



# *The* PAPACY

IN BIBLE PROPHECY







# Daniel and the Revelation

## The Response of History to the Voice of Prophecy

BY URIAH SMITH


**T**HIS book contains the history of the rise and fall of nations, and the work of the papacy, as foretold in the two great prophetic books of the Bible, Daniel and the Revelation, and then shows from secular history how accurately these prophecies were fulfilled centuries later as nation followed nation, and the papacy grew to the fullness of its power, and its subsequent decline.

It is a verse-by-verse study of these two books of the Bible, many of the prophecies of which are still unfulfilled. These unfulfilled prophecies are of the greatest importance at this time. This book interprets these difficult prophecies, and with understanding the reader is brought to realize the significance of impending events.

Over 800 pages, many illustrations, also charts showing the prophetic time periods. Bound in three bindings: Cloth, \$5.50; half leather, \$7; full leather, \$8.50.

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.  
TAKOMA PARK - - - WASHINGTON, D. C.

\$3



## The Papacy in Bible Prophecy

*[Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, likely bleed-through from the reverse side.]*



Wide World Photos

Announcing the Name of the Present Pope, Pius XI, From the Balcony of St. Peter's Church in Rome, at the Time of His Election, Feb. 6, 1922



# The Papacy in Bible Prophecy

*By* Jesse C. Stevens

Author of "Was Peter the First Pope?"  
"Return of the Jews," etc.



REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION  
TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

SOUTH BEND, IND.

PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

Printed in the U. S. A.

# The Papacy in Bible Prophecy

Copyright, 1928  
Review and Herald Publishing Association



# CONTENTS

---

THE PAPACY DEFINED - - - - -	7
THE LITTLE HORN - - - - -	12
FROM SABBATH TO SUNDAY - - - - -	22
WHY ROME CHANGED THE SABBATH - - - - -	28
AMALGAMATION WITH PAGANISM - - - - -	31
ROME EXALTS THE SUNDAY SABBATH - - - - -	34
A GREAT PERSECUTOR - - - - -	40
CATHOLICISM AND ARIANISM - - - - -	42
THE PAPACY IN DANIEL'S SECOND VISION - - - - -	47
THE BEAST AND HIS NUMBER — 666 - - - - -	57
THE MOTHER HARLOT CHURCH - - - - -	65
TWO GREAT MYSTERIES - - - - -	74
THE IMAGE TO THE BEAST - - - - -	86
THE BEAST IN THE MAKING - - - - -	93
THE MAKING OF THE IMAGE BEAST - - - - -	99
THE MARK OF THE BEAST - - - - -	100
THE CHARACTER OF SUNDAY LAWS - - - - -	118
THE DRIFT TOWARD ROME - - - - -	125





Four Great World Empires as Described in Daniel 7

## The Papacy Defined

THE Papacy, that great ecclesiastical system at the head of which sits the Bishop of Rome, is not only an interesting subject of secular history, but of Bible prophecy as well; for it is plainly brought to view almost a score of times, particularly in the symbolic prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. And there are ample reasons for this. Nations have been noticed in Bible prophecy, first, because of their relation to the people of God; second, with respect to their character; third, out of recognition of their prominence; and fourth, touching the time of the exercise of their power, the beginning and ending of which are like milestones in the journey of the church to the city of God.

This being so, there are plain reasons why the Papacy should have a place in Bible prophecy; for that power was a great persecutor of the church in the Middle Ages, millions of sincere men and women going down to martyrs' graves for maintaining their profession of the gospel, and opposing what they believed to be an apostate and fallen church. They were burned at the stake, imprisoned, assassinated, drowned, and suffered the horrible tortures of the Inquisition.

And its religio-political character, its presuming to reign over the kings of the earth, and the extraordinary claims made for and by the popes, give the Papacy a prominence that calls for it to be brought to view many times in the prophecies of the Bible. The end of the years of its ecclesiastical supremacy in 1798 is a milestone in the journey of the church, for it marks the beginning of what is called in Daniel's prophecy "the time of the end." Dan. 11:35.

### **Authenticity of the Book of Daniel**

The Papacy is most plainly brought to view in the prophecy of the seventh chapter of Daniel, in the prophet's vision of

the four great beasts coming up from the raging sea. Before entering upon a study of this prophecy, it might be well to examine the claims of the book itself. Some higher critics and modernists hold that Daniel was not a historical character; that the book of Daniel was not written in the sixth century before Christ, but in the third, by a pseudo-Daniel, etc. But we recall that Christ, when on earth, recognized Daniel as a true prophet of God, thus setting the seal of authenticity to the book ascribed to him.

In speaking to His apostles about the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, our Lord said, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by *Daniel the prophet*, stand in the holy place, whoso readeth let him understand." Matt. 24: 15.

The Christian, we feel sure, will take the indorsement of Christ in preference to the criticisms of the higher critics and modernists as to the genuineness of the book of Daniel. Then let the reader remember as we study Daniel's prophecies, that they are true prophecies, having the indorsement of Christ Himself.

#### **Four Great Beasts**

Daniel the prophet, in holy vision, is looking out upon a vast sea. It is in great commotion, for the four winds are all at the same time blowing upon it. In describing the vision, which is a great chain of prophecy covering between two and three thousand years of the earth's history, he says:

"Four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings. . . . And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear. . . . After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it. After this I beheld in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and break in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." Dan. 7: 3-8.



**Gabriel Explains the Vision**

The prophet did not comprehend the meaning of the vision, and in response to his request for understanding, the angel Gabriel, the angel that stands "in the presence of God" (Luke 1: 19), was sent to explain the vision. Gabriel said, "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings [kingdoms], which shall arise out of the earth." Dan. 7: 17.

These beasts, then, represent four kingdoms. The words "king" and "kingdom" are here used interchangeably, as is shown in Gabriel's further explanation where He said, "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth." Verse 23. Hence if the fourth beast is the fourth kingdom, then the first beast is the first kingdom, the second beast the second kingdom, and so on. Again, in explaining the ten horns of the fourth beast and the little horn, "before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots," He said:

"The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings [kingdoms] that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he [the power symbolized by the little horn] shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Dan. 7: 24, 25.

**Nebuchadnezzar's Dream of the Great Image**

The clue to the full meaning of the prophecy of the four beasts is found in the divine interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image, recorded in the second chapter of Daniel. That great king of Babylon saw in his dream an image "whose brightness was excellent, . . . and the form thereof was terrible." Dan. 2: 31. The image's head was of gold, its breast and arms of silver, its thighs of brass, its legs of iron, and its feet part of iron and part of clay. It must be plain to every one that there is a parallel between the four parts of the great image and the four beasts of Daniel's vision.

After the magicians, the astrologers, and the soothsayers, the so-called wise men of Babylon, had failed to tell the king his forgotten dream with its interpretation, as the king had demanded of them, the dream with the interpretation was made

known to Daniel in a night vision. Dan. 2: 19. It was revealed to the prophet that the four parts of the image represented four kingdoms which would rule consecutively as world powers. Daniel in the presence of the king said:

“Thou, O king, art a king of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath He given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold.

“And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron.” Dan. 2: 37-40.

This chain of prophecy, then, begins with Babylon over which Nebuchadnezzar ruled; for according to this inspired interpretation the head of gold symbolized that king and the great kingdom over which he was then reigning. The prophet said that after this, there would arise another kingdom, then a third, and then a fourth.

