

THE PAPACY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURES

by T.T. Shields

Shields' critical examination of papal claims through biblical analysis, demonstrating the absence of scriptural support for papal authority by reviewing Acts, Paul's epistles, and other New Testament writings.

3 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 1. First Address
2. 2. Second Address
3. 3. Who established the Papacy?

1. First Address

THE PAPACY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE

First Address

We ought not to approach a subject like this lightly. However greatly men may differ from one another in matters of religion, and however strongly they may speak—and sometime they must so speak—in reference to such subjects, we should at least discuss them in a spirit of reverence; for even people who are in great error, often are profoundly sincere, and to make light of matters which others hold to be true, even though they hold them in error, is only to offend, and can accomplish no good. The Roman Catholic Church is the largest body in the world bearing the Christian name. That, in itself, is enough to challenge attention, and to merit careful examination. The Roman Catholic Church does not apologize for its existence; it never compromises its position; but boldly declares its own convictions as to its mission; and endeavors to convert others to an acceptance of its teaching. With that attitude I am in full accord. A man ought not to be ashamed of that which he professes to believe. If we believe we have the truth, we should hold it fast without apology or compromise. We should "buy the truth, and sell it not." No one need be ashamed of believing the truth. Truth is never hurt by discussion. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be manifest, that they are wrought in God."

Why The Roman Church Calls Itself "Catholic" The Roman Catholic Church does not call itself one of many churches. It claims to be the one and only holy apostolic church. It calls itself the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church. It calls itself "Catholic" in the sense that it claims to be the whole and only church, having universal sovereignty over the souls of men. It goes so far as to say positively that there is no salvation outside of the Roman Catholic Church; and that submission to the Roman Pontiff is absolutely indispensable to salvation. Whether its position call he justified or not, a church that so boldly makes such extraordinary claims for itself, should certainly be examined, and studied carefully. Nor can our Roman Catholic friends—I would suggest to you that it is never appropriate to speak of the Roman Catholic Church as a "Catholic" church without the qualifying adjective "Roman"—making such claims, reasonably object to anyone's investigating as fully as may be possible the validity of that church's contention. It is never profitable to discuss any religious subject merely for the sake of disproving it. It is well always, if you would understand a subject, having divested your mind so far as is possible of all preconceptions, to come to a study of it with an open mind, and without prejudice. That is a difficult task. Sometimes we think we are without prejudice when really we come with a very settled attitude were we able to discern it.

Every Doctrine Must Be Tested by The Word of God

There is a way to study all such matters, and that is in the light of Holy Scripture. Every religion should be tested by the standards of the Word of God. It is possible to discuss many things that are unscriptural, in such a way, and in such a spirit, as to do ourselves and others more harm than good. I believe, for the Christian, it is never wise to consider any such subject apart from the light

of Scripture itself. It is impossible to bring any disputed subject to the touchstone of the Word of God without deriving profit therefrom: one either learns the subject under consideration to be untrue, or finding it to be scripturally established, one is confirmed in belief of it.

Some people face the religious problems of the day by buying as many books on the subjects as possible; and by reading them to the utter exclusion of the one supreme authority, the Bible itself. They form the habit of reading books about the Bible, and never give the Bible an opportunity to speak for itself. We have read of scientists who, in the endeavor to isolate the germs of certain diseases, have fallen victims to the plague they hoped to banish. For the Christian there is only one safe way to discuss any religious subject, and that is by comparing it with the teaching of the Word of God: in that light is our only safety.

Let Rome Speak for Herself When examining a subject like this, it is important to let people or institutions speak for themselves. If I were a Modernist, and were to write a book, I should not object to people's reading my book, and judging me by what I had written. Were I a Roman Catholic, I should not object to anyone's studying Roman Catholic books, and learning what the Roman Catholic Church teaches. It is easy to set up straw men, and to appear very heroic in knocking them down. I know a certain man, a very likeable man, but a Modernist to the core, who is fond of speaking after this fashion of the Evangelical or Fundamentalist position: describing some absurd idea which no sane Evangelical ever believed, he exclaims: "If I had to believe that"—and forthwith describes some still more absurd position to which, as an alternative, he would be driven. But nobody ever believed what the gentleman imagines. So that his vaunted heroics are quite unnecessary. He does not know what orthodoxy is. He sets up a view of the atonement which nobody ever conceived, even in a nightmare. His knowledge of evangelical orthodoxy has been derived from a study of its caricatures.

It would be possible, thus, to take a fling at the Church of Rome—or for the Church of Rome to take a fling at us, and while doing so for each to misrepresent the other. The best way to study the Roman Catholic Church is to let it speak for itself, and to judge it out of its own mouth; and see wherein the Roman Catholic Church differs from positions commonly held by Protestants. A Recent Roman Catholic Authority

I now quote from a Roman Catholic work entitled "The Papacy", consisting of "papers from the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, August 7th to 10th, 1923." These addresses were delivered at a Summer School in Cambridge University, England. The one from which I quote is by Rev. Hugh Pope, Doctor of Sacred Scripture. He begins with this simple statement:

"For a Catholic, the Papacy is the key to the whole religious question. For—to put it concisely—we believe the doctrines of our faith, not because we fancy we discover them set forth in the New Testament, nor because a vague entity called 'the Church' has held them, but because the visible teaching Church—the Corpus Christi. or Body of Christ—has taught them, and continues to teach them, through its head on earth, the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ."

