antecedent of Unitarianism (see Samosatenes, *infra*).

<sup>20</sup> Euonymus of Cappadocia (c. 335-394) in Asia Minor (modern Turkey), was an

also the Samosatenes, old and new; who when they earnestly contend that there is but one [Divine] Person, do craftily and wickedly trifle” “about the Word [the Son] and Holy Ghost, that they are not distinct Persons, but that the Word [John 1:1:1] signifieth a vocal word, and the Spirit a motion created in things<sup>22</sup>.”

Or in 1558 Reformation Anglicanism defined “heresy” as teaching contrary to: (1) “the words of the canonical Scriptures,” (2) “the first four General Councils, or such others as have only used the words of the Holy Scriptures,” or (3) whatever is “hereafter ... so declared by the Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation.<sup>23</sup>” Or Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles* says, “Constantine, Bishop of Rome [708-715 A.D.], assembled a Council of bishops in the West Church, and did condemn ... the heresy of the Monothelites, not without a cause indeed, and very justly” (Homily 2, Book 2). Hence, e.g., Louis Berkhof refers favourably to “the council of Nicea in 321,” “the Council of Constantinople in 381,” “the Council of Chalcedon in 451” - which like the preceding Council of Ephesus condemned the Nestorian heresy by stating that Mary was the God-bearer (Greek *theotokos*), and states that while “the Eutychian error was continued by the monophysites and the monothelites,” it “was finally overcome by the church.<sup>24</sup>” Likewise, in its formal documents, the Roman Church (and Eastern Orthodox Churches) accepts the Trinitarian teaching of the first four general councils, together with the Trinitarian doctrine of the fifth and sixth general councils, so that they would agree that the monothelite heresy is to be condemned; and in its formal documents the Roman Church (unlike the Eastern Orthodox Churches) also accepts the *Athanasian Creed* whose doctrine is also endorsed by orthodox Protestants.

But on the other hand, since (like the Eastern Orthodox Churches,) the Church of Rome denies the full humanity of Christ through the transubstantiation heresy, and since he who denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” is an “antichrist” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7),

---

Arian heretic. With the Arian bishop, Aetius, he established the Eunomians, a heretical Arian sect with ecclesiastical headquarters in Constantinople (modern Istanbul).

<sup>21</sup> Mohammed of north Africa (died 637), was a false prophet and founder of Mohammedanism (Islam). His infidel Mohammedan (Muslim) religion is a syncretism of Christianity, Arianism, Judaism, and other elements. Among other errors, Mohammedans deny the doctrine of the Trinity. (See Rodwell’s translation of Mohammed’s *Koran*, *op. cit.*, Suras 3:73; 4:169; 5:77; 43:57; 112.)

<sup>22</sup> Monarchianism was a second and third century heresy that denied the Trinity and claimed only the Father was Divine. It developed two heretical schools. 1) Sabellians (also called Modalistic Monarchianism, Sabellianism, or Modalism). In the third century, Sabellius claimed that there is only one Divine Person, and he manifested himself in different modes as either the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit. 2) Samosatenes (also called Dynamic or Adoptionist Monarchianism). In the third century, Paul of Samosata (in Syria), who in 260 became Bishop of Antioch in Syria, said Christ was a mere man, who had been constituted Son of God by the high degree of Divine wisdom and power in him. This heresy is followed in modern times by many of those in the Unitarian cult (one of the many minor cults). The “new” Samosatenes referred to by the *Augsburg Confession* in 1530, include anti-Trinitarian Anabaptists, e.g., Ludwig Haetzer (1490-1529); and Unitarian cult writers such as Martin Cellarium (1499-1564), who was known to Luther, and who in 1527 promulgated Unitarian views. In the years immediately after 1530, similar anti-Trinitarian views are found in the 1531 and 1532 writings of Michael Servetus (c. 1511-1553).

<sup>23</sup> *Blackstone’s Commentaries*, Vol. 4, p. 48; Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, p. 147.

<sup>24</sup> Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 306-7.

the Roman Antichrist and the Church of Rome that he is the head of, stands exposed as peddling an unorthodox Christology, and thus an unorthodox Trinity.

There is another way, from the late twentieth century onwards, that the Church of Rome came to deny “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2; II John 7). The Oriental Orthodox Churches accept the Trinitarian teaching of the first three General Councils, Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431). But they reject the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), which rightly recognized that Christ was “of one substance (Greek *homoousios*) with the Father as regards his Divinity, and at the same time, of one substance with us as regards his humanity; like us in all respects, except sin; as regards his Divinity, begotten of the Father from eternity, but as regards his humanity, begotten for us men and for our salvation of Mary the Virgin, the God-bearer (Greek *Theotokos*); one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person.” The *Athanasian Creed* likewise says, “The correct belief then, is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten from eternity; and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and body.” “Although he is God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ. He is one, not by changing Divinity into humanity, but by taking humanity into Divinity. He is one altogether, not by mingling of substance, but by unity of Person. For in the same way that a rational soul and body is one man, so God and man is one Christ.”

The Oriental Orthodox Churches are non-Chalcedonian, rejecting the truth that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2; II John 7), by embracing the monophysitist heresy condemned by the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) which denies Christ’s full humanity. But in 1971, the Pope of Rome, Paul VI, and the Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, the Patriarch of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Moran Mor Ignatius Jacob III, made a “profession of common faith in the incarnation of” “Jesus Christ.” Then in 1984, referring to this earlier declaration (4), the Pope of Rome, John Paul II, and the Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, the Patriarch of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Moran Mor Ignatius Zakka I, also made a “Common Declaration.” In this, they expressed a common desire “to strengthen further the relationship between their two sister Churches, the Church of Rome and the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch” (1); “to widen the horizon of their brotherhood and affirm herewith the terms of the deep spiritual communion which already unites them and the prelates, clergy, and faithful of both their Churches” (2). The two said, “we find today no real basis for the sad divisions and schisms that” “arose between us concerning the doctrine of the incarnation. In words and life we confess the true doctrine concerning Christ our Lord, notwithstanding the differences of such a doctrine which arose at the time of the Council of Chalcedon” (3) “Hence we wish to reaffirm solemnly our profession of common faith in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, as Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Moran Mor Ignatius Jacob III did in 1971” (4)

“Sacramental life finds in the Holy Eucharist its fulfilment and its summit” (6). “The other” six “sacraments” (referred to in 6 & 7), “which the [Roman] Catholic and the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch hold together,” “are ordered to that celebration of the holy Eucharist which is the centre of sacramental life and the chief visible expression of church communion” (7). “Our identity in faith, though not yet complete, entitles us to envisage collaboration between our Churches in pastoral care, in situations which nowadays are

frequent both because of the dispersion of our faithful throughout the world, and because of the precarious conditions of these difficult times. It is not rare, in fact, for our faithful to find access to a priest of their own Church materially or morally impossible. Anxious to meet their needs and with their spiritual benefit in mind, we authorize them in such cases to ask for the sacraments of penance, eucharist, and anointing of the sick from lawful priests of either of our two sister Churches, when they need them” (9).

The Roman Church teaches that such “admission to [Roman] Catholic Eucharistic communion is confined to particular cases of those” “who have a faith in the sacrament in conformity with that of the [Roman] Church.” “Apart from danger of death,” the Church of Rome allows this on what its “Directory” calls ““other cases of ... urgent necessity”” (*On Admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church*, 4:2;6)<sup>25</sup>. This means that for this to be allowed under the “Common Declaration of Pope John Paul II and Hh Mar Ignatius Zakka II” of 23 June 1984<sup>26</sup>, the Church of Rome adjudges the Syrian Orthodox “eucharistic” doctrine to be “in conformity with” the Roman Church’s transubstantiation. Thus there is a unity between these two churches in denying the humanity of Christ through the transubstantiation heresy.

However, to the extent that following the 1971 agreement with Pope Paul VI, Pope John-Paul II then entered a “Common Declaration” with the Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, stating that, “we find” “no real basis for the sad divisions and schisms that” “arose between us concerning the doctrine of the incarnation;” and we confess the true doctrine concerning Christ our Lord, notwithstanding the differences in interpretation of such doctrine which arose at the time of the Council of Chalcedon” (3), it follows that the Pope of Rome now clearly “biddeth” “God speed” to “a deceiver and an antichrist” “who” will “confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.” Thus the Pope of Rome “is partaker of” the “evil deeds” (II John 7,10,11) of Oriental Orthodoxy which denies the great Christological truth found in the Council of Chalcedon. Writing before these events, the Reformed theological, Louis Berkhof said, “From the earliest times, and particularly since the Council of Chalcedon, the Church confessed the doctrine of the two natures of Christ.” “It was and remained ever since for the Church an article of faith.” “In this confession Roman Catholics and Protestants stand shoulder to shoulder.”<sup>27</sup> But since the late twentieth century, it can no longer be said that, “In this confession Roman Catholics and Protestants stand shoulder to shoulder;” since the Pope of Rome now formally gives his spiritual recognition to, or “greet” (II John 11, NKJV) those who deny the humanity of Christ via the monophysitist heresy, and associated with this reject the doctrine of Christ’s two natures set forth in the *Council of Chalcedon* (451). Thus by giving his spiritual recognition to the Oriental Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, since the late twentieth century this is another way that the Pope of Rome has been found to “confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2; II John 7). That is, by bidding “God speed” to the Patriarch of the monophysitist Syrian Orthodox Church from 1971 onwards, the Pope and through him the Roman Church, “is partaker of his evil deeds,” which “confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (II John 7,10,11).

Yet there is another way that the Bishop of Rome qualifies as *The Roman Antichrist* and Roman Catholicism constitutes an antichrist religion, namely, they “denieth that Jesus is

<sup>25</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 557,559.

<sup>26</sup> *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 85, 3 (1993) 138-41, and *Information Service* 55 (1984/II-III) 61-63.

<sup>27</sup> Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 315-6, cf. 321.

the” Messiah or “Christ?” and “so is antichrist” (I John 2:22); for the Christ that Roman Catholicism presents is a false Christ that it puts *in the place of* the Biblical Christ. It is not difficult to show that the Roman Church does this. For example, the Messiah was to be both fully human and fully Divine since Isaiah says “a child” was to be “born” of “a virgin” (human) (Isa. 7:14; 9:6; Matt. 1:23) “and his name shall be” “The mighty God” (Divine) (Isa. 9:6); and concerning his humanity he further says of himself speaking through David, “Ears thou hast digged for me” (Ps. 40:6, ASV footnote), and since this requires that he was to have a human body upon which these “ears” were to be “digged,” this Messianic prophesy means, “a body hast thou prepared me” (Heb. 10:6 quoting Ps. 40:6). Indeed the humanity of the Messiah is early taught and predicted in the Old Testament, for the “seed” of “the woman” was to be of Adam’s race (Gen. 3:15,20), and this “seed” was also to be a descendant of Shem through Abraham’s Jewish race (Gen. 10:22; 11:10-29;13:15; 17:8; Luke 3:34,36,38; Gal. 3:16), for Christ “took on him the seed” or race “of Abraham” (Heb. 2:16). But as already observed the Roman Church and Roman Pontiff (like the Eastern Orthodox Churches and Eastern Patriarchs) deny Christ’s full humanity through their teaching of transubstantiation.

Furthermore, the promised Messiah or Christ of the Old Testament was to suffer for man’s sins, be his redeemer, and be his intercessor or mediator. For instance, the OT prophet Isaiah says of him, “he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows,” “he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities,” “with his stripes we are healed,” “thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin,” “my righteous servant” “shall” “justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities,” “he hath poured out his soul unto death,” “he bare the sin of many, and” as mediator “made intercession for the transgressors” (Isa. 53:4,5,10,11,12). However “Who?” says the Apostle John, “is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the” Messiah or “Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son” (I John 2:22). The Roman Antichrist denies that the Messiah or Christ is man’s redeemer and mediator and thus that he “is the” Biblical “Christ,” *infra*, and since he denies the Son he thereby denies the Father also, for “whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father” (I John 2:23). Let us not consider Christ as redeemer and mediator in more detail.

The Biblical Christ (Isa. 53:7; Acts 8:32; I Peter 1:19; Isa. 53:10; II Cor. 5:21; Isa. 53:11; Rom. 5:18) is man’s redeemer (Rom. 3:24; I Cor. 1:30; Gal. 3:13; Eph. 1:7,14; Heb. 9:12,15). However, in Roman Catholicism Mary the mother of Jesus is said to be “co-redeemer” (or in the feminine gendered form, “co-mediatrix,”) because she co-operated in man’s redemption in that she purportedly suffered for man’s sins as she stood by the cross (John 19:26,27). Indeed, in 1921 a Mass and Romish Office of “Mary, Mediatrix of all Graces,” was approved by the Roman Church<sup>28</sup>. Thus, for example, the Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents refer to “the Blessed Virgin” going “unto the cross, where she stood, ... enduring with her only begotten Son the intensity of his suffering,” and so “associated herself with his sacrifice.” They say: “By preaching and baptism she brings forth sons, who are conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of God<sup>29</sup>.” Since the Roman Catholic Christ is not man’s redeemer but only a partial-redeemer they deny “that Jesus is the” Biblical “Christ” (I John 2:22) and put a false Christ *in the place of* the Biblical Christ.

---

<sup>28</sup> Broderick, R.C., *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, Simon & Schuster, New York, USA, 1957. Imprimatur: Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, 1956, p. 237.

<sup>29</sup> *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, 62,64, *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 419,420.

As our great high priest (Heb. 5-10), the Biblical Christ (Isa. 53:12; Luke 23:34), is man's only mediator (Matt. 11:27; I Tim. 2:5). However, in Roman Catholicism Mary the mother of Jesus is "mediator of all graces," and together with various "Saint mediators," robs Christ of his place as the "one mediator between God and man" (I Tim. 2:5). Jesus said, "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." He contrasts this with "thieves and robbers" who "cometh" "to steal" and "destroy" (John 10:9,10). These are strong words by Christ, and mean that the claims of the Pope to "hold the keys" of heaven, or that Mary and other saints are "mediators," are condemned by Christ as the claims of "thieves and robbers." For Christ plainly taught, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John 14:6).

But contrary to this Biblical teaching, for example, the Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents said "the Roman Pontiff" was "Peter's successor" and so "the holder of the keys of the church (cf. Mt. 16:18-19)," claiming "that the office of binding and loosing" "was given to Peter (Mt. 16:19)." It also said the "Blessed Virgin is invoked in the Church under the titles of Advocate, Helper, Benefactress, and Mediatrix [a female form of Mediator]." "Mary has ... been exalted above all angels and men to a place second only to her Son," and "she is rightly honoured by a special cult in the church." The Council claimed the words "all generations shall call me blessed" (Luke 1:48) prophesied her "invocation and imitation." Thus they said "the liturgical cult, of the Blessed Virgin" should "be generously fostered." And they prayed, "May the most beloved Mother of the Lord, ... obtain for you in your daily journeying that lasting joy which Jesus alone can give you ...<sup>30</sup>." Since the Roman Catholic Christ (and also the Oriental Orthodox Christ and Eastern Orthodox Christ), is not our "one mediator between God and man," they deny "that Jesus is the" Biblical "Christ" (I John 2:22) and put a false Christ *in the place of* the Biblical Christ. For what saith the Biblical Christ of any person claiming people "shall be saved" and "enter in" (John 10:9) by some other "door" than Christ (John 10:2,9), whether by some Pope, some angel, some saint, or someone else? "I say unto you," "the same is a thief and a robber" (John 10:1). For such a person seeks to rob Christ of the honour due his holy name, for Christ has said, "I am the door" (John 10:7).

The Biblical Christ saves completely, that is, justification by faith *alone* (Dan. 9:24; Isa. 52:7; Gal. 3:11; Eph. 2:5,8,9; Philp. 3:9). The Apostle Peter says, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold," that is, money such as that used to purchase Romish indulgences, "but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (I Peter 1:18,19). "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea come, buy wine and milk without money and without price" (Isa. 55:1). For Jesus said, "if any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink" (John 7:37). By contrast, e.g., the Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, upheld the "doctrine of indulgences" in its *Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences*<sup>31</sup> - which was one of the principal causes of the Christian Reformation under Martin Luther. The Roman Catholic Christ saves in conjunction with a man's "good works," that is, justification by faith and works. Since the Roman Catholic Christ (and also the Oriental Orthodox Christ and Eastern Orthodox Christ) does not save man by grace alone, accepted by faith alone, they deny "that Jesus is

---

<sup>30</sup> *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, 22,66,67, Apostolic Exhortation on the renewal of religious life, 56, op. cit., pp. 375,421-3,706.*

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit., pp. 62-79.*

the” Biblical “Christ” (I John 2:22), and put a false Christ *in the place of* the Biblical Christ.

Thus the post *Vatican II* Roman Church is like the pre *Vatican II* Roman Church whose indulgences Luther rightly attacked. When Luther came to understand the words of Rom. 1:17, that in the gospel “the righteousness of God” is “revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith,” he realized that the work of salvation is “from faith to faith” and so there was no place for works of salvation, that is, *The just shall live by faith alone* (cf. Eph. 2:1,8,9; Philp. 3:9). On the Eve of *All Saints’ Day*, 1517, he nailed his 95 *Theses* to the door of the Chapel of Wittenburg Castle, and the Protestant Reformation had begun. *Luther’s Theses* included the following theses, “The true measure of the Church is the sacrosanct Gospel of the glory and grace of God” (Thesis 62). “Christians are to be taught that to give to the poor or to lend to the needy is a better work than the purchase of pardons” (Thesis 43). Or in opposition to the claim, *When the coin in the indulgence box rings, then the soul from purgatory springs*, “Those who assert that a soul straightway flies out (of purgatory) as a coin tinkles in the collection-box, are preaching an invention of man” (Thesis 27); for “Papal pardons cannot take away the least of venial sins, as regards guilt” (Thesis 76). “Every Christian who is truly contrite has plenary remission both of penance and of guilt as his due, even without a letter of pardon” (Thesis 36). “Any true Christian, living or dead, partakes of all the benefits of Christ and the Church, which is the gift of God, even without letters of pardon” (Thesis 37). “Confidence in salvation through letters of indulgence is vain; and that” “even if the Pope himself, should pledge his soul as a guarantee” (Thesis 52). “The treasures of indulgences are nets, with which they now fish for the riches of men” (Thesis 66)<sup>32</sup>.

But there is yet another way that the Roman Pope qualifies as *The Roman Antichrist* and Roman Catholicism constitutes an antichrist religion, namely, the Roman Church puts someone else *in the place of* Christ. The core of the Papal claim to authority for both the Roman Pontiff and Roman Church is found in the Pope’s title “Vicar of Christ” (Latin *Vicarius Christi*). From about the middle of the fifth century titles including “vicar” were used by the Bishop of Rome. For example, Hilary (Bishop of Rome 461-468) used the title “Vicar of Peter,” and Gelasius I (Bishop of Rome 492-6) used “Vicar of the Apostolic See.” In 495 the Roman Synod first called the Bishop of Rome, Gelasius I, “Vicar of Christ” but this title only became more specifically used to designate the Bishop of Rome under Pope Eugene III (Pope 1145-1153). In 503 A.D. the Roman Synod under Symmachus called the Bishop of Rome in Latin *Vice Dei* meaning “God’s Vicar” (or “Vice-God”), although this was sometimes referred to in Latin as *Vicarius Dei*. Pope Innocent III (Pope 1198-1216) replaced the general usage of both “Vicar of Peter” and “Vicar of God” with “Vicar of Christ” (Latin, *Vicarius Christi*). Though “Vicar of Christ” or “Vicar of Jesus Christ” became the formal Papal titles, some semi-formal usage of “Vicar of God” continued. For example, Nicholas III (Pope 1277-1280) used “Vicar of God;” the *Council of Trent* (1545-63) referred to the Pope as “vicar of God on earth” (*Dei interris vicarii*) (Session 6, chapter 1); in 1608 Benedictus of Padua referred to the Pope as *Vicarius Dei*, and in 1794 a “History of the Ancient Republic of Amalfi” was published “dedicated to the Vicar of God (Latin *Vice Deo*) Benedict XIII, with permission of superiors<sup>33</sup>.” The Council of Florence (1439) defined the

<sup>32</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 185-191.

<sup>33</sup> Benedictus of Padua, *Antithesis qua, tam falsum esse, quod Vicarius Dei sit Antichristus*, Apud Bartholmaeum Cocchium, Bononiae, 1608, p. 169; Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, referring at pp. 120-1 to “Istoria dell’ Antica Republica di Amalfi. Consecrata al Vice Deo Benedetto decimoterzo” (Wylie translates “Vice Deo” as “Vice-God” which is

Pope as “true Vicar of Christ,” and this was later quoted by the First Vatican Council (1870). This title forms part of contemporary Roman Catholic canon law, and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* states that “Vicar of Christ” is “a title of the Pope implying his supreme and universal primacy,” and is “expressive of his supreme headship of the Church on earth<sup>34</sup>.”

Thus the formal Papal title today is “Vicar of Christ” (or “Vicar of Jesus Christ”). E.g., the Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents said “the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ,” “has full, supreme and universal power over the whole church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered.” As “Vicar of Christ” the Pope claims to have the keys of heaven itself, and so the power to admit or prohibit entry through the pearly gates. These keys the Church of Rome says, were first given to the Apostle Peter, and then handed on down through the Popes<sup>35</sup>. By contrast, Holy Scripture does not say that St. Peter has such keys, let alone any of his so called “successors.” Rather in the Bible Jesus says “I ... have the keys of hell and of death.” What does he do with the key “of death”? We are told clearly, that with “the key” Jesus is “he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth” (Rev. 1:18; 3:7).

Let us now consider more carefully the Papal claim to be *Vicarius Christi* - the “Vicar of Christ.” The Latin word *vicarius* can mean “instead of another,” a “substitute,” or a “deputy<sup>36</sup>.” The Pope claims to be a “deputy” “of Christ.” This Latin word *vicarius* is found in our English word “vicarious” which can also mean “deputed” (Oxford). But just as the Latin word *vicarius* can mean “instead of another,” so the English word “vicarious” can likewise mean “in the place of,” e.g., we talk of the “vicarious suffering ... of Christ in place of [the] sinner” (Oxford). Thus the Papal title *Vicarius Christi* can also mean the Pope puts himself *in the place of*, or *instead of*, Christ. At this point we come to the very core of the meaning of the Greek word *antichristos* (antichrist), since the Greek *anti* also means *in place of* or *instead of*, and so an antichrist is one who puts himself *in the place of* or *instead of* Christ. Hence in the *Oxford Dictionary* under “vicegerence” and “vicegerency” which is the “office, dignity, or rule of a vicegerent; the fact of ruling or administering as representative of another,” we read that in 1593 Morris said “Unto all which things the jurisdiction and

---

also a correct translation); Tanner, N.P. (Editor), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Imprimatur: John Crowley, Vicar General, Westminster, 1989, Steed & Ward, London, UK and Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA, 1990, Vol. 2, p. 681.

<sup>34</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1911,1913) Encyclopedia Press, New York, USA, Imprimatur John Cardinal Furley, Archbishop of New York, Vol. 15, p. 403; hereafter referred to as “*Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913)”; Coriden, J.A. Green, T.J., Heintschel, D.E. (Editors), *The Code of Canon Law*, Imprimatur Most Rev. Peter L. Gerety, D.D., Archbishop of Newark, 1985, Paulist Press, New York, USA, 1985, p. 268; *Council of Trent (1545-1563)* Session 6, chapter 1, Decree on the residence of bishops and others of lower rank”; Glazier, M., & Hellwig, M.K., *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*, Liturgical Press, Minnesota, USA, 1994, p. 899; McBrien, R.P. (Gen. Ed), *Harper Collins Encyclopedia of Catholicism*, Harper, San Francisco, USA, 1995, p. 1310; *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967), Catholic University of America, USA, 1967, Imprimatur Patrick A. O’Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, 1966, Vol. 14, p. 641; Stravinskias, P.M.J., *Our Sunday Visitor’s Catholic Encyclopedia*, Our Sunday Visitor Inc., Huntington, Indiana, USA, 1991, p. 958.

<sup>35</sup> *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, 22, *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 375.

<sup>36</sup> Woodhouse, S.C., *The Englishman’s Pocket Latin-English and English-Latin Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1913.

authority of the Pope Christ's Vicar and Vicegerent, did extend," and in 1679 Nesse in his work *Antichrist* (at 38), said this "title ... signifies substitution and vice-generence<sup>37</sup>." Thus in the formal Papal title, "Vicar of Christ," with the associated Papal claim to have the keys to heaven, we find not only a title that effectively describes an "Antichrist," that is, one who puts himself *in the place of Christ*, but also a specific claim that shows us one way that he puts himself in the place of Christ, namely, by claiming to have the keys to heaven.

Furthermore, in Matthew 16:18 Jesus said to the Apostle Peter, "thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." Taken in isolation this text has a degree of *prima facie* ambiguity in it. But when other Scriptures are consulted, it is clear that Jesus Christ is the rock upon which the church is built, since the Apostle Paul said "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 3:11), and "Jesus Christ" is "the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2:20). Indeed, the New Testament applies Ps. 118:22, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner," consistently and repeatedly to Christ (Matt 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7). The usage of "head" stone here reminds us that Christ is the *head* of the church (Eph. 1:22; 5:23; Col. 1:18). Matt. 21:42 thus qualifies Matt. 16:18 so as to contextually require that Christ is the stone / rock on which the church is built, and the head of the church. But the whole claim of the Roman Papacy to power rests on the claim that Matt. 16:18 not only refers to Peter, but that also the Roman Popes are the successors of St. Peter and head of the church on earth. For example, in Broderick's *Catholic Concise Encyclopedia* we read under "Pope" that "the Roman Pontiff who ... has supreme jurisdiction over the universal church" is "by title and right" among other things "Successor of St. Peter" and "Supreme Pontiff," and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913) states that as "Vicar of Christ," the Pope is the recipient of "the promise made in Matt. 16:18,19" and has "supreme headship of the Church on earth<sup>38</sup>." Since the Roman Papacy claims the church is built on St. Peter, and the Popes are St. Peter's successors and head of the church on earth, it thereby puts a false Christ in the place of the Biblical Christ who is the rock on which the church is built, and as "the head" stone (Matt. 21:42) is the true and only "head of the church" universal (Eph. 5:23), with "the keys" of heaven and hell (Rev. 1:18; 3:7), or else the imagery of Eph. 5:22-32 of the catholic or universal church is wrong since it would require that the catholic or universal church is polygamously married to two husbands or two "heads," namely Christ and the "Vicar of Christ."

Since the Roman Church thus denies Christ full humanity and puts a false Christ in the place of Christ our Mediator, Christ our Redeemer, Christ our Saviour, Christ the rock on which the church is built, and since the Pope claims to be the "Vicar of Christ" and this means that as a Vice-God he puts himself *in the place of Christ* as his "deputy" with the keys to heaven itself said to be in the Pope's possession rather than in Christ's possession, it is surely fair to conclude that *The Second Scotch Confession* (1580) and others were quite right to refer to the Roman Catholic Pope as the "Roman Antichrist."

---

<sup>37</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1933, Vol. 12. Compare the fact that in 1660 Milton said "all Protestants hold that Christ hath left no Vicegerent of his power" (Free Commw, Works, 1851, 5, 432), or in application to the Pope we read in a 1572 *Discourse* "Hee onely is Antichrist that fayneth himself to do all that Christ can doo, to bee his vicegerent in earth, to sit in his place," or in 1878 Marvell recorded the fact that the "Pope ... does persecute those to the death who dare worship the Author of their Religion instead of his pretended Vicegerent."

<sup>38</sup> Broderick, R.C., *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, *op. cit.*, p. 275; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 15, p. 403.

### CHAPTER 3

#### **The Johannian Epistles - Does the Roman Antichrist fulfil all the types of issues associated with the Antichrist foretold by the Apostle John?**

It is noteworthy that all the types of issues in I and II John that the Apostle John addresses in dealing with the false teachings associated with the “many antichrists” in his day, who typed the then coming “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), also find a fulfilment in the teachings of the Roman Antichrist. This is seen, for example, by general, though not exclusive reference to, the teachings of the *Second Vatican Council (1962-5)*. Let the reader consider the following illustrations from I & II John: *Christ’s vicarious substitutionary atonement; justification by faith; regeneration or new birth; Sons of God; confession of sins to God who pardons us; Christ only without sin; assurance of believer; Christ is our Advocate; Scripture alone and false prophets; love God not the world: “lust” and “the pride of life;” not praying for “a sin unto death;” keeping God’s commandments: idolatry and love for the brethren.*

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Christ’s vicarious substitutionary atonement.*

The “blood of Jesus” “cleanseth us from all sin” (I John 1:7). Christ’s “blood” (I John 1:7) means God can “forgive us our sins, and” “cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (I John 1:9). “Jesus Christ the righteous” “is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (I John 2:1,2). “Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us” (I John 3:16). “God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him,” for “God” “loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins” (I John 4:9,10). *CHRIST’S “OBLATION OF HIMSELF ONCE OFFERED,” IS THE “FULL, PERFECT, AND SUFFICIENT SACRIFICE, OBLATION, AND SATISFACTION, FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD”* (The Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662).

1) The blood of “goats” (plural) in the Day of Atonement ceremony typed Christ’s sacrifice (Heb. 10:4) i.e., one goat signified that Christ died as a “sin offering” and the other that Christ takes our “sins” “away” (Lev. 16:15,21,22). This was fulfilled at the cross when Christ committed his “spirit” to the Father (Luke 23:46) and “entered” the heavenly Most Holy Place, “having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:12). But contrary to this, the *Vatican II Council* claimed, “The doctrine of purgatory clearly demonstrates that even when the guilt of sin has been taken away, punishment for it or the consequences of it may remain to be expiated or cleansed” (*Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences 3*)<sup>39</sup>.

2) “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:22). But the *Vatican II Council* claimed the blood which “redeemed us” (Gal. 3:13) is inadequate, and requires the addition of Mary co-redeemer. *Vatican II* claimed “Mary” was “freely cooperating in the work of man’s salvation,” so that it can be said “she ‘being obedient, became the cause of salvation for herself and the whole human race,’” and “hence” it can be said “‘the knot of Eve’s disobedience was united in Mary’s obedience’” i.e., “‘death through

---

<sup>39</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 64.

Eve, life through Mary” (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* 56)<sup>40</sup>.

3) Christ “laid down (*etheke*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *tithemi*) his life for us” (I John 3:16). St. John here uses a consummative / culminative aorist<sup>41</sup>, which focuses on the completion of the action i.e., in English terms, we would *in approximate terms* here say, “past tense” (even though the Greek aorist is actually more complex than that, for my immediate purposes, that is the relevant point here). For our purposes here at I John 3:16, the salient point is that Christ’s sacrifice is a past event fulfilled on the cross, *it is a completed action*, for Christ “needeth not daily” “to offer up sacrifice,” “for this he did once, when he offered up himself” (Heb. 7:27). “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many” (Heb. 9:28), and so when he said “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit” (Luke 23:46), as symbolized on earth by the fact that “the veil of the temple was rent in the midst” (Luke 23:45), “Christ” “entered” into the heavenly Most Holy Place, that is, “into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” “Nor” did Christ enter the heavenly Most Holy Place “that he should offer himself often, as” in the Old Jewish Day of Atonement ceremonies in which “the high priest entereth into the” Most “holy place every year” (Heb. 9:24,25). But contrary to this, the *Vatican II Council* claimed, “the Mass,” “is at the same time and inseparably: a sacrifice in which the sacrifice of the cross is perpetuated.” “In the Mass,” the “Lord is immolated” (killed as a victim). “For in it Christ perpetuates in an unbloody manner the sacrifice offered on the cross, offering himself to the Father for the world’s salvation through the ministry of” the Roman “priests” (*Instruction on the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery* 3a,b,c)<sup>42</sup>.

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Justification by faith.*

The Apostle John says, “And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ” (I John 3:23). “These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may” “have eternal life” (I John 5:13). For “the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world” (I John 4:14). The Apostle Peter says of “the name of Jesus Christ,” that “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:10,12). And the Apostle Paul says, “if Abraham were justified by works, he hath” something “to glory” about; “but not before God. For what saith the Scripture” in Gen. 15:6, “Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.” For “to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. 4:2,3,5).

By contrast, the *Vatican II Council* claimed, “From the most ancient times in the Church good works were also offered to God for the salvation of sinners, particularly the works which human weakness finds hard.” “Indeed, the prayers and good works of holy people were regarded as of such great value that it could be asserted that the penitent was washed, cleansed and redeemed with the help of the entire Christian people.” (*Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences* 6). The Roman Church thus claims that in

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 416.

<sup>41</sup> See Daniel Wallace’s *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 1996, Galaxie Software, Garland, Texas, USA, pp 559-561; & Richard Young’s *Intermediate New Testament Greek* 1994, Broadman & Holman, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, pp. 123-124.

<sup>42</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 102-3.

addition to Christ's inadequate "treasury" of righteousness, there is a further "treasury" of good works that people can seek through the invocation of saints who have a surplus of such goodness. "In Christ, the Redeemer himself, the satisfactions and merits of his redemption exist and find their efficacy. This treasury includes as well the prayers and good works of the Blessed Virgin Mary. They are truly immense, unfathomable, and even pristine in their value before God. In the treasury, too, are the prayers and good works of all the saints," who "have made their lives holy." "In this way they attained their own salvation and at the same time cooperated in saving their brothers" (*Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences* 5)<sup>43</sup>.

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Regeneration or new birth.*

The Apostle John refers to believers as those who are "born of God" (I John 3:9; 5:1,4,18) and so made "sons of God" (I John 3:1). This is referred to by the Apostle Paul when he says, "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Titus 3:5); and also by our blessed Lord Jesus Christ when he said, "Ye must be born again" (John 3:7). Thus to "be born of water" (John 3:5) is symbolic terminology for the spiritual work of regeneration (Isa. 52:15; Ezek. 36:25; Matt. 3:11; I Cor. 6:11; Titus 3:5; Heb. 10:22).

Contrary to the fact that the Apostle John says this is a work "of God," the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration perverts the symbol of water baptism, and turns it into that which it symbolizes, namely, regeneration. Thus Rome considers the good work of baptism produces spiritual renewal, justification, and forgiveness of sins, although also considers those who obtain this can lose it again. This view is contrary to the teaching of Gal. 3:11, "that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God," "for, The just shall live by faith." Thus the Church of Rome puts the emphasis on the sacrament of water baptism, as opposed to the thing it symbolizes, namely regeneration, and so misuses the sacrament of baptism by turning it into a good work helping to merit salvation. For example, the *Vatican II Council* claimed, "By the sacrament of Baptism," "man becomes truly incorporated into the crucified and glorified Christ and is reborn to a sharing of the divine life" (*Decree on Ecumenism* 22). Hence the *Vatican II Council* claimed the good work of water baptism is necessary for salvation, that is, "the necessity of" "baptism" is "affirmed" and "at the same time the necessity of the Church which men enter through baptism as through a door. Hence they could not be saved who, knowing that the [Roman] Catholic Church was founded as necessary by God through Christ, would refuse to enter it or to remain in it" (*Dogmatic Constitution of the Church* 14)<sup>44</sup>.

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Sons of God*

The Apostle John says, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God" (I John 3:1,2).

As discussed above, believers are "sons of God" by regeneration or being born again (John 3). By contrast, the Church of Rome teaches that people become *sons of Mary* (though they would claim this in addition to being sons of God). For example, the *Saint Andrew*

---

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 66,68.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 365-6,469.

*Daily Missal* on the feast of “The Blessed Virgin Mary Mediatrix of all graces,” says in the Collect, “Lord Jesus,” “You appointed the most blessed Virgin, Your mother, to be our mother also and our mediatrix before you.” And on the feast of “The Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary” (11 Oct) the missal says, the Roman “Church in” “causing us to venerate the Mother of our Saviour, desires to arouse in our souls, filial love for her who has become,” “our own mother.” The missal then quotes the Encyclical, *Ad diem illum* of Pope Pius XI (Pope 1922-39), “All of us ... were born of Mary ... . She is Mother of us all’.” Or the *Vatican II Council* said, “The [Roman] Catholic Church” “honors” “Mary” “with filial affection and devotion as a most beloved mother.” And “we are moved to a filial love towards our mother,” “the Blessed Virgin,” “and to the imitation of her virtues” (*Dogmatic Constitution of the Church* 53,67)<sup>45</sup>.

When people said to Jesus, “Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee,” Jesus made it clear that his earthly mother and family do not enjoy any special privileges of spiritual proximity to him. Jesus “answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it,” and thus Jesus’ “mother and” “brethren” were denied any special access to him through the crowd of people (Luke 8:19-21). The Romish doctrine of Mary teaches the very opposite of this Biblical truth. Jesus described his “mother” and “brethren” as “those which hear the word of God, and do it,” and the Word of God makes it clear that we believers are “sons of God” by regeneration, *not* “sons of Mary.”

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Confession of sins to God who pardons us.*

When he receives the gift of salvation, all of a believer’s sins, past, present, and future, have been forgiven (Ps. 103:12; Isa. 44:22; Rom. 5:21; 8:1; 8:32-34; Heb. 10:14)<sup>46</sup>. Though a fruit of salvation and not a cause of it for believers, believers do confess their sins since sinless perfection is not possible before glorification. “If we walk in the light,” “the blood of Jesus” “cleanseth us from all sin” (I John 1:7). “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he” that is, GOD, “is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (I John 1:8,9). “And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins” (I John 2:1,2).

These passages are contrary to all three elements of the Romish “sacrament of penance,” namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. 1) *Romish Contrition*, that is, sorrow for one’s sin and a desire not to sin again, precedes confession, and is regarded by Roman Catholics as a merit. But the Apostle John here says “If we walk in the light,” “the blood of Jesus” “cleanseth us from all sin” (I John 1:7). Certainly we should have contrition for our sins (Ps. 51:17). But if Christ’s “blood” “cleanseth us from all” not just *some* “sin,” how then can we make, or help to make, our own atonement by any good work, such as contrition? 2) *Romish Confession*, that is, confessing one sins to the priest who then “absolves” them. The Apostle John here says that: “we confess our sins” to God (I John 1:9), not some priest in auricular confession; that our “advocate” to assist us in this is “Jesus Christ” (I John 2:1), not some priest in auricular confession. That we look to God “the Father” for forgiveness (I John 2:1), not some priest to “absolve” our sins in auricular confession; and that God “is faithful and just to forgive us our sins” (I John 1:9), not some

---

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 414,422.

<sup>46</sup> Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 514.

priest in auricular confession who “absolves” us. 3) *Romish Satisfaction*, that is, “the penitent” accepts to undertake some sacrifice (e.g., penance, almsgiving, pilgrimage) which is regarded as necessary to atone for the temporal punishment of his sin. But the Apostle John says that “Jesus Christ” “is the propitiation for our sins” (I John 2:1,2), not some “good work” of penance prescribed by the priest during auricular confession, e.g., a Romish priest might say to the penitent, “Say five ‘Our Father’s’” (the Lord’s Prayer) “and twenty ‘Hail Mary’s’” (the Angelus).

Thus contrary to the teaching of the Apostle John designed to combat the teachings of the false teachers and antichrists of his day who typed the then coming Antichrist, the Church of Rome teaches “the sacrament of penance.” (This Romish “sacrament” is called variously, “Penance,” “Confession,” or “Reconciliation”). For example, the *Vatican II Council* claimed that “children might receive the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist as soon as they have attained the use of reason,” but that before a child “receive” his “first Communion” he should “first” have “the Sacrament of Penance” (*Declaration on First Confession and First Communion*).

Sometimes the Roman Church has prescribed a form of auricular confession addressing God and the priest, for example, in the *Saint Andrew Daily Missal* the Romish penitent addresses “God, and” “you, my” “father [the priest].” But sometimes the Roman Church has prescribed a form of auricular confession also addressing the “saints,” especially Mary, for example, in the *Saint Andrew Sunday Missal* the Romish penitent says, “I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, to all the Saints, and to you my father [the priest], that I have sinned<sup>47</sup>.” In either instance, the Roman Pontiff and his Roman Church are clearly setting aside the plain words of Scripture that confession of sins is to God (I John 1:9), who forgives us (I John 2:1) through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ (I John 1:7; 2:1). Thus, for example, the *Vatican II Council* claimed, “Those who approach the sacrament of Penance obtain pardon from God’s mercy for the offense committed against him, and are, at the same time, reconciled with the [Roman] Church which they have wounded by their sins” (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* 11). “Religious should likewise hold in high esteem the frequent use of this sacrament” “of Penance” (*Decree on Confession for Religious* 1,2)<sup>48</sup>.

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Christ only without sin.*

The Apostle John says, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us” (I John 1:8). “And ye know that” the Son of God “was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin” (I John 3:5).

Scripture elsewhere also teaches us of the sinful nature of fallen mankind (Ps. 51:5; Isa. 53:6; Rom. 3:23; Gal. 3:22), and the sinless human nature of Christ (II Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15; 7:26; 9:14; I Peter 1:19; 2:22). The sins of different saints of God are sometimes given in the Bible lest we should get too high a view of them, and forget that only God is perfect. For example, Mary the mother of Jesus was a godly woman, who was “blessed” to be the

---

<sup>47</sup> Lefebvre, G, *Saint Andrew Daily Missal*, With Vespers for Sundays and Feasts, Imprimatur: M. de Keyzer, Vicar General, Brugge, 26 Jan. 1962, Abbey of St. Andrew, Brugge, Biblica, Belgium, 1962, p. 1780; Lefebvre, G, *Saint Andrew Sunday Missal*, Imprimatur: M. de Keyzer, Vicar General, Brugge, 13 March 1962, Abbey of St. Andrew, Brugge, Biblica, Belgium, 1962, p. 770.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 241,362,676.

mother of the Messiah (Luke 1:48). But Jesus made it clear that in the kingdom of God, she is no more, and no less important than any other saved person, for all God's saints are likewise "blessed" (Luke 11:27,28). Like all men after the Fall of Adam, she was imputed with Adam's original sin and so subject to death (Rom. 5:14), possessed a sinful human nature that was "shapen in iniquity" (Ps. 51:5), and so like all fallen human beings she could say, "in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18), "for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I" (Rom. 7:15), and so she committed actual sins. For example, St. Mary committed such sins as negligence (Luke 2:41-45 cf. II Chron. 29:11a), ignorance (Luke 2:49 cf. Lev. 4:2,27,28), dishonesty as she tried to blame Jesus' for her sins ("Why hast thou thus dealt with us?," AV, or "Why have you treated us this way?," NASB, Luke 2:48,49; Exod. 20:16; cf. "Covered my transgressions as Adam" in Job 31:33), and presumption (John 2:3,4 cf. Ps. 19:13).

By contrast, the Church of Rome claims in their teaching of the "immaculate conception of Mary," promulgated in 1854, that when Mary was conceived in the womb of her mother, Anne, Mary was, in the words of the *Vatican II Council*, "preserved free from all stain of original sin" (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* 59)<sup>49</sup>. But what saith the Apostle John? "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (I John 1:8). For among those born of Adam, only of Christ can it be said, "in him is no sin" (I John 3:5).

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Assurance of believer.*

The Apostle John says the believer may "know" he has eternal life. "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. 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" (I John 5:11-13). This assurance includes the fact that "your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake" (I John. 2:12). Hence while initial conversion of the unsaved involves repentance of sins (Acts 2:38), for those who are already believers, we "confess our sins" (I John 1:9) because we are saved, NOT in order to be re-saved. That is, since we "know that" we "have eternal life" (I John 5:13), if we were to forget to confess a sin or die before confessing some sin, this would not effect our salvation. For "Who can tell how oft he offendeth?" (Ps. 19:12, "The Psalms," Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

By contrast, the Church of Rome teaches that one *has no such assurance* and one can fall in and out of salvation and thus need re-conversion. Hence the importance of a so called "last confession" to a priest. This is known as "justification by confession," and led Martin Luther to long hours in the confessional, trying to make sure he did not have any unconfessed sins, since he thought that if he had any sins that were not specifically itemized and specifically unrepented of, and so unforgiven, he could not enter heaven. But then, by the grace of God he came to understand the doctrine of justification by faith and the fact that salvation is a "gift" (Eph. 2:8). For example, the *Vatican II Council* claimed, "The sacrament of Penance restores and strengthens in members of the Church who have sinned ... conversion to the kingdom of Christ" (*Decree on Confession for Religious* 1, emphasis mine)<sup>50</sup>.

---

<sup>49</sup> *Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 417.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 676.

The Apostle John also teaches that the *assurance of the believer* means “that we may have boldness in the day of judgment,” for “There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment” (I John 4:17,18 cf. 2:28).

By contrast, the Roman Church claims that the lack of assurance for believers means that there is a lack of boldness on the day of judgement, with an ongoing fear of torment in the form of purgatorial fires. E.g., the *Vatican II Council* claimed, “The doctrine of purgatory clearly demonstrates that even when the guilt of sin has been taken away, punishment for it or the consequences of it may remain to be expiated or cleansed. They often are. In fact, in purgatory the souls of those ‘who died in the charity of God and truly repentant, but who had not made satisfaction with adequate penance for their sins and omissions’ are cleansed after death with punishments designed to purge away their debt” (*Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences 3*; quoting the *Council of Lyons II*)<sup>51</sup>.

The Apostle John says Jesus came with “three that bear witness in earth,” namely, “the water” (regeneration and washing away of sins, cf. Isa. 52:15; Ezek. 36:25; Matt. 3:17; John 3:5; Titus 3:5), “and the blood” (atonement), and “the Spirit” (I John 5:8) and says “He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar” (I John 5:6-10). Since in, e.g., the *Vatican II Council* the Church of Rome denies Christ’s “blood” (Christ’s vicarious substitutionary atonement), and “water” (washing away of sins by God and regeneration), we should not be surprised that they also lack “the Spirit” who, among other things, brings assurance to the believer. Moreover, since the “witness of God” in this matter is that “he hath testified of his Son,” (II John 5:9), it follows that this denial by Rome is ultimately, a denial of the “three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost” (I John 5:7). Thus the “antichrist,” “denieth the Father and the Son” (I John 2:22).

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Christ is our Advocate.*

The Apostle John says “our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (I John 1:3). Believers “have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (I John 2:1); and so believers have “confidence,” “that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us: and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him” (I John 5:14,15); for “whatsoever we ask, we receive of him” (I John 3:22).

By contrast, the Church of Rome’s lack of confidence in petitions to God, means that fellowship with God is regarded as insufficient, and so they claim people also have “fellowship” or “communion” with Romish “Saints” in heaven who through the invocation of saints receive prayers, make intercession for them to God, and assist people here on earth. Contrary to the Biblical teaching of the “communion of saints” meaning the fellowship of believers here on earth when they meet together in Christ, the Roman Church claims the terminology of “communion of saints” refers to communication with the dead, which thing is in fact forbidden Christians as a form of “witchcraft” condemned in Gal. 5:20, for instance, the Witch of Endor practised invocation of saints by invoking Samuel in I Sam. 28 (cf. Deut. 18:9-11; Isa. 8:19,20). For example, the *Vatican II Council* claimed Romish saints “have

---

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64; quoting *Council of Lyons II*, Session 4; Denzinger, H., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 32nd edition, 1963 (Collection of more important Church Documents), p. 856.

carried their crosses to make expiation for their own sins and the sins of others,” that is, to “help their brothers to obtain salvation from God,” and that they can be accessed through “the Communion of Saints.” Thus in addition to “Christ,” one should seek “satisfactions and merits” from “the prayers and good works of the Blessed Virgin Mary” and indeed “all the saints” (*Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences* 5)<sup>52</sup>.

At times, such “invocation of saints” has simply taken the place of invoking pre-existing pagan gods. For example, in Sconna, in the Abruzzi region of central Italy, east of Rome and fronting the Adriatic Sea, we find a Romanized form of a pagan snake or serpent cult. In the Garden of Eden, Satan devil-possessed a serpent, and speaking through that snake deceived our first parents (Gen. 3; Rev. 12:9). The pagan Roman goddess, Angizia, was said to “protect men from snake bites.” This was replaced by the Papal Roman “Saint,” Dominic of Sora (951-1031), a Benedictine monk, hermit, and abbot (Feast Day, 22 January). He built a number of monasteries, one at Sora, where he became the Abbot. Born at Foligno in what is now the nearby Umbria region of Italy, he died and was buried at Sora, in what is now the neighbouring Lazio region that includes Rome. Dominic was well known throughout this region of Abruzzi that produced his cult, which regards him as a great “miracle worker.” Known as “the Saint of Serpents,” “Saint” Dominic of Sora is now invoked as one who “protects from snake bites.” On St. Joseph’s Day (19 March) each year, Papists hunt for snakes in the region, for the festival of “Saint” Dominic of Sora on the first Thursday in May. Four types of snakes are collected, but the largest one, the *four-line snake* is used to coil around the statue idol of “Saint” Dominic.

Then on the first Thursday in May, at the Romish Mass for “St.” Dominic of Sora in the local Papist church, pilgrims pull a metal chain with their teeth to ring a bell, as a way of invoking Dominic for “protection against tooth-ache.” Many live snakes slither and slide around and around the statute of Dominic, who is portrayed in an idolatrous statue wearing the black habit of a Benedictine monk. With this idol of Dominic carried on the head of a man, other pilgrims accompanying the procession, hold, stroke, and carry many slippery, slimy, and slithering live snakes. It is believed that handling these snakes will save people from “the evil eye.” With the Roman Catholic priest at the front of the procession, carrying a tooth of Dominic in a reliquary, that is idolatrously venerated, (the Church of Rome gave canonical recognition to his relics in 1951,) the procession passes by every house in Sconna, by which it is said that the occupants will thereby gain a year free of disease and “protection from the evil eye.” After the ceremony, the snakes are released back into the surrounding mountains. This very pagan ritual, emanating from the heathen cult of Angizia, was thus first Roman Catholicized, and then preserved as a Papist ritual in the Popish cult of Dominic. The power of Dominic is thus devilish<sup>53</sup>.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 65-6.

<sup>53</sup> Quite apart from the fact that those in this cult look to Dominic, and not Christ, as a mediator who gives them help and protection; there is no justification for Dominic as “the Saint of Serpents” in Mark 16:18. Here, “they shall take up serpents” is a Divine guarantee of spiritual and temporal protection that God will safeguard his servants until their job on earth is done. Thus on the temporal application, when the Apostle Paul “gathered up a bundle of sticks,” and to his surprise, “there came a viper out” of the woodpile, God protected him (Acts 28:5). Or on a spiritual application, with regard to “that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan” (Rev. 12:9), “God” “shall bruise Satan under your feet” (Rom. 16:20). Thus Mark 16:18 manifests the Divine promise, “he shall give his angels charge over thee,” and “they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone” (Ps.

*Johannian Epistles teachings: Scripture alone and false prophets.*

The Apostle John says, “I have written unto you,” “because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you” (I John 2:14). “These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you. But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him” (I John 2:26,27). The “word of God” referred to by the Apostle John (I John 2:14) is now the completed revelation of Holy Scripture found in the Old and New Testaments (Dan. 9:24; Luke 11:49-51; I Cor. 13:8, NASB; Eph. 2:20). While God provides the church with preachers (Rom. 10:15) and teachers (Eph. 4:11), only the Spirit of God can convict someone of any truth presented to them. Thus the Spirit of God convicts us of spiritual truth (John 14:26; 15:26), and is able to “testify” (John 15:25) or “bear witness in earth” of Christ (I John 5:8), through God’s “word” of “truth” (John 17:17) found in Holy Writ.

By contrast, the Church of Rome in, for example, the *Vatican II Council*, said “the” Roman “Church does not draw her certainty about all revealed truths from the holy Scriptures alone. Hence, both Scripture and Tradition must be accepted and honored with equal feeling of devotion and reverence. Sacred Tradition and sacred Scripture make up a single sacred deposit,” “which is entrusted to the Church” (*Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation* 9,10). The *Vatican II Council* further claimed that the mechanism “to settle” disputes through this combination of “Scripture and Tradition” was either “the Roman Pontiff” or “the holding of councils,” and further claimed the “infallibility” of the Roman “Church” found in “the Roman Pontiff,” “is also present in the body of bishops when, together with Peter’s successor, they exercise the supreme teaching office” (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* 22,25)<sup>54</sup>. This means that the so called “ecumenical councils” made up of Romish bishops is, like the Pope, regarded as infallible.

This second element of “ecumenical councils” further breaches the Johannian Epistles teaching about “false prophets.” “Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus” says the Apostle John, “is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world” (I John 4:1-3). As discussed above, the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation denies “that Jesus is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2,3), since it is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (*Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). The first so called “ecumenical” council to uphold the teaching of transubstantiation was the *Fourth Lateran Council* of 1215 A.D. . This means, that from at least the time of the *Lateran IV Council*, Romish “ecumenical” councils have constituted a *false prophet*. Upon further investigation, it emerges that contrary to the Biblical teaching of *Scripture alone*, these so called “ecumenical” councils first claimed a prophetic gift in the so called “sixth ecumenical council” known as the *Third Council of Constantinople* in 681 A.D., which claimed “inspiration” for such councils,

---

91:11,12). But to misuse texts such as Ps. 91:11,12; Mark 16:18 to deliberately court danger, e.g., by intentionally picking up deadly snakes, is the type of Devilish temptation specifically rejected by Christ (Matt. 4:5-7).

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 374,380,755.

claiming that those who sat in the first four councils were “God-inspired fathers” (Greek *Theopneuston pateron*)<sup>55</sup>.

Therefore the *Roman Antichrist* or Roman Pope, has been working with the *Roman False Prophet* or “ecumenical” councils from at least the seventh century on. To this must be added the qualification that the 5th (553 A.D.) and 6th (681 A.D.) General Councils were a mix of truth and error, and so in harmony with Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Articles, their Trinitarian doctrine e.g., condemning Nestorians (553) and monothelites (681) is sound. Moreover, while this *Roman False Prophet* has existed from at least this time, it culminates in a greater development of the *Roman False Prophet* starting from the time of the *First Lateran Council* in 1123, since from that time the Roman Pontiff came to be the one who called and presided over such councils.

Notably, Homily 16, Book 2, Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* of 1562, says “the Church of Rome, not as it was at the beginning, but as it presently and hath been for the space of nine hundred years” “odd,” that is from the seventh century, has been “far wide from the nature of the true church.” “For neither are they *built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets*” (Eph. 2:20), “but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise.” This Homily’s usage of Eph. 2:20 is particularly apt, since it reminds us that “prophets” were for the era of the church’s “foundations” in New Testament times, and that era having ended with the Book of Revelation, the gift of prophecy necessarily ended around the same time. Thus those who now “have the testimony of Jesus” (Rev. 12:17), that is, “the Spirit of prophecy” (Rev. 19:10), have this by virtue of the fact they are in possession of what Homily 9, Book 1, Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* rightly calls, “the infallible” “Word of God.” Thus the inventions of *Constantinople III (681)* in which they did “err” (Article 21, Anglican 39 Articles) in claiming that general councils were “God-inspired” is exposed by Eph. 2:20. Significantly, this means that just as the “many antichrists” of the Apostle John’s day who typed the then coming “Antichrist” (I John 2:18) worked in conjunction with “many false prophets” (I John 4:1); so likewise, the *Roman Antichrist* works with the *Roman False Prophet* substituting both Papal claims of “authority” and “ecumenical” council claims of “authority” in the place of Biblical authority.

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Love God not the world, for example, the pride of life.*”

The Apostle John says, “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world,” “the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever” (I John 2:15-17).

Homily 16, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, “the Popes, in not hearing Christ’s voice, as they ought to do, but preferring their own decrees before the express Word of God, do plainly argue to the world that they are not of Christ nor yet possessed with his Spirit.” This Homily then asks, “What shall we judge or think of the Pope’s intolerable pride?” “Can any man,” “which either hath or shall read the Popes’ lives, justly say that they had the Holy Ghost within them?” Many examples of Papal pride are then given in this Homily, for example, “as touching that they will be termed *universal*

---

<sup>55</sup> Tanner, N.P., *op. cit.* . This same Greek word is found in II Tim. 3:16 where we read “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God (Greek *Theopneustos*).

*bishops and heads of all Christian Churches* through the world, we have the judgment of Gregory,” (d. 604) (the second last Bishop of Rome before the fuller formation of the Papacy in 607 A.D.), “who, writing” “expressly against them,” called “the Bishop of Constantinople” “the forerunner of Antichrist” (for seeking this same title of *universal bishop*).

There are many forms of worldliness and the pride of life. But one example of this is isolated for us by Jesus in his rebuke of the scribes and Pharisees in Matt. 23. Among other things, he says of “the scribes and Pharisees,” “all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments.” And they “love” “to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven” (Matt. 23:1,5-9). This teaches us that *worldly* religious leaders can manifest their *pride of life* in ostentatious clerical dress and the title “Father.” While this sin of worldly pride of life is found throughout the Roman Catholic priesthood since, for example, they are all addressed as “Father” by followers of Romanism, this sin of worldly pride of life is clearly evident in the Roman Pontiff himself since “Pope” means “Father.”

Let the reader imagine that he entered a Reformed Protestant Church in which the Minister wore either no clerical dress, or the modest clerical dress of a Low Church Evangelical Anglican Minister. (While the Word of God does not command or require clerical dress, of course, historically, some godly orthodox Protestants Ministers do wear a *modest* clerical dress, and this is not contrary to the Word of God). Imagine such a well-dressed Protestant Minister either in his coat and tie (no clerical dress); or his white surplice, black robe or gown, black preaching scarf, and clerical collar (Low Church Evangelical Anglican clerical dress). Suppose one Lord’s day morning he were to say in his Sunday sermon to the congregation, “I have made some upside-down cardboard cone hats. I think this idea that “all” “are brethren” in the church is an overstatement (Matt. 23:8), and so from now on I’m gonna’ start wearing one of these upside-down cone hats every time we come to church, just to make the point that I’m a bit different to, and a bit more important than, you guys. By the way, I’ve got some more of these upside-down cardboard cone hats out the back, and from time to time I’m gonna’ selectively give them out to members of the congregation whom I think are group leaders, and so also are a little bit more important than the rest of you guys. So when you see someone in the congregation with one of these upside-down cone hats on, feel free to genuflect to them.” The first reaction of such a congregation may be laughter at these ridiculous looking hats, and an assumption that the Minister was either joking, or had lost his marbles. But if it became clear that he was sane and completely serious, when the absurd reality of this nonsense sunk in, the body of believers would come together subject to the Word of God and with prayer under the Spirit of God to take necessary action to either bring this heresy to a halt, or that failing, to exit the church and relocate to a Biblically sound church.

Yet it is precisely this type of nonsense that the Roman Church engages in, when the Pope and his bishops wear the two-horned mitre. The mitre comes from Papal claims in the *Donation of Constantine*, and in its evolution during the twelfth century developed what the Church of Rome calls two “prominent horns” (*New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967*) from “about 1125” (*Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913*), so that it was developed essentially into the mitre used today by the Pope and bishops by that time<sup>56</sup>. This means that the rise of the two-

---

<sup>56</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913), Vol. 10, “Mitre” pp. 404-6; *New Catholic*

horned mitre parallels in time the rise of the false prophet in his greater form, from when the Pope came to call and preside over such councils from 1123. The first of the Latin language “ecumenical” councils (former “ecumenical” councils ending with the so called “eighth ecumenical” council in 870 A.D. being in Greek), started with the so called “ninth” ecumenical council of *Lateran I* in 1123 A.D. . So called “ecumenical” councils before this time were held in the East, but the *First Lateran Council* was the first “ecumenical” council to be held in the Papal heartlands of Western Europe, and all subsequent “ecumenical” councils have likewise been held in Western Europe. Thus the two-horned mitre was in use by the time the *Lateran IV Council* promulgated the transubstantiation teaching in 1215.

What is the Papal mitre or bishops’ mitre, other than a manifestation of Matt. 23:5, “all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments”? The two-horned mitres are worn by the Pope and bishops on various occasions, but one very poignant example is when the old *Roman False Prophet* is assembled in so called “ecumenical” councils. For example, at the *Vatican II Council* one can find depictions of the two-horned false prophet in pictures of the Pope and bishops (including Cardinals) standing in long rows with their two-horned mitres on stretching up into the sky. Jesus warned that “false prophets” would “come” “in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves” (Matt. 7:15), and to be sure, in these Romish “ecumenical” councils the old *Roman False Prophet* has *two horns like a lamb* in his pretensions to be a sheep, but for those who know the Word of God he stands exposed. The Word of God is clear. “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not him. For all that is in the world,” such as “the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world” ( I John 2:15,16).

*Johannian Epistles teaching: Love God not the world, for example, “lust.”*

The Apostle John says, “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes,” “is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever” (I John 2:15-17).

The Apostle Paul says, “I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 7:7). The tenth commandment includes both sexual and non-sexual lust, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house” (non-sexual lust) “thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife” (sexual lust), “nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any things that is thy neighbour’s” (Exod. 20:17). One can find many examples of worldly lust in the history of the Papacy and Popery, e.g., the adoption of (Thomas Paine) French Revolution so called “Rights of Man” values (to some extent opposed at the time by Edmund Burke,) by the *Vatican II Council*. It is sometimes claimed that, “Since Vatican II, the Church of Rome has changed.” There is some truth in this. But amidst changes such as *usually* putting their liturgy in the vernacular, Vatican II did not change most of their core teachings of apostate and unBiblical Christianity that the Reformers rightly attacked and rejected. Indeed, it added some more unBiblical teachings, such as its adoption of French Revolution type “human rights” on race and sex roles. Thus contrary to the Biblical teaching on race in e.g., Gen. 9:20-27, the *Table of Nations* in Gen. 10, Christ’s example in Mark 7:24-30 (cf. Gen. 9:25,26), St. Paul in Acts

13:26; 21:17-30, or St. James in Jas. 1:1; and contrary to the Biblical teaching on sex roles in e.g., Gen. 2 & 3, or St. Paul in I Cor. 11:8,9,14,15; I Tim. 2:12-15; Titus 2:3-5; Vatican II opposed “social or cultural discrimination” “on the grounds of sex, race, colour” or “language” (*Pastoral instruction on the means of social communication* 46; *Declaration on the relation of the Church to non-Christian religions* 5; *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* 29,61)<sup>57</sup>. Of such things the holy Apostle Paul warns, saying, “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” (Col. 2:8).

An eminent “council father” of *Vatican II*, Archbishop Lefebvre, candidly admitted this *worldly spirit* of the *Vatican II Council* and the post *Vatican II* Roman Church. In his *Open Letter* of 1986, Archbishop Lefebvre has a chapter entitled, “Vatican II is the French Revolution in the Church.” The French Archbishop has outstanding credentials as a “council father,” for example, he refers to the fact that he was nominated by the Pope to be a member of the Central Preparatory Commission for the *Vatican II Council*. But in a candid insider’s comment on the council, the Archbishop says, “the *Council Fathers felt guilty themselves* at not being in the world and *at not being of the world*” (emphasis mine) (cf. John 17:15,16). Archbishop Lefebvre also says that the “parallel I have drawn between the crisis in the [Roman] Church and the French revolution is not simply a metaphorical one. The influence of the” French Revolution “*philosophes*” or philosophers “of the eighteenth century, and of the upheaval that they produced in the world, has continued down to our times” and they “have injected that poison into the [Roman] Church” in the *Vatican II Council*<sup>58</sup>. (Rome excommunicated the Archbishop in 1988).

But let us consider in detail just one example of lust, namely, sexual lust in the form of incest. This includes both the elements mentioned by the Apostle John in describing “all that is in the world,” namely, “the lust of the eyes” in looking with incestuous sexual lust on someone, and “the lust of the flesh” in both looking with lust and also engaging in an act of incestuous sex (I John 2:16). The laws found in Lev. 18 & 20 prohibiting: incest, sex with a menstruating woman, adultery, murder, idolatry, profaning the name of Nature’s God, and

---

<sup>57</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 309,742,929,965. I consider religious freedoms to worship God, proclaim the gospel, or assemble as a group of Christian believers, such as those granted to Protestants in the *Peace of Westphalia* (1648), to be inalienable grants of liberty given by God (Exod. 1:17; Dan. 3:1-18; Acts 5:29). I consider the historic pre-“human rights” freedoms of Western countries such as freedom of speech or assembly, and trial by jury for heinous crimes, to be *highly desirable* but not “inalienable human rights.” While I am no friend of the French *Ancien Regime*, I reject the French Revolutionaries’ proposition that men may illegally overthrow a government violating such so called “rights;” and I likewise reject the claims of the American Revolutionaries against the so called “tyrant” king of George III in the mid 1770s (Rom. 13:1,2). I reject the ungodly panacea of so called “human rights” that have been promoted especially in the post World War Two era. (Stephen, J.F., *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, 1873, 2nd ed. 1874; Cambridge Univ., England, UK, 1967, pp. 54,188-210; Knox, D.B., *Not By Bread Alone*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1989, pp. 12,51-6,83-7; Johnson, R.K., *Builder of Bridges*, Bob Jones Univ. Press, South Carolina, USA, 1969, 1982, pp. 322-3; General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa, *Human Relations in South Africa*, 1966, pp. 1-9).

<sup>58</sup> Lefebvre, M., *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, Angelus Press, USA, 1986, pp. 100,102,105.

sodomy with man or beast, are of universal application to all men and all human societies at all times, being discoverable laws of nature through God's common grace (Rom. 1 & 2). Hence though the pagan nations of Canaan had no Divine revelation, for their sins of violating these laws for which they were "without excuse" (Rom. 1:20), God declared, their "land is defiled," and he would judge them, "therefore do I visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants" (Lev. 18:25). Christians who have been saved by God's special grace and possess the Divine revelation may not have to spend the same amount of time discovering these laws from nature through common grace to obtain these laws which are clearly given to them in Lev. 18, though I think they would do well to so avail themselves of God's common grace in understanding them. For the Christian, incest is "fornication" forbidden by God (I Cor. 5:1), and so contrary to both Natural Law and the Divine Law revealed.

But on a number of occasions the Church of Rome has set aside the Pauline injunction to excommunicate a "fornicator" (I Cor. 5:11), such as one involved in incest (I Cor. 5:1). For example, Pope Alexander VI (Pope 1492-1503) had a number of illegitimate children, one of whom was his daughter Lucretia who was thrice married, having obtained "annulments" for her first two marriages. Her second husband, a Spanish nobleman, Giovanni Sfroza, the Lord of Psaro, whom she married in 1493, claimed Lucretia and her father, the Pope, were involved in incestuous relations. Lucretia returned to Rome after her father annulled the marriage with Sfroza in 1497. Sfroza's allegations of incest take on added significance when it is realized that in 1501 Lucretia appeared in public with a three year old bastard boy called Giovanni. It was public knowledge in Rome that Lucretia had attended a well-known night orgy at the Vatican, and this was probably where she became pregnant with this child. *But in a Papal Bull, Alexander VI recognized the child as his.* What we now know about the laws of genetics, makes it unlikely that this child would have survived if born of father-daughter incest, though for reasons unknown to us, the Devil-possessed Pope Alexander took responsibility and declared the child to be his i.e., effectively by adoption<sup>59</sup>. The Pope thus set himself against the words of Scripture, "The nakedness of thy father," "shalt thou not uncover" (Lev. 18:7). Thus Papal incest, confirmed by a Papal Bull, was condoned by Pope Alexander VI himself; since his motive for this adoption included the fact that he was known to be in a sexual relationship with his daughter. This occurred *just shortly before* another Pope would sanction an incestuous relationship between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon.

The Biblical incest laws of Lev. 18 & 20 are written out in *Parker's Table*. This Table was drawn up in 1563 by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker. A Marian Confessor who suffered persecution under Bloody Mary (the daughter of Henry VIII's unlawfully wed Papist wife, Catherine of Aragon), he received the Archbishopric of Canterbury shortly after the accession of Queen Elizabeth I (the daughter of Henry VIII's lawfully wed Protestant wife, Anne Boleyn). Parker's Table was confirmed in Canon 99 of the *Church of England's Ecclesiastical Canons of 1603*, and then customarily printed at the end of the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*<sup>60</sup>.

<sup>59</sup> *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit.*, "Borgia, Lucrezia."

<sup>60</sup> As discussed in Part 1, at *Commentary does not embrace views that some consider are "third" or "later stage" reforms: 3b) Liberals who subvert Lev. 18:16*; in 1946, the apostate *Church of England's* Convocations revised Parker's Table and reduced the numbers of marriages within the prohibited degrees.

Theoretically, the Church of Rome agrees with the prohibited relationships in Lev. 18 & 20. But Roman Catholic Canon Law sometimes gives a dispensation for a marriage between, for example, an uncle and a niece. This includes both consanguinity (blood relation) as well as affinity (relation by marriage)<sup>61</sup>. For example, a dispensation was granted to Victor Emmanuel of Italy allowing him to marry his deceased wife's sister<sup>62</sup>. Thus the Church of Rome considers incest laws based on Biblical authority can be set aside by Papal or Roman Church authority giving "dispensations." *Great indeed!*, maintain the Papists, *is the power of the Pope, for he can, they claim, set aside the very words of God as found in the Divine Law revealed in Holy Scripture on incest, by granting a Papal dispensation, whose authority to allow incest is greater than the authority of Scripture itself which prohibits such incest.*

It seems clear that it is particularly probable that incest will be allowed by Rome when the worldly influence of politics is brought into play. For example, King Peter IV of Portugal (1798-1834), who was proclaimed Emperor Peter I of Brazil in 1822, renounced the throne of Portugal in favour of his daughter Maria II da Gloria in 1826 (who thereafter reigned 1826-28 and 1834-53). Her first marriage was to her uncle, Dom Miguel, which was allowed by Papal dispensation; but when she wanted to marry a second time, she gained an annulment for this incestuous marriage from the Archbishop of Lisbon and Cardinal Patriarch of the Indies in 1834. To be sure, Maria II da Gloria's incest was first allowed by the Roman Church, and then the incestuous relationship later annulled by the Roman Church, for exactly the same reason, namely, "love" of "the world" (I John 2:15).

As discussed below in greater detail, this was an issue at the time of the Reformation with King Henry VIII's break with Rome. The Pope had granted a dispensation for Henry VIII (King of England 1508-47, Lord of Ireland 1508-1541, King of Ireland 1541-47), to enter an incestuous marriage with Catherine of Aragon. But when Henry VIII realized his moral mistake, he repented of his sin of incest (Lev. 18:16; Matt. 14:3,4), and sent a petition to Pope Clement VII (Pope 1523-34) for an annulment of his incestuous marriage. But Catherine of Aragon's nephew, Charles V, King of Spain (1516-56), and Emperor of the "Holy" Roman Empire (1519-56), had captured Rome in 1527. With his armies being in the European "Holy" Roman Empire, they were constantly at the Pope's doorstep, and so could be easily deployed to capture Rome as they had been in 1527. This meant he was capable of exercising a worldly political pressure on the Pope that Henry VIII whose armies were in far away England could not match or rival. Thus not wishing to upset Charles V, the Pope manifested his "love" of "the world" (I John 2:15), and failed to grant Henry VIII an annulment. Interestingly, this occurred after the Pope had earlier sent a messenger to England granting the annulment, and Henry VIII had actually seen this paper, so he knew the Pope had reneged on this due to political pressure from Spain<sup>63</sup>.

<sup>61</sup> Ayrinhac, H.A., *Marriage Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law*, 1932, 3rd Revised Ed., Benziger Bros., USA, 1952, 1957 pp. 171-172, re: Canons 96 & 1076 (Consanguinity): "The [Roman Catholic] Church dispenses for grave causes in any degree of the collateral line, excepting of the course the first, but uncle and niece and cousin marriages should be discouraged;" and pp. 176-179, re: Canons 97 & 1077 (Affinity).

<sup>62</sup> *UK Parliamentary Debates*, 1907, H.M. Stationery Office, London, Vol. 175, Earl Percy, MHC at p. 991.

<sup>63</sup> "The Spreading Flame, Winds of Change," Episode 4: Henry VIII & Ulrich Zwingli, (Digital Versatile / Video Disc, DVD recording), Ambassador Productions, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 2006 ([www.emeraldhouse.com](http://www.emeraldhouse.com)).

Scripture is clear, for example, “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father’s brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife: she is thine aunt” (Lev. 18:14) i.e., this prohibits aunt-nephew marriages, and on the basis of sex parity of relationships (since the Table is largely put in terms of who a man cannot marry), uncle-niece marriages are also prohibited. The claim of Rome that it can set aside such clear texts of Scriptures, and grant a dispensation to, for example, allow uncles and nieces to marry, is morally shocking. Imagine an uncle, abusing the uncle-niece relationship of trust which is not meant to include a sexual component, to prey upon a niece. First he engages in “the lust of the eyes,” and then, once the Church of Rome grants him a dispensation, “the lust of the flesh” is allowed to be exercised with Rome’s blessing. Thus the Pope’s claim to be able to grant a “dispensation” to allow such incest, manifests “the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes,” which “is not of the Father, but is of the world” (I John 2:16).

*Johannian Epistles teaching: not praying for “a sin unto death”*

The Apostle John says, “If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death” (I John 5:16,17). There are two meanings to this. Either “a sin unto death” may refer to what the Litany of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) calls, “deadly sins” (not to be confused with the Roman Catholic teaching that uses the same terminology) i.e., the type of sins found in I Cor. 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5,6; Rev. 21:8,27; 22:15), i.e., where a willfully unrepentant person in such sin is clearly damned to hell. Secondly, “a sin unto death” may refer to sins that may lead to sickness or death, such as taking Communion at an “Open Communion” where one knows there are other Communicants present who are in unrepentant deadly sins (I Cor. 5:11; 11:28-30); or one does himself partake of Communion in such a state of unrepentant sin (I Cor. 11:28-30).

God is the Creator (Ps. 104:30) and sustainer of life (Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:3). Hence “If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death” (I John 5:16), that is, God will continue to sustain his life, and since he is a “brother” (I John 5:16) the Spirit of God will bring him to repentance (I John 1:8,9). By contrast, when a person is dying as a result of their sin, that is, they have committed “a sin unto death,” the Apostle says, “do not” “pray for it” (I John 5:16), for instance, do not pray that God will continue to sustain their life and bring them health. For example, a person who contracts AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) as a consequence of homosexual or heterosexual oral sodomy or anal sodomy (homosexual sodomy is one of the two most common ways AIDS is transmitted in Western countries), or as a consequence of drugs’ lust with infected needles (one of the two most common ways AIDS is transmitted in Western countries), or as a consequence of promiscuous heterosexual sex with associated bleeding due to the presence of concomitant venereal disease open sores (the common way AIDS is transmitted in black Africa, although it seems that heterosexual anal sodomy may be a less common way of transmission among black Africans<sup>64</sup>), has committed “a sin unto death,” and so it would be wrong to “pray” for their recovery (I John 5:16,17), although one might certainly pray for their repentance and conversion, so that their soul may go to heaven at death.

---

<sup>64</sup> Court, J.H., & Muir, J.G. *op. cit.*, p. 99.

In Lev. 20:21 God says, “if a man shall take his brother’s wife, it is an unclean thing: he hath uncovered his brother’s nakedness; they shall be childless.” That is, when this form of incest occurs God reserves to himself the right to make the couple childless as a sign of his displeasure, although he may not do so in given instances. As discussed below in greater detail, this was an issue at the time of the Reformation with King Henry VIII’s break with Rome, since the children being born of his incestuous union with Catherine of Aragon (his deceased brother’s wife), were dying. Except for one, the Divine decree, “they shall be childless” (Lev. 20:21), was enacted upon the infants of this union. But as a connected consequence of his decree, the Lord then completed that which he had begun, when in his holiness he “slew” the remaining misbegotten child of this union, Bloody Mary, who like Er, “was wicked” (Gen. 38:7). But the Pope had granted a “dispensation” setting aside the express law of God and allowing this incestuous marriage. Thus Henry VIII had to choose whether he would accept Biblical authority (Lev. 18:16; 20:21) or Papal authority (“dispensations” for incest). He chose Biblical authority and thus started a long process that spanned his whole lifetime of bringing the *Church of England* (and *Church of Ireland*) more and more to Protestantism. But it is clear from this episode, that the Church of Rome was condoning “a sin unto death” (I John 5:16), and since we cannot doubt that the Church of Rome and old Roman Antichrist was prepared to “pray” that England not break with Rome over this issue, it follows that the Pope and Roman Church thus stand exposed over this issue of the incestuous marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon as being prepared to pray for a sin unto death. But what saith the Scripture? “There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it” (I John 5:16).