Babylon was overthrown on the night of Belshazzar's feast, as told in the fifth chapter of Daniel, by the Medes and the Persians in the year 538 B. C., and Medo-Persia became the second world power, represented by the breast and arms of silver, ruling till 331 B. C., when it fell, and was succeeded by the Grecian kingdom.

Greece ruled as the third world power for nearly two centuries, when it was succeeded by the great empire of Rome, the fourth kingdom. Rome ruled as a world power for nearly seven centuries; when, through the barbarian invasions of the fourth and fifth centuries after Christ, it was broken up and ten kingdoms arose, fulfilling exactly the prophecy of the feet and toes of the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and the ten horns of the fourth beast of Daniel's vision.

These barbarian tribes came into various parts of the Roman Empire, and finally developed into kingdoms, producing in the end the nations of Europe. They were the Franks, Alemanni, Vandals, Burgundians, Suevi, Visigoths, Anglo-Saxons, Lombards, Ostrogoths, and Heruli. These were the progenitors of France (Franks), Germany (Alemanni), Portugal (Suevi), Spain (Visigoths), England (Anglo-Saxons), etc.

Again referring to the parallel between the four parts of the image of Daniel 2 and the four beasts of Daniel 7, it is plain that the lion corresponds to the head of gold, the bear to the breast and arms of silver, the leopard to the thighs of brass, the fourth, the great and terrible beast, to the legs of iron, and the ten horns to the iron and clay in the feet and toes of the great image, but here the parallel stops. Hence it is very plain, letting the prophecy be its own interpreter, that the lion symbolized Babylon, the bear Medo-Persia, the leopard Greece, the great and terrible beast Rome, and the ten horns, the tenfold division of the Roman Empire, which occurred between the years 351 and 476 A. D.

Having determined by divine interpretation that the fourth beast of Daniel's vision symbolizes the Roman Empire, and that the ten horns represent the ten kingdoms of Western Rome, we are prepared to ascertain what power is represented by the little horn which the prophet saw coming up among the ten horns on the head of the fourth beast, which was to "speak great words against the Most High," "wear out the saints of the Most High," and "think to change times and laws." Dan. 7: 25.





## The Little Horn

It is not difficult to ascertain what power is symbolized by the little horn. There are at least seven marks of identification:

1. It is a Roman power; for it comes out of the head of the fourth beast, symbolizing Rome.

2. It is a religio-political Roman power; for it is represented by a horn, as political powers are symbolized many times in Bible prophecy; while its character and work show it to be also a religious power.

3. It is a blasphemous power, in that it speaks great swelling words against the Most High.

4. It is a presumptuous power; for it thinks to "change times and laws." Another version gives the text, "He shall think to change the times and the law." There is plain reference here to some law that such a power could only *think* to change. Plainly, this does not refer to the times and laws of man, but to "the times and the law" of God; for such a power as is here brought to view would naturally have the power, while it ruled, to change the times and laws of man, but it could only presumptuously *think* it had power to change the times and law of God.

5. It is a persecuting Roman power. It is said that it would wear out the saints of the Most High, signifying great persecution, long drawn out.

6. In its rise to supremacy it would pluck up three of the original ten horns.

7. It would enjoy supremacy for "a time and times and the dividing of time," that is, 1260 years.

In the prophecy of the book of Daniel a time means a year. (See also Dan. 4:16.) Moffatt's translation reads, "For three years and half a year the saints shall be handed over to him." Always in Bible symbolic prophecy where, for example, a beast is taken to represent an earthly power, the time is likewise sym-

bolic, one day representing a year. (See Eze. 4:6; Num. 14:34.) And in such prophecies, the Jewish year of 360 days is always used. A time would be one year, times (plural), two years, and the dividing of time, one half year, equaling three and one-half years of 360 days each, or 1260 days, or symbolic years. This is confirmed by two verses in the twelfth chapter of Revelation,—sixth verse, where the period of 1260 days is mentioned, and in the fourteenth verse the same period of time is spoken of as “a time, and times, and half a time,” showing plainly that Bible prophecy, in both Old and New Testaments, allots 360 days to a prophetic year. (Compare also Revelation 13:5.)

What power fulfilled the specifications of this prophecy? Papal Rome, surely, and no other. Consider them again in order:

First, the Papacy is a Roman power. Its territory was the Roman Empire, where the great beast with ten horns had held sway. Its seat was the seat of the emperors. Hence it fulfilled this first specification.

Second, it is a religio-political power. The Pope became a political as well as a spiritual ruler. The Papacy had its territory,—the Papal States. Indeed, that the Pope is a political or temporal as well as a spiritual ruler is an essential claim of the Papacy, as contended by Bellarmine and others:

“There remains the last part of the discussion concerning the Pontiff, that which relates to his temporal power, concerning which there are found three opinions of authors. The first is that the Pope by divine right has full power over the whole world, both in ecclesiastical and political affairs. Thus teach Augustinus Triumphus (in *Summa de Potes. Eccl.*, quæst. 1, art. 1), Alvarus Pelagius (lib. 1, *De Planctu Ecclesiæ*, ca. 13), and many jurists, as Hostiensis (in *ca. Quod Super His, de Voto and Voti Redemptione*), Panormitanus (in *ca. Novit. de Judiciis*), Sylvester (in *Summa de Peccatis*, verbo ‘Papa,’ par. 2), and many others. Nay rather, Hostiensis goes further. For he teaches that by the coming of Christ all right of ownership of infidel princes was transferred to the church, and resides in the chief Pontiff [the Pope], as vicar of the supreme and true King, Christ, and therefore the Pontiff can of his own right give the kingdoms of unbelievers to such of the faithful as he wishes.”—Bellarmine, “*Disputations Concerning the Controversies About the Christian Faith, Against the Heretics of This Time*,” Vol. I, “Concerning the Roman Pontiff,” book 5, chap. 1.

"Each [sword], therefore, is in the power of the church, to wit, the spiritual sword and the material. But the latter is to be used for the church, the former by the church; the former by the hand of the priest, the latter by the hands of kings and soldiers, yet according to the beck and permission of the priest. But one sword must be under the other sword, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power. . . . Therefore we declare, assert, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff."—*From the bull of Pope Boniface VIII, Unam sanctam, issued in 1302; "Extravagantes Communes," book I, title 8, chap. 1.*

Third, the little horn power is represented as speaking great words against the Most High. The Papacy meets this specification of the prophecy in the claims made for and by the head of that power, the Pope. The following on this point is from an article in Ferraris' Ecclesiastical Dictionary (the full Latin title of this work is "*Prompta Bibliotheca, canonica, juridica, moralis, theologica nec non ascetica, polemica, rubricistica, historica*"\*):

"The Pope is of so great dignity and so exalted that he is not a mere man, but as it were God, and the vicar of God."

"The Pope is as it were God on earth, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief king of kings, having plenitude of power, to whom has been intrusted by the omnipotent God direction not only of the earthly, but also of the heavenly kingdom."

"The Pope can modify divine law, since his power is not of man, but of God."