We are here told the Papacy is the cardinal matter, the key to the whole religious question. That is why, when entering upon a discussion of religious authority, in relation to the Roman Catholic Church, I begin with a study of the claims of the Papacy in the light of Holy Scripture.

I quote again from the same authority:

"Now, if the Catholic doctrine of the Papacy is true, it must find solid justification in the New Testament—the charter of Christianity."

Personally, I did not know it was there! I have read the New Testament a great many times, and for myself I never found anything remotely suggestive of the Papacy. But here is a great scholar, who tells us the Papacy is taught in the New Testament. I feel therefore that I have read the New Testament to little purpose, if this Romanist contention be true, since I have failed to discover even a suggestion of this claim. I turn to this Roman Catholic author to discover the ground upon which the Papacy rests as set forth by Roman Catholics themselves, and am told "it must find solid justification in the New Testament".

We shall, I trust, all say, Amen, to that. That, of course, brings us immediately to the New Testament, to see what it has to say about the Papacy. I shall examine the various texts which this authority quotes.

He begins with Matthew, the sixteenth chapter, from the thirteenth to the nineteenth verses:

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesara Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed It unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The Papacy The Key to Whole Religious Question

You will see that this Roman Catholic author does not begin with a definition of the church as such: he begins with the Papacy, for we are told that "the Papacy is the key to the whole religious question". Naturally, if you are going to describe a house, you will begin with the foundation upon which it rests. This author insists that when our Lord said to Peter, "Thou art Peter"—and, as you know, the word means rock—"and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it", that He there intended to teach that Peter was the rock upon which He would build His church. That is the Roman Catholic interpretation. They go farther and insist that Peter was given a peculiar and special revelation: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed It unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

Let us examine that for a moment. Surely no one can fairly contend that there is any implication here of a peculiar and special revelation to Peter, a revelation not given to all who recognize in Jesus the Son of God: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." There is no knowing God by any mere rational process: God Is not discoverable to the human mind. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." All spiritual truth, the New Testament teaches, comes to us by revelation. It is not something that can be discovered by a test-tube, nor be discerned through microscope or telescope. "Eye hath not

seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." Whatever we know of God, we learn by revelation from Heaven. That is all our Lord intended to say to Peter when he acknowledged Him to be the Christ, the Son of the living God: "You have not discovered that for yourself. You could not possibly know that great truth, except God revealed it unto you." And that is true of everyone who recognizes in Jesus Christ the Son of the living God.

Peter's Confession Not Peter the Rock The language of the text itself, its grammatical construction, cannot fairly be made to yield the interpretation which our Roman Catholic friends put upon it. "I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock"—not upon thee as the rock, but "upon this rock I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." We shall later see what that Rock was.

Peter has just confessed the truth of the essential Deity of Christ, the eternal Sonship of the Lord Jesus; and He has said, "You did not learn that for yourself: it was revealed to you; and upon this rock, upon that revealed truth, will I build my church." And let me anticipate later studies by saying that this same Peter, when preaching on the day of Pentecost, led his hearers up to that magnificent conclusion, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." It was when he thus proclaimed the Lordship, the Deity, of Christ on the day of Pentecost, that the people were cut to the heart and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do? We have been mistaken. If that be true, that the Jesus we crucified is none other than the Son of God, how shall we adjust ourselves to that great truth?" Peter answered, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." That was the only way by which they could come into right relation to God.

What Are The Keys of The Kingdom of Heaven?

Again: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." What do we mean by the "keys of the kingdom of heaven"? Are we to suppose that the Lord did select an ordinary mortal, a man, and hand over to him absolute authority under the figure of the "keys of the kingdom of heaven", and say, "It shall be for you to say whether a man shall enter or stay without"? That is the teaching of Rome, but apart from that particular text, for the moment, can anyone who has even the most superficial knowledge of the New Testament, contend that that strange doctrine finds any support anywhere in the New Testament? "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." We shall come later to consider what the early disciples, and the apostolic church, understood by these sayings of our Lord, but I anticipate that more thorough investigation by making that enquiry.

Many of you have at least a general knowledge of the text of the New Testament: you can think through it at a glance. When that doctrine is proclaimed, that the Lord God did select a particular man, other than the Lord Jesus, to whom He committed the destiny of immortal souls, instantly you will rebel against it, saying, "I never saw that in the New Testament." That, in general. But we must come to particulars.

What did He mean by "the keys of the kingdom of heaven"? You may recall one place in Luke where our Lord spoke to the lawyers who were before him—and they were not lawyers in the sense in which we use that term today: they were men who were learned in the law of

Moses—saying, "Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." He spoke of the knowledge of God's law as a key of which the people had been deprived. What did our Lord mean when he spoke of "the keys of the kingdom of heaven", more than that to the apostles—and to all others who should yield themselves to Christ, and should constitute the spiritual body of Christ, and who should be put in trust with the gospel, to whom the gospel should be committed for proclamation to others—what did He mean more than that a key of knowledge was entrusted to their charge wherewith to unlock the kingdom of God?

Everybody who has the gospel, has the key to the kingdom of God. How often those of you who have had some experience have found one who was anxious to be saved, but who had no knowledge. He did not know where to begin. He was like a man fumbling at a door, not knowing how to open it. You have come with your Bible' and sat down with him, and quoted, perhaps, John three, sixteen, and other verses, pointing out the way of life, until the man has said, "I see it now. I believe." He has been born again, and entered into the kingdom. Everybody who has been put in trust with the gospel, and whose mind has been enlightened by the Spirit of God, and is competent to teach His Word, has, in a sense, the "keys of the kingdom of heaven", in the key of knowledge.