*Johannian Epistles teaching: keeping God’s commandments: idolatry.*

The Apostle John says, “And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him” (I John 2:3,4). “And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him” (I John 3:24). “By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous” (I John 5:2,3). “Keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21).

The Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* (29:6), Congregational *Savoy Declaration* (30:6), and *Baptist Confession* (30:6) are undoubtedly correct in saying that “transubstantiation” “is the cause” “of gross idolatries.” So too, the Dutch Reform *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563) says that the “Mass is” “a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ and a condemnable idolatry” (Question & Answer 80). The *Church of England* Book of Common Prayer (1662) isolates this for us in greater detail, saying in the Final Rubric of “The Communion Service,” “That ... no adoration ... ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances, and therefore must not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.” The Romish doctrine of transubstantiation thus displays the “spirit of antichrist” in denying “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), since his body is in heaven (Acts 3:21; Luke 24:6,39; I Cor. 11:24-26), and “it” is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.” From this first heresy of transubstantiation comes the second heresy of adoration of the sacramental bread and wine,

and thus the Papist will “bow down” and “serve” an “image,” which thing God says, “Thou shalt not” do (Exod. 20:4,5), for we are told, “Keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21).

The *Vatican II Council* claimed, “The celebration of the Eucharist in the sacrifice of the Mass is the origin and consummation of the worship shown to the Eucharist outside Mass.” “Consequently, the eucharistic sacrifice is the source and summit of the whole of the Church’s worship and of the Christian life.” “There should be no doubt in anyone’s mind ‘that all the faithful ought to show to this most holy sacrament the worship which is due to the true God, as has always been the custom of the [Roman] Catholic Church. Nor is it to be adored any the less because it was instituted by Christ to be eaten’ (*Council of Trent*, Session 13; Decree on the Eucharist, chapter 5, Denzinger 878, 1643). For even in the reserved sacrament he is to be adored because he is substantially present there through the conversion of bread and wine which, as the Council of Trent tells us, is most aptly named transubstantiation” (*Instruction on the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery* 3:e,f)<sup>65</sup>.

Furthermore, the Roman Church upholds as the “seventh ecumenical council” the *Second Council of Nicea* (787), which claimed “images of” “Jesus Christ and of our undefiled Lady, ... and of the honourable angels, and of all saintly and holy men” may be given idolatrous “honour” “and he that adores an image adores in it the person depicted thereby.” Thus the *Vatican II Council* said, “This” “council” “proposes again the decrees of the Second Council of Nicea, of the Council of Florence, and of the Council of Trent” (*Dogmatic Constitution of the Church* 51). Vatican II specified, “The practice of placing sacred images in churches so that they be venerated by the faithful is to be maintained.” But it then made this concession, “Nevertheless their number should be moderate” (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* 125). It might reasonably be asked why such idolatry should be “moderate”? Why state that “images are displayed in churches for the veneration of the faithful,” but “there should not be too many such images”? Why take the view that “they distract the people’s attention from the ceremonies” when there are two or more images of the same saint, and so “there should not be more than one image of any particular saint” (*General Instruction on the Roman Missal* 278), lest “they foster devotion of doubtful orthodoxy” (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* 125)<sup>66</sup>? After all, if images really should be “venerated by the faithful,” should not the maxim be, *The more the merrier*, as it was before the *Vatican II Council*?

But of course, the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5), which the Roman Church reckons as the “twenty-first ecumenical council,” was not, like other “ecumenical councils,” summoned in order to deal with a “heresy.” Rather, as the French Archbishop, Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991) perceptively recognized, the Church of Rome was simply concerned that it did not “love the world” and “the things that are in the world” enough (I John 2:15), and so convened a council to modernize and be more worldly. Hence one of Lefebvre’s followers, “Father” Herve Gresland said, “Since Vatican II, we realize that the [Roman] Church is influenced by the world.” “The [Roman] Church is aping the modern world.” Lefebvre had been Archbishop of Dakar (then the largest city of French Africa) and Apostolic Delegate of Pope Pius XII (Pope 1939-1958) for French speaking Africa, from where he made annual visits to see Pope Pius XII. Indeed, in 1976 the Vatican’s official journal, *Osservatore Romano* (French edition, July 1976), said the “missionary bishop, Mgr. Lefebvre, gave a new life to the work of the [Roman] Church” and “his creative work left in Africa a profound mark.”

<sup>65</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 103-4.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35,193,412.

Lefebvre left Dakar in 1962 when Pope John XXIII (Pope 1958-1963) made him Assistant to the Papal Throne and Roman Court. In 1962 Pope John XXIII also made Archbishop Lefebvre a member of the *Preparatory Commission of the Vatican II Council*. But this eminent “council father” of the *Vatican II Council* was critical of the *Vatican II Council*, and rejected “the neo-modernist and neo-Protestant Rome of Vatican II” in his *Declaration* of 1974. Lefebvre took the view that “the Pope is infected with humanism” and said, “I reject this modernist Rome which is changing our religion,” and which he claimed was following “the agenda of the Freemasons and the Protestants<sup>67</sup>.” Though he was one of the so called “fathers” of the *Vatican II Council*, Lefebvre was later excommunicated in 1988 after consecrating four new Roman Catholic bishops who shared his pre-Vatican II views. He and his followers were right in seeing the spirit of worldliness in the Rome of the *Vatican II Council*, but they failed to recognize that this same spirit of worldliness is relevant in understanding the longer history of Roman Catholicism, which is in fact one long history of syncretisms between Christianity and various worldly influences over the centuries.

Lefebvre’s comments about the *Vatican II Council* being influence by “Protestants” require qualification. Specifically, while this council gave *some* concession to the Protestant teaching based on I Cor. 14 that it was “the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church” and minister the sacraments in a tongue” understood by “the people,” it did not go so far as to say having these in Latin *where the people DO NOT understand this tongue* “is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God” (Article 24, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*). Rather it allowed both Romish masses in the vernacular and in Latin, leaving it to the discretion of “the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority to decide whether, and to what extent, the vernacular language is to be used” (*Instruction on Music in the Liturgy* 47)<sup>68</sup>, although in practice, at least to date, most masses have been moved over from Latin to the vernacular.

Likewise, while this council gave *some* concession to the Protestant teaching that the Bible should be “translated out of the original tongues” (*Authorized King James Version* title page) rather than from the Latin Vulgate and other Latin sources, nevertheless, this concession was greatly muted and effectively undermined by the fact that it did not insist that this should be an “exact translation of the holy Scriptures” (Dedicatory Preface to King James, *Authorized Version*). That is, the Protestant belief in translating the Word of God from the original languages relates to a belief in verbal inspiration (Num. 22:20; Ps. 119:89; Jer. 1:7; II Tim. 3:16; II Peter 1:20,21), and so the translation must be a word for word literal translations (sometimes called “formal equivalence,”) with italics used for added words, such as one finds in, e.g., the Authorized (King James) Version (1611) or New King James Version (1982). But the neo-Alexandrian translations to emerge from the *Vatican II Council* they now use, namely, the [*Roman*] *Catholic RSV* (1965), *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985), all fails to use italics for added words, and indeed in the case of the *Jerusalem Bible* and *New Jerusalem Bible* cannot do so since they use “dynamic equivalents” rather than techniques of more literal translation.

Furthermore, failing to recognize the Providential preservation of the OT Received

---

<sup>67</sup> “Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991) and the Society of St. Pius X” ([www.burcom.au/~cdnet/history.htm](http://www.burcom.au/~cdnet/history.htm)); *The Vatican*, A Film by R.J. Boyer, E. Lebec, C. Talczewski, Episode “John-Paul II: 1978,” France 3 - Ellipse Documentaires, BRTN, CRFT, RTBF, 1996, English Version, SBS Australia, 1998.

<sup>68</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 92.

Text and NT Received Text (Isa. 59:21; Matt. 5:18; 24:35; I Peter 1:25), means that unlike textually sound *Textus Receptus* translations such as the NT neo-Byzantine text *Authorized Version*, these Popish Versions intersperse the additions of the Apocrypha throughout the Old Testament, and base their NT on neo-Alexandrian Texts which are focused on the highly corrupt Alexandrian Texts of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus<sup>69</sup>. Jesus upheld the OT Jewish canon (Luke 11:51) and said that “all the Scriptures” of the Old Testament were to be found in the Jewish canon of “Moses and all the prophets” (Luke 24:27), and the Apostle Paul likewise upholds the Jewish OT canon (Rom. 3:1,2). This general teaching is matched by specific Scriptural quotes in the NT which are always from the canonical OT and never from the Apocrypha. By contrast, neither *Vatican II* nor these Papist neo-Alexandrian versions if the [Roman] Catholic RSV, JB, or NJB say, “the Church doth” “not apply” the Apocrypha “to establish any doctrine” (Art. 6, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*); or the “books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 1:3; Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 1:3; cf. *Baptist Confession* 1:3).

Moreover, while the Vatican II Council gave *some* concession to the Protestant teaching that “The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord’s sacraments by Christ’s ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike” (Article 30, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*), it greatly limited communion in both kinds to special occasions “with the bishop’s approval,” for example, “newly baptized adults in the Mass,” or the “bridegroom and the bride at their Nuptial Mass” (*General Instruction on the Roman Missal* 242)<sup>70</sup>.

Likewise, this council gave *some* concession to the Protestant teaching that the “commonly called” so called sacrament of “Extreme Unction” had “grown partly” out “of the corrupt following of the Apostles” (Mark 6:13; James 5:13-15) (Article 25, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*), since among other errors, the Roman Church failed to recognize the apostolic teaching that when this was administered in New Testament times the apostles “healed them” (Mark 6:13), and it was the hope of the faithful that “the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord will raise him up” (James 5:15). Of course, it is not always the Lord’s will to heal a sick person (II Cor. 12:7-10), and so James 5:13-15 should not be read as a guarantee of healing in either apostolic or post-apostolic times. But contextually, healing must be *one reasonable possibility*, and so the Romish “sacrament” of “Extreme Unction” which is *administered only when it was reasonably certain that someone is about to die*, must necessarily “have grown partly” out “of the corrupt following of the Apostles” (Article 25, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*).

This error was to some extent acknowledged by *Vatican II* which said that “‘Extreme Unction,’ which may also and more fittingly be called ‘Anointing of the Sick,’ is not a sacrament for those only who are at the point of death. Hence, as soon as anyone of the faithful begins to be in danger of death from sickness or old age, the fitting time for him to receive this sacrament has certainly already arrived.” Thus *Vatican II* decreed that there be “separate rites for Anointing of the Sick and for Viaticum” (*The Constitutions of the Sacred*

---

<sup>69</sup> For more information with regard to this vitally important issue of upholding the AV’s OT and NT Received Texts, see my Textual Commentaries (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 187-8.

*Liturgy* 73,74)<sup>71</sup>. But “Viaticum” refers to the Mass given to a dying person, and so *Vatican II* still required that “Extreme Unction” continue to be administered, but expanded this so called “sacrament” to also include “anointing of the sick.” Therefore while the *Vatican II Council* gave *some* concession to the Protestant teaching against “Extreme Unction,” this was a long way short of the Protestant teaching that “Extreme Unction” is “not to be counted for” one of the “Sacraments of the Gospel,” for it does “not have any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God” (Article 25, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*). Why? Because “oil” was used since it was the best medicine available at the time (Luke 10:34), and so the meaning of Mark 6:13; James 5:13-15 is *use the best available medicine and also pray to God for healing*. Thus, for example, the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* “Visitation of the Sick” Service, rightly makes no provision for so called “anointing with oil,” since this has long since ceased to be the best available medicine for at least most ailments. Moreover, *Vatican II* retained the essential Roman theology of “sacramental graces” which is at variance with Holy Writ<sup>72</sup>.

But in addition to the fact in the *Vatican II Council* the Roman Church only gave *some* concessions to the Protestant teaching on church services in the vernacular, Communion in both kinds, and “Extreme Unction” being a corruption of James 5:13-15; it is notable that none of the great saving truths of the Protestant Reformation were adopted by the Church of Rome in this council, which remained very much the Roman Catholic Church both before and after *Vatican II*. Nevertheless, given the fact that he was an eminent “council father” of the *Vatican II Council*, who had been appointed by Pope John XXIII to the *Preparatory Commission of the Vatican II Council*, Archbishop Lefebvre’s comments about the *Vatican II Council* being influenced by “Protestants” are valuable in helping to understand such concessions as: allowing the use the vernacular language in church services, Communion in both kinds on *some* occasions, and expanding the so called “sacrament” of “extreme unction” to include “anointing of the sick.” Presumably, it was also this type of thinking that influenced the *Vatican II Council* to state that the idolatrous “veneration” of “images” should be of a “moderate” number, for example, “there should not be more than one image of any particular saint” in a church (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* 7:125; *General Instruction on the Roman Missal* 5:11). That is to say, by reducing the number of idols in a Roman Catholic Church, it is made to look *more like* a Protestant Church, while nevertheless still retaining the Romish practices of idolatry. But what is this but the “wisdom of this world” (I Cor. 1:20) in a compromise based on worldly principles of “meeting the other party half-way”? Such “love” of “the world” (I John 2:15) principles are entirely inappropriate when it comes to theological doctrine, which should not be measured by the standards of tradition or the standards of the world, but by the standards of God’s infallible Book, the Holy Bible! In the words of the Reformation’s catch-cry and motto: *Faith Alone, Grace Alone, Scripture Alone!*

Thus the *Vatican II Council* did not go so far as to say, “The Romish doctrine concerning” “worshipping and adoration, as well of images,” “and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God” (Article 22, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*). The *Vatican II Council’s* changes may greatly aggravate Romanists like the French Archbishop, Lefebvre; and simultaneously satisfy the desires of “ecumenical movement” persons who wish to embrace the old *Roman Antichrist*, that is, the Pope; and also embrace as a “bridge-builder”

---

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>72</sup> Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 616,620.

between Romanism and Protestantism, the old *Roman False Prophet*, that is, the Roman Pope with his bishops in “ecumenical councils.” But for Bible believing Protestants who accept the authority of God’s holy Word, such changes, though real, cannot conceal the underlying reality that *Rome has not fundamentally changed on most core issues*. After all, whether as, before the *Vatican II Council* there is a superabundance of idols in a Roman Catholic Church; or whether, as after the *Vatican II Council*, there is a reduced number of idols in a Roman Catholic Church; the reality remains that such practices violate the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6; Deut. 5:8-10) and the clear teaching of the Apostle John, “keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21).

*Johannian Epistles teaching: keeping God’s commandments: love for the brethren.*

The Apostle John says, “And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him” (I John 2:3,4). “And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him” (I John 3:24). “By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous” (I John 5:2,3). “He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes” (I John 2:9-11). “In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother.” “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him” (I John 3:10,11,12,14,15). “I beseech thee,” “not as though I wrote a new commandment unto thee, but that which we had from the beginning, that we love one another” (II John 5).

There are different forms of religious persecution against Christianity. The first type is a *general persecution* of anyone who professes to be Christian (whether or not they really are Christians). E.g., the ten general persecutions of Christians under Pagan Rome (1st to 4th centuries)<sup>73</sup>. A second type is a *specific persecution of those who profess some specific spiritual tenet or tents of religious orthodoxy* (whether or not they are orthodox in all areas, or really are Christians). E.g., the persecutions of orthodox Trinitarians by Arians (4th to 7th centuries); or persecutions by Papal Rome against the orthodox (6th century on) e.g., the Marian Martyrs (16th century)<sup>74</sup>. A third type of persecution is a *persecution of those upholding specific Christian morals* (whether or not they are actually true Christians). E.g., the murder of Kilien of Ireland in Germany in 689 A.D. because he told the Governor that his incestuous marriage to his deceased brother’s wife should be ended<sup>75</sup>.

There is a long history of the Roman Church making confessors and martyrs out of the saints. Their preferred technique has generally been a continuation of the technique

<sup>73</sup> Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 1-40.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 43-4,52-4 (Orthodox Trinitarians by Arians), pp. 302-582 (Protestant Marian Martyrs by Papal Rome).

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 54-6.

pioneered by the Arians against orthodox Trinitarians i.e., a *specific persecution of those who profess some specific spiritual tenet or tenets of religious orthodoxy* that is contrary to Popery. (Although since the *Second Vatican Council* they have increasingly supported the third type under the name of “human rights,” e.g., supporting the persecution of godly men in the workplace who uphold Christian morals of patriarchy against feminism.) Between the sixth (*Second Council Constantinople*) and thirteenth centuries (*Crusade Against the Albigenses*), the Roman Church perfected a particular twist in their technique of this second type of persecution. They became past masters of a technique that would isolate a group of heretics who clearly rejected an orthodox spiritual or moral truth. They would rightly condemn them. Then they would wrongly associate them with a group of orthodox Christians who held a tenet of orthodoxy contrary to Rome, and falsely connect the two groups together. They would then condemn the orthodox anti-Romanists, together with the heretics, claiming that the two groups were really one and the same group. This technique of “deceivableness” (II Thess. 2:10), not only justified their persecution of the orthodox in the eyes of their ignorant minions, who wrongly thought the orthodox adhered to the connected heresy, and who could, if necessary, be shown examples of such heretics from “the group” (which was really two groups); but it also meant that if anyone tried to defend the orthodox Christians, they could be falsely charged with supporting the heresy that they incorrectly associated with them.

This methodology was masterfully evident in the anathemas of the *Second Council Constantinople* (553). This Council rightly condemned Nestorian heretics. But it also condemned the orthodox who rejected the notion of an “ever-virgin Mary.” Thus the orthodox (rejecting an “ever-virgin Mary”) were condemned with the heretics (Nestorians) as one group. The false prophet again used this technique in the *Third Council of Constantinople* (681). This Council rightly condemned Monothelite heretics. But it also condemned the orthodox who believed in the inspiration of Holy Scripture as a completed revelation with true prophets only existing in Bible times, since this council claimed “inspiration” for “general” or “ecumenical” councils i.e., giving them the status of a prophet. Thus the orthodox (rejecting “inspiration” claims of general councils) were condemned with the heretics (Monothelites) as one group. Rome’s deceptions were thus seen in the holy confessors anathematized by the thundering condemnations of the *Constantinople II Council* (553), for refusing to accept the teaching of an “ever-virgin Mary;” the confessors anathematized by the thundering condemnations of the *Constantinople III Council* (681), for refusing to accept the “inspiration” claims of this council which effectively raised “general” / “ecumenical” councils to the status of a prophet; and the confessors anathematized by the thundering condemnations of the *Nicea II Council* (787) for refusing to commit idolatry. *Was this love for the brethren?*

The Romish experts of this technique also used it with devastating effect in their *Crusade Against the Albigenses*, which comprised of both heretical Cathar Albigenses, and orthodox Waldensian Albigenses. There is evidence that the Waldensians are an ancient group indeed e.g., their Papist enemies claimed in a medieval story hostile to the Waldensians, that they had separated from the Church of Rome in the fourth century as a protest against Emperor Constantine’s land grants to the Bishops of Rome in the *Donation of Constantine*<sup>76</sup>. While the claim that they separated because of the *Donation of Constantine* is clearly false since this was a later eighth century document, the fundamental claim seems

---

<sup>76</sup> Bihlmeyer, K., *Church History*, Revised by H. Tuchle, translated from the thirteenth German edition by V.E. Mills and F.J. Muller, Vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*, Newman Press, Maryland, USA, 1963, pp. 146,211.

difficult to ignore i.e., the Waldensians were already in existence in the eighth century when the *Donation of Constantine* began to circulate, and protesting against its claims, the Papists then falsely said that this was the reason why the Waldensians were an independent group from Rome. Just when they separated or came into existence *as a group* between the fourth and eighth centuries is not clear. However, they may well have originated under Constantine, not because of the *Donation*, but because they rejected episcopal church government, i.e., Constantine's creation of the four (later five) metropolitan patriarchates, would have put the Waldensians under the Bishopric of Rome, a church authority they rejected. Alternatively, they may have originated in the sixth century (533-565) or seventh century (607) in rejection of Rome's universal titular primacy from 533 to 565, later repudiated by Gregory I as a teaching of "Antichrist," and then revived as a governing primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 607 with the formation of the Roman Papacy by Boniface III. Or possibly they originated in the eighth century with the formation of the Papal states and then came under increased persecution from the ninth century with the formation of the "Holy" Roman Empire in 800 A.D. . Whether the Waldenses originated in the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, or 8th centuries is unclear. But it is clear that they are a very old group who rejected Rome's claim to jurisdiction over them; and the evidence is that they were in existence at, or around the time, the fraudulent *Donation of Constantine* began to circulate i.e., no later than the eighth century A.D.; and we have further positive historical confirmation of their existence from as early as c. 1000 A.D. .

The Waldensians were joined in the 12th century by Peter Waldo in Lyons (France), who either took the name Waldo from this small pre-existing group of Waldenses, or gave it to the pre-existing group. But in either instance, it is clear that either under the name of "Waldensians" or some earlier name(s), the Waldensians have a much greater antiquity than the time of Peter Waldo. E.g., before the time of Peter Waldo, they were known as "Henricians" from 1147, because their most prominent preacher was Henry of Toulouse. But before this time, some of their better known preachers included Berengarius around 1000 A.D., followed by Peter Bruis who preached at Toulouse. Peter Waldo then acted as the human instrument by which God encouraged the missionary work of the Waldenses, who then spread out further<sup>77</sup>.

Following missionary work encouraged by Peter Waldo, in the 12th and 13th centuries, Waldensians were found in north-west Aragon (Spain) at Lerida; in France at Clermont; on the border of France and the German Empire at Lyons, and Valence; and also in the Empire of Germany and Kingdom of Italy at Mainz, Metz, Toul, Regensburg, Besancon, Gruaro, Verona, Cerea, Modena, Genoa, Aix, Florence, and Rome. They were also in pocketed areas around Vienna on the Danube River (German Empire) and Milan (Italy). Waldenses existed in a broad geographical arc of land stretching from the area of Albi and Toulouse (southern France), through the areas around Narbonne, Beziers, Arles, Avignon, and up to the area around Turin (Italy). Heretical Manichean (Manichaeian) Cathars who thought all creation and matter to be evil, were located in Italy at Vitterbo, Orvieto, Siena, Pisa, Bologna, and a pocketed area around Milan. These Cathars also existed in the area of Albi, Toulouse, and Narbonne (southern France).

This meant that both Cathars and Waldensians were in pockets around Albi, Toulouse, and Narbonne in southern France; and both were also in a pocketed area around

---

<sup>77</sup> Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, p. 56 .

Milan (Italy). The Waldensians were known to have preached against the Cathars<sup>78</sup>. However, Rome exploited the fact that both groups existed in southern France around Albi, Toulouse, and Narbonne. “Albigense” means from “Albi” in France, and so as to justify their attack on the proto-Protestant Waldensians, both the Manichean Cathars around Albi, as well as the Waldensians around Albi, were designated “Albigenses,” and the Manichean Cathar heresy was then attributed to “Albigenses” indiscriminately, i.e., with no distinction between Cathar Albigenses and Waldensian Albigenses. While the finer details are lost in unrecorded history, it appears that the two religious groups fought together, when attacked together, by the Papist armies in e.g., their *Crusade Against Albigenses*. But the Waldensian Albigenses were certainly *not* neo-Manichean “Cathars,” and the confusion of these two groups of “Albigenses,” has slandered the (proto-Protestant) Waldensian Albigenses with the claim of Manichean (or Cathar) heresy.

Under normal circumstances, the Waldensians of the Albi region would not have been distinguished from other Waldenses who inhabited various regions of Western Europe at this time. But they have this distinction of being labelled “Albigenses” by the Papists, who then wrongly persecuted them on the basis that the Cathar Albigenses and Waldensian Albigenses, were all “Albigenses” who embraced the Cathar heresy of Manicheanism. Thus the Waldensian Albigenses have this badge of godly pride to wear, “Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute, and shall say all manner of evil against you *falsely*, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you” (Matt. 5:11,12, my emphasis). Certainly Protestant hagiology frequently refers to “the Albigenses and Waldenses” till they reunited as a single group following the *Crusade Against Albigenses*, and I think this perspective is justifiable on this basis of Matt. 5:11,12. Therefore, in continuation of this time honoured Protestant tradition, unless otherwise stated, when I refer to “Albigenses” I mean the Waldensian Albigenses, not the Cathar Albigenses.

And so let us now consider the Waldensian Albigenses and other Waldenses condemned by the thunders of the interdicts of the *Roman False Prophet* in 1179 (*Lateran III Council*) and 1215 (*Lateran IV Council*). The brave Waldensian Albigenses were falsely grouped together with the Cathar Albigenses, and the Waldensian Albigenses were then falsely accused by Romanists of being neo-Manichean and sexually immoral. Both groups of Albigenses were attacked, and both groups of Albigenses fought together in seeking, unsuccessfully, to escape their Papist persecutors in their *Crusade Against the Albigenses*. It is clear that the two groups of Albigenses fought long and hard, to defend themselves against the Papist Crusaders. In 2004 I inspected some of the Albigensian sites in southern France at Albi, Toulouse (where the *Crusade Against the Albigenses* started in 1209), Carcassonne, and Foix. This included Carcassonne Castle, finally taken in the *Crusade Against the Albigenses* by Simon de Montford in 1209; Foix Castle where the Earls of Carcassonne lived and gave religious freedom to both groups of Albigenses; and Montsegur Castle in Foix (where the *Crusade Against the Albigenses* ended in 1243). The victorious Papists subsequently built a fortress-like looking Cathedral at Albi which they started in 1265, as a statement of their triumphant control of the region; though today, in a discreet and less obvious locale in Fonvielle Street (Rue Fonvielle), I saw Albi’s “Temple Protestant.” I also saw another “Reformed Temple,” which now stands opposite the Palais du Justice in Toulouse, which is

---

<sup>78</sup> Dowley, T. (Editor), *The Atlas of the Bible and the History of Christianity*, British & Foreign Bible Society, Swindon, UK, 1997, p. 104.

where the Earls of Toulouse lived before the Palais du Justice was built on that spot<sup>79</sup>. These Protestant Churches remind us that the Papists were ultimately unsuccessful. The Albigensian sites are also a reminder that in the Waldenses, God preserved the truth of the Gospel in the darkest days of medieval Popery.

The Waldensian “Albigenses were a people of the reformed religion” in that they were proto-Protestants, “who inhabited the country of Albi.<sup>80</sup>” Their history reunites as one with the wider group of their fellow Waldenses, after the surviving remnant of Waldensian Albigenses from the thirteenth century *Crusade Against the Albigenses*, left southern France to join their fellow French-speaking Waldensian brethren, the *Vaudois* or Waldenses in north-west Italy<sup>81</sup>. The Waldenses then later embraced the Protestant Reformation in the synod of 1532 A.D. (celebrated in the *Chanforan Monument* at Terre Pellice, near Turin, which I have been privileged to inspect). Persecutions continued. *Was this love for the brethren?* I have beheld the fountain to King Carlo Alberto which stands today in the Waldenses’ town of Terre Pellice, as a memorial to the king who gave religious tolerance to the Waldenses only as late as 1845.

A large stone I have seen now stands at Constance in the south-west of Germany to mark the place, where after the thundering condemnation of the proto-Protestant teaching of Wycliffe and Huss by the *Roman False Prophet* in 1414-8 (*Council of Constance*), *fire was made to come down from earth in the sight of men*, as it was falsely claimed that the Roman Church was acting with God’s authority, when the fires of execution were lit and Huss of Bohemia (martyred 1415) and Jerome of Prague (martyred 1416) were burnt at the stake. *Was this love for the brethren?* The nearby Lutheran Church was dedicated 450 years later in 1865 to honour the memory of the holy martyr, Huss. Then came the thundering anathemas of the *Roman False Prophet* in 1545-63 (*Council of Trent*). The great mathematician, John Kepler (1571-1630), was a Lutheran Protestant who had studied Lutheran theology at Tübingen University in German. Kepler was a school teacher who in 1594 became a mathematics teacher at the Lutheran High School of Graz in Austria. Graz is Austria’s second largest city, and by 1568 some three-quarters of its population were Protestant Christians. But under the Counter-Reformation the Hapsburgs’ Austro-Hungarian Empire had Jesuits sent into Graz to found a university, made it the seat of a Papal nuncio, and placed anti-Protestant pressure on the Protestants, one of whom was Kepler. The Hapsburg’s Archduke Ferdinand closed down Kepler’s school. Tycho Brahe invited Kepler to join him in Bohemia, and this gave Kepler a window of opportunity to escape from the Papist persecution of Protestants in Graz. In January 1600, Kepler left Graz to become Tycho Brahe’s assistant at Benatek Observatory (Benatky nad Jazerou) outside of Prague in Bohemia (Czech). This was very fortunate for Kepler, because in the same year, the Papist persecution in Graz became more violent, as they pushed all remaining Protestants out of Graz in 1600. *Was this love for the brethren?*

What of the holy confessor Primoz Trubar (1508-1585), who having been God’s instrument to bring the holy Protestant faith to Slovenia was then forced out of the country, and was followed by a wave of Protestant confessors and martyrs as the Romish Austro-Hungarian Empire moved to overturn this missionary work, desecrating Protestant graves and

---

<sup>79</sup> Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 67-83.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

<sup>81</sup> Blakeney, R.P., *Popery in its Social Aspects*, George McGibbon, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, [late 19th century], p. 108.

churches, burning Protestant books, and removing Protestants from the area in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries?<sup>82</sup> *Was this love for the brethren?* When, by the grace of God, Protestantism was re-established in Slovenia, the Lutherans built a church in the capital of Ljubliana in the nineteenth century. When I visited this Lutheran Church in 2004, I was delighted to discover that it contains two plaques thanking God for Primoz Trubar. Moreover, while Slovenia has remained a predominantly Roman Catholic country, it is now a secular state; and in recognition of this Lutheran history connected with Primoz Trubar, like a number of German States, Slovenia has made the *Eve of All Saints' Day*, known in Lutheran tradition as *Reformation Day* (31 October), a public holiday<sup>83</sup>.

Or what of the holy French confessors of 1854-5 documented by the great nineteenth century Anglican clergyman, Canon Richard Blakeney? At that time the Foreign Aid Society *Report for 1855* recorded, "The scenes of the last century, when the Church in France was in the wilderness, and in the clefts of the rocks of the Cevennes, have been renewed in the year 1854-5. Deprived of their places of worship, even the school-room taken away from them, the children of God have met in the woods for edification" in places such as "Alencon," "Villefavard," and in "Upper Vienne" at "Limoges" and elsewhere. This *Report* records "these wrongs" by "local" government "authorities" were "instigated" "by the Romish hierarchy" against "the Reformed" "persecuted Protestants." Thus the persecuting power was "the Romish hierarchy" acting through the instruments of "the Civil Government."<sup>84</sup> *Was this love for the brethren?*

What of the holy Spanish confessor, Manuel Matamoros, a Protestant missionary of Barcelona in Spain, who another Anglican clergyman, William Bramley-Moore in his edition of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (1867), records was arrested in 1860? The Spanish Magistrate asked him, "Do you profess the Catholic Apostolic Roman faith? And if not, what?" His reply included the statements, "My religion is that of Jesus Christ. My rule of faith is the Holy Bible." "The Roman Catholic Church not being based upon these principles, I do not believe in her dogmas, and still less do I obey her in practice." Matamoros was then imprisoned in Barcelona, and later transferred to a prison in Granada. In December 1861, he was sentenced to seven years penal servitude (and another, Trigo, was sentenced to four years *for propagating Protestant principles*); and in another trial in September 1862 to eight years imprisonment. Protestants in the United Kingdom sought to obtain his (and some others) release. The Protestant Alliance, Evangelical Alliance, and others were active to this end. Members of the British Parliament became involved, including Lord Stratford, and large meetings were addressed by Sir Robert Peel in Bristol, Liverpool, and London. General Alexander interceded with the Government of Spain in a Madrid meeting. Matamoros (and others) were finally released, but condemned to exile from Spain<sup>85</sup>. *Was this love for the*

---

<sup>82</sup> Didier, V. *et al*, *History of Yugoslavia*, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1972, McGraw-Hill, English translation 1974, New York, USA, pp. 166,167-8.

<sup>83</sup> As with the revised first edition of this work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006), so likewise the second edition of this work (2010) was Dedicated to God on the Eve of All Saints' Day with special reference to the Reformation wrought by God under Martin Luther when he nailed his 95 Theses to the Door of Wittenberg Castle on the Eve of All Saints' Day, 1517. (See "PART 1: PREFATORY REMARKS AND PRINCIPLES," section, "The Dedication," subsection, "The Anglican Calendar.")

<sup>84</sup> R.P. Blakeney, *Popery in its Social Aspects*, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-3.

<sup>85</sup> Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 714-5.

*brethren?*

In 1620, the Papist Jesuit priest, John Sarkander, who had been educated by Jesuits in Prague, was executed for treason. As Papist Bishop of Olomouch, he persecuted and killed thousands of Protestants under an inquisitorial forced-conversion policy of *convert to Popery or die*. But in 1859, Pope Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878) beatified him at Rome, giving him the title, "Blessed Sarkander." Then in 1995, Pope John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) canonized him at Olomouch in Czech, giving him the title, "Saint Sarkander." Arthur Noble records of this scandal, "The canonization of" "Jan Sarkander" "caused widespread anger among Czech Protestants." For example, "Pavel Smetana," formerly Moderator of the Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren, "reminded the Pope that Sarkander was a representative of 'the violent reconversion of Moravia to [Roman] Catholicism'."<sup>86</sup> Lutheran church leaders at Skoczow, Poland, the place of Sarkander's birth in 1576, also refused an invitation from Pope John-Paul II to attend ceremonies connected with Sarkander's canonization<sup>87</sup>. Thus the murderous Sarkander has been glorified by two Popes. *Was this love for the brethren?*

Though many Irish Roman Catholic terrorists who have been responsible for the attempted murder, or actual murder, of British Protestants, have been apprehended, charged, prosecuted, convicted, and jailed, up to and including contemporary times, *not one of them has ever been excommunicated by Rome. Is this love for the brethren?* What saith the Scripture? "Ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (I John 3:15). Little wonder then that (as more fully discussed in Part 3,) the Romish cult of Aloysius Cardinal Stepinatz (1898-1960) has held such a historic appeal among Romanists in Ireland. During World War Two, some 700,000-750,000 Serbs (over 99% Serbian Orthodox but including less than 1% who were Protestants), were killed by the Nazi Ustashi after having refused to convert to Roman Catholicism. The Roman Catholic Croatian Archbishop of Zagreb, Archbishop (later Cardinal), Stepinatz, was convicted in 1946 of collaboration with this murderous regime. Yet neither he nor any of the Romish bishops, priests, monks, nuns, or laity involved were ever excommunicated. Indeed, in 1998, Pope John-Paul II beatified the convicted Nazi war criminal, Stepinatz, thus bestowing upon him the title of "Blessed," and authorizing a Romish cult for the so called "Blessed Stepinatz." *Was this love for the brethren?*

"But" some say, "Didn't the Roman Church change on this type of issue after *Vatican Two*?" Those taking this view point to two elements of the *Vatican II Council*. Firstly, its designation of both Protestants and those in other churches as "separated brethren;" and secondly its "Decree on Ecumenism" towards both Protestants and others. It must be admitted that since Vatican II, the Roman Church has found it necessary to read down and distort the natural meaning of the Biblically sound damnatory clauses in the *Athanasian Creed*. For the Christ who suffered and died for our salvation, and rose again, cannot be called "Lord" outside the Biblical Trinity (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15,16; Rom. 1:1-3; 5:6; 8:9;10:9; I Cor. 8:5,6; 12:3; II Cor. 13:14). Thus they now openly embrace Trinitarian heretics such as the Eastern Orthodox or Oriental Orthodox as part of their new "ecumenical" views, and outright unbelievers such as Mohammedans or Jews as part of their new "inter-faith" views. In this context, the damnatory clauses of the *Athanasian Creed* were simply *too Biblical* for them, and through some fudging, side-shuffling, and dodging, this most

---

<sup>86</sup> Noble, A., "Pope beatifies a mass murder ...," *European Institute of Protestant Studies* 1 Aug 1999 ([www.ianpaisly.org/article.asp?](http://www.ianpaisly.org/article.asp?)).

<sup>87</sup> Bill Burkett's *News & Views* ([www.action.com/newsview](http://www.action.com/newsview)).

beautiful creed was pushed to one side and ignored. As already observed, a most eminent council “father” of Vatican II, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, candidly admitted that the motivation of the *Vatican II Council* for this type of thing, was simply their desire to embrace the spirit of worldliness.

For example, “The Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras” (17 Dec. 1965). In this document, the Pope of Rome and Patriarch of Constantinople, said they now “wish to erase from the memory and midst of the Church the sentences of excommunication” they made against each other in the Great Schism of “1054.<sup>88</sup>” Thus contrary to the Biblically sound teaching of the *Athanasian Creed*, Rome gave spiritual recognition to a well known Trinitarian heretic who denies the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son*, namely, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, who is the Patriarch held in first place of honour among the Eastern Orthodox, (a position of honour that does not carry with it any form of titular primacy among the Eastern Orthodox Churches in general, although he does hold a position of primacy, with some powers, inside the Greek Orthodox Church). Likewise, there was the “Joint Declaration on Unity” between Pope Paul VI and Vasken I, Catholicos and Supreme Patriarch of the Armenian Orthodox Church (12 May, 1970). Like other Oriental Orthodox Churches, the Armenian Orthodox are well known Trinitarian heretics who deny the humanity of Christ via the monophysitist heresy. Yet in this declaration the Pope of Rome and Catholicos of the Armenian Orthodox, were prepared “to pray together, to meet and to exchange the kiss of peace” in “unity” and “brotherhood.<sup>89</sup>” No orthodox Protestant would ever give such a spiritual greeting to a Trinitarian heretic like Vasken I (II John 7,10,11); and once again, this required the Pope of Rome to set aside the Biblically sound teaching in the *Athanasian Creed*.

There is also a change between the *Second Vatican Council* (1962-5) which referred to Protestants (and others) as “separated brethren,” and says “though we believe they suffer from” doctrinal “defects,” “they” “have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation;” and the *Fifth Lateran Council* (1512-17) which “declared by the constitution of Pope Boniface VIII,” that the Bull “*Unam Sanctam*” has “the approval of the present sacred council,” since *Unam Sanctam* says “it is essential to the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff<sup>90</sup>.” Sometimes a false prophet declares war contrary to the truth (I Kgs 22:11), and sometimes a false prophet declares “peace” contrary to the truth (Jer. 6:13,14; 8:10,11). So likewise, sometimes the *Roman False Prophet* declares open war on God’s saints contrary to the truth as he did in his teaching of *Unam Sanctam* in 1512-17 (*Lateran V*), and sometimes the *Roman False Prophet* declares “peace” with God’s saints contrary to the truth as he did in his teaching of “separated brethren” in 1962-5 (*Vatican II*). But in either instance, the *Roman False Prophet* speaks contrary to God’s true prophets of the OT and NT, that is, contrary to Scripture.

From the time of the Reformation on, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Roman Church came in for strong and justifiable criticism on *Unam Sanctam* from Martin Luther and other Protestants. For example, in his *Smalcald Articles* (1537) (4:9-11) upheld

---

<sup>88</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 471-3.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 533-4.

<sup>90</sup> *Decree on Ecumenism* 3;20,21, *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 456,468; Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 115-6 (quoting Friedberg’s and Richter’s *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Vol. 2, p. 1245).

in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* (1576 & 1584) (Epitome 3), Luther said, “the Pope” “is the true Antichrist,” “who has raised himself over and set himself against Christ because the Pope will not let Christians be saved without his authority, which amounts to nothing. It is not ordered or commanded by God. This is called precisely, ‘setting oneself over God and against God,’ as St. Paul says” (II Thess. 2:4). The age of European exploration also brought to Europeans the knowledge of ignorant heathens around the globe. A controversy then erupted inside the Roman Church between those who wanted to modify *Unam Sanctam* with such concepts as “invincible ignorance” (*Invincible Ignorance View*), and those opposed to this modification (*Exclusive Romanist Salvation View*). Those wanting the *Invincible Ignorance View* and its associated concepts, anachronistically claim that the words of *Unam Sanctam*, “it is essential to the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff,” do not actually mean what they say; but are qualified to only refer to those who *contrary to their better knowledge are outside the Roman Church*. For example, in 1690 Pope Alexander VIII (Pope 1689-1691) condemned the proposition that “pagans, Jews, heretics, and other people of the sort, receive no influx [of grace] whatsoever from Jesus Christ;” or in 1713, Pope Clement XI (Pope 1700-1721) in his Bull, *Unigenitus* condemned the proposition that “no grace is given outside the [Roman] Church.”<sup>91</sup>

By contrast, Pope Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878) is a representative of the *Exclusive Romanist Salvation View*. In his *Encyclical Letter* of 1854 he rejected the views of what was by then the majority of Romish theologians, such as Bishop Milner, namely that heathen and “heretics” outside the Roman Church could still be saved on the basis of “invincible ignorance.” In his *Syllabus* (1854), Pope Pius IX “stigmatized” as some “of the principal errors of our time,” the propositions that “men may in any religion find the way of eternal salvation, and obtain eternal salvation,” “eternal salvation may at least be hoped for of all those who are not at all in the true [Roman] Church of Christ,” or “The [Roman] Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the [Roman] Catholic Church is the only true religion.” The *Syllabus* also puts these same propositions in the positive form, that is, Pope Pius IX declared, “Man cannot find the way of eternal salvation, neither obtain eternal salvation in any religion,” “eternal salvation of any out of the true [Roman] Church of Christ is not even to be hoped for,” and “The [Roman] Church has power to define dogmatically the religion of the [Roman] Catholic Church to be the only true religion.”<sup>92</sup>

But the majority view continued to prevail within the Roman Church, with this group wanting the concept of “invincible ignorance” which reads down Pope Pius IX’s *Encyclical Letter* of 1854, in exactly the same way that they read down *Unam Sanctam*. Thus writing with the *Imprimatur* of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, John Farley, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913) refers to Pope Pius IX, and then adds, “But it is likewise certain that those who are ignorant of the true religion, if their ignorance is invincible, are not, in this matter, guilty of any fault in the sight of God.” This *Catholic Encyclopedia* also says, “Whoever indeed has recognized the true [Roman] Church,” “but contrary to his better knowledge refuses to enter it,” “exposes himself to eternal damnation.” “Otherwise the gentle breathing of grace is not confined within the walls of the [Roman] Catholic Church, but reaches” “many who stand afar, working in them” “justification, and thus ensuring the eternal salvation of” “upright Jews and pagans,” “or” “many Protestants educated in gross

---

<sup>91</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913), Vol. 14, p. 767; quoting Denzinger-Bannwart, 11th ed., Freiburg, 1911, n. 1295 (Pope Alexander VIII) and n. 1379 (Pope Clement XI).

<sup>92</sup> Blakeney, R.P., *Manuel of Romish Controversy, op. cit., Encyclical Letter of Pius IX*, pp. 285-98.

prejudice.” The Roman Church does not thereby refer “the eternal salvation of” non-Roman Catholics “solely and exclusively to ‘invincible ignorance’,” but also “places the efficient cause of the eternal salvation of all men objectively in the merits of the Redeemer, and subjectively in justification through baptism or through good faith enlivened by the perfect love of God, both of which may be found outside the [Roman] Catholic Church.” “Recognizing from the [Roman] Catholic doctrine of grace that the possibility of justification and of eternal salvation is not withheld even from the heathen,” “all Christians” include “e.g., the various Protestant bodies” who are “brethren.”

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* also observes that this Roman Catholic doctrine of “tolerance toward the erring” is different to the Protestant teaching found in “the large catechism of Martin Luther, which on ‘pagans or Turks [Mohammedans] or Jews or false Christians’ passes the general and stern sentence of condemnation: ‘wherefore they remain under eternal wrath and in everlasting damnation’<sup>93</sup>” (Mark 16:16; Gal. 5:20; Eph. 2:12; Rev. 21:8). But the *Catholic Encyclopedia* simultaneously fails to fairly represent the alternative *Exclusive Romanist Salvation View of Unam Sanctam* and Pope Pius IX, choosing instead to develop the *Invincible Ignorance View* by creating the picture of a fictional consensus among Romanists in favour of this “tolerance” view.

So too, writing on *The Reunion of Christendom* in 1928, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Bourne, says of “the axiom ‘outside the [Roman] Church there is no salvation,’” that “it is equally true that without the deliberate act of the will there can be neither fault nor sin, so evidently the axiom applies only to those who are outside the [Roman] Church knowingly, deliberately, and wilfully” (*Invincible Ignorance View*). In the same book, Pope Pius XI (Pope 1922-1939) in his encyclical letter, “Fostering True Religious Unity,” refers to Protestants (and others) as “our separated children” (*Invincible Ignorance View*). But he also asks, “How can men with opposite convictions” (such as Roman Catholics and Protestants,) “belong to one and the same federation as the faithful [Roman Catholics]: those who accept Tradition as a source of revelation and those who reject it; those who recognize” “the hierarchy of [Roman] bishops,” “and those who regard it as gradually introduced;” “those who adore Christ” “in the” “Eucharist” “through” “transubstantiation, and those who assert that the body of Christ is there only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the sacrament; those who in the Eucharist” believe there is a “sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial of the Lord’s Supper; those who think it is right and useful to pray to the Saints reigning with Christ, especially to Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who refuse such veneration as derogatory due to Jesus Christ ‘the one mediator of God and men’ (cf. I Tim. 2:5)?” And with respect to “Protestantism” he specifically says, “not one will” “with devout submission” “obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his capacity of teacher or ruler.” Hence Pope Pius XI concludes, “there is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the” Roman “Church” of “those who are separated from it.”<sup>94</sup>

Thus on the eve of the *Vatican II Council* we find in the *Saint Andrew Daily Missal* (1962) of the Roman Church, with a foreword by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster in London, William Godfrey, the usage of “separated brethren” for Protestants

<sup>93</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913), Vol. 14, pp. 761-73 at 766-7 on “Toleration;” referring to Denzinger-Bannwart, *op. cit.*, n. 1647 (with regard to Pope Pius IX).

<sup>94</sup> Marchant, J. (Editor), *The Reunion of Christendom*, Cassell, London, UK and Sydney Australia, 1929, pp. 18,28,30-2,34.

in this context. Here, that “idol shepherd,” the Pope (Zech. 11:17), robs Christ of his standing as “chief Shepherd” (I Peter 5:4), as Rome wickedly claims England as “Mother” Mary’s “dowry.” This is seen in the following extracts from a longer, more tedious Marian “Prayer for the conversion of England” to Popery, which the text says carries with it an indulgence of “300 days” relief from purgatory as a “plenary” indulgence “once a month.” “O blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and our most gentle Queen and Mother, look down in mercy upon England thy Dowry,” “O sorrowful Mother.” “Intercede for our separated brethren, that we may be united to the Chief Shepherd, the Vicar of thy Son,” the Pope, “Amen.”<sup>95</sup> (Here the Pope is conceptualized not as *Vicar of God’s Son*, but as *Vicar of Mary’s Son*.)

This is significant in showing the pre-*Vatican II* position, namely, that the “the axiom ‘outside the [Roman] Church there is no salvation’” was interpreted two ways, that is, either as meaning, in the words of Pope Pius IX’s 1854 *Encyclical*, “eternal salvation of any out of the true [Roman] Church” “is not even to be hoped for” (*Exclusive Romanist Salvation View*: the minority view of Roman Catholic hierarchy for hundreds of years), or as meaning, the axiom “applies only to those who are outside the [Roman] Church knowingly, deliberately, and wilfully” (*Invincible Ignorance View*: the majority view of Roman Catholic hierarchy for hundreds of years). Thus on the *Invincible Ignorance View* there is “the possibility of justification and of eternal salvation” for “heathen,” “Jews,” and “all Christians” “e.g., the various Protestant bodies.” The *Invincible Ignorance View* (which reads down Pope Pius XI’s statements in the same way they read down *Unam Sanctam*) also considered that Protestants (and others) can be referred to as “separated children” since they have “separated” from the Church of Rome, and are “brethren.” However, the ultimate goal of Rome was “the unity of Christians” “by” “the return to the” Roman “Church” of “those who are separated from it.”

Against this backdrop, *Vatican II* (1962-5) was significant in that it endorsed the *Invincible Ignorance View* as opposed to the *Exclusive Romanist Salvation View* of *Lateran V* (1512-17). But it is important to keep in view *Vatican II*’s qualifications.

For example, *Vatican II* says on “separated brethren,” “one cannot charge with the sin of the separation those who at present are born into” Protestant (and other) “communities and in them are brought up in the faith of Christ, and the [Roman] Catholic Church accepts them” “as brothers. For men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are put in some, though imperfect, communion with the [Roman] Catholic Church” (*Decree on Ecumenism* 3)<sup>96</sup>. From such statements comes:

*Qualification 1:* Protestant (and other) “separated brethren” are in *Invincible Ignorance*, for “one cannot charge” them “with the sin of” “separation” from Rome.

*Qualification 2:* One can still “charge with the sin of separation” from Rome Protestants of an earlier era. *Vatican II* does not apply this retrospectively, that is, before 1962-5. Therefore, the Church of Rome continues to justify earlier Protestant (and proto-Protestant) persecutions, for example, Huss of Bohemia (martyred 1415), Martin Luther (Bull of Excommunication 1521, and Edict Against Luther from the Diet of Worms, 1521 which meant that if he was arrested he could be burnt at the stake), the Marian confessors and

<sup>95</sup> Lefebvre, G., *Saint Andrew Daily Missal*, *op. cit.*, p. 1843.

<sup>96</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 455.

Martyrs of England (1555-7), the Saint Bartholomew Day martyrs of Paris (1572), the Ancien regime martyrs of France (following the Revocation of the *Edict of Nantes*, 1598, by King Louis XIV in 1685, up till 1789), the southern French Protestant confessors and martyrs of the Restoration at Nimes and elsewhere (1814-20), the Saint Joseph Day confessors and martyrs of Barletta, Italy, (1866), the *Independent State of Croatia* Protestant confessors and martyrs of Serbian descent in Slatina (Croatia, 1941) or Srem (Serbia, 1941-2).

*Qualification 3:* As a manifestation of *Qualification 2*, Romanists involved in the persecution of Protestants before this time who have been, or subsequently are, “declared venerable,” “beatified,” or “canonized,” continue to be upheld as role models for Papists. For example, the canonization of “Saint Pope Pius V” (Pope 1566-1572) still stands. Before he became Pope Pius V, the Bishop of Sutri, Michele Ghisleri, was made a Cardinal and appointed as Grand Inquisitor General over the entire Roman Church’s Inquisition. As Pope Pius V, in opposition to Protestantism, he applied the decrees of the *Council of Trent* (1545-63). In his *Papal Bull Against Elizabeth* (1570), the Protestant Queen of England, Pope Pius V (an advocate of the *Exclusive Romanist Salvation View*), said that God “entrusted the government of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church (outside of which there is no salvation) to one man alone on the earth, namely to Peter,” “and to Peter’s successor, the Roman Pontiff.” “Resting” “upon” this “authority,” he denounced “Elizabeth” as “a heretic” and said, “we declare,” “the nobles, subjects and peoples of the” “realm” of England “and all others who have taken an oath of any kind to her,” “to be absolved for ever of such oath,” “fidelity and obedience,” and “we enjoin and forbid all” “that they presume not to obey her admonitions, commands, and laws. All who disobey our command we involve in the same sentence of anathema.” Moreover, “Saint Pope Pius V” called upon France and Spain to carry out his Bull and from that time till the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, there was essentially a state of warfare between Protestant England and the Papists of the Counter-Reformation<sup>97</sup>.

Likewise, after *Vatican II* the canonization still stands of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits, whose cult has a long history of persecuting Protestants. For example, Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* records that “the day fixed” for the *Irish Massacre* of 1641, was “the 23rd of October,” St. Ignatius Day (Ignatius of Constantinople d. 877), which the Jesuits were in some way using as a symbolic day in deference to Ignatius Loyola, seemingly on the basis that they were saying Ignatius Loyola was named after this earlier Ignatius<sup>98</sup>. Or the Irish “Protestant” confessor, Hubert Butler records, that in his post World War Two exposure of World War II atrocities in the *Independent State of Croatia*, a prominent Irish Jesuit, “Father Devane,” was found to be fraudulently using a Slav name, Mihajlo Dvornik, as part of his deceptive tactics when he “solemnly declared” that there had not been any “forced conversions” to Romanism in Croatia<sup>99</sup>, even though there had in fact been the mass murder of millions of Serbs (predominantly Serbian Orthodox, though including a small number of Protestants,) who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism.

*Qualification 4:* The Roman Pontiff and Roman Church claims *universal jurisdiction* among all who profess and call themselves “Christian.” Therefore Protestant (and other) “separated brethren” who are “baptized are put in some, though imperfect, communion with the

<sup>97</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 240-1.

<sup>98</sup> Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 592.

<sup>99</sup> Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue & Other Essays*, Penguin, UK, 1992, p. 280.

[Roman] Catholic Church.” But “the divisions among Christians prevent the [Roman] Church from realizing the fullness of catholicity proper to her *in those of her sons* who, though *joined to her by baptism*, are yet separated from full communion with her.” This relates to the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration, since Rome considers “Baptism,” “constitutes the sacramental bond of unity existing among all who through it are reborn” (*Decree on Ecumenism* 3,4,22)<sup>100</sup>. To be sure, in 1962-5 the *Roman False Prophet* performed *great wonders*, claiming the invisible miracle of baptismal regeneration in every baptism performed, whether inside or outside the Roman Church, and further claiming that by baptism all such persons, whether inside or outside the Roman Church, become by this invisible miracle, “sons” of Rome. Did not Christ himself warn that “false prophets” would “shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect” (Matt. 24:24)?

*Qualification 5:* The place of “Ecumenical dialogue” under *Vatican II* means Rome seeks to use the concept of “separated brethren” as a tool to bring all who profess and call themselves “Christian” into the Roman Church. The *Vatican Two Council* said, “restoration of unity among all Christians is one of the principal concerns of the Second Vatican Council.” Hence among the “divisions” that “arose in the West” “which are commonly referred to as the Reformation,” though “there exist considerable differences from the doctrine of the” Roman “Church even concerning Christ the Word of God made flesh and the work of redemption, and thus concerning the mystery and ministry of the Church and the role of Mary in the work of salvation;” nevertheless, it is the “hope” of the Roman Church “that the ecumenical spirit” of Protestants “will gradually increase.” “This” *Vatican II* “Council urges” “faithful” Roman Catholics to remember that “their ecumenical activity cannot be other than fully and sincerely [Roman] Catholic, that is, loyal to the truth we have received from the Apostles and the Fathers, and in harmony with the faith which the [Roman] Catholic Church has” “professed” (*Decree on Ecumenism* 1,13,19,24). “Thus” “ecumenical dialogue is” “striving for a more complete communion between the Christian communities,” “it serves to transform modes of thought and behaviour and the daily life of those communities. In this way, it aims at preparing the way for their unity of faith in the bosom of a [Roman] Church one and visible” (*Reflections and Suggestions concerning ecumenical dialogue* 2:1:d)<sup>101</sup>.

Notably, concerning this “restoration of unity among all Christians” which “is one of the principal concerns of the Second Vatican Council,” the Romanist must ensure he is “in harmony with the faith which the [Roman] Catholic Church has” “professed” (*Decree on Ecumenism* 1,24). This same *Vatican II Council* elucidates elsewhere on what this “faith” is, stating at the beginning of the *Decree on Ecumenism* that the *Vatican II* “Council” “has already declared its teaching on the Church, and now, moved by a desire for the restoration of unity among all the followers of Christ,” sets out relevant “guidelines” for Romanists to follow (*Decree on Ecumenism* 1)<sup>102</sup>. For example, The “teaching concerning the institution, the permanence, the nature and import of the” “primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his infallible teaching office” as “Peter’s successor, the Vicar of Christ, and the visible head of the whole Church,” *Vatican II* “proposes anew to be firmly believed by all the faithful.” “All the faithful” “are in communion with each other in the Holy Spirit so that ‘he who

---

<sup>100</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 455,458,469 (emphasis mine). Rome made similar claims to all baptized persons in e.g., *Council of Trent* Session 7, Canons 4,8,14 (Blakeney’s *Manual of Romish Controversy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-30).

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 452,463,467-8,470,540-1.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 453.

dwells in Rome knows those in most distant parts to be his members’.” “All men are called to this catholic unity which prefigures and promotes universal peace” (*Dogmatic Constitution of the Church* 13,18)<sup>103</sup>. It is clear from these and other statements of *Vatican II*, that the so called “restoration of unity among all Christians” which “is one of the principal concerns of the Second Vatican Council” in its *Decree on Ecumenism*, can only be attained by “separated brethren” *ultimately* bowing the knee to Rome and uniting with the Roman Church under the power of the Pope as so called “Vicar of Christ.” *This is precisely the type of thing said by Pope Pius IX* discussed above when he concluded, “there is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the” Roman “Church” of “those” “separated children” such as those in “Protestantism” “who are separated from it.”

SADLY, BY NOT READING *VATICAN II* CAREFULLY, MANY HAVE SIMPLY SEIZED ON THE TERMS “SEPARATED BRETHREN” AND “ECUMENISM” IN *VATICAN II*, TO WRONGLY CONCLUDE THAT THE ROMAN CHURCH HAS FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGED AT A DOCTRINAL LEVEL, WHEN IN FACT IT HAS MERELY CONTINUED A PROCESS OF *TACTICAL CHANGE* IN ORDER TO TRY AND UNITE ALL WHO PROFESS AND CALL THEMSELVES “CHRISTIAN” UNDER HER ROMAN PONTIFF AND “ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.” Furthermore, the fact that under *Vatican II* “ecumenism” is perceived as a mechanism by which to bring “separated brethren” back into the Roman Church, underscores the fact that Romish tolerance to “separated brethren” can be withdrawn in the future when the Church of Rome considers she has sufficiently “educated” such persons by “ecumenical dialogue” that they are no longer in “invincible ignorance.” When one takes into account the other above qualifications, for example, the continued glorification of Protestant persecuting “Saints,” I think it seems reasonable to conclude that Rome will do this at some future point in time that she regards to be opportune for these purposes.

*Vatican II* considers “ecumenical action” is “distinct” from “the work of” specifically “preparing and reconciling those individuals who wish for full [Roman] Catholic communion,” although “there is no opposition between the two” (*Decree on Ecumenism* 4). The Roman Church “aims” to use “ecumenical dialogue” “to transform modes of thought and behaviour,” and “in this way” is “preparing the way for their unity of faith in the bosom of a [Roman] Church one and visible: thus ‘little by little as the obstacles to perfect ecclesiastical communion are overcome, all Christians will be gathered, in a common celebration of the Eucharist, into the unity of the one and only Church’.” “This unity” “dwells in the [Roman] Catholic Church as something she can never lose” (*Reflections and Suggestions concerning ecumenical dialogue* 2:1:d; quoting *Decree on Ecumenism* 4). Since *Vatican II* states the Roman Church’s objectives of “ecumenical” “dialogue” with “separated brethren” such as Protestants to be, “that, little by little,” she will suck “all Christians” into “a common celebration of the Eucharist,” and “into the unity of the one and only Church,” which “subsists in the” Roman “Church as something she can never lose” (*Decree on Ecumenism* 4)<sup>104</sup>; the question arises, What then is the relevant doctrine of Rome for admitting such “separated brethren” to “the Eucharist” as she seeks to suck them into the vortex of this heresy of Roman “unity”?

*Qualification 6:* Only semi-Romanists who are fellow idolaters are close enough “brethren”

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 364,365,370.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 456-7; 540-1.

to partake of the Roman Mass. *Vatican II* said, “the body of Christ” is “offered in sacrifice” at “the Eucharist, “The relation between local celebration of the Eucharist and the universal” Roman Church “is stressed” “by special mention in the Eucharistic prayers of the Pope, the local bishop and other members of the Episcopal College,” and “what has been said” “of the Eucharist as centre and summit of the Christian life holds” (*On Admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church* 2:1,3). This therefore includes the earlier statements of *Vatican II*, such as the idea that “worship” should be “shown to the Eucharist,” that is, adoration, since “the Eucharistic sacrifice is the source and summit of the whole of the Church’s worship and of the Christian Life” (*Instruction on the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery* 3e). Hence “admission to [Roman] Catholic eucharistic communion is confined to particular cases of those Christians who have a faith in the sacrament in conformity with that of the [Roman] Church” (*On Admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church* 4:2). “For” “Christians to be admitted to the Eucharist in the [Roman] Catholic Church the Instruction requires that they manifest a faith in the sacrament in conformity with that of the” Roman “Church. This faith is not limited to a mere affirmation of the ‘real presence’ in the Eucharist, but implies the doctrine of the Eucharist as taught in the” Roman “Church” (*Note Interpreting the ‘Instruction on Admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church under certain circumstances* 7)<sup>105</sup>.

THIS MEANS THAT A SO CALLED “SEPARATED BROTHER” WHO TAKES THE ROMAN MASS MUST, AMONG OTHER THINGS, BELIEVE IN TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND ADORATION OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS. But “adoration” “either unto the sacramental bread or wine” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians” (Final Rubric of “The Communion Service,” *Church of England Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). And what saith the Apostle Paul? “But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be” “an idolater,” “with such an one no not to eat” (I Cor. 5:11). The Apostolic teaching “not to eat” with “an idolater” refers to any fellowship meal, and thus certainly includes when Christians “eat the Lord’s Supper” (I Cor. 11:20) or “Communion” (I Cor. 10:16), since we are to “flee from idolatry” (I Cor. 10:14). “Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived,” “idolaters” “shall” not “inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9,10).

FURTHERMORE, THE STATEMENT OF *VATICAN II* THAT THOSE “SEPARATED BRETHREN” ADMITTED TO THE ROMAN MASS MUST HAVE AN “AFFIRMATION OF THE ‘REAL PRESENCE’ IN THE EUCHARIST,” MEANS THAT SUCH COMMUNICANTS MUST “CONFESS NOT THAT JESUS CHRIST IS COME IN THE FLESH” (II JOHN 7), SINCE THEY MUST DENY THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST VIA THE TRANSUBSTANTIATION HERESY. That is because “the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances,” “and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (Final Rubric of “The Communion Service,” *Church of England Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). And what saith the Apostle John? “Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.” “Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God.” “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 7,9-11).

---

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 104,554,555-7,562.

The NT has many instances of false brethren who claimed to be “Christians” and regarded believers as “brethren” in some sense “separated” from the teachings they peddled (Rom. 16:17; II Peter 2:1,2; Rev. 2:2), for example, the Judaizers at Galatia. But the issue for Christians is not whether or not such heretics regard believers as “separated brethren.” A NUMBER OF PROTESTANTS APPEAR TO HAVE LOST THE INITIATIVE IN THIS MATTER, AND MUST REGAIN THE INITIATIVE BY ASKING, “HOW DOES THE WORD OF GOD TEACH US TO DEAL WITH THE CHURCH OF ROME?”

## CHAPTER 4

### How should we deal with the Roman Catholic Pope in spiritual matters?

The Bible teaches us that if anyone “preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed” (AV) or “anathema” (ASV) (Gal. 1:8). Moreover, in Gal 5:20,21 we read that wilfully unrepentant persons in “heresies ... shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” Since the Roman Catholic Church (like the Oriental Orthodox Churches and Eastern Orthodox Churches,) preaches a false gospel of justification by faith and works, rather than justification by faith (Gal. 3:11), the Scriptures thus declare them to be heretics under God’s “anathema” (ASV) or “accursed” (AV) (Gal. 1:8,9).

Another important passage is II John 7-11. Here we read “he that biddeth ... God speed” to “an antichrist” is deemed by God to be “a partaker of his evil deeds.” The terminology of “bid him God speed” (II John 10,11, AV) means “giveth him greeting” (ASV), that is to say, give religious recognition to him. While the *Second Epistle of John* was written with immediate reference to a group of antichrists who typed the then coming Antichrist, rather than at a time when the Roman Antichrist had arisen, the basic principle is clear. If we give a spiritual “greeting” to the Roman Catholic Pope (or either an Oriental Orthodox Patriarch or Eastern Orthodox Patriarch) by holding him up as a “Christian leader,” then we are made “a partaker of his evil deeds.” Clearly then we should deny all spiritual recognition to the Roman Antichrist (or any other antichrist) and work to expose him and the false system of religion that he is the spiritual head of.

Therefore the Word of God is perfectly clear with respect to the fact that, e.g., the *Second Scotch Confession (1580)* is correct, and that the Roman Pope may be referred to as the *Roman Antichrist*, and treated accordingly (II John 7-11). The denial of Christ’s full humanity, that is, “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2; II John 7), the presentation of a false unBiblical Christ *in the place of Christ* by the Roman Pontiff, and also the central claim of the Roman Pope to be the “Vicar of Christ” and so sit *in the place of Christ* on earth, means that on application of the antichrist teaching found in the Johannian Epistles (I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7), the Pope stands exposed as the *Roman Antichrist*.

*Should orthodox churches require that those in teaching roles  
recognize the Papacy as the Roman Antichrist?*

The Apostle John warns that there are “many antichrists” who type the “Antichrist” (I John 2:22), and so he said to “try the spirits” in order to avoid the “spirit of antichrist” (I John 4:1,3). Likewise Jesus warned that “many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ,” “For there shall arise false Christs” (Matt. 24:5,24), and these words surely include antichrists

who say “I am Christ” by putting themselves *in the place of Christ*<sup>106</sup>, by claiming to be a Vice-Christ or Vice-God. This the Roman Pope does by claiming to be the “Vicar of Christ,” although as Homily 21, Book 2, “Against Rebellion,” in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* observes, he acts “most contrary to the doctrine and example of our Saviour Christ, whose vicar ... he pretendeth to be,” and so “the Bishop of Rome” is actually a “spoiler and destroyer ... of the Church.” Thus Homily 16, Book 2, “Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost,” in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, “Therefore, dearly beloved, according to the good counsel of St. John, ‘believe not every spirit, but first try them whether they be of God or no’ (I John 4). ‘Many (Matt. 24:5,24) shall come in my name,’ saith Christ, ... all the Popes ... are worthily accounted among the number of ... ‘false Christs’ (Matt. 24:24).” This meant that the Reformation Anglican Church required from those who subscribed to it confession the recognition that “all the Popes” were “false Christs,” that is, antichrists.

Likewise, the *Second Scotch Confession of 1580* says: “We abhor and detest ... Papistry, ... we detest and do not accept the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist upon the Scriptures of God.” With the Reformation Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles of 1562* and the Presbyterian *Second Scotch Confession of 1580*, all Bible believing churches should require that those who hold teaching positions in their churches recognize in harmony with the antichrist teaching found in the Johannian Epistles, that the Roman Pope constitutes the *Roman Antichrist*. In the general affairs of the world, among purported “Christian leaders,” the influence and power of the Roman Pontiff is second to none. Hence if those who hold church teaching positions do not warn people about such a well known antichrist as the *Roman Pope*, how can it be said that they are “blameless” (I Tim. 3:2,10)?

## CHAPTER 5

### **The Gospels and Johannian Epistles - Does the Roman Antichrist meet all the descriptors of the Antichrist foretold by Christ in the Gospels and the Apostle John?**

The *Second Scotch Confession* was subscribed to by the King of Scotland, James VI (Scottish Regnal Years: 1567-1625; King of Great Britain and Ireland, Regnal Years: 1603-1625); the Council and Court, at Holyrood in Edinburgh, in 1580; and hence is sometimes called, “The King’s Confession;” although it was then subscribed to by persons of various ranks the following year in 1581. It was a bi-lingual Confession written in both Scotch and Latin by John Craig (c. 1512-1600), who was a friend and colleague of John Knox<sup>107</sup>. The

---

<sup>106</sup> Compare Paisley’s *The Pope is the Antichrist*, pp. 60-1; and cover-jacket, “ALL THE POPES SAY: - I AM CHRIST” (Matt. 24:5); and Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, pp. 12-4,33.

<sup>107</sup> John Craig, son of Craig of Craigston of Aberdeenshire (killed 1513 at Flodden), was educated at St. Andrew’s University. He became a Roman Catholic Dominican, becoming Master of Novices at the Dominican Convent in Bologna, Italy. He read, and agreed with Calvin’s Institutes; and was condemned by the Roman Church to be burnt as a heretic. He escaped, retuning to Scotland in 1561 where he was Ordained as a Protestant Minister at Holyrood. Though in the Scottish north from 1571-9, in 1579 he was appointed Chaplain to James VI and returned to Edinburgh. He was a member of a Commission recommending abolition of episcopal church government in Scotland, which then occurred in 1581. Following certain conflicts in Scotland, he submitted to royal supremacy “as far as the

description of the Roman Pope in the *Second Scotch Confession (1580)* as the “Roman Antichrist,” allows, though does not require the conclusion, that the *Roman Antichrist* is not simply an antichrist but *the* Antichrist. In I John 2:18 the Apostle John says there are “many antichrists” who type the “Antichrist” who “shall come.”

Careful consideration of the Antichrist in the Johannian Epistles, together with the Gospels, shows that unlike some antichrists, the *Roman Antichrist* fulfills all the descriptors of *the* Antichrist. Unlike any other antichrist, such as the many antichrist Patriarchs of (monophysitist or anti-Chalcedonian) Oriental Orthodoxy and (Chalcedonian) Eastern Orthodoxy, the Pope of Rome *uniquely* fulfills all the descriptors of *the* Antichrist in the Gospels and Johannian Epistles. Like some other antichrists, e.g., the Oriental Orthodox Patriarchs and Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs, the *Roman Antichrist* “denieth that Jesus is the Christ” (I John 2:22) or Messiah. In the case of the Roman Pope, (as with the Nestorian Patriarch, Oriental Orthodox Patriarchs, and Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs,) this is done by putting a false Christ in the place of the Biblical Christ. E.g., through the invocation of saints, the Roman Pontiff (like the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs) “denieth” “Christ” (I John 2:22) as the one who makes “intercession for the transgressors” (Isa. 53:12), being the “one mediator between God and men” (I Tim. 2:5). A recent example of this is found in the so called “canonization” of Mary MacKillop (1842-1909), a Romish nun who bears the ugly and repulsive accolade of being the first Popish “Saint” to be canonized in Australia (Beatified 1995 by Pope John-Paul II; her tomb was visited and prayed at by Pope Benedict XVI in 2008<sup>108</sup>; Canonized 2010).

We cannot doubt that the Roman Pope “denieth” “Christ” (I John 2:22), for example, as man’s redeemer, mediator, and saviour through his claims of Mary as “co-redeemer,” “co-mediator,” and teachings of justification by faith and works. Thus the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession of 1530* (1:21) rightly states, “The memory of saints may be set before us, that we may follow their faith and good works” (Heb. 11). “But the Scripture teacheth not to invoke saints, or to ask help of saints, because it propoundeth unto us one Christ the mediator, propitiator, high priest, and intercessor. This Christ is to be invoked, and he hath promised that he will hear our prayers,” “‘If any man sin, we have an advocate with God, Jesus Christ the righteous’ (I John 2:1).”

Like some other antichrists, (such as the antichrist Patriarchs of Oriental and Eastern Orthodoxy,) the *Roman Antichrist* denies “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7). This denial is accomplished by his teaching of transubstantiation since it is said that at the Roman Mass (or Eastern Orthodox Eucharist,) that the sacramental bread and wine becomes the actual body and blood of Christ so that he is corporally present. But Scripture teaches that Christ is “taken up” “into heaven” till he “so come” at the Second Advent (Acts 1:11). Therefore while the fully Divine Christ may be spiritually present in an inter-personal way with believers (Matt. 18:20), since like the other Divine Persons of the Trinity he is omnipresent; nevertheless, the fully human Christ can only be bodily present in one place at any one time, since it is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one

---

Word of God allows.” He published Craig’s *Catechism* in 1592.

<sup>108</sup> For details of the connected 2008 Papal Visit to Australia, see my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “3) The Antichrist visits my hometown of Sydney, Australia (2008)” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

time in more places than one” (*Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662*). Thus the Apostle Paul says we “eat this bread, and drink this cup,” not with a Christ who already has bodily come, but rather, “till he come” bodily at the Second Advent (I Cor. 11:26 cf. Rev. 1:7).

Unlike any other antichrist, the *Roman Antichrist* uniquely fulfills some of the descriptors of *the Antichrist* found in the Johannian Epistles. He fulfills the meaning of the word “Antichrist” (I John 2:18;22; 4:3) in his claim accepted by hundreds of millions of Roman Catholics to be “Vicar of Christ.” That is because the Greek word *anti* means *in the place of*, and the Latin word *vicar* also carries this meaning, so that both “Antichrist” and “Vicar of Christ” mean one who stands *in the place of Christ* as his deputy.

Moreover, it is contextually clear that St. John considers the Antichrist (I John 2:18) will be of significance to the entire church. For this to be so requires that he will have to claim some kind of universal jurisdiction in the church. While the Bishops of Rome did this to some extent with a titular primacy under the Eastern Emperor, Justinian from 533 to 565 which was an important stepping stone in the gradual movement of the Bishops of Rome to the Roman Papacy, and also a prophetic type of what was to occur from 607; this only became the greater reality with a governing primacy over Constantinople when in 607 the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, got a decree from the Eastern Emperor, Phocas, making him “universal bishop” and giving him governing power over the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Thus since the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607, the Roman Antichrist has uniquely been an antichrist whose claims to a “universal” jurisdiction have to be taken seriously. Thus only the Roman Antichrist has had this kind of significance to the entire church.

Furthermore, all three synoptic Gospel writers record Christ’s warning that “many,” and not a few, “shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:5; Luke 21:8), and both St. Matthew and St. Mark record that in his Olivet discourse Christ further said that they “shall deceive many” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:5). While this may refer to false Christs other than Antichrist, thousands of years have now elapsed since Christ uttered these words of warning, and it must be said that the main “false Christs” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) to have arisen are those of “Antichrist” (I John 2:18). There are only four kinds of antichrists who can be said to have been “many” in number, to have “come in” the “name” of “Christ,” and have consistently over time been able to “deceive many.” These four kinds are: the antichrist Patriarchs of the Nestorian Church, namely the succession of *Catholicos-Patriarchs of the East Syrian Church*; the antichrist catholicoses and patriarchs of monophysitist (anti-Chalcedon Council) Oriental Orthodoxy such as the Armenian Orthodox *Patriarch of Jerusalem*<sup>109</sup>, the Syrian Orthodox *Patriarch of Antioch*, or the Coptic Orthodox

---

<sup>109</sup> In Armenian Orthodoxy, there are two *catholicoses*. The primatial *catholicos* at Ejmiadzin, and the *catholicos* at Antilyas in Lebanon. There are also two patriarchs, the *Patriarch of Constantinople* and the *Patriarch of Jerusalem*. While the *catholicos* at Antilyas has administrative autonomy, he still gives spiritual recognition to the *catholicos* at Ejmiadzin as primate. Both of the two patriarchs also give spiritual allegiance to the primacy of the *catholicos* at Ejmiadzin. The Oriental Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople*, was created in 1461 as the Ottoman Empire wanted centralization of Armenian Orthodoxy in the capital Constantinople. Since the jurisdictional territory of this patriarchate included most Armenian Orthodox, this Armenian Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople* constituted the most powerful Armenian Orthodox bishop, even though he held spiritual allegiance to the *catholicos* at Ejmiadzin. Thus in the same way that the *Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem* looks

*Patriarch of Alexandria*, that is, the Coptic Orthodox Pope (who is the only Oriental Orthodox Patriarch who retains the older title of “Pope<sup>110</sup>,” and is also primate of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church); the antichrist Patriarchs of (pro-Chalcedon Council) Eastern Orthodoxy such as the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Jerusalem*, the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Antioch*, the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Alexandria*, the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople*, or the Russian Orthodox *Patriarch of Moscow*<sup>111</sup>; and the

---

to the primacy of the Roman Catholic Pope, so likewise the Armenian Orthodox *Patriarch of Jerusalem* looks to the primacy of the *catholicos* at Ejmiadzin. (By contrast, like other Eastern Orthodox, the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Jerusalem* regards the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople* as the first patriarch among Eastern Orthodox patriarchate equals.)