The following is from the oration of Christopher Marcellus, in the fourth session of the Fifth Lateran Council, 1512:

"Thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician, thou art the director, thou art the husbandman; finally, thou art another God on earth."—*"History of the Councils," Labbe and Cossart, Vol. XIV, col. 109.*

Again:

"Christ intrusted His office to the chief Pontiff; . . . but all power in heaven and in earth had been given to Christ; . . . therefore the

---

\* The latest edition of this book was published at the Press of the Propaganda at Rome in 1899. This shows it has the approval of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. VI, p. 48, speaks of it as "a veritable encyclopedia of religious knowledge" and "a precious mine of information." It is therefore legitimate to conclude that the statements in this work represent the current Roman Catholic view concerning the power and authority of the Pope.



chief Pontiff, who is His vicar, will have this power."—*Gloss on the "Extravagantes Communes," book 1, "On Authority and Obedience," chap. 1.*

We quote also the following from Bellarmine, the great Catholic author :

"All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that He is over the church, all the same names are applied to the Pope."—*"On the Authority of the Councils," book 2, chap. 17.*

And finally, though a score more of similar statements might be given, all from Catholic works as above, we have the following from an encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, dated June 20, 1894 :

"We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty."—*"The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII," p. 304. Benziger Bros., New York.*

This particular feature of the prophecy should remind the reader of the Bible of the prophecy uttered by the apostle Paul in writing his second epistle to the church at Thessalonica. He said :

"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 worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God [or as given in the American Revised Version, "setting himself forth as 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." 2 Thess. 2: 3-7.

This prophecy is fulfilled in the Papacy. Every church historian speaks of the great falling away, the apostasy from the faith of the church as established by Christ and the apostles. This falling away was in embryo before the apostle Paul's death, and he could plainly see it. He said, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work." This falling away was gradual, covering centuries, till at last there was developed that great, boastful, persecuting, religio-political power, at the head of which sits a man claiming the very prerogatives of God Himself.

**Think Himself Able to Change Times and the Law**

Did the Papacy fulfill the fourth specification, that of presumptuously claiming the power to change even the times and the law of God? Most certainly! Indeed, one of the claims of the Papacy is that it has the power to modify or change even divine law. We quote again from the book previously referred to, a part of the title of which is "*Prompta Bibliotheca*:"

"The Pope is of so great authority and power that he can *modify*, explain, or interpret even divine laws. The Pope can modify divine laws, since his power is not of man but of God, and he acts as vicegerent of God upon earth with most ample power of binding and *loosing* [the plain inference is that this is done by modifying divine law] his sheep."

Again, mark the wording of the prophecy, "He shall think to change times and laws." The revised versions render it, "He shall think to change the times and *the law*." Moffatt renders the passage, "He shall plan to altar the sacred seasons and the law." Spurrell's translation reads, "He shall think to change times in the law." We repeat, there is plain reference here to God's law, that is, the ten commandment law, and to God's time mentioned therein. The law which is referred to is unchangeable. Such a power could only presumptuously think himself able to change this law.

The Bible frequently speaks of the unchangeable nature of the law of God. The psalmist says:

"The works of His hands are verity and judgment; all His commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. III : 7, 8.

And the Saviour said:

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5 : 17, 19.

Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed's American translation reads:

"Do not suppose that I have come to do away with the law or the prophets. I have not come to do away, but to enforce them. For I tell

you, as long as heaven and earth endure, not one dotting of an 'i' or the crossing of a 't' will be dropped from the law until it is all observed."

Hence in these strong words the Saviour brought the law in its entirety, every commandment of it, every word of it, and every letter of it, up to the last great day when the heavens and earth in their present form will pass away. (See 2 Peter 3: 3-13.)

The law of God is unchangeable in its very nature; for it partakes of the nature of God. The same attributes that the Bible ascribes to God, it likewise ascribes to the law. God is love, holy, just, good, spiritual, righteous, and eternal. The Scriptures say the same of the law. 1 John 5: 3; Ps. 119: 142; 111: 7, 8, etc. The word says, "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3: 4. Why is this so? It is not an arbitrary statement of Scripture. There is a reason for it. Sin and the character of God are opposites. Sin is of the devil. 1 John 3: 8. The transgression of the law is sin simply because the law is an expression of God's character, and this too is the reason it is unchangeable.

This thought was very forcibly expressed a few years ago in an editorial in the *Sunday School Times*:

"While God remains God, His moral law will be binding upon all who would have any part in His life. God's moral law is eternal; it is an expression of His very being. As such it can no more be abrogated than can God Himself."—*Jan. 3, 1914.*

Also the law is a unit. Ten commandments constitute the law that points out sin, but God looks upon them as one. So we read:

"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2: 10.

#### **The Time in the Law**

"He shall think to change times in the law." What is referred to here? The only time mentioned in the law of God is in the fourth, or Sabbath, commandment. And it is plain that there has been a tampering with the law at this point, as is evidenced by the incongruity in profession and practice on

the part of Christian people. While professing to keep the ten commandments, they are keeping the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as the Sabbath, but the fourth commandment reads, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." It must be known by all that the seventh day of that commandment is not Sunday. Sunday is the name given to the first day of the week.

The Bible plainly teaches that the ten commandment law, in contradistinction to the law of Moses, is binding everywhere, and at all times, and upon all peoples. Rom. 3:19; James 2:10; 1 John 3:4. The word "whosoever" is a general word in these scriptures. That law has no limitations. This is true because it is a moral law, a transcript of the character of God. It therefore embraces the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13, 14. It is the purpose of the gospel to regenerate man so that the law will be written in the fleshly tables of his heart. Jer. 31:33; Rom. 8:5-8. All of this is acknowledged and has been taught by all great Protestant bodies of Christendom. The Methodist discipline says:

"Although the law . . . as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."—*Methodist Episcopal Church Doctrines and Discipline*, edited by Bishop Andrews, p. 23.

In the "Baptist Church Directory," pp. 167, 168, edition 1877 (and the words are repeated verbatim in many covenants of local Baptist churches), we find the following:

"We believe that the Scriptures teach that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of God's moral government, . . . and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts, arises entirely from their love of sin, to deliver them from which, and to restore them, through a Mediator, to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is one great end of the gospel."

From the "Presbyterian Confession of Faith" we take the following:



"The moral law is of use to all men, to inform them of the holy nature and will of God, and of their duty, binding them to walk accordingly. . . . The moral law is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments which were delivered by the voice of God upon Mt. Sinai and written by Him on two tables of stone."

Similar quotations might be given from standards of other denominations, but these are doubtless sufficient to call attention to the point in question. Now, notwithstanding this profession that the ten commandment law is binding on all men, Sunday, the first day of the week, is kept as the Sabbath, of which the Bible says not a word.

The Papacy, symbolized plainly by the little horn of this prophecy, is the power that has thought to change the times in God's law, that is, the Sabbath. The Papacy gave to the Christian world the Sunday sabbath. It is not of divine origin, but of human; and more, it is a child of apostasy, coming into the church in the time of that falling away and apostasy when the traditions and commandments of men supplanted the commandments of God.

#### **The Papacy and the Sunday Sabbath**

Here then in this prophecy is the charge which the God of heaven makes that the Papacy changed the Sabbath, and the charge is acknowledged. The Papacy has boasted for many centuries of this attempted change in God's law, and has consistently thrown it into the face of Protestantism, the rallying cry of which has been, "The Bible and the Bible only," when there is nothing in the Bible to sanction the keeping of the first day of the week as the Sabbath in place of the divinely appointed seventh-day Sabbath.