How Are Things "Bound" or "Loosed"?

Once more: "And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." That word was not spoken exclusively to Peter. Turn to the eighteenth chapter of Matthew. verse eighteen, and read this: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." If you say, "That only transfers from Peter to the Church collectively the same authority", I would have you observe that it is surely not without significance that the very next verse, spoken almost in the same breath, reads as follows: "Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, It shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." Undoubtedly the prayer of faith of any believer can loose things in heaven—and bind them; and can loose things on earth, and bind them. Our Lord said to His disciples, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

Surely the loosing and binding do not imply some juridical, official, authority which a man exercises by virtue of an official position he holds. It is a spiritual authority, exercised by Those who agree in faith, and who petition Heaven—and whose prayers are heard.

Peter Frequently Mentioned First This Roman Catholic author labors to show that Peter is frequently mentioned first among the disciples. That is not extraordinary. Select any dozen men, and there will probably be some distinguishing quality about one of them which will secure his primacy among the group. It may not be that he is personally superior to the others, nor that he is officially the first, but that he is more aggressive, has more initiative, is more outspoken. For example, I should not like to distinguish between various members of the church of which I am pastor. There are many who are naturally of a retiring disposition, but who are in no sense inferior. But there are other positive characters, In their daily occupation they take the initiative, they must do so; and whenever you meet such characters you become conscious of the presence of a

positive personality. Peter was undoubtedly just such a man; but to say that because Peter is occasionally mentioned first is to imply that his primacy was recognized among the disciples, proves nothing so much as the want of a better argument.

Peter's confession is given us not in the Synoptic Gospels only, but is set out in John's Gospel as well, though under other circumstances. Only in Matthew are these special promises associated with it. I was interested to observe that this Roman Catholic authority explains the absence of any reference to Peter's primacy in Mark's Gospel. He says— and I think in that he is probably correct—that Mark received much of his information from Peter, and that there is a very distinct Petrine influence observable in Mark's Gospel. For that reason, words or incidents which would appear to give more importance to Peter than to others are omitted—because this first Pope was so modest that he refrained from telling Mark anything that especially applied to himself!

Alleged Reason for Mark's Silence

He attributes Mark's silence in respect to some of these matters to the alleged fact that he obtained his information from Peter, and that Peter was too modest to tell him. If it be true, that modesty was a distinguishing characteristic of the first Pope he certainly discovered some way of avoiding its transmission to all his successors, No Pope who ever succeeded to the throne of Peter—if that could be allowed for a moment—was ever noted for his modesty.

I am glad to observe little things like that, for it is quite obvious that this was written in part, with the hope that it might reach the eye of Protestants, and that evangelicals would naturally make their appeal to the Scripture. So this controversialist wisely, from his point of view, endeavors to meet all objectors on their own ground by beginning with the New Testament. I presume he has made the best of it. I have read many books on this subject, and have examined not a few Roman Catholic authors, and they all labor that passage in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew. That is their great charter. I am constrained to say to them, "If that is the best you can do; if it be so that the Roman Catholic Church is the one and only church, and that the Pope is the supreme head of the Church, and that there is no salvation apart from the Church, or without submission to the Pope, is it not strange that it should require such great ingenuity to establish your position?"

Alleged Argument For The Papacy in John's Gospel

I need not quote the passages which speak of the confession of Peter in Mark, Luke, and John. But in John, chapter twenty-one, verses fifteen to seventeen—this author calls attention to the fact that John's Gospel was written to establish the truth of the Deity of Christ; and of course, that is generally recognized: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Those of you who are familiar with John's Gospel will have recognized that the twenty-first chapter is a kind of postscript. The Gospel seems naturally to close with the verses I have just quoted: "These are written, that ye might believe." Then the writer begins again, and adds the twenty-first chapter. This Roman Catholic author quite ingeniously imagines that the special reason for the addition of this chapter was that the author, by the Holy Ghost, desired to set forth the primacy of St. Peter!

Let us look at it:

"So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto Him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep"

Three times Peter was here commissioned as a shepherd of the sheep, to feed the lambs and the sheep of the flock. And on this authority our author assumes Peter to have been made the supreme shepherd! A Sunday School boy in the Junior Department ought to know better than that. Everyone knows that Peter three times bad denied his Lord, and that subsequent to the resurrection he had had a private audience with his Lord—and this scholar tries to make something of that. "He appeared unto Simon." The Lord has a way of doing that with backsliders, dealing with them privately, giving them a chance to repent. To me, it is significant that there is not in Scripture a word recorded of that interview. There is no Oxford Groupism there. Peter alone settled that matter with his Lord, and was forgiven. Then the Lord gave him an opportunity for a threefold public declaration of his love for Him. But who would ever imagine, reading that, apart from the pretensions of Rome, that it was designed to exalt Peter? On the contrary, Peter was humiliated by it, almost as though he would say, "O Lord, do not remind everybody of my fall. I have said I love Thee." "Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me." He would not have been grieved had he interpreted it after the fashion of the Roman Catholic Church—but would have been proud of the special distinction accorded him by this alleged three-fold commission. The General Teaching of The New Testament The Modernists tell us that it is very dangerous to endeavor to support a given position by citing texts of Scripture in proof. They tell us, for instance, that it is useless to endeavor to establish the truth of the Deity of Christ by quoting Scripture. I grant you that a doctrine is not established by the citation of a single scripture, to the exclusion of the general teaching of the Word. A text may be wrested from its context, and made to convey something opposite to the primary meaning which may be read on the face of it when considered with its context. The way to study Scripture is to compare spiritual things with spiritual. Hence it is not enough to study these particular scriptures to which I have referred, and to which we are referred by our Roman Catholic author.