<sup>110</sup> Before the fuller formation of the Roman Papacy, some local Diocesan bishops were sometimes called “Popes;” but following 607 when the Bishop of Rome came to be “universal Bishop,” he considered the whole world was his Diocese, and in manifestation of this claim, the term “Pope” came to be reserved for just the Bishop of Rome. Hence when we say that Boniface III was “the first Pope” in 607, we use the terminology “the first Pope” in this qualified sense as being a “Pope” in the now normatively accepted sense of a bishop claiming a universal jurisdiction. However the older usage of the term “Pope” has survived in two contexts, one formal, the other semi-formal. In a formal context, the Coptic Orthodox Church, which as monophysitist heretics, never accepted the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, continued the old tradition of calling their Patriarch, “Pope” to this day. In a semi-formal context, among Papists, the Jesuits are organized under the Superior General of the Jesuits who is colloquially, but not officially known, as “the black Pope.” I.e., because he is like the a Diocesan Bishop to Jesuits, he is commonly, though unofficially, given the title of “pope,” and so known among both the black-robed Jesuits and other Papists as “the black Pope.” Thus e.g., in March 2006 the Protestant *Evangelical Times* of the UK, under the title, “‘Black pope’ to resign,” said, “The head of the Jesuits, known as the ‘Black Pope’ because of his black robes, has announced his resignation, effective from 2008” (in Editor John MacKenzie’s *Faith & Facts*, S.A, March 2006, p. 12; now under Editor Errol Stone, P.O. Box 1117, Innaloo City, W.A., 6918, Australia).

<sup>111</sup> Eastern Orthodox Churches (e.g., Bulgarian Orthodox or Albanian Orthodox) accept the Council of Chalcedon (451) and so reject monophysitism; but in many respects are very similar in appearance and theology with the Oriental Orthodox Churches which deny the Christological teaching of the Council of Chalcedon and are monophysitist. Both Eastern Orthodox Churches (e.g., Albanian Orthodox or Serbian Orthodox) and Oriental Orthodox Churches (e.g., Armenian Orthodox) are independent and subject only to a particular *catholicos*, patriarch, or bishop of their church. (E.g., in Oriental Orthodoxy the Syrian Orthodox Church, known also as the Syrian Jacobite Church after the monophysitist James Baradai, has an affiliated sister Syrian Jacobite Church in Malabar, India, which was brought to Malabar in 1665 by Bishop Gregory from Jerusalem, and was originally under the Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, but which became independent and is under its own Metropolitan Bishop, the *Indian Antichrist*. Or in Eastern Orthodoxy, the Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus recognizes some spiritual oversight by the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople*, but is independent of Greece and the Archbishop of Athens under the Archbishop of Constantia; and the Church of Finland is under the Archbishop of Kuopio and Bishop of Helsinki). The Syrian Orthodox *Patriarch of Antioch* has rarely lived in Antioch, and this Oriental Orthodox Patriarch’s usual residence was Dayr az-Zafaran in Turkey till World War I when he twice relocated, eventually moving from 1959 to the capital of Syria, Damascus. In this he seems to have followed the example of the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch*

antichrist *Patriarchs of the West*, that is, the Popes of Roman Catholicism. When one contrasts the respective world-wide power and influence of these antichrists historically, we cannot doubt that the *Roman Antichrist* has clearly been able to “deceive many” more than the antichrist catholicoses and/or patriarchs of the Nestorian Church, Oriental Orthodoxy, or Eastern Orthodoxy.

Moreover, Christ refers to both “false Christs” and “false prophets” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22), seeming to imply that they will, or at least may, work together. This same idea also seems present in I John 4:1-3 where “false prophets” are used as types of the then coming Antichrist. The *Roman False Prophet* came into existence in a lesser form with the “ecumenical councils,” starting from the so called “fifth” and “sixth” “ecumenical” or “general councils” of 553 and 681; and thereafter came into existence in a greater form with the “ecumenical councils” starting from the so called “ninth” “ecumenical” or “general councils” from 1123 and following, when the Roman Pope came to be the one who called and presided over such councils. The so called “sixth” “ecumenical” council, claimed the status of a prophet by claiming “inspiration” for such councils, which had the effect of retrospectively elevating the so called “fifth” “ecumenical” council’s erroneous claims of 553 that Mary was “ever-virgin.” In time, the rise of the *Roman False Prophet* in its lesser 553 form, came slightly after the *Roman Antichrist* first arose to a temporary position of titular universal jurisdiction as a *prophetic type* with the bestowal of imperial favours on John II (Bishop of Rome 533-5) in 533, when Justinian referred in his Code to the Bishop of Rome as “the head of all the churches.” But this was only a titular or ceremonial honour bestowed by the prerogative of the emperor which did not extend the Bishop of Rome’s governing powers to include the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but only gave him a titular primacy over Constantinople. Being a royal prerogative of the emperor, stated in a Letter attached to Justinian Code’s and so having no legal force beyond a stated intention of how the emperor would use a royal discretion to so regard the Bishop of Rome in ceremonial and titular terms, this titular or ceremonial honour *ipso facto* terminated with the death of the emperor Justinian in 565, at which time the pre-533 position was reverted to. Moreover, such claims to there being a “universal bishop” were then repudiated as the teachings of “Antichrist” by a subsequent Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome 590-604). Then when these claims were revived by Boniface III (Bishop of Rome, 607; first Roman Pope, 607), the *Roman Antichrist* arose from 607, after Phocas declared the Bishop of Rome to be “universal bishop;” then came the claim to the status of a prophet by the *Roman False Prophet* claiming “inspiration” from 681, and in time this was before the *Roman False Prophet* arose in a greater 1123 form from the time of the *Lateran I Council*.

In the same way that the Popes of Rome from 607 on can be called either “antichrists” or “false Christs” (plural) since they are a succession of men, or the *Roman Antichrist* (singular) since they form *one office* of the Papacy; so likewise, the “ecumenical” or “general councils” starting from 681 and continuing in their lesser form from 553, and in their greater form from 1123, up till 1962-5 with the *Vatican II Council*, can be called either “false prophets” (plural) since they are a succession of councils, or the *Roman False Prophet* (singular) since they form *one office* in the Roman hierarchy. Certainly “false prophets” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) includes in its orbit false prophets other than *the* false prophet who

---

*of Antioch* since this Eastern Orthodox Patriarch has lived in Damascus, Syria, since the fourteenth century. The Roman Catholic Church established a “patriarch” subject to the Pope in Jerusalem from 1099-1244, and re-established it from 1847 known as *The Latin Patriarch*.

it seems on the basis of these Scriptures is going to work with *the* Antichrist. For example, other false prophets include: Mohammed, the false prophets of three of the four major cults (Joseph Smith of the Mormons, Ellen White of the Seventh-day Adventists, and Mary Baker of the Christian Scientists), or the many false prophets of the charismatic and Pentecostal churches. But to the extent that Matt. 24:14; Mark 13:22; I John 4:1-3 indicate that *the Antichrist* is to work with *the False Prophet*, the fact that the *Roman Antichrist* has consistently worked with the *Roman False Prophet* since his rise in the sixth and seventh centuries is surely significant. In this context, it is also notable that Christ warned, “they shall deliver you up to councils” (Mark 13:9).

The *Roman False Prophet* has shaped Eastern Orthodoxy which sometimes is called “the Church of seven councils.” That is because Eastern Orthodox accepts the teachings of the *Roman False Prophet* in his lesser form, when he spake at the so called “fifth” (553), “sixth” (680-1) and “seventh” (787) “ecumenical” councils. Yet after the *Great Schism* of 1054, the *Roman False Prophet* stayed with the *Roman Antichrist* to develop into a greater form from 1123. In this greater form, he went on to make more proclamations, at more so called “ecumenical” councils, so that it is clearly only the *Roman Antichrist* who has worked with the *Roman False Prophet* in his greater form, and continues in a close and ongoing relationship with him.

But we are given three further descriptors in the Synoptic Gospels that apply to the Popes of Rome, but do not apply to the Nestorian Patriarch or Patriarchs of Oriental and Eastern Orthodoxy. In the first place, while the Nestorian, Oriental Orthodox, and Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs are antichrists in the sense that they present a false Christ in the place of the Biblical Christ by e.g., denying Christ’s full humanity, none of them actually say of themselves, “I am Christ” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8), by e.g., claiming to be Vice-Christ as “the Vicar of Christ” with a universal jurisdiction; and in the second place, this means that none of them can be said to specifically be “false Christs” themselves (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22). I.e., it is the combination of the claim to being a Vice-Christ as “Vicar of Christ,” together with a claim to “universal” jurisdiction that must be taken seriously, that is required for someone to seriously say, “I am Christ” in any sense, and so be *the* Antichrist.

Furthermore, the antichrists spoken of by Christ claim a jurisdiction on earth, for men “shall say” of them, “Lo, here is Christ, or” “there” (Matt. 24:23; Mark 13:21), which is met by the Pope’s claim to be Christ’s vicar *on earth*. Thus among those antichrists who have been both “many” in number (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:5; Luke 21:8), and over time been able to “deceive many” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:5), the Roman Pope *uniquely* fulfils these descriptors. The *Roman Antichrist* says “I am Christ” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8), in the form of a Vice-Christ by his claim to be Christ’s Deputy as “Vicar of Christ;” and by this same claim he also fulfils the descriptors of “false Christs” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) which people point to and say, “Lo, here is Christ” (Matt. 24:23; Mark 13:21) as the Vice-Christ of the Pope.

It is also worthy of note that the Apostle John refers to the *singular* “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), and the Lord Jesus to the *plural* “false Christs” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22). This means that Antichrist (singular) is an office made up of successive incumbent “false Christs” (plural). As the Anglican clergyman, Reverend Browne has shown, a number of “ancient” writers have understood the “false Christs” of Matt. 24:24 this way. Browne notes, “Chrysostom, upon this place” of I John 2:18 “(Homily 3) applying the text of Matt. 24:24 (of many false Christs and false prophets, able to deceive the elect, if it were possible,) to Antichrist, signifieth that it is not necessary to Antichrist for” him to be “one singular man.”

“Primasius interpreting this text” of I John 2:18 “by Matt. 24:24, declareth that he thought Antichrist to be no one singular person. Ruffinus,” in his *“Expositionione Symboli*, applying also that text, Matt. 24:24, declareth that he thought not Antichrist to be one singular person.<sup>112</sup>”

It is also noteworthy that Jesus said that after his ascension in the period before the Second Advent, “ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it.” But this context of a long time till the Second Advent will then be exploited by false Christs that people point to, and “say to you, See here; or see there” (Luke 17:22,23). Furthermore, in his Olivet Discourse, Jesus uses the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and the following period up to the fall of Masada in 73 A.D. as a prophetic type of the events occurring just prior to the Second Advent. Thus while the “tribulation” (Matt. 24:15-22) “in those days of affliction” (Mark 13:14-21) meets a *prima facie* fulfilment as a prophetic type around 70 A.D., the statement that this will be like nothing “from the beginning” of this world up to “this time,” nor “shall be” thereafter (Matt. 24:21; Mark 13:19), goes well beyond the events surrounding the destruction of Jerusalem, to “the time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time” (Dan. 12:1), which occurs just before the Second Advent (Dan. 12:1,2; Matt. 24:27; Mark 13:26). This means one can date the rise of the “false Christs” to sometime after 70-73 A.D., and also means that the office of antichrist that they form will play some prominent role just before the Second Advent. This therefore indicates a long reign of “false Christs” in some kind of Antichrist office in the period after 70-73 A.D. .

Hence while Christ’s words, “if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not” (Matt. 24:23) in the Olivet Discourse (Matt. 24:23; Mark 13:22), might *prima facie* refer to a series of staged false second comings, the general absence of any such teaching elsewhere in Scripture, coupled with the fact that the “many” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6) “false Christs” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) who have come in the interim have only been consistently met in the antichrists forming the office of the Roman Papacy, surely indicates that the better interpretation is that the office of Antichrist will be active for a long period before the Second Advent in a series of “many” antichrists filling that office (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6); and then in the events occurring just before the Second Advent, this Antichrist will play some key role of particular significance as in these times of “great tribulation” (Matt. 24:21) and “affliction” (Mark 13:19), people look to the old Antichrist for guidance as men say, for example, “Lo, here is Christ,” in the Vatican-City State, “or there” he is on a Papal Visit to Australia in 2008 or the UK in 2010, and so they look to what they believe is “Christ” in the form of the Vice-Christ or “Vicar of Christ on earth.”

Moreover, the fact that Christ says “there shall arise false Christs” in Matt. 24:24 after referring in Matt. 24:22 to “those days” of the 1260 day-year prophecy (Dan. 7:25; cf. Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:4-6), (on inclusive reckoning, 607-1866 A.D.) will “be shortened” as they were in parts of Western Europe by the Reformation, also indicates a long succession of “false Christs” in the Office of Antichrist. Of course, in other parts of Western Europe where this liberation did not occur, Romish persecution continued longer, e.g., the French Confessors and martyrs of the *Ancien Regime*, or the Lutherans persecuted in the Balkans following the work of Primoz Trubar and others. But these “days” were then further

---

<sup>112</sup> Browne, J.H., *A Charge*, Delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeanry of Ely, at a visitation held in the Parish Church of St. Michael’s, Cambridge, on 21 May 1840, with Appendix, J. Hatchard & Son, London, 1840, pp. 224-6.

“shortened” by the rise of the secular state from the late 18th and 19th centuries in other parts of Western Europe, such as France and parts of Italy. E.g., when I visited Terre Pellice (near Turin) in north-west Italy, I there saw a water fountain given by King Carlo Alberto in 1845 who gave religious tolerance to the Waldenses; although in the Papal States of Italy this Papal power continued the whole period (even surviving in a reduced measure in some parts of the old Papal States for several years after 1866 till 1870).

Therefore the *Roman Antichrist* not only fulfills all the descriptors of an antichrist specified in the Synoptic Gospels and Johannian Epistles, but of the “many antichrists” (I John 2:18) that have historically been “many” in number and been able to “deceive many” (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:5; Luke 21:8), he *uniquely* fulfils all of *the* Antichrist descriptors found in the Synoptic Gospels and Johannian Epistles. Hence on the basis of what is said in the Gospels of Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, and Saint Luke (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; Luke 17:22,23; 21:8), together with the Johannian Epistles (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11), the only “false Christs” who can constitute *the* “Antichrist” (I John 2:18) are the Roman Popes who have been “many” in number, who have “come in” the “name” of “Christ,” and can be said to by far “deceive many” over the centuries (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:5). To be sure, these *many* Popes of Rome *come in the name of Christ*, saying “I am Christ” as a Vice-Christ by putting themselves in the place of Christ as “Vicar of Christ,” thereby fulfilling the very meaning of the word “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), i.e., as one who puts himself *in the place of Christ*, and they have deceived and continue to deceive the *many* deluded people of Roman Catholicism.

These facts mean the Gospels and Johannian Epistles point to the *Roman Papacy* as *the* Antichrist. Since these Scriptures use both the singular “Antichrist” (I John 2:18) and plural “false Christs” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) for the office of Antichrist (singular), which is made up of a succession of incumbent antichrists (plural), I consider it is correct to say either “The Roman Papacy (plural) is the Antichrist,” or “The Roman Pope (singular) is the Antichrist.” If this conclusion is correct and the *Roman Antichrist* is in fact *the* Antichrist, then it must be said that of the “many antichrists” who type the “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), the Nestorian Patriarchs, Oriental Orthodox Patriarchs, and the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs are “many antichrists” who as types are the most similar to *the* “Antichrist” himself (I John 2:18). For example, in connection with the Syrian Churches alone there are three such antichrists, the Eastern Orthodox *Greco-Syrian Antichrist* (Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch), the Oriental Orthodox *West Syrian Antichrist* (Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch), and the Nestorian Church’s *East Syrian Antichrist* (the *Catholicos-Patriarch* of the *East Syrian Church*). Thus having first examined these important Antichrist passages in Matthew 24; Mark 13; Luke 21; and I & II John which point to the Roman Popes as being the Antichrist, in order to test this conclusion and either verify it or reject it, we will need to consider the detailed and definitive description given of the Antichrist by the Apostle Paul in II Thess. 2:1-12.

## CHAPTER 6

### **Is the Antichrist of II Thessalonians 2:1-12 a philosophy, a devil, or a man?**

On the basis of the prophetic principles outlined above in the section entitled, “Principles of Prophetic Interpretation,” it is reasonable to look for an antichrist in New Testament times who prophetically typed the coming Antichrist, as well as seek identification of the Antichrist himself.

In considering the Antichrist foretold in II Thessalonians 2:1-12 *prima facie* suggestions include: a philosophy e.g., atheism; a supernatural power; a Roman Emperor of New Testament times; or the Roman Papacy. With respect to the Roman Papacy, it should also be noted that historically there was a general belief among Protestants that the Antichrist foretold in II Thess. 2 is the Roman Pope, and among the major Protestant churches, this was historically made a test of orthodoxy at a confessional level (Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist). For example, the Congregational Church's *Savoy Declaration* (1658) 26:4 says, "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God, whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" (II Thess. 2:3,4,8).

The proposition that the Antichrist is a philosophy, such as atheism or communism, can be ruled out on the basis that this is a "man" (Greek *anthropos*) who "exalteth himself" (II Thess. 2:3,4). It is also clear that the Antichrist performs miracles (II Thess. 2:9; cf. Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22); and this also rules out an ungodly philosophy such as atheism or communism. Moreover it is clear from I & II John that the antichrists of the Apostle John's day who typed the then future Antichrist, were human beings, and so it follows that the greater fulfilment in the Antichrist must also be a human being. These same factors also act to rule out the idea that the Antichrist is a devil, possibly Satan himself, as he is a "man of sin," and "man" in II Thess. 2:3 is Greek *anthropos* meaning a human being.

St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is generally dated to the 50s A.D. . The Roman Emperor Caligula reigned from 37 to 41 A.D., and the Jewish historian Josephus records that Caligula ordered that a statue of himself be set up in the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem (*Antiquities* 188). This event would therefore be vividly in the minds of the Apostle Paul's original readers as recent history. On the one hand, *prima facie* this sounds very much like II Thess. 2:4 where we read, the Antichrist "opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship" (NASB) or "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped" (AV), and even "as God" (AV), "sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God" (ASV), or "shewing himself that he is God" (AV). But on the other hand, Caligula did not personally *sit in the temple of God*, nor was there first an "apostasy" (NASB) or "falling away" (AV) in the church (II Thess. 2:3), nor was this done in the context of Satanic miracles designed to deceive (II Thess. 2:9), and nor was Caligula's reign terminated by the Second Advent and Caligula then slain by Christ himself (II Thess. 2:8). Therefore I conclude that Caligula is here used as a prophetic type of the coming Antichrist. Since the figure used by the Apostle Paul as a prophetic type of the then future Antichrist was a man, the Roman Emperor Caligula, it follows that the Antichrist himself must be a man.

Since Caligula was located in Rome and the head of Imperial Rome, i.e., the *Pontifex Maximus*; it follows from this fact that the greater fulfilment will probably be located in Rome, and the head of the Roman Empire, i.e., the *Pontifex Maximus*. Furthermore, since the Roman Emperors of the Apostle Paul's day restrained the Antichrist "until he," that is the restraining power, "be taken out of the way" (II Thess. 2:7), and since the Roman Emperors were both a political and a spiritual power claiming divinity, the implication must be that the Antichrist will be both a political power and a spiritual power, "shewing himself that he is God" (II Thess. 2 :4), who if manifested in NT times would have been a human rival to the

Roman Emperor. This again indicates that the Antichrist is a man. (Although as further discussed in chapter 13, the description “son of perdition” in II Thess. 2:3 requires that, like Judas Iscariot, the Antichrist is devil-possessed by Satan himself, John 13:26,27; 17:12, so that to address the Antichrist is to address Satan himself.)

## CHAPTER 7

### **A trilogy showing that the Roman Antichrist is *the* Antichrist of II Thessalonians 2:1-12**

Who then is the Antichrist referred to in II Thess. 2:1-12? Historical analysis shows there are a number of factors indicating that the Roman Catholic Pope is here depicted in prophesy. In II Tim. 3:17 we find the terminology of “the man of God,” and the singular “man” denotes a class of men (plural), who each may be called “the man of God.” So likewise in II Thess. 2:3 we find the terminology of the “man of sin,” and the singular “man” denotes a class of men (plural), namely the Popes, who each may be individually called the “man of sin.” Let the reader consider this trilogy: firstly, the Antichrist’s time of rising is post-New Testament following a great apostasy (II Thess. 2:3); secondly, the words “And ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let” i.e., he who now hinders will hinder, “until he be taken out of the way. And shall that Wicked be revealed” (II Thess. 2:6-8); and thirdly, the fact that the Antichrist “as God, sitteth in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4).

Firstly, the Antichrist must be a post New Testament figure since his rise to power is in association with a “falling away” or great apostasy (II Thess. 2:3) in the church (cf. Acts 20:29-31). This is quite different to the Roman Emperors whose power historically predates any such “falling away” in the church, and who held their power quite autonomously from any such great apostasy. What greater apostasy has there ever been than the rise of the Roman Papacy, and associated gradual demise of New Testament believing apostolic Christianity, with its denial of the doctrines of justification by faith and infallibility of Holy Scripture? A great apostasy in the church was evident with e.g., the claim of Mary to be “ever-virgin” in the *Second Council of Constantinople* (553), the claim to “inspiration” by the *Roman False Prophet* in the *Third Council of Constantinople* (680-1) (though both of the 553 and 680-1 councils mixed truth with error, containing orthodox Trinitarian theology), followed by the greater rise of this *Roman False Prophet* from 1123 when the Pope came to call and preside over such councils; the rise of the Roman Papacy in a prophetic type with John II accepting titular primacy by the Eastern Roman Emperor, in 533 which was continued till 565; and shortly after that Gregory the Great repudiated such notions of some of his predecessors and all but one of his successors to the Bishopric of Rome, there then came the actual rise of the Roman Pope when he was given the title “universal bishop” by the Eastern Roman Emperor in 607 A.D. .

The years 533 and 607 are of particular significance. From 533 the claims of *some* Bishops of Rome to a *universal primacy* in the church, had been accepted by the Byzantine Emperor in Constantinople. Specifically, Justinian in an Epistle attached to his Code, exercised a royal prerogative in regarding the Bishop of Rome as “head of ... the ... churches,” and so via this royal prerogative gave a ceremonial or titular primacy to the Bishop of Rome in the East i.e., over the Patriarchate of Constantinople, that did not expire till Justinian’s death in 565. Before 533 the Bishop of Rome had expanded his powers to

become a governing primate in four of the five Patriarchates (Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome), and in 533 he then became titular primate over the remaining fifth Patriarchate (Constantinople) by virtue of Emperor Justinian's letter saying that the Bishop of Rome was "head of all the holy churches." But this position from 533 was tenuous since it did not take the form of black-letter law, but simply stated an intention in a Letter of the Emperor that he would exercise a discretion he had as emperor to regard the Bishop of Rome as "head of ... the ... churches," i.e., a titular or ceremonial primacy only, and it not only expired with the emperor's death in 565; but the whole notion of a "universal bishop" was later repudiated by the most important Bishop of Rome to ever hold that Bishopric, Gregory the Great, who is one of the four doctors of the Western Church<sup>113</sup>. However, from 607, the Roman Papacy clearly had a *universal significance* to the church by virtue of the Emperor Phocas's claim that the Bishop of Rome was the *universal bishop* i.e., he then became a governing primate over the remaining fifth Patriarchate (Constantinople). The rise of the post New Testament *Church of Rome* under the Roman Papacy from 607, is sometimes called by historicists, "The Great Apostasy" (II Thess. 2:3), and this is surely an apt description.

A second factor deals with the statement about the Antichrist, "ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work: only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one" (II Thess. 2:6-8, ASV). In *The Roman Antichrist* (1957), Fred Leahy propounds II Thessalonians 2:5-8 from the *American Standard Version*. He asks, "What power restrained the 'lawless one'?" (II Thess. 2:8, ASV). His answer, "The power of the Roman Emperor,<sup>114</sup>" is a conclusion shared by a number of both ancient and modern writers.

Tertullian (160-212), a presbyter in the North African Church of Carthage, said in his *Apology*, that there was a "necessity for our offering prayer in behalf of the emperors, nay, for the complete stability of the empire, and for Roman [Empire] interests in general." The reason for this, he said, was that there was "a mighty shock impending over the whole earth - in fact, the very end of all things threatening dreadful woes," and this "is only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman Empire. We have no desire, then, to be overtaken by these dire events; and in praying that their coming may be delayed, we are lending our aid to Rome's duration."<sup>115</sup>

Also writing in the *Church Fathers' Era* (post New Testament to 451 A.D.) while the Western Roman Empire was still in existence, John Chrysostom (c. 346-407), the Patriarch of Constantinople in Asia Minor, understood "he who now restrains" (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV ftn) to refer to the Roman Empire. This Bishop of Constantinople said in his Homily on II Thessalonians 2:6-9:

One may ... naturally inquire, what is *that which withholdeth* [II Thess. 2:6] ...

---

<sup>113</sup> In the Anglican Protestant *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), which in its connected 39 Articles identifies the Bishop of Rome as the Antichrist from 607 (Homilies in Article 35); the four doctors are each given black letter days on the Calendar, i.e., Gregory the Great (March 12), Ambrose (4 April), Augustine (28 Aug.), and Jerome (30 Sept.).

<sup>114</sup> Leahy, F.S., *The Roman Antichrist*, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-9.

<sup>115</sup> Tertullian's *Apology*, Part 1, Apologetical chapter 32; in Coxe, A.C. (Ed.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Christian Literature Publishing Company, USA, 1885.

? Some say, the grace of the Spirit, others the Roman Empire, to whom I most of all accede ... [that is,] he [the Apostle Paul] says this of the Roman Empire ... . And he did not say that it will be quickly, ... but what? *That he might be revealed in his time...* .

*For the mystery of iniquity doth already work.* He speaks here of Nero, as if he were the type of Antichrist ... . *Only he who now hindereth will hinder, until he be taken out of the way;* that is, when the Roman Empire is taken out of the way, then he shall come ... . For as long as the fear of this empire lasts, no one will readily exalt himself, but when that is dissolved, he will attack the anarchy, and endeavour to seize upon the government both of men and of God. For as the kingdoms before were destroyed, that of the Medes by the Babylonians, that of the Babylonians by the Persians, that of the Persians by the [Grecian] Macedonians, that of the [Grecian] Macedonians by the Romans: so will this be by Antichrist, and he by Christ, and it will no longer withhold. And these things Daniel delivers to us with great clearness<sup>116</sup>.

Emperor Claudius reigned from 41 to 54 A.D. and Emperor Nero from 54-68 A.D. . As noted earlier, St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is generally dated to the 50s A.D., and so it is within reason to argue that either Claudius or Nero are being specifically referred to by the Apostle Paul when he says *the mystery of iniquity doth already work*, or given his earlier reference to Caligula (37-41) discussed above, that he means by "the mystery of iniquity" (AV) or "lawlessness" (ASV) "doth already work" (II Thess. 2:7), a number of Roman Emperors of the first century A.D. . Elsewhere Chrysostom says: "Dost thou not hear what Nero's character was, whom Paul even calls the *mystery* of Antichrist? For 'the mystery of iniquity' he says 'already worketh' " (II Thess. 2:7)<sup>117</sup>. This notion that Nero's iniquity is a forerunner of the Antichrist's iniquity is particularly interesting when one considers that when the Greek form of Nero Caesar, which is Neron Caesar, is written with Hebrew letters, then the numerical values of the Hebrew letters adds up to 666 (Rev. 13:18)<sup>118</sup>.

John Chrysostom is surely correct to reject the idea that it is the Holy Spirit who withheld the Antichrist "until he be taken out of the way" (II Thess. 2:7). That is because such a view attacks the Trinitarian teaching of God's omnipresence, that is, God is everywhere. It is one thing to say that under God's permissive will something may happen, for example, the father and mother of the human race, Adam and Eve, were permitted to eat the forbidden fruit (Gen. 2 & 3). But there can be no such thing as a teaching that the Spirit

---

<sup>116</sup> *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom ... on the Epistles of S. Paul the Apostle to the Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians*, new edition, revised by H. Walford, J. Parker & Rivingtons, Oxford, 1879, Homily 4, II Thess. 2:6-9, pp. 491-492.

<sup>117</sup> *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, 1889, reprint: Eerdmans, Michigan, 1969, Vol. 11, p. 558.

<sup>118</sup> NeRON KeSaR is calculated as follows. N = 50, E (in Nero's name is a vowel placed under the N), R = 200, O = 6 (on vowel pointer Vav which = 6), N = 50, K = 100, E = 0 (in Nero's name is a vowel placed under the K), S = 60, A = 0 (in Nero's name is a vowel placed under the S), R = 200. Thus 50 + 200 + 6 + 50 + 100 + 60 + 200 = 666. Such a calculation has been made by various writers, e.g., (the preterist) Chilton, D., *The Days of Vengeance*, An Exposition of the Book of Revelation, Dominion Press, Fort Worth, Texas, USA, 1987, pp. 350-2; Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, p. 702.

is “taken out of the way,” as opposed to God permitting something under his permissive will (in contrast to his directive will). This is clearly taught in Holy Scripture. David says, “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up to heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there” (Ps. 139:7,8). Thus that which is “taken out of the way” must be some human government, and since the Apostle Paul says “ye know what withholdeth” the Antichrist in his day (II Thess. 2:6), that human government is surely the Roman Emperor, which after the split of the Roman Empire into the Eastern and Western Empires became the Western Roman Emperor.

The emperor of the Western Roman Empire was taken out of the way when the Western Roman Empire finally collapsed about 70 years after Chrysostom’s death in 476 A.D. . It is therefore quite significant that John Chrysostom and others understood II Thess. 2:6-8 to require that the Antichrist could not be revealed until after the removal of the Roman Emperor’s power. Furthermore, he also understood II Thess. 2:6-8 to require that the Antichrist would have to emerge fairly soon after the Empire’s collapse, and then continue until Christ’s return. What an amazing fulfilment one finds to this in the Roman Papacy and *only* the Roman Papacy.

Because the Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire (also known as the Byzantine Empire) in Constantinople, continued to hold jurisdictional power over a relatively small part of Western Europe, most notably in the Papal heartlands of Rome itself; there was some limited but continuing relevance of the Eastern Roman Empire to the rise of the Roman Papacy in the old Western Roman Empire and Western Europe<sup>119</sup>. Certainly if the Eastern Roman Emperor had lacked these limited holdings, especially in Rome, the fact that an Eastern Patriarch, namely, the *Patriarch of Constantinople*, was neither under the Western Patriarch, namely the Bishop of Rome, as either the titular primate or a governing primate, would have been irrelevant to the rise of the Roman Papacy. That is because the Roman Papacy arose in continuation of the Western Roman Emperor and Western Roman Empire, i.e., the focus is on Rome, so that the heartlands of Papal Rome’s power became Western Europe, including with some border changes, the area of the old Western Roman Empire under Imperial Rome. Hence after the Roman Papacy cut itself off from the Eastern Roman Empire in *c.* 728, and gained temporal power with the Papal states from 756 A.D., and thus clear political control of Rome, it mattered not that the Eastern Orthodox Churches under the Patriarch of Constantinople split away from the Roman Church in 1054. *Unless, as did not happen, the Roman Pope renounced all claims to “universal” primacy.* Hence *The Great Schism* of 1054, establishing the Greek Orthodox Church, and later Eastern Orthodox Churches, did not have the effect of reversing the gains of the Papacy in 607 for *the purposes of the Antichrist prophecies*; any more than did the Reformation Anglican *39 Articles* declaration, “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.” That is because, between 607 and 1054, the temporal power of the Papacy had been established from 756, and was paramount there by the time of the establishment of the so called “Holy” Roman Empire. *Moreover, the Pope still claimed “universal” primacy.* Thus the bi-polar

---

<sup>119</sup> E.g., the Eastern Roman Empire of Justinian (who gave the Bishop of Rome titular primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 533), included a relatively small number of territorial holdings in the West, in particular, parts of Croatia, Slovenia, North-West Italy (with the Metroplitanate of Milan), far south Italy and Sardinia (with the Metroplitanate of Carales), the far south of Spain (with the Metroplitanate of Cartagena), and most importantly, the Patriarchate of Rome. Dowley’s *Atlas of the Bible and the History of Christianity*, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-5.

rivalry of Rome and Constantinople is relevant *to the period from the 5th to 8th centuries, but not later.*

Therefore, as the situation was in the late fifth to eighth centuries, the rise of the Roman Papacy in Western Europe still needed some aid from the Eastern Roman Emperor. The rising power of the Bishop of Rome after the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 is evident in the letter of the Eastern Roman Emperor, Justinian, in 533 A.D., attached to *Justinian's Code*, in which Justinian refers to the Bishop of Rome as “the head of all the churches.” Because it was mentioned in the NT, and had an older See than Constantinople, “the primacy of honour” had been given to “the Bishop of Rome” by the *Council of Constantinople* (381), which gave the “bishop of Constantinople” “honour next after the Bishop of Rome.” This original “primacy of honour” was like the primacy of honour the Russian Orthodox or Serbian Orthodox Churches now give to the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, i.e., it has no governing power or even titular primacy attached to it, but was simply a “primacy of honour” in ceremonial terms. While the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) likewise considered Constantinople should hold a ceremonial status of “second place after” Rome, it also considered there should be “equal rank” and “equal privileges” between “New Rome” (or Constantinople) and “Rome.” But these qualifications of equality are lacking in Justinian’s later, which states that “Constantinople” or “new Rome holds second place after the holy apostolic seat of elder Rome” (*Corpus Juris Civilis Novellae* 131.2.14). Thus (unlike the Bishop of Constantinople,) Justinian clearly considered the Bishop of Rome had a titular primacy in 533 A.D. Hence, for example, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913) says:

After his election to the See of Rome, Boniface obtained a decree from Phocas [in 607 A.D.], against Cyriacus, Bishop of Constantinople, by which it was ordained that “the See of Blessed Peter the Apostle should be the head of all the churches,” and that the title of “universal bishop” belonged exclusively to the Bishop of Rome - an acknowledgment somewhat similar to that made by Justinian eighty years before [in 533 A.D.] (Novell, 131 c. II tit. xiv.)<sup>120</sup>.

In the *Code of Justinian* (*Corpus Juris Civilis*) we read in a letter by Justinian to John II (Bishop of Rome 533-535), that the “bishop of” “Rome” holds an “Apostolic See” and is “head of all the holy churches” so that “we have exerted ourselves to unite all the priests of the east and subject them to the See of Your Holiness.” Thus “John, Bishop of the City of Rome,” in writing to Justinian, says “This See is indeed the head of all churches,” as “the words of your most reverend piety testify.”<sup>121</sup>

But these words in the *Code of Justinian* are in a Letter (Epistle), not a legal enactment. Thus they established for Rome a titular primacy only in the non-legal sense,

---

<sup>120</sup> *Council of Chalcedon* canons 9,28, Mansi 3:560 C, in Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 82-3; *Corpus Juris Civilis Novellae* 131.2.14 in Wolfgang Kunkel’s edition of *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, August Raabe Printer, Berlin, Germany, 1959, p. 655 (Greek, “*Konstantinoupoleos tes neas Romes deuteran taxin epechein meta ton agiotaton apostolikon thronon tes presbuteras Romes*”; Latin, “*Constantinopoleos Novae Romae secundum habere locum post sanctam apostolicam sedem senioris Romae*”); *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1933, Vol. 2, p. 660.

<sup>121</sup> S.P. Scott’s edition of *The Civil Law* in 17 volumes, Central Trust Company, Cincinnati, USA, 1932, AMS Press, New York, USA, 1973, pp. 10-13, *The Code of Justinian*, Volume 12, Civil Law, Second Edition, Book 1, Title 1:4.

that Justinian himself considered and gave such a position of primacy to the Bishop of Rome. It was simply Justinian's royal prerogative and practice to so regard the Bishop of Rome, and so *while the years 533 to 565 are most significant in understanding the history of rise of the Roman Papacy from 607*, this Letter of 533 did not legally bind either Justinian's Byzantine Emperor successors nor the Patriarchs of Constantinople, to accept the Bishop of Rome's jurisdictional claims during 533 to 565, nor to accept this titular primacy gained in 533 beyond the life of Justinian who died in 565. Thus disputation with the Eastern Bishop of Constantinople remained after Justinian used the terminology of "head of all the churches" in his letter in 533, and was not finally resolved till the decree of Emperor Phocas in 607 declared that the Bishop of Rome was "universal bishop" of the church.

Thus while the Bishops of Rome could claim a basis for a *titular primacy* from a *Letter*, but not a *legal enactment* from 533 to 565, this was a titular primacy over Constantinople (comparable, though even less binding, than the type of primacy offered, but rejected by the *Church of Rome's* Pontiff over the *Church of England* in the *Anglican Roman Catholic International Committee's* document "Gift of Authority" in 1998). This spiritual rise in power of the Bishop of Rome from 533 to 565 and from 607, was followed by the temporal rise in power of the Roman Papacy in 728 and 756. The presence of a viceroy in Rome after 476 representing the Eastern Roman Emperor in Constantinople, meant that the Pope did not have temporal power till the Romish West cut itself off from the Byzantine East around 728 A.D., and the Rome of the Emperors was fully succeeded by the Rome of the Popes, further manifested shortly afterwards with the first of the Papal states in 756. Thus the Papacy went through a spiritual rise to power following the fall of Rome in 476 with the Byzantine Emperor Justinian's Letter of 533 giving a titular and ceremonial primacy from 533 to 565 over the Patriarchate of Constantinople; then the Byzantine Emperor Phocas's decree of 607 giving a governing primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople; with the result that the spiritual Rome of the Emperors was succeeded by the spiritual Rome of the Popes. Then followed a temporal rise to power with the severing of links to the Eastern Roman Empire by Western Papal Rome about 728, and the rise of the Papal states from 756; with the result that the temporal Rome of the Western Emperors was succeeded by the temporal Rome of the Popes. Thus the Roman Pope gained his "two swords" of temporal and spiritual power in Western Europe.

The second Roman Catholic Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster in London, England, Cardinal Manning (Cardinal 1875-92), was a strong supporter of such Papal power. E.g., he claimed, "if Christian history be true, Christendom was a creation of Almighty God," "and this creation had for it head, and as the chief representative of his Divine Son, the person who was chosen to be his Vicar upon earth."<sup>122</sup> "They have been also accused of tyranny over princes" or "kings that their power is limited. The dread chimera at which the English people especially stand in awe, - the deposing power of the Pope, what was it but that supreme arbitration, whereby the highest power in the world, the Vicar of the Incarnate Son of God, anointed high-priest and supreme temporal ruler, sat in his tribunal" "to judge between nation and nation, between people and prince, between sovereign and subject?"<sup>123</sup> Thus Cardinal Manning claims, "the temporal power of the Vicar of the Son of God," "stands

---

<sup>122</sup> Cardinal Manning's *The Independence of the Holy See*, Burns & Oats, London, UK, second edition, 1877, pp. 88-9.

<sup>123</sup> Manning, H.E., *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance*, Catholic Publication Society, New York, USA, 1875, p. 125.

by the side of the Immaculate Conception” of Mary, “as a theological certainty.<sup>124</sup>”

To this it must also be said that the Roman Pope has claimed his power to be greater than that of temporal rulers. For example, the creationist writer and Anglican clergyman, Henry Alcock (1838/9-1915) advocated a plain creationist reading of Gen. 1:3-31; 2:1-3 that understood the six days of creation as six 24 hour days (on the same basic model as J. Pye Smith). He thus refers disparagingly to the claims of Pope Innocent III (Pope 1198-1216) who claimed superiority over temporal rulers on the basis of an allegorical interpretation of Gen. 1:16, “God made two great lights,” claiming “the following: - ‘These words signify that God made two dignities, the pontifical and the royal; but the dignity that rules the day, that is the spiritual power, is the greater light; and that which rules the night, or the temporal, is the lesser; so that it may be understood that there is as much difference between Popes and kings, as between the sun and moon’.<sup>125</sup>”

Therefore it is clear the Bishop of Rome’s rising power was evident in Justinian’s Epistle (Letter) of 533, *Reddentes Honorem* (Latin, ‘Offering Honour’), attached to *Justinian’s Code* which gave him a titular and ceremonial primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 533 to 565. Hence commenting on the time the Antichrist was “revealed” (II Thess. 2:8), for example, Matthew Poole in his *Commentary* (1685) says: “it is most generally referred to the time of Boniface the Third, to whom Phocas granted the style of ecumenical bishop, and to the Church of Rome to be the mother church<sup>126</sup>.” Thus through reference to the Emperor’s Letter to the Bishop of Rome in 533 and Phocas’s decree of 607, it is clear that the Roman Papacy was only able to rise after the Western Roman Emperor and Western Roman Empire were “taken out of the way,” at which time “that Wicked” Antichrist foretold in Scripture could “be revealed” (II Thess. 2:7,8). Who but the Papacy could be said to fit these time constraints? Who else could be said to arise shortly after the restraining influence of the Western Roman Empire had been “taken out of the way” from 476, and then continue till the Second Advent (II Thess. 2:6-8)?

Thirdly, the Antichrist “sitteth in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4). In the prophetic type of II Thess. 2:4 this happened with the Roman Emperor Caligula (37-41 A.D.) erecting his statue in the Jerusalem Temple. The history of the Crusades shows that in a physical sense the Roman Papacy has sometimes taken possession of the old Jewish temple site. For example, the *First Crusade* (1095-1101) was announced at the Council of Clermont by Pope Urban II, and the Papal army entered Jerusalem in 1099. But this is not the sense in which the Roman Pope “sitteth in the temple of God;” indeed, by this time the Jewish Temple had

---

<sup>124</sup> Manning, H.E., Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ*, 1860, 3rd edition, Burns & Oats, London, UK, 1880, p. 231.

<sup>125</sup> Alcock, H.J., *English Mediaeval Romanism*, With a Preface by R.P. Blakeney, James Miller, London, 1872, pp. 46-7; quoting Sixth Letter to Goudon, by Wordsworth. Alcock, H.J., *Earth’s Preparation For Man*, *op. cit.*; Smith, J.P., *The Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science*, *op. cit.*, 5th edition, 1852. Notwithstanding some criticisms of Pye Smith’s regional earth gap school model of creation in Gen. 1:3-2:3 (Ramm, B., *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, Paternoster, London, UK, 1955, pp. 131-3,171,234), its features of a universe and global creation in Gen. 1:1, followed by a long gap in time, and then a local creation of the Edenic region in Gen. 1:3-2:3, have been recently followed by John Sailhamer in *Genesis Unbound* (1996), *op. cit.* .

<sup>126</sup> Poole, M., *A Commentary on the Holy Bible*, 1685, reprint: Banner of Truth Trust, 1962, Vol. 3, p. 760 (II Thess. 2).

long since ceased to exist there, being destroyed by the Roman in 70 A.D. . Rather, the Pope “sitteth in the temple of God” in quite a different sense. The NT sometimes refers to the church as *the temple of God* (I Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:19-22) and the immediate context of II Thess. 2:4 is concerned with “a falling away” or apostasy in the church (II Thess. 2:3). Notably then, the Bishop of Rome’s claims to be “Vicar of Jesus Christ,” “Successor of St. Peter,” and from 607 “universal bishop” means he thus *claims jurisdiction* to be sitting in God’s temple - the church. For example, the Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents referred to the Pope as “the Supreme Pontiff.” It said, “the Roman Pontiff ... has been granted by God supreme, full, immediate and universal power in the care of souls” in “the universal Church” (*Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church* 2)<sup>127</sup>. Such claims are rightly addressed by e.g., the *Confession of Faith of the Dutch Reformed Church (1618 & 1619)*, which held in the Synod of Dort, Article 31, that “Christ” is “the only universal bishop, and the only head of the church.” But while “Christ” is here correctly said to be “the only universal ... head of the church,” or put another way, *the only head of the universal church* (Eph. 5:29-32; Col. 1:18; 2:19); nevertheless, the Roman Pope clearly has a *universal significance* to the church by virtue of the Papal claim to be *universal bishop* of the church / temple of God and thus a *universal jurisdiction* in the church / temple.

In medieval times, “the temple of God” was found in the pure church, such as the Waldensians; but it also included part of the Roman Church. There were sometimes true believers still operating in the Roman Church for their whole life, such as Wycliffe, although his Lollard followers found it necessary to leave the Roman Church. Certainly since the latter part of the 8th century on the continent, with the formation of the first Papal state in 756, and the “Holy” Roman Empire in 800; and in the British Isles from the fifteenth century when the Inquisition was established against the Lollards, one no longer finds true believers in the Church of Rome as anything more than relatively rapid transitory figures, heeding the call, “Come out” (II Cor. 6:17; Rev. 18:4). But to the extent that they are there for any time, we are reminded that the Roman Pontiff still sits in the very “temple” of God (Eph. 2:21; II Thess. 2:4).

But there is another sense in which the Pope of Rome sits in “the temple of God.” The church is referred to as “the temple of God” in I Cor. 3:16 and II Cor. 6:16, and it is clear from I Cor. 3:17 that a “man” (singular) can “defile the temple of God,” in which instance “him shall God destroy.” But of particular relevance in better understanding II Thess. 2:4 is I Cor. 6:19,20. As with these other references in the Apostle Paul’s Epistles to the Corinthians, the presence of a plural form of “you” / “your” with a singular form of “temple” shows that “temple” here refers to a corporate body, that is, the church (I Cor. 12:27). In I Cor. 6:19,20, this idea of the “body” is developed more fully. It is of course instructive to remember that the Authorized Version uses “thee,” “thou,” and “thy” for “you” / “your” in the singular, and “ye,” “you” and “your” for “you” / “your” in the plural. Thus the meaning of the passage from the Greek is more easily understood in the AV than e.g., the NKJV because of this. Let us consider I Cor. 6:13-20. Here in “the body is not for fornication,” “body” is singular. Then “Know ye [plural] not that your [plural] bodies [plural] are members of Christ [singular]? Shall I then take the members [plural] of Christ, and make them members of an harlot?” *Thus verse 15 is clearly is conceptualizing the individual bodies of professing Christians, rather than a corporate church body.* Likewise, verse 16 is singular, “What? Know ye [plural] not that he [singular] which is joined to an harlot is one body [singular].” The combination of “he” in the singular and “body” in the singular, means

---

<sup>127</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 564.

*verse 16 clearly is conceptualizing the individual bodies of professing Christians, rather than a corporate church body.* Again this is so in verse 18, “Flee fornication. Every sin that a man [singular] doeth is without the body [singular], but he [singular] that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body [singular]” (AV). The combination of “he” in the singular and “body” in the singular, means *verse 18 clearly is conceptualizing the individual bodies of professing Christians, rather than a corporate church body.*

But when we come to verses 19 and 20 the Greek changes. It then reads, “What? Know ye [plural] not that your [plural] body [singular] is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you [plural], which ye [plural] have of God, and ye [plural] are not your [plural] own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your [plural] body [singular]: and in your [plural] spirit [singular] which are God’s.” The combination of “ye” “you” and “your” in the plural throughout and “body” [singular], means *verses 19 and 20 are clearly conceptualizing the corporate church body, rather than individual bodies of professing Christians.* Thus the singular “spirit” of this corporate “body” (I Cor. 6:20) is the Holy Spirit or “Holy Ghost” who dwells in this “body” (I Cor. 6:19). If verses 19 and 20 meant individual Christian’s body each constituted a temple, it would read either a), “thy body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in thee, which thou hast of God, and thou art not thy own ... therefore glorify God in thy body and in thy spirit;” or b) “your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, ... therefore glorify God in your bodies: and in your spirits.” I.e., in I Cor. 6:19,20 St. Paul has moved from referring to the individual bodies of individual professing believers in verses 13-18, and taken up the idea of verse 15 that the many “bodies” are members of a singular body of Christ, which has a singular spirit in the Holy Spirit. Thus he says the corporate “body” of the church is a temple which can be defiled by the actions of individuals in it.

The particular form of defilement of the “body” (plural) was caused by some individual member(s) in it committing “fornication” (I Cor. 6:18,19). In this same general passage, St. Paul also says “fornicators” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9). Thus while these fornicators were no part of the true church of Christ, but rather were the tares amongst the wheat (Matt. 13:24-30,36-43), they are still here counted as being in “the temple of God” which they were defiling by their wickedness. So likewise, the Popes of Rome commit many sinful acts, including idolatry, and the Apostle Paul also says “idolaters” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9). But though the Papal idolaters are no part of the true church of Christ, but rather are the tares amongst the wheat (Matt. 13:24-30,36-43), they are still counted in II Thess. 2:4 as being in “the temple of God” which they defile by their wickedness.

The fact that these three identifiers meet such a clear fulfilment in the Roman Papacy, clearly acts to identify the *Roman Antichrist* as the Antichrist. Further analysis of II Thessalonians chapter 2 also confirms this conclusion.

## CHAPTER 8

### **The Antichrist is guilty of “shewing” “that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).**

In II Thess. 2:4 the Antichrist is described as one “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4). God is to be “exalted” (Ps. 46:10), but instead, the Antichrist “exalteth himself” (II Thess. 2:4). Pride can make a person their own god. This sin was at the heart of Satan’s original rebellion against God, since “Lucifer” “said,” “I

will be like the most High” (Isa. 14:12,14). So too, when he came to our first parents, Lucifer said to them, “ye shall be as gods” (Gen. 3:5). The sin of self-seeking can make a man his own god, when men “seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ’s” (Philp. 2:21), for example, the Pope, like “Diotrephes,” “loveth to have the preeminence” (II John 9).

Two broadly different meanings to “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4) could apply on this translation, depending on whether human gods or the Divine God is meant. Both possibilities can argue support from Dan. 11:36 which says the Antichrist “shall exalt ... himself above every god” - which can refer to human gods (John 10:34,35), and also “against ... God” himself. Concerning the first meaning, namely, that the Pope “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called god,” Wylie takes the view that with respect to “called God” it is “magistrates and kings who are meant,” since “in Scripture, magistrates are called ‘gods.’ ‘I have said ye are gods.’ ‘God sitteth in the assembly of the mighty, he judgeth among the gods’” (Ps. 82:1,6). Thus this “foretells that Antichrist would usurp supremacy over all civil authority, and rule on earth; and truly the Papacy has fulfilled the prophecy to the letter.” So too John Cumming says, “if I open the Book of Exodus 22:28, ‘Thou shalt not revile *the gods*,’ evidently the magistrates; Ps. 82:6,” “and our blessed Lord said, John 10:35: ‘If God called them *gods* unto whom the word of God came,’ plainly meaning church magistrates, kings, and rulers.” “Now it is a matter of history that the Pope exalts himself above all magistrates, kings, and rulers,” that is “above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4)<sup>128</sup>.

Concerning the second meaning, that is, that the Divine God is here meant. “Above” (AV) here is Greek *epi* and can also be translated as “against,” so that this then reads, “he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4, ASV). Martin Luther took the view that both of these meanings of the Greek were intended and so in his *Smalcald Articles* (1537) he says the “Pope” “has raised himself over and set himself against Christ” and then repeats this combination of “over” and “against” saying, “This is called precisely, ‘setting oneself over God and against God,’ as St. Paul says” (II Thess. 2:4). But it is also possible to translate these Greek words of II Thess. 2:4 as the Antichrist “opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship” (NASB), or if Greek *epi* is translated as “against” (ASV) then it is translated “against every so-called god.”

This portion of II Thess. 2:4 is surely referring to Dan. 11:36 which says the Antichrist “shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above (Hebrew ‘*al*’) every (Hebrew *kal*, or ‘all’) god, and shall speak ... against (Hebrew ‘*al*’) the God of gods” (emphasis mine) The Hebrew word here translated as “above” and “against” is ‘*al*’ and can mean “above,” “over,” “upon,” or “against.” Either the words of Dan. 11:36 that he will “exalt himself above ... god” (AV) or “exalt himself ... against ... God” are referred to as the Antichrist “exalteth

---

<sup>128</sup> Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, p. 106; Cumming, J., *Apocalyptic Sketches*, *op. cit.*, pp. 472-3. I went to London (working in my profession as a school teacher), April 2001-April 02 (1st trip); Dec. 02-July 03 (2nd trip); August 03-April 04 (3rd trip); Oct. 05-April 06 (4th trip); & Sept. 08-March 09 (5th trip). On my third trip to London, in December 2003 I saw an old Church of John Cumming’s. In the 1860s he was the Minister of Crown Court *Scottish National Church*, Convent Garden, London, WC2 (near the Royal Opera House); now known as the *Crown Court Church of Scotland*. It has an attractive sandstone entrance with an architecturally built-in sandstone Christian Cross placed over the word, “HOLY.”

himself above (*epi*) ... God (*theon*)” (AV) or “exalteth himself above (*epi*) all (*panta*)<sup>129</sup> that is called ‘God (*theon*)’” (AV); or “exalteth himself against (*epi*)... God (*theon*)” (ASV) or “exalteth himself against (*epi*) all (*panta*)’ that is called ‘God (*theon*)’” (II Thess. 2:4, ASV), or the words of Dan. 11:36 that he will “exalt ... himself above every god” are quoted as the Antichrist “exalts himself above (*epi*) every (*panta*)’ so-called ‘god(*theon*)’” (II Thess. 2:4, NASB). If the NASB form is followed then it is notable that the words “against every god” in the Greek of II Thess. 2:4 are “*epi panta theon*” and these identical words are found in the Septuagint’s translation of Daniel 11:36 which also says “the king shall exalt and magnify himself *against every god*.” But a different word is used for “exalt” and so the view that St. Paul is here endorsing the second form found in the Septuagint is inconclusive. Since this passage in Daniel 11:36-12:3 is also addressing events concerning the Antichrist and Second Advent it is contextually reasonable to conclude that II Thess. 2:4 is referring to Dan. 11:36. Thus I think it fair to conclude that the reader of II Thessalonians chapter 2 is meant to look to the Book of Daniel in general, and Dan. 11:36-45 in particular, for further clarification about the Antichrist (compare Jesus’ technique in Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14)<sup>130</sup>.

The English is not always able to convey multiple meanings in the Hebrew or Greek, and so more than one English rendering may sometimes be valuable. In such instances as we find here at II Thess. 2:4, it is not a case of “the AV is wrong and the ASV or NASB are right,” nor conversely that “the ASV or NASB are right and the AV is wrong.” It is simply that the English can only be rendered one way to convey one of the underpinning meanings or nuances where there are multiple meanings or nuances. (This same issue exists on a number of Biblical passages.) Significantly, whether one follows the Authorized Version’s form of II Thess. 2:4 that the Antichrist “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped” (AV), or the New American Standard Bible’s form of II Thess. 2:4 that the Antichrist “opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship” (NASB), the description fits the Roman Papacy. The Marian Martyr, Bishop Latimer, in a sermon he preached in the presence of the Protestant King Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547-1553), said that “the Pope will have all things that he doth taken for an article of our faith,” and “In this we learn to know Antichrist, which doth elevate himself in the church [II Thess. 2:4] ... . His canonizations, and judging of men before the Lord’s judgement be a manifest token of Antichrist. How can he know Saints? He knoweth not his own heart.

---

<sup>129</sup> Greek “*panta* (all) *legomenon* (that is called)” is majority Byzantine text manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), and with no good textual argument against it, correct. A variant followed by Beza (1565 & 1598) reads, “*pan* (all) *to* (‘the’ redundant in English translation) *legomenon* (that is called),” and followed by Scrivener’ Text (1894 & 1902), is incorrect; although it makes no difference to English translation. This appears to be one of Beza’s “textual trademarks.” For this type of issue, see Appendices 1 in my textual commentaries (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

<sup>130</sup> James Frame refers to Dan. 11:36 and says St. Paul is “alluding to this passage and” specifically “quoting *epi panta theon*” (above / against every god), but in doing so “Paul inserts *legomenon* to prevent the possibility of putting the would-be gods on a level with the true God; but whether *legomenon* refers solely to the would-be gods designated as such, ‘so called’ (compare Iren. V, 25:1 ...) [as translated in the NASB], or whether it embraces both the would-be gods and the true God, ‘which is called God,’ [as translated in the AV,] rightly or wrongly (so most interpreters), is uncertain.” (*International Critical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*, T & T Clarke, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 255).

And he cannot know them by miracles, for some miracle-workers shall go to the Devil.<sup>131</sup>”

Notably Luther used both forms of translation in exposing the Roman Pope as the Antichrist. Martin Luther generally translated these words of II Thess. 2:4 the same way as the AV, that is, the antichrist “exalteth himself above” or “against all that is called God;” but he was also known to translate them the same way as the NASB. Thus on the one hand, translating these words the AV way and referring to both Dan. 11:36 and II Thess. 2:4, he said, “As Daniel says,” the Pope “exalts himself over and against the God of gods. For God gave commandments through Moses,” but the Pope “sits in the temple of God, that is, in Christendom.” Papal “decrees, and the language of his decretals, prove this. In these two ways the Pope has now destroyed two hierarchies. By the first, the law of the world, he has trodden down obedience and government.” And by “the other, he has disturbed the church; subjugated Holy Scripture; torn and destroyed the Sacrament, together with its usage; and suppressed the Gospel until humanly unrecognizable!<sup>132</sup>” Commenting on both II Thess. 2:4 with Dan. 11:36,37, Luther said, “There’s no name by which the Pope could be called that’s as odious as he deserves ... . In his letter to the Thessalonians Paul called him an adversary who exalted himself above all that is called God [II Thess. 2:4]. Daniel also prophesies that he is very exalted and magnifies himself above the God of his fathers [Dan. 11:36,37].<sup>133</sup>” Luther also followed this AV form of translation “exalteth himself above all that is called God” in his *Smalcald Articles* where he says this happens in the sense that the Pope subverts justification by faith<sup>134</sup>.” But on the other hand, translating these words the NASB way in his *Lectures on First John*, Luther said, “the true antichrist” is “the Papacy.” “Justification through Christ gradually came to be regarded as worthless and the antichrist appeared.” Thus “the Pope exalted himself above the kingdom of Christ,” and so ““He opposes and exalts himself above every so called god,” as II Thess. 2:4 says.<sup>135</sup>”

This is significant since if II Thess. 2:4 is understood to be quoting Dan. 11:36 then the statement that the Antichrist will set “himself forth as God” (ASV) or “a god,” “exalt ... and magnify himself above every god,” “speak ... against ... God,” and “nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all”(Dan. 11:36,37), is contextually qualified in Dan. 11 by the statement that he will worship a number of gods, namely, he shall “honour the god of forces,” and also “a god whom his fathers knew not,” and also deal with “most strong holds with” the help of “a strange god” (Dan. 11:38,39). This being so, the statements that the Antichrist exalts himself “above / against every god” (Dan. 11:36; II Thess. 2:4, NASB) or “above / against all that is called God” (Dan. 11:36, II Thess. 2:4, AV), or what “is worshipped” (II Thess. 2:4, AV), and shows no “regard for any other god” since he magnifies himself against or “above them all” (Dan. 11:37), must mean that he will in some way claim certain Divine attributes or prerogatives that are properly attributed to a god or God, but not specifically claim Divinity for himself since he still worships “the god of forces,” “a god

---

<sup>131</sup> Corrie, G.E., *Sermons by Hugh Latimer*, sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555, The Parker Society, Cambridge University Press, 1844, pp.148-9 (emphasis mine).

<sup>132</sup> Luther’s Works, Weimer edition, 11:2 on Dan. 11:36; quoted in Lee, F.N., *Antichrist in Scripture: Luther and Calvin’s Doctrine of Antichrist*, Focus Christian Ministries, Craven Herald & Pioneer Skipton, North Yorkshire, England, UK, 1992, p. 20.

<sup>133</sup> *Luther’s Works*, Vol. 54, p. 343.

<sup>134</sup> Russell, W.R., *Luther’s Theological Testament, The Schmalkald Articles*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, USA, 1995, p. 130.

<sup>135</sup> Luther’s *Lectures on First John*, American Edition, 30:252f, 287f, quoted in Lee, pp. 33-4.

whom his fathers knew not,” and “a strange god” (Dan. 11:38,39).

What Divine attributes or prerogatives might this be that the Antichrist claims? To some extent this depends on whether one translates II Thess. 2:4 as a “god” (NASB) or the “God” (AV). In II Thess. 2:4 reference is first made to “the temple of God” and the meaning here must be the temple of the one true God since the Greek literally reads “the (*tou*) God (*theou*).” By contrast, the Antichrist sitting “in the temple,” is said to be “shewing himself that he is God (*theos*)” not “the God (*o theos*).” This means that the Greek is ambiguous and could be translated as either, “shewing himself that he is God” (AV) or “shewing himself that he is a god.” The same is true for the “God (*theon*)” before “sitteth” i.e., “as God (*theon*) sitteth in the temple of God,” which is “*theon*” not “*ton theon*,” and so could likewise be rendered “as God” (AV) or “as a god,” and also he words “all that is called God (*theon*)” (AV). While Martin Luther generally translated this passage as “God,” he sometimes translated it as “a god.” In Luther’s *Collected Works* he says, “the Antichrist” ““as a god (*theon*), sits in the temple of God, claiming he is a god (*theos*).” “He opposes and exalts himself above all that is called a god (*theon*) or that is worshipped’ (II Thess. 2:4).” “He, the Pope, openly damned the Word of God at Constance in connection with John Huss [in 1414].” “The Apostle therefore says (II Thess. 2:8) that ‘the Lord shall consume him’” “with great force;” “the whole Papal empire!”<sup>136</sup>

Firstly, let us consider this translation that the Antichrist sets himself forth as “a god” (Luther). Two broadly different meanings could apply on this translation, one based on a meaning of “a god” referring to a human in Scripture, the other based on a pagan Roman meaning of “a god.” As noted above with respect to the Pope *exalting himself above all that is called god*, “gods” can refer to magistrates and kings (Exod. 22:28; Ps. 82:1,6; John 10:35). For example, Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, “earthly princes” are sometimes called “gods (Ps. 82:6)” “in the holy Scriptures” “doubtless for that similitude of government which they have, or should have, not unlike unto God.” If this same view is taken with respect to the Pope setting himself forth as “a god” (II Thess. 2:4, Luther’s translation), then it means that the Pope “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is” a judge or a king or some kind of temporal ruler. If so, this requirement is met with, for example, the Pope’s temporal power making him a king in the Papal states from 756 to 1870 and in the Vatican City State since 1929.

But there is another possibility of “a god” made with respect to a relevant pagan Roman meaning of “god.” In the pagan Roman religious beliefs of NT times, the concept of a human gaining divine attributes, was evident in the cult of emperor worship. Julius Caesar like a number of subsequent emperors was deified after his death, but was not formally deified during his lifetime. Yet during his lifetime he claimed a number of divine attributes such as the attribute of worship. He also claimed the title of “Supreme Pontiff” or *Pontifex Maximus*, and a statue of him was set up in temple at Rome with the inscription “To the unconquered god.” The title “*Pontifex Maximus*” meant the Pagan Roman Pontiff was the high priest in a college of priests, and so likewise, the Papal Roman Pontiff robs Christ of his position as our great “high priest” (e.g., Heb. 8:1); even as his minion Romish priests rob believers of their standing in the universal priesthood of all believers (I Peter 2:9; Rev. 5:10). Yet these honours did not amount to formal deification and Suetonius says that as a mortal he should not have accepted them. Augustus avoided assuming overt divine status, even though he accepted various divine honours in the form of worship usually regarded as belonging to a

---

<sup>136</sup> Luther’s *Collected Works*, Ed. Walch, 18, pp. 1573f; quoted in Lee, p. 18.

god. Therefore Roman Emperors were given some sort of status as a human being with divine attributes during their lifetimes<sup>137</sup>. The fact that Julius Caesar was referred during his lifetime as a “god” in a temple, even though he was not formally deified and was regarded as a human with certain divine attributes is very significant. It means that if one can show similar qualities of the Pope, then in the thinking of the religious cultural context that II Thess. 2:4 was written, the Pope too may be fairly classified as “a god.”

But before making such a conclusion, we must first ask if there is anything in the II Thess. 2:1-12 passage that might justify such a meaning? One such factor has already been covered with respect to the fact that II Thess. 2:4 refers to Dan. 11:36 and it is clear from Dan. 11:36-39 that the Antichrist claims Divine attributes rather than Divinity *per se*. But there is another contextual factor. Unlike the usual prophetic passages which contain one prophetic type pointing to the greater fulfilment, there are two prophetic types in II Thess. 2:1-12 and both are Roman Emperors! First, there is the prophetic type of Caligula in II Thess. 2:4 mentioned above. Secondly, we read in II Thess. 2:7 that “the mystery of iniquity” was “already” at “work” in St. Paul’s day. One way that *the mystery of iniquity* was *already work* was in idolatry, for the Apostle Paul exhorted believers to “flee from idolatry” (I Cor. 10:14), and yet the Church of Rome is filled with idols (see “he shall think to change ... the law” Daniel 7:25, ASV).

The New Testament condemns the usage of a “graven” “image” as an idol (Acts 17:29; Rom. 1:23), and in this clearly upholds the Second Commandment which may be summarized as, “Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image.” (Exod. 20:4-6; Deut. 5:8-10). By contrast, the Roman Church upholds the idolatrous teaching of the *Second Council of Nicea* (787 A.D.), which among other things says: “images of” “Jesus Christ and of our undefiled Lady, ... and of the honourable angels, and of all saintly and holy men” may be given idolatrous “honour” “and he that adores an image adores in it the person depicted thereby.” As the Papists bow low to their idols of Christ and Saints, especially Mary, they set aside the Holy Decalogue and the words of the Apostle John, “keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21).

Furthermore, the Apostle Paul refers to the Ten Commandments, and says of the Jews, “Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?” (Rom. 2:22) i.e., a temple despoiler or robber. It is possible to “rob God” (Mal. 3:8), for example, some Old Testament Jews robbed God of the honour due to his name by profane worship via “robbery for burnt offering” (Isa. 61:8). The Jews the Apostle Paul refers to robbed God the honour due to his holy name (3rd and 8th commandments, Exod. 20:7,15). By failing to accept Christ as the Messiah, when they went to the Jewish temple in Jerusalem they robbed God of the honour due to his name in contrast to Jewish Christians who offered pure worship in the Jewish temple (Luke 24:53; Acts 2:46; 3:1-10; 5:20-25,42; 21:17-30; 22:17); and they also robbed God the honour due to his holy name by not being in the temple of the Christian Church (I Cor. 3:16,17; 6:19; II Cor 6:16; Eph. 2:21). As these Jews thus set about to “commit sacrilege” (Rom. 2:22), they were guilty of one aspect of what an idolater does, for in worshipping an idol contrary to the second commandment (Exod. 20:4-6), an idolater also robs God of the praise due to his holy name, and so the Apostle says “Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?” (Rom. 2:22). So too, the Papal Antichrist is guilty of these violations of the second, third, and eighth commandments, for he “sitteth in the temple

---

<sup>137</sup> Lyttelton, M., & Forman, W., *The Romans their gods and their beliefs*, Orbis, London, 1984, pp. 22,66,70,76,77,81.

of God” (II Thess. 2:4), that is, the church, and robs God the honour due to his holy name through the impure worship offered by this system of religious apostasy. This “mystery of iniquity” of so violating the second and eighth commandments was clearly “already” at “work” (II Thess. 2:7) in the Apostle Paul’s day with the religious apostates of his time.

A second way “the mystery of iniquity” (AV) was “already” at “work” (II Thess. 2:7, AV) in NT times was the way Imperial Roman law set aside some of God’s laws prohibiting incest. Old Testament morals are not necessarily New Testament morals. Certainly “the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites,” and Jewish “civil precepts,” “do not bind Christian men” (Art. 7, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*) (Mark 7:19, NASB; Acts 15:5; Gal. 2:14; 4:10,11; 6:13; Col. 2:16,17; I Tim. 4:3-5; Heb. 9:15-20). For these Jewish ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts which put a distinction between the Jewish nation and Gentile nations, “even the law of commandments contained in ordinances,” were “abolished” by Christ (Eph. 2:15). For the Christian Church is “the Israel of God” now (Gal. 6:16), albeit one with internal Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian wings (Rom. 9-11). “Yet notwithstanding” the abolition of these Mosaic laws, “no Christian man whatsoever is free from obedience of the commandments” in “the Old Testament” “which are called Moral” (Article 7, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*). All the major confessions and catechisms of the Reformation uphold the Holy Decalogue. The OT moral law binding on Christians consists of the *Ten Commandments* as modified in the NT (Rom. 2:22-24; 7:7; 13:9; Eph. 6:1-3; James 1:25, 2:7-12), that is, the name of Jesus Christ is now included under the Third Commandment; in the double meaning of, for example, John 20:1 Jesus rose on “the first [day] of the week” which simultaneously means “the first of the Sabbaths” so that Sunday is established as the Lord’s day under the Fourth Commandment (John 20:19,26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10); and the Seventh Commandment prohibits polygamy (Matt. 19:9). This also includes OT laws that can be reasonably characterized as expressing one of the Decalogue’s precepts in a manner harmonious with the NT, for example, Deut. 18:10,11. Moreover, the OT morality of Lev. 18 & 20 continues to bind all men since they are discoverable laws of nature through God’s common grace (Rom. 1 & 2) and so the heathen nations of Canaan were justly judged for violating them (Lev. 18:25). NT morals may also continue other OT morality (e.g., Gen. 6:1-4; Matt. 24:37-39). For instance, long before the Jewish ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts enacted by Moses, the King of Salem, Melchizedek, received tithes from Abraham (Gen. 14:18-20). Since Christ “is a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek” (Ps. 110:4; Heb. 7:17), it follows that he is entitled as of right to “tithes” (Heb. 7:9,10), which should now be paid for gospel ministry (I Cor. 9:13,14). Thus I consider it remains valid to characterize and quote Mal. 3:8-10 under this header, and historically, for example, the *Church of England* clergy were entitled to tithes under the laws of England, and throughout the country-side the English had “tithe barns” (although some Christians dispute the obligatory nature of tithing).

Before Noah’s Flood in antediluvian times, polygamy was prohibited for Adam had many “ribs” but only one wife (Gen. 2:21-24), and while those who entered the Ark were monogamous (Gen. 7:13; I Peter 3:20), the sins of the antediluvians clearly included polygamy (Gen. 4:19,23). But later Old Testament law not only permitted polygamy e.g., Abraham had three wives (Gen. 16:1,3; 25:1), or Jacob had two wives (Gen. 29,30); but Old Testament Jewish civil precepts actually commanded it in the case of the Levirate marriage rule (Deut. 25:5-10), and Onan incurred God’s wrath for refusing to fulfil this polygamous OT morality (Gen. 38:8-10). Some Christian commentators consider that these OT instances of polygamy were only permitted by God because of *the hardness of men’s hearts* (e.g., Matthew Henry, John Gill, and Matthew Poole), that is, ideally men in the OT were still

meant to be monogamous<sup>138</sup>. Some who adopt this view claim the Levirate marriage rule of Deut. 25:5-10 only applied to a deceased man's brother who was single. In my opinion such a view is contrary to the natural reading of the passage which makes no such qualification. Moreover, the Levirate marriage rule also helps to explain at least one scenario explaining how it is that in Deut. 21:15-17 some men could "have two wives, one beloved, and another hated" since they may not have much liked to marry their deceased brother's wife; though this is not the only possible scenario (Gen. 29).

I think God's permission to allow polygamy was *limited in time* to the period of Abraham to NT times, and *limited in scope* to the Jewish race until Christ's time. Unlike the above Non-Conformist Puritan (that is, non-Anglican Protestant) writers, the traditional Anglican view "looked for the silver lining" in the cloud of OT polygamy, and so saw something positive about OT Jewish polygamy, even though it reserved the right to condemn a particular instance of OT Jewish polygamy when it was considered to have been contracted in ungodliness. Homily 10, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, "it 'was permitted to the fathers of the Old Testament to have at one time more wives than one' as 'a special prerogative,' 'not for satisfying their carnal and fleshly lusts, but to have many children; because every one of them hoped, and begged oft-times of God in their prayers, that that blessed' Messianic 'seed which God promised should come into the world' might come and be born of his stock." For example, "David took him more concubines and wives out of Jerusalem," from whom of one was "born" "Nathan" (II Sam. 5:13,14), an ancestor of Mary who was "blessed" to be the Messiah's mother (Luke 1:48), "Jesus" "being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son"-in-law "of Heli," a descendant of "Nathan" (Luke 3:23,31)<sup>139</sup>. But this same Homily also says God "did" "not" "allow" every instance of polygamy one finds in the OT (cf. I Kgs 11:1-3); and states that such polygamy is now "plainly" "forbidden us by the law of God," for the Christian (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:2).

But whether one looks upon OT Jewish polygamy, with qualification, in a more positive way (Anglican *39 Articles*), or in more negative way (Puritans: Henry, Gill, and Poole), it is certainly clear from a careful reading of the Old Testament that *as a general proposition* the ideal of monogamy was still upheld through reference to Adam and Eve and Noah's Flood. Moreover, polygamy resulted in many problems, for instance, the Levirate marriage rule was clearly not always liked by men (Gen. 38:8-10,26; Deut. 25:7,9,10), and could produce friction or envy between wives (Gen. 16:4-6; 21:9-12; 30:1; Lev. 18:18; I Sam. 1:1-6). The New Testament Covenant replaces the Old Testament Mosaic Covenant with its Mosaic ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts (Heb. 9:15-20); and so in the NT, Christians are not bound by Jewish civil precepts such as the Levirate marriage rule. Furthermore, Jesus reintroduced the antediluvian ban on polygamy, since he does not say a person engaging in marriage after an unBiblical divorce "engages in polygamy" but rather "committeth adultery" (Matt. 19:9); and the Apostle Paul says a man is to "have his own wife" and a "woman" "her own husband;" and that for "a bishop" to "be blameless" requires

---

<sup>138</sup> Matthew Henry's *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (1706-21) for Deut. 21:10-17; John Gill's *Exposition of the Old Testament*, Matthew & Leigh Strand, London, 1810; Reprint: Baptist Standard Bearer, Arkansas, USA, 1989, Vol. 2, p. 88 on Deut. 21:15-17; Matthew Poole, *op. cit.*, for Deut. 21:15-17.

<sup>139</sup> Matt. 1 gives Joseph's genealogy, which was Jesus *legal*, not *natural* line, since Jeconiah was barred from being the Messiah's natural ancestor, Jer. 22:24,30; 37:1; Matt. 1:11.

that if married, he be “the husband of one wife” not two or more wives (I Cor. 7:2; cf. I Tim. 3:2,12; 5:9; Titus 1:6).

It is significant for the laws of incest that in the NT Christians are not bound by Jewish civil precepts such as Deut. 25:5-10, and that the NT’s reintroduction of the earlier ban on polygamy further highlights the fact that the exception to the incest laws made in this Jewish civil law via the Levirate marriage rule (Matt. 22:23-29) is no longer applicable (Matt. 19:9). That is because, without this qualification, Lev. 18:16 which had previously prohibited a man from marrying either his living or deceased brother’s wife, unless under the Levirate marriage rule the brother was both deceased and also had no children from her, now constitutes a blanket ban on a man marrying his brother’s wife, “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother’s wife: it is thy brother’s nakedness.” Before the Reformation, Basil the Great said that such a union was void, and his Biblical teaching was maintained after the Reformation by *Parker’s Table* (1563), drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker. But while the Imperial Roman government forbade some forms of incest (I Cor. 5:1), it did not do so consistently. Consider the following similarities between Imperial Rome and Papal Rome.