From "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine," a Catholic catechism by the Rev. Henry Tuberville, p. 58, we take the following:

*Ques.*—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

*Ans.*—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

*Ques.*—How prove you that?

"*Ans.*—Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest [of the feasts] by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power."

Similar words are found in "A Doctrinal Catechism," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, approved by the Most Reverend John Hughes, D. D., Archbishop of New York, p. 174:

"*Ques.*—Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?"

"*Ans.*—Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her,—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority."

And we take the following paragraph from an article occurring in the *Catholic Mirror*, of Baltimore, Md., the late Cardinal Gibbons' official organ, Sept. 23, 1893:

"The Catholic Church for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. We say by virtue of her divine mission, because He who called Himself the 'Lord of the Sabbath,' endowed her with His own power to teach, 'he that heareth you, heareth Me; ' commanded all who believed in Him to hear her, under the penalty of being placed with the 'heathen and publicans,' and promised to be with her to the end of the world. She holds her charter as teacher from Him—a charter as infallible and perpetual. The Protestant world at its birth [in the Reformation of the sixteenth century] found the Christian sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the church's right to change the day, for over three hundred years. The Christian sabbath is therefore to this day the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world."

Another statement along the same line will be sufficient to prove the acknowledgment of the truth of the prophetic charge as to the attempted change in the times of God's law:

"You will tell me that Saturday was the Jewish Sabbath, but that the Christian sabbath has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shall keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and

do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer?

"You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered."—*Library of Christian Doctrine; Why Don't You Keep Holy the Sabbath Day?*" pages 3, 4.

Here is a prophecy in the Bible, then, that charges the Papacy with tampering with the law of God, particularly with reference to the times in that law, that is, the Sabbath day; and in addition to the fact that the Roman Catholic acknowledges the charge, and boasts of it, history corroborates the prophecy.



## From Sabbath to Sunday

How did Sunday, the first day of the week, come to be observed in place of the original Sabbath, the seventh day? A stock answer to this question is that Christ changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week in honor of His resurrection, that being the day He arose from the dead. This is nothing but assumption. The New Testament is as silent as the tomb as to presenting evidence of any such change by our Lord. If such a change had taken place, it would have been incumbent on the Lord to have inspired the writers of the New Testament to write it as plainly in the New Testament as the institution of the seventh-day Sabbath is written in the Old Testament; but it is not there, and therefore the silence of the New Testament writers is a weighty argument against a divine institution of the Sunday sabbath, as is often claimed. And it should be remembered that the writers of the books of the New Testament had ample opportunity to mention such a change had it taken place; for the books that comprise it were written from fifteen to sixty years after the resurrection, but they are silent. The fact is, they all continue to speak of the seventh day as the Sabbath which all the apostles observed. (See Acts 13: 14, 42, 44; 16: 13; 18: 4; Luke 23: 53-56.)

### No Change Contemplated by Christ

There are two very plain and unmistakable facts that show that our Saviour never contemplated making any change in the Sabbath day:

First, in the most emphatic language He brought the law of God, of which the Sabbath is a part, in its entirety up to the last great day. He said, "Verily I say unto you, Till *heaven and earth pass*, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." The change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week would cause not only a jot or a tittle to pass from the law, but an entire command-

ment; but the Saviour spoke of the law as a unit till that day when the heavens and the earth pass away.

Second, His words to the disciples before His crucifixion and resurrection, when He prophesied the doom and desolation of Jerusalem and the temple, as recorded in Matthew 24, show plainly that He contemplated no change in the Sabbath; for He practically commanded them to remember the Sabbath after His resurrection.

As He left the temple for the last time, He exclaimed, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." Matt. 23: 37, 38.

The disciples who were with Him at once understood these words to be a prediction of the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem. They called His attention to the stones of fabulous size in the temple, some of which, as Josephus says, were twenty-five cubits long, eight cubits thick, and twelve cubits wide. But Jesus said, "See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Matt. 24: 2.

They then went to the Mount of Olives on the east of Jerusalem, and as they sat there, the disciples said to the Master, "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

Here were two questions in one. The disciples coupled in their minds the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the world. Our Saviour answered the first question, and in doing so gave them signs whereby they might know when the day of Jerusalem's doom was drawing nigh. At last he gave them a final sign, saying:

"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. . . . But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on *the Sabbath day*." Matt. 24: 15-20.



Now let it be remembered that this prophecy was fulfilled nearly forty years after the prophecy was given, forty years after His resurrection; for it was fulfilled in A. D. 70, when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed by the Romans. This no one will dispute.

This shows, then, most emphatically and conclusively, that the Saviour saw that the Sabbath would be with them and recognized by them nearly forty years after His resurrection. It was to be recognized as much as the seasons of the year. He said, From this time on through the years pray your heavenly Father that He will not let this trouble come so that you will have to flee with your wives and little ones into the mountains in the winter time, and also pray that He will not allow it to come so that you will have to flee *on the Sabbath day*.

No one can fail to see the reason the Saviour had in mind in admonishing them to pray that their flight be not on the Sabbath day, and it certainly shows that the Saviour did not change the Sabbath, nor contemplate any change, and also that He intended that they should still remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The destruction of Jerusalem and the flight by Christ's disciples took place in the very heart of apostolic times, and this is evidence that the apostles kept the seventh-day Sabbath. This is taught all through the book of Acts.

#### **Sabbath Observed for Centuries**

The truth is that the seventh-day Sabbath was observed by the early Christians, and this observance continued for several centuries. This is a matter of plain history. Dr. Lyman Coleman, in "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," chapter 26, sec. 2, says:

"During the early ages of the church, it [the first day of the week] was never entitled 'the Sabbath,' this word being confined to the seventh day of the week, which, as we have already said, continued to be observed for several centuries by the converts to Christianity."

Another English writer says:

"It is certain (and little do you know of the ancient condition of the church if you know it not) that the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed . . . by the Christians of the East Church, above three

hundred years after our Saviour's death."—*"A Learned Treatise on the Sabbath," Edward Brerewood, p. 77.*

The Sunday did not come into the church as a Sabbath, nor in the place of the Sabbath. Sir William Domville says:

"Centuries of the Christian era passed away before the Sunday was observed by the Christian church as a Sabbath. History does not furnish us with a single proof or indication that it was at any time so observed previous to the Sabbatical edict of Constantine in A. D. 321."—*"The Sabbath: or an Examination of Six Texts," p. 291.*

The whole truth of the matter is expressed clearly in the following from Cox's "Sabbath Laws," pp. 280, 281:

"Very shortly after the period when Constantine issued his edict enjoining the general observance of Sunday throughout the Roman Empire, the party that had contended for the observance of the seventh day dwindled into insignificance. The observance of Sunday as a public festival, during which all business, with the exception of rural employments, was intermitted, came to be more and more generally established ever after this time, throughout both the Greek and the Latin churches. There is no evidence, however, that either at this, or at a period much later, the observance was viewed as deriving any obligation from the fourth commandment; it seems to have been regarded as an institution corresponding in nature with Christmas, Good Friday, and other festivals of the church, and resting with them on the ground of ecclesiastical authority and tradition."