If the Roman Catholic contention be true, and Peter was really accorded the primacy, and was by divine intention exalted above his brethren, then the first people to understand that would be the people who were Peter's contemporaries. And certainly of all people, Peter himself should have understood it, He should have known he was a pope, and should have acted as a pope. James, John, and the early church, should have known and recognized it, and accorded him the first place.

How Was Peter Regarded by His Contemporaries? Did they? Can that contention be supported? Take for example the first passage quoted, in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew: "Upon this rock I will build my church." Later in the chapter it says, "From that time forth began Jesus to shew his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned,

and. said unto Peter—you are mistaken, Your Holiness"? Oh, no "Get thou behind me, Satan." I think at that point Peter did resemble some of the Popes! Said our Lord, "Thou art an offence unto me: for thou savorest not the things that be of God." Our Lord did not recognize Peter as being superior to the other disciples when, having just made his confession, he showed that he was not immune to the attacks of the evil one by objecting to the program that the Lord had just announced. Christ did not then, or at any other time, accord the primacy to Peter. Someone has remarked that the only time Peter acted like a pope was when he drew his sword and cut off a man's ear; but there is nothing to indicate that our Lord accorded Peter the first place.

Peter Never Claimed Primacy For Himself

Furthermore, Peter did not claim it for himself—and Peter was not particularly reluctant to claim anything; he was never backward in coming forward. I think the true interpretation of these passages in which Peter appears so prominently is that he was naturally a man of initiative, a man of positive conviction, a man of impulse, a man who was a born leader of men; and when there was anything to be said, he said it; where there was anything to be done, he did it. We have all met people like that. Very naturally, they are mentioned first. There was all that about Peter, but he never claimed superiority over his brethren.

There were three whom our Lord took with Him on several occasions. To the mount of transfiguration He took Peter—but He took James and John as well. Into the room where lay the body of the ruler's daughter, he went, excluding everybody except the parents, and Peter, James, and John. When He went to the garden, not all the disciples followed Him closely; but He did take Peter, James, and John—not Peter alone. Those three were close to Him, but Peter never assumed, before Pentecost or afterward, the position of one who had been appointed by the Founder of the church as its supreme visible head.

We have two epistles written by Peter, as well as the record of his missionary endeavors in the Acts of the Apostles, and we have several references to him in Paul's epistles, notably Galatians and First Corinthians; but in none of these does it appear that either Peter or the other disciples recognized that Peter had been given a place superior to that of the other apostles.

There are two or three further observations, I must make at this stage of my argument. Peter was the preacher on the day of Pentecost. Peter preached, but he "stood up with the eleven". It was very natural that Peter should speak. When a deputation waits upon the government, or any public body, someone is usually appointed to speak for the group. Peter very frequently did the speaking. and on the day of Pentecost, being filled with the Holy Ghost. he "stood up with the eleven" But when they were asked, "What shall we do?" Peter said nothing to indicate that membership in a particular human society, or submission to a particular human authority was a term of salvation. He said, "Repent, and he baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins . . . then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers" The Apostles "Sent" Peter In the eighth of Acts we read that "Philip went down to Samaria, and preached Christ unto them." Then follows an account of the blessing of God upon His word and we read again: "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent forth Peter and John." Think of it, "The apostles which were at Jerusalem"—"sent Peter." "Peter

did not remain in Jerusalem, sitting upon a throne, "reigning" over the church: he was commissioned by the church, and he went down to add his testimony to that of Philip, and to confirm the saints. Then you will recall how he was specially commissioned to go to Caesarea, and how he preached the gospel to Cornelius, a Gentile. Thereafter the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had received the word of God—you have the account in the eleventh of Acts—and those who were of the circumcision contended with Peter saying, "Thou wentest into men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them" And Peter explained and justified his conduct. But at that day no one believed in Peter's infallibility. Later (Acts fifteen), there was a discussion as to circumcision, and at that assembly, not Peter, but James, presided. At the conclusion, it was James who summed up their findings; and they commanded the people to abstain from blood and certain other things.

We see therefore that the apostles called Peter to account. They did not regard him as a "holy father", who, speaking, *ex cathedra* was infallible. Although he had been the church's mouthpiece on the day of Pentecost, he was still required to give an account to his brethren and explain his conduct. Later Paul writes in Galatians, and records how Peter behaved himself rather strangely, and states, "I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." He read the "holy father" a lecture! Not privately but "before them all". Think of any Roman Catholic doing that to the Pope! But Peter was blameworthy. In the same epistle Paul speaks of "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars"—but he did not call Peter the pope. He was one of three "pillars", but not the head of the church. Then again to the Corinthian church, Paul writes in his first epistle, chapter three, saying, "One saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos." That was tantamount to saying, according to our Roman Catholic friends, that there were some who preferred Paul and Apollos to the Pope! But Paul said they were but ministers by whom they had believed. It is true Paul did not mention Cephas when he said, "I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase", but the implication of equality was there. Indeed in the same chapter from which I have just quoted, Paul says, "Whether Paul, or Apollos or Cephas," etc. Here he names Peter last.