<p><b><i>The martyr:</i></b> John the Baptist.</p> <p><b><i>The incestuous King:</i></b> Herod Antipas of Galilee and Perea (Mark 6:14).</p> <p><b><i>Incest:</i></b> Herod had married “Herodius,” “his brother Philip’s wife” (Matt. 14:3).</p> <p><b><i>The Issue: <u>Biblical Authority</u> (Lev. 18:16; 20:21) versus <u>Roman Imperial authority</u> (allowing such unions):</i></b></p> <p>“For John” the Baptist “had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:14).</p> <p><b><i>The King’s Response:</i></b> Herod refused to repent.</p> <p><b><i>The martyrdom:</i></b> Bastard daughter of King Herod and his brother’s wife responsible for John the Baptist’s martyrdom (Mark 6:22-28).</p>	<p><b><i>The martyr:</i></b> Thomas Cranmer.</p> <p><b><i>The incestuous King:</i></b> Henry VIII of England and Ireland (Lev. 20:21).</p> <p><b><i>Incest:</i></b> Henry had married Catherine of Aragon, his brother Arthur’s wife.</p> <p><b><i>The Issue: <u>Biblical Authority</u> (Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Mark 6:14) versus <u>Roman Papal authority</u> (allowing such unions if the Pope gives a dispensation):</i></b></p> <p>For Thomas Cranmer had said unto Henry, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife (Lev. 20:21).</p> <p><b><i>The King’s Response:</i></b> Henry repented.</p> <p><b><i>The martyrdom:</i></b> Bloody Mary, the bastard daughter of King Henry and his brother’s wife, responsible for Thomas Cranmer’s martyrdom.</p>
---	---

The Church of Rome pays lip service to the Biblical incest laws prohibiting a man marrying his brother’s wife, by theoretically recognizing the Biblical teaching of Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Matt. 14:3,4; Mark 6:14; Luke 3:19,20. But in a manifestation of the fact that the Pope as “the man of sin” “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II

Thess. 2:3,4), the Church of Rome says that the Pope has the authority to set aside the Word of God and give a dispensation allowing such an incestuous union. Thus Papal authority is usurped above Biblical authority. Although such Papal “dispensations” to allow incest *tend* to be used in connection with political “wheeling and dealing,” rather than in cases of “simple laymen” of the Roman Church with no such political power.

We learn in Lev. 20:21 that God reserves to himself a right to make “childless” such an incestuous couple. Henry VIII had married Catherine, the wife of his deceased brother, Arthur. Henry wanted a son as heir, but except for their daughter Mary, they were childless, and some Protestants saw in this God’s wrath against incest fulfilling Lev. 20:21. But the Pope set his own authority against that of Holy Scripture, by first giving a dispensation allowing this incestuous marriage, and then when God’s wrath against incest was seen in the repeated deaths of Henry’s children, refusing to declare the union invalid. Wicked and treacherous men in England like the ex-chancellor, Thomas More, were prepared to attack Biblical authority by supporting Roman Papal authority to grant dispensations condoning such sexual immorality. By contrast, the righteous Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, upheld the concept of Biblical authority, and in defiance of Papal authority, declared this accursed union void; and married Henry to his second wife, Anne Boleyn, from whom was born Elizabeth I in 1536. Anne Boleyn was later executed, and so the following marriage was clearly valid (Deut. 24:3; Rom. 7:2,3; I Cor. 7:39) with Henry’s third wife, Jane Seymour, and from this marriage came Edward VI in 1537. When Bloody Mary came to the throne she killed on average one Protestant a week during her short reign, giving rise to the first English edition of *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (Latin edition, 1554, 1st English edition, 1563). The question naturally arises, if God had killed the offspring of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon per Lev. 20:21; why did Bloody Mary live on? But the martyrdom of Protestants was brought to an abrupt stop, when Mary Tudor died suddenly and unexpectedly, from no obvious natural cause; resulting in the conclusion God had kept this bastard, Bloody Mary, alive in order to kill her at a time that would make it even clearer that contrary to Papal authority he was acting in harmony with Lev. 20:21 in accordance with what the Protestants were saying.

With respect to incest laws, it should be noted that while incest between parents and children was always prohibited (Gen. 19:30-38), a number of close relationships were permitted when the human race was smaller, and genetically stronger, evident in the longer ages men lived to even in Abraham’s time. This was the natural corollary of the human race first descending from Adam and Eve, and then racial groups descending from Noah’s three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. But by Mosaic times the incest laws of Lev. 18 & 20 were in place. Like the laws of Lev. 18 prohibiting adultery, sex with a menstruating woman, idolatry and murder, profanation of the name of Nature’s God, or sodomy with man or beast, these incest laws are capable of being discerned by godly reason and clearly had a universal, and not simply a provincial Jewish application, since God declared “the nations” of Canaan had “defiled” “the land” because of such “iniquity” (Lev. 18:24,25). If God was prepared to judge Gentile nations who had no Divine revelation because, contrary to godly reason, they allowed, for example, incest between aunts and nephews or uncles and nieces (Lev. 18:12-14), or marriage to a brother’s wife or a wife’s husband (Lev. 18:16); then we ought not to be surprised if God also judged those who had the Divine revelation of Leviticus 18, and contrary to it allowed such incest if it received a “Papal dispensation.” Under King Henry VIII, the law of England recognized this by Statute 32nd of Henry VIII, chapter 38, which declared that only “God’s law” defined as the “Levitical degrees” could “impeach any marriage” for incest. The simple and natural reading of these degrees was promulgated in

Archbishop Parker's Table in 1563 and confirmed by Anglican *Church of England* ecclesiastical law in canon 99 of 1603.

The principles evident in Lev. 18 and 20 extend to four degrees. They prohibit both consanguinity (blood relations) and affinity (relations by marriage) which are treated the same for the purposes of "near of kin" (Lev. 18:6); and what is a prohibited relationship for one sex can be applied as an equivalent to the other sex since the issue is one of "kin" (Lev. 18:6). For example, a man cannot marry his sister by consanguinity (Lev. 18:9), and so by affinity a man cannot marry his sister-in-law, that is, his brother's wife (Lev. 18:16), or applying these principles, either his half-sister, or the sister of his wife. While a second reason is given (in a polygamous society) why a man cannot so marry the sister of his wife during her life, namely, it would "vex her" (Lev. 18:18), even if she were dead, the first reason would still apply, namely she is "kin" (Lev. 18:6), and so a man could not marry his deceased wife's sister. Or put the other way, a woman could not marry her deceased sister's husband; or a woman could not marry her deceased husband's brother.

While the OT teaches original monogamy with Adam and Eve, and polygamy was still banned in antediluvian times as seen in the example of the eight entering Noah's Ark being monogamous as opposed to the bigamist Lamech in Cain's race; later Old Testament law allowed polygamy. That later OT law allowed bigamy is seen in the fact that Mosaic law regulated, but did not prohibit, bigamy, and thus condoned bigamy in Exod. 21:9,10; Lev. 18:18; Deut. 21:15-17. But in the NT, the earlier ban on polygamy evident in antediluvian times, was reintroduced, Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:2,12. Under the New Covenant, Christians are not bound by Jewish ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts {Heb. 9:15-20}; and so with the repeal of OT Jewish civil law, the exception to the incest laws found in the Levirate marriage rule is no longer applicable. Indeed, the requirement of a widow marrying a deceased husband's brother in Deut. 25:5-10 ceases to even be possible in a monogamous society. With this exception removed, it follows that all marriages to a deceased brother's wife, and equivalents, are banned from NT times.

Degrees more distant than a deceased brother's wife are also forbidden, through to a man not marrying his aunt by consanguinity (Lev. 18:12,13) or his aunt by affinity (Lev. 18:14), or the equivalents of a woman not marrying her uncle by consanguinity or affinity. Thus King Henry VIII put in place Biblical Law over Papal law on incest, and this was then consistently developed with Archbishop Matthew Parker's Table (Archbishop of Canterbury: 1559-1575) and later Anglican canon law.

This contrast between Papal authority and Biblical authority is clearly stated in King Henry VIII's *First Act of Succession* in 1534. Before this Act passed, Cambridge University and Oxford University voted by majorities declaring that this marriage was in their view invalid. Moreover, King Henry and Cranmer had also sought the opinion of some leading Roman Catholic universities of the day, and the Sorbonne in Paris together with the other four universities of France, and the most renowned Roman Catholic university of Italy, Bologna University, together with Padua University and Ferrari University, had all declared that the incestuous marriage between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon was invalid. But notwithstanding this, the Pope of Rome stood firm in maintaining Papal authority with the earlier Papal dispensation allowing incest. This 1534 Act of Parliament refers to "the Bishop of Rome" acting "contrary to the great and inviolable grants of jurisdiction given by God" with respect to "succession to" "heirs" (that is, valid marriages produce valid heirs whereas invalid marriages such as incestuous marriages, produce bastards who do not inherit). It then

says, “the marriage” “solemnized between Your Highness and the Lady Katherine, being before lawful wife to Prince Arthur, your elder brother, which by him was carnally known, as does duly appear by sufficient proof in a lawful process had and made before Thomas, by the sufferance of God, now Archbishop of Canterbury,” “shall be, by authority of this present Parliament, definitely, clearly, and absolutely declared, deemed, and adjudged to be against the laws of Almighty God, and also accepted, reputed, and taken of no value nor effect, but utterly void and annulled. And for default of such sons of your body begotten, the imperial crown shall be to the issue female, which is Lady Elizabeth.<sup>140</sup>”

The play writer William Shakespeare (1564-1616) was clearly influenced to some extent by the general Protestant culture of his day. He received a Protestant baptism, marriage, and burial. In 2003 I inspected a copy of relevant records kept at Holy Trinity Anglican Church, Stratford-upon-Avon, in Warwickshire, England, of the Protestant baptism (26 April 1564) in Elizabethan England, and Protestant burial (25 April 1616) in Jacobean England, of William Shakespeare. His body lies buried just in front of the Communion rails. He is also known to have had a Protestant wedding, since the Worcester episcopal registry contains a bond (28 Nov 1582) as security for the Anglican Bishop to issue a licence of marriage for William Shakespeare and “Anne Hathaway of Stratford” (who died in 1623, and who is buried immediately to the left of her husband as one looks towards the Communion rails).

In his play, *King Henry VIII* (written about 1612-13), he seeks to create an entertaining play for his audience and accordingly remains silent on some negative features of Henry VIII, by shrewdly selecting a segment of Henry VIII’s life that has a happy ending with the birth of his Protestant daughter, Elizabeth I. Hence Shakespeare features, for example, Henry VIII’s troubled “conscience,” since for having married his “brother’s wife,” Catherine of Aragon, he suffered “a judgment” from God (Act 2, Scene 4). This marriage with his non-British or *foreign* Spanish wife, Catherine of Aragon, who says to the Romish Cardinal Wolsey of the Latin Church, “I am not such a truant since my coming, as not to know the language I have lived in: a strange tongue makes my cause more strange, suspicious; pray, speak in English” (Act 3, Scene 1); resulted in the “Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied with other learned and reverend fathers” declaring this “marriage made of none effect” (Acts 4, Scene 1). Connected with this, Henry VIII married the “Lutheran” (meaning Protestant in a non-sectarian sense,) Anne Boleyn (Bullen) (Act 3, Scene 2), sanctioned by the “virtuous Cranmer” (Act 4, Scene 1), who is “a worthy fellow” (Act 3, Scene 2), and a “good and gracious Lord of Canterbury” (Act 5, Scene 1). Shakespeare ends his play with Henry VIII and Cranmer proudly looking at the child of this marriage, Elizabeth I (Act 5, Scene 5). When this play was first performed in London’s *Globe Theatre* (under the name *All is True*), it was no doubt intended to give a comforting anti-Romanist message to its audience focusing on Henry VIII’s noble break with Rome and associated rejection of incest, his marriage to the Protestant Anne Boleyn, and associated birth of Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603), whose Protestant reign had ended in her death only about a decade earlier. This type of historical selectivity and white-washing of Henry VIII, was no doubt chosen by Shakespeare to enhance the comfort and entertainment value of his play to his original audience. It certainly avoided such unpleasant themes as, for example, Henry VIII’s semi-Romanism, or the reign of his Papist daughter, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558). But while this type of historical selectivity may be appropriate

---

<sup>140</sup> Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, p. 142; Wylie, J.A., *The History of Protestantism*, Cassell, London, 1899, Vol. 3, p. 398.

as the backdrop for a semi-fictional stage-play, it should never be allowed to become a substitute for historical analysis of a period.

It must be clearly understood that the transition from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism in England was a two-staged process. Henry VIII (Regnal Years:1509-1547) was a transitional figure who started as a Roman Catholic, and then as a semi-Romanist progressively and slowly moved England in an ever more Protestant direction. He also militarily secured England's borders against possible attacks from Romanist countries aimed at bringing England back to the slavery of Popery. Some of his actions, such as his strongly Romish *Six Articles* (1539), or his persecution of some Protestants, manifested elements of his semi-Romanism which should not be glossed over or ignored.

For example, his *Six Articles* (1539) were known as “the bloody whip with six strings,” and were justifiably opposed by Cranmer, whose back was metaphorically bloodied by their lash when they required him to separate from his wife. These articles taught: transubstantiation (Article 1); “communion in both kinds is not necessary,” and transubstantiation is “not” to be “doubted” (Article 2); “priests” “may not marry” (Article 3); “vows of chastity” by e.g., monks and nuns “ought to be observed” (Article 4); “private masses be continued” (Article 5); and “auricular confession is expedient and necessary” (Article 6)<sup>141</sup>. The seriousness of the theological error in Henry VIII's *Six Articles* (1539) is highlighted by comparative analysis between them and the specific and detailed descriptions of Antichrist's doctrine in Holy Writ. Articles 1,2, and 5 of the *Six Articles* upheld “masses” (Art. 5) in which it was claimed transubstantiation occurred (Art. 1 & 2). Since transubstantiation denies the humanity of Christ, it being *against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one*, Articles 1,2, & 5 of the *Six Articles* contained the teaching of Antichrist condemned in II John 7. The Apostle John teaches the confession of sins to God who pardons us (I John 1:7-9; 2:1,2). Since auricular confession to a priest is contrary to the teaching of the Apostle John designed to combat the teachings of the false teachers and antichrists of his day who typed the then coming Antichrist, Article 6 of the *Six Articles* contained the teaching of Antichrist condemned in I John 1:7-2:1. The Apostle Paul teaches that one element of *The Great Apostasy* connected with the Antichrist (II Thess. 2:3) when “some shall depart from the faith,” is his “forbidding” of people “to marry” (I Tim. 4:1,3). Therefore the priestly or monastic “vows of chastity” required by Articles 3 & 4 of the *Six Articles* contained the teaching of Antichrist condemned in I Tim. 4:3. Certainly then, we cannot doubt that the strongly Romish *Six Articles* are to be thoroughly rejected, and clearly show that Henry VIII was a semi-Romanist.

Before he broke with Rome in 1534<sup>142</sup>, Henry VIII had opposed English translations of the Bible. He had sought to suppress Wycliffe's hated English translation from the Latin Vulgate, that the godly Lollards had distributed at risk of their very lives for centuries. From 1526, when Tyndale had originally sought to smuggle into England copies of his Bible translated from the Hebrew and Greek, Henry VIII had ordered the navy's tall ships to lie off the coast, to stalk the English Bible smugglers, to seek out and destroy their hated cargo, and if such a thing were possible, to halt this entry of the very Word of God itself into England. As in England, the wicked and mean Papist, Thomas More, spewed out verbal vomit and abuse against Tyndale for having put the Scriptures into the people's tongue; by sea and by

<sup>141</sup> Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 233-4.

<sup>142</sup> See Henry VIII's *First Act of Succession* (1534) and *English Supremacy Act* (1534) in Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 142-3; & Henry VIII's *Irish Supremacy Act* (1537).

land, King Henry's forces roamed and raged and managed to seize and destroy some 18,000 or two-thirds of Tyndale's Bibles, but about 6,000 or one-third of them came through this fiery ordeal, landed safe and secure in England, and were tactical point-forces in the campaign for the liberation of England from Popery. Henry VIII's Roman Catholic Bishop of London, purchased an entire batch of Tyndale's Bibles, in order that he might burn the hated book<sup>143</sup>. But this gave money to Tyndale for the further printing of his translation<sup>144</sup>, and so paradoxically helped spread the Word of God, as the Lord made "all things work together for good to them that love" him (Rom. 8:28). Thus Henry and his Papist forces acted like the OT King Jehoiakim, who took the Word of God, "cut it with" his "penknife, and cast it into the fire" (Jer. 36:23). But the Word of God is indestructible, for "the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, after that the king had burned the roll," "saying, Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll, which Jehoiakim the king of Judah hath burned" (Jer. 36:27,28).

And then the Spirit of God began his "strange work" (Isa. 28:21) in the secret places of King Henry's heart and mind. With Thomas Cranmer at his side in *the king's great matter*, by the grace of God, Henry VIII submitted to Biblical authority over Papal authority on the matter of his being married to his brother's wife (Lev. 18:16). He came to tremble before a holy God, as he heard in *the voice of nature*, God's voice echoing to him in peals of thunder every time he thought about how a child of his incestuous union had died, "they shall be childless," "they shall be childless," "they shall be childless" (Lev. 20:21). Now the book that he once hated for men to read and understand in their mother-tongue, he began to love as a book from this great and powerful God, that the royal subjects of his realm should indeed read in English. The king now joined his power and authority with the work of centuries that the Lollards had been performing with their distribution of Wycliffe's English Bible. He authorized the publication of English translations of Holy Writ from the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament, beginning with Coverdale's Bible in 1535, then Matthew's Bible in 1537, and finally the Great Bible in 1539, so named because of its great size, being 15 inches or 38 cm long, and 9 inches or 23 cm wide.

When he died a martyr's death at Antwerp, Holland in 1535, the English Bible translator, William Tyndale's final words as he was being tied to the stake, were, "Lord, open the eyes of the King of England."<sup>145</sup> The Lord had already begun to open the King of England's eyes, as seen in his break with Rome in the previous year. But Tyndale's prayer, while already being partially answered in 1535, was even more greatly answered with the Great Bible in 1539, and most fully answered on Henry VIII's death-bed. Thus, contrary to Papal sin and iniquity which "opposeth and exalteth" Papal power "over all that is called God" (II Thess. 2:3,4), for example, over the authority of Scripture which is "the word of God" (I Thess. 2:13; I Tim. 4:5), which Popish power kept the Word of God largely out of the reach of common men in their own language, Henry VIII upheld Biblical authority by authorizing English translations of Scripture from 1535, and having the *Great Bible* translated into English and placed in all parish churches from 1539; following his 1538 royal injunction for the clergy to put in every church "the whole Bible" in "one book."

---

<sup>143</sup> Bragg, M., pp. 108-12.

<sup>144</sup> "The Spreading Flame, Winds of Change," Episode 4: Henry VIII & Ulrich Zwingli, (Digital Versatile / Video Disc, DVD recording), Ambassador Productions, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 2006 ([www.emeraldhouse.com](http://www.emeraldhouse.com)).

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 111-2; Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, p. 283.

Indeed, under God, Henry VIII laid a seed-plot of Biblical authority that in the long run would blossom into the fair flower of Protestantism. Specifically, he upheld Biblical authority in opposition to Papal authority and “sin” (II Thess. 2:3) by ending the incestuous marriage with his first wife, Catherine of Aragon, in harmony with Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Mark 6:14; establishing by statute “God’s law” in the “Levitical degrees” as the basis of incest laws in the realm of England. He upheld Biblical authority against Papal authority which claimed England and Ireland as part of the universal jurisdiction of the Roman Pope, who “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” in the form of a Vice-God as “vicar of God” or “vicar of Christ” (II Thess. 2:4), with the *English Supremacy Act* of 1534 and the *Irish Supremacy Act* of 1537. For example, the *Dispensation Act (1534)* (25 Henry VIII, chapter 21) said “no” “persons of this” “realm,” “shall henceforth pay” “Peter-pence or any other impositions, to” “the Bishop of Rome, called Pope;” nor “shall henceforth sue to the said Bishop of Rome,” “or to any” “persons having or pretending any authority by the same, for licences” and other things. This Act repeatedly recognized Biblical authority, stating, for example, that without reference to the Pope certain “licenses” “may lawfully be granted without offending the Holy Scriptures and laws of God;” or stating that the “Archbishop of Canterbury” could grant certain “licenses” “for causes not being contrary or repugnant to the Holy Scriptures and the laws of God.<sup>146</sup>”

The placement of Henry the Eighth’s *Great Bible* in all churches from 1539, followed quickly after Henry VIII’s injunction of 1538 to place “one book of the whole Bible of the largest volume of English” in every church. The *Great Bible* of 1539 also facilitated the fulfilment of Cranmer’s 1538 injunctions to clergymen concerning “the whole Bible” “in English” “set up” “within” every “church.” These injunctions stated “that you shall discourage no man” “from reading or hearing” “the said Bible, but shall expressly provoke, stir, and exhort every person to read the same, as that which is the very lively word of God, that every Christian man is bound to embrace, believe, and follow, if he look to be saved.” And “you shall make” “one sermon every quarter of the year at least, wherein you shall purely and sincerely declare the very gospel of Christ, and” “exhort your hearers” “not to repose their trust” “in any other” “beside Scripture; as in wandering to pilgrimages, offering of money, candles, or tapers to images or relics, or kissing or licking the same, saying over a number of [rosary] beads,” “for the doing whereof you not only have no” “reward in Scripture, but contrariwise, great threats and malediction of God, as things tending to idolatry and superstition,” “which” “God Almighty does most detest and abhor.” And “for avoiding the most detestable offence of idolatry forthwith take down,” “and” “suffer from henceforth no candles, tapers, or images of wax to be set afore any image or picture,” “admonishing” “parishioners that images serve none other purpose but as to be books of unlearned men that cannot know letters, whereby they might be otherwise admonished of the life and conversation of them that the said images do represent; which images, if they abuse for any other intent than for such remembrances, they commit idolatry” “to the great danger of their souls<sup>147</sup>.” Amidst such preaching, many idols were cast down to the ground, for example, the pilgrimage to “our Lady of Walsingham” in East Anglia was closed down in the 1530s.

Notwithstanding his requirement that monkish “vows” of celibacy *already made* “ought to be observed” in Article 4 of his *Six Articles (1539)*; in harmony with broad

---

<sup>146</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 222-7.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 231-3.

Protestant Biblical sentiments of anti-monasticism which held that such vows were one example of the Roman Papacy's "forbidding" people "to marry" (I Tim. 4:3); Henry VIII moved to *stop any more* monkish vows of celibacy *being made from that time on*, with the closure of the monasteries from 1536 to 1540. In an era when Papal "sin" (II Thess. 2:3) included simony and the appointment of corrupt church officials, Henry VIII further upheld Biblical authority by seeking "a bishop" who was "blameless" (I Tim. 3:2), and so having Thomas Cranmer who believed in Biblical authority, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1533. Notwithstanding Henry VIII's inconsistencies on the matter, at least *to some extent*, contrary to Papal "sin" (II Thess. 2:3) which repudiated love for the brethren (I John 2:3,4,9-11;3:10-15,24; 5:2,3; II John 5), he showed tolerance and love towards *some* Protestants, such as his last wife, Catherine Parr, as well as the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer.

The strongly Romish *Six Articles (1539)* had forced bishops such as Hugh Latimer of Worcester and Nicholas Shaxton of Salisbury, out of their Diocesan bishoprics. Yet Cranmer, who had openly opposed the *Six Articles* in the House of Lords, survived such persecution that befell some of his fellow Protestants. What those subscribing to the Romish *Six Articles* called Cranmer's "heresy," was public knowledge. In 1543 Henry VIII even received official charges of "heresy" against the *Six Articles*, lodged against the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, by some clergy of Canterbury Cathedral. "I know now," King Henry said jestingly to Cranmer when he was on a barge near Lambeth Bridge, "who is the greatest heretic in Kent." But the King who applied uneven force in upholding the Six Articles, consistently protected Cranmer, and named this well-known Protestant as an executor of his royal will<sup>148</sup>. King Henry had heard the *voice of nature* echoing the words of Holy Writ, "they shall be childless" (Lev. 20:21); and he knew what an important role the God of the universe had made for Thomas Cranmer in this, *the king's great matter*. As the psalmist declares, "Touch not mine anointed" such as Thomas Cranmer, "and do my prophets" such as now constitute the Holy Bible, "no harm" (Ps. 105:15). As under God, the Duke of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, was Martin Luther's earthly protector; so under God, the King of England and Ireland, Henry VIII, was Thomas Cranmer's earthly protector.

King Henry also had his son and heir, the future Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1547-1553), raised as a Protestant. This fact indicates that Henry saw his reign as transitional to that of his Protestant son whom he expected to one day succeed him. (Henry VIII no doubt assumed, as it happened, wrongly, that Edward VII would live a long life so that his older Roman Catholic daughter Mary would pre-decease Edward; and that in any event Edward would have Protestant children to in turn succeed him.)

Thus when the semi-Romanist, Henry VIII, lay-a-dying in 1547, he had been moving slowly and surely, further and further in the Protestant direction for years. While death-bed conversions need to be treated with caution, the reality of them sometimes occurring is evident in the thief on the cross, to whom Christ said, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43). When King Henry VIII lay-a-dying, his old and trusted friend, the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, entered the king's chamber, and came to the king's bed-side. The king could no longer speak. Cranmer, whose "feet" were "shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace" (Eph. 6:15), now asked the king for a sign "that he rested *on Christ alone*," (a core *justification by faith* Protestant teaching which rejects any mediator but Christ, and repudiates any idea of "righteousness" outside of

---

<sup>148</sup> Chadwick, O., *op. cit.*, pp. 115-6.

“Christ” “through” “faith,” Philp. 3:8,9). Henry VIII answered Cranmer in the affirmative, as “Henry pressed his [Cranmer’s] hand,” and then died<sup>149</sup>. Notwithstanding the rarity of death-bed conversions, given that one can fairly contextualize this as part of a clear and consistent trend in Henry VIII’s life which slowly progressed more and more towards the Biblical Christianity of Protestantism, it is reasonable to conclude that Henry VIII died as a Protestant. Cranmer said that he would, (like the OT Nazarites, Num. 6:5,) let no razor come upon his face, but grow his beard long till he died, in respectful memory of King Henry VIII of England and Ireland. Which thing he then did till the day of his own death. Indeed, for the 450th anniversary of the martyrdom of the Protestant Thomas Cranmer, under the Papist Queen, Bloody Mary (1556-2006), in 2006 there was a Cranmer exhibition case I saw at the Evangelical Anglican *Moore Theological College* Library in Sydney, Australia, (at the top of the Library’s staircase.) Among other things relevant to Cranmer, it showed an artwork of the bearded Cranmer’s long flowing white beard, with a note explaining the significance of this “Beard of Sorrow<sup>150</sup>.”

Henry VIII was the instrument by which God sowed the seed-plot of Biblical authority, and the seed he had planted, bore great and beautiful fruit after his death when the wonderful Protestant Reformation came to England under his Protestant son, Edward VI (1537-1553), who was under the godly guidance of the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. And notwithstanding the subsequent attempt to snuff out the Reformation by his illegitimate daughter, Bloody Mary, (whom Henry had later effectively legally adopted in his Succession Act,) the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ shone brightly in England again under Henry VIII’s Protestant daughter, Elizabeth I (1533-1603). Therefore, the initial issue that led to the Church of England’s break with the Church of Rome, namely, Biblical authority rather than Papal authority with specific reference to the Biblical incest laws, is quite important for a number of reasons. But one of the issues is clearly that the “the mystery of iniquity” (AV) or “the mystery of lawlessness” (ASV) was “already” at “work” (AV) (II Thess. 2:7) in NT times in the way Roman Imperial law set aside some of God’s laws prohibiting incest, to some extent evident in the martyrdom of John the Baptist who “had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18). That is because the way the Pope of Rome refused to recognize that Henry VIII’s marriage to Catherine of Aragon was invalid, likewise manifested the fact that Roman Papal law set aside God’s laws prohibiting incest, and this was to some extent evident in the martyrdom of the Protestant Archbishop, Thomas Cranmer, (who also died for other manifestations of his belief in Biblical authority as opposed to Papal authority,) under the bastard-born, Bloody Mary.

A third way “the mystery of iniquity” (AV) was “already” at “work” (II Thess. 2:7, AV) is found in the presence of “many antichrists” who typed the then coming “Antichrist” (I John 2:18). Thus II Thess. 2:7 here provides an important linkage between the Pauline and Johannian descriptions of the Antichrist. The Asiatic gnostic antichrists of NT times, like the then future Roman Antichrist, denied Christ’s true humanity (I John 4:2,3; II John 7). Thus there is a contrast between “the mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:8) and “the mystery of godliness” (I Tim. 3:16). The “mystery of godliness” includes the recognition that “Christ Jesus” is “God” who “was manifest in the flesh,” that is, Christ’s humanity, and that he was

<sup>149</sup> Wylie, J.A., *The History of Protestantism, op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 407 (my emphasis).

<sup>150</sup> For a depiction of this “Beard of Sorrow,” see e.g., MacCulloch, D., *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, Yale University Press, London, 1996, p. 362 (picture from Lambeth Palace, thought to have been painted later in the 17th century with an inscription referring to Cranmer’s martyrdom).

“received up into glory,” that is, his body is now in heaven (I Tim. 3:13,16). “But” (ASV) says the Apostle Paul, “in the latter times some shall depart from” this “faith,” and so their associated “giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1), among other things, includes the denial of Christ’s humanity in the transubstantiation heresy (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), that is, a denial of Christ as “God” “manifest in the flesh,” and “received up into glory” (I Tim. 3:16).

Moreover, commenting on the contrast between “the Church of Rome” whose “doctrines” are “spoken of” in “Scripture” “as ‘the mystery of iniquity’” (II Thess. 2:7), “which sets out to work in the Church in opposition to ‘the mystery of godliness’” (I Tim. 3:16), the *Church of England (Continuing)* bishop, David Samuel, finds another fulfilment in II Tim. 3 which warns of “perilous times” (II Tim. 3:1). Referring to II Tim. 3:5 which warns of men “having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof,” saying, “from such turn away,” Bishop Samuel says “even in the Apostle Paul’s day, Satan was initiating that apostasy” by a “mystery of iniquity” or “form of ungodliness” that was “not open sin and wickedness, but dissembled piety, specious errors, wickedness under the form of godliness, cunningly managed.” Writing in 2004, Bishop Samuel says “we have” this “in the Agreed Statements of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches,” coming from “the Commission set up by” the Archbishop of Canterbury, “Archbishop Ramsey and Pope Paul VI in 1966.” For example, the ARCIC (Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission) 1998 document, “‘The Gift of Authority,’ is simply intended to educate Anglicans into what acceptance of Papal primacy means. The Report states: ‘Within his wider ministry, the Bishop of Rome offers a specific ministry concerning the discernment of truth, as an expression of universal primacy.’ This is the point to which the Anglican Church has been brought by the ecumenical movement.” And “as the Church of England slides towards Rome, the Vatican is wooing evangelicals through” the so called “Evangelicals and Catholics Together by corrupting their understanding of justification by faith.” *Bishop Samuel concludes that “this should make plain beyond a shadow of a doubt which way the ecumenical movement is heading, and the method by which it proceeds. It first creates a climate in which truth and error can be viewed complacently and accommodated side by side. Then it proceeds to eliminate the truth.” Moreover, “the ecumenical movement” “is never standing still, it is moving steadily towards its goal, which is the reunion of all churches under the Pope*<sup>151</sup>.”

ARCIC documents do not represent an authoritative teaching by either the Roman Catholic or Anglican Churches. Rather, they are “offered to the Churches of the Anglican Communion and to the Roman Catholic Church for their serious consideration,” in order to foster ecumenical dialogue as a “step towards unity.”<sup>152</sup> Although the confederal nature of Anglican Churches, and e.g., the confederal nature of Dioceses in the *Anglican Church of Australia* in which each Diocese is essentially independent, means that such a document is not going to be accepted throughout the Anglican Communion e.g., it has been rightly rejected by the *Evangelical Diocese of Sydney*<sup>153</sup>. The ARCIC proposal of Papal authority

<sup>151</sup> Samuel, D.N., *op. cit.*, pp. 128-30.

<sup>152</sup> ARCIC’s *The Final Report*, Windsor, 1981, Bocado & Church Army Press, Oxford, 1982, back-cover.

<sup>153</sup> On the confederal nature of e.g., Anglican Dioceses inside the Anglican Church of Australia, see my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.),” subsection, “The secular

over the Anglican Church, has presently split over the issue of what kind of authority this should be, titular and ceremonial *only*, or accompanied with actual and real governing power. The Anglicans who supported the ARCIC proposal wanted the Bishop of Rome to have the same type of power over the Anglican Communion that the present primate of the Anglican Communion, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has over Anglican Churches in the Anglican Communion outside of his immediate English jurisdiction. That is, a ceremonial and symbolic primacy, something like the primacy given the Bishop of Rome, over the Patriarch and Patriarchate of Constantinople in *ceremonial and titular* terms, by the Eastern Roman Emperor, Justinian in 533 to 565 A.D. . Likewise, Justinian's views, stated in a letter, rather than a legal enactment, were not legally authoritative, and did not bind successor Eastern Roman Emperors, Patriarchs of Constantinople, nor Bishops of Rome. Indeed, following the expiration of this titular primacy with the death of Justinian in 565 (who granted it in a Letter as discretion within his royal prerogative during his reign,) they were repudiated by a later Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great. By contrast, the Romanists wanted the Bishop of Rome to have the same type of power over the Anglican Communion that he presently has over Roman Catholic Churches, that is, a primacy of power requiring obedience to him, like the primacy given the Bishop of Rome over the Patriarch of Constantinople by Phocas in 607 A.D. (before the *Great Schism* of 1054, when the Eastern Orthodox Church under the Patriarch of Constantinople split from Rome).

But ARCIC's *Gift of Authority* (1998) clearly upheld Papal primacy. Reference was made to the two types of primacy, "Forms of primacy exist in both the Anglican Communion and in the churches in communion with the Bishop of Rome." E.g., "The Archbishop of Canterbury exercises a primatial ministry in the whole Anglican Communion." "Within his wider ministry, the Bishop of Rome offers a specific ministry concerning the discernment of truth, as an expression of universal primacy" "from the chair of Peter." "When the faith is articulated" by "the Bishop of Rome" "within the" "body of bishops," i.e., with their agreement, the teaching "is" "the wholly reliable teaching of the whole church that is operative in the judgment of the universal primate. In solemnly formulating such teaching, the universal primate must discern and declare, with the assured assistance and guidance of the Holy Spirit, in fidelity to Scripture and Tradition, the authentic faith of the whole Church." "The reception of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome entails the reception of the specific ministry of the universal primate. We believe that this is a gift to be received by all the churches." "Such a universal primate will exercise leadership in the world and also in both communions, addressing them in a prophetic way." "An experience of universal primacy of this kind would confirm two particular conclusions we have reached: that Anglicans be open to and desire a recovery and re-reception under certain clear conditions of the exercise of universal primacy by the Bishop of Rome; [and] that Roman Catholics be open to and desire a re-reception of the exercise of primacy by the Bishop of Rome and the offering of such a ministry to the whole Church of God" (*Gift of Authority* 45,47,61,62).

Writing centuries ago in *Brown's Bible* (1778), the (Presbyterian Protestant) historicist clergyman, John Brown, (commenting on Rev. 13:3,) considered Biblical prophecy may indicate "the apostasy of the Protestants to Popery" at a then future time. At the time this may have struck many as an unduly alarmist possibility, and indeed, may even now strike many as still such, for example, the ARCIC *Gift of Authority* views about a Papal "universal

---

society seeks the abolition of these holy days" (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at "Commentary on the Received Text").

primate” are not agreed to by Evangelical Anglicans such as those in the Australian Diocese of Sydney, and disagreements exist between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in ARCIC as to the powers to be given to any future Papal primate of the Anglican Communion. Nevertheless, with efforts by the Roman Church since the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5) to use “ecumenical dialogue” to bring “separated brethren” into “unity of faith in the bosom of a [Roman] Church one and visible” (*Reflections and Suggestions concerning ecumenical dialogue* 1,2:1:d)<sup>154</sup>, able to bring the *Church of England* down to its knees in saying it would accept any kind of Papal primacy, Brown’s speculation must be taken more seriously than ever before.

ARCIC’s proposed combination of a governing Papal primacy over the Roman Catholic Church, coupled with a titular Papal primacy over the *Church of England*, is the same type of thing that existed when the Bishop of Rome already had a governing primacy over the Patriarchates of the West, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch; to which was then added by the Byzantine Eastern Emperor, Justinian, a titular primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 533, which lasted as long as he remained Emperor till 565 (and after its expiration in 565 was repudiated between 590 and 604 by the Bishop of Rome). This forms part of the original rise of the Roman Papacy, when the Western Roman Emperor had been “taken out of the way” in 476, even though that “Wicked” Antichrist was not then fully “revealed” (II Thess. 2:7,8) until the formation of the Roman Papacy about 130 years later, with the Decree of Phocas in 607 establishing Boniface III as the first Pope<sup>155</sup>, and giving the Roman Pope governing primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 607 (which it maintained till 1054). If Rome’s titular primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 533-565 was a stepping stone to governing primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 607, then the type of titular primacy that has already been offered the Pope over the *Church of England* in 1998, could, *if it was accepted*, likewise prove to be a stepping stone to a governing primacy at some future point in time. Thus the possibility raised centuries ago by John Brown of an “apostasy of the Protestants to Popery,” should not be ignored.

But there was a further way that *the mystery of iniquity was already work*. The Apostle Paul’s Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is generally dated to the 50s A.D. . Emperor Claudius reigned from 41 to 54 A.D. and Emperor Nero from 54-68 A.D. . It is therefore within reason to argue that either Claudius or Nero are being specifically referred to by St. Paul when he says “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” (AV), or given his earlier reference to Caligula (37-41) he means by “the mystery of iniquity doth already work,” a number of Roman Emperors of the first century A.D. . Thus there are clear contextual factors to argue from these prophetic types that the Antichrist would claim certain divine attributes and so like Julius Caesar in this qualified sense be capable of being

---

<sup>154</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 539-541.

<sup>155</sup> Before the fuller formation of the Roman Papacy following 607, some local Diocesan bishops were known as “Popes;” but when the Bishop of Rome came to be “universal Bishop,” he claimed the whole world was his Diocese, and in manifestation of this claim, the term “Pope” came to be reserved for just the Bishop of Rome. Hence when we say that Boniface III was “the first Pope” in 607, we use the terminology “the first Pope” in this qualified sense as being a “Pope” in the now normatively accepted sense of a bishop claiming a universal jurisdiction. The older usage of “Pope” has survived in the Coptic Orthodox Church which has continued the older tradition of calling their Patriarch, “Pope.”

described as “a god” rather than actually being deified as a god.

Significantly then, one Latin form of the pagan Roman Emperor’s title “Supreme Pontiff” (Latin, *Pontifex Maximus*) was *Summus Pontifex*, and this was taken over as one of the official titles of the Roman Pope. Thus on the one hand, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913) states that the “custom of decreeing divine honours to the emperors remained in existence until the time of Gratian, who was the first to refuse the insignia of the *Summus Pontifex* and the first whom the senate failed to place among the gods<sup>156</sup>,” but on the other hand, this same *Catholic Encyclopedia* states that one of the “most noteworthy of” the Pope’s “titles” is “*Summus Pontifex*.<sup>157</sup>” Thus the Pope claims a title which in New Testament times was applied to the Roman Emperors as a mark of their divine attributes.

Thus it is clear that if one follows the translation that the Antichrist sets himself forth as “a god,” then by reference to the prophetic types of the pagan Roman Emperors, one can show that the Roman Pope is “a god” in the same sense as, for example, Julius Caesar. That is, just as Julius Caesar was not deified during his lifetime but because he had certain divine attributes such as the title “Supreme Pontiff” in the form *Summus Pontifex* he could in the context of a *temple* in Rome be called a “god,” so likewise, though the Pope is not actually deified but has certain divine attributes such as the title “Supreme Pontiff” in the form *Summus Pontifex* he can in the context of the *temple* / church of II Thess. 2:4 be called “a god.” Such a view of “a god” in II Thess. 2:4 thus has good and clear support from the times that St. Paul penned these words.

What of the translation of II Thess. 2:4 that the Antichrist sets himself forth “as God” (Luther & AV). Such a translation is also possible from the Greek. Notably, this has historically been the preferred translation of those Protestants who identify the Pope as the Antichrist of II Thess. 2:4.

The traditional terminology for describing the Pope as “God” in II Thess. 2:4 is well expressed in the term “Vice-God” (or “Vice-Christ”). The Oxford defines a “vice-god” as “one who (on earth) takes the place, or exercises the power, of God.” Some of the historical examples it then gives to illustrate this include a quote from 1624 A.D. when Bishop Montagu said, “There is an headship which will not reach that illimited power given to the Pope, our Lord, Vice-God upon earth” (Gagg. 63); in 1659 Baxter says, “Not only the Romish universal monarchy and vice-godhead, but even its patriarchal primacy was no apostolic tradition” (Key Cath. 20, 84); in 1664 Owen refers to “your vice-god [Pope] Paul V” (Vind. Animad. Fiat Lux 16, Works, 1855, 14, 392); or in 1712 Matthew Henry said, “To call them Anti-Gods, and Anti-Christ, however they pretend to be Vice-Christ and Vice-Gods” (Popery Spir. Tyranny, Works, 1853, 2,342). Wylie also uses the terms “Vice-Christ” and “Vice-God” of the Pope<sup>158</sup>.

Thus in the same way that a vice-roy exercises the royal powers of the sovereign in a realm during a monarch’s absence, and so has royal powers and prerogatives in the name of the sovereign; or in the same way a Vice-President exercises the powers of the president in a republic in a president’s absence or incapacity, and so has presidential powers and

<sup>156</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, “Apotheosis” p. 650.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 12, “Pope,” p. 270.

<sup>158</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1933, Vol. 12; Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, pp. 119,120.

prerogatives in the name of the president; so likewise a vice-god exercises the divine powers of God in the absence of God's visible manifestation on earth, and so has divine powers and prerogatives in the name of God. The Pope's status as a Vice-God stems from his claim to be "Vicar of Christ," since this means he claims to be Christ's deputy and so stand in Christ's place here on earth as he exercises Christ's Divine powers and prerogatives. His description as a Vice-Christ or Vice-God, thus manifests his Papal titles, "Vicar of Christ" or "Vicar of God." It is through this concept of a Vice-God that Protestants have traditionally understood the words of the Authorized Version's translation of II Thess. 2:4 to apply to the Pope, namely, that he "sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

The Church of Rome has clearly used this thinking to claim that the Pope as a vice-God, in the form of the so called "Vicar of Christ," can arrogate to himself the titles and attributes not just of *a god*, but of *the God*. Consider e.g., the canon law development of the pagan Roman Emperor's title of "Supreme Pontiff" or *Summus Pontifex*, as already noted, used of pagan Roman Emperors as a mark of their divine attributes. The Roman Catholic *Code of Canon Law* (1983), says in Canon 331, "The Bishop of the Church of Rome," "is" "the Vicar of Christ (*Vicarius Christi*), and pastor of the universal church on earth." The Romish Canon Law commentary on this then says, "At times he is termed the Supreme Pontiff (*Summus Pontifex*), a term that Vatican II applied primarily to Christ, the supreme High Priest (LG21) and by analogy to the Pope<sup>159</sup>." The Code later applies the Divine Attribute of infallibility to the Pope under this title, saying in Canon 749, "The Supreme Pontiff (*Summus Pontifex*), in virtue of his office, possesses infallible teaching authority (*infallibilitate in magisterio*)." And in Canon 751 it defines "schism," saying that "schism is the refusal of submission to the Supreme Pontiff (*Summo Pontifici*)<sup>160</sup>."

Not long after the Western Roman Emperor was "taken out of the way" (II Thess. 2:7) with the fall of Rome and the Western Roman Empire in 476 A.D., the Roman Synod under Symmachus in 503 A.D. called the Bishop of Rome in Latin *Vice Dei* meaning "Vicar of God" or "Vice-God," and so during this time the Bishop of Rome was clearly "shewing ... that he is God" (II Thess. 2:4) in the form of a Vice-God. While Symmachus (Bishop of Rome 498-514) is one of the bad Bishop's of Rome, without the added element of a serious claim to a "universal" jurisdiction such as occurred from 607, he was still not a "Pope" in the sense that we now generally use that word for the Roman Papacy.

This understanding of "shewing ... that he is God" in II Thess. 2:4 focuses on the Divine Attributes of God himself in the person of Christ. Thus this view also focuses on the Papal title, "Vicar of Christ." Since the Church of Rome accepts that Christ is the Second Person of the Godhead, it follows that among other things the formal Papal title "Vicar of Christ," continues to express the basic idea of the semi-formal Papal title, "Vicar of God." In discussing the title "Vicar of Christ" the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913) states the "title Vicar of God used for the Pope by Nicholas III" (Pope 1277-1280) "is employed as an equivalent for Vicar of Christ." This same article on "Vicar of Christ" refers the reader to "FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca canonica*, VI (Rome 1890)," under the word "*Papa*." At this

---

<sup>159</sup> Coriden, J.A. *et al* (Editors), *The Code of Canon Law, op. cit.*, p. 267 (emphasis mine); referring to "LG" ("Lumen Gentium"), also known as "Dogmatic Constitution of the Church," 21 (*Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 372-4).

<sup>160</sup> *Code of Canon Law*, Latin-English Edition, Canon Law Society of America, Washington, D.C., USA, 1983; Imprimatur: Rev. Msgr. John F. Donoghue, Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Washington, Washington, D.C., 3 Oct. 1983.

reference in Ferraris's work, we find the "Roman Pontiff" is described as "vice-Christ" (Latin, *Christi vices*), and also as "vice-God on earth" (Latin, *in terris Dei vices*).

In 1208, Pope Innocent III (Pope 1198-1216), commenced the cruel Crusade against the Albigenses in France, and he also convened the *Fourth Lateran Council* (1215) which formally declared the idolatrous and blasphemous teaching of transubstantiation, to be official Roman Catholic doctrine. Commenting on Pope Innocent III, the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967) refers favourably to his consecration sermon in which he describes his status as Christ's "vicar" as making him *less than God, but greater than man*<sup>161</sup>. In this *Second Consecration Sermon*, Pope Innocent III says:

I am set in superiority over kings and hold the throne of glory. For truly to me applies the words of the Prophet, "I have set you above nations and kingdoms that you may pluck up and pull down, and destroy and disperse, as well as build up and plant (Jeremiah 1). Likewise to me applies the words of the Apostle, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven" (Matthew 16). ... Now therefore ... [the Pope] really is the vicar of Jesus Christ (Latin *vicarius Jesu Christi*), successor of Peter, Lord Christ, ... constituted mediator between God and man, less than God (Latin *citra Deum*), but greater than man (Latin *sed ultra hominem*), a lesser God (Latin *minor Deo*), but a greater man (Latin *sed major homine*)<sup>162</sup>.

Pope Innocent III's belief the Pope is "over kings" and "above kingdoms" shows one way the Papacy "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God" (II Thess. 2:4) in the sense of "gods" meaning magistrates and kings (Ps. 82:1,6), and the fact he describes the Pope as "a lesser God" shows one way he "sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is a God" (II Thess. 2:4), namely, he usurps from "God" "the Son" (Heb. 1:8) the place of "mediator" (Heb. 12:24). Since Innocent III relates this to his claim to be "vicar of Jesus Christ," and since it was he who developed "Vicar of Jesus Christ" or "Vicar of Christ" as the formal Papal "vicar" titles, it follows that his claims show how all subsequent Popes claiming the formal Papal title, "Vicar of Jesus Christ" (or "Vicar of Christ"), likewise fulfil these words of II Thess. 2:4.

This notion of Pope Innocent III that as "Vicar of Jesus Christ" the Pope is "less than God, but greater than man," being "a lesser God," shows how this title effectively makes the Pope some sort of a Vice-God. The legal history of Roman Catholic canon law also clearly takes this view in a decretal of Pope Innocent III, referred to by both Wylie and Paisley in their discussions of II Thess. 2:4<sup>163</sup>. This is located in the *Decretals of Pope Gregory IX* (1:7:3) (Pope 1227-41), and published in a classic edition of Roman Catholic canon law called *Corpis Juris Cononici*, which contains six different compilations. *Corpis Juris Cononici* was dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII (Pope 1572-1585), and has gone through numerous reprints. For instance, Friedberg and Richter's two volume *Corpis Juris Cononici* (1879-1881), a facsimile edition of which was produced in 1955 at Graz (or Gratz) in Austria.

---

<sup>161</sup> *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Catholic University of America, 1967, Vol. 7, pp. 521-2, "Innocent III, Pope."

<sup>162</sup> Migne, J.P., *Patrologiae Curses Completus*, Paris, France, 1857-66, Volume 217, pp. 567-8 (Latin text), Pope Innocent III's Second Consecration Sermon.

<sup>163</sup> Wylie's *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, p. 120; Paisley's *The Pope is the Antichrist*, p. 54.

Pope Innocent III was Pope from Jan / Feb 1198 to July 1216, and in a decretal bearing the date “1st September, 1198,” and so clearly enacted during his Pontificate, we read of those whom the Pope separates. “It is certainly not a man (*non enim homo*), but God who separates [them] (*sed Deus separat*), for the Roman Pontiff (*Romanus Pontifex*), not as a mere man (*qui non puri hominis*), but as true vice-God (*sed veri Dei vicem*), governs on earth (*gerit in terris*)<sup>164</sup>.” The fact that the “Roman Pontiff” is said to be “not a mere man” or “not purely a human” (Latin, *non puri hominis*) because of his status as “vicar of God” or “vice-God” (Latin, *Dei vicem*), clearly shows this view has been sanctioned by the Roman Church herself. Thus it is claimed that the Roman Pope, as “vice-God” (*Dei vicem*), exercises the very powers of God (*Deus*) himself. Hence it is surely no distortion to see in these claims, and the Papal claim to be “Vicar of Christ,” with its associated claims to mediatorial Godlike attributes and powers, that the Pope is a Vice-God, having *Godlike powers* to forgive sins, and *divine attributes* to admit or bar entry of a person’s soul into heaven. Therefore we find in these claims a clear example of how the Roman Pontiff, “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4), in the form of a vice-God.

Bernard of Parma is sometimes remembered for his *Glossa ordinaria* in Gregory IX’s *Decretals*, Book III, which puts a strong distinction between clergy and laity, saying e.g., “the laity should not stay near the altar” “while the mass is celebrated.” However, he also referred to the Pope as “Vice-God” (Latin, “*Dei vicem*”)<sup>165</sup>. Likewise, Gaetano Moroni, the Ajutante di Camera of two Papal households, Gregory XVI (Pope 1831-1846) and Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878), wrote on this matter in his classic work, *Dizionario*. In his elucidation on the formal Papal title, “Vicar of Jesus Christ,” (Italian, “*Vicario di Gesu Christo*”), Moroni refers to the Pope by the semi-formal Papal title, “Vicar of God” (Italian, “*Vicario di Dio*”), and describes him as a “Vice-God” (Italian, “*Vice-Dio*”)<sup>166</sup>.

The second Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, in London, England, and a council “father” of the *Vatican I Council* (1870) which defined Papal “infallibility,” Cardinal Manning, also wrote on this matter. Referring to “the doctrine of infallibility,” as set forth in the First “Council of the Vatican,” the Cardinal says, “Some have said that the decree made the Pontiff to be a Vice-God. If they meant *Dei* or *Christi Vicarius*, many generations of Christians have said so before them, and we feel it no reproach.” By “Christians” Manning means Papists, and I cannot accept that such an apostate form of Christianity can fairly be called “Christian” without blaspheming the name of God, contrary to the third commandment (Exod. 20:7; Rom. 2:23,24)<sup>167</sup>. “Others” continues the Cardinal, “have said that to declare the Pontiff to be infallible is to invest him with divine attributes.” To which Manning then

---

<sup>164</sup> *Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, Lib. (Book) 1, Tit. (Title) 7, cap (chapter) 3; in Friedberg, A., Richter, A.L. (Editors), *Corpus Juris Cononici*, Tauchnitz, Lipsiae [Leipzig], Germany, 1879-1881, Volume 2, 1881, p. 99.

<sup>165</sup> Watt. J.A., “The theory of Papal monarchy in the thirteenth century. The contribution of the canonists,” *Traditio*, Studies in Ancient & Medieval History, Thought, & Religion, Fordham University Press, New York, 1964, Volume 20, pp. 179-317 at p. 262.

<sup>166</sup> Moroni, G., *Dizionario Di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastica*, Comilazione Del Cavaliere Gaetano Moroni Romano, Secondo Ajutante Di Camera Di Sua Santita Pio IX, Dalla Tipografia Emiliana, Venezia (Venice), Italy, 1860, Volume XCIX, p. 21.

<sup>167</sup> See my comments on the usage of the term, “Christian,” in my Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, “10) Miscellaneous Matters,” section “a) Christians: Professed Christians and True Christians” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

makes the staggering claim, “infallibility, though it be a divine attribute, may be communicated” i.e., to the Pope<sup>168</sup>. Notably then, Manning here equates the formal Papal title, “Vicar of Christ” (*Christi Vicarius*), and the semi-formal Papal title, “Vicar of God” (*Dei Vicarius*), with the Pope’s description as “a Vice-God;” and claims that this “Vice-God” has had the “divine attribute” of “infallibility” “communicated” to him.

Furthermore, we also find in this classic edition of Roman Catholic canon law dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII, *Corpus Juris Canonici*, in *Decreti Prima Pars* (96:7) the following statement, “It is quite obviously shown that the Pontiff can neither be bound nor released by secular power. It is clearly established by the godly emperor Constantine ... that he was called God (Latin, *Deum appellatum*), since it is obvious that God cannot be judged by human beings.” (So to we read in the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* at Canon 1404, “The First See is judged by no one<sup>169</sup>.”) Hence Wylie is correct when he says, “In the canon law the Pope is called God<sup>170</sup>.” But to this it must be said that in the broader context of this *Decreti Prima Pars*, *Distinctio* 96, we find seven canons later in *Decreti Prima Pars* 96:14, that this same emperor “Constantine,” also purportedly declared the Roman “Pontiffs” to be “Vicar of the Son of God<sup>171</sup>.” This means that in the broader context of this canon law *Distinctio* 96, the semi-formal Papal title, “Vicar of the Son of God” (Latin, *vicarius Filii Dei*) (96:14), acts as a qualification to the statement that the “Pontiff” is “called God” (Latin, *Deum appellatum*) (96:7). Thus *the Pope is “called God” because he is “the vicar of the Son of God,”* that is, “*God” because he is a Vice-God.* Since *Decreti Prima Pars* 96:7 says the Pope is “called God,” it is surely fair to say that this is another example of how the Pope has exalted “himself above all that is called God,” and has been found to be “shewing ... that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).

Moreover, Paisley refers to commentary on this *Decreti Prima Pars* 96:7 in the 1661 Lugduni (Lyon, France) edition of *Corpus Juris Canonici*. This quotes “Pope Nicholas” as saying, “I am ... God himself, and I, the Vicar of God. What can you make me but God?”

---

<sup>168</sup> Manning, H.E., Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, Burns & Oates, London, UK, & Catholic Publication Society, New York, USA, 2nd edition, 1877, pp. 181-2. Manning’s analogy with Apostles receiving the so called “divine attribute” of forgiving sins in John 20:23, which he wrongly claims the “Anglican” accepts, is flawed. As the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) recognizes in *The Communion Service*, a Minister cannot, as the Roman Church claims, actually *grant* the forgiveness of sins; rather he can only “pronounce the Absolution,” i.e., state that “God” “hath promised forgiveness of sins” if there is true “repentance,” on which premise he can *pronounce* that the penitent are forgiven *on the authority of Scriptures which he then reads*, namely, “St. Matthew 11:28;” “St. John 3:16;” “I Timothy 1:15;” “I St. John 2:1” (or other Scriptures).

<sup>169</sup> Coriden, J.A. *et al* (Editors), *The Code of Canon Law*, *op. cit.*, p. 951; *Code of Canon Law*, Latin-English Edition, *op. cit.* Canon 1404, Latin, “*Prima Sedes a nemine iudicatur*”.

<sup>170</sup> Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, p. 120.

<sup>171</sup> Latin, “*Satis euidenter ostenditur, a seculari potestate nec solui prorsus, nec ligari Pontificem, quem constat a pio principe Constantino ... Deum appellatum, cum nec posse Deum ab hominibus iudicari manifestum sit*” (*Decreti Prima Pars, Distinctio* 96, canon 7); and “*Constantinus,*” “*Pontifices*” “*vicarius Filii Dei*” (*Decreti Prima Pars, Distinctio* 96, canon 14) in Friedberg, A., Richter, A.L. (Editors), *Corpus Juris Canonici, op. cit.*, Volume 1, 1879, pp. 339,342; Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, pp. 88,120.

Again if prelates of the church be called and counted of Constantine for gods, I then, being above all prelates, seem by this reason to be above all gods'.” Once again, the first qualification here is the nexus between the Papal claim to be “God” and also the “Vicar of God,” that is, “*God*” because (as “*Vicar of God*”) *he is a Vice-God*. The second qualification here refers to the usage of “gods” by “Constantine.” Bettenson records the words of Pope Gregory in 1081, “the emperor Constantine the Great,” “when” “in the” “Council of Nicea,” “presumed to give no sentence of judgment over them, but addressed them as gods and decreed that they should not be subject to his judgement but that he should be dependent upon their will.<sup>172</sup>” In this context “gods” clearly means church magistrates / rulers (Ps. 82:1,6; John 10:35) who sat in this General Council, and so the Papal claim to “be above all gods” (strikingly similar to “above all that is called god” in II Thess. 2:4), is a claim to be higher in rank than all other church prelates who constitute church magistrates or “gods.”

This language is also similar to that of Pope Boniface VIII (Pope 1294-1303) who is best known for his Papal Bull *Unam Sanctam*, which claimed a person had to “be subject to the Roman Pontiff” for “salvation.” Boniface said, “I am all in all, and above all, so that God himself and I the Vicar of God have both one consistory.” “Wherefore, if those things that I do, be said to be done not of man, but of God, what can you make me but God?<sup>173</sup>” The Papal claim of Boniface to be “above all” is comparable to the prophesy that the Antichrist will oppose and exalt himself “above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4); and Pope Boniface’s statement, “what can you make me but God” clearly parallels the words of prophesy that the Antichrist “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4). Once again, context requires the qualification that the Pope claims to be “*God*” because as “*Vicar of God*” *he is a Vice-God*. Nevertheless, we once again find in the core Papal claim to authority, namely, to be the Vicar of Christ or Vicar of God, the recognition that this means the Popes are claiming to be Vice-Gods, and *in this qualified sense* claim to be “God” himself.

Writers such as e.g., Matthew Poole, Matthew Henry, and Charles Spurgeon, have also referred to the Papist description of the Roman Pontiff, as “our Lord God the Pope.” Commenting on II Thess. 2:4, Matthew Poole refers to Latin forms of the titles, “*Dominus Deus noster Papa*” (“our Lord God the Pope”), and “*Tu es alter Deus in terra*, ‘Thou art another God on earth’,” as examples of the “titles” “the Popish writers give the Pope.” Matthew Henry says, “to whom can” II Thess. 2:3,4 “better apply than the bishops of Rome, to whom the most blasphemous titles have been given, as *Dominus Deus noster Papa* - our Lord God the Pope, *Deus alter in terra* - another God on earth<sup>174</sup>” Or writing shortly after the *First Vatican Council* (1870), Spurgeon commented on II Thess. 2:3,4, saying, “The evil system of Popery was foreseen by the apostle, and it is every day developing itself. A few months ago the Pope claimed to be infallible, but long before he had been publicly adored, and spoken of as ‘our Lord God the Pope.’ The Popish system teaches that [in transubstantiation] the priest creates his Creator, and thus it sets ‘the son of perdition’ ‘above’

---

<sup>172</sup> Paisley, pp. 54-5; Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 106.

<sup>173</sup> Townsend, G., *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, Seely and Burnside, London, 1841; Reprint AMS Press, New York, USA, 1965, Volume 4, pp. 145,159 (*Hostiensis in c. ‘Quanto de transl. praeb’* and *Ex summa casuum fratris Baptista*).

<sup>174</sup> Poole, M., *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 760; Matthew Henry, M., *Commentary on the Holy Bible* (1706-21) for II Thess. 2:3,4.

‘God’ ‘himself’.<sup>175</sup>”

*Corpus Juris Canonici* is a collection of works compiled between the early twelfth and early sixteenth centuries. They first appeared under the title *Corpus Juris Canonici* (“Body of Canon Law”), as a consequence of the name used for this edition approved by Pope Gregory XIII in *Cum pro munere* (1580). They were replaced by the *Codex Juris Canonici* (“Code of Canon Law) in 1917; which was revised in 1983. But *Corpus Juris Canonici* remains a classic canon law work in any study of the legal history of Roman Catholic Canon Law, having been compiled by Cardinals and canonists in response to a request by the Bishops of the *Council of Trent* (1545-63). One of the collections in *Corpus Juris Canonici* is the *Extravagantes of Pope John XXII* (1325). The classic commentary (or gloss) by Zenzelinus de Cassinis (commonly called “Zen” in the commentaries) (died 1334), is written in columns around the main text. At *Extravagantes of John XXII*, 14:4, commenting on “ac haereticum declaramus,” Zen refers under “Declaramus” to “our Lord the Pope.”

However, in some of the revised critical editions of *Corpus Juris Canonici*, first published in 1582, and brought out following the request to do so by the Bishops of the *Council of Trent*, some sixteenth century (Antwerp, Holland, 1584) and seventeenth century (Paris, France, 1612) editions, such as that of Paris, France, in 1685<sup>176</sup>, change Zen’s “our Lord the Pope” (*Dominum nostrum Papum*), to “our Lord God the Pope” (*Dominum Deum nostrum Papum*). Thus the relevant section changed by these canonist editors reads, “To believe that our Lord God the Pope, has not the power to decree as he is decreed, is to be deemed heretical.” Thus e.g., in the Lyons (Lugduni), France, edition of 1584, kept at the British Library in London, England, I inspected a copy of the *Extravagantes of John XXII*, which uses the formulae of words, “*Dominum Deum nostrum Papam*,” meaning, “our Lord God the Pope” (14:4)<sup>177</sup>.

In practice, though not in theory, Roman Catholic canon law, also includes the views and interpretations placed on it by canonists interpreting *Corpus Juris Canonici*, or later Roman Catholic bodies of canon law. In the Biblical sense of the word, “Lord” may in some contexts be synonymous with “God,” e.g., “there is” “one Lord Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 8:5,6). Therefore, the fact that some canonists considered the Pope was their “Lord” not simply in the sense of a temporal and spiritual ruler, but also, in the sense of a vice-God, as “God,” and so interpreted Zen’s “our Lord the Pope” to be synonymous with “our Lord God the Pope,”

---

<sup>175</sup> *Spurgeon’s Devotional Bible*, p. 722 (II Thess 2:3,4). This work was originally published under the title of *The Interpreter* (Passmore & Alabaster, London, UK, 1870); and first reprinted by Baker Books, Michigan, USA in 1964 and again in a UK edition in 1995. ISBN 0-85234-343-4. (Hereafter called *Spurgeon’s Devotional Bible*.)

<sup>176</sup> While some commentators refer to other editions such as the 1584 (Antwerp) and 1612 (Paris) editions; a commonly quoted edition for these purposes is the 1685 Paris edition of *Corpus Juris Canonici*. E.g., reference to this title in this edition’s commentary on *Extravagantes of John XXII*, Title 14, chapter 4, at “Declaramus,” was quoted in *Protestant Alliance Magazine*, March 1922 ([www.geocities.com/cfpchurch/Pope.html](http://www.geocities.com/cfpchurch/Pope.html)).

<sup>177</sup> *Extravagantes* Tit. XIII, Cap. III, gloss on “ac haereticum declaramus,” p. 153, in: *Liber Sextus Decretalium*, D. Bonifacii Papae VIII, Clementis Papae, V., Constitutiones, Extravagantes tum Viginti D. Ioannis Papae XXII, Tum Communes, Delicentia Dom Nostri GREGORII XIII Pont. Max., Lugduni [Lyons, France], MDLXXXIII [1584]. (British Library L.23.f5.)

means that this is *one* view of at least *some* Roman Catholic canonists. Shortly after these words reference is made in the commentary (or gloss), to the Popes as “vicars of Christ” (*Christi vicarii*), so that “our Lord God the Pope” is contextually understood to mean the Pope as a *Vice-Christ* or *Vicar of Christ* is “our Lord God” i.e., “our Lord God the Pope” because he is considered *the vicar of our Lord God*. Furthermore, in Title 13, which is the title immediately before this Title 14, in the main text of *Extravagantes of John XXII* 13:1, reference is made to “the Roman Pontiffs” as “vicars of Christ” (*Romani Pontifices Christi vicarii*). This contextual qualification is significant because no Roman Catholic canonist would ever refer to the Pope as “our Lord God” *per se*, a claim that even they would accept was blasphemous; but only as “our Lord God” in the sense of a *vice-Christ* (or *vice-God*) as “vicar of Christ” (or “vicar of God”)

Nevertheless, even with this important qualification that once again the contextual meaning of “God” is as a vice-God or vice-Christ on the basis that the Pope is the “Vicar of God” or “Vicar of Christ,” the fact that Roman Catholic canonists were prepared to refer to the “our Lord God the Pope” in some editions of *Corpus Juris Canonici*, is significant. It is yet another clear example of how the Roman Church herself accepts that the Pope “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4), since as the purported “vicar of Christ” or “vicar of God” he is regarded as a vice-Christ or vice-God, and in this context, has been referred to by some Roman Catholic canonists as “our Lord God the Pope.”

Another classic work on Roman Catholic canon law is Mansi’s *Sacrorum Conciliorum*. In this we read that at the Roman Church’s “ecumenical Council” known as the *Fifth Lateran Council* (1512-17), that Christopher Marcellus gave an oration in the Fourth Session in which he said to Pope Julius II (Pope 1503-1513), “Thou art another God on earth” (Latin, *tu ... alter Deus in terris*) (Mansi 32:761). This statement has since obtained a certain notoriety by both Roman Catholic and Protestant writers with respect to the exalted status of the Papacy. For instance, writing in 1975 with an imprimatur on their combined work, Professor of the Saint Thomas Aquinas University of Rome, Olivier De La Brosse (a member of the Romish Dominican Order), two honorary professors of the [Roman] Catholic Institute of Paris, Joseph Lecler and Henry Holsterin (both Romish Jesuits), together with Charles Lefebvre, are Roman Catholic writers who use this quote in a pro-Papacy context. They say, “Marcellus” “stresses at length the importance of the presence of the Pope for the validity of councils for the repression of schisms and heresies, and” “throws at Julius II the most famous digression in a speech of ecclesiology, ‘You ... are in fact, another God on earth’.” By contrast, though not going so far as to call it “the most famous digression in a speech of ecclesiology,” Matthew Poole in 1685, Matthew Henry during 1706-21, John Cumming in 1852, and (the Moderator of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster* till 2008,) in 1988 Ian Paisley - also known as the Lord Bannside, (since 2010 made Baron Bannside of North Antrim, Northern Ireland, by Queen Elizabeth II,) are Protestant writers who use this quote in an anti-Papacy context in which they see it fulfilling the words of II Thess. 2:4 that the Antichrist shows himself as “God.”

But once again, this is qualified in the broader context of the *Fifth Lateran Council* since we also read in the Ninth Session that Pope “Leo” X (Pope 1513-1521) being “the Roman Pontiff” is “vicar on earth of Christ, the only begotten Son of God” (Latin, *Christi unigeniti Dei filii gerentem vices in terris Romanum pontificem*) (Mansi 32:874)<sup>178</sup>. Since

---

<sup>178</sup> Mansi, G.D [1692-1769], Labbe, P [16-67-1667], Cossart, G [1615-1674], Colleti, N [1681-1765], & Martin, J.B. [1864-1922], *Sacrorum Conciliorum*, H. Welter, Paris,

the Pope is referred to as “God on earth” (Latin, *Deus in terris*) (Mansi 32:761) because he is in Latin, “*Christi* (of Christ) ... *Dei* (of God) *fili* (the Son) *gerentem* (‘governing’ or ‘reigning’) *vices* (in the place) *in* (on) *terris* (earth)” (Mansi 32:874) i.e., “vicar on earth of Christ, the ... Son of God,” this is not a claim by the Roman Church that the Pope is “God” *per se* (a proposition that even the Church of Rome would regard as blasphemous), but rather, yet again this is Roman Catholic theological claims that *the Pope is “God”* (Latin, *Deus*) *because as “vicar of Christ” he is a Vice-God* (Latin, ‘*Dei ... vices*’ = ‘in the place ... of God’). But once again, since Mansi 32:761 says the Pope is “God on earth,” it is reasonable to conclude this is yet another example of how he has been found to be “shewing ... that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).

In II Thess. 2:4 we are first told “that he as God sitteth in the temple of God.” As discussed above “temple of God” can refer to the church, and this is where the Roman Pope claims jurisdictional authority. The Pope says he sits in the *Church of Peter* (Latin, *Cathedra Petri*). Then in the words of the *Authorized Version* the Antichrist is pictured as “shewing himself that he is God,” or in the words of the *Revised Version* and *American Standard Version* as “setting himself forth as God.” One very clear way that the Roman Pope is guilty of “shewing himself that he is God” (AV) or “setting himself forth as God” (ASV) is this. As previously discussed in the introductory section entitled “Can the Roman Catholic Pope be fairly described as ‘The Roman Antichrist’?” the core of the Papal claim to authority is found in the Pope’s title “Vicar of Christ” which in Latin is *Vicarius Christi*. The *Vatican II Council* supported the Roman Church’s claim that as “Vicar of Christ” the Pope has the keys of heaven itself, which he says were handed down to him as St. Peter’s successor, and so he says he has the power to admit or prohibit entry to heaven (*Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* 22)<sup>179</sup>. By contrast, Scripture says Jesus alone has these keys (Rev. 1:18; 3:7). Since the Latin word *vicarius* can mean “instead of another,” the Papal title *Vicarius Christi* means the Pope puts himself *in the place of*, or *instead of*, *Christ* as his deputy here on earth. Since the meaning of the Greek word “anti” in antichrist is *in place of* or *instead of*, and an antichrist is one who puts either a false Christ *in the place of* or *instead of* Christ, or puts himself *in the place of* or *instead of* Christ, it follows that in the Papal claim to be “Vicar of Christ” the Pope exposes himself as an antichrist who puts his claims to have the keys to heaven in the place of Christ’s claim to be the only one to have the keys to heaven.

There is another clear way that the Pope is guilty of “shewing” “that he is God” (AV) or “setting himself forth as God” (ASV). In Matt. 23:9 Christ says, “call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.” In studying this Scripture it is important to “rightly divide the word of truth” (II Tim. 2:15). Scripture refers to certain church leaders, including St. Paul, as “fathers” (I Cor. 4:15) but this is a *description* not a

---

France, and Leipzig, Germany, 1901-1927, Vol. 32, p. 761, Part D (Fourth Session), and Vol. 32, p. 874, Part D (Ninth Session). De La Brosse, O., Lecler, J., Holstein, H., Lefebvre, C., *Latran V et Trente*, Imprimi potest Paris, 5, janvier 1974, M. Hoel, S.J. Praep. Prov. & Imprimatur Paris, 8 mars 1975, E. Berrar, Vic. Ep., Editions De L’Orante, Paris, 1975, p. 55 (a French language work), “Marcello ... .” “Il insiste longuement sur l’importance de la presence du pape pour la validite des conciles comme pour la repression des schismes et des heresies, et” “lance a Jules II la plus celebre apostrophe de l’ecclesiologie: ‘Toi ... enfin, un atre Die sur la terre!’” Poole, M., *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 760; Matthew Henry, M., *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (1706-21) for II Thess. 2:3,4; Cumming’s *Apocalyptic Sketches*, *op. cit.*, p. 477; Paisley, p. 54.

<sup>179</sup> *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 375.

*title*. In this Biblical sense of “father,” we may speak of the later *Church Fathers’ Era* e.g., St. Augustine or St. Jerome. Or with regard to the *Great Protestant Missionary Movement* that started in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, we may speak of the Baptist, William Carey who went to India in 1793 as *the Father of Modern Missions*; being followed by such persons as, for example, the Anglican, Henry Martyn, a Bible translator and Christian missionary to both heathens in India and infidels in Persia<sup>180</sup>.

But we *do not* use “father” as a title and so, for example, we *do not* refer to “Father Augustine,” “Father Jerome,” or “Father Carey.” Thus, for example, we may describe Abraham as our spiritual father in fulfillment of the promise in Gen. 17:3 that Abraham would be “a father of many nations.” While this had a racial application to the Jewish race and a number of Gentile races (Gen. 25:1-19), it also has a spiritual application to both Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians who are “Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Gal. 3:29). Another exception is found with biological fathers (and adoptions, for example, Joseph and Jesus in Luke 2:41,48; 3:23<sup>181</sup>). This refers to one’s immediate “father” (Matt. 19:19) and racial fathers beyond this such as, for example, Jewish racial “fathers” (Matt. 23:30,32). Hence in the parable of Lazarus and Dives (Luke 16:19-31), the Jew in hell, Dives, calls out to “Father Abraham” (Luke 16:24,30). He is clearly not a spiritual son of Abraham since Abraham is in heaven and Dives in hell, but Abraham refers to him as “Son” (Luke 16:25) because he is one of his racial descendants. Likewise, Scripture teaches that all human beings are of Adam’s race (Gen. 3:20), and because “Adam” was “the first man” it follows that like Seth, all human beings “have borne” his “image” (Gen. 5:3; I Cor. 15:45,49), and so Adam is the father of the human race.

The name “Pope” is from the Latin *papa* and Greek *papas* and means “Father.” Do either of these qualifications apply to the Bishop of Rome’s usage of “father”? The first qualification does not apply since “Pope” is not merely a *description* of the Bishop of Rome, but rather a *title*. The second qualification is equally non-applicable since “Pope” is not reserved for biological descendants of the Bishop of Rome. Thus we are left with the conclusion that the words of Jesus are directed at the very thing the Bishop of Rome is doing when he takes upon himself the title of “Pope.”

The Church of Rome anachronistically claims that earlier Bishops of Rome before

---

<sup>180</sup> Since 1978, the Anglican Calendar has given a black letter day on 19 October, for “Henry Martyn, missionary and Bible translator in India and Persia (1781-1812).” I support the 1662 Anglican Calendar with no omissions whatsoever, although I support a small number of the added black letter days on the 1978 Australian Anglican Calendar, of which this is one. See by Sir Marcus Loane (1911-2009) (Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, 1966-1982; Primate of Australia, 1978-1982), *They Were Pilgrims*, 1970, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, & Carlisle, Pennsylvania, USA, 2006, pp. 55-136 (Henry Martyn).

<sup>181</sup> The genealogy in Matt. 1:1-16 is that of “Joseph” (Matt. 1:16) and since it includes in Matt. 1:11 “Jechonias” (AV) or “Jeconiah” (NKJV) it cannot be the legal line of Jesus royal descent on the basis of Jer. 22:24-30. Thus it is a legal genealogy of Jesus through Joseph. His biological genealogy through Mary is found in Luke 3:23-38 since Joseph was Jacob’s son by birth (Matt. 1:16) but “the son” meaning son-in-law “of Heli” (AV) or “Eli” (NASB) by marriage (Luke 3:23). This genealogy in Luke 3 make no reference to Jeconiah, but make it clear Jesus was the biological son of, among others, David, Judah, Jacob, Isaac, Abraham, Shem, Seth, and Adam (Luke 3:31,33,34,36,38).

607 were “Popes” in the later post 607 sense of the Papacy having “universal” jurisdiction. The first Bishop of Rome for whom we have evidence that he was called “Pope” was Marcellinus (Bishop of Rome, 296-304). Under the persecution of the Roman Emperor Diocletian, Marcellinus proved himself to be an idolater for he was known to have made sacrifices to the pagan Roman deities a year before his death. A dark cloud of uncertainty hangs over the last year of Marcellinus’s life. It is uncertain as to whether or not he repented of this idolatry. One view considers his idolatrous conduct continued to his death and was responsible for disturbing the peace for many years after his death, and this is the explanation for the interval of three to four years before the next Bishop of Rome, Marcellus I, succeeded him in 309. Though claims that he was martyred remain unproven, another view considers he repented and died a martyr’s death, so that the Church of Rome calls him “Pope” and “Saint Marcellinus,” celebrating his feast day on 26 April. Whichever view is correct, the fact that he was called “Pope” should be placed in the wider context that during the 3rd to 5th centuries “Pope” was used as a title by many bishops. This practice was continued by the Coptic Orthodox Church which as a heretical monophysitist church remained outside the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church, and which has continued this older tradition of calling their patriarch “Pope” e.g., their incumbent Patriarch is Pope Shenouda III (Coptic Orthodox Pope since 1971). But from the 6th century on, “Pope” was increasingly reserved for the Bishop of Rome, and the first writer to consistently follow this practice was Magnus Felix Ennodius who died in 521, and who thus testifies to the growing push by some for the Bishop of Rome to be made “universal bishop.” The idea being that because the Bishop of Rome claimed a “universal” jurisdiction as “universal bishop,” he was “the Pope” of a world-wide diocese. Thus in general other bishops ceased to use the title, and it is in this sense that we say the Roman Papacy was formed in 607, and that Boniface III was “the first Pope.” With the rise of the Papacy following the imperial favours bestowed upon it, with the Bishop of Rome first gaining a temporary titular primacy under Justinian from 533-565, and then more permanently with the rise of the actual formation of the Papacy from 607, the Papacy in its form as a “universal” bishopric was born in 607, and by the eighth century the Western Church of Rome had restricted the title “Pope” to the Bishop of Rome alone<sup>182</sup>.