At first, the day was merely esteemed because Christ arose on that day, but it was not esteemed as a Sabbath, nor in the place of the original Sabbath. No one claimed any divine authority for observing it. Friday was also esteemed, and likewise the day of the Saviour's betrayal. Mosheim says:

"Perhaps also the Friday on which our Saviour died, was from the earliest times regarded with more respect than other days of the week."—*"Ecclesiastical History," cent. 1, part 2, chap. 4, note to sec. 4, Murdock's translation.*

Of the second century he says:

"Most of them, likewise, held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter, that on which He was crucified."—*Id., cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 8.*

Dr. Peter Heylyn writes:

"Because our Saviour rose that day from among the dead, so chose they Friday for another, by reason of our Saviour's passion; and

Wednesday on the which He had been betrayed: the Saturday, or ancient Sabbath, being meanwhile retained in the Eastern churches."—*"History of the Sabbath," part 2, chap. 1, sec. 12.*

Thus we see that in the early centuries Sunday was merely esteemed as the resurrection day, as Friday was esteemed as the crucifixion day; meanwhile many Christian people kept the original Sabbath. Sunday was not esteemed as a Sabbath any more than Friday was. They knew of no divine command forbidding them to work on Sunday or commanding them to rest. One authority states the matter thus:

"Labor in the country [on Sunday] was not prohibited till the Third Council of Orleans, A. D. 538. It was thus an institution of the church. . . . The earlier Christians met in the morning of that day for prayer and singing hymns, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, and then *went about their usual duties.*"—*"Dictionary of Chronology," art. "Sunday," p. 813.*

We have thus far quoted from histories and religious works, but the following from the editor of a secular paper in answer to an inquiry on the Sunday-sabbath question, every unbiased reader of history knows to be the truth on this question:

"For hundreds of years it never occurred to the early church that Sunday had any particular sanctity, or that it was wrong to do on that day what one pleased after the religious service was over. The very first law on the Sunday question ever passed was the edict of Constantine issued in A. D. 321. But that only made the day what we now call a holiday, releasing people from the obligation of labor. Nothing was said about its being wrong to work on Sunday. It was not till A. D. 538 that all work was prohibited. The idea among the early Christians seemed to be that the Sunday was purely a matter of church custom and convenience, and no part of any religious or moral law."—*San Francisco Examiner.*

#### **No Divine Command for Sunday**

There is no divine command for the observance of Sunday. It is not at all to the point to quote the fourth commandment; for that commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work," etc.

That commandment says the seventh day is the Sabbath, and it is particular and definite. The Sabbath is not an institution

apart from the day. It was made out of a day, a particular day, the seventh day. It is not an institution that can be shifted from one day to another at man's will. The Creator made the Sabbath by resting on the seventh day, by blessing it, and then sanctifying it, that is, setting it apart for a holy use. This He has done to no other day of the week.

Our Saviour's resurrection did not make the first day of the week a rest day, a Sabbath day. The rite of baptism is the gospel ordinance by which we declare our faith in His death, burial, and resurrection (Rom. 6: 1-6), and not the keeping of the first day of the week as a Sabbath. Sunday is not the Sabbath day in God's sight, and it is impossible in God's sight to desecrate a day that He never made a Sabbath.

The Bible says, "Sin is the transgression of the law," but there is no divine law commanding any one to rest on Sunday, the first day of the week, and it is therefore impossible to desecrate the Sunday sabbath in God's sight by doing legitimate work on that day. Countries and states going outside their sphere have made it a crime, but God has never made it a sin.

Nor can we escape the duty of keeping holy God's Sabbath day by saying it is Jewish. According to the Bible, the Sabbath was instituted and given to man more than two thousand years before it was given to the Jews as a people. It comes down to us from creation, being instituted at the close of creation week. Gen. 2: 1-3. When the Saviour was on earth, He said with reference to its institution, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," certainly carrying our minds back, not to the exodus, but to the beginning of things, as told in the first chapters of Genesis.

## Why Rome Changed the Sabbath

It should be remembered that when we speak of Rome's changing the Sabbath, we mean only an attempted change. No power can change the Sabbath, for no power can change the facts on which the Sabbath rests. It is based upon the facts that the Creator made all things in six days, that He rested on the seventh day, that He made holy the seventh day, and that He sanctified that day. Merely taking up another day of the week as the Sabbath does not change these facts. Christ's rising from the dead on the first day of the week did not alter these facts. It did not make another day the Sabbath. The seventh day will remain the Sabbath as long as these facts remain. Therefore we speak of the change of the Sabbath in an accommodated sense. That change in the practice of most Christians touching the making of a rest day, came about so gradually that it covered centuries. Its development kept pace with the growth of the Roman Church, the church of power and influence in the early centuries. That church took this day, the first day of the week, which was merely esteemed as a festal day by the early Christians in honor of the resurrection, and for certain reasons exalted it into the place of the original Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. What were the reasons? First, a hatred of the Jewish people, and a purpose to have nothing in common with them; and second, an amalgamation with the pagan forms and times of worship.

Neander, conceded by many to be one of the best of church historians, says:

"Opposition to Judaism introduced the particular festival of Sunday very early, indeed, into the place of the Sabbath. . . . The festival of Sunday . . . was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to



transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday.”—“*History of the Christian Religion*,” Vol. I, p. 186, Rose’s translation.

### The Jews Hated

The Jews had become a hated people because of Christ’s crucifixion, and this hatred predominated in the Roman Church. The cry in those days was: “Let us have nothing in common with the Jews.” Growing out of this feeling, the first step taken by the Roman Church in trampling underfoot the Sabbath, was the act of turning the Sabbath into a fast, to render it more despicable to men, while Sunday remained a joyful festival.

While the Eastern churches retained the Sabbath, a portion of the Western churches, led by the Roman Church, turned it into a fast. Some of the Western churches refused to comply with this ordinance, and a long-drawn-out controversy ensued, the result of which is stated by Dr. Peter Heylyn:

“In this difference it stood a long time together, till in the end the Roman Church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast through almost all the parts of the Western world. I say the Western world, and of that alone, the Eastern churches being so far from altering their ancient custom that in the Sixth Council of Constantinople, A. D. 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day upon pain of censure.”—“*History of the Sabbath*,” part 2, chap. 2, sec. 3.

### The Real Reason Stated

Neander states the real reason for this attitude on the part of the Roman Church:

“In the Western churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday in particular as a fast day.”—“*History of the Christian Religion*,” p. 186, Rose’s translation.

By the term “Judaism” is meant in particular the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath. This of course was inconsistent on the part of the Roman Church, as it is for any other church to speak of the keeping of the fourth commandment as Judaism, any more than the keeping of the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” or the seventh, “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” is Judaism. Keeping the ten commandments is not Judaism. The New Testament makes a very plain distinction

between the sacrificial, or ceremonial, law and the ten commandment law, and it invariably teaches its binding claims upon all. (See Rom. 3: 19, 20; 7: 7, 12, 14; 8: 3, 4; James 2: 8-12; 1 John 3: 4, etc.)