Paul said of himself—and he wrote the greater part of the New Testament—"I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." Paul did not recognize the supremacy, the primacy of Peter.

I am sure the contention of our Roman Catholic friends cannot be supported by Scripture, but we shall pursue our study further in a later lecture.

2. Second Address

THE PAPACY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE

Second Address

I spoke to you recently on the claims of the Papacy in the light of Holy Scripture, quoting from a Roman Catholic author, to show that the Church of Rome professes to find its primary authority for the Papacy in the New Testament itself. That being so, since we recognize no authority in religion but the Word of God, it is sufficient for our purpose that we should inquire what light the Bible itself can throw upon this subject.

Estimating People And Institutions at Their Own Valuation In my last address I endeavored to show you that neither Peter, nor his fellow-apostles, in the early days of the church, put such construction upon Christ's words to Peter (Matthew 16:18-19), as is placed upon them by the Roman Catholic Church. In dealing with a question of this sort, one's mind cannot fail to recognize that we are combating the claims of an institution that is worldwide, and hoary with age. There are people who would be inclined to ask how it could be possible that so many should have been for so long, and to such an extent, deceived into accepting the extraordinary claims of Rome if her pretensions were without scriptural warrant?

Introductory to the subject in hand, it may be remarked that it seems to be a human habit to accept people and institutions very largely at their own valuation. There are certain people who earn for themselves great reputations by much personal advertising. I recall receiving a letter from my father when I was barely out of my teens, telling me that he had just listened to a sermon by an extraordinary evangelist. He said he had long assumed that in zeal for the Lord, in consecration to His service, in the abundance of his labors, and in his sufferings for Christ, the Apostle Paul had set an example which had scarcely been equaled. But after listening to this gentleman, he said it would be quite easy to conclude that the Apostle Paul was a mere tyro, who had accomplished but little, and whose record of sacrifice was scarcely worth recording, The evangelist had so loudly and successfully blown his own trumpet, had so effectually advertised himself, that the majority of the people accepted him at his own estimate.

Doubtless that was good advertising. Good advertisers do not argue: they proclaim. If there were a man named Smith making a certain soap, and if he had money enough to tell people that Smith's soap was the best in the world, and to tell them often enough, it would be unnecessary to explain or justify its alleged superiority, to outstrip his more modest competitors.

There are people and institutions which know how to "sell themselves", as the phrase goes. I knew a man who made it a rule to hear all the visiting preachers who came to town. They were advertised as a modern Elijah, a human dynamo, a cowboy from the wild west, or something of the sort. Invariably this brother would report what a wonderful man so-and-so was. When I inquired whether he had personal knowledge of the greatness of the man's achievements, I invariably discovered that he knew nothing beyond what the much advertised preacher had said of himself.

When ex-President Taft of the United States visited Toronto some years ago, he told a story about Mr. Theodore Roosevelt. He said Mr. Theodore always reminded him of a little girl of whom he had heard, who came home from school and told her mother that she was the cleverest girl in her class. "I am delighted to hear that", said her mother, "did your teacher say so?" "Oh no" "Did the other members of your class tell you that you were the cleverest girl among them?" "No." "Does your record show that you are the cleverest girl?" "No. " "Then how do you know" "I found it out myself" The Roman Catholic Church for centuries has proclaimed its superiority to all others. It has declared, not that it is one of many churches, but that it is the only church. All others are impostors. All ministers are frauds. They so teach in their catechism. The one and only church on earth is the Holy Apostolic Church of Rome. Without apology they have declared that there is but one visible head to the church, the Pope; and that submission to the Roman Pontiff is absolutely indispensable to salvation.

There is nothing neutral about the Roman Catholic Church—nor anything particularly modest. Boldly it proclaims that it is the one and only church. It is therefore not surprising that so large a part of the world should at last have come to believe it.

Moody used to say that a lie could travel around the world while truth was getting its boots on. If one is a big enough liar, and he has a loud enough voice, people will accept what he says without asking for proof. But when one proclaims the truth, almost invariably they will demand that it be proved!

I believe that in all human history there never was foisted upon the sons of men a more colossal fraud from the foundation to the top-stone, than the Roman Catholic Church. It is founded in a lie, it teaches and preaches lies, it is a fabrication of falsehood through and through; and where it touches the truth, it is only to pervert it, or prostitute it to its own purpose.

Let us now complete briefly an examination of the scriptural teaching respecting this matter. The author whom I quoted in my last address insists that there is scarcely any doctrine of the gospel that has such solid scriptural support as the doctrine of the Papacy. I have already shown you that Peter did not interpret what the Lord had said to him as intended to exalt him above his fellow-apostles, for, impulsive as he manifestly was, gifted with initiative as he undoubtedly was, there is nothing within the New Testament to indicate that Peter ever attempted to lord it over his brethren. The Apostle Paul, also, who said he was not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles, failed to recognize the primacy of Peter.

There are two things to which I now direct your attention. First, a further study of the question of Peter's primacy; and, secondly, what the Scripture has to say in respect of the Romanist claim that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome.