Broderick says “Holy Father” is a “title of reverence accorded to the Pope as spiritual father of the universal church<sup>183</sup>,” but in Scripture these sacred words are reserved for God and God alone (John 17:11). What a contrast there is between the Bishop of Rome’s claim to be “the Pope” and “the Holy Father” with the clear words of Jesus, “And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. ... But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted” (Matt. 23:9,11,12). On the Thursday Before Easter, the Roman Church has a foot-washing service, the first word of which in Latin is “*Mandatum*,” from the words of the Latin Vulgate in John 13:34, “*Mandatum* (A commandment) *novum* (new) *do* (I give) *vobis* (unto you),” i.e., “A new commandment I give unto you,” from which they call the day “Maundy Thursday.” This is based on a decontextualization of John 13:34 which is a commandment “That ye love one another; as I have loved you” (John 13:34), not a commandment to institute a foot-washing service.

---

<sup>182</sup> *Saints & Sinners: History of the Popes*, Episode 1, Narrated by Anthony Clare, An Opus Television Production for SC4 International in association with RTF and La Cinquieme; *New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15 edition, 1998, USA, Vol. 7, p. 821; Lefebvre, G, *Saint Andrew Daily Missal*, *op. cit.*, p. 1203; *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 11, p. 572.

<sup>183</sup> Broderick, *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, *op. cit.*, p. 184, “Holy Father.”

Moreover, this “Maundy Thursday” service is an absurdly literal reading of John 13:1-17, in which it is said that in John 13:14,15 Jesus gave a command to wash one another’s feet as an ongoing church ordinance. In fact, Jesus here gave an ongoing command for Christians to practice humility, hospitality, and serve one another (cf. Matt. 20:27), of which foot-washing was a Middle East cultural manifestation both before this time (Gen. 18:4) as well as in Christ’s day (Luke 7:38; I Tim. 5:10), but a practice which ceases to have significance in later cultures. Thus historically, this foot-washing rite rightly came to be discontinued by Protestants. But on this day in Rome, the Pope himself washes some poor people’s feet. What a striking example this is, on the one hand, of the Pope keeping the letter of the law to a ridiculous degree by insisting that an actual foot-washing service occur in a shoe-wearing culture where it is totally inappropriate since people’s feet are not dusty and dirty; but on the other hand, completely disregarding the real meaning of John 13:1-17 as he sets about to “exalt himself” in the church by having those involved call him “Pope” meaning “Father,” contrary to Matt. 23:9,12. Some poor beggars of Rome might get their feet washed by the Roman Pontiff on what is called “Maundy Thursday,” but to do so they must remain spiritually unclean as they call their foot-washer, “Pope,” meaning “Father”<sup>184</sup>.

Furthermore, Jesus words here concerning anyone who shall “exalt (Greek *hupsousei*, indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *hupsoo* / *hypsoo*) himself” are particularly interesting since the root Greek word “exalt” here is *hupsoo*. This same basic root word is found in the Septuagint’s translation of Dan. 11:36 were we read that the

---

<sup>184</sup> In 1572, in a private ceremony, on the Thursday Before Easter, Queen Elizabeth I, called for “thirty-nine ladies and gentlewomen (for so many were the poor folks, according to the number of years complete of Her Majesty’s age),” and “kneeling down upon the cushions and carpets,” “first washed one foot of every one of them,” “then wiped, crossed, and kissed them.” She then “gave to each one certain yards of broad-cloth, to make a gown,” “and gave to each of them a pair of shoes,” “a wooden platter, wherein was half a side of salmon, as much ling, six red herrings, and cheat loaves of bread,” “a white wooden dish with claret wine,” a “towel and apron.” In her generosity she then further gave “thirty-nine small white purses, wherein were also thirty-nine pence,” and the same number of “leather purses, each containing twenty shillings, for the redemption of Her Majesty’s gown” (No 6183, *Add. Mss.*, in the British Library, London, cited in Hone’s *Table-Book*, Vol. 1, pp. 479, 480; quoted in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, or Documents & extracts illustrative of the ritual of the church in England after the Reformation, Edited by Members of the Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, J.G.F. & J. Rivington, J. Masters, London; Deightons Macmillan, & Co., Cambridge; J.H. Parker, Oxford; 1848, pp. 282-3.) While I find *Hierurgia Anglicana* a useful source book, it should be remembered that it is a Puseyite production which generally uses its sources uncritically, and frequently distorts matters. Only benighted Puseyites would try to use this to justify a Maundy Thursday Service in a Church, since it is clear that in the Elizabethan *Book of Common Prayer* of 1559, no such service was included. (*Hierurgia Anglicana* makes similar analytical errors by claiming e.g., at p. 157 that copes worn in the ritual of the Order of the Garter, should be used, contrary to the 1662 prayer book, in a normative Anglican Church Service. Clearly they are “grasping at straws”). Contextually, this was a ceremony connected with the Queen’s Birthday Celebrations as seen by the symbolic usage of the number 39, and not one customarily done. It was clearly very selective as the Queen chose only women, and included a most generous example of Christian charity to these poor women. But as the Reformation advanced through its second stages, even such a “one-off” foot-washing ceremony came to be jettisoned by the monarch.

Antichrist shall “exalt (Greek *hupsōthēsetai*, indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *hupsōo*) himself.” Since Jesus says in Matt. 23:9,12 a person calling himself “father” is an example of one who “shall exalt himself,” it follows that this is a clear example of where the Bishop of Rome “exalteth himself” and is “setting himself forth as God” (ASV) or “shewing” “that he is God” (AV) (II Thess. 2:4), by claiming a spiritual title in “Pope” and “Holy Father” that belongs to “no man ... upon the earth,” but only to “your Father, which is in heaven” (Matt. 23:9). Thus the Pope here claims a Divine Attribute of God, taking from God the Father his very name and title in flagrant breach of Jesus command, “call no man your father upon the earth” (Matt. 23:9)<sup>185</sup>. This blasphemy further violates the Third Commandment and so shows the Pope as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) setting aside the Holy Decalogue’s precept, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain” (Exod. 20:7); as he wickedly takes the name of God the Father to himself. Thus the “Antichrist” “denieth the Father” of Holy Scripture (I John 2:21).

The whole basis for Papal succession rests on the idea that the church was built on the Apostle Peter who as “the first Pope” was the “rock” and the Popes are St. Peter’s successors. But what says the Scripture? “The Lord is my rock” (Ps. 18:2; 92:15) and “Who is a rock save our God?” (Ps. 18:31). Thus when the Bible says: “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 3:11), and “Jesus Christ” is “the chief corner stone” (Eph. 2.20), Scripture is attributing to Christ a Divine Attribute since we have no “rock” but God. Hence in arguing that “the rock” was “a Pope” another Divine Attribute is taken from Almighty God, falsely attributed to the Apostle Peter, and then this is used to further bolster the purported power of the Papacy.

There is also another clear way that the Roman Pontiff is guilty of “setting himself forth as God” (ASV) or “shewing” “that he is God” (AV) (II Thess. 2:4). In the 1600s, the Anglican Bishop, Edward Stillingfleet records that the Church of Rome was “pretending to infallibility, in determining controversies.” Likewise, in the 1800s Charles Simeon of Cambridge (1759-1836) refers to II Thess. 2:3,4,8,9 and how “the Papal Hierarchy” did “assume to itself the unalienable prerogatives of the Most High God.” He further says “St. Paul’s account ... of the man of sin corresponds exactly with this,” and as an example of this Simeon refers to “their claims to infallibility<sup>186</sup>.” These claims were formally made part of Roman Catholic doctrine by the decree of the First Vatican Council which claimed the Pope was “infallible.”

In his *Systematic Theology*, the distinguished Reformed theologian, Louis Berkhof (1873-1957) discusses “the Attributes of God.” One of these is God’s “absolute perfection.” Referring to theologian, James Orr (1844-1913), Berkhof notes:

Says Dr. Orr: “perhaps we can say that infinity in God is ultimately: (a) internally and qualitatively, absence of all limitation and defect; (b) boundless potentiality.” In this sense of the word the infinity of God is simply identical with the perfection of His

---

<sup>185</sup> Here I note that clergymen in the Roman Church and some other apostate churches, also arrogantly take the title “Father,” by which they show how radically their concept of ministry varies from the Biblical model in Matt. 23:1-12.

<sup>186</sup> Stillingfleet, E., *A discourse concerning idolatry practised in the Church of Rome*, Printed by Robert White, Westminster Hall, London, UK, 1676, p. 7; Simeon, C., *Expository Outlines on the Whole Bible*, 1833, eighth edition 1847, Zondervan, Michigan, 1956, Vol. 9, Outline on “The Destruction of Popery” at p. 535.

Divine Being. Scripture proof for it is found in Job 11:7-10; Ps. 145:3; Matt. 5:48<sup>187</sup>.

Berkhof's reference to Matt. 5:48 is noteworthy. Here Jesus says, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." On the one hand, Jesus' statement reminds us that our own fallen (Gen. 3), fallible (Ps. 19:12), sinful (Ps. 51:5) human nature is incapable of perfection (I John 1:8), and so we must be imputed with Christ's righteousness to meet this standard (Rom. 5). But on the other hand, Jesus' teaching also reminds us that there is an infallible, sinless God who "is perfect" (Matt. 5:48).

In Job 11:7 we read, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" What a contrast there is between this perfection of God, and the imperfection of man. For example, David says, "Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret faults" (Ps. 19:12). Yet since the First Vatican Council (1869-1870), the Pope has formally claimed this Divine Attribute of perfection in the form of Papal Infallibility<sup>188</sup>. The Vatican I Council said "that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra* ..., he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the whole church" and in this, "he possesses ... infallibility<sup>189</sup>." This decree was retrospective but as opponents of it noted at the time, this decree contradicts the historical reality that the Constantinople III Council (681) condemned the monothelite formula of Pope Honorius I. In practice, it has only been applied twice, firstly, retrospectively to the dogma promulgated by Pope Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878) in 1854 concerning the so called "immaculate conception" of the Virgin Mary, and secondly, to the dogma promulgated by Pope Pius XII (Pope 1939-1958) in 1950 concerning the so called "Assumption of Mary." The Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents upheld this teaching, referring to the "primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his infallible teaching office," and saying, "the Roman Pontiff does not utter a pronouncement as a private person, but rather does he expound and defend the teaching of the [Roman] Catholic faith as the" falsely claimed "supreme teacher of the universal Church, in whom the Church's charism of infallibility is present in a singular way." It also upheld the associated Marian teachings, referring to "the Immaculate Virgin preserved free from all stain of original sin," citing "Pius IX, Bull *Ineffabilis*, 8 Dec. 1854" *et al* (immaculate conception), who "was taken up body and soul into heavenly glory, when her earthly life was over, and exalted" "as Queen over all things," citing "Pius XII. Const. Apost. *Munificentissimus*, 1

---

<sup>187</sup> Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, p. 60, quoting from Orr, J., *Side-Lights on Christian Doctrine*, p. 26. James Orr's writings should be considered with a degree of caution. On the one hand, he was a religiously conservative champion of orthodoxy on a number of issues. But on the other hand, he held to macroevolution rather than creation; and he had some religiously liberal unorthodox opinions about Scripture that I only became aware of in more recent years, in which he claimed Scripture had "varying degrees of inspiration." E.g., he incorrectly claims "Pekah's twenty years in II Kings 15:27 ... is shown by the Assyrian synchronisms to be a mistake" (Orr's *Revelation and Inspiration*, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1952, pp. 171-5, 180, 215; referred to in Cairns, A., *Apostles of Error*, Faith Free Presbyterian Church, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1989 and *Let the Bible Speak*, 55 Market Street, Ballymoney, Northern Ireland, UK, 1989, pp. 30-4, 38).

<sup>188</sup> Sadler, I.A., *op. cit.*, p. 267; Guinness, H.G., *The Approaching End of the Age*, Viewed in the Light of History, Prophecy, and Science, Hodder and Stoughton, London, fifth edition, 1880, p. 193.

<sup>189</sup> *Vatican I Council*, chapter 4, "On the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff."

Nov. 1950” 1854”*et al*<sup>190</sup>.

Since the Papal claim to infallibility has only two recognized usage, let us consider them further. The Papal doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary (1854), maintains that at her conception in her mother Anne, Mary was preserved “from every stain of original sin<sup>191</sup>,” and so had a fallen sinless nature like Adam and Eve before the Fall. It is clear from Scripture that Mary was not sinless. This teaching is contrary to the broad Biblical truth that after the Fall of Adam, Christ alone is “without sin” (Heb. 4:15; cf. II Cor. 5:21; I Peter 1:19; I John 3:5); for example, Isaiah says, “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way” (Isa. 53:6), and St. Paul says, “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23, see also I Kgs 8:46; Matt. 6:12; Rom. 7; I John 1:8). Moreover, in specific terms, we know that Mary committed such sins as: negligence, for she left Jerusalem without first ensuring Jesus was with them (Luke 2:41-45; compare II Chron. 29:11a); ignorance, for she was not careful to consider Jesus’ mission and know that he “must be about” his “father’s business” (Luke 2:49 compare Lev. 4:2,27,28); dishonesty, for she tried to shift the blame for her negligent conduct onto the sinless Jesus, saying, “Why hast thou thus dealt with us?” (AV) or “Why have you treated us this way?” (NASB) (Luke 2:48); and presumption, for on a number of accessions she not only presumed that she had some special access to Jesus which allowed her to interrupt him, which thing prompted Jesus to repeatedly make the point that all his followers are equal before him and that Mary holds no special place beyond any other believer (Matt. 12:46-50; Mark 3:31-35; Luke 8:19-21), but she also presumed to tell Jesus to do something in his public ministry that he was going to do anyway, with the result Jesus put her in her place, saying, “Woman, what have I to do with thee?” (John 2:3,4, compare Ps. 19:13). This claim of Mary’s sinlessness resuscitated an element of Coelestius’s Pelagian teaching that “there were men without sin before Christ’s coming” condemned by, among others, St. Augustine<sup>192</sup>.

The Papal doctrine of the Assumption of Mary (1950) finds no warrant for the assumption that Mary was translated to heaven at death. The normal process is for “the spirits of just men made perfect” to go to “heaven” (Heb. 12:23), there to await resurrection bodes at the Second Advent (I Thess. 3:13; 4:16,17). The small number of exceptions to this, of which the bodily resurrection of Christ on the third day is the principle example, all type the saints who will receive resurrection bodies at the Second Coming, and are all specifically documented in Scripture precisely because they are so extraordinary. These are Enoch (Gen. 6:24); Moses (Jude 9), Elijah (II Kgs 2:11), (hence both Moses and Elijah were bodily present at the Transfiguration, Matt. 17:2,3), and some saints at the time of Jesus’ resurrection (Matt. 28:52,53; Eph. 4:8-10). The absence of any mention of Mary being translated therefore basically rules out such a possibility. Moreover, the claim that she was translated in order to be made “Queen of Heaven” is a blasphemy against the Kingship of Christ, and his bride the Church (Eph. 5:31,32), and represents the deification of Mary by ascribing to her Divine Attributes contrary to many Scriptures, starting with Gen. 3:5. This type of thing is also contrary to the clear teaching of Luke 11:27,28, that Mary is no more and no less “blessed” (Luke 1:48), than any other Christian who shall “hear the Word of God, and keep it” (Luke 11:28).

---

<sup>190</sup> *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* 18,25,59, *Vatican II Council Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 370,380,417-8; *Bettenson’s Documents*, p. 271.

<sup>191</sup> Broderick, *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, *op. cit.*, p. 194 “Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.”

<sup>192</sup> *Bettenson’s Documents*, pp. 53-4.

Jesus upheld the infallibility of Holy Scripture for he taught that men “err” and indeed “greatly err” when they do not follow “the Scriptures” (Mark 12:24,27). Thus I conclude that far from being infallible, the Papal claim to infallibility as tested by the two examples so far used for it by the Church of Rome, shows just how fallible and unBiblical the Church of Rome is when compared to God’s Infallible Book! Well may the words of Jesus be applied to the so called “infallible” doctrines of “the immaculate conception of Mary” and “the Assumption of Mary,” “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures” (Matt. 22:29). Thus since the First Vatican Council the Pope has formally claimed the Divine Attribute of perfection in the form of infallibility, which Attribute of “perfection” belongs to “the Almighty” (Job 11:7) and by derivation his God-breathed Infallible Book (II Tim. 3:16), and so it follows that the Pope has once again been found to be “setting himself forth as God” (ASV) or “shewing” “that he is God” (AV) (II Thess. 2:4).

Notably, even a preterist (that is, one who considers the Antichrist prophesies are all fulfilled long ago in the past,) like James Frame is prepared to concede that once “temple of God” is understood to mean “the church,” this then facilitates an “easy .... application” to the Pope (that is, a historicist understanding which considers the Antichrist prophesies are focused on the Roman Papacy). Frame first states that a number of “commentators interpret the temple as equivalent to the church,” and as his examples refers to Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), John Chrysostom (d. 407), Theodoret (d. 5th century), Jerome (d. 420), and others. He then says that such “an interpretation ... makes easy the application ... by Protestants, to the Pope sitting in the *Cathedra Petri* [Latin, *Chair of Peter*]<sup>193</sup>.”

Therefore it seems to me that the reader of II Thess. 2:4 is meant to go through a number of stages in understanding the meaning of II Thess. 2:4. Firstly, using a Biblical meaning of “a god,” the reader recognizes that the Antichrist “opposes and exalteth himself above all that is called a god” in the sense of magistrates and kings being called “gods” (Ps. 82:1,6; John 10:34,35), and that he shows himself to be “a god” in, for example, the sense of being a temporal king with the Papal states from 756 to 1870 and that Vatican City State from 1929. Then, using a Roman meaning of “a god,” after looking at the prophetic types of the Roman Emperors in II Thess. 2:1-12 the reader sees the Antichrist as “a god” since like the Roman Emperors of St. Paul’s day he claims divine attributes recognizably similar to the pagan Roman Emperors evident in, for instance, the Emperor’s title *Summus Pontifex* (Supreme Pontiff). But then the reader is meant to go to a third stage and ask, If the Antichrist sits in “the temple of God” what God does he ultimately claim the Divine Attributes of but *the* God? Thus the reader moves to the translation of II Thess. 2:4 as “God.” Since this is the Antichrist, it then follows that the Divine Person of the Trinity whose attributes he will especially claim in this context will be those of Christ. If one is reading the original Greek of this text rather than a translation, this staged transition from “a god” (Luther) to “God” (Luther & AV) is done without any change of the text. But the English language is not able to convey in the same way that the Greek does, this incremental meaning change as one considers the text, and so to properly understand this passage in English we need like Luther to sometimes translate it as “a god” and sometimes translate it as “God.” Thus the description of II Thess. 2:4 fits the Pope like a hand in a tailor made glove irrespective of which of the meanings of “a god” or “God” in this verse one focuses on. Thus it is clear that in II Thess. 2:4 the Pope is the Antichrist “claiming he is a god” (Luther’s

---

<sup>193</sup> Frame, J.E., *The International Critical Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 257.

translation) or “shewing” “that he is God” (AV).

The following chart summarizes some of the these elements.

***Divine Attributes, Powers, and Prerogatives claimed by the Pope of Rome.***

*The Pope “as God, sitteth in the temple of God,  
shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4)  
in the form of a vice-God or vice-Christ as “Vicar of Christ”  
with a “universal” jurisdiction in “the temple” or church “of God.”*

THE BIBLE SAYS OF THE BIBLICAL “FATHER” AND “SON” / “CHRIST” (I John 2:22):	THE POPE “DENIETH” THE BIBLICAL “FATHER” AND “SON” / “CHRIST” (I John 2:22) IN HIS CLAIMS:
<p><u>1) The Church’s foundation stone in Matt 16:18.</u> <i>Jesus Christ is the stone.</i> “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 3:11). “Jesus Christ” is “the chief corner stone” (Eph. 2:20). “The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner” (Ps. 118:22 quoted in Matt 21:42). “For who is God save the Lord? Or who is a rock save our God?” (Ps. 18:31).</p> <p><u>2) Head of the Church as Universal Bishop.</u> “Christ is head of the church” (Matt. 21:42; Eph. 5:23; compare Eph. 1:22; Col. 1:18) and “Bishop of your souls” (I Peter 1:25). (The Holy Ghost is Christ’s universal representative on earth, John 14:26; 15:26; I John 5:6.)</p> <p><u>3) Divine power of forgiveness.</u> The Jews rightly asked “Who can forgive sins but God only?” and Jesus did not disagree (Ps. 130:3,4; Isa. 43:25), but showed his Divinity, saying, “The Son of man hath</p>	<p><u>1) The Church’s foundation stone in Matt 16:18.</u> “Pope” Peter is “the stone” and the Popes of Rome claim to be his successors. (Vatican I Council; Vatican II Council <i>Conciliar &amp; Post Conciliar Documents</i>.)</p> <p><u>2) Head of the Church as Universal Bishop.</u> Pope claims the power of headship as “universal bishop” of the church, establishing the Roman Papacy on this claim in 607. (The Pope commits “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,” Matt. 12:31; but usurping the place of the Holy Ghost in his claim to be “Vicar of Christ” with a universal jurisdiction, and thus is “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3).</p> <p><u>3) Divine power of forgiveness.</u> The Pope claims he has the power to forgive sins.</p>

<p>power on earth to forgive sins” (Mark 2:7,10).</p> <p><u>4) Divine power to admit or bar entry to heaven.</u> Jesus Christ has “the keys of ... death” and is “he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth” (Rev. 1:18; 3:7)</p> <p><u>5) Divine infallibility and man’s fallibility.</u> The “Almighty” has “perfection” (Job 11:7), but fallen man is “shapen in iniquity” (Ps. 51:5) and in this state can never fully “understand his errors” (Ps. 19:12).</p> <p><u>6) Divine title of God the Father.</u> “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain” (Exod. 20:7). Jesus said, “call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven” (Matt. 23:9). Jesus addresses God the Father as “Holy Father” (John 17:11).</p>	<p><u>4) Divine power to admit or bar entry to heaven.</u> Pope claims he has the keys to heaven and can admit or bar souls. E.g. he issues indulgences <i>Vatican II Council Conciliar &amp; Post Conciliar Documents</i>).</p> <p><u>5) Divine infallibility and man’s fallibility.</u> Pope claims perfection in the form of “infallibility” when speaking “<i>ex (from) cathedra</i> (the Chair [of St. Peter])” on matters of faith or morals (Vatican Council,1869-70).</p> <p><u>6) Divine title of God the Father.</u> “Pope” is from Ecclesiastical Latin <i>papa</i> and Ecclesiastical Greek <i>papas</i> and Greek <i>pappas</i> meaning “Father.”  Pope is blasphemously addressed by the title” Holy Father.”</p>
--	---

## CHAPTER 9

### The Antichrist’s coming is “with the working of Satan” (II Thess. 2:9)

Another indicator which does not fit with what we know of the prophetic types of the Roman Emperors, but which does fit the Roman Antichrist, is that his coming is “after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9). The work of Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921), might be profitably consulted here. In Warfield’s *Counterfeit Miracles* he devotes an entire chapter to “Roman Catholic Miracles<sup>194</sup>.” This same feature of II Thess. 2:9 is also found in Matt. 24:23,24; Mark 13:21,22. John Calvin was surely right when commenting on the “false Christs and false prophets” (Matt. 24:23; Mark 13:22) in this parallel passage in Matt. 24:24 and Mark 13:21, “since our Lord declares that *antichrists* and *false prophets* would be armed with miracles, there is no reason why the Papists should talk so haughtily on this ground.” “In support of their superstitions they plead miracles, those very miracles which, the Son of God predicted, would corrupt the faith of many, and which, therefore, wise men ought not to hold in such estimation as to be sufficient of themselves to prove either one or another kind of doctrine.<sup>195</sup>” (Cf. Matt. 7:21-23.)

<sup>194</sup> Warfield, B.B., *Counterfeit Miracles*, Banner of Truth Trust, London, 1918, 1972, “Roman Catholic Miracles” pp. 71-124.

<sup>195</sup> Calvin, J., *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists Matthew, Mark, and*

Homily 2, Book 2, entitled, “Against Peril of Idolatry,” Article 35 of the Anglican Church’s *39 Articles*, includes the following dissertation.

What meaneth it, that they, after the example of the Gentile idolaters, burn incense, offer up gold to images, hang up crutches, chains, and ships, legs, arms, and whole men and women of wax before images, as though by them or Saints (as they say) they were delivered from lameness, sickness, captivity, or shipwreck? ... let them read the eleventh chapter of Daniel the prophet. Who saith of Antichrist, *He shall worship [a] god whom his fathers knew not with gold, silver, and with precious stones, and other things of pleasure* [Dan. 11:38] ... . Wherefore, when we see men and women ... go on pilgrimages to images, kneel before them, hold up their hands before them, set up candles, burn incense before them, offer up gold and silver unto them, hang up ships, crutches, chains, men and women of wax before them, attributing health and safeguard, the gifts of God, to them or the Saints whom they represent (as they rather would have it); who can doubt but that our image maintainers, agreeing in all idolatrous opinions, outward rites and ceremonies, with the Gentile idolaters, agree with them in committing most abominable idolatry?

And, to increase this madness, wicked men, which have the keeping of such images, for their more lucre and advantage, after the example of the Gentile idolaters, have reported and spread abroad, as well by lying tales as written fables, diverse miracles of images ... . [For instance, they say] Such an image was brought by angels ... [or this] image of our Lady was painted by St. Luke ... [or this] cripple came and saluted this Saint of oak, and ... he was made whole; and lo, here hangeth his crutch. Such an one is a tempest vowed to St. Christopher, and escaped; and behold, here is his ship of wax. Such an one by St. Leonard’s help brake out of prison; and see here his fetters hang ... . And, if it were admitted that some miraculous acts were by illusion of the Devil done where images be, (for it is evident that the most part were feigned lies and crafty jugglings of men,) yet followeth it not therefore, that such images are to be honoured ..., neither ought miracles to persuade us contrary to God’s word. For the Scriptures have, for a warning hereof, foreshowed that the kingdom of Antichrist shall be mighty in miracles and wonders to the strong illusion of the reprobate [Matt. 24:24; II Thess. 2:9-12; Rev. 13:13,14]<sup>196</sup>.

The distinction that this Homily makes between “lying tales as written fables, diverse miracles of images” i.e., some fraudulent miracles claimed by Papists; and “some miraculous acts” which “were by illusion of the Devil done where images be” i.e., some real miracles claimed by Papists that are done by the power of the Devil, is a distinction of much value when considering “the miracles” of Francis Xavier, which appear to have instances from both of these two categories e.g., fraudulent claims that he “raised the dead,” intermingled with some genuine miracles. This indicates that if there is “a good Romish fraud” around, the Devil may sometimes decide to work with him by giving him some real miracles, and thus helping to advance the cause of Romanism.

The Roman Catholic, Francis Xavier, was born in Popish Spain in 1506, and died in

---

*Luke*, translated by Reverend William Pringle, Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1861, Volume 3, p. 140.

<sup>196</sup> Griffiths’ *Two Books of Homilies*, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-5.

1552. He was one of the seven original members of the Order of Jesuits, set up under Ignatius Loyola, as part of the Counter-Reformation to hinder, and if at all possible, to halt, the advance of the true and Biblical Gospel of Jesus Christ under Protestantism, as ignited by the Reformation started in 1517 under Martin Luther at Wittenberg in Germany. Like the other Jesuits, Francis Xavier was committed to halting the truth of Biblical Protestantism, by promoting the Romish errors of Popery. He worked as a Romish missionary in Central and East Asia. A key element of his basic approach was to get heathens to swap their old heathen idols, for the new idols of Romanism. For example, when working in Goa, India, in the early 1540s, he used a bit of Popish salesmanship, so that instead of worshipping the heathen Hindu goddess Shiva, ‘have a look at our bigger, brighter, better, idol of Mary.’ Thus aided by the temporal power of the Portuguese, and the spiritual power of devils, Hindu Indians became Papists. And in turn the Roman Church rewarded Francis Xavier, by canonizing him in 1622, thus making him, “Saint” Francis Xavier.

And a bit later than Francis Xavier, the Jesuits moved to set up an Inquisition in Goa from 1560, to help their so called conversion process move along. Thus the Romish Inquisition became “the stick,” and “the carrot” remained these new idols of Romanism. Of course, this is all contrary to the Biblical gospel of justification by faith, and so these Asiatic Indians were not true converts to Christianity. Nevertheless, this type of approach of intermingling supernatural miracles and temporal force looks very much like the type of thing the Roman Antichrist will do at the very end of time when “the mark of the beast” is given out in Rev. 13:13-18 (see “Appendix on the mark of the beast and meaning of 666 in Revelation 13”).

Certainly there are many instances of real miracles that are in fact Satanic miracles, in the Roman Church. Roman Catholic miracles include, for example, the stigmata miracles. In these instances individuals get raw and bloody marks either on their palms or in their wrists, on their foreheads, on either their left or right side, and in their feet, all of which are like Christ’s marks. Here the Roman church claims that these people are especially pious and are participating in Christ’s crucifixion. The first verified case of this was Francis of Assisi (1181-1226), and the Roman Church now recognizes more than 300 genuine instances of the stigmata<sup>197</sup>. However this requires the belief that Christ’s atonement is not completed, that is to say, that it is still ongoing (as in the Roman Mass). Thus this claim should be rejected for we are told in Rom. 5:6, “in due time Christ die for the ungodly.” Therefore the proposition that someone can become part of Christ’s passion in this way, is doubly blasphemous, since it means that the stigmatic is actually participating in the sacrifice of Christ’s passion (compare Heb. 9:25-28). Furthermore, the stigmata miracles attack the doctrine of justification by faith and support a false Gospel of justification by faith *and works*, because by entering into the passion of Christ the stigmatic is considered to be doing a good work that merits him favour with God. God does not act in a manner contrary to his revealed will. Therefore this stigmata phenomena cannot be from God because it attacks the

---

<sup>197</sup> Warfield, B.B., *op. cit.*, “Stigmata,” p. 308. “Stigmata” is a transliteration into English from the Greek, “*stigmata* (neuter plural accusative noun, from *stigma*),” meaning “marks.” Though a relatively small number of fraudulent instances of would be “stigmatics” working up these kind of marks by their own efforts have been discovered, more than 300 instances have now been found in the Roman Church that exhibit supernatural activity and origins. But of all the stigmatics, Francis of Assisi is easily the most famous, having supernaturally received the impression of the stigmata five times, i.e., once on each hand, once on each foot, and also in his side.

completed atonement of Christ on the cross and attacks justification by faith. Yet it is clearly supernatural and occurs with devout Roman Catholics. There are also healing miracles associated with the Roman Church. Sometimes these are by stigmatics such as the twentieth century Italian monk, Padre Pio (1887-1968).

Sometimes there are visions such as the Apparitions of Lourdes in which Bernadette Soubirous is said to have had Mary, the mother of Jesus, appear to her and say, “I am the Immaculate Conception.” Consider this type of phenomena with the words of Colossians 2:18. “Let no one keep defrauding you of your prize by delighting in self-abasement” (NASB) (like the pain a stigmatic suffers from the stigmata), “and worshipping of angels” (like the “veneration” or “special worship” called *dulia* Romanists give to angels<sup>198</sup>, compare Rev. 19:10), “intruding into those things which he hath not seen” (like the “visions” of Bernadette Soubirous who through the power of the Devil thought she saw Mary, the mother of Jesus, but really, “hath not seen” any such thing). What does this passage go on to say about this type of thing? That such a person is “vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind” and is “not holding fast” to Christ (Col. 2:18,19, NKJV). Therefore in all these we see the Papal Antichrist and his antichrist religion “whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9).

Furthermore, the Charismatic or Pentecostal phenomena is known in church history as Montanism, after the heretic Montanus. Tertullian became a religious apostate when he embraced Montanist teaching in 207 A.D. . Like the modern day Charismatics and Pentecostals, the ancient Montanists had an emphasis on ecstatic utterances and prophesy. Hence after he embraced the Montanist heresy, Tertullian said, “We have among us now a sister who has been granted gifts of revelations, which she experiences in church during the Sunday Services through ecstatic visions in the Spirit.” Eusebius describes the Montanists, saying in “Mysia over against Phrygia, Montanus” “first exposed himself to the assaults of the adversary,” that is, the Devil, when he “became possessed of a spirit, and suddenly began to rave in a kind of ecstatic trance, and to babble in a jargon, prophesying in a manner contrary to the custom of the Church.” He rejected this lying wonder and records that the Montanists “were expelled from the Church and debarred from Communion.<sup>199</sup>”

The two key Montanist elements of “tongues” and “prophesy” were also rejected by the Protestant Reformers. In dealing with the error of the Roman Church having services in Latin with people for whom this was an unknown tongue, the Reformers articulated the Biblical teaching from, for example, I Cor. 14, that services should be in the language of the people; thus repudiating the claims of those who like the Montanists, seek to have public worship in “an unknown tongue” (for example, the Anglican Church’s *39 Articles*, Article 24). And in dealing with the error of the Roman Church in claiming extra Biblical revelations in their “ecumenical councils” and “saints,” the Reformers articulated the Biblical teaching from, for example, Eph. 2:20, that Scripture is complete, and this is one element of the *Scripture alone* (Latin, *sola Scriptura*) teaching.

That the Roman Church should, on the one hand, after the *Vatican II Council* cease to violate the Biblical teaching of I Cor. 14 against speaking in church services in an unknown

---

<sup>198</sup> Broderick, R.C., *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, *op. cit.*, “Angel” p. 33 & “Veneration of the Saints” p. 324.

<sup>199</sup> Tertullian, *De amina*, 9, c. 210; Eusebius, HEV 16:7; both in Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 77-8.

tongue by their old way of Latin services, through changing their services from Latin to the language of the people; but then on the other hand, violate the Biblical teaching of I Cor. 14 against speaking in church services in an unknown tongue by their new way of condoning Montanist babblings by embracing the Charismatic or Pentecostal teaching of “tongues;” is NOTHING MORE THAN THE ROMAN CHURCH KEEPING THE SAME HERESY BUT PRESENTING IT IN DIFFERENT CLOTHING. Likewise, the *Vatican II Council* kept all the Roman Church’s old claims to extra Biblical revelations, and so the post *Vatican II Council* Church of Rome can be seen to have exacerbated their basic heresy here, by adding yet another form of extra-Biblical “revelations” in the form of Montanist prophesies by embracing the Charismatic or Pentecostal teaching of “the gift of prophesy.” The Roman Church before the *Vatican II Council*, condemned the Montanist heresy. The Roman Church after the *Vatican II Council*, condones the Montanist heresy. This is a clear change in doctrine by the Church of Rome.

In the Roman Church’s claim that “prophetic visions” or “revelations” are still possible, and occur with both some of their “Saints” and also in the revelations of their “ecumenical councils,” and since the Vatican II Council in Montanist Charismatic or Pentecostal “prophesying,” we come to a core issue of Biblical Christianity. The Protestant Reformers recognized that the gift of prophecy came to instruct those living in Old Testament times and to create the Old Testament, then the prophetic gift disappeared in the inter-testamental period, then it returned to instruct those living in New Testament times and to create the New Testament, and then it disappeared permanently. For example, the *Westminster Confession of Faith* says “nothing at any time is to be added” “unto” “Scripture” “by new revelations of the Spirit” (1:6).

Jesus clearly taught this in Luke 11:49-51 where he refers to “the prophets” “from” “Abel” “unto” “Zacharias,” that is, the Old Testament canon arranged in Jewish order with the thirty-nine books placed on twenty-two scrolls from Genesis to I & II Chronicles, thus rejecting the Apocrypha and any prophetic gift in inter-testamental times, and then says “prophets” returned with “apostles” thus dating these new prophets to the same general time as the apostles, that is, New Testament times, and then says “the blood of all the prophets” would “be required of this generation.” The only way that “this generation” could be judged for “the blood of all the prophets” is if “all the prophets” existed by then. Since this was said about 30 A.D., and if a little baby then alive was the youngest of “this generation” to be a prophet, he would die by about 100 A.D. (if he lived to about 70, Ps. 90:10), this requires a termination of the prophetic gift by about 130 at the latest, and indeed the canon of Scripture closed with the Book of Revelation around 96 A.D. . Moreover, the prophet Daniel foretold that the Messiah would “seal up vision and prophet” (Dan. 9:24, ASV footnote), that is, the gift of “prophecy” (Dan. 9:24, AV), and so Christ fulfilled this by declaring in Luke 11:49-51 that the prophetic gift would cease within 70 to 100 years of about 30 A.D. .

The Apostle Paul also clearly taught this, saying, “if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away” (I Cor. 13:8, NASB). He dated this termination time by saying “apostles and prophets” were for the church’s “foundation” period (Eph. 2:20). This nexus between “apostles and prophets” shows both are limited in time to the church’s “foundation” in New Testament times, and so neither can exist after apostolic New Testament times. The Apostle Paul died before the Book of Revelation. When Jesus appointed his apostles in about 30 A.D., they were all adult men, so the minimal possible age for any would be about 20 years old. If a person who was 20 in 30 A.D., lived to be 70 years of age he would die in 80 A.D. and if he lived to be 100 years of age, he would die in 110 A.D. . This means *the*

*prophetic gift which existed among more than just the apostles, but which existed only during apostolic times*, had to cease between 80 and 110 A.D. . When these 80 to 110 A.D. dates are compared with the dates from Luke 11:49-51 of the prophetic gift ceasing between 100 and 130 A.D., the overlap between these two ranges of dates means that the prophetic gift had to cease between about 100 and 110 A.D. . The Book of Revelation was written in about 96 A.D., but the prophetic gift would have continued for some years in order for these prophets to confirm to the body of believers that the Book of Revelation was inspired. But all such prophets would have ceased to possess the gift of prophesy within a maximum period of about 15 years of St. John penning the final “Amen” to the Book of Revelation. Thus the Protestant recognition of *sola scriptura* (Scripture alone) struck down the Romish pretensions to “visions” or “revelation” in their “Saints” or “ecumenical councils.” That is, the recognition that the gift of prophecy existed only in Bible times, means any claim to this gift either in inter-testamental or post New Testament times (including a very short period of no more than 15 years after the New Testament was completed,) is thus necessarily the claim of a false prophet, and so in the Protestant teaching of *Scripture alone* the Reformers exposed the Church of Rome’s “signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9) in claiming the prophetic gift. Thus all Papal claims to an extra Biblical Divine revelation are clearly false.

## CHAPTER 10

### **The mystery of iniquity doth already work (II Thess. 2:7): justification by works.**

In the Gospel Jesus refers to those who say to him “Lord, Lord, have we not ... in thy name ... cast out devils? And in thy name done many wonderful works?” But Jesus then says to them, “I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:22,23). The Greek word for “iniquity” in Matt. 7:23 is *anomia* referring to law-breaking, and this same Greek word is found in II Thess. 2:7 where we read of “the mystery of iniquity.” In both Matt. 7:21-23 and II Thess. 2:7,9, it is clear that while those who work “iniquity” may perform many miracles, they do so by the power of the Devil rather than the power of God; and their “iniquity” or violations of God’s holy law, evident for example in the Ten Commandments acts to expose such persons as religious deceivers.

In his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, St. Paul says “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” (II Thess. 2:7); and in his Epistle to the Galatians, he refers to Judaizers who like the later Roman Church adopted justification by works (covenant of works) rather than justification by faith (covenant of grace). This clearly includes related matters of salvation and regeneration referred to in e.g., I John 3:1,9; 5:1,4,18. Martin Luther’s recovery of the doctrine of justification by faith (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16; 3:11,12,26) at the first stage or Lutheran stage of the Reformation, stands as the defining moment in the rise of Protestantism. The Reformation catch-cry: *Faith alone, Grace Alone, Scripture Alone*, found in the Latin of the Reformation Motto: *sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*, grew from men regenerated by the Holy Ghost who had accepted the gospel of justification by faith alone (Rom. 1-11).

But to understand more fully the issues concerning the “two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar,” i.e., the covenant of works, as opposed to the covenant of grace (Gal. 4:21-31), one must consider some elements in the second stage of the Reformation. The second stage Reformation teaching of covenants constitutes important Protestant teaching (notwithstanding disagreements among the orthodox on this matter, which ultimately affected “third stage” Reformation Confessions among

Puritan Protestants).

It is clear from Gal. 3 and other Scriptures, that there has only been *one covenant of grace* by which men have been saved, namely, the *covenant of grace*, or eternal or “everlasting covenant” (Heb. 13:20), which has operated as a covenant *inside* both OT and NT covenants. (Cf. the Jewish “sabbath” as a “covenant,” Exod. 31:14,16, inside the Sinai “covenant” Exod. 24:7,8.) This covenant of grace dates from Adam’s time after the Fall (Gen. 3:15), being known to Adam’s son, Abel (Gen. 4:1-4; Heb. 11:4). But it was “foreordained” (I Peter 1:20) “before the world began” (I Tim. 1:9; Titus 1:2). The covenant of grace resulted from a covenant agreement being made between the Father and the Son, and in the Son all of “his” elect “seed” (Ps. 89:26-29; Zech. 6:13); and the covenant of grace is made between the Trinitarian God and the elect person with Christ as its surety (Isa. 55:1-3; Heb. 7:22). This agreement on the covenant of grace is maintained notwithstanding diversity among the orthodox as to whether the covenant of grace agreement between the Father and Son is seen as a separate covenant, namely, “the covenant of redemption;” or whether (as in my view,) this agreement between the Father and Son is seen as one element of the covenant of grace i.e., there is no separate covenant of redemption.

There are rival Reformation views among the orthodox as to whether the covenant of grace was inside the Sinai covenant, but was abused and misunderstood by NT Jews who wrongly turned it into a *covenant of works* (historic view of e.g., Presbyterians, John Brown of Haddington, and some Reformed Anglicans); or whether (as I think is the case,) the Sinai covenant was a *covenant of works*, given as a theoretically alternative way of salvation, but one which due to original sin no man could ever keep so as to merit salvation, so that his *necessary* failure was meant to drive him to cry out for mercy under the *covenant of grace* (historic view of e.g., Congregationalist John Owen, Reformed Baptists, and some Reformed Anglicans). Whichever view one takes on the Sinai covenant, the orthodox holding to the second stage of the Reformation agree that Gal 3:17,18 teaches “the covenant” of grace was not disannulled by the Sinai covenant, and that Abraham had this covenant “confirmed” to him i.e., it predates Abraham; and from other Scriptures, are agreed that it goes back to Adam’s time after the Fall. This area of agreement on the one, eternal, covenant of grace as being the only way that men have ever been saved since the Fall, and operating as a covenant within various OT and NT covenants so that it was administered differently in the Old and New Testaments, represents the orthodox teaching of the second stage of the Reformation.

Thus as part of the teaching of the second stage of the Reformation, orthodox Protestants accept that a covenant of works was made with Adam before the Fall, and that this may be contrasted with the covenant of grace (Rom. 5:12-21). From this covenant theology comes the classic second stage Reformation teaching of threefold imputation i.e., Adam’s sin is imputed to every human being at conception (Ps. 51:5) under the covenant of works (as opposed to the Augustinian notion of original sin found at the first stage of the Reformation), our sins are imputed to Christ when he suffered and died for them, and Christ’s righteousness is imputed to the saved under the covenant of grace. The orthodox who accept the second stage of the Reformation doctrine of covenants, also recognize that the NT contrasts the covenant of grace and covenant of works in e.g., Rom. 3:27; 6:14; Gal. 2:21; 3:12; 4:24. This area of agreement is maintained notwithstanding rival views among the orthodox as to whether this covenant of works referred to in the NT is: the Sinai covenant which men may fruitlessly seek to be justified under (my view), or the covenant made with Adam as a covenant of works which men may fruitlessly seek to be justified under, or the Sinai covenant as it was misinterpreted by the Jews to be a covenant of works which they

fruitlessly sought to be justified under.

The Roman Pontiff and his Roman Church do not accept the first stage Reformation teaching on justification by faith, much less do they recognize the second stage Reformation teaching on covenants. But to the extent that the Apostle Paul clearly teaches the existence of “two covenants” (Gal. 4:24), in the context of iniquitous “heresies” (Gal. 5:20) against justification by faith which were already at work in Galatia (Gal. 1:6-9; 23:16; 3 & 4), this Judaizing teaching that Christians should walk in the covenant of works rather than the covenant of grace, is yet another example of how “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” (II Thess. 2:7) in apostolic times. This heresy was present with the Judaizers at Galatia, and was then later found in Romanism under the Roman Pontiff.

## CHAPTER 11

### **The Antichrist’s iniquity (I Tim. 3:16; 4:1-4)**

*“The mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) counterfeits “The mystery of godliness” (I Tim. 3:16). Giving heed to seducing spirits” and “Forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:1,3): Romish religious orders cannot marry. “Forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3): Romish marital indissolubility. “Forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3): Romish Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity. “Commanding to abstain from meats” (I Tim. 4:3). I Tim. 3:16-4:5 in overview.*

*“The mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) counterfeits  
“The mystery of godliness” (I Tim. 3:16).*

The Apostle Paul first says, “without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory” (I Tim. 3:16). Then he says, “that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith” (I Tim. 4:1). This means that in studying the great apostasy here foretold by the Apostle Paul, and also foretold elsewhere by the Apostle Paul as a “falling away” (II Thess. 2:3) with the rise of “the mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), the matters isolated in I Tim. 3:16 to 4:5 have a special relevance.

*Prima facie*, the Church of Rome may appear to believe in the “mystery of godliness” described in I Tim. 3:16, in most, though not all instances, through reference to the three universal (or “catholic”) creeds, namely, the Apostles’, Athanasian, and Nicene. Of these three creeds, the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, Article 7, rightly says, they “ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrant of holy Scripture.” But under stricter scrutiny, the Church of Rome in fact denies the “mystery of godliness.” The statement that Christ was “seen of angels” refers to the witness of angels with respect to his incarnation (Luke 2:9,10,13); his temptation in the wilderness (Matt. 4:11; Mark 1:13), his bodily resurrection (Matt. 28:2,5; Luke 24:4-7,23; John 20:12); and his ascension (Acts 1:9-11); when he was “received up into glory” (I Tim. 3:16). One reason for this emphasis on the human body of Christ, and the fact that if it is present it can be clearly “seen,” but now it has been “received up into glory” and gone into heaven, becomes apparent when it is remembered that those in the apostasy that “depart from the faith” (I Tim. 4:1), will deny that Christ “was manifest in the flesh” (I Tim. 3:16). This the Church of Rome does by

her teaching of transubstantiation in the Mass, for “the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances,” “and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (Final Rubric of “The Communion Service,” *Church of England Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

There is another reason for the reference to Christ being “seen of angels” with respect to his temptation in the wilderness (Matt. 4:11; Mark 1:13). Christ had the sinless human nature of Adam before the Fall (Eccl. 7:29, NKJV; II Cor. 5:21; Heb. 7:26; 9:14; I Peter 1:19; 2:22 // Isa. 53:9; 1 John. 3:5; ), not the fallen sinful human nature of Adam and all other men after the Fall (II Chron. 6:36; Ps. 51:5; Rom. 7:14-25). He showed that Adam before the Fall need not have sinned, *not* that fallen men after the Fall can attain sinless perfection. In the Garden of Eden, Satan devil-possessed a serpent, and came to Eve at a time of *greater vulnerability* while she was by herself (Gen. 3:1), and then came to Adam at a time of *greater vulnerability* through his wife who had already eaten the apple (Gen. 3:6)<sup>200</sup>. In the temptation in the wilderness, Satan also came to the second Adam a time of *greater vulnerability*, after he had “fasted forty days and forty nights,” and now “hungered” (Matt. 4:2). But where the first Adam failed, the second Adam triumphed. In the Garden of Eden, Satan tempted Adam and Eve with food (Gen. 3:1,6). In the temptation in the wilderness, Satan also tempted the second Adam with food (Matt. 4:3,4). But where the first Adam failed, the second Adam triumphed. In the Garden of Eden, Satan tempted Adam and Eve to distrust God’s Word, which said, “thou shalt not eat of it” (Gen. 2:17), as “the serpent said,” “Ye shall not surely die” (Gen. 3:3,4). In the temptation in the wilderness, Satan also tempted the second Adam to distrust God’s Word, by twisting Ps. 91:11 so as to expound it in a way that made it repugnant to another part of Scripture, namely, Deut. 6:16 (Matt. 4:5-7). But where the first Adam failed, the second Adam triumphed. In the Garden of Eden, Satan tempted Adam and Eve to worship another god other than the true God, namely themselves, saying, “ye shall be as gods” (Gen. 3:5), promising that if this was done that they would gain something, namely, “knowing good and evil” (Gen. 3:5). In the temptation in the wilderness, Satan also tempted the second Adam to worship another god other than the true God, namely Satan himself, saying, “fall down and worship me,” promising that if this was done that he would gain something, namely, “the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them” (Matt. 4:8-10). But where the first Adam failed, the second Adam triumphed.

It might be asked, how the *Church of Rome* denies this wonderful truth, that the Second Adam, having overcome in areas that the first Adam failed, was then “seen of angels” (I Tim. 3:16) which ministered to him (Matt. 4:11; Mark 1:12,13). *Prima facie* the Church of Rome accepts the teaching of Christ’s sinless human nature, through reference to e.g., its

---

<sup>200</sup> In S. of Sol. 8:5, the apple tree cannot be where Solomon was born, since being the son of King David he was born in a palace. Thus like other parts of the Song of Solomon which refer to Christ (e.g., S. of Sol. 5:10-14, cf. Rev. 1:14), and his bride the church (e.g., S. of Sol. 4:7; 6:4,9,10 cf. II Cor. 10:4; 11:2; Eph. 5:27; Rev. 12:1), this must refer to Christ. But Christ was born in a stable, and so if “brought forth” “under the apple tree,” this must be allegorical, referring to the fact that Christ was “made under the law” (Gal. 4:4) which convicts men of sin (Rom. 7:7), and ultimately stems from original sin (Rom. 5:12). If so, the imagery of Christ being born “under the apple tree,” that is, into a world of sin, has no propriety unless sin is symbolized by an apple, for which reason it follows that the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden must have been an apple, as church tradition harmonious with Scripture also amply testifies.

acceptance of the Trinitarian teaching in the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) . But the great truth that Christ “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15), is seriously undermined by the Romish teaching of the “immaculate conception of Mary,” in which it is claimed that *Mary also* was sinless and had the sinless human nature of Adam and Eve *before* the Fall. Thus the great spectacle of Christ’s temptation in the wilderness, which involved Christ being “seen of angels,” and which testifies that Christ was without sin, is undermined by denying its uniqueness. Mary was certainly sinful. She committed such sins as negligence (Luke 2:41-45 cf. II Chron. 29:11), ignorance (Luke 2:49 cf. Lev. 4:2,27,28), dishonesty (“Why hast thou thus dealt with us,” AV, or ” “Why have you treated us this way?,” NASB, Luke 2:48,49), and presumption (John 2:3,4 cf. Ps. 19:13). “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23). Thus the Romish doctrine of the “immaculate conception of Mary,” in which it is claimed that “Mary, at the first instance of her conception,” “was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin<sup>201</sup>,” in effect denies the great truth of Christ’s uniqueness in being “without sin” (Heb. 4:15), and so *in substance* denies a fundamental feature in the teaching of Christ’s temptation in the wilderness, “seen of angels” (I Tim. 3:16).

The Church of Rome also denies that Christ was “justified in the Spirit” in three clear ways. In the first place, Christ is “justified” (AV) or “vindicated in the Spirit” (NASB), by the promised coming of the Holy Ghost who witnesses to Christ, and is a “Comforter” who represents Christ (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7-13). But the blasphemous claim of the Roman Pope to be the “Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction in the church usurps the place of the Holy Ghost, and so makes the Pope “the son of perdition” who can never be saved (Matt. 12:32; II Thess. 2:3; Rev. 20:10) i.e., he blasphemes the Holy Ghost by usurping his place.

Furthermore, Christ was “vindicated in the Spirit” (I Tim. 3:16, NASB) when he “triumphed over” “principalities and powers” (Col. 2:15), expressed in his triumphal march through hell. For after his spirit went to God (Luke 23:43,46), entering the heavenly Most Holy Place (Heb. 9:12,24-28; 10:19), signified by the earthly “veil of the temple” being “rent in the midst” (Luke 23:45), his “soul” then descended into “hell” (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27). Here, though “being put to death in the flesh,” he was made alive “by the Spirit, by which” “he went and preached unto the” disembodied “spirits” of antediluvians “in prison” (I Peter 3:18,19), telling them that their rebellious desires to partake of such forbidden lusts as miscegenation and murder (Gen. 6:1-4,9-13), had not ultimately thwarted the purposes of God, and that they would continue to be punished in hell for their wickedness, for he had “triumphed over” all his enemies (Col. 2:15). Thus Christians who were spiritually baptized and had “a good conscience toward God,” would by his grace “no longer” “live” “in” these “lusts” and other similar sins (I Peter 3:21; 4:2,3). But Christ “was not left in hell” (Acts 2:31); for then the bodily “resurrection of Jesus Christ” (I Peter 3:21) occurred, “through the” effective operation of “the blood of the everlasting covenant” of grace (Heb. 13:20), as Christ rose on “the first of the week” or “the first of the Sabbaths” (John 20:1).

The glorious truth that Christ was thus “vindicated in the Spirit” (I Tim. 3:16, NASB), by his triumphal march through hell, is denied by the Roman Church who seek to use I Peter 3:18,19 to teach the spurious doctrine of purgatory (II Macc. 12:39-45, *Apocrypha*). Christ specifically rejected the idea that hell could ever be some kind of purgatory, since after they

---

<sup>201</sup> Blakeney’s *Manuel of Romish Controversy*, *op. cit.*, p. 182 (1854 Dogma of Pope Pius IX).

have been in hell for some time, at “the resurrection of damnation” (John 5:29), he says some will say unto him, “Lord, Lord,” and seek to “enter the kingdom of heaven,” but he will say, “I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:21-23). So too, in the parable of Lazarus and Dives, when Dives is “in hell,” and “tormented in this flame,” he raises a petition, “Father Abraham, have mercy on me.” But this possibility is rejected, for between heaven with “Abraham” and “hell,” “there is,” says Abraham, “a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence” (Luke 16:24-31).

As the late nineteenth century *Church of England* Canon of York, Canon Blakeney has observed, the Romish doctrine of purgatory is contrary to many Scriptures, including Luke 23:42; Rom. 8:1; II Cor. 5:1,8; Eph. 1:7; 4:32; Philp. 1:21,23; Col. 2:18; Heb. 1:3; I John 1:7; Rev. 7:14; 14:13<sup>202</sup>. For Christ says, “I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work” (John 9:4). And Scripture says, “now,” not some future time in purgatory, but “now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation” (II Cor. 6:2). “And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment” (Heb. 9:27), in which “the spirits of just men” are “made perfect.” For the saved “are come unto” “the heavenly Jerusalem” (Heb. 12:22,23). Thus for us who are redeemed, “we have boldness in the day of judgment,” for which “there is no fear,” “because fear hath torment” (I John 4: 17,18), such as in the Romish doctrine of purgatory, whereas “he that hath the Son hath life” (I John 5:12).

Moreover, Christ has been “vindicated in the Spirit” (I Tim. 3:16, NASB) by the authority of an infallible Bible. For “prophecy came” as “men” “were moved by the Holy Ghost” (II Peter 1:21), and indeed all of Scripture was “given by inspiration of God” (I Tim. 3:16), and preserved by God (I Peter 1:25). The Greek word here for “inspiration” is *Theopneustos* from *Theos* meaning “God” and *pneo* meaning to “breathe,” i.e., the Bible is “God-breathed.” The Greek word for “Spirit” or “breath” is also *pneuma*, so that to say Scripture is “God-breathed” is to say it is inspired by the Holy *Spirit* of God. Indeed, God chose the very words the Bible writers were to use, taking them from their vocabulary so as to preserve distinctive writing styles. This is called, “verbal inspiration.” For example, God said to Isaiah, “I have put my words in thy mouth” (Isa. 51:16), and to Jeremiah, “whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak” (Jer. 1:7). Thus the psalmist declared, “For ever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in heaven” (Ps. 119:89). But the Church of Rome rejects a Divinely Inspired and Divinely Preserved authoritative Bible. Like the Colossian heretics, Romanism is based on “vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8). Like the Judaism of Jesus’ day, it may be said of Roman Catholicism, “Full well ye reject the commandments of God, that ye may keep your own tradition” (Mark 7:9), e.g., the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6; I Cor. 6:9; 10:14) is hid from their people, and set aside by such idolatrous Romish practices as adoration of the communion elements, as well as worshipping and adoration of images and relics. Since the Church of Rome rejects an authoritative Bible, they deny the Biblical witness about Christ, and that he was “vindicated in the Spirit” (I Tim. 3:16, NASB) by the Bible. Rather, they substitute an unBiblical Christ for the Biblical Christ.

The Church of Rome also denies that the pure gospel of Christ was “preached,” and “believed on” (I Tim. 3:16). For the Apostle Paul said, “I” “preach the gospel” (Rom. 1:15). And in Gen. 15:6 “what saith Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto

---

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 167-70.

him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. 4:3-5). Homily 3, Book 1, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* refers e.g., to Basil of Caesarea (c. 329-379). “St. Basil, a Greek author, writeth thus: ‘This is a perfect and a whole rejoicing in God, when a man advanceth not himself for his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth himself to lack true justice and righteousness, and to be justified by the only faith in Christ. And Paul,’ saith he, ‘doth glory in the contempt of his own righteousness, and that he looketh for *the righteousness of God by faith*’” (Philp. 3:9)<sup>203</sup>.

This denial of justification by faith by Romish “good works” has many forms, such as pilgrimages, fastings, and asking saint “mediators” to pray for people on the basis that these saints in heaven have “merits” of their own by which they can aid their petitioners. E.g., the (10 February) Collect for the sixth century nun, “Saint” Scholastica (the sister of “Saint” Benedict), asks that the petitioner “may deserve to attain eternal joys” “by” the “prayers and merits” of the “blessed virgin Scholastica.” Or the (2 April) Collect of “Saint” Francis of Paula, a sixteenth century hermit sent by Pope Sixtus IV (Pope 1471-1484) to France, claims that “Francis” was “raised” “to the glory of the saints,” for which reason the petitioner seeks “by his merits and example,” to “obtain” “happiness” in heaven. Or the (19 June) Collect of the fourteenth century “Saint” Juliana Falconieri, whom the *Saint Andrew Daily Missal* says, “had a great devotion to the holy Eucharist and practised to a rare degree the Servite devotion to the Sorrows of our Lady,” asks that “through her merits that when” the petitioner’s “last hour shall come,” the petitioner “may be comforted and strengthened and safely guided” “to” their “heavenly home<sup>204</sup>.” Yet behind such “invocation of saints” lies nothing but the power of devils, and it is therefore surely noteworthy that we read in the next verse of these religious apostates “giving heed to seducing spirits” (I Tim. 4:1).

The fact that Papal Rome *prima facie* appears to believe in the “mystery of godliness,” but under stricter scrutiny denies the “mystery of godliness,” is significant. It means that “the mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), is in fact a *counterfeit* of “the mystery of godliness” (I Tim. 3:16). As James Wylie observed, “We read but once of the ‘mystery of godliness,’ and but once of the ‘mystery of iniquity.’” “They stand over against each other: the ‘mystery of iniquity,’ fashioning its outward character and [re]semblance upon the ‘mystery of godliness,’ making it its pattern, till at last the ‘mystery of iniquity’ presents itself to the world a perfect imitation and counterfeit of the ‘mystery of godliness.’ Seeing the two mysteries stand so related to each other, the one mystery interprets the other.”<sup>205</sup>

“Giving heed to seducing spirits” and “Forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:1,3):

---

<sup>203</sup> Griffiths’ *The Two Books of Homilies*, *op. cit.*, p. 28; referring to Basil’s Homily 20, De Humilitate, 3; Opp. 2, 158 E (modernizing “knowledgeth” to “aknowledgeth”).

<sup>204</sup> Lefebvre, G, *Saint Andrew Daily Missal*, *op. cit.*, p. 1133, 1189, 1269-70. By contrast, the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* offers Biblically sound prayer in the Collects of red-letter days “through Jesus Christ our Lord” on e.g., Saint Michael and all Angels Day (29 Sept), or “through the merits of” “Jesus Christ our Lord” on Saint Luke’s Day (18 Oct.). And the black-letter days of the 1662 prayer book Calendar have no specifically required religious observance, and only in some general way remember those named, as in some way, however limited, offering some kind of good example.

<sup>205</sup> Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist*, p. 24.

*Romish religious orders cannot marry.*

Papal “sin” (II Thess. 2:3) or “lawlessness” (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV) includes the setting aside of God’s law on marriage. The Bible teaches that celibacy is “good” for those who are called to it and have the gift of “continency” / singleness like the Apostle Paul (I Cor. 7:1,7,8,26); but those who marry have “not sinned” (I Cor. 7:28) since marriage is also a “good thing” (Prov. 18:22), “honourable” and “undefiled” (Heb. 13:4), for those called to it like the Apostle Peter (Mark 1:30; I Cor. 9:5). The gift of continency gives a believer an option, either to marry, or not to marry, but in the latter case a believer with this gift will not “burn” with sexual lust (I Cor. 7:9) and commit fornication. This is clear from I Cor. 7:27,28,36-38, where celibacy is urged on those with the gift of continency due to the distresses of the times, but they are also told they may marry if they wish. Hence those who engage “in marriage doeth well, but” those who do not “doeth better” (I Cor. 7:38). Thus on the one hand, the Apostle Paul could say he had the gift of continency (I Cor. 7:7); but on the other hand, he could say that he had the “right to lead about a wife that is a sister” in the Lord, if he so chose (I Cor. 9:5, ASV footnote). Thus the gift of continency leaves a person heterosexual and with a capacity to marry if the person so wishes, but this gift also gives that person the capacity not to marry and not to live in inordinate lust and fornicate.

This is quite different to the Romish teaching of celibacy since it presumes, contrary to I Cor. 9:5; I Tim. 3:2,11,12; Titus 1:6, that those in religious orders necessarily have the gift of continency. It also holds contrary to I Cor. 7:7,27,28,36-38; 9:5, that such persons are not permitted to marry and remain within religious orders. Thus Rome gives “heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” by “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:1,3) persons in their religious orders, for example, priests, monks, and nuns (compare I Tim. 3:2,12). Furthermore, in Rom. 1 we read of how those in idolatry may become “reprobate” and given over to all kinds of “covetousness” (Rom. 1:22-25,28,29), including therefore sexual covetousness and lust (Exod. 20:17). Since the Roman Church is deeply into idolatry, with its adoration of the consecrated Communion bread, or veneration and adoration of images of saints, especially Mary, we should not be surprised if they are given over to inordinate sexual lust. This is one element of I Tim. 4:1, since it is by the power of “seducing spirits” that idols such as those found in Rome operate.

The Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (2:1) says “of the marriage of priests,” “in Germany, not until about four hundred years” before 1530, “were the priests by violence compelled to live a single life,” by “the Pope of Rome’s decree.” The Apostle “Paul calleth that ‘a doctrine of devils’ which forbideth marriage (I Tim. 4:1,3).” Commenting on “forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats” (I Tim. 4:3), the independent Reformed Baptist preacher, Charles Hadden Spurgeon remarks, “How well this describes the Church of Rome, which combines both superstitions.<sup>206</sup>” Or in *Brown’s Bible* (1778), the Scottish Presbyterian Minister, John Brown of Haddington (d. 1787), says of “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3), that to “forbid clergymen or others to marry,” has the effect of “thus exposing them to temptations to unchastity<sup>207</sup>.”

---

<sup>206</sup> *Spurgeon’s Devotional Bible* (1870), p. 725 (I Tim. 4:3).

<sup>207</sup> Brown’s *Study Bible* of 1778, also known as *The Self-Interpreting Bible*, with notes by the Reverend John Brown of Haddington, Scotland (1722-1787), Revised Edition with the appended notes of the Rev. Dr. Henry Cooke (1788-1868) and Rev. Dr. Josiah Porter (1823-1889), Gresham, London & Glasgow, [19th century edition, printing year undated, late 19th century or early 20th century].

The Anglican clergyman, Henry Jones Alcock, documents how under mediaeval Romanism, the Romish doctrine of celibacy resulted in gross sexual immorality by Roman Catholic clergy, including various Popes who had bastard children. The documentation in Alcock's book includes, for example, nunneries that were brothels, and monks who raped nuns, and while he does not suggest that the sexual immorality he documents in the monastic system is always as extreme as prostitution and rape, he nevertheless finds that the incidents of sexual immorality are so great that "the evils" are "inseparable from the monastic system." An investigation of some monasteries in 1536 and 1537 by two commissioners, Richard Layton and Thomas Leigh, found a great deal of monkish foulness in the monasteries, and they were mercifully abolished in England under Henry VIII's wise closure of the monasteries from 1536 to 1540. But Alcock's book is also concerned with the sexually immoral tendency of the confessional, since Romish priests have sometimes coupled the use of the confessional with their sexual desires to target vulnerable victims. E.g., in the Preface to Alcock's *English Mediaeval Romanism*, the Rev. Dr. Richard P. Blakeney says "the confessional and celibacy produce immorality. It is so in every Roman Catholic country<sup>208</sup>." Alcock's work does not refer simply to isolated incidents but a general trend in a Church whose idolatry means it is "giving heed to seducing spirits" (I Tim. 4:1), well documented frequently from Roman Catholic sources, to show a high incidence of sexual immorality by Romish priests, monks, and nuns in connection with the celibacy requirement being imposed by the Roman Church "forbidding to marry" (I Tim. 4:3).

The historic unchastity specifically documented by Alcock is of a heterosexual kind. However, in more recent times, the Roman Church has been embroiled in cases of sexual immorality from Romish clergy either seducing or raping minors, especially, though not exclusively, in the form of homosexual sodomy. Once again, the connection to Romish idolatry is relevant since Romans 1 teaches that God sometimes gives people of to a homosexual orientation as a Divine Judgment on them for their idolatry.

Thus, for example, in the Unites States of America alone, a survey commissioned on behalf of the US Roman Church's hierarchy, found that between 1950 and 2002 there were 11,000 allegations of child sexual abuse against 4,450 Romish priests. Of theses, 3,300 or 30 per cent, were unable to be investigated because the priests involved had died before the allegations were made. 1,000 or about 9 per cent were investigated and found to be false. But a staggering 6,700 or about 61 per cent had been investigated and substantiated. However a prominent victims abuse group, called the "'Survivors' Network of those Abused by Priests" claimed the real numbers were even higher. Yet even if, for the sake of argument, we stipulate that the lower figures used by the Church of Rome herself are correct, this means that of the 7,700 cases that they did investigate 6,700 or 87 per cent were substantiated. Taken over the fifty-two year period till 2002, this means that on the Roman Church's own figures, on average two or three cases per week, or 128 cases per annum, of child sexual assault by Romish priests has occurred each year for over half a century in the United States of America alone!<sup>209</sup>

In July 2004 the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Portland, Oregon, USA, announced

---

<sup>208</sup> Alcock, H.J., *English Mediaeval Romanism*, *op. cit.*, e.g., pp. vi-viii, xiii (Preface), xiii (Introduction), 157-9, 162-4; 175, 177.

<sup>209</sup> *British Church Newspaper* 5 March 2004 (reproduced in *Faith & Freedom*, "4,450 RC priests accused of sex abuse," March 2004, p. 4).

that it was filing for bankruptcy because *it needed protection* from its large number of creditors arising from the cost of many lawsuits against it from victims of sexual abuse by Roman Catholic priests. The Archdiocese had already paid out tens of millions of dollars to settle over 130 claims, and there were dozens of more cases still pending when they made the announcement. This means that insult has been added to injury for the sexual victims of these Popish priests. By this action the Roman Church has shown it is interested in the *protection* of its financial coffers, but it has also shown that it lacks any comparable interest in the *protection* of these victims of Romish priests.

This was then followed in the same year, for the same reasons, with bankruptcy in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson, Arizona, and then the Roman Catholic Diocese of Spokane, Washington. It seems hard to see anything but general callous indifference by the Roman Church on such matters, when e.g., one considers that just one month before his diocese filed for bankruptcy, in November 2004 the Romish Bishop of Spokane, William Skylstad, had been elected for a three year term as the President of the *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops* (USCCB). The situation in which the Diocese of Spokane was about to declare bankruptcy due to law suits flowing from gross, persistent, and prolonged child sexual abuse by Romish priests of that diocese, neither prevented his election, nor led to immediate calls for his resignation from that position. The Pope of Rome did not feel obliged to intervene and demand Bishop Skylstad's removal, even though Scripture says, "A bishop" (meaning any church overseer, e.g., a bishop in an Anglican structure, or any local pastor in any Protestant Church), "must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach" (I Tim. 3:1,7). It is surely notable, that at this same USCCB meeting, these same Romanist Bishops voted against a proposal to urge those of the Roman obedience to read the Bible<sup>210</sup>.

In seeking to better understand the Roman Church's action of filing for bankruptcy in her USA's Archdiocese of Portland, Diocese of Tucson in 2004, the Diocese of Spokane in 2004, the Diocese of San Diego in California in 2007 (following an agreement to pay c. \$198 million in over 140 child sexual abuses cases)<sup>211</sup>, or the Diocese of Wilmington in Delaware in 2009 (again with over 140 claims filed by persons claiming they had been sexually abused)<sup>212</sup>, it may be helpful to consider that it would seem that these victims have offended the Roman Church in *two* particulars. Firstly, they did *challenge the authority of the Roman Church* by taking the matter to court for settlement, rather than allowing the Roman Church to settle it with them behind closed doors, with, for example, the Popish Diocesan Archbishop or Bishop fully compensating them by offering them "a warm smile," and perhaps a *small* sum of money. Secondly, they did *target the bellies of the priests* by seeking to get money from the Roman Church. Both of these seemingly were regarded by the Roman Church *in a dim light*.

---

<sup>210</sup> Cloud, D.W., "[Roman] Catholic Bishops Vote Against Urging People to Read Bible," Friday Church News Notes, 26 Nov. 2004, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, Mi, 48061, USA ([www.wayoflife.org](http://www.wayoflife.org)); in *Faith & Freedom*, P.O. Box 88, Para Hills, South Australia, 5096, Jan. 2005, p. 11.

<sup>211</sup> "Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego" *Wikipedia* (27 May 2010) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman\\_Catholic\\_Diocese\\_of\\_San\\_Diego](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman_Catholic_Diocese_of_San_Diego)).

<sup>212</sup> "US [Roman] Catholic diocese files for bankruptcy protection" (Reuters, 19 Oct. 2009) (<http://www.wastoday.com.au/business/us-catholic-diocese-files-for-bankruptcy-protection-20091019-h40j.html>).

Whether such sexual immorality has the form of seduction, or the form of rape (in which case it is even more serious, since it is both a *sexual* sin and a sin of *violence*), and whether or not such sexual immorality involves unnatural acts (if so, it is even more serious again as it is *against nature*), the Bible teaches that all fornicators should be excommunicated (I Cor. 5:11). Yet the Church of Rome avoids such strong Biblical action, and shows tolerance to these fornicators in Romish religious orders, in a number of instances simply transferring known child molesters from one parish to another. Thus, for example, in recent years three Roman Catholic European bishops have resigned, or in North America, the senior ecclesiastical figure of Cardinal Bernard Law resigned, in connection with a failure to deal properly with Romish priestly sexual abuse of minors. A similar type of attitude has often been adopted to those espousing murderous and seditious notions (e.g., Gal. 5:20,21) in Central and South America with “liberation theology.” Like the child molester Roman Catholic priests who have not been adequately disciplined, but just “had their wrists slapped” and moved on to another Roman Catholic parish, those promoting “liberation theology” views in South America have not generally been disciplined adequately. Notably, the former Roman Catholic priest and convert to Protestantism who now runs Berean Ministries in the USA, Richard Bennett, attributes Roman “Catholic laws on celibacy for priests, as a cause of the crisis” of child-molestation<sup>213</sup>.

On the one hand, in fairness to the Church of Rome and others, it must be said that media reports on these types of incidents are not always balanced and fair, that false allegations are sometimes made, in some instances irrational and emotive parents wrongly believe inaccurate claims by their children, and adolescent minors sometimes fantasize sexual acts from an adult in authority. This problem is more acute in areas where no evidence can be adduced, e.g., the claim of a sexual connotation to “being looked at” by a school teacher, or the false claim that an adult male was “sexually aroused” when he “looked at” them. This is especially likely in group dynamics of children aged about 12 to 16 where if one claims such a thing happened, a number of other children may fantasize this and claim they too “saw” it on this or another occasion. Such over-sexed children, both boys and girls, may e.g., fantasize that a an adult male “has an erection” on the basis of either focusing their minds on the normal bulge in male trousers in the genitalia region, or by focusing their minds on the normal crease that forms in trousers when a male sits down, either of which can be wrongly interpreted by their immature over-sexed minds as “an erection.” (It is also exacerbated by post 1960s sexually immoral fashion trends, in which many men wear jeans and other trousers *on the hips*, thus making the male genitalia protrude more; and this can be further accentuated by tighter fitting trousers in the genitalia region e.g., jeans. This is part of the over-sexed cultural climate that can affect adolescent perceptions in a general way, and so work adversely against even those men who do not wear such clothing.<sup>214</sup>)

---

<sup>213</sup> Bennett, R., “The Root Cause of [Roman] Catholic Scandals & the Sovereignty of God,” *English Churchman*, 31 Oct & 7 Nov. 2003, pp. 8,10 (also referring to [www.bereanbeacon.org](http://www.bereanbeacon.org) “better to marry than to burn”).

<sup>214</sup> Jeans were Hill-Billy dress, and this element in rock’n’roll was a factor in their usage as a fashion item from about the 1960s. Like certain fashion designs prohibited to ancient Israel in their cultural context (Deut. 23:11,12), jeans reflect a worldly culture connected with Big Beat Popular Music (such as rock’n’roll, pop, metal or heavy metal, R & B / Rhythm & Blues, Rap or Hip Hop, and Punk) music in our cultural context (Col. 2:8; I John 2:15-17). Racial traits of African Negroids include above average musical skills with respect to rhythmic feel and pulsation, evident in e.g., the great Negro Spirituals produced by Protestant Negroes, or their disproportionately very high representation among jazz

Sometimes, though not always, such thinking may start with a malicious motive, i.e., seeking to put in a complaint against a teacher or male authority figure they dislike, (possibly because he legitimately disciplined them over some matter,) but then the immature child's brain comes to convince itself that this really did happen. Due to the promotion of an over-focus on romantic "love," and sexual immorality in worldly music and entertainments, together with the breakdown of teaching children moral values such as, "Thou shalt not covet" with the meaning "Thou shalt not lust" (Rom. 7:7) with respect to sex, this problem is more acute in our over-sexed Western World than it once was. Thus innocent men in schools and churches have sometimes suffered grievously from cruel and false allegations of this nature, when they have been mishandled by well intentioned but incompetent persons who do not understand relevant aspects of child psychology, and tend to attribute much greater maturity of thought and judgment to children aged about 12 to 16 than they generally warrant. Therefore proper safeguards should always apply with respect to evidence, and sadly under the misleading name of "child protection," there is a growing tendency not to apply ample safeguards to protect innocent men based on *justice*.