Another church historian speaks of this same matter thus:

“Another Roman Church regarded Saturday as a fast day in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath. Sunday remained a joyful festival in which all fasting and worldly business was avoided as much as possible, but the original commandment of the decalogue respecting the Sabbath was not then applied to that day.”—*Dr. Charles Hase, in “Ancient Church History,” part 1, div. 2, sec. 69.*

And that the Roman Church declared the Sabbath a fast day that they might not seem to have anything in common with the Jews, is stated by another writer as follows:

“Some of the Western churches, that they might not seem to Judaize, fasted on Saturdays, as Victorinus Petavinonensis writes: We use to fast on the seventh day. And it is our custom then to fast, that we may not seem, with the Jews, to observe the Sabbath.”—*Lord King, in “Enquiry into the Constitution of the Primitive Church,” part 2, chap. 7, sec. 11.*

This same thing is seen also in the decree of the Council of Nicæa in A. D. 325, over which Constantine presided, decreeing that the Roman custom of celebrating Easter on Sunday only should be followed throughout the whole Roman Empire. Shortly after this council, Constantine wrote a letter to the churches, in which he said:

“Truly, in the first place, it seemed to every one a most unworthy thing that we should follow the custom of the Jews in the celebration of this most holy solemnity, who, polluted wretches! having stained their hands with a nefarious crime, are justly blinded in their minds. It is fit, therefore, that, rejecting the practice of this people, we should perpetuate to all future ages the celebration of this rite, in a more legitimate order, which we have kept from the first day of our Lord’s passion even to the present times. Let us then have nothing in common with the most hostile rabble of the Jews.”—*“A Historical View of the Council of Nice,” by the Rev. Isaac Boyle, A. M., pp. 55, 56, edition 1836.*

Plainly, then, a hatred of the Jews to whom God had given the ancient Sabbath was the first thing that led the Roman Church to suppress the Sabbath and exalt the Sunday in its place.

## Amalgamation With Paganism

IN the centuries immediately following the days of the apostles, there was a great apostasy, a falling away from the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, upon which the Lord Jesus founded His church. The apostle Paul, before his death, could see this apostasy in embryo. In writing to the church at Thessalonica, he said:

“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 worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was 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.” 2 Thess. 2: 3-7.

Note the apostle's words: “The mystery of iniquity doth already work.” Every church historian speaks of the apostasy and falling away of those early centuries. Mosheim, in his “Ecclesiastical History,” gives the reasons for it. He says:

“A ridiculous precipitation in receiving new opinions, a preposterous desire of *imitating pagan rites*, and of *blending them with the Christian worship*, and that idle propensity which the generality of mankind have toward a gaudy and ostentatious religion; all contributed to establish the reign of superstition upon the ruins of Christianity.”—*Book 2, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 2.*

Another says:

“At the end of the second century, within a little more than one hundred and fifty years after the first preaching of the gospel, it is obvious to remark the changes already introduced into the Christian church. Christianity began already to wear the garb of heathenism. The seeds of most of those errors that afterward so entirely overran the church, marred its beauty, and tarnished its glory, were already beginning to take root.”—*Wharey's “Church History,” cent. 2, sec. 7.*

Speaking of the same thing, Hislop says:

"This tendency on the part of Christians to meet paganism half way was very early developed. . . . Upright men strove to stem the tide, but in spite of all their efforts, the apostasy went on, till the church, with the exception of a small remnant, was submerged under pagan superstition."—*The Two Babylons*, p. 93.

#### **Anxious for Conversion of Pagans**

The Catholic Church was very anxious for the conversion of the pagans, and in order to make it easy for them to come over into Christianity, as it was then represented by the Catholic Church, that church adopted pagan rites, ceremonies, and festal days, so that when the pagans came over into the Christian church, they found the same things there, only under different names. One example might be given of this:

Take Christmas. When December 25 was set apart as Christ's birthday, it was well known, as it is now by every one who has looked up the matter, that our Saviour was not born in December, much less on the 25th. A pagan festival in honor of the sun god was observed by the pagans, who were sun worshipers centuries before our Lord was born, at that very time of the year. This sun god in the ancient pagan mythology was supposed to have been cut down by his enemies and reborn at the time of the winter solstice. The mother of the sun god "was mystically said to have been changed into a tree, and when in that state to have brought forth her divine son." So when the Catholic missionaries went out, they found this day observed far and wide among the pagans. What must be done with it? The pagans, for obvious reasons, were wedded to it. It was thought expedient, in order to conciliate the pagans, to bring this festal day over into the church, and set it apart as Christ's birthday. This same policy was followed with other festal days.

#### **Borrowed From the Pagans**

Another day that was observed among the pagans, and had been for centuries, was the Sunday. The sun was the first god of the pagans, and the first day of the week was named by them after their first god. This was the chief of all days to the pagan sun worshipers. One writer has spoken of it as "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times." In Constantine's first Sunday law he styled it "the venerable day of the sun."

Now it should be remembered that many of the so-called Fathers of the church had been heathen philosophers, and unfortunately, they brought with them into the church, many of their old ideas and principles. They contended that it would facilitate the conversion of the pagans if the Christians would unite with them in a day of weekly celebration; while on the other hand, to go to the pagans keeping the same day as the Sabbath which had become identified with the Jews, would not be expedient. The reasons which induced the church of that day to adopt the ancient festival of Sunday in place of the Sabbath are given by Morer, an apologist for the change:

“It is not to be denied but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshiped the sun, and as a standing memorial of their veneration, dedicated this day to him. And we find by the influence of their examples, other nations, and among them the Jews themselves, doing him homage; yet these abuses did not hinder the Fathers of the Christian church simply to repeal, or altogether lay by, the day or its name, but only to sanctify and improve both, as they did also the pagan temples polluted before with idolatrous services, and other instances wherein those good men were alway tender to work any other change than what was evidently necessary, and in such things as were plainly inconsistent with the Christian religion; so that Sunday being the day on which the Gentiles solemnly adored that planet, and called it Sunday, partly from its influence on that day especially, and partly in respect to its divine body (as they conceived it), the Christians thought fit to keep the *same day and the same name of it*, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by that means *hinder the conversion of the Gentiles*, and bring a *greater prejudice* than might be otherwise taken against the gospel.”—*“Dialogues on the Lord’s Day,” pp. 22, 23.*

Thus again we see that on the one hand, hatred of the Jews who observed the true Sabbath, and on the other hand a catering to the pagans who observed Sunday, were two contributing factors in exalting the Sunday festival into the place of the Sabbath of the Lord.



## Rome Exalts the Sunday Sabbath

THE first step taken, as we have seen in a previous chapter, was the act of the Roman Church in turning the Sabbath into a fast day, while Sunday remained a joyful festival. This was done that the Sabbath might become despicable in the eyes of men, and that they might be more inclined to accept the Sunday festival. Such was the first step taken by the Roman Church toward the suppression of the Sabbath of the Lord.

The second step taken toward the change to Sunday, was the Sunday law of Constantine in A. D. 321. This first Sunday law was a part of the church-state régime inaugurated in the time of Constantine. It reads as follows:

“Constantine, Emperor Augustus, to Hepidius: On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people residing in the cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain sowing or for vine planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations, the bounty of heaven should be lost.”—*Given the 7th day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls each of them for the second time. Schaff's translation.*

Chambers' Encyclopedia speaks as follows regarding this law:

“Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the Sabbatical observance of that day is known to have been ordained, is the edict of Constantine 321 A. D.”

And again:

“By none of the Fathers before the fourth century is it [the first day of the week, Sunday] identified with the Sabbath; nor is the duty of observing it grounded by them either on the fourth commandment, or on the precept or example of Jesus or His apostles.”

Constantine's law, then, was the first Sunday law, and it was made in a time when the foundation of the Papacy was

being laid, and, as will be seen in a future chapter, this Sunday law was a distinguishing mark of that union of church and state born in the time of Constantine.