I. In considering the question of Peter's primacy, let me call certain matters to the minds of those of you who know, at least in outline, the books of the New Testament. In many places there would be found in a company like this not very many who could from memory scan the New Testament, but I am happy to believe that we have not a few here who can, perhaps not in detail, but in general, summon before their mind's eye the contents of the various books of the New Testament. The Acts of The Apostles

We have in the Acts of the Apostles an inspired history of the Christian church of the apostolic era, when the foundations of the church were laid, and when the apostles in person exercised their ministry among the churches—and I feel sure you have only to reflect for a moment or two upon the Acts of the Apostles, and mentally scan the record, to reject utterly the postulate that the Papacy can be scripturally supported.

Consider the outstanding personalities whose work is recorded in the Acts, beginning with Peter and John, going on to the seven who were elected to serve tables, the most conspicuous among whom was the first Christian martyr, Stephen then recall the career of Saul of Tarsus who becomes Paul the apostle to the Gentiles; think also of Apollos, and Silas, and John Mark, Mark, and James, and the other apostles, not many of whom are mentioned after the first chapter of The Acts of the Apostles, and I am sure you will fail to recall a single incident in which the inspired record even suggests that Peter, beyond the exhibition of ordinary initiative, ever took precedence of his brethren.

Consider the two examples where Peter was called to account by his brethren. The first (Acts 11:1-18), was for having gone in to men uncircumcised, when his right to do so was challenged. The implication there is at least that there was no recognition of his superior authority. He was justified by the brethren only when he recounted his experience in Cæsarea, when the Spirit of God came on the occasion of his preaching to Cornelius and his household.

Later at the assembly of the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-31), over which James presided, Peter again related his experience, and Paul and Barnabas told of how God had set His seal to their testimony to the Gentiles. The council was very much like an ordinary Baptist Convention where the brethren convened to confer with each other, and discuss their work, and a resolution embodying their findings was read by President James—but there is nothing in the account of that proceeding comparable to the history of the ecclesiastical councils of the church since that day.

Next, glance at the Epistles of Paul, and you will fail to find, either explicitly or implicitly, any word which would indicate that there was anyone in the church who was recognized as its visible head. Indeed, wrapped up with the doctrine of the Papacy is the Roman Catholic conception of one vast church, highly organized, with a hierarchical form of government headed by the Pope—that conception of the church is alien to the New Testament. It cannot be found in the Acts, and certainly not in Paul's Epistles. On the occasion of my last address a brother came to me at the close, with an open Bible, calling my attention to Paul's statement of his burdens, to which the apostle added, "Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches." Paul must have been interfering with somebody else's office in taking upon his own shoulders the burden of the churches—taking it away from "papa" the Pope, the Holy Father. The Epistles of Paul

Call to mind Paul's Epistles: Romans, First and Second to Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second to Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, the Epistle to the Hebrews if indeed Paul was the human author of it. You will read them all in vain to discover anything to indicate that the Apostle Paul, who was caught up into paradise and given an abundance of revelations, and who was in labor more abundant than all of them, and who wrote the major part of the New Testament—you will search his writings in vain to find any suggestion that could by any reasonable process be construed as indicating that the Apostle Paul had ever

heard of a Pope, or anybody like him. As to the Papal claim, one might have supposed that Peter, having, allegedly, received such commission, and having been established as Pope, in writing his Epistles—the second of which was written near the end of his life, for in it he says that the Lord had shown him that He must "shortly put off this tabernacle" if, I say, as our Roman Catholic friends allege, Peter had "reigned" as Pontiff for twenty-five years in Rome, he ought to have known something about it. And it is surely inconceivable that he would make no allusion to the important office he occupied, had he been Pope. But he simply called himself an "apostle of Jesus Christ". He exhorts the elders, and speaking of himself, says, "Who am also an elder." Nowhere does he claim that he had been appointed head of the church.

II.

Turn now for a moment to the second consideration, namely, the contention that Peter was the first bishop of Rome. Understand, I am confining my examination this evening to the historical record of the Bible itself, because the Church of Rome claims that Peter had a Pontificate of about twenty-five years, beginning to reign in the year forty-one or forty-two, and continuing until his martyrdom, perhaps about sixty-seven. If that be so, one might expect some reference to it somewhere in the New Testament. I affirm—and then I shall endeavor to prove the statement that it is impossible from Scripture to prove that Peter ever visited Rome.

Paul Says Nothing of Peter's being in Rome

I anticipate the objection of some, saying that I know very well that there is a tradition that Peter was martyred in Rome, that he was crucified and that at his own request he was crucified head downward because he thought he was not worthy to be crucified in the same manner as his Lord. Even if that could be historically established, it would not prove that he was Bishop of Rome. But it is a tradition which may, or may not, have an element of truth in it. He may have been martyred in Rome, but the Scripture does not say so. But even if he were martyred in Rome, there is no scriptural evidence of his having been Bishop of Rome. In fact, I believe the general teaching of Scripture is to the contrary effect.

But, to our proof. The Epistle to the Romans was written by the Apostle Paul probably about fifty-eight. That date is generally accepted. If the allegation of our Romanist friends be true, that Peter became Bishop of Rome in forty-one or forty-two, Peter had been "reigning" in Rome for some sixteen years when Paul wrote his Epistle. The Epistle To The Romans

Sketch the picture for yourself. Peter—we say nothing for the moment about his being the Pope—is the Bishop of Rome. Paul writes to the Romans, and tells them that he has long wanted to visit them, and that his reason for desiring to go to Rome, was that he might have some fruit among them also: "As much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also." You will recall that it was invariably the way of the Apostle Paul not to build upon another man's foundation. According to the Romanist theory, there must have been a well-established church, with Peter at its head, for at least sixteen years at the time Paul addressed this Epistle to the Romans.