But on the other hand, in fairness to the genuine victims of sexual abuse by Romish priests, it must be said that there are now enough proven instances of this, even on the Roman Church's own figures and actions, to show that this is a serious problem in the Church of

---

composers and players. The historical proclivity of Negroids towards gross forms of sexual immorality goes back to Ham, who sodomized his dead-drunk father (Gen. 9:22; Lev. 20:17; Hab. 2:15); and as the *Church of England Canon of York*, Dr. Fausset observes, "In Ham's sin lies the stain of the whole Hamitic race, *sexual profligacy*, of which Sodom and Gomorrah furnish us an awful example" (Fausset, A.R., *Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia, op. cit.*, p. 108). The music of rock'n'roll (originally a crude word meaning sex), was a cultural marriage of white and black morally degenerate elements. Negroid pulsation elements were used so people would *feel* rather than *listen to* the music, and rhythmically encourage various lusts, to some extent manifested in the terminology of, *sex, drugs, and rock'n'roll*. From its outset in the 1950s, it played an important role in encouraging racial desegregation and miscegenation, together with other forms of lust, resulting from both its general emphasis on *working up the flesh* with *fleshly lusts*, its lyrics, and the lifestyles of its "idols" such as "Elvis the Pelvis" - referring to his sexually gyrating pelvis (Presley, the so called "king of rock'n'roll," a white man with a "black voice," was addicted to various drugs, including heroin), or the Beatles' John Lennon (a Caucasian who unBiblically divorced his Caucasian wife, and entered a mixed marriage with a Mongoloid woman from Japan). These facts are sufficient to prove that no Christian should have anything to do with the worldly Big Beat Popular Music; although I note that some later Big Beat Popular Music "idols" have sunk to further depths of moral and spiritual depravity. It is not necessary to keep up to date with the fleeting details about this or that rock "idol," or their latest song, most of whom come and go just as quickly, although cult followings have attached to some. (See e.g., Garlock, F., *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast*, Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Ca., USA, 1971; Bob Larson's *Book of Rock*, Tyndale House, Illinois, USA, 1987 [while I find much that is useful in Larson's works, he e.g., tends to focus on too narrow a range of sins; and contrary to Rom. 1:17; 16:17; Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11 he embraces the ecumenical compromise with Papists, so that e.g., contrary to Matt. 7:21-23 he thinks Papist exorcists are Christians]; Peck, R., *Rock*, Bob Jones University, S. Carolina, USA, 1985; Ankerberg, J. & Weldon, J., *The Facts on Rock Music*, Harvest, Oregon, USA, 1992.)

Rome. For example, in 2010, Belgium's Roman Catholic Bishop of Bruges resigned over homosexually abusing a boy<sup>215</sup>; and Bishop Walter Mix of Augsburg stepped down in connection with sex abuse allegations from 1996-2000<sup>216</sup>. In 2010, Pope Benedict XVI also accepted the resignation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare, James Morarity, over his dealing with sex abuse cases<sup>217</sup>.

In the United States of America alone, the resignation of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston, Massachusetts, USA, Cardinal Bernard Law, in December 2002, over Roman Catholic child sexual abuse scandals; or the bankruptcy of five Roman Catholic dioceses in 2004, namely, the Archdiocese of Portland, Oregon, the Diocese of Tucson, Arizona, and the Diocese of Spokane, Washington; and thereafter also the Diocese of San Diego, California in 2007; and Diocese of Wilmington in Delaware in 2009; all five of which filed for bankruptcy over payouts to victims of such scandalous abuse in *just their own* diocese alone; clearly shows the widespread seriousness of this matter. These concerns include the clear evidence that in instances where rape or seduction of minors has occurred by Romish priests, the matter has been "hushed up," and far from being excommunicated, the seducer priest, or worse still, the rapist priest of a pubescent minor, or even more shockingly, a pre-pubescent minor, has simply been transferred to another parish church with another group of vulnerable minors.

Moreover, though Cardinal Law resigned in the context of a sex abuse scandal in his Diocese of Boston, for having quietly transferred known sexually abusive child molester priests from parish to parish; he was neither excommunicated nor defrocked. Rather, he was appointed by *Pope John Paul II* as Arch-priest of Great St. Mary's Basilica in Rome. This is one of the three basilicas in Rome geographically outside the main Vatican City State, which forms part of the Vatican City State's extra-territorial holdings in Rome.

Thus the evidence indicates that at different times in history sexual immorality has burst out among those in Romish religious orders in different forms. The fact that it has consistently done so over time reminds us that in abrogating God's law, "*Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image*" (Exod. 20:4-6), the Roman Pontiff and Church are "giving heed to seducing spirits" (I Tim. 4:1) who sometimes lead them into sexual immorality (Rom. 1) (this factor is also the same for a number of Puseyite Anglican dioceses and churches likewise involved in child sexual abuse); and in setting aside God's law and "forbidding" those in religious orders "to marry" (I Tim. 4:3), the Roman Pope and Church have been responsible for creating a system in which a great deal of sexual immorality is likely, for like the Jewish religious leaders of Jesus' day, "they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers" (Matt. 23:4). For those who do not have the gift of continency, the antidote to their sexual desires is marriage (I Cor. 7:2). *Rome commands idolatry and so commands "giving heed to seducing spirits," and forbids the antidote to normative sexual desire by "forbidding" those in religious orders "to marry," and so is*

---

<sup>215</sup> "Belgium's [Roman] Catholic bishop of Bruges quits over abuse," BBC News (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8639253.stm>)

<sup>216</sup> "German Bishop Resigns Over Sex Abuse Scandal" Pattaya Daily News (<http://www.pattayadailynews.com/en/2101/05/090/german-bishop-resigns-over-child-sex-abuse-scandal/>).

<sup>217</sup> "Belgium's [Roman] Catholic bishop of Bruges quits over abuse," BBC News (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8639253.stm>)

*responsible for the sin.* And when one considers that idolatry, whether by Romanist clergy, or semi-Romanist Puseyite Anglican clergy is the antecedent sin that leads God to sometimes give people over to a homosexual orientation as a Divine Judgment (Rom. 1:20-28), we see how so called “celibate” clergy can in act be a Devilish cloak for sodomite clergy seeking to molest children.

Thus the Romish attempt to downplay the seriousness of child abuse. This seen by the way sexually abusive paedophile (pedophile) priests have simply been moved from one parish to another, rather than excommunicated. Or the way a man embroiled in sexual scandal, namely, Cardinal Law was appointed to be Arch-priest of Great St. Mary’s Basilica in Rome by Pope John-Paul II, and in that capacity, this disgraced “prince of the Roman Church” celebrated a key requiem mass for his beloved Pope in 2005. This all forms part of a long history in the Roman Church of likewise *failing to take appropriate action against child abusers.* So too, the Roman Church’s endorsement of idolatry opens them up to God’s Judgment of giving over idolaters to a homosexual orientation (Rom. 1:20-28; cf. I Kgs 14:23,24); and when to this is added “celibate” clergy rules, the door is wide-open for homosexual child-molesters to use the Roman Church as a cloaked tool for their own wicked ends. Satan who has devil-possessed every Pope of Rome since 607 knows what’s going on, and he’s clearly prepared to work with such persons as Romish priests.

Thus *Rome has a long history of failing to take adequate measures with adequate speed against forms of child abuse that she herself admits are immoral.* This is seen by the history of the *castrati* in the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries. Or in more recent times, by the failure to adequately discipline sexually abusive Romish priests in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In such matters, the Roman Pope again shows himself to be “the man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “lawlessness” (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV) as he sets aside the command, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Lev. 19:18; Matt. 22:39; Gal. 5:14). For in such cases of child abuse, the Church of Rome is like “a certain priest” that “came down” past where “thieves” had “stripped” a man “of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead,” who “when he saw him, he passed by on the other side.” And the Roman Pontiff is like “a Levite,” who “likewise,” “when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side” (Luke 10:27,30-32).

*“Forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3): Romish marital indissolubility.*

Rome also engages in “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3) by refusing to remarry Biblically sound divorcees. For example, if a wife commits adultery, or if a husband deserts his wife to live in adultery with another woman, the innocent partner may divorce the guilty spouse and remarry another (Deut. 24:1-4; Matt. 5:32; 19:9). What barbaric cruelty the Roman Pope and his church shows when it engages in “forbidding to marry” such Biblically sound divorcees (I Tim. 4:3) If a woman learns that her husband is a bigamist, who has established a second house with a second wife and family in another city, so that when he moves between these two cities on business trips, he moves into the house with this other wife and family, and then returns to her, the Bible says she can divorce him for adultery. But the Pope of Rome says she cannot divorce her bigamist husband, who like evil Lamech practises the prohibited sin of bigamy (Gen. 2:22,24; 4:23; 7:13). Why should a woman stay married to a man who engages in acts of homosexual sodomy? Why should a woman stay married to a man who creeps into their thirteen year old daughter’s bedroom to incestuously rape her? Though Papal authority says such a wife cannot divorce her husband and remarry another, the Bible says she can for such “fornication” (AV) or “sexual immorality” (NKJV)

(Matt. 5:32; 19:9).

*“Forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3): Romish Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity.*

Rome further practices “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3) by having far wider Degrees of Consanguinity (blood relationships) and Affinity (marital relationships) than Scripture in their Romish list of forbidden incestuous marriages, for no good reason, adding various degrees of relationships in addition to those found in Lev. 18 & 20<sup>218</sup>. The severity of these is sometimes militated by the granting of “dispensations” to marry within these added degrees, especially so if politically powerful persons make such a request i.e., there is practical observation evidence that politically powerful persons might deliberately “look around” for “a suitable person” to first enter a union in who is in such extended degrees with a “papal dispensation,” with an understanding, whether implied or stated privately, that “if things don’t work out,” the Pope will then agree to an annulment of this “dispensation” so as to effectively allow for a divorce. *But of course, these type of “special arrangements” only apply to the rich and powerful.* Moreover, it should also be said that less commonly such “dispensations” are sometimes granted to those inside the prohibited Biblical degrees. After all, for the rich and powerful, the Pope might be prepared to “change ... laws” (Dan. 7:25), and allow “a little bit of incest.”

Consider e.g., the marriage of William the Conqueror (c. 1028-1087) and Matilda of Flanders (1031-1083) in c. 1053. The *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), says “Pope Nicholas II” decided “to grant a dispensation to Duke William of Normandy to marry his cousin Matilda of Flanders,” and so “William’s irregular marriage was legalized by Nicholas II in 1059.<sup>219</sup>” What the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003) calls an “irregular marriage” between Duke William of Normandy (later King William I of England,) and his “cousin,” was in fact a Biblically sound marriage to a *fourth* cousin requiring no Papal “dispensation” in order for it to be “legalized” under God’s law.

William I of England (King of England 1066-1087), was five canonical degrees from the Duke of Rolf (Rollo) (c. 865-c. 930), the Founder of the Duchy of Normandy in France<sup>220</sup>. Matilda of Flanders (1031-1083), was also five canonical degrees from the Duke of Rolf<sup>221</sup>.

---

<sup>218</sup> Ayrinhac, H.A., *op. cit.*, pp. 166-179, re: Canons 96,97,1076, & 1077; *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967), *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 167-170; Vol. 4, pp. 192-196.

<sup>219</sup> *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Second Edition, Thomson Gale in Association with the [Roman] Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 2003, Vol. 2, p. 189; Vol. 14, p. 729.

<sup>220</sup> The Duke of Rolf’s son was (1) William I (c. 876-942), Duke of Normandy (927-942). His son was (2) Richard I (c. 932-996), Duke of Normandy (942-996). His son was (3) Richard II (c. 996-1027), Duke of Normandy (1027-1035). His son was (4) Robert I (c. 993-1035), Duke of Normandy (1027-1035). His son was (5) William II, Duke of Normandy, known after 1066 as *William the Conqueror* or William I of England.

<sup>221</sup> The Duke of Rolf’s daughter was (1) Adele (also known as Gerloc) (c. 897-962). She married William I of Poitou (d. 963) who was also William III of Aquitaine (c. 920-963). Their daughter was (2) Adela (also known as Adelaide) (c. 945-1004). She married Hugh Capet (d. 996), King of France (987-996). Their son was (3) Robert II (c. 970-1031), King of France (996-1031). Robert II’s daughter was (4) Adela (c. 1009-1079). She married Baldwin V (d. 1067), Count of Flanders (1035-1067). Their daughter was (5) Matilda of Flanders (1031-1083).

Thus in both instances their three-times-great grandfather, was the Duke of Rolf, making them *fourth cousins*. At the time, Roman Catholic canon law forbade marriage to seven canonical degrees. We know this because in 1075 the *Council of London* prohibited marriages from a common ancestor to seven degrees, that is, to sixth cousins<sup>222</sup>. Thus in 1049 Pope “Saint” Leo IX (Pope 1049-1054) held the *Council of Rheims*, which specifically forbade marriage between William II of Normandy (later William I of England) and Matilda of Flanders. Leo IX refused to grant a dispensation allowing this marriage. But in 1059, Pope Nicholas II (Pope 1059-1061) granted a dispensation. Later Roman Catholic canon law came to limit their prohibition to four canonical degrees, although judged by Biblical morality, third cousins is still far too wide.

In *Parker’s Table*<sup>223</sup> relationships of affinity are prohibited to the same extent as those of consanguinity on the principle that “a man” “and” “his wife” are “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24; Eph. 5:31). For example, “thou shalt not uncover” “the nakedness of thy father” (Lev. 18:7) prohibits father-daughter incest (consanguinity), and this equates in degree of relationship by marriage, “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter in law” (Lev. 18:15) (affinity), and “Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter” i.e., stepdaughter (or mother-in-law) (Lev. 18:17) (affinity). In accordance with Leviticus 18 & 20, the Protestant *Parker’s Table (1563)* removes the exception of the Mosaic civil law’s Levirate marriage rule (Deut. 25:5-10) under NT morality which does not regard the old Jewish ceremonies, rites, and civil precepts as binding upon Christians (Gal. 2:14; Eph. 2:15; Heb. 9:15-20), and which upholds monogamy (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:2), and on the principle of relationship equality of prohibited degrees (e.g., sex equality of prohibited degrees since stylistically Lev. 18 & 20 is largely put in terms of prohibited relationships for men), prohibits *at their outer limits of affinity in the first degree* marriage between a man and his deceased wife’s sister (i.e., sister-in-law by affinity) or a woman and her deceased husband’s brother (i.e., brother-in-law by affinity), and marriage between a man and his deceased brother’s wife (i.e., sister-in-law by affinity) or a woman and her deceased sister’s husband (i.e., brother-in-law by affinity) (Lev. 18:16; Mark 6:18); and also extends to *the second degree of affinity*, that is, *at their outer limits of affinity in the second degree* a man shall not marry his wife’s father’s sister (i.e., aunt by affinity) or a woman shall not marry her husband’s father’s brother (i.e., uncle by affinity), and a man shall not marry his brother’s son’s wife (i.e., niece by affinity) or a woman shall not marry her brother’s daughter’s husband (i.e. nephew by affinity) (Lev. 18:14).

---

<sup>222</sup> Rule, M., *The Life and Times of St. Anselm*, Archbishop of Canterbury & Primate of the Britains, Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co., London, UK. 1883, pp. 415-421. The statement at p. 419 is quoted in Horace Mann’s, *The Lives of the Popes* (Kegan Paul, London, UK, 1925,) at p. 65, “William ‘was in the fifth degree of descent from Duke Rollo, and Matilda was also descended from Duke Rollo through Adela, the wife of her great-grandfather, Hugh Capet.’”

<sup>223</sup> *Parker’s Table* was historically published with the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. But it was altered by advocates of incest in the *Church of England* in 1946 and *Anglican Church of Australia* in 1981, in order to maintain sexually permissive parity with worldly statutes previously passed in England and Australia designed to strike down and render ineffectual the fuller range of Biblical incest laws enacted by King Henry VIII. This *revised list of sins* which condones a number of incestuous relationships before this time rightly condemned by Anglicans as *prohibited marriages*, has appeared in subsequent editions of the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* with no note advising readers that it is the 1946 Revised Table.

King Henry VIII of England broke with Rome over the issue of *Biblical authority versus Papal authority*, when he upheld the incest laws of Lev. 18 & 20 against Papal claims of authority to set aside such laws. In addition to *Church of England* canon law, these incest laws were incorporated into the laws of England. Thus the great English Common Law jurist, Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780), in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765-9), says, “By statute” 32 Henry VIII, chapter 38 (and 25 Henry VIII, chapter 22; 28 Henry VIII chapter 7), “it is declared that all persons may lawfully marry, but such as are prohibited by *God’s law*.” “And (because, in the times of Popery, a great variety of degrees of kindred were made impediments to marriage, which impediments might however be bought off for money) it is declared by the same statute that nothing (*God’s law* excepted) shall impeach any marriage, but within *the Levitical degrees*; the farthest of which is that between uncle and niece.” Notably, the Roman Church’s “forbidding to marry” (I Tim 4:3) by extending these degrees further, was also roundly condemned at the beginning of the Reformation by Martin Luther. In his famous treatise, “The Babylonian Captivity” (1520), Luther asked, “What earthly sense is there in the rule that no man can marry a widow of a deceased relative to the fourth degree?” (i.e., under Roman Catholic canon law a man cannot marry a woman who is his deceased wife’s first cousin, which in Luther’s example he says is a “widow,” or a woman cannot marry a man who is her deceased husband’s first cousin)<sup>224</sup>.

“*Commanding to abstain from meats*” (I Tim. 4:3).

Moreover, in fulfillment of the “falling away” (II Thess. 2:3) known as *The Great Apostasy* (II Thess. 2:3), foretold by the Apostle Paul to transpire “in the latter times” when “some shall depart from the faith” (I Tim. 4:1), the Church of Rome has historically imposed rules to “abstain from meats” (AV) or “foods” (NKJV) (I Tim. 4:3). Thus, e.g., in commenting on I Tim. 4:3, John Calvin says, “the Papists” “object, that” “they do not absolutely forbid the usage of marriage and of flesh, but only on certain days constrain to abstinence of flesh, and make the vow of celibacy compulsory on” “monks,” “priests, and nuns. But this excuse is excessively frivolous, for first, they nevertheless make holiness to consist in these things; next, they set up a false and spurious worship of God; and lastly, they

---

<sup>224</sup> *Blackstone’s Commentaries*, 1765-9, Vol. 1, p. 435 (emphasis mine); Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, p. 110. Blackstone says “The method of computing these degrees in the canon law, which our” English “law has adopted, is” “we begin at the common ancestor, and reckon downwards, and in whatsoever degree the two persons, or the most remote of them, is distant from the common ancestor, that is the degree in which they are related to each other.” For example, Man X “and his brother are related in the first degree, for from the father to each of them is counted only one.” But the same Man X “and his nephew are related in the second degree; for the nephew is two degrees removed from the common ancestor” of the “grandfather.” *Thus first cousins are in the second degree* (from the common ancestor), and the Roman Catholic Canon law rule prohibits marriages with a deceased wife’s first cousin or deceased husband’s first cousin. But Blackstone also notes that a different system of reckoning is found in the civil law of Europe where they “count upwards, from either of the persons related, to the common stock, then downwards again to the other, reckoning a degree for each person in both ascending and descending” (*Blackstone’s Commentaries*, Vol. 2, pp. 206-7). *Thus first cousins are in the fourth degree* since from cousin A to the common grandparent is two degrees, and then down again to the other first cousin is another two degrees. Since Luther here uses the European *civil law* reckoning, when he says “the fourth degree” he means that which canon law and English law reckons as *the second degree*.

bind consciences by a necessity from which they ought to have been free.” “Not unjustly, therefore, do we maintain that this prediction was uttered against the Papists, since celibacy and abstinence from certain foods are enjoined by them.<sup>225</sup>”

The specific nature of these food rules has varied over time, for example, before the *Vatican II Council* (1963-5) Roman Catholics were enjoined to not eat meat on Fridays but only fish; although this particular food rule has been liberalized since the *Vatican II Council*. On the one hand, Canon 1251 of the Roman Catholic *Code of Canon Law* (1983) states that “Abstinence from meat, or some other food determined by the Conference of Bishops, is to be observed on all Fridays” other than Fridays which “are solemnities.” “Abstinence and fasting are to be observed on Ash Wednesday and Good Friday.” But on the other hand, Canon 1253 of this Code creates a loophole, saying, “The Conference of Bishops” can “substitute, in whole or in part, other forms of penance” “in the place of abstinence or fasting.” The practical effect of Canon 1253 has been that Roman Catholic Bishops’ Conferences have said their adherents can do whatever penance they please on Fridays, for example, the Stations of the Cross, or Hail Marys. Thus in the post *Vatican II Council* era, the older Romish practice of abstaining from meat other than fish on Fridays has frequently fallen into disuse. Nevertheless, some Papists still “abstain from meats” (I Tim. 4:3) on Fridays, and many more adhere the injunctions of Canon 1251 “commanding to abstain from meats” (I Tim. 4:3) on Ash Wednesday and the Fridays in Lent. Thus Calvin’s three criticisms remain valid.

For while Scripture allows certain optional holy days and fast days (Rom. 14:5,6), Rome makes them obligatory parts of e.g., their Good Friday (*Vatican II Council*, *infra*). Moreover, they link them with their justification by work’s righteousness dogma, and so give “heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1), in a way “already” at “work” in New Testament times (II Thess. 2:7); for St. Paul says, “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you” (Gal. 3:1), and “how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire to be in bondage?” (Gal. 4:9). And this was said to the Galatians entangled in works’ righteousness, for which reason the Apostle Paul also says, “by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. 2:16); “But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11); and, “If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed” (Gal. 1:9).

Thus food rules are also sometimes imposed by the Papists as part of their “good works” to earn salvation on pilgrimages. For example, when I visited the early seventeenth century Protestant Archbishop *McGrath’s Castle* in October 2001 (over two days, one of which was *Irish Massacre Day*, Tues. 23 Oct.), in its Irish border-town that the north call Tullyhomen and the south call Pettigo, I met some Roman Catholics who had made the pilgrimage to nearby Lough Derg. Lough Derg is about seven kilometres or four miles away from this border-town. Near a monastery, Romish pilgrims have been going there for well over one thousand years to undertake the pilgrimage known as “Saint Patrick’s purgatory.” For three days they undertake Romish penitential rites on this bleak and remote island surrounded by a dull, barren, landscape. Their “self-abasement and severe treatment of the body” (Col. 2:23, NASB) includes the requirement of being barefoot as they walk around this

---

<sup>225</sup> Calvin, J., *Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, Translated by Reverend William Pringle, Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1861, p. 101.

rocky island. These Romish penitential rites are connected to a doctrine of justification by works since these deluded Popish pilgrims believe they are reducing their future time in purgatory by undertaking “Saint Patrick’s purgatory” in this life. Among other things, the penitential rites involves “commanding” them “to abstain from meats” (AV) or “foods” (NKJV) (I Tim. 4:3), as they are only permitted to eat one meal a day, consisting of either dry bread or oatcakes, together with black coffee or black tea.

This type of Papal “sin” (II Thess. 2:3) or “lawlessness” (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV) in “commanding” people “to abstain from meats” (AV) or “foods” (NKJV) was clearly endorsed by the *Second Vatican Council* (1963-5), which abrogated God’s law, “let no one judge in food or in drink, or regarding a festival” (NKJV) or “holyday” (AV) (Col. 2:16). In discussing “penitential elements,” the *Second Vatican Council*, imposed upon Roman Catholics “penance during the Lenton Season.” In particular, this Council required that “the paschal fast must be kept” “on Good Friday” and preferably also on the following “Saturday” before Easter (*The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, 109). While Scripture allows voluntary fasting for various reasons (Mark 2:20; Rom. 14:5,6), this Popish ascetic requirement that people “must” “fast” on these days violates the clear teaching of Col. 2:16. In the Popish mind it is also associated with good works meritoriously gaining favour with God, for which reason this same Popish council spoke favourably of the Mohammedan’s justification by works “fasting” as spiritually and morally commending them (*Declaration on the relation of the church to non-Christian religions* 3)<sup>226</sup>.

*I Tim. 3:16-4:5 in overview.*

If we allow Scripture to be our guide, and consider I Tim. 3:16-4:5 in overview, this means that there are certain key elements of the great apostasy that should be emphasized through reference to the specifics of this passage. We should emphasize that the Roman Church is an *apostate* form of Christianity (“some shall depart from the faith”). As such, it mingles truth and error, and has much in it that is theologically sound e.g., the three creeds, and the doctrine dealing with original sin and the Trinity in the first four General Councils of Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451); together with the connected Trinitarian clarifications in the fifth and sixth General Councils of Constantinople II (553, correctly condemning the Nestorians) and Constantinople III (681, correctly condemning the Monothelites). It thus passes itself off as “Christian” by appearing, at first glance, to believe in such teachings as “the mystery of godliness” in I Tim. 3:16. But in fact, the Church of Antichrist comes like Lucifer did to our first parents, Adam and Eve, with all deceivableness, craftiness, and guile. The Church of Rome is Satan’s masterpiece, and will trap the unwary, the superficial, and any not prepared to travel through “the strait” and “narrow” “gate” “which leadeth to life” (Matt. 7:13,14). The “mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) counterfeits the “mystery of godliness” (I Tim. 3:16), and so as a wolf in sheep’s clothing (Matt. 7:15), it may at first appear to be Christian. But upon more carefully inspection, it emerges that Popery does not believe in “the mystery of godliness” (I Tim. 3:16), “having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof” (II Tim. 3:5), for Popery denies “the power of God unto salvation” in the “gospel” of free grace (Rom. 1:16,17; 5:15), and the Biblical Christ.

We should emphasize that the Roman Church denies the full humanity of Christ by its teaching of transubstantiation in the Mass, it being contrary to the truth of Christ’s natural

---

<sup>226</sup>

*Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 30-1,739-40.

body, to be in more than one place at once (Christ “was manifest in the flesh;” and he had a real human body, “seen of angels” at the time of his birth, temptation in the wilderness, and resurrection, but which has now been “received up into glory”). We should emphasize the great Christological and soteriological truth, that Christ alone was without sin, evidenced e.g., by his resistance of temptation to sin when in the wilderness (Matt. 4:1-11) (one of the things, “seen of angels,” I Tim. 3:16). Thus the spurious Romish teaching of “the immaculate conception” of Mary, radically undermines the teaching of Christ’s sinlessness.

The claim of the Roman Pontiff to be the “Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction in the church, is a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Christ was “vindicated in the Spirit,” NASB, and since the Holy Ghost comes in the place of Christ, it is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of God for the Roman Pope to claim to be the one who stands in the place of Christ, as the “Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction). The Romish doctrine of purgatory is repugnant to Holy Writ (Christ was also “vindicated in the Spirit,” NASB, by his triumphal march through hell, and so it is a gross perversion of Scripture for the Roman Church to misuse I Peter 3:18-20 to try and justify the Romish doctrine of purgatory). The Christ of the Bible is the only true Christ, because the Bible is infallible and the Bible, not Romish tradition which is repugnant to the Bible, should be our guide (Christ was also “vindicated in the Spirit,” NASB, through the testimony of Holy Writ, which is inspired by God through the Holy Ghost).

The Romish gospel of justification by faith and works is a false and spuriously gospel, fraudulently pushed forward in place of the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith (Christ was “preached” and “believed on”). This includes the Romanist devaluation of the gospel truth that Christ is our redeemer, with their claim of Mary as “co-redeemer” of mankind (Christ, not Mary, was “preached” and “believed on” in I Tim. 3:16). The Roman teaching of “Saint” “mediators” claims justification in the evidence of supernatural miracles from “saints” who have been “invoked.” This includes their devaluation of Christ our only mediator, with their claim of Mary as “co-mediator.” While some of these stories of miracles performed after “the invocation” of some saint are fraudulent, some have the stamp of undeniable evidence. But their effectiveness is through the power of Satan, for Christ is the only mediator between God and man, thus invocation of saints is an example of those in the “falling away” (II Thess. 2:3) of “the latter times,” “giving heed to seducing spirits” (I Tim. 4:1).

The Roman Church’s requirement of non-married or “celibate” clergy, is premised on the inaccurate presupposition that all those who want to join a Romish religious order have the gift of continency. This has been a contributory factor to a long history of sexual scandals spanning many hundreds of years by those in Romish religious orders, including Popes, bishops, and in our own day, numerous Popish priests (“forbidding to marry”) involved in sex scandals, e.g., many homosexual child molestation cases. E.g., referring to the written records of Burchard, Lea writes, “The public marriage, he says, of the [illegitimate] daughters of Innocent VIII [Pope 1484-92] and Alexander VI [Pope 1492-1503], set the fashion for the clergy to have children, and they diligently followed it, from the highest to the lowest,” so that they “kept concubines, while the monasteries were brothels<sup>227</sup>.”

---

<sup>227</sup> Lea, H.C., “The Eve of the Reformation,” in Spitz, L.W. (Editor), *The Reformation*, Basic Interpretations, D.C. Heath and Company, Canada and USA, 1972, p. 108.

The force with which Rome sought to defend this type of sexual immorality and vice in its religiously orders, even to the point of killing more pious fellow Papists who were publicly opposed to its practices of unchastity, is well seen in the case of Savonarola of Florence (1452-1498) in Italy<sup>228</sup>. Pope Alexander VI took offence at what was regarded as the attack on the Pope's scandalous life in Savonarola's sermons on the OT Book of Amos. Savonarola was concerned with corruption in the clergy of which he saw Pope Alexander VI as an obvious example i.e., the type of thing later associated with the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, which lacked the concomitant Protestant concern for the associated need of doctrinal reform. He was ultimately excommunicated and burnt to ashes. Savonarola's death reminds us of the entrenched bitterness and hostility that the Roman Church had to those who sought the reform of morals among its clergy, and that *having resisted such reform, the Roman Church was with great unwillingness forced to bring about such moral reform of its clergy "chaffing under the bit," as brought about by those of the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation fighting a rear-guard action to try and halt the Protestant Reformation from expanding further.* The Counter-Reformation did not meet all of the Protestant's concerns, but it did meet Savonarola's concerns.

The Papists' teaching of "marital indissolubility," is a cruel and unBiblical teaching, that adds insult to injury because those who receive Biblically sound divorces, are prohibited by the Roman Church from remarrying ("forbidding to marry," I Tim. 4:3). The Prohibited Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity in the Roman Church, are ridiculously wide, going to the fourth canonical degree i.e., third cousins; and in former times going to seven canonical degrees i.e., sixth cousins ("forbidding to marry," I Tim. 4:3). The Romish imposition of ascetic dietary rules connected with a doctrine of justification by works' righteousness, such as the requirement to abstain from food and fast on Good Friday, or to abstain from various foods when on pilgrimages, gives a false focus to religious devotion, and is part of the wider spurious teachings of justification by works found in the Roman Church ("commanding to abstain from meats," I Tim. 4:3).

The Apostle Paul concludes this section (I Tim. 3:16-4:5), "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained" (I Tim. 4:6).

## CHAPTER 12

### **The Antichrist's *sin* (II Thess. 2:3).**

There are some further descriptions in II Thess. 2 which of themselves are not sufficiently detailed to distinguish the Roman Pope from some other sinister figures. But having first determined by the above five indicators that the Roman Catholic Pope is the Antichrist, we can now profitably turn to these descriptors to better understand those elements of this Antichrist that God has shown us in his Infallible Book that he would have us consider about the Papal Antichrist. In II Thess. 2:3 the Antichrist is described as a "man of sin." Concerning the singular usage of "man" in "man of sin" (II Thess. 2:3) the Anglican *Church of England's* Bishop Jewel (1522-71) says:

A single man appears hardly sufficient for the whole work here assigned, and it is

---

<sup>228</sup> *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit., "Savonarola, Girolamo."*

agreeable to the Scripture ... to speak of a body or a number of men under character of one. Thus ... the High Priest, Heb. 9:7, for the series and order of High Priests; the office and not the individual filling that office at any special time is pointed at<sup>229</sup>.

In further development of the “the man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3), he is described as a man of “iniquity” (AV) or “lawlessness” (NKJV) (II Thess. 2:7). The underpinning meaning of both encompasses common thought. The Apostle Paul says, “I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 7:7, quoting the Ten Commandments at Exod. 20:17 and Deut. 5:21). And the Apostle John, “Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law” (I John 3:4). Sin is lawlessness and lawlessness is sin. Thus the descriptions “man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and a man of “lawlessness” (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV) cover common ground.

This feature of the Roman Antichrist is evident in a number of different ways. Referring to the fifth commandment, the Apostle Paul says, “Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that is may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth” (Eph. 6:2,3; quoting Deut. 5:16). The fifth precept’s promise, “That thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land” or *earth* “which the Lord thy God giveth thee” (Deut. 5:16) contains a “promise” (Eph. 6:2) that goes well beyond the Promised “land” (Deut. 5:16) of Palestine promised to the Israelites, and looks to the new “earth” (Eph. 6:3); for the promise of this precept points to “a better country, that is, an heavenly” one, where “God” “hath prepared for” his people “a city” (Heb. 11:16). To be sure, men keep God’s commandments, such as, “Honour thy father and thy mother” (Deut. 5:16), not in order to be saved, but because they are saved; and so they are recipients of the “promise” of those who are to “live long,” even for all eternity, “on the” new “earth” (Eph. 6:2,3; Rev. 21:1). But how is a man first saved, so that he partakes of this promise as evidenced by his keeping of God’s laws (I John 5:2,3) such as this fifth commandment? “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8,9). By denying the gospel of grace and substituting for it a false gospel of faith and works, the Roman Pontiff and Roman Church in fact seek to deny men access to this wonderful promise of the fifth commandment, sending them instead to the fires of hell. Thus by denying justification by faith, “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3, AV) and “iniquity” (AV) or “lawlessness” (NKJV) (II Thess. 2:7) violates this element of the Holy Decalogue’s fifth commandment.

The Pope is a “man of sin” since Roman Catholicism sets aside Christ’s law to preach the Gospel (Matt. 28:18-20) and condemn any false gospel (Gal. 1:6-9) by denying the true gospel by, for example, denial of justification by faith (Rom. 1:17), or many “Saint” mediators for the “one mediator” Christ (Acts 2:33; I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 4:14-10:39; 12:24). As Homily 16, Book 2, in Article 35 of the Anglican Church’s *39 Articles* observes: “the Bishops of Rome ... have forsaken ... the commandments of God, to erect and set up their own constitutions.” Moreover, his “sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “lawlessness” (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV) includes the fact he violates The Ten Commandments prohibition on idolatry (2nd commandment), blasphemy (3rd commandment), and in the past - murder (6th commandment).

The Roman Mass is described in Reformation Anglican documents as “idolatry” (due

---

<sup>229</sup> Jewel, J., *A Prophecy concerning the Rise and Downfall of Antichrist*, Extracted from the works of Bishop Jewel, Thomas White, Dublin, Ireland, 1830, p. 27.

to adoration of the consecrated Communion elements) and “blasphemous” (as it denies Christ’s completed atonement on the Cross) (Communion Service, *Book of Common Prayer 1662*, Final Rubric & 39 Articles, Arts. 22 & 31). Other major Protestant Confessions say similar things. The Lutheran *Smalcald Articles* upheld as authoritative in the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* (Epitome 3), reject the Romish teaching of the “sacrifice” “of the mass,” and state that “under the Papacy,” “the mass” “has been the highest” “of all the various Papal idolatries” (2:1). Or both the Congregational Church’s *Savoy Declaration* and Presbyterian Church’s *Westminster Confession of Faith* clearly regard members of the Roman Church as idolaters since they both say “such as profess the true reformed religion, should not marry with ... Papists, or other idolaters” (*Savoy Declaration* 25:3; *Westminster Confession* 24:3). Both later identify members of the Roman Church as idolaters through reference to the Roman Mass. The *Savoy Declaration* says “the Popish sacrifice of the mass (as they call it) is most abominable” and “injurious to Christ’s own only sacrifice” (30:2) whereas the *Westminster Confession* says: “... the Popish sacrifice of the mass (as they call it) is most abominably injurious to Christ’s one, only sacrifice” (29:2); and then both the *Savoy Declaration* (30:6) and the *Westminster Confession* (29:6) say: “transubstantiation ... is repugnant ... to Scripture ... and hath been, and is the cause of manifold superstitions; yea, of gross idolatries.”

The Roman Mass denies justification by faith (Gal. 2:16; 3:11) because its recipients think that by taking the wafer, they are doing a good work that merits them righteousness and favour with God. The Roman Mass denies the completed atonement of Christ on the cross (Heb. 9:25,26), since it claims that in “the sacrifice of the mass” Christ is offered up afresh. In the Roman Mass, the Pope (and his priestly minions,) is found to “magnify himself above all” (Dan. 11:37), to “exalt himself, and magnify himself above” “God” (Dan. 11:36), for in it, the Pope (or his minion priests), being a creature, blasphemously claim to create their Creator, and thus the Pope “exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4). The Roman Mass denies the humanity of Christ via the transubstantiation heresy, for it is against the truth of Christ’s natural body for Christ to physically be in more places than one at the same time. The Roman Mass involves an act of idolatry, for the Papist is meant to “adore” the consecrated elements, by genuflecting to them. For the average member in the Church of Antichrist, the Roman Mass is the central act of worship and virtually every Popish services he attends will include the Mass. Little wonder then, that transubstantiation, and hence the Roman Mass, is isolated in I John 4:3; II John 7 as a key identifier of Antichrist.

Furthermore, in Isaiah 52:5 “the Lord” says “my name ... is blasphemed” because Jews who claim to be worshippers of the Lord hold values and live lives at variance with their profession of faith. Likewise, the Roman Church and Roman Papacy violate the third commandment and blaspheme the Lord’s name by claiming to be “Christians” since they set aside the only means of salvation that God has offered to man to become Christian. For example, they deny that “Christ hath redeemed us” (Galatians 3:13) in their claim that Mary the mother of Jesus is “co-redeemer,” or they reject justification by faith in favour of justification by a combination of faith and works (Gal. 3:11). Consider, for example, both before and after Pope Leo officially approved it in 1520, the Romish rosary. This rosary consists of a series of beads that Papists use to count off prayers. In the much used “Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary,” Roman Catholics use a rosary with five sets of ten beads at each of these fifty beads saying a “Hail Mary” prayer to Mary, separated after each tenth bead by five larger beads and at each of these they say an “Our Father” (Lord’s Prayer), with a small number of other prayers being said (such as the “Gloria Patria”) with a small number of beads connecting this rosary to a crucifix. Quite a apart from the fact that Mary receives far more

prayers in this rosary than God, the whole thing is an example of setting aside Christ's law, "When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (Matt. 6:7). Those who peddle such a spurious gospel are declared by God in his Infallible Book to "be accursed" (Gal. 1:8,9), and those adhering to such "heresies ... shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21). *The Papal sin and lawlessness of violating the third commandment touches at the very heart of what it means to be saved and in a relationship with God, it touches on the very fundamentals of what it is to be a Christian.* It manifests a core meaning of what it is the Pope does when he "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God" (II Thess. 2:4), and it reaches to the very heart of the gospel and associated issues of the Protestant Reformation. Papistry sets aside the gospel of justification by faith, and then violates the third commandment by *taking the Lord's name in vain* when it claims one can be a follower and disciples of *Christ, a Christian,* and believe a false gospel of justification which includes a man's works (compare "he shall think to change ... the law" Dan. 7:25, ASV).

In the *Fifth Lateran Council* (1512-17), the Roman Church under the Pope's presidency "declared by the constitution of Pope Boniface VIII," that the Bull "*Unam Sanctam*" has "the approval of the present sacred council." *Unam Sanctam* says "it is essential to the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff<sup>230</sup>." This blasphemy sets aside the gospel of justification by faith. But it was replaced in the *Second Vatican Council* (1963-5) with the claim that Protestants (and others) were "our separated brethren" and "our separated fellow Christians." But the salient point here is that the Church of Rome had not made this change because she had repudiated her false gospel of faith and works in favour of justification by faith and Biblical authority. Rather, the Pope and Church of Rome had failed to achieve their desired result of frightening Protestants (and others) into accepting Papal power and influence, and so now, that past master of "all deceivableness" (II Thess. 2:10), the Pope, together with the Roman Church, sought to gain by guile an expanded Papal power and influence "in the temple of God" (II Thess. 2:4). Jesus says of those who blasphemously take his name, saying, "Lord, Lord," "in thy name" have we not done various things, "I never knew you," for the true Christian "doeth the will of" the "Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21-23). Thus it is a form of blasphemy for the Roman Pope and Roman Church to first claim to be "Christian," and then seek to put their spiritually murky arms around Protestants and embrace them as "separated brethren." For "whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." "For he that biddeth" "God speed" to "an antichrist," "is" made a "partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 7-11).

It should also be observed that the Roman Church has a long history of *failing to take appropriate action against child abusers.* Consider e.g., the ghastly and revolting history of the Italian *castrati* soprano singers in the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries, where a young boy was castrated to become a *castrato*. The *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967) refers to this under the heading of "Castration," and says, "Although St. Alphonsus Ligouri records some conflicting opinion regarding the morality of this procedure for this purpose" of making "*castrati*," "particularly in Italy in the 16th and 17th centuries," "the view that it was morally acceptable was never held by more than a few theologians;" "however, some historians have erroneously concluded that the practice had ecclesiastical approval because sometimes the "*castrati*" "were allowed to sing in church choirs." In the first place, I note that the

---

<sup>230</sup> Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 115-6 (quoting Friedberg's and Richter's *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Vol. 2, p. 1245); Elliott, Vol. 2, p. 85.

admission of “some conflicting opinion” indicates those involved in these practices could claim *some* support from Roman Catholic theologians. Why were these Popish theologians not disciplined for their castrati views? But in the second place, I note that the fact that only “a few theologians” regarded this as “morally acceptable” must condemn the Roman Church even more. It means that in practice, *in the heartlands of Papal Italy*, much of which was then Papal states in which the Roman Pontiff was capable of direct political action, *the Roman Church failed to take a strong stand against a form of child abuse that they agreed was immoral.*

Well over ninety per cent of the *castrati* were thereafter not good enough to become a *castrato* singer, but this gruesome chapter in Italian history was *to some extent* encouraged by the Popes who, for example, had *castrati* singing in the Sistine Chapel. Let the reader imagine a young boy sitting in a tub after being castrated, screaming and screeching and crying out in great agony after his scrotum has been cut off in the hope that he “too, may sing in a church choir, and maybe even for the Pope in the Sistine Chapel.” Then imagine the more than ninety per cent of these child abused castrated males as they slowly grow into manhood and then old age, having not made the grade to be a *castrato* singer. And what even of those who did become a *castrato* singer, such as Farinelli? Had they, in mature years, been given the opportunity to undo the mutilation of their genitalia that was done to them when they were of tender years, how many would wish for such an opportunity?

Let the reader imagine that far away from Italy in, for example, Ireland, a British Protestant Minister in the *Church of Ireland* climbs the pulpit in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries when the usage of *castrati* in Italian opera was prominent, and condemns the Pope’s “iniquity” in not adequately speaking out and using the full force of his powers against such practices, describing this as a manifestation of the Papal “man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3). “How different,” says this Irish Protestant Minister, “to the way the Pope doth use his powers to condemn and persecute Protestants in his temporal land holdings in and around Rome, yet doth not likewise use his powers to earnestly seek to stop them that mischievously make little male children into *castrati*. So hot in persecuting the saints of God, and so cold in stopping them in the *castrati* crimes.” Imagine the fathers and mothers in the congregation nursing little children. How grateful they, and all the other wise Irishmen of the holy Reformed faith in the congregation would be, as they thanked God to be in a *Protestant* governed land, under the Protestant Crown, safe and secure from the groping, grasping, mutilating, child abusing castration hands found in a Romanist region like Italy. *The general silence and inaction of many Popes* in failing to condemn and bring these child abuse horrors to an early end cannot be denied. Their failure to enact and enforce appropriate legislation to stop this child abuse in the Papal states is a matter of historical fact; as are the screams and tears of pain, by so many young boys as they recovered from their shockingly unnecessary ordeal, in the vast majority of instances, only to be later rejected as castrati singers, and to live out their lives as e.g., shop keepers, with a high-pitched squeaky voice, and no scrotum. The Roman Church’s further aiding and abetting of these gruesome child abusers by having *castrati* sing in the Sistine Chapel and allowing this in other Romish Churches cannot be denied.

We cannot doubt that one way that “the mystery of iniquity” was “already” at “work” in apostolic times (II Thess. 2:7), was in the persecution and sometimes martyrdom of God’s saints (Acts 6:8 to 7:60). Papal “sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) historically also included the persecution and sometimes even murder of God’s saints who opposed his heretical teachings. In 1993 Eritrea gained independence from Ethiopia and the Eritrean Orthodox Church was made a single diocese of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church

which defers to the primacy of the Oriental Orthodox *Patriarch of Alexandria*, the Coptic Orthodox Pope. We learn that in February and March of 2003 A.D., “Eritrean security forces” “jailed” “170 Protestant Christians” who thereafter were “beaten and threatened with death” “for refusing to return to the historically dominant” Oriental “Orthodox Church.” Relatives posting bail “were forced to sign a statement acknowledging that if a bailed prisoner was caught meeting in public or private with more than three others, he would be liable for execution.<sup>231</sup>” That those in Eritrea under the spiritual leadership of the *Egyptian Antichrist*, the Coptic Orthodox Pope, should so persecute those seeking to leave Oriental Orthodoxy is not entirely surprising. After all, the *Egyptian Antichrist* is one of “many antichrists” who type the “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), and we cannot doubt the old Antichrist himself has condoned a great deal of persecution and murder of the saints.

A record of Papal “sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) in setting aside the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” can be found in various editions of *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*. This includes e.g., the martyrdom of His Grace, Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury on 21 March 1556. In Reformed (or Low Church Evangelical) Anglican terms, Cranmer is *the third man of the Reformation* i.e., after Luther as *the first man of the Reformation* and Calvin as *the second man of the Reformation*. He is remembered in the “Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer ... Primo Elizabethae” i.e., the 1559 Act re-establishing the Protestant prayer book after the reign of the Roman Catholic Queen, Bloody Mary; and this 1559 prayer book being thus a symbol of Protestantism, this 1559 Act has historically been printed at the start of the 1662 prayer book (a tradition carried into modern times by Oxford University, but not Cambridge University printers). This Act says, in part, “Where at the death of our late Sovereign Lord King Edward the Sixth, there remained one uniform Order of Common Service and Prayer ... in the Church of England, ... the which was repealed, and taken away ... in the first year of the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion: be it therefore enacted ... that the said ... repeal ... shall be void and of none effect, ... and that the said Book with the Order of Service, ... with ... alterations and additions therein ... shall stand and be, from and after the ... Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist ... .” Moreover, since 1978 in Australia, and 1980 in England, Thomas Cranmer has been given a black letter day on the Anglican Calendar on 21 March<sup>232</sup>.

The 450th anniversary of Thomas Cranmer’s martyrdom fell in 2006. During this year, in Australia, the Evangelical Anglican Diocese of Sydney’s Moore Theological College, erected in their Library a display case in honour of Cranmer, which I was pleased to inspect. Also in 2006, I was privileged to attend at Oxford, England, in the UK, a special outdoor

---

<sup>231</sup> *English Churchman*, 18 & 25 April, 2003, (Compass Direct), article, “Eritrea Jails 170 Protestant Christians and Threatens Death for Worship,” p. 7.

<sup>232</sup> This required transferring Benedict’s black letter day from 21 March to 11 July. I support the 1662 Anglican Calendar with no omissions whatsoever, although I support a small number of the added black letter days on the 1978 Australian and 1980 English Anglican Calendars, of which this (and the associated transference of Benedict to 11 July) is one such instance. See by Sir Marcus Loane (1911-2009) (Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, 1966-1982; Primate of Australia, 1978-1982), *Masters of the English Reformation*, 1954, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, & Carlisle, Pennsylvania, USA, 2005, pp. 223-303 (Thomas Cranmer).

memorial service to Cranmer's memory in March. Organized under the *Protestant Truth Society* (PTS), the main part of the open air witness was conducted by the Presiding Bishop of the *Church of England (Continuing)*, Bishop Malcolm, with the assistance of a former presiding bishop of the C. of E. (Continuing), Bishop Samuel. Bishop Malcolm laid a wreath at the "X" on the road marking the spot outside Baliol College where Cranmer was martyred. Then at the nearby Oxford Martyrs' Memorial, a second wreath was laid by some Irish Protestants wearing orange ribbons on their lapels, and a third wreath by the PTS Wycliffe Preacher, Reverend Guy Davies. A large placard carried throughout the open air witness by a fellow attender, read, "REMEMBER THE PROTESTANT MARTYRS." Tragically, many had evidently forgotten, and were nowhere to be seen. But let us thank God that so many did indeed, *Remember the Protestant martyrs!*

Or Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (1867) records various persecutions and martyrdoms of French Protestants following the revocation in 1685 of the Edict of Nantes (1598), up till the time of the French Revolution. Or Forbush's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (1926) records the martyrdom of French Protestants by Papist supporters of the *Ancien Regime* especially during the time of the Second Restoration, in the south of France, at Nimes from 1814 to 1820. At that time some of the Papists declared, "We will wash our hands in Protestant blood, and make black puddings from the blood of Calvin's kids<sup>233</sup>."

Or the gifted Congregationalist theologian of Homerton College, London, England, UK, (John) Pye Smith (1774-1851) records various Protestant confessors and martyrs. For example, the "butcheries in the Netherlands" by "Philip II, the tyrant of Spain and the Austrian Netherlands" who in 1567 sent the Duke of Alva to the Netherlands who murdered thousands of Protestants. Or the persecutions by some of the Romish Princes of the southern German states. Or the persecutions in the Palatinate, Bishopric of Salzburg in Austria, or Thorn in Poland, and elsewhere around 1730<sup>234</sup>. Philip II, King of Spain (1556-98) and King of Portugal (1580-98), was a Papal puppet who sent the Spanish Armada to destroy Protestantism under Queen Elizabeth I in England, but whose Armada was, by the grace of God, defeated in 1588. He gave his name to the Philippines of East Asia, a country in which more than 90 per cent of the population's souls are enslaved to Roman Catholicism. The year after Philip II had sent the Duke of Alva to lead Spanish and Italian Papists to commit gruesome martyrdoms of Dutch Protestants in 1567, the Eighty Years War (1568-1648) between the Dutch and Spain in which the Dutch sought liberation from the Romanist Spaniards, started when the Protestant Prince William I of Orange (1533-84), a Lutheran, commanded first wave liberator forces against the Papist Spaniards in 1568; and like the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), it ended in 1648 with the *Peace of Westphalia* (named after the historic region of Westphalia in northwest Germany). The Thirty Years War had started when the King of Bohemia (in Czech), Ferdinand III (later the "Holy" Roman Emperor who was a signatory to the *Peace of Westphalia*), sought to impose Popery throughout his lands leading to immediate conflict with the Protestant noblemen not only of Bohemia, but also of

---

<sup>233</sup> Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 607-666; at p. 666 Bramley-Moore refers briefly to the "vile atrocities" at Nimes in "1815-16" (formerly sometimes Anglicized as "Nismes," and so done by both Bramley-Moore and Forbush). But for the greater detail, see Forbush, W.B. (Ed.); *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. A History of the lives, sufferings and triumphant deaths of the early Christian and the Protestant martyrs, revised edition 1926, reprint: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, USA, 1962, pp. 332-349.

<sup>234</sup> Smith, J.P., *The Reason of the Protestant Religion*, Jackson & Walford, London, 2nd edition, 1851, pp. 34-36.

Austria. During the Thirty Years War, front-line battle Protestant towns, especially in Germany, were in alliance with Sweden and the Netherlands, as they fought bravely and gallantly for their religious freedoms against cruel Papist tyranny and oppression. When both the Eighty Years War and Thirty Years War ended with the *Peace of Westphalia* (1648) which gave Protestants freedom to worship and admission to state offices in all the German States, Swiss cantons, and the Netherlands, Pope Innocent X (Pope 1644-1655) went into a Satanic Papal rage. The Pope denounced these provision of religious freedom to Protestants in his Papal Bull, *Zelo domus Dei*, saying they were “null and void, invalid,” “rejected, absurd,” and “without force or effect.”<sup>235</sup>

## CHAPTER 13

### **The Antichrist’s sin: Blasphemy by “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3).**

In reiterating its transubstantiation teaching, the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent* (1563) clearly set aside the second commandment (Exod. 20:4-6; Deut. 5:8-10), “Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image.” Concerning the Roman Mass, it said, “If anyone says, that in” “the eucharist, Christ” “is not to be adored with worship,” “and that the adorers thereof are idolaters: let him be anathema” (13th Session, Canon 4). Moreover, it claimed, for example, that “in the sacrament of the” “eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of” “Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ” (Session 13, Canon 1). It further said, if anyone rejects this teaching of the “conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and whole substance of the wine into the blood,” “which conversion” “the” Roman “Catholic Church” “calls transubstantiation,” then “let him be anathema” (Session 13, Canon 2). Since the *Roman Antichrist* thus presided over and endorses a council pronouncing an “anathema” on those Christians who reject transubstantiation and who thus have “the Spirit of God” and “confesseth that Jesus is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2), it follows that the Pope has attributed to the work of God the work of Satan, which thing may constitute an unpardonable sin of “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 12:22-32).

If so, this is quite autonomous from, and should not to be confused with, the fact that every Pope from 607 commits the unpardonable sin by claiming to be “the Vicar of God” or “Vicar of Christ” i.e., a vice-God or vice-Christ, with a “universal” jurisdiction, thus making him “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3). That is because when the Pope thus “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” as a vice-God (II Thess. 2:4), he usurps the place of the Holy Ghost who is Christ’s universal representative on earth (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7).

Poignant indeed are the comments of Charles Spurgeon who said, “The Popish system teaches that [in transubstantiation] the priest creates his Creator, and thus it sets ‘the son of perdition’ ‘above’ ‘God’ ‘himself’ (II Thess. 2:3,4)<sup>236</sup>” Spurgeon further said, “Martin Luther used to say that every sermon ought to have the doctrine of justification by faith in it. True, but let it have the doctrine of atonement in it. He says he could not get the doctrine of justification by faith into the Wurtembergers’ heads. And he felt half inclined to take the

<sup>235</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 216-7.

<sup>236</sup> *Spurgeon’s Devotional Bible*, p. 722 (II Thess 2:3,4).

Book into the pulpit and fling it at their heads, in order to get it in. I am afraid he would not have succeeded if he had. But Oh! How would I try to hammer again, and again, and again upon this one nail, ‘The blood ... is ... the life thereof’ (Lev. 17:14). ‘When I see the blood, I will pass over you’ (Exod. 12:13).” “What profit is there in the unbloody ‘sacrifice of the mass,’ as Antichrist puts it? Do any say, it is ‘an unbloody sacrifice,’ yet at the same time offer it for a propitiation for sin? We fling this text in their faces, ‘Without shedding of blood there is no remission’ (Heb. 9:22). Do they reply that the blood is there in the body of Christ? We answer that even were it so, that would not meet the case, for it is ‘without the shedding of blood,’ without the blood-shedding; the ‘blood’ as distinct from the flesh; ‘without the shedding of blood there is no remission’ of sin.<sup>237</sup>”

The Roman Papacy denies and blasphemes each of the three Divine Persons of the Trinity. The Pope denies and blasphemes the Father by taking his title “Holy Father” (John 17:11) contrary to Christ’s command, “call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father which is in heaven” (Matt. 23:9). The Pope denies and blasphemes the Son by denying his full humanity in the transubstantiation heresy (I John 4:2,3; II John 7), “it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (*Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662*). “He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son” (I John 2:21). The Pope also denies and blasphemes the Holy Ghost by denying the unity of the three Divine Persons (Matt. 28:19; II Cor. 13:14), by usurping the Spirit’s role in the Papal claim to be “Vicar of Christ.” Jesus taught the unity of the three Divine Persons, saying, the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (John 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7). He then further taught this unity, saying, that “the Spirit” “shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you” (John 16:13-15). For “the Holy Spirit” is “the Spirit of Christ” (Rom. 8:9).

As Berkhof rightly notes, “the Spirit is called ‘the Spirit of the Lord’” (II Cor. 3:17) because “He came as the” Comforter (Greek “Parakletos”), “to take the place of Christ and to do his work on earth.” “Now in the case of the Son his revelational work rested on His unity with the Father” (John 10:30). “Just so the work of the Spirit is based on His unity with the Father and the Son, John 16:14,15.<sup>238</sup>” But the Pope denies and blasphemes the Holy Spirit by putting himself *in the place of Christ* as “Vicar of Christ.” (In this he is typed by the antichrist Patriarchs of Eastern Orthodoxy who also deny this unity of the three Divine Persons with respect to the Holy Ghost, in their instance by denying the double procession of the Holy Ghost who proceeds from the Father *and the Son*, by claiming that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *alone*.) Great indeed is this blasphemy of the Pope against the Holy Ghost, for in the verse immediately before we are told that he is found “shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4) in the form of a Vice-God or Vice-Christ by his claim to be “Vicar of Christ,” we are told, that he is “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3).

---

<sup>237</sup> Spurgeon, C.H., “An Unalterable Law,” in *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, London, UK, 1914, (reprint: Pilgrim Publications, Pasadena, Texas, USA, 1979), Vol. 60, Sermon no. 3418 (Hebrews 9:22), pp. 373-84 at pp. 378,381.

<sup>238</sup> Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 96-7 (emphasis mine). Cf. “The Pope is the Antichrist,” 2003 (cassette) by the incumbent Minister of the *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)* in Aberdeen, Scotland, UK, the Reverend David Blunt (United Protestant Society, UK tape, obtained from Rev. John Shearer, The Rectory, Nuffield, Henley-on-Thames, Oxon, RG9 5SN, England, UK).

If the unpardonable sin is committed, then like Judas Iscariot, true repentance is not possible (Matt. 26:14-16; 20-25; 47-50; 27:3-10; Acts 1:15-20,25), and so Judas Iscariot is called “the son of perdition” (John 17:12). Moreover, “Satan entered into” “Judas Iscariot” (John 13:26,27), and so this “son of perdition” was devil-possessed by Satan himself. Thus it is instructive to note that the Apostle Paul also refers to the Antichrist as “the son of perdition” (AV) (II Thess. 2:3); and on the basis of John 13:26,27; 17:12 this indicates that the Antichrist is also devil-possessed by Lucifer, a proposition also consistent with II Thess. 2:9. (Cf. “seven heads and ten horns” of both the Devil and Antichrist, Rev. 12:3,9,13:1.) This fact is supported by the reality that we know of Roman Catholic bishops *who have not sat in Romish “ecumenical” Councils*, and also Roman Catholic priests, who have converted to Protestantism, for example, the Roman Catholic Bishop, Miler McGrath, who became a Protestant *Church of Ireland* Archbishop<sup>239</sup>. By contrast, we know of no Pope who has ever been able to repent and come to the true faith of Protestantism.

The Old Testament prophet Isaiah could address “the king of Babylon” (Isa. 14:4) and speak to Satan himself (Isa. 14:12-15), and the Old Testament prophet Ezekiel could address the king of Tyre and speak to the Devil himself (Ezek. 28:11-17). That was because Lucifer himself, and not some lesser devil, had devil-possessed these kings. So too, irrespective of what processes the conclave of Cardinals goes through to elect a new Pope, once elected, because that Pope commits the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost by usurping the role of the Holy Spirit of God and blasphemously claiming to be “the vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction, that Pope becomes “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3), and is devil-possessed by Satan himself, so that he operates his Pontificate by “the working of Satan” (II Thess. 2:9). A serious claim to be such a vice-God requires a concomitant claim to universal primacy, so as to match the position of Christ as “Shepherd and Bishop of your souls” (I Peter 2:25). Such a serious claim dates from Boniface III, who was established as “universal bishop” in 607, thus simultaneously establishing both the Office of Roman Papacy and the Office of Antichrist.

The Roman Pope does exactly what the Devil wants in all matters. Since unlike God, the Devil is not omnipresent, in general he cannot personally go far from Rome himself, at least while the Roman Pontiff is awake, since he lives in the Devil-possessed Roman Pontiff, whom he controls like a puppet on a string, although for various reasons he may allow other demon “spirits” to sometimes enter the Pope (Rev. 16:13 cf. Matt. 12:45; Luke 8:2). Thus from Rome the Devil organizes his legions of devils (Rev. 12:3,4) to do his bidding around the world, and thus Rome is “the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit” (Rev.

---

<sup>239</sup> Miler McGrath had McGrath’s Castle built in the early seventeenth century on the present north-south Ireland border-town of what the north call Tulleyhomen and the south call Pettigo, with a financial grant from Queen Elizabeth I. The McGrath Clan has met in contemporary times at this town. Bishop Miler McGrath was a Roman Catholic bishop who had never sat in a Romish “ecumenical” council,” and who converted to Protestantism. He went on to become the (Anglican) *Church of Ireland’s* Archbishop of Tipperary. His sarcophagus (which like McGrath’s Castle I have visited,) contains his facial and body image on top, and is located at Cashell Cathedral, which is set up on a high and impressive beach-front mountain peak in County Tipperary. Consider also the work of a former Roman Catholic priest, Richard Bennett, who is President of Berean Beacon Ministries, USA ([www.bereanbeacon.org](http://www.bereanbeacon.org)), and who with Martin Buckingham edited *Far From Rome, Near to God* (1994), which gives the testimonies of fifty former Roman Catholic priests who were converted and became Protestants.

18:2). It is the spiritual capital of Satan himself (Rev. 13:2). It is a sobering thought, that when addressing the Roman Pontiff, one can, like Eve in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:1-5; Rev. 12:9), or the prophets Isaiah (Isa. 14) and Ezekiel (Ezek. 28), address the Devil himself. For about one and a half millennia, over the centuries the Devil has moved his devil-possessing spirit from one Pope to the next, always speaking through him as his supreme mouthpiece, and the physical representative of his power on earth. This ancient, ongoing metamorphosis from one Papal body to the next, is unrecognized and hidden from those who “received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved” (II Thess. 2:10). Yet the spiritual form of the Devil (Rev. 12:3) dwells in the body of the Antichrist (Rev. 13:1). No exorcism, or attempted exorcism of a Pope could ever succeed, since God has declared the Pope to be “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3), and God does not operate contrary to his Word.

In this direct encounter with the Devil, it is notable, that as with his devil-possession of a serpent in Eden (Gen. 3), the Devil appears in a credible form that is capable of deceiving men. He does not, in this form, overtly attack Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but falsely claims to point men to him. The Devil has organized many false religions, and also entices men into unbelief (Rev. 21:8) e.g., atheism (Pss. 14:1; 53:1). But when men seek the truth of Christ, he is there, waiting to ensnare them in Popery, so that thinking themselves to be escaping from falsehood, they in fact run directly into the arms of the Devil’s masterpiece, the Roman Catholic Church. Those who think they can “live like a devil, and die like a saint,” also fall easy prey to this deceit, since when e.g., they make their “last confession” to the Popish priest, they are in fact confessing their sins, not to God, but to a minister in the Church of Antichrist.

The lusts of man’s flesh and the Devil’s world, may lead men into the theft and covetousness of atheistic communism. (It may sometimes suit the purposes of the Devil to promote agnosticism or atheism, especially, though not exclusively, in traditionally Protestant countries, as a means of sending men to hell while disconnecting men from their religions, in order that he may later bring them, or their descendants, into the Church of Rome.) But the Devil speaking through the Pope, will then condemn communism, in order that the political naive and simplistic, spiritually blinded politicians of the Western world, who are rightly opposed to Marxism, might then be drawn into the vortex of “the great whore,” and commit spiritual “fornication” (Rev. 17:1,2) with the anti-communist Church of Rome. What silly “suckers” these ungodly politicians who think they are so wise really are, when dealing with wiles of the Devil himself!

The lusts of man’s flesh and the Devil’s world, are happy for men to go into e.g., gluttony, pornography, prostitution, fornication, adultery, sodomy, covetousness of patriarchal church leadership roles by feminist women, abortion, or euthanasia. But the Devil, speaking through the Pope, then rightly, but cynically, makes pronouncements that such things are wrong. Thus unwary Christians and other moral men, may be sucked into the vortex of the Devil’s delusion, and think favourably of the Pope. So too, when men are in a Christian Church, the Devil, through the so called “Ecumenical movement,” asks them to recognize their “fellow Christians” in Popery. Even though the Papists reject the gospel of justification by faith (Gal. 3:11) in favour of another gospel (Gal. 1:7-9), based on a combination of faith and works; and even though Papists are “called a brother,” while being “an idolater” (I Cor. 5:11) of the Roman Mass and various statues. Thus these persons also run directly into the arms of the Devil’s masterpiece, for “he that biddeth” “an antichrist” “God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (I John 7,11). The Devil is “the god of this world”

(II Cor. 4:4), and the Devil demands his purported “due,” through his mouthpiece, the Pope of Rome.

## CHAPTER 14

### **The Antichrist’s *sin*: The short Pontificate of John-Paul I and the long Pontificate of John-Paul II.**

The short reign of John-Paul I (Pope 1978), followed by the second longest Pontificate in the history of the Papacy, that of John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005), provides us with an opportunity to examine the modern post Vatican II Papacy. These Pontificate’s have been looked upon with great favour by apostate Protestants involved in the “ecumenical” compromise, but has the Roman Papacy really changed?

On the 34th day of his Pontificate in 1978, Pope John-Paul I died, and his body was discovered by his housekeeper, a nun, Sister Vincenza, who had taken a cup of coffee to him as he lay in bed at about 5.30 a.m. . But the Vatican’s officialdom immediately practised “all deceivableness” (II Thess. 2:10), by engaging in a cover-up. A Vatican communique then claimed that the Pope’s private secretary, Monsignor John Magee, had discovered his dead body. The initial reason for spinning this lie appears to be that celibate Romish priests and Popes are not meant to have nuns in their bedroom, since the burden of “forbidding” people “to marry” (I Tim. 4:3) who do not have the gift of continency (I Cor. 7:7), may result in fornication. We cannot doubt that for any man to be alone in his bedroom, let alone *lying in his bed at 5.30 in the morning* with such a woman present, at the very least is a failure to “abstain from all appearance of evil” (I Thess. 5:22). Thus the “deceivableness” of Pope John-Paul I (Pope 1978) in pretending not to have a nun in his bedroom when he did, and so failing to “abstain from all appearance of evil” (I Thess. 5:22), gave rise to the further deceit of the Vatican’s officialdom claiming a Papal secretary had discovered his dead body. Having investigated this matter, John Cornwell thinks another later motive for perpetuating this lie by Cardinal Oddi, was that he did want to admit that the Vatican had made an earlier statement containing an error of fact. Thus we see in these actions a fulfilment of the old maxim, *O what a web we weave, when at first we try to deceive!*

Next, someone decided to “tell a whopper,” and claim that Pope John-Paul I had died clutching a religious book, entitled, *The Imitation of Christ*. This claim was broadcast on *Vatican Radio*. But the evidence for the falsity of this claim was so strong, that *Vatican Radio* later backed down and admitted its earlier story was false. When the truth came out about these lies connected with John-Paul I’s death, many wondered if the web woven by Vatican officialdom had been done in order to cover up an inside murder of the Pope. But the evidence does not seem to support such a theory in this form. Rather, the human evidence indicates that Pope John-Paul I was a weak, sickly, and incompetent man, who died of a heart-attack because he ineptly forgot to take his medicines which he negligently left at Venice from before his election as Pope, and incompetently failed to either have them brought to him at Rome, or to get new medicines prescribed for him by a doctor in Rome<sup>240</sup>.

---

<sup>240</sup> Cornwell, J., *A Thief in the Night*, The Death of Pope John Paul I, Viking, 1989, reprint: Penguin, London, UK, 1990, pp. 21,93,291-2,298,356-7; and this same author’s comments in: *Saints & Sinners: History of the Popes*, Episode “The Oracle of God,”

However, when it is remembered that the Pope is devil-possessed by the Devil himself, and under his direct control, it must be concluded that for unknown reasons, the Devil wanted the body of which he was dwelling in under the name of Pope John-Paul I to die. A devil-possessed man such as the Pope, may still have some personal expression allowed him, subject to the controlling “spirits of devils” (Rev. 16:13). Possibly then, Pope John Paul I really was an ill and inept man, who kept on forgetting to take his life sustaining medicines, and for a reason or reasons unknown, the Devil did not use his controlling power to correct this. Alternatively, the Devil may have actively stopped John-Paul I from sending for his medicines, in order for him to die. In either instance, the Devil evidently thought that John-Paul I’s usefulness to him had run its course, and it was time for a new metamorphosis into a new Papal body and new Papal form, with Pope John-Paul II.

Significantly Pope John-Paul I’s double-standards, in which officially he would never allow a nun into his bedroom, but in which unofficially he did; coupled with the apparent ease with which the Vatican’s officialdom could spin lies in a cover-up about a Papal secretary finding his dead body, or try and make him look “more holy” by claiming (until the truth forced them to backdown,) on *Vatican Radio* that he died reading *The Imitation of Christ*; reveals how a Pope, and those intimately connected with him in the Vatican’s officialdom, are prepared to work “with all deceivableness” (II Thess. 2:10). Of such, Christ said, “Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.” “When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it” (John 8:44). Or St. John says, “all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

The Pontificate of his successor, John-Paul II, was also involved in associated elements of “deceivableness” (II Thess. 2:10), “sin” (II Thess. 2:3), and “lawlessness” (II Thess. 2:7, NKJV) against the ninth commandment. A Vatican memorandum issued in 1984 under John-Paul II’s Pontificate, concerning, “The death of Pope John Paul I,” said that, “the private secretary of the Pontiff,” “ran to the bedroom of Pope John Paul I when he was summoned by the sister, who suspected that something might be wrong.” Thus we here have official confirmation that a nun was in the Pope’s bedroom, and that in fact she called for the Papal secretary. But, says the Vatican memorandum, “it makes no real difference, whether the Pope was found dead by a sister, or, as the Vatican communique said, by the private secretary of the Pontiff.” THIS IS AN EXTRAORDINARY STATEMENT THAT HONESTY DOES NOT MATTER, and that if an official “Vatican communique” is incorrect, “it makes no real difference<sup>241</sup>.”

It might be reasonably asked why under the Pontificate of John-Paul II, honesty over the events of John-Paul I’s death were dismissed as what “makes no real difference”? But it must be remembered that the Pontificate of John-Paul II is closely allied to that of John-Paul I, because John-Paul II immediately continued the new, post Vatican II tradition started by John-Paul I, of using “John-Paul” as a Papal name. With the stench of this scandal from the short lived seven week Pontificate of John Paul the First still in the air around Rome, a new Pope was elected, Karol Wojtyla of Poland. (Satan speaking through his latest devil-

---

Narrated by Anthony Clare, An Opus Television Production for SC4 International in association with RTF and La Cinquieme.

<sup>241</sup> Cornwell, J., *op. cit.*, pp. 356-7, at p. 357, “Vatican Memorandum Supplied to Episcopal Conference, June 1984.”

possessed Pontiff.) Woityla, understandably sought to distance himself from his immediate predecessor's duplicity, and the associated scandal concerning both this Pontiff and also the Vatican officialdom connected with his death. But spurning the Biblical injunction to "abstain from all appearance of evil" (I Thess. 5:22), like a pig "in the mire" (II Peter 2:22), Woityla unashamedly chose to adopt his predecessor's name, and thus become Pope John-Paul II. In the approximately 1400 years since the rise of the first Roman Pope, Boniface III in 607 (Bishop of Rome 607, then Pope 607), the 200th Pope<sup>242</sup>, John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) then had the second longest Pontificate (exceeded only by the 191st Pope, Pius IX, Pope 1846-1878). Since John-Paul II chose to so closely ally himself with a Pope whose name was being covered with the mud of scandal, involving, among other things, duplicity over the presence of a nun in his bedroom, some of the mud from the John-Paul I scandal sticks for all time to John-Paul II, who clearly identified quite strongly with his predecessor, when amidst the stench of a contemporary scandal over a nun in the bedroom of John-Paul I, he brazenly appropriated the murky name of "John-Paul" to himself.

This shadowy side of the Papacy has also been evident in its attitude towards a Vatican Bank scandal. Archbishop Paul Marankun, was President of the Vatican Bank from 1971 to 1989, first under Pope Paul VI, then under Pope John-Paul I, and then under Pope John-Paul II. His lack of commitment to the eight commandment, "Do not steal," and ninth commandment, "Do not bear false witness," from which one can also derive the moral precept, "Defraud not" (Mark 10:19), was clearly evident in the Bank of Ambrose (*Banco Ambrosiano*) scandal and associated Calvi Affair. After Robert Calvi had been jailed under Italian law for currency fraud, Archbishop Marankun continued to do business with him. Showing an appalling lack of business ethics, when asked why, he replied, "When Calvi was in jail I asked somebody, 'Hey! What's going on?' And the fellow says, 'Nah, if you're not caught, you're not worth anything'." Under Monsignor Marankun's presidency, the Vatican Bank sent letters indicating its control over Panamanian companies in debt, in order to give Calvi's *Bank of Ambrose* extra time. But the Archbishop then insisted that the Vatican Bank was in no way obligated to honour the companies bad debts; and so these *letters of comfort* were, on the Archbishop's own admission, a baseless and groundless exercise, *with no concern for the rights of the creditors who were intended to be misled by them*. But when the *Bank of Ambrose* went bankrupt following the mysterious disappearance of \$1.3 billion (thousand million), the *Vatican Bank* under Monsignor Marankun, eventually agreed to pay \$US250 million to Italian creditors of the bank.

While still head of the Bank of Ambrose, Calvi was found hanging from the scaffolding of Blackfriar's Bridge, London, UK, in 1982. It was thus of some interest to note that on 20 April 2005, the same day that the media announced the election of Pope Benedict XVI as Pope John-Paul II's successor, the news media also reported that in Rome, a Sicilian mobster and crime boss, together with two others, had been indicted over Calvi's murder. The Italian judge announced that among others, the murder trial would involve Pip Calo, a convicted Cosa Nostra treasurer, as well as Ernest Diotallevi, a crime boss of Rome. Italian prosecutors have linked the murder to the Italian Mafia, and connected it with Calvi's theft of money from an Italian financier, Licio Gelli, who was the head of a shady Masonic Lodge. Yet for his involvement in the financial scandal to do with the Bank of Ambrose, and connection with the sleazy Robert Calvi, the Pope was not prepared to remove Monsignor

---

<sup>242</sup> This reckoning excludes from the count, all those since 607 A.D. whom the *Church of Rome* has subsequently declared to be antiPopes.

Marankun from office as the Vatican Bank's President<sup>243</sup>.

With respect to the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Rom. 13:9), and tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" (Rom. 7:7), one must consider Pope John-Paul II's failure to adequately discipline sexually abusive priests. Elements of the case of Cardinal Bernard law have already been discussed (in Part 2, chapter 10). Though Cardinal Law resigned in 2002 in the context of a sex abuse scandal in his Diocese of Boston, USA, for having quietly transferred known sexually abusive child molester priests from parish to parish; he was neither excommunicated nor defrocked. Rather, he was appointed by *Pope John Paul II* as Arch-priest of Great St. Mary's Basilica in Rome. This is one of the three basilicas in Rome geographically outside the main Vatican City State, which forms part of the Vatican's extra-territorial holdings in Rome. At the Pope's Funeral telecast around the world, the cameras at one stage focused on the presence of the brazen Cardinal Law. Just days later, Cardinal Law was called upon to celebrate one of the most important Requiem Masses held during the nine days of mourning, declared by the Vatican for Pope John-Paul II's death. As he celebrated this Requiem Mass at Rome on Monday 11 April 2005 inside his church of Great St. Mary's, simultaneously outside the church, there was a protest by members of the "Survivors Network for those Abused by Priests"<sup>244</sup>.

What are victims of child abuse by Popish priests in America and elsewhere, meant to make of these lofty positions held by the disgraced Cardinal Law at both Great St. Mary's Basilica and the Pope's funeral? How can anyone claim that John-Paul II took the issue of sexual abuse by Roman Catholic clergy seriously enough, when he appointed a disgraced Cardinal to the position of Arch-priest of Great St. Mary's Basilica in Rome, where this man embroiled in sexual scandal then held a prominent position in the funeral services of the Pope who appointed him when he celebrated a key Requiem Mass for the late Pontiff?