#### Council of Laodicea

The third step was taken in the latter part of the fourth century, at the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 364). The keeping of the true Sabbath was being revived at this time, and was gaining ground. This, of course, did not please the pagan elements in the church, which were doing everything in their power to suppress it and exalt the Sunday in its place. William James, in his "Sermons on the Sacraments and Sabbath," pp. 122, 123, says with reference to this matter :

"When the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths, which *had become so general at the close of this century [the fourth]*, was evidently gaining ground in the Eastern church, a decree was passed in the Council of Laodicea [A. D. 364], 'that members of the church should not rest from work on the Sabbath, like Jews.'"

Dr. William Prynne, speaking of this same matter, says :

"It is certain that Christ Himself, His apostles, and the primitive Christians for some good space of time, did constantly observe the seventh-day Sabbath: . . . the evangelists and St. Luke in the Acts ever styling it the Sabbath day, . . . and making mention of its . . . solemnization by the apostles and other Christians, . . . it being still solemnized by many Christians after the apostles' times, even till the Council of Laodicea [A. D. 364], as ecclesiastical writers and the 29th canon of that council testify, which runs thus: 'Because Christians ought not to Judaize, and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day (*which many did refuse at that time to do*). But preferring in honor the Lord's day (*there being then a great controversy among Christians which of these two days . . . should have precedency*), if they desired to rest, they should do this as Christians. . . . The seventh-day Sabbath was . . . solemnized by Christ, the apostles, and primitive Christians, till the Laodicean Council did in a manner quite abolish the observation of it. . . . The Council of Laodicea . . . first settled the observation of the Lord's day, and prohibited . . . the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath under an anathema.'"—*"Dissertation on the Lord's Day Sabbath," pp. 33-44.*

#### Roman Catholic Testimony

From a Catholic catechism we take the following :

"*Question.*—Which is the Sabbath day?

"*Answer.*—Saturday is the Sabbath day.

"*Ques.*— Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

"*Ans.*— We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea, transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday."—*The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine*, Rev. Peter Geiermann, C. S. S. R., p. 50, 2d ed., 1910. (This work received the "apostolic blessing" of Pope Pius X, Jan. 10, 1910.)

The Roman Church, like many unto this day, was inconsistent in rejecting the seventh-day Sabbath on the ground of its being Jewish. The Sabbath commandment of the decalogue is no more Jewish than any of the other nine. We never think of claiming that it is not a sin for us to murder people because of the Jewish commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." No one is accused of Judaizing because he teaches the binding claims of the commandments which say "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not steal."

The Sabbath was made and given to man long before there ever was a Jew. It comes down to us from Eden. Gen. 2:1-3. And it is very important to notice that when the Creator wrote His law on Sinai, He placed the Sabbath in the very heart of His law, that law which, according to the Scriptures, is universal in the scope of its jurisdiction. Rom. 3:19. This is not true of the seven yearly sabbaths of the Jews, mentioned in Leviticus 23. They were placed in the book of the law, which has been commonly called the ceremonial law. They were figurative, shadowy, and passed away. Col. 2:16. But the seventh-day Sabbath was given to man before sin entered, and was not included among the ceremonial sabbaths. The Sabbath became a part of that law which points out sin (Rom. 3:20), that law that is a transcript of the character of God. 1 John 3:4; James 2:10-12.

#### **Yearly Sabbaths**

This Biblical distinction between the moral law and the ceremonial laws, and likewise between the Sabbath of the decalogue and the yearly sabbaths, has been recognized by eminent Bible scholars of the leading Protestant denominations. One quotation will be sufficient. The following are the words of Dr. Justin Edwards, a noted American divine, who lived from 1787 to 1853, and was for years the president of Andover Seminary:

"Under the Jewish dispensation were incorporated two kinds of law. One was founded on obligations growing out of the nature of men, and their relations to God and to one another. . . . Such are the laws written by the finger of God on tables of stone, and are called moral laws. The other kind, called ceremonial laws, related to various outward observances, which were not obligatory till they were commanded, and then were binding only on the Jews till the death of Christ.

"There were also two kinds of Sabbaths, or days of rest. One was the day of weekly rest; and the command to keep it holy was placed by the Lawgiver in the midst of the moral laws. It was called, by way of imminence, 'THE SABBATH.' The command to keep the other sabbaths was placed by the Lawgiver among the ceremonial laws, because it was like them, as the command to keep the weekly Sabbath was like the laws with which it was associated. One class was fundamental, permanent, universal moral law; the other class was local, temporary, ceremonial laws."—*The Sabbath Manual,* p. 133.

The following poem may help some one to see the point on this matter :

**"It's Jewish"**

"When we present God's holy law,  
And arguments from Scripture draw,  
Objectors say, to pick a flaw,  
'It's Jewish.'

"Though at the first Jehovah blessed  
And sanctified His day of rest,  
The same belief is still expressed,  
'It's Jewish.'

"Though not with Jewish rites, which passed,  
But with the moral law 'twas classed:  
Which must exist while time shall last,  
'It's Jewish.'

"If from the Bible we present  
The Sabbath's meaning and intent,  
This answers every argument,—  
'It's Jewish.'

"Though the disciples, Luke and Paul,  
Continue still this rest to call  
The 'Sabbath day,' this answers all,  
'It's Jewish.'

“They love the day of man’s invention,  
But if Jehovah’s day we mention,  
This puts an end to all contention,  
‘It’s Jewish.’

“O ye who thus God’s day abuse,  
Simply because ’twas kept by Jews,  
The Saviour, too, you must refuse,  
He’s Jewish.

“The Scriptures, then, we may expect  
For the same reason you’ll reject;  
For if you will but recollect,  
They’re Jewish.

“Thus the apostles, too, must fall;  
For Andrew, Peter, James, and Paul,  
Thomas and Matthew, John and all  
Were Jewish.

“So to your helpless state resign  
Yourself in wretchedness to pine;  
Salvation, surely you’ll decline,  
It’s Jewish.”

#### **Council of Orleans**

The fourth step was taken in the first part of the sixth century at the Council of Orleans, 538 A. D. Constantine’s edict permitted Sunday labor in the country, and work on Sunday was not prohibited till A. D. 538.

First, the change of the Sabbath was so gradual that it covered centuries, which of course would not have been the case had Christ changed the Sabbath by divine authority; second, the Papacy, after having a gradual growth for centuries, was launched forth on her career of ecclesiastical supremacy in 538 A. D., as we shall later see. As the Papacy grew, the Sabbath was changed, and when we reach the year of her supremacy, the last step is taken in the exaltation of the Sunday, and it is called the “new sabbath”—the *new* sabbath, let the reader observe, five hundred years after the Saviour’s resurrection. Recall the words of Daniel 7:25 with reference to the little-horn power:

"He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and shall think to change times and laws: and they shall be *given into his hand* until a time and times and the dividing of time."

This period of time began in 538 A. D.





## A Great Persecutor

DID the Papacy fulfill the fifth specification of this prophecy, — wearing out the saints of the Most High? It is a very plain prophecy of great and extended persecution. No reader of history will deny the fulfillment of this part of the prophecy by the Papacy. The persecutions of the Dark Ages have indeed blackened the pages of history. A few quotations will be sufficient:

“That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind, will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history. The memorials, indeed, of many of her persecutions are now so scanty that it is impossible to form a complete conception of the multitude of her victims, and it is quite certain that no powers of imagination can adequately realize their sufferings.”—*History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, William Edward Hartpole Lecky, Vol. II, p. 32.