Read the Epistle carefully. It contains a number of salutations to people of whom Paul had heard, but he does not say anywhere, "Be sure to remember me to Bishop Peter." He does not send his greetings to the Bishop of Rome! From a man occupying such an influential position in the apostolic

church as the Apostle Paul did, to write to Rome where Peter had already been "reigning" for sixteen years, and completely to ignore Peter's position and presence would have been the essence of discourtesy. There are people who go all the way from this continent to Rome to visit the Pope. Certainly in the Epistle to the Romans. Paul is absolutely silent on the subject of Peter's presence in Rome. I have a shrewd suspicion that the reason for it was that Peter was not there, and Paul knew that he was not there.

Paul's Prison Epistles But again, several of Paul's Epistles were written from Rome. Paul was a prisoner in Rome for some time. You remember how the Acts of the Apostles concludes? Paul was part of the time in prison, but the last two verses of the Acts of the Apostles tell us that "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

It is worth remarking too that the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, recording Paul's arrival at Rome, and his subsequent course there, fails to mention the presence of so important a person as Peter. The Epistle To The Ephesians But some of Paul's Epistles were written from Rome. We speak of them as the prison Epistles. They are Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and 2 Timothy. Look at Ephesians a moment: "I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles" (Ephesians 3:1). In this Epistle Paul makes no mention whatever of Peter. He does refer to "Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord", who apparently carried the Epistle from Rome to Ephesus. Paul evidently designed to give the Ephesians news of his own personal affairs by word of mouth: "Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye alight know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts" (Ephesians 6:21-22). If, as the Church of Rome contends, Peter had been Bishop of Rome from about forty-one it must be recognized as a strange omission for Paul to neglect to make the slightest allusion to Peter, either as apostle or bishop. The Epistle to The Philippians In Philippians, also written from Rome, Paul says, "Salute every saint in Christ Jesus. The brethren which are with me greet you. All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all, Amen" (Php 4:21-23). Can you conceive a man of Peter's prominence being in Rome, and Paul's making no mention of the fact in either of these Epistles? The Epistle to the Colossians

Colossians is another of the prison Epistles, and a number of names are mentioned therein. Again Paul sends Tychicus, and with him "Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother . . . Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him); and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God which have been a comfort unto me." Where is Peter? He omits any reference to him as included among "these only" who were his "fellow-helpers unto the kingdom of God." "Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always laboring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God. For I bear him record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you. Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea" (Colossians 4:7-16). But never a word about Peter. The Second Epistle to Timothy The Second Epistle to Timothy is another of the

prison Epistles, and Timothy was Paul's own son in the faith, a fellow-preacher. Paul gives a brief account of certain people: "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia. Only Luke is with me" Where was Peter? If he had left, why was he not mentioned with the others who had "departed?" But again: "Erastus abode at Corinth: but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick. Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren" (2 Timothy 4:10-11, 2 Timothy 4:20-21). Was Peter, whom Romanish allege to have been so conspicuous unnamed, and merely included perhaps, in "all the brethren?" Can you imagine that possible? An Especially Important Passage But there is another especially important passage in this epistle: "The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain: but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me" (2 Timothy 1:16-17). How deeply the great apostle appreciated the affectionate ministry of this rather inconspicuous Onesiphorus! Can it be supposed that Peter, the Bishop of Rome, would have allowed his "beloved brother Paul" to languish in prison without visiting him? Or, if Peter were there, and did visit him, that he would have given such honorable mention to Onesiphorus, while failing to record a visit from Peter? To ask such questions is to answer them: Peter was not there.

John's Epistle

John's Epistles are supposed to have been written years after the termination of the ministry of Paul and Cephas. Perhaps nearly thirty years had elapsed between the writing of Paul's second Epistle to Timothy and the writing of John's first Epistle. John must have been an elderly man when he wrote. His second and third epistles were probably written some time after 95 AD. If there had been any head of the church, one might have supposed John would know something about it. But there is not the remotest allusion to that conception of things in either of John's three Epistles. The Book of Revelation The Book of Revelation also was probably written after ninety-five A.D. Paul's last Epistle was written perhaps a-bout sixty-six: and Revelation about thirty years afterwards. The latter book contains in its first chapter a representation of the church, and the Head of the church walking amid the seven golden candlesticks, and the seven golden candlesticks are the seven churches, and the stars In the right hand of Him Who trimmed the lamps are the angels of the seven churches. The book is "the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John" God sent a message to the seven churches—not to the church, not to a universal visible Church of which the Bishop of Rome was the visible head. Why was the Papacy, then more than half a century old, not mentioned? Because there was none.