Hosea (Jose) Barba, a professor of Latin American studies at ITAM University in Mexico City, Mexico, is a member of a group making allegations against the Rome based religious order, "Legion of Christ." This Roman Catholic Order was started in 1941, and within 65 years had about 500 Popish priests and 2,500 seminarians, in about 20 countries, including the USA. Barba's group has accused the Romish Order's founder, Marcial Maciel, of serial homosexual sex abuse by priests from the 1940s to 1960s. They were brought against the still living Maciel, under Roman Catholic canon law at the Vatican in 1998. The case was filed at the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, formerly known as *The Inquisition*. The incumbent *Prefect* of the body formerly called *the Inquisition*, was Cardinal Ratzinger. Likewise, a Mexican Roman Catholic Bishop, handed Cardinal Ratzinger a similar letter two years later in 2000, making similar allegations of homosexual sexual abuse by Maciel against a Spanish priest, who claims he was molested by Maciel in the 1950s. Barba then gave another letter to the Vatican, to be forwarded to Cardinal Ratzinger, outlining alleged sexual abused by Maciel in 2002. This *specific* instance of a failure to treat sexual abuse or sexual abuse allegations with appropriate seriousness, has to date become a *general* hallmark of the Roman Church's standard response to such matters.

---

<sup>243</sup> Cornwell, J., *op. cit.*, pp. 345-9; "Four charged over death of Vatican banker Calvi," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 April 2005, p. 9.

<sup>244</sup> "Pedophile Scandal: Former Archbishop to celebrate Mass," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 April 2005, p. 7; "News and Current Affairs Special: Pope John Paul II Funeral" (live broadcast), ABC TV, Sydney Australia, 8 April, 2005; *Newshour*, With Jim Lehrer (USA TV News), 11 April, 2005.

Professor Barba claims that for over six years, Cardinal Ratzinger deliberately obstructed and prevented any investigation of his serious sex scandal allegations. Finally, *some two years after Marcial Maciel Degollado's death* in January 2008, he was found guilty of both homosexually raping boys who were minors, and also heterosexually fathering at least one child i.e., he was a bisexual. On 1 May, 2010, the Vatican admitted he had been “immoral” and committed “true crimes<sup>245</sup>.” While maintaining that the presupposition of “innocent until proven guilty” should always apply, it must be said that *Cardinal Ratzinger dawdled far too long before finally agreeing in December 2004* to investigate this matter, which he evidently *failed to treat with appropriate seriousness*. The investigation was not been helped by the fact that the month before, in November 2004, Pope John-Paul II *warmly and publicly praised* Maciel. It is also notable that the investigation then took six years, and the fact that Maciel had been dead for over two years before the GUILTY verdict was announced, looks very much as though he was being given a good deal of practical immunity during this lifetime.

Of course, for Lucifer who has devil-possessed every Pope since 607, this is just a cynical exercise in “damage control management” in the running of his great masterpiece of deception, the Roman Catholic Church, rather than an issue he is really in any way concerned about. It might also be remarked, the Papists deluded by him are certainly better than him. The difference between the Black Mass, which may be performed by a small number of Satanists, some of whom may also be Papists who know the secret that the Pope is the Antichrist, and possessed by the Devil, but choose the dark path and worship him from their most wicked lusts; in which in a Roman Catholic Church on the witches’ sabbath, there is bodily nudity and ritual sex, and desecration of “Christian” religious objects, including an inverted cross as part of the Black Mass<sup>246</sup>; and the Roman Mass in which idolatry and blasphemy are present for deceived Papists who actually think they are celebrating the Christian Lord’s Supper instituted in the New Testament; is the difference between where the Devil would like to take people (the Black Mass), and where he is able to take most of his Papist minions (the Roman Mass). This thus also bespeaks the wider truth that we should remember that Papists are themselves deceived, and so in moral terms, would generally be a lot better than the Devil, whom they are tricked by. Thus to a large extent Satan who devil-possess the Pope, relies on the average Papists’ generosity to “come to the defense of the Pope.” Notably then, just after John-Paul II died in April 2005, the USA Roman Catholic Church told the media that the sex abuse scandals in the Roman Church would not be allowed to overshadow the Cardinal’s election of a new Pontiff. The President of the [Roman] *Catholic University* in Washington, “Father” David O’Connell, said, “For 1 billion [Roman] Catholics throughout the world, this is not the most important issue.”<sup>247</sup>

Certainly from the Cardinal’s perspective as “the princes” of the Roman Church, he was right. Notwithstanding Cardinal Ratzinger’s and Pope John-Paul II’s sluggish response to the investigation of these serious allegations, just four months later in April 2005, Cardinal

---

<sup>245</sup> *New York Times*, USA, 2 May, 2010; cited in “Marcial Maciel” Wikipedia (29 Sept. 2010) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marcial\\_Maciel#cite\\_note-6](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marcial_Maciel#cite_note-6)).

<sup>246</sup> Josh McDowell & Don Stewart’s *Handbook of Today’s Religions* (Campus Crusade for Christ, USA, 1983, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee, USA), pp. 167-8 (The Black Mass).

<sup>247</sup> “Pedophile victims won’t let Papal Mass pass untroubled,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 April, 2005, p. 8.

Ratzinger became Pope Benedict XVI. The choice of the name, “Benedict,” meant that the Pope made a special symbolical link of himself to previous Popes of this name. This thus includes Benedict VIII (Pope 1012-1024), who at the *Council of Pavia* (1022), forbade married clergy. This clearly embraces the heresy of “forbidding” people “to marry” (I Tim. 4:3), with vows of celibacy. While not the only relevant factor, such vows of celibacy are certainly a *contributory factor* to the sexual abuse endemic in the Roman Church<sup>248</sup>. To some extent this is also seen in the subsequent sex scandals of Benedict IX (Pope 1032-1044, April-May 1045, disputed rule 1047-1048). While keeping the requirement of Pope Benedict VIII not to marry, Pope Benedict IX had an openly dissolute Pontificate, which Mann concedes had a “violent and immoral career,” that included “plundering” and “murdering.” Hayward says, “whilst the private life of the” “Pope remained always scandalous, his public life was ruled by” “greed.”<sup>249</sup> Among other sins, his wickedness included public knowledge among the citizens of Rome of his participation in the sexual immorality of wild orgies held in the City of Rome.

Since the Bishopric of Rome expanded to first become a semi-formal temporary titular primate from 533 to 565, and then the Papacy with formal jurisdictional primacy in 607 A.D., the Church of Rome’s second longest serving Pope, Pope John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005), is also a good example of one way the Church of Rome is guilty of “giving heed to seducing spirits” (I Tim. 4:1) in the form of “invocation of the saints” contrary to Scripture (John 14:6; I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24). The Roman Church has a three-tiered process whereby they first declare a significant Papist “Venerable,” then beatify and call him “Blessed,” and then canonize and called him “Saint.” Movement through the three stages is not automatic, and so what the Roman Church deems to be a less significant, but still significant person, might simply retain the title “Venerable” or “Blessed” in perpetuity, that is, without ever being canonized and so made a Romish “Saint.” For example, “Blessed” Benedict XI (Pope 1301-1304), was beatified in 1736 by Clement XII (Pope 1730-1740), but has never been canonized. Before John-Paul II, since the 16th century only about 300 Romish Saints had been canonized. Known as “the Saint maker,” John-Paul II canonized around 450 Romish “Saints” - far more than any previous Pope before him. He also beatified more than 1,300, including the longest serving Pope, “Blessed” Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878), who called the *Vatican I Council* (1869-70) that made the doctrine of Papal “infallibility” part of the Roman Church’s required teaching; and “Blessed” John XXIII (Pope 1959-1963), who called the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5).

Likewise, with respect to the sixth commandment, “Do not kill” (James 2:11), *at best, Rome has a modern history of failing to take adequate measures with adequate speed against forms of murder that she herself, in modern times, admits are immoral; and at worst, she seeks to covertly condone certain forms of violence in modern times, while overtly condemning them.* This is evident in the *silence of Pope Pius XII* (Pope 1939-1958) over the World War Two mass murder of Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs by the Nazis. Or Pius XII’s later elevation of the Archbishop of Zagreb, Croatia, and convicted Nazi war criminal, Aloysius Stepinatz, to Cardinal in 1952. Or the beatification by Pope John-Paul II of “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinatz in 1998. (These issues are more fully discussed in Part 3.)

---

<sup>248</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 April, 2005, “The Choice of Name: Paying homage to ... past,” p. 8; “Sex abuse allegation casts long shadow,” p. 9.

<sup>249</sup> Mann, H., *The Lives of the Popes*, Kegan Paul, London, 2nd edition, 1925, Vol. 5, pp. 248-9; Hayward, F., *A History of the Popes*, Dent & Sons, London, UK, 1931, p. 146.

Thus the second longest serving Pope, John-Paul II, set aside the first commandment, “Thou shalt have no other gods but me,” by “shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4) in the form of a vice-God, with his blasphemous Papal claim to be the “Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction in the Church. Such blasphemy also violates the third commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain.” This precept is also violated by his claim to be a “Christian” and associated claim that Roman Catholicism is a true form of “Christianity,” whereby “the name of God is blasphemed” (Rom. 2:24), since the *Church of Rome* denies the Biblical “gospel” of justification by faith, which says, “the just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16,17), and the Christian should “avoid them” who deny this “doctrine” (Rom.16:17). The Pope set aside the second commandment, “Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image,” in many ways, including his Mariolatry, which contrary to Matt. 11:27; 12:46-50, is evident in his Papal crest which contained the letter “M” for Mary, and its associated motto, “Totus Tuus” (Latin, “Totally thine”), meant that “Totally thine” referred to “M”ary. Impure worship (Isa. 1:13-15), including Sunday Masses, meant that contrary to the second and fourth commandments (Exod. 20:4-6; 8-11), he profaned the Lord’s day with his idolatrous adoration of the communion elements.

Like all the Popes, he also denied the greater meaning of the fifth commandment’s promise, in which the promised “land” (Deut. 5:16) entered by the Children of Israel, was a prophetic type pointing to the greater “promise” of the new “earth” (Eph. 6:2,3 cf. Heb. 11:8-10), for those who have been “quickenened” from spiritual death, and “saved” “by grace” “through faith” (Eph. 2:5,8); since the Pope’s false gospel denies that this is a work of “grace,” “the gift of God,” and “not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8,9). He set aside the 6th commandment, “Do not kill” (James 2:11), with his 1995 canonization of the 16th and 17th century mass murderer of Protestants, “Saint” Sarkander of Moravia, and his 1998 beatification of the convicted Nazi war criminal, “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinat. The eight commandment, “Do not steal,” ninth commandment, “Do not bear false witness,” and associated moral precept, “Defraud not” (Mark 10:19), were disregarded by Pope John-Paul II, who turned a blind-eye (Zech 11:17) to the financial scandal of the Vatican Bank in its dealing with the *Ambrose Bank*, refusing to remove from office the implicated Vatican Bank’s President, Monsignor Marankun. While being worshipped as an “idol” by his flock, “the idol shepherd” also turned a blind-eye, so that “his right eye” was “utterly darkened” (Zech. 11:17), to the seriousness of the sex abuse scandals of Romish priests. The seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Rom. 13:9), and tenth commandment, “Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 7:7), were disregarded by John-Paul II, as he failed to adequately discipline sexually abusive priests, seen e.g., in the way he made the disgraced Cardinal Law of Boston, USA, the Arch-priest of Great St. Mary’s Basilica in Rome.

Thus on the one hand, we cannot doubt, that John-Paul II’s Pontificate was marked by the violation of all the commandments of the Holy Decalogue (Exod. 20:1-17), that glorious “law of liberty” (James 2:12), which was abolished on tablets of stone (Jer. 3:16), in order that it might be written on the tablets of human hearts under the new covenant in the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ (Jer. 31:31-34; Heb. 8:10; 10:16,17). Little wonder the Pope is so opposed to this “law of liberty,” for the third commandment condemns as blasphemy those who falsely profess the name of Christ (Rom. 2:24), by e.g., denying the sufficiency of *Christ alone* (Latin, *solo Christo*) (Philp. 3:8,9), denying the doctrine of justification by faith (faith alone: Latin, *sola fide*) (Rom. 1:16,17; 16:17); or denying the sole redemptive work of Christ by grace (grace alone: Latin, *sola gratia*) (Rom. 3:24), by e.g., the teaching of “Mary co-redeemer;” or denying the sole mediatorial work of Christ (I Tim. 2:5), by e.g., the teaching of “saint mediators;” or denying the completed work of Christ on the cross, who entered the

heavenly Most Holy Place in fulfilment of Day of Atonement types (Lev. 16; Heb. 8-10) when he said, "It is finished" (John 19:30), "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46; Rom. 5:6,8; Heb. 9:28), by the blasphemy of the Roman Mass in which it is said Christ is offered up afresh for the sins of the living and the dead; or denying that the gift of prophecy existed only in Bible times (Scripture alone: Latin, *sola Scriptura*) (Luke 11:47-51; I Cor. 13:8, NASB; Eph. 2:20), by e.g., the claim of "visions" from Romish Saints, or "Divine revelation" with "ecumenical councils." Or the fourth commandment (Heb. 3 & 4) and fifth commandment (Eph. 2:5,8,9; 6:2,3), contain within them pointers to "the everlasting gospel" (Rev. 14:6) of God's grace, whereby the "accursed" false "gospel" of Popery (Gal. 1:8,9), which denies that, "The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11), is struck down and exposed as some "other gospel" than the "gospel" "of Christ" (Gal. 1:8-10). For "the mystery of iniquity" which peddled a false gospel, based upon justification by works, was "already" at work" in apostolic times, but its fuller manifestation was restrained until the Western Roman Emperor was "taken out of the way" in 476 A.D., and "then" "that Wicked" Roman Papacy "was revealed" (II Thess. 2:7,8). To be sure then, like all the Popes of Rome Pope John-Paul II was "the man of sin" (II Thess. 2:3) and "iniquity" (II Thess. 2:7).

But on the other hand, the funeral of John-Paul II proved to be a great event in worldly affairs. When the second longest serving Pope, whom "with all deceivableness" (II Thess. 2:10) was presented as "the third longest serving Pope" on the fraudulent basis that "the Apostle Peter was the first Pope," died, the Vatican historian of Rome's La Sapienza University, reminded the peoples of the world, "The Church of Rome is perhaps the last absolute monarchy in the world<sup>250</sup>." Thus some "wondered" (Rev. 13:3) at the power of a twentieth and twenty-first century Western European "king" (Dan. 11:36), who was not a titular or ceremonial king, but an *absolute monarch*. In Asiatic India, where the Hindu's heathen goddess Vishnu is greatly worshipped, there was a special affection for this Pope who said of Mary, that he was "Totally thine," and whose coffin contained the letter "M" for Mary on it. India announced three days of official mourning over this Papal proponent for the cult of Mariolatry. Also reflecting the pagan Indian's love for goddess figures, the Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, said the Pope "had endeared himself especially to the people of India by initiating the process, of granting sainthood to Mother Teresa" of Calcutta<sup>251</sup>. Thus some of the openly heathen world, "wondered" (Rev. 13:3) at this "king" who was known; not because "he" had "regard" for "the" Christian "God of his fathers" (Dan. 11:37), that is, the "God" of the better Bishops of Rome before 607 like St. Silvester (Bishop of Rome 314-335) St. Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome 590-604)<sup>252</sup> before *The Great Apostasy* (II Thess. 2:3); but rather they "wondered" (Rev. 13:3) at the "king" who was known with world-wide acclaim, to "honour the God of" saint-mediator spiritual "forces" (Dan. 11:36,38). Hence the goddess worshipping heathen Hindus of India "wondered" (Rev. 13:3) at this "king" (Dan. 11:36), who had so "endeared himself" to them.

Billed on the front-page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* (9 & 10 April, 2005), under the headline, "The greatest farewell in history," about 2 billion (two thousand million) watched this Requiem Mass at St. Peter's Basilica in the Vatican City State, on world-wide

<sup>250</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 April, 2005, p. 9.

<sup>251</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 April, 2005, p. 8.

<sup>252</sup> On the Calendar of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, St. Gregory the Great is given a black letter day on 12 March, and St. Silvester is given a black letter day on 31 Dec. . They are both worthy recipients of this honour, in a prayer book whose 39 Articles also condemns every Bishop of Rome from 607 as the Antichrist (Article 35).

television around the globe. Several million “pilgrims” packed into Rome, including the Papist Archbishop of Sydney, Cardinal George Pell, who said that this massive funeral was an event, “unprecedented in Papal history.”<sup>253</sup> Thus “the world wondered after the” Pope (Rev. 13:3). Present at his funeral, were world rulers: kings, presidents, and prime ministers. Some were dazzled by the way he had thought “to change the times” in which he lived (Dan. 7:25, ASV). Typical was the former Polish President and Solidarity Leader, Lech Walesa, (whose predominately Papist country went into mourning with Polish flags in the capital of Cracow’s, Market Square, being draped in black,) who said that without Pope John-Paul II, “there would” have been “no end of communism, or at least much later”<sup>254</sup>. Thus some “wondered” (Rev. 13:3) at a man who could so “change the times” in which he lived (Dan. 7:25, ASV), that he would be an important contributory factor to bringing down the Iron Curtain of Communism, that had divided parts of Western Europe such as Germany, and also divided Western Europe from Eastern Europe extending to the Far East of Asia. (Other relevant factors included information from a double-agent USSR super-spy, who revealed the economic weakness of the USSR, so the USA President, Ronald Reagan, could propose the “Star Wars” programme in order to effectively bankrupt the USSR which could not afford to match this expenditure, and so financially collapsed.)

Under the heading, “Medieval pageant for the Pope’s final exit,” the *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that “All week,” the spectacle in St. Peter’s “square” was “like a medieval pageant, with flags fluttering, people playing guitars and singing religious songs, and shrines of candles and offerings formed around lampposts and the two fountains known as ‘Scripture’ and ‘Tradition’.”<sup>255</sup> With an average wait in the queue of 13 hours, but with some having to wait in the queue up to 24 hours, about 2 million people, pushed and packed their tired and fatigued bodies in to see Pope John-Paul II’s dead body; only to have to then push and pull themselves out from the place of this suffocating and sweaty ordeal<sup>256</sup>. But at least things were not as bad for these modern “pilgrims” involved in medieval pageantry, as they had been for their medieval pilgrim forbears, such as those of Rocamadour in France; where up to 30,000 medieval pilgrims daily climbed 216 steps, saying a “Hail Mary” on each step, till they came to “the Black Virgin” in the Notre Dame Chapel; a trek which cost a number of them their lives, when they were killed in the crush<sup>257</sup>.

At the world-wide telecast of the Pope’s funeral, a number of times the cameras showed the crowd chanting, “Saint” (“Santo”), or holding up placards, reading “Saint” (“Santo”); or “Saint Soon” (“Santo Subito”<sup>258</sup>). They were encouraged in this folly by the German Cardinal, Joseph Ratzinger, who was conducting the Papal funeral. Cardinal Ratzinger (shortly later elected by the conclave of Cardinals to be John-Paul II’s successor, the 201st Pope, Pope Benedict XVI), invoked John-Paul II by *seeking his blessing*. Taking the name that belongs to God the Father *alone* (Matt. 23:9), namely, “Holy Father” (John 17:11), and blasphemously applying it to the Pope in accordance with Papist doctrine;

---

<sup>253</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 April, 2005, p. 8; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 & 10 April, 2005, p. 1.

<sup>254</sup> “Global Tributes,” “John Paul II Tribute,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 April 2005, p. 4; *Newshour*, With Jim Lehrer (USA TV News), 4 & 5 April, 2005.

<sup>255</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 April, 2005, p. 8.

<sup>256</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 April, 2005, p. 10.

<sup>257</sup> “The Rocamadour Balloon Festival,” Directed by J. Dufour & G. Thion, Produced by Ampersand, SBS TV Australia, 2005.

<sup>258</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 & 10 April, 2005, p. 15.

denying (I John 2:23) God the Father (Heb. 12:9,23) and God the Son (II Cor. 1:23; 5:6,8,10), by robbing God of his Divine Prerogative as keeper of men's souls, by blasphemously entrusting John-Paul II's soul *to Mary*; and denying that Christ is man's only mediator (Matt. 11:27; John 10:7; 14:6), and so blasphemously denying that it is the mediatorial work of Christ under the New Testament covenant that leads saved men's "spirits" to "heaven" (Heb. 12:23,24), *by blasphemously attributing mediatorial powers to Mary*; and denying that the Pope as "the son of perdition" (II Thess. 2:3 cf. Judas Iscariot in John 17:12) cannot be saved (Rev. 19:20; 20:10), having committed the unforgivable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:31,32), by usurping the place of the Holy Ghost (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:8-13) with his blasphemous claim to be "the Vicar of Christ" with a "universal" jurisdiction in the church; Cardinal Ratzinger said of John Paul II, "he sees us and blesses us. Yes, bless us, holy Father. We entrust your dear soul, to the Mother of God, who guided you each day, and who will guide you now to" "eternal glory"<sup>259</sup>." These deluded persons, encouraged by Cardinal Ratzinger, not knowing the simple Biblical distinction between saints and sinners, and thinking that the Romish doctrine of "Saints" was correct, were therefore hoping for John-Paul II's speedy canonization. Thus they "wondered after the" apocalyptic "beast" of Rome (Rev. 13:3).

The Vatican has diplomatic relations with over 130 states, and most of these sent representatives to the Pope's funeral, conducted by his Papal successor, Cardinal Ratzinger. When Pope Benedict XVI was enthroned shortly afterwards in the so called "Chair of St. Peter," dignitaries included King Juan Carlos and Queen Sophia of Spain, the French Prime Minister, John-Peter Raffarin, the German Chancellor and President, Horst Kohler, the Duke of Edinburgh, presidents from Ireland, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and Argentina. The USA delegation was led by the apostate Protestant George Bush's apostate Protestant brother, the Governor of Florida, Jeb Bush. The apostate Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, also attended<sup>260</sup>. The funeral of Pope John-Paul II, and the enthronement of Pope Benedict XVI shortly afterwards in 2005, showed how "the kings of the earth," whether apostate Protestants, followers of an Eastern Patriarch, Papists, or openly pagan, love to commit spiritual "fornication" with "the great whore" who "sitteth" upon the "seven mountains" of Rome (Rev. 17:1,2,9). For "who is like unto the" Pope? And "who" among all these kings of the earth, "is able to make war with him?" (Rev. 13:3). For "God" did "send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (II Thess. 2:11,12).

## CHAPTER 15

### **The Antichrist's *sin*: "with all deceivableness" (II Thess. 2:3,10).**

We are told that the Antichrist will act "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness" (AV) or "with all deceit of unrighteousness" (ASV) (II Thess. 2:10). There are many ways that the Roman Papacy has done this. When in 2005, Cardinal Ratzinger became Pope Benedict XVI, his choice of the name, "Benedict," meant that he made a special symbolical link of himself to all previous Popes of the name, "Benedict." This therefore includes the

---

<sup>259</sup> "News and Current Affairs Special: Pope John Paul II Funeral" (live broadcast), ABC TV, Sydney Australia, 8 April, 2005.

<sup>260</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 April, 2005, p. 9.

eleventh century Pope, Benedict IX, who was Pope three times, 1032-1044, April-May 1045, and 1047-1048. His depraved and licentious life included wild orgies and violence. He excommunicated any who were opposed to him. His fraud, in which he acted “with all deceivableness” (II Thess. 2:10), including his selling of the Papacy, and then reclaiming it on two separate occasions.

The desire of the Bishop of Rome to expand his influence, and his preparedness to do so by fraud, was evident in the time of Augustine (354-430), Bishop of Hippo (modern Annaba, Algeria, formerly, Bone,) in north Africa. Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* refers to how the African Church resisted the Bishop of Rome’s claims to supremacy. “Let” “the notable attempt to falsify the first Nicene Council for the Pope’s supremacy, practised by Popes in St. Augustine’s time, be a witness hereof; which practice indeed had then taken effect, had not the diligence and wisdom of St. Augustine and other learned and godly bishops in Africa by their great labour and charges also resisted and stopped the same.” As Griffiths explains in his commentary on this, the Bishop of Rome, “Zosimus in the year 418 tried to establish his right to receive appeals from the judgements of bishops in Africa by citing a canon made by the Synod of Sardicea in 347 as having been made by the great Council of Nicea in 325, and the attempt was continued by his two immediate successors, Boniface I and Celestine I.”<sup>261</sup>

But one of the most blatant ways that this “Wicked” (AV) or “lawless one” (NKJV) (II Thess. 2:8) set aside the Ninth Commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16; Matt. 19:18; I Tim. 1:10), and acted with “deceivableness” (AV) or “deception” (NKJV) (II Thess. 2:10), is found in the history of *Constantine’s Donation*<sup>262</sup>. Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, “Let the forged gift of Constantine” be used to show the “falsifying and corrupting” of “histories” by the “Papists,” “for the maintenance of their wicked and ungodly purposes.” First found among a group of documents now known as the *False Decretals*, the *Donation of Constantine* was written about 750 to 800 A.D., though it fraudulently purports to have been written some four hundred to four hundred and fifty years earlier by Constantine. It is riddled with heresy and error. For example, contrary to the Biblical teaching that “there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. 2:5), the *Donation of Constantine* endorses the Romish doctrine of patron saints and invocation of saints, claiming that the Apostle Peter restored Constantine the Great to health, and that “Peter and Paul, will be opposed ... in the present and in the future life” to anyone disregarding the document and its claims. Or contrary to the Biblical teaching, “The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1: 17; Gal. 3:11), the *Donation of Constantine* claims that one may “obtain pardon from our Lord God Jesus Christ our Saviour by vigils, fasts, and tears and prayers,” and that “the wave of salvation” is obtained by the good work of receiving a baptism of “triple immersion.” These spiritual claims further violate the ninth precept, “Do not bear false witness” (Deut. 5:20; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20).

The *Donation of Constantine* had a number of purposes, including the support of

---

<sup>261</sup> Griffiths’ *Two Books of Homilies*, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-8; referring to Bishop Jewel’s, *Jewel’s Reply to Harding’s Answer*, Art. 4, Div. 6, “*The Pope a Forger*,” and *Milman’s History of Latin Christianity*, Book 2, chapter 4 (modernizing Afrike to Africa).

<sup>262</sup> Translation here and below concerning the “four chief seats” of the Eastern Patriarchs, from Henderson, E.F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, Translated and Edited by Ernest Henderson, George Bell & Sons, London, 1896, pp. 319-29.

Papal claims to temporal power and universal primacy in the church. For example, Papal rights to dispose of lands was based on the *Donation of Constantine*, and its fraudulent history was overlaid with a false late medieval story about the Waldensians whom it was said were set up in the time of Emperor Constantine as a protest movement against the generous land grants given to the Bishops of Rome in this document. On the one hand, this acts to show a more ancient origin of the Waldensians than is sometimes attributed to them, i.e., the testimony of their independence from Rome and recorded protest against this fraudulent eighth century *Donation of Constantine* more properly indicates that they were known to be an independent group from *at least* the eighth century, *and possibly, though by no means certainly, earlier than this*. This also matches further positive historical evidence of their existence from as early as *c.* 1000 A.D., becoming known as “Henricians” from 1147, and after being joined in the 12th century by Peter Waldo, they became more generally known as Waldenses (although it is unclear if Waldo took his name from, or gave it to, this group). But on the other hand, the claim that the Waldenses separated from Rome in the fourth century as a consequence of the *Donation of Constantine* is clearly false. The *Donation of Constantine* was used by both Pope Nicholas I (Pope 858-867) and Pope Leo IX (Pope 1049-1054), both of whom have been canonized by the Church of Rome which refers to them as “Saint Nicholas I” and “Saint Leo IX.” The *Donation of Constantine* was quoted by Pope Nicholas I in 865, and this document formed part of Roman Catholic Canon Law from at least the time of the *Great Schism* in 1054 when Pope Leo IX used it against the Bishop (Archbishop) of Constantinople, and it remained part of Roman Catholic canon law until 1628<sup>263</sup>.

This first definite canon law usage of the *Donation of Constantine* in 1054 is doubly significant because of its inferred relationship to the events leading up to the decree of Emperor Phocas in 607 that the Bishop of Rome was “universal bishop.” The emperor Constantine (Emperor 307-337) divided the Roman Empire into four divisions under four patriarchs in four metropolitans, the Bishop of Rome, Bishop of Alexandria, Bishop of Antioch, and Bishop of Constantinople, to which was then added the fifth patriarch with the Bishop of Jerusalem. This is the first time the Bishop of Rome gained jurisdiction outside of his Diocese of Rome. The Bishop of Rome was the *Patriarch of the West* (a semi-formal Papal title from 642-1870, and since 2006; and a formal Papal title from 1870-2006), and the other four bishops were the *Patriarchs of the East*. The two main centres of power were Rome and Constantinople, sometimes called “New Rome.” Because the See of Rome was older than the See of Constantinople, the *Council of Constantinople* (381) gave the “Bishop of Constantinople” “honour next after the Bishop of Rome.” Thus the “Bishop of Rome” held “primacy of honour.” However, this “primacy of honour” was like the primacy of honour the Russian Orthodox or Rumanian Orthodox Churches now give to the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, i.e., it does not even carry with it a titular primacy, let alone a governing primacy, but is simply a “primacy of honour” in ceremonial terms.

In time, first the Bishop of Rome, and then the Bishop of Constantinople, would attempt to increase their influence and become primate over these other metropolitans. Over time, the Bishops of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, voluntarily deferred to the Bishop

---

<sup>263</sup> Attwater, D. (Editor), *The Catholic Encyclopedia Dictionary*, Second Edition Revised, Imprimatur: E. Morrogh Bernard, Vic. Gen., Cassell and Company, USA, 1931,1949, pp. 156,188; Bihlmeyer, K., *op. cit.*, pp. 146,211; Schaff, P., *History of the Christian Church*, Volume 4, Mediaeval from Gregory I to Gregory VII A.D. 590 - 1073, Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910, chapter 60.

of Rome, who effectively became governing primate of these other three Metropolitans. While they did not impinge on the jurisdictional autonomy of the Bishop of Constantinople from the Bishop of Rome, the 150 bishops of the *Council of Constantinople* (381), nevertheless gave the “bishop of Constantinople” “primacy of honour next after the Bishop of Rome” on the basis Constantinople was “New Rome.” As the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) observed, these “150 bishops” “gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome; judging ... that the city honoured by the monarchy and the senate, and enjoying equal privileges with the old imperial Rome, should likewise receive equal rank in matters ecclesiastical, holding the second rank after her.<sup>264</sup>” Thus by 451 formal ecclesiastical jurisdiction was effectively bipolar between the Bishop of Rome and Bishop of Constantinople. But the Bishop of Rome had been given “primacy of honour” in ceremonial terms in 381, and Rome thereafter sought to use this, as a lever, to increase her power. While the Bishop of Rome sought ever more power and universal primacy, the Bishop of Constantinople simply sought to retain the bipolar *status quo*. *Of course, there were also independent churches outside the jurisdiction of both of these Patriarchs, such as independent orthodox churches in the British Isles, or independent unorthodox churches such as the monophysitist churches in e.g., Egypt (found today in the Coptic Orthodox Church).*

Rome gained further status in 533 when a letter by Justinian in Justinian’s Code, regarded the Bishop of Rome “the head of all the churches.” This was purely a titular primacy that lasted by royal prerogative only so long as Justinian remained Emperor till 565. Even while it was operational, it gave Rome no governing power over the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Nevertheless, the essential feature of the Roman Papacy as the Antichrist that “sitteth in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4) was now fulfilled *as a prophetic type*, since from 533 to 565, the Emperor considered that the Bishop of Rome had titular primacy over “all the churches,” as well as his governing primacy over four of the five patriarchates.

But it is clear that between 565 and 607 this situation did not prevail and indeed two Bishops of Rome during this time, Pelagius II (Bishop of Rome: 579-590) and Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome: 590-604), both rejected such claims when they were advanced by the Patriarch of Constantinople for himself. Hence in documenting “The origin and growth of the Papacy,” the Presiding Bishop of the *Church of England (Continuing)*, a Reformed, Low Church Evangelical, Anglican Protestant Church, Bishop Edward Malcolm says:

In 587 Johannes Nestenta, Patriarch of Constantinople, called a Synod. At it he endeavored to be accepted as a universal or ecumenical bishop or patriarch. The Bishop of Rome, Pelagius II rebuked him for this. Pelagius’s successor, Gregory the Great, went further. He called it a “foolish, frivolous, proud, new, profane, pestiferous, superstitious, perverse, wicked, yea, a blasphemous name” (*Ecclesia Anglicana Ecclesia Catholica*, 2nd Edition Revised, 1840, p. 572). He added, “I confidently affirm, that whosoever calls himself or desires to be called an universal priest or bishop, is in his pride the forerunner of Antichrist ...” (*Ibid.*). Gregory died in 604, and was succeeded by the short-lived Bishop Sabinian, who died in 606. He was in turn succeeded by Bishop Boniface III, who applied to the Emperor that Rome should be known as the head of all churches, and that the Bishop of Rome should be a universal or ecumenical bishop ...<sup>265</sup>.

<sup>264</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 82-3.

<sup>265</sup> The Right Reverend E. J. Malcolm, “Papal Jurisdiction,” *The Journal of The Church of England (Continuing)*, Association of the Continuing Church Trust, England, Issue

Thus near the end of the sixth century, around the same time as the incumbent Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great, repudiated such claims of universal primacy by some of his predecessors; the Bishop of Constantinople changed tack from his historical position of simply seeking to maintain the bipolar *status quo* between Rome and Constantinople. He now upped the ante. The Bishop of Constantinople now declared in agreement with some of the earlier Bishops of Rome before Gregory, that there was indeed a universal primate, but further added that as the bishop of the Byzantine Empire's capital he was that primate, and so the Bishop of Constantinople constituted the "universal bishop." This then helped propel the contest for governing primacy between the Bishop of Constantinople and later Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, back into focus, in what was effectively a *Mexican stand-off*. But the Bishop of Rome ultimately won out when in 607 he procured a decree from Emperor Phocas declaring that the Bishop of Rome was "universal bishop."

This means that the rise of the Bishop of Rome to universal primacy was a late event coming in early medieval times from 607. But in order to rewrite history, in the *Donation of Constantine* the emperor Constantine purportedly made a "decree that" the Bishop of Rome "have the supremacy ... over the four chief seats, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem." The effect of this revisionist interpretation of history was to try and conceal the fact that the Bishop of Rome lacked universal primacy until 607, and to make the battle between the Bishop of Rome and Bishop of Constantinople between 451 and 607 appear to be one in which the Bishop of Constantinople was wilfully ignoring the decree of Emperor Constantine that the Bishop of Rome was primate. It also fraudulently drew on the name of the saintly figure of Silvester (Bishop of Rome 314-335). Then against this revisionist historical backdrop, at the time of the *Great Schism* in 1054, the Pope used the *Donation of Constantine* to claim he had primacy over the Bishop of Constantinople as a grant from Constantine.

Though Rome then lost the Patriarchate of Constantinople, by this time it had developed as both a temporal and spiritual power in Western Europe, with Papal States from 756 and the "Holy" Roman Empire from 800 A.D. . Thus its claims to "universal" jurisdiction still had to be taken seriously, just like they still had to be taken seriously after the Papacy lost jurisdiction in England at the time of the Reformation, for which reason Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles says, "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England." Hence while the initial bi-polar contest between Rome and Constantinople was important for the establishment of the Bishop of Rome's claim to a "universal" jurisdiction as something that had to be taken seriously; having established this office, the seriousness of the claim was thereafter maintained notwithstanding the loss of this Patriarchate with the Great Schism of 1054, or the loss of parts of Western Europe with the Reformation of the sixteenth century started in 1517.

To this day, Romanists writers attempt to write revisionist histories comparable to that of the usage of the fraudulent *Donation of Constantine* at the time of The Great Schism of 1054, in order to try and bolster Rome's fallacious claims. The classic stereotypical revisionist history is argued by, for example, the Romanist writer, Stenhouse. He quotes writers who upheld Roman primacy from *within the four metropolitans that deferred to Rome*, and uses these to give the impression of an earlier universal primacy by the Bishop of

Rome<sup>266</sup>. In the first place, this ignores those within his purported jurisdiction who did not accept the Bishop of Rome's authority. E.g., we know of independent orthodox churches in the British Isles which, for instance, did not keep Easter on the same date that Rome did; and we know of independent unorthodox churches in Asia and North Africa that, for instance, embraced the monophysitist heresy. But even staying within the broad general argument, any earlier writers who refer to the Bishop of Rome in primatial terms would contextually do so for one of four broad reasons. Either they are deferring to the Bishop of Rome in primatial terms as one of the five patriarchs with a geographically limited primacy, but do not mean their comments to in anyway deny comparable primacy to the other four patriarchs. Or they may mean after 381 that the Bishop of Rome has a ceremonial "primacy of honour;" or they are within the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction and do not mean their comments to be taken as a comment on the specific rival ecclesiastical claims that developed between Rome and Constantinople (that is, they were deferring to the Bishop of Rome as Patriarch of the West or Primate of the Western Roman Empire Church). Or they are within his jurisdiction and do mean their comments to be taken as a comment on any rival ecclesiastical claims of different patriarchs such as those that specifically developed between Rome and Constantinople.

Or they are within his jurisdiction and do mean their comments to be taken as a comment on any rival claims within an area i.e., deferring to the Bishop of Rome as the primate of the Roman Church the person identified with, as opposed to other independent churches known to him in the same broad geographical area that he knew to not hold such an allegiance with Rome, and which he did not regard as unorthodox on the basis that they did not also defer to Rome. (Although he may have regarded at least some of such churches as unorthodox for other reasons.) In such an instance, this would be something like taking the comments of a modern day Roman Catholic in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Sydney who deferred to Rome, as "proof" that e.g., Reformed Anglicans in the Low Church Evangelical Diocese of Sydney, Free Presbyterians in Sydney, and independent Baptist Churches in Sydney, "must therefore" also all defer to Rome. Such a proposition is clearly preposterous and the analogy is somewhat flawed since modern day Papists would no doubt regard Evangelical Anglicans, Free Presbyterians, Baptists, and others, as "unorthodox" because they do not defer to Rome. But the broad point made in this analogy is still correct. E.g., there is evidence that a point came where some of the churches in the British Isles had an allegiance to Rome, and some did not, before Rome finally expanded to take them over, (although even then the English Church remained much more independent than did Continental Roman Churches,) until the time of the Lollards and then the Reformation. In this sense, there were *something like* modern day denominations operating in the same geographical area; and so while the comments of such writers may show a group of churches with an allegiance to Rome, this does not "prove" the point the Romanists claim it does.

Thus what is clear is that this type of revisionist historical perspective fails to present the views of those who did not so defer to the Bishop of Rome, e.g., this type of approach omits the bipolar ecclesiastical jurisdictional views expressed by the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), that there were "equal privileges" between New Rome (Constantinople) and Old Rome (Rome). Stenhouse's writers were clearly not men living under the Bishop of Constantinople, and even if as he has *not* done, Stenhouse did find a writer living in this region who deferred to Rome, he would either mean a ceremonial "primacy of honour" gained in 381, or if he meant anything more than this, he would not represent the mainline

---

<sup>266</sup> Stenhouse, P., *[Roman] Catholic Answers to "Bible" Christians*, Chevalier Press, Sydney, Australia, 1988, pp.17-19; compare Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 79-83.

view from this area, which was one of deferring to the Bishop of Constantinople as their primate, rather than the Bishop of Rome. Thus writers like Stenhouse do not seek to enlighten the reader as to the historical backdrop of rivalry between Rome and Constantinople. This type of revisionist presentation of history, of which Stenhouse is but a typical Popish example, shows that the Church of Rome still engages in the same type of deceit evident in the *Donation of Constantine*.

The history of the *Donation of Constantine* is steeped in chicanery, deceit, and fraud. Philip Schaff is surely correct when he says of the entire collection which contains the *Donation of Constantine* known as the *False Decretals*, that this “collection is to a large extent a conscious ... church fraud, and must as such be traced to the father of lies [John 8:44]. It belongs to the Satanic element in the history of the” church’s “hierarchy.”<sup>267</sup>

## CHAPTER 16

**The Antichrist’s sin:  
“the mystery of iniquity doth already work”  
“with all deceivableness”(II Thess. 2:3,7,10):  
the sin of cremation.**

In Holy Writ, the example of the saints is always burial, not cremation (e.g., Gen. 23:19; Num 20:1; Deut. 10:6; Josh. 24:29,30). This was the example of our Lord himself. He could not possibly have been cremated. In the first place, as foretold through the type of the Passover lamb, the OT Scriptures required that not “a bone of him shall be broken” (John 19:36; Exod. 12:46; Num. 9:12; Ps. 34:20); and had he been cremated, most, if not all, of his bones would have been burnt down into lime powder. Furthermore, it was prophesied that his body would not “see corruption” (Ps. 16:10). It is clear from Ps. 16 that this was related to the fact that Christ would rise the third day (Acts 2:27,30) i.e., the burial of his body was a symbol of his shortly following resurrection.

Scripture also teaches this same basic truth with respect to the burial of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Canaan (Gen. 25:8-10; 49:30-32; 49:33; 50:13,14). Abraham was saved under the covenant of grace, which was confirmed and administered under the Abrahamic Covenant (Gal. 3:15-18), although for we Christians, this everlasting covenant is now administered under the new covenant of the NT (Heb. 9:15; 13:20). Abraham “looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God,” and thus he “died in faith, not having received the promises, by having seen them afar off” (Heb. 11:10,13). His burial in Canaan was thus a symbolic statement of faith. It stated that the Children of Israel would take possession of Canaan as a prophetic type; and that this prophesied the fact that his spiritual descendants would take possession of new Canaan on the new earth at the resurrection of the just. It was like the statement of Job, “though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God,” “at the latter day upon the earth” (Job 19:25,26). The same was true of the patriarchs Isaac and Jacob, and thus “by faith Joseph, when he died,” “gave commandment concerning his bones” (Heb. 11:22).

Abraham’s burial in Canaan was a type, pointing to his bodily resurrection in the new

---

<sup>267</sup> Schaff, P., *op. cit.*, chapter 60.

earth typed by the Canaan that all believers shall inherit (Matt. 5:5; Gal. 3:3,16,29; Rev. 21:1ff). The word “seed” (Gen. 12:7) or “offspring” (Gen. 21:23, NASB) is a singular plural in the promises to Abraham. St. Paul makes the point in Gal. 3:16,29, that God chose a word that could mean both singular and plural in “seed” or “offspring.” This is evident in his usage in Gal. 3:16 of “*spermati* (neuter singular dative noun, from *sperma*)” to mean the singular “seed” (twice) of Christ, as opposed to his usage in Gal. 3:29 of “*sperma* (neuter singular nominative noun, from *sperma*)” to mean the plural “seed” of those saved in Christ. By contrast, he says we do not read of “*spermasin* (neuter plural dative noun, from *sperma*),” meaning “seeds” (Gal. 3:16), i.e., a word that only has a plural application. Therefore, “seed” has a singular application in the Messiah to come from Abraham i.e., the “seed” (singular), for “to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds (plural), as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed (singular), which is Christ” (Gal. 3:16). In other words, God did not choose a word that only meant “seed” (plural) so that it could refer to both the Messiah (singular) and the Messianic Community (plural). Thus it still has a plural application in the Messianic Community i.e., those saved by grace through the Messiah, and so, “if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed (plural), and heirs according to the promise” (Gal. 3:29). If then Abraham received burial in Canaan as a statement of his belief in the resurrection of the body as typed by earthly Canaan; and if Christ received burial of the body as a type of his resurrection of the body; it follows that if we are the “seed” (plural) of Abraham (Gal. 3:29), then like the Abrahamic “seed” (singular) of Christ (Gal. 3:16), we too should receive burial as a statement and testimony of the resurrection of the body.

Of course, this does not apply when persecutions by the enemies of Christ, mean that we must “give” our “body to be burned” (I Cor. 13:3). This has occurred with numerous martyrs, most notably, the Marian martyrs Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, who were burnt at the stake at Oxford. So too, the Roman Church on orders of the *Council of Constance*, exhumed the body of the morning star of the Reformation, John Wycliffe, and had his bones burnt and thrown into the River Swift at Lutterworth. On a number of occasions (in both April 2003 and October 2003), I have inspected the site where, according to tradition, his ashes were thrown into the River Swift. In such instances, the saint of God has done nothing wrong, since his “body” was “burned” for his witness to Christ by the enemies of Christ (I Cor. 13:3). Rather, it will be one of the sins that God calls his persecutors to account for, that they burnt his bones into lime ashes.

Likewise, on this same principle, while all the saints of God under God’s directive will be indestructible till they have finished the work given them by the Lord (Ps. 91:11; Mark 16:18); nevertheless, if the work of a saint is done, he may sometimes have his body destroyed by e.g., bombing in wartime, fire in wartime or peacetime, or loss in a ship at sea. However, it is clear from these above Scriptures, that burial, not cremation is the Biblical requirement for the saints of God, who should make preparations to ensure they are buried, as a statement of faith in the resurrection of the body<sup>268</sup>.

---

<sup>268</sup> See Howard, D., *Burial or Cremation, Does it Matter?* Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 2001, p. 32. The reader should consult this work with caution, since it contains religiously liberal ideas about the doctrine of the future life evolving slowly over time (*Ibid.*, pp. 10-11), contrary to such clear Biblical passages as e.g., Pss. 23:6; 49:8,9; 133:3; Prov. 10:25; Matt. 22:31,32. It also uses bad translations of Scripture (e.g., at p. 5, Gen. 50:2,3, NIV). See also Levell, A.J., *Cremation Not For Christians*, Gospel Standard Trust Publications, Harpenden, Hertfordshire, England, UK, 1981, 4th edition, 2000.

Another factor is the issue of desecration of human remains. In Amos 2:1 we read, “Thus saith the Lord; for three transgressions of Moab, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because he burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime.” This passage clearly teaches that to cremate a person who should be buried, so that their bones turn “into lime” ashes, is a great sin. Since as discussed above, the NT clearly teaches that we should be buried, it follows that Amos 2:1 speaks of a universal, not merely a provincial Jewish precept.

But to this there are some qualified exceptions. In some grave and unusual circumstances, the body may be burnt, but not the bones. For instance, where there is contagion, such as occurs with the Black Plague, the body may be burned, but not the bones, for sanitary reasons. The bones should then be buried (Amos 6:10). So too on a battlefield. If the practice of an enemy is to desecrate the human remains of bodies e.g., by cannibalism (Ps. 27:2,3), or some other form of desecration, then the body may be burnt, but not the bones, in order to carry them back with the army to a place of safe burial (I Sam. 31:11-13; II Sam. 2:5). A person might through no fault of his own, be killed in a fire, whether as a Christian martyr (I Cor. 13:3), or e.g., in a bushfire, or in an act of war.

Another important exception is Divine Judgement (e.g., Gen. 18 &19). God has sometimes destroyed the evil ones by fire (Num. 11:1-3; 16:35). In this context, heinous crime may also be punished by burning (Gen. 38:24; Lev. 20:14; Josh. 7:25,26; I Kgs 12:28; 13:1-3). In like manner, burial has some times been denied evildoers (Jer. 25:33 cf. Num. 25:4). This was evidently a symbol of the fact that they had no part in the resurrection of the just.

Thus historically, e.g., the laws of England, denied a person guilty of such heinous crime as suicide, or self-murder (I John 3:15), a Christian burial. The *Church of England Book of Common Prayer* (1662), rightly says in the rubric at the very beginning of “The Order for the Burial of the Dead,” that “the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that” (among other things,) “have laid violent hands upon themselves.” As Edward Christian rightly notes, “suicide is a proof of cowardice,” “and it were enacted” (at 1809 A.D.), “that the coroner in every instance when his jury had found that the person deceased had been the author of his own death, should be directed to deliver the dead body to the surgeons to be anatomized.<sup>269</sup>”

But allowing bodies to be cremated only transpired in countries like the UK in the late 19th century. The *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) only makes provision for burial. In 1978, the *Church of England in Australia* (which later changed its name to the Anglican Church of Australia,) produced *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB)<sup>270</sup>. Like Anglicans

---

<sup>269</sup> Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 15th edition, 1809, Reprint Professional Books, Oxford, England, UK, 1982, Vol. 4, p. 190.

<sup>270</sup> In broad terms I do not support the AAPB, although there is a small amount of material in it that I find useful. Its title page says it is “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662” in Australia, but in practice it has sadly been generally used as a mechanism to phase out the 1662 prayer book. Thus while I support the 1662 prayer book, I find only a very small amount in the AAPB of value, such as a small number of the black letter days added on its Calendar (although I reject most of its Calendar changes and support the 1662 prayer book Calendar with just a small number of these black letter days added in).

inside the Anglican Communion elsewhere, the AAPB specifically allowed for “cremation” and a “crematorium” service<sup>271</sup>. This constituted a serious departure from Biblical teaching and the doctrine of the BCP (1662). Deep divisions remain over this issue, and e.g., the Diocese of Sydney, Anglican clergyman, Donald Howard, quite rightly wrote in defence of burial in *Burial or Cremation, Does it Matter?* (2001). Modern cremation, which burns “the bones” “into lime” ashes (Amos 2:1), was first allowed in the UK after a legal ruling in 1884. The first English cremation society was formed in 1874; and an Act of the UK Parliament clearly legalized it in 1902, though exempted clergymen opposed to the practice from conducting a cremation service<sup>272</sup>. The first crematorium built in the USA was in 1876 at Washington, Pennsylvania.

This was in fact a reversion to ancient pagan practices. In ancient pagan Greece, the heathen god Zeus forced Achilles to allow Hector’s body to be cremated, and what remained of the bones were put in a golden urn with those of Patroclus. Given the size of e.g., the skull, backbone, leg-bones, and arm-bones, it follows that most of the bones must have been burnt into lime powder to fit the remains into an urn. So too, the ancient pagan Romans followed the Greek practice of cremation (Virgil’s *Aeneid*). Indeed, cremation columbarium were built in ancient Rome. However, the practice seems to have declined in the second century.

Jews opposed the practice. As Fausset observes, “Hebrew tradition” recognizes that Amos 2:1 means, “tore his body after death from the grave and burned it.” The Jews buried their dead. The Jewish Rabbis’ “reason, ‘Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return’ (Gen. 3:19)<sup>273</sup>.” Christians also opposed cremation. Wherever the gospel of Christ went, cremation stopped and burial started. Indeed, one can study the spread of Christianity by reference to the study of cemeteries, since pagan Romans cremated their dead, whereas Christian Romans buried their dead<sup>274</sup>. The same is true today in India, where pagan Hindus

---

It also includes some rubric recognizing some long established practices e.g., before the prayer for what the 1662 prayer book calls the “Church militant here in earth” at Communion, AAPB rubric says: “The priest may bid special prayers and thanksgivings” (p. 119); and likewise, the well established tradition of the congregation reading the “General Thanksgiving” at Matins or Evensong is recognized in a rubric saying, “A general thanksgiving, which may be said by the congregation with the Minster” (p. 35). But while I might thus find some minimalist “use” for the AAPB; rather than produce the AAPB, I would have simply added a “Supplement” to the 1662 prayer book, stating on it: 1) Rubric formally recognizing a small number of pre-existing established practices, e.g., at the Matrimony Service, after the man says, “With this ring I thee wed” etc., and “the man” has put “the ring upon the fourth finger of the woman’s left hand,” then before they kneel down; I would include the AAPB rubric, “If the bride is to give the bridegroom a ring, she does so” at this point (p. 551); and 2) Specifying that a small number of days should now be added to the pre-existing Calendar as black letter days. In short, I do not support the AAPB as a package deal, though I support a very small amount of its added rubric and black letter days, which if extracted from the AAPB’s 636 pages, would in toto fit on one, or (depending on print size,) at the most two, BCP (1662) Supplement pages.

<sup>271</sup> AAPB, “Funeral Services,” pp. 584,593,595,597.

<sup>272</sup> Howard, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>273</sup> Fausset, A.R., *Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopaedia, op. cit.*, pp. 103,104,481.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

cremate their dead, but Christians bury their dead. Thus the reintroduction of cremation in the late 19th century manifested the rise of worldly paganism among the population of the Western world.

Since cremation was practised in first century pagan Rome, it follows that this is an example of “the mystery of iniquity” “already” at “work” (II Thess. 2:7). At first, when it was reintroduced in the Western world, the Pope of Rome opposed the practice. E.g., Broderick’s *Catholic Concise Encyclopedia* (1957), which has an imprimatur from Cardinal Spellman of New York (1956), states at “Cremation,” “The [Roman] Church forbids ecclesiastical burial to those who order that their bodies after death are to be burned,” “because: the practice was historically an act of disbelief in immortality;” “and because cremation does not show reverence to the human body.” “For grave reason e.g., plague, the [Roman] Church permits the destruction of bodies by fire.<sup>275</sup>” Though this section lacks reference to Biblical quotes, we cannot doubt that it stated Biblical truths prohibiting cremation.

But after the Vatican II Council (1962-5), the Roman Church’s revised list of sins, meant that it reversed its position, and allowed cremation. The revised Roman Catholic Canon Law of 1983 specifically allows for cremation. With an imprimatur from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Newark, Archbishop P.L. Gerety (1985), Canon 1176 of the Roman Catholic *Code of Canon Law* (1983) says, “The [Roman] Church ... does not ... forbid cremation unless it has been chosen for reasons which are contrary to Christian teaching.” This would be like saying that sodomy is not prohibited “unless it has been chosen for reasons which are contrary to Christian teaching.” One cannot choose to be cremated, any more than one can choose to engage in sodomite acts, without acting *contrary to Christian teaching*. In commenting on this, the *Code of Canon Law* then says, “cremation is no longer forbidden ... . The former [canon] law was quite forceful and restrictive in its opposition to cremation (CIC 1203)<sup>276</sup>.”

So much for the Roman Church’s claim of being “*semper eadem*” (Latin, “always the same”). Well may one of the Vatican II Council’s most prominent “fathers,” Archbishop Lefebvre, say that “Vatican II is the French Revolution in the Church;” for while Romanism has always been a paganized form of Christianity, this turnabout on cremation has made the Roman Church even more paganized in its practices. Archbishop Lefebvre’s frank admission that at the Vatican II Council, his fellow “*Council Fathers felt guilty themselves* at not being in the world and *at not being of the world*” (emphasis mine) (I John 2:15-7)<sup>277</sup>, helps us better understand the Roman Church’s new found tolerance of cremation.

It is clear that for about 100 years, the Satan-possessed Pope of Rome, held to the traditional Christian line on this matter to curry favour with “moral conservatives.” But when it suited the Devil’s purposes, he then helped toboggan cremation onto greater acceptance, by condoning it. Those who look to Romanists on other moral issues such as abortion, pornography, and homosexuality, would do well to heed this lesson. The Church of Rome cannot be trusted on moral issues. She will abandon her positions on these other

---

<sup>275</sup> Broderick, R.C., *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

<sup>276</sup> Coriden, J.A. *et al* (Editors), *The Code of Canon Law*, Canon Law Society of America, Paulist Press, New York, USA, 1985, p. 837.

<sup>277</sup> Lefebvre, M., *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, *op. cit.*, (1986) pp. 100,102,105.

issues if and when it suits the Devil to do so, just as she did on the cremation issue; or just as she did on spiritual issues to do with the Trinity, by bidding “God speed” (II John 11) to Trinitarian heretics in Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy following the Vatican II Council. The fact that Papal Rome from the late 20th century on, now condones cremation, just as pagan Rome of the first century did, is a powerful example of how the “man of sin,” manifests “the mystery of iniquity” that did “already work” in the Apostle Paul’s day (II Thess. 2:3,7) with the sin of cremation.

## CHAPTER 17

### **The Antichrist is a “strong delusion” for those “who believed not the truth” (II Thess. 2:11,12)**

Another feature of II Thessalonians chapter 2 needs to be considered, namely, verses 10-12. These are most chilling verses for by them we learn what God will do to those who submit themselves to the Roman Antichrist. Christians who submit themselves to Scripture rather than the Pope, recognize that the religious system of Roman Catholicism is “accursed” (AV) of God and bound in the bonds of “anathema” (ASV) for preaching “another gospel” (Gal. 1:6,8,9) than, “The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11). Both the presentation of a false unBiblical Christ *in the place of Christ* by the system of Roman Catholicism and thus its head the Roman Pontiff, and also the central claim of the Roman Pope to be the “Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction, and so sit *in the place of Christ* on earth, means that for all who accept the authority of the infallible Bible, on application of the antichrist teaching found in the Johannian Epistles the Pope stands exposed as the *Roman Antichrist* (I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7). The Word of God is also perfectly clear on how *the Roman Antichrist* should be treated, namely, he should be denied all spiritual recognition (II John 7-11). To do otherwise, and give the Roman Antichrist some form of spiritual greeting violates a broad fundamental of the faith dealing with religious separation from apostasy. At the time of the Reformation it was the practise of all Protestant churches to maintain such religious separation from the apostate Church of Rome, and it is only by apostasy that any church now bows in “ecumenical” compromise to the Church of Rome and gives a spiritual “greeting” (II John 11) to the Roman Pontiff. Those who do such things shall incur the wrath of God foretold in II Thess. 2:10-12.

Why then are so many people blinded to the identity of the Pope as the Roman Antichrist? Why do they shrink from denouncing him in harmony with e.g., the *Second Scotch Confession* of 1580 as the *Roman Antichrist*? In II Thess. 2:10-12 we are told that the Papal Antichrist will work “with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” In applying II Thess. 2 to the Roman Papacy, Charles Spurgeon (1834-1892) said of verses 11 and 12, “It is hard to account for the apparent sincerity of Romish emissaries and their dupes, except upon the theory that they are given over to their delusions and justly left to perish in their own folly<sup>278</sup>.”

The words of the Evangelist, Dr. Gratton Guinness (1835-1910) in *Romanism and the Reformation* are surely appropriate here.

---

<sup>278</sup> Spurgeon’s *Devotional Bible* (1870), *op. cit.*, p. 722.

You ... Protestant, ... *look to it that you be not found fighting against the truth*, warring against the word of God, resisting the testimony of the prophetic Spirit, hindering the work of the Reformation, promoting the progress of the apostasy, opposing Christ, and helping Antichrist. .... [The Roman Catholic] Cardinal Manning says, “The Catholic Church is either the masterpiece of Satan or the kingdom of the Son of God.” Cardinal Newman says, “A sacerdotal order is historically the essence of the Church of Rome; if not divinely appointed, it is doctrinally the essence of Antichrist.” ...

You shrink from it do you? I accept it. Conscience constrains me. History compels me. The past, the awful past rises before me. I see THE GREAT APOSTASY [II Thess. 2:3], I see the desolation of Christendom [II Thess. 2:4], I see the smoking ruins, I see the reign of monsters; I see those vice-gods [II Thess. 2:4], that Gregory VII, that Innocent III, that Boniface VIII, that Alexander VI, that Gregory XIII, that Pius IX; I see their insufferable blasphemies. I see their abominable lives; I see them worshipped by blinded generations, bestowing hollow benedictions, bartering lying indulgences, creating a paganized Christianity; I see their liveried slaves, their slaven priests, their celibate confessors; I see the infamous confessional, the ruined women, the murdered innocents; I hear the lying absolutions, the dying groans; I hear the cries of the victims; I hear the anathemas, the curses, the thunders of the interdicts; I see the racks, the dungeons, the stakes; I see that inhuman Inquisition, those fires of Smithfield [in London, where some of the Marian martyrs were burnt at the stake], those butcheries of St. Bartholomew[’s day in France, 1572], that Spanish Armada, those unspeakable dragonnades [of the French Ancien Regime], that endless train of wars, that dreadful multitude of massacres. I see it all, and in the name of the ruin it has wrought in the church and the world, in the name of the truth it has denied, the temple it has defiled, the God it has blasphemed, the souls it has destroyed; in the name of the millions it has deluded, the millions it has slaughtered, the millions it has damned; with holy confessors, with noble reformers, with innumerable martyrs, with the saints of ages, I denounce it as the masterpiece of Satan [II Thess. 2:3,9-12], as the body and soul and essence of Antichrist<sup>279</sup>.”

At the time of the Protestant Reformation Martin Luther referred to the Roman Catholic Pope as the Roman Antichrist. For example, in 1520 he wrote a tract in response to a Papal Bull against him entitled, “Martin Luther Against the Detestable Bull of the Antichrist;” and in the same year his treatise on *The Babylonian Captivity* identified the Church of Rome as “Babylon” and the Roman “Pontiff” as speaking “the blasphemy of Antichrist.” Furthermore, in *Romanism and the Reformation*, Grattan Guinness documents the fact that the Roman Papacy was understood as the Antichrist by, for example, Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, Tyndale, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, and Knox<sup>280</sup>.

For example, in his *Commentary on The First Epistle of John*, John Calvin rejects a futurist (that is, prophesies are all to be fulfilled in the future,) view of the Antichrist. Commenting on the words of I John 2:18, “As ye have heard that Antichrist shall come,”

---

<sup>279</sup> Guinness, H.G., *Romanism and the Reformation*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1887, pp. 258-60; parts of this are quoted in Paisley’s *The Pope is the Antichrist*, pp. 69-70.

<sup>280</sup> Guinness, *Romanism and the Reformation*, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-243.

Calvin says “under the Papacy, there is nothing more notorious and common than the future coming of Antichrist; and yet they are so stupid, that they perceive not that his tyranny is exercised over them.” “The Popes have imagined an Antichrist, who for three years and a half is to harass the Church. All the marks by which the Spirit of God has pointed out Antichrist, clearly appear in the Pope.” He then further says, “Except we desire wilfully to err, we may learn from Paul’s description to know Antichrist.”

In his commentary on II Thessalonians chapter 2, John Calvin rejects a preterist interpretation (that is, the idea that the prophecies are all fulfilled long ago in the past,) of II Thess. 2 which locates the Antichrist in the first century A.D. . Calvin says:

... the minds of the ancients were so bewitched that they believed that Nero would be Antichrist. Paul, however, is not speaking of one individual, but of a kingdom that was to be seized by Satan for the purpose of setting up a seat of abomination in the midst of God’s temple. This we see accomplished in Popery.

Calvin’s view that a preterist interpretation of II Thess. 2 is the result of being “bewitched” is a very strong condemnation of such preterism since he thereby says that it is the result of someone being under demonic influence (compare Gal. 3:1; II Thess. 2:9,10).

Commenting on II Thess. 2:4 Calvin argues that the Antichrist does not take “the name of God Himself, but” rather “His majesty and worship.” That is, on the one hand there “are the things that belong particularly to God;” but “on the other hand,” if one “considers well what the Pope usurps for himself” then one “will not have much difficulty in recognizing Antichrist.” Calvin further says:

Scripture declares that God is the only Lawgiver *who is able to save and destroy* (Jas 4:12), and the only King whose office it is to govern men’s souls by His Word. It represents Him also as the Author of all holy observance; it teaches that righteousness and salvation are to be sought from Christ alone; and it assigns the means and the method. There is not one of these things which the Pope does not claim to be his own prerogative. *He boasts* that it is his right to bind men’s consciences with such laws as he pleases, and to consign them to eternal punishment. With regard to the sacraments, he either institutes new ones at his own whim, or corrupts and debases those which have been instituted by Christ. But more - he does completely away with them in order to put in their place *the blasphemies which he has devised*. He contrives means of attaining salvation which are wholly at variance with the teaching of the Gospel, and in a word does not hesitate to alter the whole of religion according to his inclination. *What, I ask, does it mean to be lifted above all that is reckoned to be Divine* [II Thess. 2:4], *if this is not what the Pope is doing?* When in this way he deprives God of His honour, he leaves Him nothing but the empty title of God, while he transfers to himself the whole of His power. And this is what Paul adds shortly afterwards, ... that the son of perdition would declare himself to be God [II Thess. 2:3,4]. As we have said, Paul does not use the term *God* by itself, but indicates that *the pride* of Antichrist would be such that he would set himself apart from his position and rank as servant, mount the judgment-seat of God, and would reign with a Divine and not human power. *Anything that is put in the place of God, even though it does not bear the name of God, is, as we know, an idol.*

*In the temple of God* [II Thess. 2:4]. This one word fully refutes the error or

rather stupidity of those who hold the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ on the ground that he has a settled residence in the church, however he may conduct himself. Paul sets Antichrist in the very sanctuary of God. He is not an enemy from the outside but from the household of faith, and opposes Christ under the very name of Christ. The question, however, is asked how the church may be referred to as the den of so many superstitions, when it was to be *the pillar of truth* (I Tim. 3:15). My answer is that it is so referred to not because it retains all the qualities of the church, but because it has still some of them left. I admit, therefore, that it is the temple of God in which the Pope holds sway, but the temple has been profaned by sacrileges beyond number ... .

*Even he, whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders* [II Thess. 2:9] ... . By lying signs he means not simply those that clever individuals contrive with lies and deceit for the purpose of leading the simple-minded astray - the kind of fraud with which the whole of the Papacy abounds, for they are part of the supremacy which Satan has previously made his own - but he holds that falsehood [which] consists in the fact that Satan reverses what are otherwise truly the works of God, and uses miracles in a wrong way to obscure the glory of God ... .

*And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error* [II Thess. 2:11] ... . Without any doubt we have a notable demonstration of this in the Papacy. No words can express how foul is the abomination of the Papists, how massive and shameful are their nonsensical superstitions, and how far removed their ravings are from common sense. None who have even a moderate acquaintance with sound doctrine can think of such depravity without the utmost horror. How, then, does the whole world gape in astonishment at them, unless it is because men have been blinded by the Lord and turned into dunderheads?<sup>281</sup>.

## CHAPTER 18

### The Antichrist's defeat

The Antichrist is not invincible in either the temporal or spiritual spheres. Nothing is more central to his Office as Pope or Office as Antichrist than the claim to be a vice-God or vice-Christ as "vicar of Christ" with a "universal" jurisdiction dating from when Boniface III was made the first Roman Pope as "universal bishop" under the Byzantine Emperor in 607. But this claim was powerfully struck down, and rendered ineffective in England and other Dominions of the Crown by e.g. Article 37 of the *Church of England's* 39 Articles, which says, "The King's majesty hath the chief power in ... England, and other his Dominions, ... whether ... Ecclesiastical or Civil ... and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. ... The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England ... ." For as the Preface of the Authorized (King James) Version rightly says, "the truth," "hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed." This "blow" was first "given" by Henry VIII in his break with Rome and his status as "supreme head" of the Church of England & Ireland "as far as the law of Christ allows;" continued by Edward VI; revived and continued by Elizabeth I and successive monarchs as "Supreme Governor" of the Anglican

---

<sup>281</sup> MacKenzie, R. (Translator), *Calvin's Commentaries, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, Great Britain, 1961, pp. 399-402,405-8 (emphasis mine).

Church; and manifested in Article 37 of the 39 Articles<sup>282</sup>.

Throughout the Empire of Roman Catholicism, mixed marriages have been used to try and unite elements of the Caucasian “iron” with the “clay” of coloured races (Dan. 2:43). Spain reflects this. The north of Spain has a white Caucasian population, and the south of Spain has an olive-skinned coloured mixed race population (making it primarily Caucasian Caucasoid and Mediterranean Caucasoid admixed). This mixed multitude of Spanish Papists formed part of the military forces of the Antichrist in the 16th century. The Spanish Roman Catholics set sail to take white Protestant England by storm in 1588 with the Spanish Armada sent by Philip II, King of Spain and Portugal. The Papists of the Spanish Armada were in fact far too powerful for the Royal Navy of Elizabeth I, Queen of England and Ireland, Supreme Governor of the Church of England & Church of Ireland, to convincingly destroy. The Spanish Armada consisted of about 40 line-of-battle warships, together with about another 90 smaller ships and transports, carrying about 19,000 invasion troops. About 180 Popish monks and friars were also present. The Armada had specific approval from “the working of Satan” himself “with all power and signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9). “Sister Mary of the Visitation,” was a Lisbon nun in the order of the Sisters of Charity (founded by the Romish “Saint” Vincent de Paul, 1581-1660, who was canonized in 1737). “Sister Mary” was powerful in exhibiting the miracles of the Devil, being a “stigmatic,” and the Popish naval command did not set sail till they had first consulted this daughter of the Devil<sup>283</sup>.

Spain was a greater military power than England, and it possessed a lucrative empire

---

<sup>282</sup> Unlike the Pope who claims a “universal” jurisdiction, Henry VIII said he was “head” of the church only in England and Ireland, and only “as far as the law of Christ allows.” He required the Great Convocation of Bishops in England to not oppose the question, “Do you acknowledge the king as your supreme head *as far as the law of Christ allows?*” And the 1534 Act of Supremacy said the King of England was “the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England,” and the 1534 Treasons Act made it high treason punishable by death to refuse to acknowledge the king as such. Thus in 1534, the Papist, Thomas More was tried and executed for treason for not taking the required oath because it repudiated Papal encroachments into England, and upheld the high moral standards of the Bible by recognizing the invalidity of the incestuous union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Like the wicked John Fisher who met a similar fate in 1535, Thomas More was clearly an evil and twisted man, deserving of the death penalty. Both Papists were beatified by Rome in 1886 and canonized by Rome in 1935. As to the question, “How many innocent Protestant lives were saved by the execution of such evil men as Thomas More and John Fisher?” we can only guess; though the later reign of Bloody Mary gives us some idea. But while in the first stage of the English Reformation the terminology of “supreme head” was used, as a consequence of concern flowing from further study of God’s Word in such passages as Col. 1:18; 2:19; in the second stage of the English Reformation this was changed under Elizabeth I to, “Supreme Governor of the Church of England” (and Ireland), and has stayed so ever since. I.e., “Supreme Governor of the Church of England” represents the title of the monarch after matured consideration, whereas the usage of the terminology of a local church “supreme head” in England was a transitional term which in the final analysis was wisely jettisoned.

<sup>283</sup> Chadwick, O., *op. cit.*, pp. 288,295. “Sister Mary” later fell into disfavour with the Spanish Papists when she supported independence for Portuguese Papists. The embarrassed Spanish Papists then tried to distance themselves from their once trusted minion.

throughout South America from which it gained added wealth from silver and gold. Philip II had two regular professional armies, whereas Elizabeth I had only a part-time militia. With typical Japhethite inventive skill, the English navy had modified and streamlined their smaller warships for speed and manoeuvrability, and had heavier gun batteries placed on their warships than they had ever previously used. In the battle, they had about 40 ships of the first rank, and about another 60 ships during most of the fighting (although the fleet had about another 100 ships which only made a short appearance). The long-barrelled canons of the English fleet were called culverins. Under the command of the Second Baron Howard of Effingham (whose second-in-command was Sir Francis Drake), and taking the upwind position, three times the English ships met the Spanish Armada along the southern coast (at Plymouth, Portland Bill, and Isle of Wight), and attacked and withdrew against the Spaniards at will. They pounded the huge Spanish galleons but without much success, and the Popish Spanish fleet quickly formed a defensive crescent formation, which meant the English could only attack the sides. The English Protestants sought to destroy the Spanish Papists from a distance with their culverins over five days, firing desperately upon the wicked and evil forces of Antichrist, but to no avail against the great and dreadful Spanish galleons. “*For vain is the help of man*” (Ps. 108:12).

By the Providence of God, the weather was now against the Papists, when the Spanish Armada went through the Strait of Dover and anchored off Calais in France. Strong tidal flows meant the Spanish could not get out in formation if attacked. Their ships were now pinned against the coast. The English Royal Navy seized the strategic advantage of the moment, as they sent in eight fire-ships, soaked in pitch and set ablaze, to go on the rising tide against the scattered Papist ships. Then in a dawn raid off Gravelines (in what was then in the Spanish Netherlands, but is now in France, about midway between Calais and Dunkirk), the English Royal Navy advanced on the Spanish ships, and fired at relatively close range with their culverins. On the one hand, by the grace of God, the English succeeded in scattering the ships of Spanish Armada. But on the other hand, only limited damage had been inflicted on the Romanist’s Armada. Though using up virtually all of their powder and shot, the English Protestants still had great difficulty in actually sinking the ships of the Spanish Papists. The horrible realization dawned on the Protestants that the culverin was not as powerful as they had anticipated, as it was proving itself incapable of blowing the Papist ships out of the water. Indeed, only three Spanish galleons were sunk or driven onto the coast by this action. E.g., the flag-ship of the Spanish Armada, under the command of the Romish Duke of Medina-Sidonia, was hit over 200 times, but it still stayed afloat. It was clear that this was a David and Goliath battle, in which the smaller English Protestant fleet was unable to inflict significant structural damage upon the Goliath like military forces of Antichrist, with their monstrous Spanish galleons. “*For vain is the help of man*” (Ps. 108:12).

The English Protestants were just about out of ammunition, and the Spanish Papists were battered but by no means defeated. From a shorter-term perspective, this was a stalemate because the Spanish Papists had been scattered and unable to land their assault forces in England, whereas the English Protestants had been unable to destroy the Spanish Armada which could still regroup and fight another day. However, from a longer-term perspective, the Popish Spaniards still posed a serious security threat to Protestant England. The military forces of Antichrist now lay off the English coast, stalking and balking at the Protestants, with the threat of future attack. For the Protestants, things still looked grim, when the Duke of Medina-Sidonia ordered his gruesome and seemingly unsinkable Spanish galleons to sail up the east-coast of the British Isles, and then westward over the north of

Scotland. Lying off the coast of the British Isles, there now lurked the dark, gigantic, black, monstrous, and sinister military forces, of the very Antichrist himself. Man, indeed racially blessed white Aryan man with his God given creative genius (Gen. 9:27), in the form of Caucasians from the British Isles, had done his best to defeat these evil military forces; man, indeed, religiously blessed man, in the form of Protestants (Rom. 1:17; 15:29), had done his best to defeat these evil military forces; but “*vain is the help of man*” (Ps. 108:12).

The Protestants had put their faith in God, and prayed for deliverance. St. James says, “The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” (Jas. 5:16). That is because it is offered up through the “sweet savour of Christ” (II Cor. 2:15). Then at the Protestant’s darkest hour, he who a generation before, had exercised his Divine Prerogative under Lev. 20:21 and killed the offspring from the incestuous marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, so as to make the issue of *Biblical authority verses Papal authority* clear; he who had waited to kill the evil daughter of this union, Bloody Mary, at the height of her reign of terror against the Protestants just 30 years before; he who in ancient times “made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged” in the time of the great flood (Gen. 8:1); he who in olden times, “caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind” (Exod. 14:21), so to allow the Children of Israel to pass through at the time of the exodus; he “whose name alone is Jehovah” (Ps. 83:18), chose to clearly glorify his wondrous name once more. The God of the universe, who “didst blow with” his “wind,” when “the sea covered” the ancient Egyptians, and “they sank as lead in the mighty waters” before the Israelites (Exod. 15:10); now blew once more, not this time for racial Israel, but for spiritual Israel, since the Church of Christ is Israel now (Gal. 3:29). The winds now blew the Spanish Papists southwards, dashing them against the coasts of Scotland and Ireland, smashing and bashing these dirty “dogs” (Matt. 7:6), together with their galleons, into thousands and thousands of little pieces.

About 15,000 Papists were killed, and at least 40 Spanish galleons were destroyed, with only about 60 of the 130 ships of the Spanish Armada surviving. With less than half their fleet, and most of their invasion army sent to the “flame[s]” of “hell” (Luke 16:23,24), the Spanish Papists limped back to Spain. The English Protestants had no delusions about what had happened. They gave credit where credit was due, and knew the Spanish to be master seamen. They knew that they had thrown their naval military might against these Spanish “swine” (Matt. 7:6), but to no lasting avail. The medal struck to commemorate the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 makes no vain-glorious revisionist attempts to paint the English Protestants as having won the day by their own strength, or stealth, or gallantry, or tactical brilliance. The medal struck by Queen Elizabeth I to commemorate this victory contains the Latin inscription, *Flavit Deus et Dissipati Sunt*, meaning, “God blew and they were scattered.” Praise be to God! The Spanish Papists had put their confidence in a combination of idolatrous spiritual forces and temporal military forces. The Popish “idols” of their unBiblical Christ and their Romish saints, “are silver and gold, the work of men’s hands.” “They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them,” they are spiritually deaf, dumb, blind, immobile, and indeed dead. These spiritually “dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into” the “silence” of hell. “But we will bless the Lord from this time forth” on earth “and for evermore” in heaven. “Praise the Lord” “O Israel,” that is, the Christian Church of God found only among those of the holy Protestant faith, “trust thou in the Lord: he is their help and their shield” (Ps. 115:4-9,17,18). The Papists also put their trust in military might, for “some trust in chariots, and some” trust “in horses,” but the Protestants had put their trust in “the name of Jehovah our God” (ASV). The forces of Antichrist were “brought down and fallen: but” the forces of Christ were “risen, and” made to “stand upright” (AV). “Save Lord: let the king hear us when we call,” and

“send thee help from the sanctuary” (Ps. 20:2,7-9).