It is quite obvious that John had never heard of such an office. That is enough. I affirm that it is utterly impossible to find a vestige of scriptural support for the doctrine of Peter's primacy, anywhere at anytime; and equally impossible to find scriptural proof that Peter was Bishop of Rome; or that Peter ever was in Rome. The Papal Conception Alien to Christianity

Two simple observations, and I have finished. First, that the whole spirit of the Papacy is alien to New Testament teaching. Neither Paul nor Peter, nor any of the apostles. were "princes" of the church. There is not a word in the New Testament of any one of the apostles who accompanied

with our Lord, presuming to "reign" over individual or church. On the contrary, they were forbidden to lord it over God's heritage. The conception of a hierarchical government of a single church is pagan. It is not Christian. It is not in the New Testament. No Appointment of Peter's Successor

If it be so that Peter was martyred somewhere about the seventh decade, the year sixty-seven or so, one might have supposed that some provision would have been made for a successor. You are familiar with the New Testament. Let your mind run from Matthew to Revelation, and ask yourself whether there is the remotest suggestion anywhere of a gathering of the heads of the church to elect one of their number as Pope, a conclave of Cardinals to elect one of their number to be the vicar of Christ, God's sole representative on earth, clothed with divine authority, submission to whom is to be made a term of salvation. Was anything more absurd ever offered for human acceptance than the pretensions of Rome? How amazing that so large a part of the world's population should have accepted these claims as though they were scripturally authorized, and therefore valid! As you read your New Testament—and I hope you will read it often—never assume that you have become familiar with the Word of God. If you have already read it through a hundred times, I beg of you to begin again. You have not received one-thousandth part of the truth it contains for your edification and as you read it again, look for the Papacy in the New Testament. Talk about hunting for a needle in a haystack! That would be easy in comparison. Puzzle: find the Papacy. I can promise you that you will never earn a prize for so doing, for the simple and sufficient reason that it is not there.

What The New Testament Says of The Church As you study, ask yourself the question. What has the New Testament to say of the church and its officers? It abounds with teaching respecting the church, a body of regenerated people, of "believers" who have been "born again", who have redemption in Christ through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins; who have been called out from the world, separated from the world and worldliness, unto the gospel of Christ. You will find the record of companies of people who came together to pray, and worship, and observe the ordinances, and to approach God through the one and only Mediator, Jesus Christ our Lord, without the assistance of saints or angels—and certainly without the help of an earthly priest. The privilege of direct access to God at the mercy-seat, through the one and only High Priest, the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, is taught plainly in the Scripture.

Furthermore, you will find the alleged first Pope, Peter, telling those to whom he writes that they are all priests: "We are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood." We do not need a priest. We have one High Priest Who has entered into heaven itself with His own blood, "now to appear in the presence of God for us". The simplest and youngest child, who can but lisp the name of the sinner's Saviour, may kneel before Him and find acceptance. The vilest sinner and the purest saint come on the same terms, and find acceptance at the same place: the mercy-seat, the throne of grace—and all through the precious blood of Christ. How beautifully simple It is!

I would have you see what a grotesque misrepresentation of God is involved in the assumption that the Lord Who made heaven and earth and filled them both with beauty, is responsible for the mummery of the Roman Catholic Church. May God save us from turning again to the beggarly elements of the world from which He, through the Spirit of grace, has for ever emancipated us! We are only the Father's little children, but we have a great Intercessor. We can talk to Him, we can stammer out our poor prayers, we can worship Him here, we can worship Him anywhere.

"Where high the heavenly temple stands, The house of God not made with hands, A great High Priest our nature wears, The Patron of mankind appears.

"With boldness therefore at the throne, Let us make all our sorrows known; And ask the aid of heavenly power To help us in the evil hour."

3. Who established the Papacy?

THE PAPACY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE Who Established the papacy? The papacy claims, to be a divine institution. The Pope claims to be the Vicar of Christ, the one and only supreme representative of God upon earth. The Roman Catholic Church calls itself "Apostolic" and declares that it is the only true church. It teaches that the Roman Catholic Church was founded by Jesus Christ and appointed the custodian and sole agent of His authority in heaven and on earth. Thus, we have very briefly stated the tremendous claim to sole authority made by the Roman Catholic Church.

We think we have proved to a demonstration in the foregoing pages that the pretensions of Rome are absolutely devoid of scriptural warrant.

If, then, God did not establish the Roman Catholic Church, who did? No one who has any knowledge of Roman Catholic history can doubt that it is a super-human organization. It has continued for so long. It has withstood so many storms that it must be supported by more than human power. If it be not of God, whence came it? Its whole bloody history: the immorality of its laws: the immorality of much of its priesthood, and of many of its institutions, all proclaim that it is not from above but from beneath.

It is this writer's supreme conviction that the Papacy is Satan's earthly headquarters: that the Pope, so far from being the Vicar of Jesus Christ, is the Vicar of the devil. In short, that the perpetual parson of the Pope is the Antichrist. While the scripture has nothing to say in support of the blasphemous pretension of the Papacy, it says much that really identifies the Papacy as the Antichrist. In support of this thesis, we set out the following scriptures: The Antichrist in Second Thessalonians

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now 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, until he be taken out of the way: And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders. And with all deceivableness of uprightness 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" (2 Thessalonians 2:3-12). The Antichrist in Revelation Revelation 17:1-18

"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon

many waters; With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her. I wondered with great admiration. And the angel said unto me. Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven beads and ten horns. The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is. And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and whence he cometh, he most continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled. And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

Revelation 18:1-24

"And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her: for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her. And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with

her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning, Standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying. Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city for in one hour is thy judgment come. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more; The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyme wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble. And cinnamon, and odors, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men. And the fruits that thy soul lusted after are departed from thee, and all things which were dainty and goodly are departed from thee, and thou shalt find them no more at all. The merchants of these things, which were made rich by her, shall stand afar off for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing, And saying, Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls. For in one hour so great riches is come to nought. And every shipmaster, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea, stood afar off. And cried when they saw the smoke of her burning, saying, What city is like unto this great city! And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and wailing, saying, Alas, alas, that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate. Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her. And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all. And the voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee: and the sound of a millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee; And the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth."

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net