Two defeats of the Antichrist are specified in II Thess. 2:8. Both of these defeats are gloriously highlighted in the Anglican Church’s *Irish Articles (1615)*, which state in Article 80, “The Bishop of Rome is” “that *man of sin*, foretold in the Holy Scriptures, *whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming*” (II Thess. 2:3,8). The latter of these defeats occurs at the Second Coming, when “the Lord” “shall destroy” “that Wicked” one “with the brightness of his coming.” It is clear that the Papacy is too big and too strong, too imbued with the power of Satan, for any man or combination of men to thoroughly destroy. By the grace of God, men may sometimes win specific battles against the Antichrist, but in the larger war against the Antichrist, victory will always prove illusive to men. The Roman Church with the Antichrist Pope at her head, is *the masterpiece of Satan*, and it can only be finally destroyed by Christ himself. This is something that Christ will deal with *in person* upon his return. Thus there awaits the spectacle of Christ at his Second Coming, and the Pope with Satan devil-possessing him, with “the sparks flying” in a one-on-one battle-royal between the God of the Universe, His Divine Majesty, King Christ, destroying “with the brightness of his coming” the Papal Antichrist who is devil-possessed by the god of this world.

But an earlier defeat of Antichrist is also referred to, when “the Lord shall consume” “that Wicked” one “with the spirit of his mouth” (II Thess. 2:8). St. John says of Christ, “Out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword” (Rev. 1:16), and Christ himself warned, “Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of my mouth” (Rev. 2:16). This defeat of the Papal Antichrist “whom the Lord shall consume” (II Thess. 2:8), occurs by “the Spirit of Christ” (Rom. 8:9), every time that he brings about conviction in the believer’s heart by giving “reproof,” “correction,” and “instruction” from the Scriptures (II Tim. 3:16), which are the Divinely Inspired (II Tim. 3:16) and Divinely Preserved (I Peter 1:25) “Oracles of God” (Rom. 3:2). “For the Word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword” (Heb. 4:12). For the Spirit of God, acting through the Word of God, exposes the Pope’s falsehood, and consumes his power to practice deception, whether in matters of faith or morals.

The Papal Antichrist thus suffers defeat upon defeat every time he is pierced through by “the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God” (Eph. 6:17). Martin Luther with the German Duke of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, upheld Biblical authority against Papal authority, for “The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:17). Thus did “the Lord” “consume” “that Wicked” Pope “with the Spirit of his mouth” (II Thess. 2:8). Thomas Cramer with King Henry VIII of England, upheld Biblical authority against Papal authority, “For John” the Baptist “had said,” “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:17). Thus did “the Lord” “consume” “that Wicked” Pope “with the Spirit of his mouth” (II Thess. 2:8). At the German *Diet of Spires*, the godly Lutheran electors and princes said of the edict banning Lutheranism in Roman Catholic areas, “*we protest*” “before God,” “the said edict to be null and void as contrary to God, his Word” (Acts 5:29), “our soul’s salvation” (Mark. 8:36), “our consciences” (I Peter 3:21), and “the former edict of the Diet of Spires” (Exod. 20:16)<sup>284</sup>. As a consequence of this *Protest of the Diet of Spires* on 20 April 1529, the followers of the Reformation became known as “Protestants.” Thus did “the Lord” “consume” “that Wicked” Pope “with the Spirit of his mouth” (II Thess. 2:8). And every time any believer stands with King Christ, and upholds Biblical authority against Papal

---

<sup>284</sup> Bainton, R.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 165-6 (emphasis mine).

authority, then does “the Lord” “consume” “that Wicked” Roman Papacy “with the Spirit of his mouth” (II Thess. 2:8).

## CHAPTER 19

### Historical Protestant recognition of the Pope as the Antichrist.

The independent Protestant preacher and writer, John Bunyan (1628-1688) is best known for his work *Pilgrim's Progress*. E.g., when in February 2003 I visited the John Bunyan sites at Bedford and Elstow in England, among other things, in the Bedford Central Library I saw modern mural sculptures depicting various scenes from *Pilgrim's Progress* in the library's foyer. Likewise at the *Bunyan Meeting Free Church* I inspected bronze doors on the church, presented to the church in 1876 by Hastings, Duke of Bedford, which in ten panels depict scenes from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (although I do not approve of some nudity which marred these panels). And I photographed one of the stained-glass windows inside this church, depicting a scene from *Pilgrim's Progress*. Then at Elstow in the grounds of Moot Hall, opposite the Anglican Church, there was a sign reading, “ELSTOW John Bunyan's Birthplace,” followed by a picture of the pilgrim from *Pilgrim's Progress*.

John Bunyan was certainly in no doubt that the Pope was the Antichrist of II Thess. 2. In his dissertation on the *Ruin of Antichrist* he quotes from II Thess. 2 and declares that “Popish edicts are the support of the Religion of Antichrist.” Bunyan refers to the “man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3, AV) and in elaborating on “the ordinances of Antichrist” he says they include “his masses, prayers for the dead, images, pilgrimages, monkish vows, sinful fasts, and the beastly single-life of their priests.” He upholds the Protestant Reformation in England, saying that “the noble King, Henry VIII,” “the good King Edward his son,” and the “Queen also, the sister to King Edward,” that is Elizabeth I, all cast down the “Antichristian-worship” of “Antichrist<sup>285</sup>.”

These comments clearly act to distance him from extremist elements among some of his fellow Puritans, who would speak in a much more negative and imbalanced way about Henry VIII; and seek to deny the legitimacy of Elizabeth by not endorsing Henry's actions in breaking with Rome for incest on the basis of *Biblical authority not Papal authority* with respect to e.g., Lev. 20:21 and Mark 6:18; and once again, also possibly speak more negatively of Elizabeth than Bunyan does. In the difficult days following the Restoration of 1660, a number of innocent English Puritans were made to suffer with the guilty Puritans, because the continued glorification of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford by a number of Puritans made Anglicans concerned that further acts of sedition against the Crown might occur, such as had transpired with the murder of King Charles I in 1649, and attempted murder of King Charles II in 1651. Though “the blame” for such Restoration measures should therefore not be simply “sheeted home” to Anglicans, but should also be “sheeted home” to such extremist Puritans whose glorification of the Biblically condemned “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) underpinned such provisions as Anglicans sought to uphold the Biblical teaching, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17); it nevertheless must be said that Bunyan was a saintly man.

---

<sup>285</sup>

Owens, W.R. (Ed), *John Bunyan*, Vol. 13, Miscellaneous Works, “Of Antichrist and His Ruine,” 1692, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994, pp. 434,438,440,441.

It is certainly both sad and wrong *in terms of its unfairness to Bunyan* that such a man was persecuted by Restoration Anglicans for not attending an Anglican Church on Sundays; even if such laws might have been considered to be contextually necessary for some time in order to both re-establish the Anglican Church and also “keep the lid” on those English Puritans prepared to engage in “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) against the Crown (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:7; I Peter 2:17). That such an action might on one level be deemed “wrong” *in terms of its unfairness to Bunyan* since a godly man like Bunyan would not e.g., have tried to kill the king; and simultaneously on one level be deemed, “necessary,” because there were substantial numbers of extremist Puritans still around; is at best a paradox, and at worst an impossible contradiction. Though I ultimately leave the matter to God to judge both the Anglican politicians of the era, and Cromwell glorifying Puritans of the era, over this thorny matter of Bunyan’s imprisonment for not attending Anglican Church services; personally, I could not condone any action in a professedly Protestant Christian State, which sets aside the sentiment of a passage like Col. 2:16, “Let no man ... judge you in ... the sabbath days,” by either denying religious freedom of worship to Anglican Protestants or Puritan Protestants. I can accept that the Test Acts were a necessary, albeit very regrettable, expedient against the English Puritans due to their general glorification of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford; and I can accept that Anglicans needed to eject Puritan clergy from Anglican Churches. But I simultaneously maintain this could, and should have been done, under the 1689 Toleration Act type of provisions being introduced at the same time, or before the 1662 Act of Uniformity, so that this should have operated from 1662 the way it operated after 1689.

Paradoxically then, when I have visited *an Anglican Church*, St. Mary’s Church of England (*Continuing*) at Reading (just outside of London), I have been reminded of these events since the outside Church noticeboard of this Low Church Evangelical Anglican Church reads at the bottom of it, “This Chapel was built on the site of the old County Gaol [Jail] where it is said that John Bunyan was once imprisoned.” Alas, Bunyan did not live to see the benefits of the *Toleration Act* of 1689; and the enhanced Protestant unity that occurred in England as both Anglican Protestant and Puritan Protestant rallied in support of King William III of Orange. The 1689 Act did what neither Cromwell’s republic did (which made Anglican services “illegal” from 1645 to 1660), nor Anglicans did in the early days of the Restoration (which made Puritan services illegal from 1662-1689) i.e., it gave freedom of worship to both Anglican and Puritan Protestants. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” (Ps. 133:1).

Likewise King James of the King James Bible of 1611, regarded the Roman Pope as the Antichrist. When he was a teenager, the son of Mary Queen of Scots and Lord Darnley, James VI of Scotland (1566-1625), who became the later James I of Great Britain and Ireland (Scottish Regnal Years: 1567-1625; King of Great Britain and Ireland, Regnal Years: 1603-1625), subscribed to the *Second Scotch Confession* (1580) which refers to the Bishop of Rome as the “Roman Antichrist.” This Confession of 1580 & 1581 required the belief that the Pope was *an* antichrist, though left open the question of whether or not the Pope was *the* Antichrist (I John 2:18). And when he was twenty years of age, King James declared the Pope to be *the* Antichrist in his “Epistle to the whole church militant” known as “A paraphrase upon the Revelation of the Apostle S. John.” For example, King James said Rev. 13 refers to “the Pope’s arising: his description, his rising caused by the ruin of the fourth monarchy of the Roman Empire: the rising of the false and Papistical Church; her description; her conformity with her monarch the Pope.” Hence he says in Rev. 15 “The

faithful praiseth God for the Pope's destruction and their deliverance<sup>286</sup>.” This is significant because it means that the Pope is being referred to as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3, AV) when the translators of that classic Protestant Bible, the Authorized King James Version of 1611, wrote in their dedication:

“To the most high and mighty prince, JAMES, by the grace of God, King ..., Defender of the Faith ..., the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself ... by writing in defence of the Truth, (which hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed,) ... .

Thus in contrast to the Papal Antichrist's “deadly wound” (with the loss of the Papal states 1860-70) which prophecy foresaw “was healed” (Rev. 13:3) (with the creation of the Vatican City State in 1929), the translators of the Authorized Version saw another wound inflicted on the Papal Antichrist by King James “writing in defence of the Truth” “which ... will not be healed.” The basis of this rest in the fact that James I was Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church and so *Defender of the Faith*, as well as king i.e., he had both a spiritual (or ecclesiastical) and temporal (or civil) jurisdiction. It was because “The King's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other his Dominions, ... whether ... Ecclesiastical or Civil,” that the “Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England” (Article 37, Anglican 39 Articles).

This statement is surely similar in type to the words of the Marian martyr, Bishop Latimer, to his fellow Marian Martyr, Bishop Ridley, when in 1555 they were both chained to the stake to be burnt for their faithfulness to apostolic Christianity as recovered by the Protestant Reformation, and Latimer said to Ridley, “Be of good comfort, Mr. Ridley, and play the man! We shall this day light such a candle by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out.” James I's “defence of the Truth” obviously displeased the Church of Rome for just six years earlier, the Roman Catholic Order of Jesuits had unsuccessfully tried to kill King James and the Members of the British Parliament in the Guy Fawkes Gunpowder treason plot of 1605. Knowledge of this plot was clearly known to, and concealed by, the Jesuit, “Father” Garnet<sup>287</sup>. It was thereafter annually remembered with fireworks and bonfires on Bonfire Night (5 Nov.).

Notably then, the *Preface to the Act of Uniformity*, 1662, which introduced the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, states that the reading “of holy Scripture ... [is] now ordered to be read according to the last Translation.” Since this “last Translation” was the *King James Version* of 1611 it follows that this Act made the KJV the *Authorized Version (AV)* according to the use of the Church of England<sup>288</sup>. Thus the law of

---

<sup>286</sup> James I, *A Paraphrase Upon the Revelation*, in *Workes [Works]*, pp. 39,47,57; quoted in Froom, L., *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 537-9; modernizing some words.

<sup>287</sup> Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, *op. cit.*, pp. 470,587-91; Chadwick, O., *op. cit.*, pp. 291-2.

<sup>288</sup> Another tradition seems to look to a derivation from the Royal Prerogative for “the King ... [to] grant to a particular Persons the sole use of some particular Employments, (as of Printing the Holy Scriptures ...).” (William Hawkins' [1673-1746] *Pleas of the Crown*, Vol. 1, p. 231). That is, “Authorized” means “Printed by Authority” and thus refers to Letters Patent such as those granted by Authority of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II for Collins to print the Holy Bible.

England required that a copy of a translation of the Bible, namely, the Authorized (King James) Version, which described the Pope as the “man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) in its dedicatory preface, be used in all Anglican Churches. In fact, belief that the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist was required at a confessional level by Anglicans from the time of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* in 1562 through reference to the Homilies of Article 35. For example, Homily 10, Book 1, entitled, “An Exhortation to Obedience,” says plainly, “the bishop of Rome” “ought” “to be called Antichrist.” Or Homily 21, Book 2, entitled, “Against Rebellion,” clearly says “the Bishop of Rome” is “the Babylonical beast of Rome” (Rev. 17). Thus like the Anglican *Church of Ireland*, the Anglican *Church of England* in England and Wales, made recognition of the Pope as *the* Antichrist a confessional requirement of orthodoxy in its Articles of Religion. Furthermore, its long-standing requirement which remained in place till the nineteenth century that only the AV be used in church services for “such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the liturgy” (Preface, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662), further made recognition of the Pope as Antichrist an officially endorsed teaching of Anglicanism.

In harmony with this, I think that one of the officially endorsed teachings in every Bible believing Christian church should be that the Roman Pope is the Antichrist foretold in I and II John and II Thessalonians chapter 2. The identification of Antichrist, like the identification of Christ, is unalterable. The Papacy cannot be the Antichrist on one day or in one century, and then not the Antichrist in another century, anymore than Jesus can cease from being the Christ. In the same way that those who deny the reality of Satan open the door for Satan to work even more effectively against God, so those who deny the reality that the Antichrist is among us, and has been among us as the Roman Pope for about 1400 years, open the door for the Antichrist to work even more effectively against Christ. Thus I endorse the Reformation practice, manifested in various Protestant churches, of officially endorsing the teaching that the Roman Pope is the Antichrist foretold in the Pauline and Johannian Epistles.

This recognition that the Pope is the Antichrist reached the status of Confessional doctrine not only in Article 35 of the Church of England’s *Thirty-Nine Articles*, but other major Protestant Confessions that grew out of the Reformation. For instance, the Lutheran *Smalcald Articles* written by Martin Luther in 1537 state: “the Pope ... is the true Antichrist ..., who has raised himself over and set himself against Christ .... . This is called precisely, “setting oneself over God and against God,” as St. Paul says [II Thess. 2:4]<sup>289</sup>.” The Anglican *Irish Articles* (1615) also refer to the Authorized Version’s translation of II Thess. 2:3,4 which reads, “that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition” who “exalteth” himself. The Anglican *Church of Ireland’s Irish Articles of Religion* were enacted for the realm of Ireland in 1615 under King James I of the King James Bible, in his capacity as King of Ireland, being King of the three kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland. These *Irish Articles* say in Article 80, “The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the universal church of Christ, that his works and doctrine do plainly discover him to be that ‘man of sin,’ foretold in the Holy Scriptures, ‘whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit

---

<sup>289</sup> Part 2, Article 4, sections 9-11; in Russel, W.R., *Luther’s Theological Testament: The Schmalkald Articles*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, USA, 1995; Appendix A, “The Schmalkald Articles” Translated & Edited by William R. Russell; p. 130, with editorial footnote by Russel saying, “2 Thess. 2:4. Luther regularly applied this text to the Papacy. Compare Hans Preuss, *Die Vortellungen vom Antichrist im spateren Mittelalter, bie Luther und in der konfessionellen Polemik* (Leipzig, 1906), 156.”

of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming” (II Thess. 2:2,3,8)<sup>290</sup>. The Presbyterian Church’s *Westminster Confession* (adopted by the *Church of Scotland* 1649 & 1690) (25:6) says: “There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:3,4), and these same words are repeated in the Congregational Church’s *Savoy Declaration* (1658) (26:4) which adds the words of II Thess. 2:8, “whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” Not to be left out, *The Baptist Confession of 1689*, Article 4, says, “the Pope of Rome ... is no other than Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God; whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming” (II Thess. 2:3,4,8)

However, the recognition of the Roman Pope as the Antichrist predates the Reformation started by God under Martin Luther in 1517 A.D. . Historically there is a long tradition of recognizing the Roman Catholic Pope as the Roman Antichrist. For instance, in *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* in the chapter entitled “The persecutions of the Waldenses in France,” we read how “the reasons of” the Waldenses “separation from the Church of Rome were published in a book written by the Waldensian, Peter Bruis, under the title ‘Antichrist;’” and much later in the twelfth century, the Waldensian, “Peter Waldo” also “asserted that the Pope was Antichrist.”

Likewise, combining the imagery of II Thess. 2, Rev. 13 & 17, the martyr, John Huss wrote in 1412-14 A.D.,

I beseech you in Christ Jesus ... to be prepared for a battle; for the reconnoitres of Antichrist have already begun, and the fight will soon follow ... *The Lord shall destroy the head and the tail* [compare II Thess. 2:8] - that is, the Pope and his prophets. Masters, doctors, priests, who under the false pretext of sanctity conceal the abomination of the beast [Rev. 13]. Pray, what greater abomination can there be than a harlot who should parade herself and offer herself publicly [Rev. 17]? Yes there is the still greater abomination of the beast sitting in a place of honour and offering himself for worship to all comers, as though he were God [II Thess. 2:4]: ready to sell whatever a man may wish to buy in matters spiritual. Yea he sells what he doth not possess<sup>291</sup>.

Commenting on II Thess. 2:3,4, Hendrickson says that the idea that the Pope is the Antichrist can be traced back to the Bishop of Rome himself, Gregory I (Bishop of Rome, 590-604). Likewise Bishop Jewel says, “Gregory saw who they were that should work this departing, and make way for Antichrist; therefore [he] said, ‘I speak it boldly: whosoever calleth himself universal priest, or desireth so to be called, [as doth the Pope,] in the pride of his heart, he is the forerunner of Antichrist.’” And Francis Turretin (1623-87) also refers to when “John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, usurped the title of *Ecumenicus*” which the Bishop of Rome applied to himself from 607 A.D. 607 (dated by some on an Anglican Annunciation Day Calendar which starts the year on 25 March, to 606<sup>292</sup>), and says that

<sup>290</sup> Schaff, P., *The Creeds of Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 526.

<sup>291</sup> Workman, H.B. & Pope, R.M. (Editors), *The Letters of John Hus*, Letter 26, pp. 118,119; quoted in Fromm, L., *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 117.

<sup>292</sup> The usage of the 606 date is more common before 1750 (see 24 George II, chapter 23), when the new year started in England on *Annunciation Day* (25 March). But because

“Gregory I” in “approximately A.D. 600” in “his Epistle to the Emperor Mauritius, Book 4, Letter 30,” says:

Moreover, I say confidently that anyone calling himself universal priest, or desires to be so called, shows himself, by self-exultation, to be the forerunner to the Antichrist because by this display of pride he sets himself superior to others<sup>293</sup>.

Let us now consider what the Bishop of Rome, Gregory said in his sixty-eighth Epistle<sup>294</sup>. Known as the Epistle “To Eusebius of Thessalonica” Gregory actually addresses seven named bishops - together with “many other bishops.” He says (emphasis mine):

... Be it known to your fraternity that John, formerly bishop of the city of Constantinople, *against God* [Dan. 11:36; II Thess. 2:4], against peace of the church, to the contempt and injury of all priests, exceeded the bounds of modesty and of his own measure, and unlawfully usurped in synod *the proud* [Dan. 11:36] and pestiferous title of ecumenical, that is to say, universal [bishop]. When our predecessor Pelagius of blessed memory became aware of this, he annulled by a fully valid censure all the proceedings of that same synod, except what had therein been done in the cause of Gregory, bishop of Antioch ....; taking him to task with most severe rebuke, and warning him to abstain from that new and temerarious name of superstition ... . In which matter, ... we once again addressed ... John by letter, bidding him relinquish that *name of pride* [Dan. 11:36]... . And having found that he paid no regard, we have not desisted the like admonitions to ... Cyriacus, his successor. But since it is the case, as we see, *now that the end of the world is near at hand* [II Thess. 2:2], *that the enemy of the human race has already appeared in his harbingers, so as to have as his precursors* [II Thess. 2:3; I John 2:18], through this *title of pride* [Dan. 11:36], the very priests who ought to have opposed him by living well and humbly, I exhort and entreat that not one of you ever accept this name, that not one consent to it ..., but, as becomes ministers of Almighty God that each keep himself from this kind of poisoned infection, and *give no place to the cunning liar-in-wait* [II Thess. 2:9-11], since this thing is being done to the injury and rendering asunder of the whole church, and as we have said, to the contemning of you all. *For if one, as he supposes, is universal bishop, it remains that you are not bishops...* . We ... admonish you, that ... nothing should be done with ... this preposterous name [of ‘universal

---

for about 50 years before this time, a number of people also followed the 1 January New Year’s Day Calendar in England, both dates were increasingly given in England for about 50 years for something falling between 1 January to 24 March. Thus e.g., reference might be made to St. Prisca’s Day, “173¾” meaning 18 Jan. 1733 on an Annunciation Day Calendar starting the New Year on 25 March, or 18 Jan. 1734 on a Calendar starting the New Year on 1 Jan. . Though some usage of the Phocas decree dates on an Annunciation Day Calendar i.e., 606, continued after this time, the usage of the 607 date is the one I use as that which is most readily understood by most readers.

<sup>293</sup> Hendrickson, W., *Exposition of 1 & 2 Thessalonians*, Baker, Michigan, 1955, pp. 173-4; Jewel’s *A Prophecy concerning the Rise and Downfall of Antichrist*, *op. cit.*, p. 19; Turretin, F., *Francis Turretin’s Seventh Disputation: Whether it can be proven the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, c. 1661, 1848 Edinburgh edition translation, reprinted: Protestant Reformation Publication, Forestville, California, USA, 1999, p. 89.

<sup>294</sup> *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1979, Vol. 13, Pt. 2, pp. 18-19.

bishop’].

It is clear from this epistle that the Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great, considers no one is entitled to the “preposterous name” of “universal bishop, and in isolating the Bishop of Constantinople as a prophetic type of the coming Antichrist, Gregory I uses language descriptive of the antichrist in Dan. 11:36; II Thess. 2:1-12; and I John 2:18. He therefore sees the Bishop of Constantinople as an antichrist who is a prophetic type of the coming Antichrist, that is, one of the “harbingers” or “precursors” (I John 2:18) of the coming antichrist that is “the enemy of the human race” who appears at “the end of the world” (II Thess. 2:2,3). Thus while Gregory does not think that the Bishop of Constantinople is *the* Antichrist, he does think by his “preposterous” claims to be “universal bishop” he is a *forerunner* pointing to the fuller manifestation of the Antichrist; and so passages dealing with the Antichrist in Dan.11:36 and II Thess. 2:1-12 can in a qualification manner be applied to such an earlier antichrist as an incomplete prophetic type. Thus e.g., I would agree with Elliott’s *Horae Apocalypticae* (1862), Wylie’s *The Papacy is the Antichrist* (1888), and Paisley’s *Antichrist* (1988 & 1989), that the “three horns” of Dan. 7:7,8,24, are the Vandals (c. 533), the Ostrogoths (c. 556), and the Lombards (c. 752); because the actions of the Bishops of Rome under the titular primacy of Justinian from 533-565 prophetically type the rise of the Roman Papacy from 607, and the Lombards of c. 752 then precede the rise of the Papal States from 756.

What Gregory saw about the Bishop of Constantinople being a prophetic type of the Antichrist took on a new layer of meaning after The Great Schism of 1054 A.D., after which time the Eastern Orthodox Churches split away from the Roman Church, and for instance, the Archbishop of Constantinople became the Patriarch of an Eastern Orthodox Patriarchate. One of the key issues in the *Great Schism* was the Trinitarian issue of whether there is a double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son* (Western view of the Roman Church and later the Protestant Churches), or whether there is a single procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *alone* (view of the Eastern Orthodox Churches). Like the later Reformation Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century, the Reformation Anglican Church upheld the three creeds, and so we read in Article 8 of the Anglican *Church of England’s* Thirty-Nine Articles, “The Three Creeds, *Nicene Creed*, *Athanasius’s Creed*, and ... the *Apostles’ Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.”

The two great issues of *The Great Schism* were the issue of Papal authority, and this Trinitarian issue, though *The Great Schism* ultimately included other matters. The Protestant Reformers agreed with the Eastern Orthodox Churches against the Roman Catholic on the issue of Papal authority; and agreed with the Roman Catholic Church against the Eastern Orthodox Churches on this Trinitarian issue.

The primary matter with regard to the Trinitarian issue related to the *Nicene Creed*, which is the creed of the 150 fathers in the *Council of Constantinople* (381), to which is added the words “God of God” from the creed of the 318 fathers in the *Council of Nicea* (325), and the final “Amen.” The Church of Rome (500 years later endorsed in this decision by the Protestant Reformers), added to the *Nicene Creed* the *Filioque* (found before this time in the *Athanasian Creed*), that is, the words “and the Son” so that the *Nicene Creed* referred to the double procession of the Holy Ghost, that is, “I believe in the Holy Ghost ... who proceedeth from the Father and the Son.” The double procession of the Holy Ghost is thoroughly Scriptural (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7; Acts 2:17,32,33; 16:7; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; I

Peter 1:11). In saying “the Holy Ghost ... proceedeth from the Father,” the earlier *Nicene Creed* did not thereby mean to teach a single procession of the Holy Ghost. Rather, it echoed the words of Jesus in John 14:26, “But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send.” Since the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, one can in one context say he “proceeds from the Father,” in another context, “he proceeds from the Son,” and in another context, he “proceeds from the Father and the Son.” All are correct so long as the context does not seek to deny the double procession of the Holy Ghost. Thus Jesus also in another context says the Spirit proceeds from him, “If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you” (John 16:7). And in yet another context Jesus gives the full picture of the Spirit’s double procession, saying, “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26).

Adding the words “and the Son” to the *Nicene Creed* was in harmony with *The Athanasian Creed* (written about 500 years earlier). The *Athanasian Creed* is named after, not written by, Athanasius, just like the *Apostles’ Creed* is named after, not written by, the Apostles. This Creed was named in honour of Athanasius who was a Bishop of Alexandria for 46 years about 200 years before the *Athanasian Creed* was written. Athanasius (who died in 373) took part in the *Council of Nicea* (325) and was a great defender of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in opposition to the Arian heresy which denied Christ’s Divinity. Among other things, this Creed upholds the teaching of the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. The *Athanasian Creed* contains clauses which pronounce the Bible’s teachings (Gal. 5:22,21; II Peter 2:1) that damn to hell those who do not accept the wonderful truths it proclaims. Providing *The Athanasian Creed’s* references to “the universal faith” of “we” who “believe and confess” “our Lord Jesus Christ,” are taken to mean *on the matters specified* i.e., the Trinity, Incarnation, atonement, death, resurrection, ascension, intercession, and return of Christ to judge at the Second Advent, it is Biblically sound and its damnatory clauses remind us that those in *unbelief* are damned (Mark 16:16; Eph. 2:12; Rev. 21:8), e.g., Jews, Mohammedans, Hindus, and Buddhists; and willfully unrepentant persons in *heresy* on such matters are damned (Mark 16:15,16; Rom. 1:1-3; 5:6; 8:9; 10:9; 16:17; Gal. 4:6; 5:20,21; II Peter 2:1), e.g., the Eastern Orthodox denial of the Holy Ghost’s double procession from the Father *and the Son*; the Jehovah’s Witnesses denial of the Trinity; or the religious liberals denial that man has a soul, the reality of hell, or the Second Advent.

Therefore, the fact that after the *Great Schism* of 1054 A.D. the Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Constantinople, does, like all the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs, deny the true doctrine of the Holy Trinity by denying the double procession of the Holy Ghost, means that as the *Constantinopolitan Antichrist* the Archbishop of Constantinople is an even more apt *type* of the Antichrist than he was in Gregory’s times. For what saith the Scripture? “He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father” (I John 2:22,23). Since this Constantinopolitan Antichrist “denieth the Son” (I John 2:23) in that he denies the Biblical Christ who says, of “the Comforter,” “I will send him unto you” (John 16:7), and “I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth” (John 15:26), the Constantinopolitan Antichrist puts a false Christ in the place of the Biblical Christ and is an “antichrist” (I John 2:22). For the Apostle Paul also refers to “the Spirit of God” as “the Spirit of Christ” (Rom. 8:9); and in an epistle in which he condemns any who preach “any other gospel” as “accursed” (AV) or “anathema” (ASV) (Gal. 1:6-9), saying that those in such works as “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20), he also teaches the double procession of the Holy Ghost, saying, “God hath sent forth

the Spirit of his Son” (Gal. 4:6) i.e., “God” the Father “sent the Spirit,” and this is called “the Spirit of his Son,” so that both the Father and the Son are involved in sending forth the Spirit. If there was only a single procession of the Holy Ghost, we would simply read, “God sent forth the Spirit.”

Thus the Reformation Anglican Church, by stating in her *Thirty-Nine Articles*, Article 19, that the Greek Orthodox Church has “erred,” and by upholding the *Athanasian Creed* in Article 8, rightly condemns to hell the Constantinopolitan Antichrist and his antichrist religion. Likewise, the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* (1576 & 1584) upholds the *Apostles’ Creed*, the *Nicene Creed*, and the *Athanasian Creed*, as the “three approved symbols” of the faith. So too, *The French Confession of Faith* (1559) which Schaff says was “prepared by Calvin and his pupil, De Chandieu,” says in Article 5, “we confess the three creeds, to wit: the Apostles’, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, because they are in accordance with the Word of God.” The Protestant Reformer of the German section in Switzerland, Ulrich Zwingli, upheld the *Athanasian Creed*, as did the Belgic Confession adopted at Antwerp in 1566 and also adopted by the Synod of Dort held in the Netherlands in 1619 - the Synod of Dort being widely approved by the Reformed Churches, for example, the Dutch Reform Church<sup>295</sup>.

Having established that the Constantinopolitan Antichrist, the Archbishop (formerly Bishop) of Constantinople (at Istanbul), is an even more worthy *type* of the Antichrist some 500 years after Gregory’s time when he embraced the heresy of the single procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *alone*, let us not return to the basic point made by Gregory in his day, that he saw in the Bishop (later Archbishop) of Constantinople a forerunner of the coming antichrist since his claimed title of “universal bishop” is a title of deceit, and one should “give no place to” such a “cunning lier-in-wait” (II Thess. 2:9-11).

Not long after the Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great’s death in 604 A.D., a new Bishop of Rome took upon himself what Gregory called the “preposterous name” of “universal bishop” which had formerly been claimed by the Bishop of Constantinople. Pope Boniface III, who received the relevant decree from the emperor Phocas held the See of Rome for just over 8½ months during 607 A.D.<sup>296</sup>. In what is known as *The “Ecumenical Patriarch” Controversy*, the Bishop of Constantinople had been claiming the title of “Ecumenical Patriarch.”<sup>297</sup> But as *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913) states:

After his election to the See of Rome, Boniface obtained a decree from Phocas, against Cyriacus, Bishop of Constantinople, by which it was ordained, that “the See of Blessed Peter the Apostle should be the head of all the churches,” and that the title of “Universal Bishop” belonged exclusively to the Bishop of Rome ...<sup>298</sup>.

---

<sup>295</sup> Schaff’s *Creeds of Christendom*, p. 356; Kelly, J.N.D., *The Athanasian Creed*, Adam & Charles Black, London, 1964, p. 49.

<sup>296</sup> See, for example, *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis)*, translated by R. Davis, Liverpool Univ. Press, 1989, p. 62. These dates, and a reference to Phocas’s decree, can also be found in J.N.D. Kelley’s *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford University Press, 1986.

<sup>297</sup> See, for example, Richards, J., *The Popes & the Papacy in the early Middle Ages 476-752*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1979, p. 177; & *New [Roman] Catholic Encyclopedia*, [Roman] Catholic University of America, 1967, Vol. 2, p. 670, *Boniface III*.

<sup>298</sup> The Encyclopedia Press, USA, 1907,1913, Vol. 2, p. 660, *Boniface III-VIII*.

After this decree was granted in 607 A.D., a column was erected in Rome in Phocas's honour<sup>299</sup>. To this day, Phocas's Column is still standing in the Roman Forum<sup>300</sup>.

No less a figure than the Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great said that anyone using this title of "universal bishop" is "against God" (Dan. 11:36; II Thess. 2:4) and the usage of this by the Bishop of Constantinople made him one of the types, or forerunners, or "harbingers" or "precursors" (II Thess. 2:7; I John 2:18) of the coming Antichrist that is "the enemy of the human race" who appears at "the end of the world" (II Thess. 2:2,3). This means that to argue that from 607 A.D. when the Roman Pope took that very title of "universal bishop" he became the fulfilment of the Antichrist prophecies which were, at least in part, typed by the Constantinopolitan Antichrist, the Bishop of Constantinople, is to make an argument that has methodological support from the Bishopric of Rome itself!

What saith the three great doctors of the Reformation, Martin Luther (d. 1546), John Calvin (d. 1564), and Thomas Cranmer (Marian Martyr, m. 1556)? *The first man of the Reformation*, Martin Luther, refers to "when there were still bishops in Rome, before the Pope." He says, "the Papacy did not exist before Emperor Phocas and Boniface III, and the church in the whole world knew nothing of it. St. Gregory, pious ... bishop of the Roman church, condemned it and would not tolerate it at all<sup>301</sup>." And Luther also says, the "Pope ... is the true Antichrist ..., who hath raised himself over and set himself against Christ .... This is called precisely, 'setting oneself over God and against God,' as St. Paul saith" (II Thess. 2:4)<sup>302</sup>.

*The second man of the Reformation*, John Calvin, is well known for his *Institutes*. In Calvin's *Institutes*, his most commonly cited writer among the ancient and early mediaeval church writers is the doctor, St. Augustine (over 300 times), and his second most commonly cited writer is the doctor, St. Gregory (over 50 times)<sup>303</sup>. As with the Anglican Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles, Calvin disagrees with Gregory's view on images<sup>304</sup>; makes the same qualification that "Gregory" taught "they ought not to be worshipped;" and like Luther describes him as "a pious man<sup>305</sup>." Thus Calvin looks with general favour on Gregory. He refers to how "the title of 'Universal Bishop' arose ... in the time of Gregory ... . Gregory ... strongly insisted that the appellation is profane; nay, blasphemous; nay, the forerunner of Antichrist." And of "the vile assassin Phocas" (Byzantine Emperor: 602-610), Calvin says, "At length Phocas, who had slain Maurice, and usurped his place ... conceded to Boniface III ... that Rome should be the head of all the churches." "Hence have sprung those famous axioms which have the force of oracles throughout the Papacy in the present day ..., that the Pope is the universal bishop of all churches, and the chief Head of the Church on earth." Concerning "these ... defenders of the Roman See ... [who] defend the title of 'Universal Bishop' while they see it so often anathematised by Gregory," Calvin then says, "If effect is

<sup>299</sup> See, for example, Richard, J., *op. cit.*, p. 177.

<sup>300</sup> *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 9, p. 391, *Phocas*.

<sup>301</sup> *Luther's Works*, Vol. 41, p. 299

<sup>302</sup> Luther's *Smalcald Articles* 4:9-11, upheld in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Epitome 3.

<sup>303</sup> Lester Little's "Calvin's Appreciation of Gregory the Great, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 56, 1962, p. 146.

<sup>304</sup> *Institutes* 1:11:5; cf. Article 35, Anglican 39 Articles, Homily 2, Book 2, Parts 2 & 3.

<sup>305</sup> Calvin's *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Jer. 10:8.

to be given to his [Gregory's] testimony, then they [the Romanists], by making their Pontiff 'universal,' declare him to be Antichrist. The name of 'head' was not more approved. For Gregory thus speaks: '... All ... are under one head members of the Church ..., the saints under grace, all perfecting the body of the Lord, are constituted members: none of them ever wished to be styled <universal>' (Gregory, Book 4, Epistle 83)."

Calvin further says, "We call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist." "I will briefly show that" "Paul's words" "can only be understood of the Papacy. Paul says that Antichrist would *sit in the temple of God* (II Thess. 2:4). Hence ... his nature is such, that he abolishes not the name either of Christ or the Church, but rather uses the name of Christ as a pretext, and lurks under the name of Church as under a mask. But ... Paul foretells that defection will come, ... that that seat of abomination will be erected, when a kind of universal defection comes upon the Church, though many members of the Church scattered up and down should continue in the true unity of the faith." "Neither," "was" "this calamity ... to terminate in one man." "Moreover, when the mark by which he distinguishes Antichrist is, that he would rob God of his honour and take it to himself, he gives the leading feature which we ought to follow in searching out Antichrist: especially when pride of this description proceeds to the open devastation of the Church. Seeing then ... the Roman Pontiff has impudently transferred to himself the most peculiar properties of God and Christ, there cannot be a doubt that he is the leader and standard-bearer of an impious and abominable kingdom<sup>306</sup>." And in *Calvin's Commentaries* on I John 2:18 and II Thess. 2, he further declares the Roman Papacy to be the Antichrist.

And *the third man of the Reformation*, Thomas Cranmer, also thinks highly of Gregory<sup>307</sup>. For in opposing the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and upholding "the [true] profession of the catholic faith," he favorably cites a number of church fathers and doctors, including in this list what "St. Gregory writeth<sup>308</sup>." Yet in his profession of faith that preceded his martyrdom by being burnt to death at Oxford in 1556 at the hands of the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558); this first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, among other things, recited the *Apostles' Creed*, and said, "And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ's enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine<sup>309</sup>."

It is also clear that the fundamental categories of thought that identify the Roman Papacy as the Antichrist of II Thess 2 predate the Protestant Reformation. Writers from the Church Father's Era such as, for example, John Chrysostom (4th to 5th centuries) or Jerome (4th to 5th centuries) interpreted "the temple of God" (II Thess. 2:4) as the church. Furthermore, writing before the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 A.D., John Chrysostom interpreted II Thess. 2:6-9 to mean that the Roman Empire in existence when the Apostle Paul wrote II Thessalonians and still in existence in Chrysostom's day, was

---

<sup>306</sup> Calvin's *Institutes*, 4:7: Sections Introduction; & 4:7:4,17,20,21,25.

<sup>307</sup> While those of the holy Reformed faith would be in general agreement that Luther is the first man of the Reformation, and Calvin the second man of the Reformation, the issue of who thereafter is "the third man of the Reformation" lacks such unanimity, and tends to be resolved more along intra-Protestant sectarian lines. My own view that Cranmer is "the third man of the Reformation" is an Anglican view.

<sup>308</sup> "The Third Book ...," *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*, Edited by G.E. Duffield, Sutton Courtney Press, Berkshire, England, 1964, pp. 131-3.

<sup>309</sup> Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, p. 411.

restraining the coming of the Antichrist and must first “be taken out of the way” before the Antichrist could “be revealed” (II Thess. 2:7,8). This means that the Antichrist would have to arise not long after 476 A.D. . Then the Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great (6th to 7th centuries) argued that whoever attributes to himself the title of “universal bishop” is a forerunner of Antichrist who sets himself “against God” (II Thess. 2:4), and identified the Bishop of Constantinople as a type of the coming Antichrist though reference to his claim to be “universal bishop.” Thus the subsequent fulfilment of this prophetic type shortly after Gregory the Great’s time when Pope Boniface III claimed this title “universal bishop,” means Boniface thereby became part of the greater fulfilment of the Antichrist prophecy which was thereafter manifested in the ongoing office of the Roman Papacy which continued to claim universal spiritual jurisdiction in the church / temple of God. Furthermore, in the twelfth century, Gerhardus and Dulcino of Novara said “the Pope was Antichrist.<sup>310</sup>” We also know from history that Waldensians such as Peter Waldo identified the Pope as the Antichrist in the twelfth century, as did John Huss in the fifteenth century. Nevertheless, it is also clear that at the time of the Reformation leading Protestants such as, for example, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Thomas Cranmer, William Tyndale, Ulrich Zwingli, and John Knox accepted this identification, as did a number of Protestant Confessions. Thus the view that the Pope is the Antichrist certainly became the accepted Protestant interpretation of II Thess. 2 by the Protestant Reformers.

Thus recognition of the Roman Papacy as the Antichrist stands out as the best Biblical understanding of II Thess. 2 in the light of subsequent church history. It is also the traditional historical understanding of II Thess. 2 accepted by Protestants from the time of the Reformation.

## CHAPTER 20

### **Some Points of Intersection between the description of Antichrist in the Synoptic Gospels, Pauline Epistles, and Johannian Epistles.**

Contrast and comparison of the key Scriptures used to identify the Antichrist from the three areas of the Gospels, Pauline Epistles, and Johannian Epistles, show some intriguing points of intersection. A notable contrast is found in the fact that Matthew 24:5 & 24 uses the plural, “false Christs;” whereas II Thessalonians 2:3 & 4, uses the singular, “that man of sin,” who “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God,” and likewise I John 2:18 refers to a singular “antichrist” (I John 2:18; 4:3). The only way to reasonably reconcile these passages of Scripture on the Antichrist is to conclude that the Antichrist is an Office that contains a succession of men i.e., the Office of the Roman Papacy established in 607 A.D., is the Office of the Antichrist.

Comparing and contrasting these NT passages is also significant and valuable as an aid in isolating key issues of importance in understanding the dangers posed to “the doctrine

---

<sup>310</sup> Townsend, G., *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, op. cit.*, Vol. 4, pp. 189-90.

of Christ” by the Roman “antichrist” (II John 7,9).

**1) THE ANTICHRIST IS TYPED BY LESSER ANTICHRISTS.**

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim. 4:1-5)	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11).
“Many” “shall come in Christ’s name “and deceive many;” has a <i>partial</i> fulfilment in the many Patriarchs of Oriental Orthodoxy who deny Christ’s humanity in the monophysitist heresy; in the many Catholicos-Patriarchs of the East Syrian Church who deny Christ’s humanity in the Nestorian heresy; in the many Patriarchs of Eastern Orthodoxy who deny Christ’s full humanity in the transubstantiation heresy; and a more perfect greater fulfilment in the many Popes of Rome who deny Christ’s full humanity in the transubstantiation heresy.	“The mystery of iniquity doth already work” fulfilled in a number of ways e.g., the false gospel of justification by works found in NT times at Galatia (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16; 3:11); but <i>one</i> way it was already at was by the presence of antichrists who in the form of first century A.D. emperors claimed spiritual jurisdiction and Divine Attributes like the then future Papal Antichrist would do so by “shewing” “that he is God” in the form of a Vice-God or Vice-Christ as “Vicar of Christ,” and so attacked the Christian Church.	From the Apostle John day’s on, there have been “many antichrists” who type the “Antichrist,” for instance, various gnostics, Manicheans, Nestorians, and monothelites. But the antichrists most closely resembling and typing <i>the</i> Antichrist of Rome who denies “Christ is come in the flesh,” i.e., his full humanity via the transubstantiation heresy, are the Patriarchs of the Nestorian Church and Patriarchs (or occasionally independent bishops) of Oriental Orthodoxy and Eastern Orthodoxy.

**2) THE ANTICHRIST IS A MASTER DECEIVER WHO WORKS FROM INSIDE THE CHURCH AND SO IS NOT IMMEDIATELY OBVIOUS WITH A FALSE GOSPEL.**

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim. 4:1-5)	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11).
a) <u>The Pope’s Appearance.</u> The “false Christs” seek, “if it were possible,” to “deceive” or “seduce” the “elect,” and so work from within the visible church and are not immediately obvious. This is fulfilled in the Roman Popes who comes	a) <u>The Pope’s Appearance.</u> The “son of perdition” Judas Iscariot (John 17:12) passed himself off as one of the faithful twelve apostles till at the very last he sprung his surprise attack from within the apostolate (John 13:21-30; 18:2-5; Acts 1:25).	a) <u>The Pope’s Appearance.</u> The Antichrist “is a liar” who “denieth” “the Christ” not overtly but covertly as “a liar” to them who “know not the truth” (I John 2:20,21), working from within the church as he “transgresseth, and abideth not in the

<p>subtly and with guile, not “in the name of Satan,” but rather, “in” the “name” of “Christ.” He works on earth as men say, “Lo, here is Christ” as a Vice-Christ on earth.</p>	<p>Likewise “the son of perdition” antichrist (II Thess. 2:3) works from inside “the temple of God,” that is, the church, “with all deceivableness” and will “lie” (II Thess. 2:10,11), “giving heed to seducing spirits” (I Tim. 4:1).</p>	<p>doctrine of Christ” (II John 9).</p>
<p><u>b) The Pope’s claim to a “universal” jurisdiction.</u> It is contextually clear that for the “false Christs,” “if it were possible,” to “deceive the very elect” (Matt. 24:24); that they must make a serious claim to a “universal” jurisdiction in the church. This is met in the Roman Papacy from 607 A.D. .</p>	<p><u>b) The Pope’s claim to a “universal” jurisdiction.</u> The Antichrist “sitteth in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4), and this church (e.g., I Cor. 6:19) must be the universal or catholic church (Eph. 5:31,32; Heb. 2:12; Rev. 12:17) in order for the Antichrist to be of universal significance to Christians; and so he must make a serious claim to a “universal” jurisdiction as the Pope has done since 607.</p>	<p><u>b) The Pope’s claim to a “universal” jurisdiction.</u> It is contextually clear that St. John considers the Antichrist (I John 2:18) will be of significance to the entire church. This requires that he will have to make a serious claim to kind of universal jurisdiction in the church, met in the Bishops of Rome since the establishment of the Roman Papacy in 607 with the first Pope, Boniface III.</p>
<p><u>c) The Pope’s Gospel.</u> “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness” (Matt. 24:14). But in opposition to this gospel “there shall arise false Christs,” “and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect” (Matt. 24:24).</p>	<p><u>c) The Pope’s Gospel.</u> “Now ... in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing sprits, and doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1). The “mystery of iniquity doth already work” (II Thess. 2:7). “I marvel that ye are so soon removed from ... the grace of Christ unto another gospel” (Gal. 1:6). “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?” (Gal. 3:1). “But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11). “Christ hath redeemed us” (Gal. 3:13).</p>	<p><u>c) The Pope’s Gospel.</u> Unlike the Biblical “Christ” who “hath redeemed us” (Gal. 3:13); unlike the Biblical “Christ,” that Christians “be found in,” “not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith;” the “antichrist” “denieth the” Biblical “Christ” (I John 2:22), with e.g., the false gospel of Mary “co-redeemer,” and justification by a combination of faith and works.</p>

### 3) PAPAL AUTHORITY NOT BIBLICAL AUTHORITY (SCRIPTURE ALONE).

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim. 4:1-5)	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11).
Pope says, "I am Christ" in the form of a Vice-Christ by his claim to be "Vicar of Christ" with a "universal" jurisdiction; and thus the Popes of Rome are also "false Christs."	Pope is found "shewing himself that he is God" in the form of a Vice-God by his claim to be "Vicar of God" or "Vicar of Christ" with a "universal" jurisdiction.	Pope fulfils the meaning of "Antichrist ( <i>antichristos</i> )," as one who is <i>in the place of Christ</i> by his synonymous claim to be "Vicar of Christ" ( <i>Vicarius Christi</i> ) with a "universal" jurisdiction. Greek " <i>antichristos</i> " = Latin " <i>Vicarius Christi</i> ."

### 4) THE LYING INVISIBLE MIRACLE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim. 4:1-5)	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11).
Pope fulfils requirement of "false Christs" to be under devilish power and "shew great signs and wonders" by both visible miracles e.g., Lourdes, and invisible miracles e.g., sacramental transubstantiation. Christ says in Matt. 24:28, "wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered." The eagles here symbolize angels (see Ezek. 1:10). I.e., one will know when he has bodily returned because his body will be surrounded by angels per Matt. 25:31. Jesus here gives us a test that if anyone claims the body of Christ is somewhere, if it is not surrounded by the visible presence of angels, the claim is false. Hence on one application of these	Pope is "the man of sin" & "iniquity" by e.g., his teaching of idolatrous adoration of sacramental bread and wine contrary to Second Precept, and his claim of "the sacrifice of the mass" which denies Christ's completed atonement on the cross and so is a form of blasphemy contrary to the Third Precept. Article 31 of the Anglican 39 Articles says concerning this denial of Christ's completed atonement (Heb. 9:25-28) in the "sacrifices of" the Romish "Masses," which claim "the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt;" that they are "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." And the Pope gives "heed to	Pope fulfils requirement to be under devilish power of a "spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" by invisible miracles said to be part of his teaching of transubstantiation. "For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances, and therefore must not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one" (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican <i>Book of Common Prayer</i> of 1662).

<p>principles (though not the only possible application), Matt. 24:28 teaches us to reject the transubstantiation heresy as there is no visible presence of angels at the Roman Mass.</p>	<p>seducing spirits” and exhibits devilish” power” in “working” “signs and lying wonders” by both visible miracles e.g., Fatima, and invisible miracles. E.g., sacramental transubstantiation which shows a “fall away from the faith” that “God was manifest in the flesh” and “received up into glory” (I Tim. 3:16; 4:1).</p>	
---	--	--

### 5) THE LYING MIRACLES OF OTHER POPISH SACRAMENTS

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim. 4:1-5)	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11).
<p>Pope fulfils requirement of “false Christs” to be under devilish power and “shew great signs and wonders” by invisible miracles of “sacramental grace”: baptismal regeneration; confirmation; marriage (with its corollary of indissolubility); religious orders (with its corollary of celibacy); absolution in auricular confession; and extreme unction; and visible miracles with healings after the anointing of the sick (which was expanded beyond extreme unction by the <i>Vatican II Council</i> of 1963-5).</p>	<p>Pope is “that man of sin” and “iniquity” by his setting aside of God’s law of marriage which contrary to Pope’s indissolubility claims allows Biblical divorcees to remarry (Matt.19:9), thus “forbidding to marry;” and in this and also his religious orders celibacy teaching is “forbidding to marry” after “giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” in this, and his other sacraments with their associated miracles.</p>	<p>Pope fulfils requirement to be under devilish power of a “spirit that confesseth not that Jesus” who “is come in the flesh.” E.g., he “denieth” the Biblical “Christ” (I John 2:22) by his “Sacrament” of auricular confession, which denies that “if we confess our sins,” “Christ cleanseth us,” for “we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous (I John 1:7,8; 2:1).</p>

### 6) THE LYING VISIBLE MIRACLES OF SAINT MEDIATORS AND ESPECIALLY MARY AS “CO-MEDIATOR.”

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim.	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II
---	---	---

13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	4:1-5)	John 7-11).
Pope fulfils requirement to “shew” “signs and wonders” by miracles of Saint “mediators” e.g. stigmatics, and especially Mary who is focused on more than any other “Saint mediator.”	Pope is “the man of sin” and “iniquity” by his idolatrous veneration of Mary and Saints contrary to the Second Commandment; and gives “heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils,” exhibiting Satanic “power,” “signs,” and “lying wonders” by miracles of Saint “mediators” such as Mary. Pope as “the son of perdition” is possessed by Lucifer himself (John13:26,27; 17:12; II Thess. 2:30 cf. Isa. 14; Ezek. 28); and his two “infallible” declarations both uphold Mariolatry.	Pope is “a liar” and “denieth” the Biblical “Christ” by denying him as the one who makes “intercession” (Isa. 53:12) as the “one mediator between God and men” (I Tim. 2:5), i.e., “the door” (John 10:7); by his teaching of Saint mediators in general and Mary as “co-mediator” in particular.

**7) SEEKING TO DAMN SOULS BY A FALSE GOSPEL, DENYING CHRIST THE REDEEMER BY “MARY CO-REDEEMER,” AND ATTACKING THE GOSPEL OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH i.e., FAITH ALONE & GRACE ALONE.**

<i>The Gospels</i> (Matt. 24:4,5,23,24; Mark 13:5,6,21,22; & Luke 17:22,23; 21:8).	<i>The Pauline Epistles</i> (II Thess. 2:1-12 & I Tim. 4:1-5)	<i>The Johannian Epistles</i> (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11).
Popes are “false Christs” who seek, “if it were possible,” “to seduce” or” deceive the” “elect;” who have accepted the invitation, “Repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15); which elicited “faith in God” (Mark 11:22) and Christ’s substitutionary atonement (Matt. 20:28; Mark10:45) as “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29), “that whosoever believeth in him	Pope “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” by e.g., 1) exalting his false gospel of justification by faith and works above God’s gospel of justification by faith alone (Eph. 2:1,5,8,9); or 2) exalting Mary above Christ by e.g., denying Christ as redeemer (Gal. 4:5; Titus 2:14; I Peter 1:18; Rev. 5:9) in claiming Mary as “co-redeemer” (or co-mediatrix). “That they all might be	Pope “denieth that Jesus is the Christ,” by e.g., denying the OT prophesied role of his substitutionary atonement (Isa. 53), with its message of “good tidings” (Isa. 52:7; 61:1,2), and “new covenant” (Jer. 31:31-34) containing the “everlasting covenant” (Isa. 55:3), that is, the” covenant” of “grace” (Gen. 6:8,18); by e.g., his teachings of Mary as “co-redeemer” (or co-mediatrix) and justification by faith and

should not perish” (John 3:16) but “be saved” rather than “damned” (Mark 16:16).	damned who believed not the truth” (II Thess. 2:12).	works. (Cf. Gal. 3:1; I Tim. 4:1.)
--	--	------------------------------------

## CHAPTER 21

### Summary and Conclusion.

In chapters 1-19 the following propositions have been established.

*Proposition 1.* The Apostle John foretold the coming of the Antichrist, whom he said was typed by a number of antichrists, including some from his own day (I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7). Over the centuries there have been “many antichrists” who deny the humanity of Christ, that is “who confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (II John 7), such as the Asiatic gnostics, the African gnostics, the Nestorians, and the monothelites. But there have been four significant kinds of antichrists who have stood the test of time. These are the Catholicos-Patriarchs of the *East Syrian Church* who deny Christ’s humanity via the Nestorian heresy, the Patriarchs (or independent bishops) of Oriental Orthodoxy who deny Christ’s humanity through the monophysitist heresy, the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs (or independent bishops) who deny Christ’s full humanity via the transubstantiation heresy, and the Western Patriarchs or Popes of Rome who deny Christ’s full humanity via the transubstantiation heresy. The transubstantiation heresy denies Christ’s full humanity because while the fully Divine Christ may be spiritually present in an inter-personal way with believers since like the other Divine Persons of the Trinity he is omnipresent; nevertheless, the fully human Christ can only be bodily present in one place at any one time, since it is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (*Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662*). Thus like, for example, the *Second Scotch Confession (1580)*, the Roman Pope may be fairly referred to as the *Roman Antichrist*.

But of these “many antichrists” that the Apostle John says will type the “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), only the Popes of Rome fulfil the requirement of putting themselves *in the place of Christ*, which they do by their claim to be “Vicar of Christ.” Since “Antichrist” from the Greek, *Antichristos*, means *in the place of Christ*, and “Vicar of Christ” from the Latin, *Vicarius Christs*, means *in the place of Christ*, these terms are synonymous, and among the “many antichrists” who have stood the test of time, fulfilled *uniquely* in the *Roman Antichrist* who claims to be “the Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction. The Roman Pope is the only antichrist to fulfill all of the Apostle John’s descriptors of *the Antichrist* whose teaching that the Antichrist will be of significance to the whole church also requires the conclusion that he will claim a “universal” spiritual jurisdiction.

#### *Elucidation on Proposition 1.*

On the basis of I and II John it is thus clear that *the Roman Antichrist*, that is, the Roman Catholic Pope is *an antichrist*, as indeed are the Nestorian Church’s Catholicos-Patriarchs of the *East Syrian Church*, the Oriental Orthodox Patriarchs, for example, the

*Egyptian Antichrist* of the Coptic Orthodoxy Patriarchate of Alexandria, and the *West Syrian Antichrist* of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch, and likewise Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs, for example, the *Constantinoplean Antichrist* of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the *Russian Antichrist* of the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow. Such recognitions act to manifest and protect broad fundamentals of the Christian faith since it is in harmony with, and manifests a fundamental understanding of important issues in, the antichrist teaching found in the Johannian Epistles (I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7).

This recognition of, for example, the Roman Pope as the *Roman Antichrist* means that in harmony with broad fundamental Biblical principles of religious separation, the Pope's claims and teachings are to be condemned and the pure gospel of Jesus Christ proclaimed in its stead (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16; 3:11). We are not to give the Roman Antichrist spiritual recognition as a religious leader since in the false unBiblical Christ he proclaims and in the way he puts himself *in the place of Christ* as "Vicar of Christ" he "is a deceiver and an antichrist," and were we to "bid him God speed" we would be made a "partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 7,10,11). We recognize the Biblical teaching that he is a false teacher bringing in "damnable heresies" (II Peter 2:1) and he is "accursed" (AV) and bound in the bonds of God's "anathema" (ASV) for preaching "another gospel" (Gal. 1:6,8) other than the gospel which says, "no man is justified by the law in the sight of God," "for, The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11). Thus we should maintain the Biblical teaching of religious separation from apostasy and warn believers of the false system of Roman Catholic religion that is headed up by Roman Antichrist.

On the basis of the Johannian Epistles which refer to the Antichrist and teach that there are "many antichrists" who type *the* "Antichrist" who "shall come" (I John 2:18), the orthodox should agree with Homily 16, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* that in application of "the good counsel of St. John, 'believe not every spirit, but first try them whether they be of God or no' (I John 4)," and the words of Jesus, "'Many (Matt. 24:5,24) shall come in my name,' that 'all the Popes' are "'false Christs' (Matt. 24:24)" that is, antichrists.

While the "false Christs" here foretold might include false Messiahs rather than antichrists, in the millennia since Christ said these words the principal fulfilment has been found in antichrists who alone, over time, have been "many" in number and able to "deceive many" (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8). Some of these descriptors in the Gospel passages are met by other antichrists, since the antichrist Catholicos-Patriarchs of the Nestorian Church, antichrist Patriarchs of Oriental Orthodoxy, and antichrist Patriarchs of Eastern Orthodoxy, have like the Popes of Rome, been "many" in number (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8), been able to "deceive many" (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6), and "many" of these have been able to show "signs and wonders" to "seduce" or "deceive," "if it were possible," even "the" "elect" (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) with both visible and invisible miracles. But it is significant, that of the four kinds of antichrists who have been able to meet these criteria, only the Popes of Rome fulfill three further descriptors. Only the *Roman Antichrist* says, "I am Christ" (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8), since only the Pope of Rome claims in a formal title of office to be, "Vicar of Christ" with a universal jurisdiction in the church, and thus "Christ" as his universal representative and deputy; and through this claim to be "Vicar of Christ" *on earth* it can only said of the Pope, "Lo, here is Christ" (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) in the form of a Vice-Christ; and likewise through his claim to be "Vicar of Christ" only the Popes of Rome qualify as "false Christs" (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22).

The *Roman Antichrist* fulfills all the descriptors of *the* Antichrist in the Gospels and Johannian Epistles, and of the three kinds of “many” antichrists (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8; I John 2:18) who fulfil some of the descriptors of *the* Antichrist in the Gospels and Johannian Epistles, the *Roman Antichrist* alone fulfils four descriptors, namely, the very meaning of the word “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), which as the Greek *Antichristos* means “in the place of Christ,” and is found in the Latin, “*Vicarius Christi*” also meaning “in the place of Christ” as “Vicar of Christ;” the description of “false Christs;” his location on earth (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22), and the statement, “I am Christ,” all four of which the Roman Popes fulfil in their claim to be “Vicar of Christ” with a “universal” jurisdiction. Therefore the Gospels and Johannian Epistles point to the *Roman Papacy* as being not simply an antichrist but *the* Antichrist. If indeed the *Roman Antichrist* is *the* Antichrist, then it notable that of the “many antichrists” who type the “Antichrist” (I John 2:18), the Nestorian Church’s Catholicos-Patriarchs, Oriental Orthodox Patriarchs, and Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs are “many antichrists” who as types most closely resemble *the* “Antichrist” himself (I John 2:18). But in order to either confirm or reject this conclusion that the *Roman Antichrist* is in fact *the* Antichrist, it is necessary to examine the detailed and definitive description given of the Antichrist by the Apostle Paul in II Thess. 2:1-12.

*Proposition 2:* The historic teaching of Protestant Churches went further than *Proposition 1* and identified the Roman Pope not simply as *an* antichrist but *the* Antichrist foretold by the Apostle Paul in II Thessalonians chapter 2. For example, the Anglican Church required that the *Authorized Version* of 1611 which referred to the Pope as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) in its dedicatory preface to King James, be used in church services in the *Act of Uniformity* (1662) for “such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the liturgy” (The Preface, *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662). In harmony with this, I maintain that if an orthodox believer first accepts the self-evident truth that as “Vicar of Christ” the Pope is an antichrist and so the *Roman Antichrist*, if he then *continues to consider the matter* of who is the Antichrist of II Thessalonians chapter 2 and the Johannian Epistles in humble prayer and reflection, then the Lord will in his graciousness convict him of the marvelous prophetic truth that the Pope of Rome is indeed that Antichrist foretold in Holy Scripture, in agreement with, for example, Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Tyndale, Knox, Bunyan, Spurgeon, various Protestant Confessions (Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, & Baptist), and the Authorized Version’s translators.

*Proposition 3.* The categories of Biblical thought which are needed to identify the Roman Pope as the Antichrist of II Thess. 2 can be found as early as the 4th to 5th centuries with respect to referring to the New Testament teaching that “the temple of God” is the church (I Cor. 3:16,17) in the writings of, e.g., St. John Chrysostom or St. Jerome; as dating to just after the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 from St. Chrysostom’s writings; and as early as the 6th to 7th centuries with respect to an application that easily fits the Pope in the writings of St. Gregory the Great, who identified the Bishop of Constantinople as a prophetic type of the coming Antichrist through reference to his claim to be “universal bishop,” and then this title was shortly afterwards adopted by a subsequent Bishop of Rome. Hence the subsequent formation of the Roman Papacy as the “universal bishop” from 607, requires on the teaching of the church doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory, the conclusion that from 607 (on a 1 January New Year’s Day Calendar; or some prefer to use 606 on a 25 March New Year’s Day Anglican Annunciation Day Calendar), the Pope is none other than the Antichrist foretold in Scripture.

Identification of the Roman Pope as the Antichrist predates Protestantism as this view was clearly held by a number of Waldensians at least three centuries before the Reformation, and also by John Huss a century before Luther nailed his 95 thesis to the door of Wittenburg in 1517. However, this usage of the Gospels (Matt. 24:5,24; Mark 13:6,22; Luke 17:22,23; 21:8), Pauline Epistles (II Thess. 2:1-12; I Tim. 4:1-5), and Johannian Epistles (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11), is consistent with the usage of this passage at the time of the Reformation, for example, Luther's tract, "Martin Luther Against the Detestable Bull of the Antichrist" (1520).

*Proposition 4.* Comparative analysis of the keys Scriptures used to identify the Antichrist from the three areas of the Gospels (Matt. 24:5,24; Mark 13:6,22; Luke 17:22,23; 21:8), Pauline Epistles (II Thess. 2:1-12; I Tim. 4:1-5), and Johannian Epistles (I John 2:18,22; 4:2,3; II John 7-11), show significant points of intersection or overlap, and so help us isolate key issues of relevance in understanding the spiritual battle between Christ and Antichrist.

*The Antichrist is typed by "many" lesser antichrists* (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8; II Thess. 2:7; I John 2:18). Of the "many" who have come over the millennia, the Catholicos-Patriarchs of the Nestorian Church, and Patriarchs of Oriental Orthodoxy and the Patriarchs of Eastern Orthodoxy most closely resemble and type the Patriarchs of the West or Roman Popes who constitute *the* Antichrist.

Contrary to the claims and expectations of futurists who are looking for some overtly obvious and sinister Antichrist figure, *the Antichrist is a master deceiver who works from inside the church and so is not immediately obvious.* In this sense, the Devil comes to us as Antichrist in the same way he came to our first parents in the Garden of Eden. At that time, Satan devil-possessed a snake and then spoke through that serpent as part of his elaborate ruse (Gen. 3). So likewise, we are forewarned in Holy Scripture that "false Christs" shall seek, "if it were possible," "to seduce" or "deceive" the "elect" by working inside the visible church (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22). For like the "son of perdition" Judas Iscariot (John 17:12), the "son of perdition" Antichrist (II Thess. 2:3) works from inside "the temple" or church "of God" (II Thess. 2:4) "with all deceivableness" (II Thess. 2:10), with his victims "giving heed to seducing spirits" (I Tim. 4:1). For the Antichrist "denieth the Christ" not in an overt way, but in a covert way, as "a liar" to them who "know not the truth" (I John 2:21,22), working from within the visible church as a corrupter of "the doctrine of Christ" (II John 9).

*The Antichrist replaces Biblical authority with Papal authority.* In his claim to be "Vicar of Christ" with a "universal" jurisdiction in the church, the Pope fulfils the Antichrist descriptors with a series of "false Christs" (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) saying "I am Christ" (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8), fulfils the very meaning of the word "Antichrist" (I John 2:18), and as a Vice-Christ or Vice-God shows "that he is God" (II Thess. 2:4). He thus strikes down *Scripture alone* (Latin, *sola Scriptura*) with his own purported authority.

*In the lying invisible miracle of transubstantiation* the Pope shows "signs and wonders" (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) which are "signs and lying wonders" "after the working of Satan" (II Thess. 2:9), as the Pope gives "heed to seducing spirits" and "devils" (I Tim. 4:1) who, among other things, deny "the mystery of godliness" that "God was manifest in the flesh" and "received up into glory" (I Tim. 3:16). The Pope does this by an invisible miracle, and so shows himself to be under the devilish power of a "spirit that confesseth not

that Jesus” who “is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7) since transubstantiation denies the full humanity of Christ, “it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” (*Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662*). Transubstantiation also shows the Pope is “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), by his teaching of the idolatrous adoration of the sacramental bread and wine contrary to the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6); and his teaching about “the sacrifice of the mass” which denies Christ’s completed atonement on the cross and which is a blasphemous violation of the Third Commandment (Exod. 20:7).

In *the lying miracles of other Popish Sacraments* the Pope shows “signs and wonders” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) which are “signs and lying wonders” “after the working of Satan” (II Thess. 2:9) as the Pope gives “heed to seducing spirits” and “devils” (I Tim. 4:1); and shows himself to be under the devilish power of a “spirit that confesseth not that Jesus” who “is come in the flesh” (I John 4:2,3; II John 7). His invisible miracles of “sacramental grace” include: the invisible miracle of “baptismal regeneration,” and “confirming” this in the “sacrament of confirmation.” His invisible miracle of absolution in his “sacrament of confession” greatly attacks the doctrine of justification by faith. In auricular confession to a priest, the Roman Pope teaches *justification by confession*, that is, unless one remembers and confesses all of one’s sins one cannot go to heaven, and so one falls in and out of salvation depending on whether or not one has any unconfessed sins (for which reasons the Papists put much importance on the “Last Confession” of a dying man). This type of “bondage” (Gal. 4:8,9), kept Martin Luther in long hours at the confessional trying to remember all his sins, till he realized that salvation is “the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8), and so while as a general proposition the believer will “confess” “sins” (I John 1:9) asking God to “forgive” him (Matt. 6:12), he need not be worried about not going to heaven because he has forgotten to include some sin in this list, for the Biblical doctrine of *justification by faith* does away with the false and spurious teaching of *justification by confession*.

The Popish invisible miracle in “the sacrament of marriage” results in marital indissolubility requirements, i.e., “forbidding to marry” of Biblically sound divorcees (I Tim. 4:3); and the Popish invisible miracle in “the sacrament of religious orders” results in celibacy requirements. Thus in his sacramental teaching of marriage the Pope is found to be “giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” by “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:1,3). In the case of those entering Popish religious orders this is a simple prohibition on marriage and requirement of celibacy. This shows the Pope to once again be “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) as he sets aside God’s law on a “bishop” (AV & NKJV) or “overseer” (NKJV ftn) (I Tim. 3:1) being “the husband of one wife” (I Tim. 3:2) and “deacons” also being “the husbands of one wife” (I Tim. 3:12) in his “forbidding to marry” of clergy. I.e., while the Bible allows clergy to be married, like St. Peter (Mark 1:30; I Cor. 9:5), it also allows for celibate clergy like St. Paul, but like him, they must *additionally* have the gift of continency and singleness (I Cor. 7:5,7,38; 9:5).

The Pope further shows himself as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) in the case of those entering a Roman Catholic marriage, as he sets aside God’s law on marriage, which allows remarriage for Biblical divorcees. For example, if a man cruelly beats his wife, all the time engaging in acts of adultery with his secretary, the Pope of Rome would insist that this woman cannot divorce her husband and marry another, whereas the Bible says she can (Deut. 24:1-4; Matt. 5:32; 19:9). Why should a man stay married to a wife who commits adultery on their marriage bed with various tradesman who come to the house? Why should a man stay married to a woman who approaches a beast, to lie down

with it in bestial sodomy? The Pope of Rome would insist that such a man cannot divorce his wife and marry another, whereas the Bible says he can (Deut. 24:1-4; Matt. 5:32; 19:9). Why should a woman stay married to a man who is convicted in law as a rapist of another woman? Though Papal authority says such a wife cannot divorce her husband and remarry another, the Bible says she can. Why should a woman stay married to a man who engages in acts of bestial sodomy? The Bible allows a woman to divorce her husband for such “fornication” (AV) or “sexual immorality” (NKJV) (Matt. 5:32; 19:9), and remarry another; but the Pope of Rome says an unrelenting “No” to such a woman divorcing and remarrying.

Both before and after the *Second Vatican Council* (1963-5) the Pope’s invisible miracles have included extreme unction. But since the *Second Vatican Council* this sacrament has become “anointing of the sick” (Session 5, chapter 2, section 11). Due to this expanded usage of the sacrament, it is now often called by Papists “the sacrament of the sick.” The *Roman Ritual* still specifies that this is intended “For those about to die,” that is, extreme unction, but it now also specifies that it is to be administered to a “Sick person on the forehead and hands,” in order to “make him well again in mind and body.<sup>311</sup>” When this new “sacrament of the sick” is administered it may be attended by the visible miracle of healing, and if so, this shows the power of devils and not God, for the Pope’s “coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:8), designed, “if it were possible,” “to seduce” and “deceive the” “elect” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22).

In *the lying visible miracles of Saint mediators and especially Mary as “co-mediator”*, the Pope shows “signs and wonders” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22) which are “signs and lying wonders” “after the working of Satan” (II Thess. 2:9) as he gives “heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1) by the visible miracles attributed to Saints and especially Mary after Papists have invoked Mary or some Saint in their prayers. Indeed, as “the son of perdition,” he is, like Judas Iscariot, devil-possessed by Satan himself (John 13:26,27; 17:12; II Thess.2:30), and in this sense, bears a further resemblance to the ancient kings of Babylon (Isa. 14:4-23) and Tyre (Ezek. 28:11-19). Thus like the serpent he possessed in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3; Rev. 12), one can address Satan himself by addressing the Roman Pope. Lucifer, who unlike God, is not omnipresent (Ps. 139:7-10; Prov. 15:3), is thus usually physically present in Rome, from where he generally organizes his legions of unholy angels to do his bidding (Rev. 18:2). As the one who has possessed and controlled every Pope of Rome for about 1,400 years since 607 A.D., it is clear that he wishes to strongly promote Mariolatry, at times by Satanic miracles. Yet by such visible miracles, “the Devil” who “is a liar, and the father of it” (John 8:44), manifests the fact that his puppet-controlled Pope is “a liar” who “denieth” the Biblical “Christ” (I John 2:22), who is man’s only intercessor and mediator (Isa. 53:12; I Tim. 2:5). The Pope’s Mariolatry and veneration of Saints once again shows that he is “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7), since this teaching includes the idolatrous veneration of graven images of Saints such as Mary contrary to the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6), “Thou

---

<sup>311</sup> Tanner, N.P. (Editor), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Imprimatur: John Crowley, Vicar General, Westminster, 1989, Steed & Ward, London, UK and Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA, 1990, Volume 2, p. 857 (Vatican II Council, 5:2:11); *The Roman Ritual*, Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, *Rite of Anointing and Pastoral Care of the Sick*, Liturgical Books, Dublin, Republic of Ireland, 1974, *Concordateum original*: Michael Harty, Bishop of Killaloe, *Imprimi Potest*: Dermot, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland, pp. 54-7.

shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image.”

The Pope also *seeks to damn souls by a false gospel that denies Christ the Redeemer by teaching “Mary Co-redeemer,” and by attacking the gospel of justification by faith (faith alone, grace alone).* The Popes seek, “if it were possible,” “to seduce” or “deceive the” “elect” (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22). This focus on the “elect” necessarily includes a focus on the gospel which saves the “elect.” The Pope “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4) in a number of ways, but this certainly includes the fact that he exalts his false gospel of justification by faith and works above the gospel of justification by faith (Rom. 1-11), thus denying man’s salvation is by grace alone (Latin, *sola gratia*) accepted by faith alone (Latin, *sola fide*). He thus denies the words of the Reformation catch-cry: *Faith alone, Grace Alone, Scripture Alone*; manifested in the Latin of the Reformation Motto: *sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*. Thus the Pope gives “heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1) that men might be “bewitched” into justification by works (Gal. 3:1,11; 4:9). The Pope does this in a number of ways. But one of the various ways he denies justification by faith with its associated teachings such as the completed work of Christ on the cross (John 19:30; Rom. 6:10; Heb. 7:27; 13:20), and one of the ways he “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4), is through exalting Mary above Christ by, for example, denying Christ the Redeemer in his claims of “Mary the Co-redeemer.” The Pope thus “denieth that Jesus is the Christ” (I John 2:22) since Christ is man’s redeemer (Gal. 3:13; 4:5; Titus 2:14; I Peter 1:18) for “the Lamb” of God “hast redeemed us to God by” his “blood” (Rev. 5:8,9).

*Proposition 5.* We read in Acts that St. Paul founded the Church of Thessalonica over three weeks, being there for three sabbaths. During that time, or by later epistles, he taught them about such things as the Second Advent and Antichrist, for he says in II Thess. 2:15 to “hold fast the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle,” and it is clear from II Thess. 2:1-12 that this included teaching on the Antichrist. Therefore this type of teaching is fairly basic. It is part of the ABC’s of Christianity that we should know about; and hence it is in all the major Confessions of the Protestant Reformation.

Thus a general belief historically existed among Protestants that the Antichrist foretold in the Johannian Epistles (I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7) and Pauline Epistles (II Thess. 2:1-12) is the Roman Pope, and among Protestant churches this historically was made an officially endorsed teaching. For example, this was made an officially endorsed teaching in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, and further officially endorsed among Anglicans in the *Church of England* after the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662 required the usage of the Authorized Version of 1611 in Church of England services, since the Dedicatory Preface to King James refers to the Pope as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3, AV). It was also historically recognized at a confessional level by the Lutheran *Smalcald Articles* (1537) which were upheld in the Lutheran *Formule of Concord* (1576 & 1584); the (Anglican) Church of Ireland’s *Irish Articles of Religion* (1615); the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession of Faith* (adopted by the *Church of Scotland* 1649 & 1690); the Congregational Church’s *Savoy Declaration* (1658); and *The Baptist Confession* (1689). In harmony with this historic recognition, I consider that in every religiously conservative Protestant Church it should be an officially endorsed teaching that the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist foretold in Holy Scripture by the Apostle John in I and II John and the Apostle Paul in II Thessalonians.