“Under these maxims Rome has always acted. What a long roll of bloody persecutions is her record! The extirpation of the Albigenses, the massacre of the Waldenses, the martyrdom of the Lollards, the slaughter of the Bohemians, the burning of Huss, Jerome, Savonarola, Frith, Tyndale, Ridley, Hooper, Cranmer, Latimer, and thousands of others as godly and faithful as they, have been her acts; the demoniacal cruelties of the Inquisition were invented by her mind and inflicted by her hand—that Inquisition which was for centuries the mighty instrument of her warfare against devoted men and women whose crime was only this, that they ‘kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.’”—*Key to the Apocalypse*, H. Grattan Guinness, p. 91.

“Under these bloody maxims [already cited at some length] those persecutions were carried on. . . . After the signal of open martyrdom had been given in the canons of Orleans, there followed the extirpation of the Albigenses, under the form of a crusade, the establishment of the Inquisition, the cruel attempts to extinguish the Waldenses, the martyrdoms of the Lollards, the cruel wars to exterminate the Bohemians, the burning of Huss and Jerome, and multitudes of other confessors, before the Reformation; and afterward, the ferocious cruelties practiced in the Netherlands, the martyrdoms of Queen Mary’s reign, the extinction, by fire and sword, of the Reformation in Spain

and Italy, by fraud and open persecution in Poland, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the persecutions of the Huguenots by the League, the extirpation of the Vaudois, and all the cruelties and perjuries connected with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. These are the more open and conspicuous facts which explain the prophecy, besides the slow and secret murders of the holy tribunal of the Inquisition.”—“*The First Two Visions of Daniel*,” *Rev. T. R. Birks*, pp. 248, 249.

This persecution is not denied by any instructed Catholic. We take the following from the Catholic Encyclopedia :

“In the bull ‘*Ad extirpanda*’ (1252) Innocent IV says: ‘When those adjudged guilty of heresy have been given up to the civil power by the bishop or his representative, or the Inquisition, the polestà or chief magistrate of the city shall take them at once, and shall, within five days at the most, execute the laws made against them.’ . . . Nor could any doubt remain as to what civil regulations were meant, for the passages which ordered the burning of impenitent heretics were inserted in the papal decretals from the imperial constitutions. . . . The aforesaid bull ‘*Ad extirpanda*’ remained thenceforth a fundamental document of the Inquisition, renewed or reinforced by several popes, Alexander IV (1254-61), Clement IV (1265-68), Nicholas IV (1288-92), Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and others. The civil authorities, therefore, were enjoined by the popes, under pain of excommunication, to execute the sentences that condemned impenitent heretics to the stake.”—*Vol. VIII, p. 34, art. “Inquisition.”*

This feature of the prophecy has indeed met its fulfillment in the awful persecutions under papal rule.



## Catholicism and Arianism

WE now come to the sixth specification of the prophecy under consideration,—the plucking up of three of the ten horns, or kingdoms. Did the Papacy in its rise to ecclesiastical supremacy fulfill this feature of the prophecy?

In those centuries Christendom was divided into two great factions,—Catholic and Arian. After the Council of Nicæa, Arianism was looked upon by the Catholic Church as heretical. Three of the ten kingdoms espoused Arianism. There had also been in progress for a considerable time a controversy relative to the headship of the church, whether the bishop of Rome or the bishop of Constantinople should be of superior dignity. The controversy was interrupted by the edict of Justinian, which edict became famous, declaring the bishop of Rome to be the head of the universal church and the corrector of heretics. Immediately both Justinian and the Roman bishop lent their energies to the destruction of these heretical nations. They were in the way of the ambitions of Justinian and the supremacy of the church. The Heruli had already been dispensed with, but there were left the Vandals and the Ostrogoths. Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," says:

"When Justinian ascended the throne, about fifty years after the fall of the Western Empire, the kingdoms of the Goths and Vandals had obtained a solid, and, as it might seem, a legal establishment both in Europe and Africa. . . . The safety of the East enabled the emperor to employ his forces against the Vandals; and the internal state of Africa afforded an honorable motive, and promised a powerful support, to the Roman arms. . . . John of Cappadocia ventured to oppose in full council the inclinations of his master. He confessed that a victory of such importance could not be too dearly purchased; but he represented in a grave discourse the certain difficulties of the uncertain event. . . . Justinian felt the weight of this salutary advice, . . . and the design of the war would perhaps have been relinquished, if his courage had not been revived by a voice which silenced the doubts of profane reason. 'I have seen a vision,' cried an artful or fanatic bishop of the East. 'It is the will of Heaven, O emperor! that you should not aban-

don your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African church. The God of battles will march before your standard, and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of His Son."—*Vol. IV, pp. 113-116 (chap. 41, pars. 1-3).*

### A Holy War

The African war against the Vandals then assumed the character of a holy war, being undertaken for the extension of the empire and the benefit of the church in exterminating that heretical nation. The war was a complete success. Says Gibbon:

"The defeat of the Vandals and the freedom of Africa were announced to the city [of Carthage] on the eve of St. Cyprian, when the churches were already adorned and illuminated for the festival of the martyr whom three centuries of superstition had almost raised to a local deity. The Arians, conscious that their reign had expired, resigned the temple to the Catholics, who rescued their saint from profane hands, performed the holy rites, and loudly proclaimed the creed of Athanasius and Justinian."—*Id., p. 128.*

The Vandals had now been uprooted, but there was still left another great Arian power, the Ostrogoths.

No sooner was the war against the Vandals over than a campaign was launched against the Ostrogoths, who occupied Rome and Italy. The Papacy could never develop to supremacy, nor even independence, as long as this power dominated in Rome and Italy. The war against the Ostrogoths, too, was a holy war, like the war against the Vandals.

"When Justinian first meditated the conquest of Italy, he sent ambassadors to the kings of the Franks, and adjured them, by the common ties of alliance and religion, to join in the holy enterprise against the Arians."—*Id., p. 175.*

The campaign against the Ostrogoths was entirely successful. Again we quote from Gibbon:

"The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the attack and was almost entirely consumed in the siege of Rome. . . . One year and nine days after the commencement of the siege, an army, so lately strong and triumphant, burnt their tents, and tumultuously repassed the Milvian bridge."—*Id., p. 172.*

### Beginning of the Middle Ages

This took place in A. D. 538; hence the sixth specification of the prophecy was fulfilled, and this year marks the beginning

of the 1260 years of papal supremacy, which is the seventh identification mark. George Finlay, in his "Greece Under the Romans," p. 295, says:

"With the conquest of Rome by Belisarius, the history of the ancient city may be considered as terminating; and with his defense against Witiges [A. D. 538], commences the history of the Middle Ages."

The Middle Ages, roughly speaking, is the age of the Papacy. Imperial arms placed Vigilius on the papal seat. Dr. Philip Schaff, in his "History of the Christian Church," says:

"Vigilius . . . ascended the papal chair under the military protection of Belisarius [A. D. 538-554]."—*Vol. III, p. 327.*

That really marked the beginning of a new order.

"Down to the sixth century all popes are declared saints in the martyrologies. Vigilius is the first of a series of popes who no longer bear this title. . . . From this time on the popes, more and more involved in worldly events, no longer belong solely to the church; they are men of the state, and then rulers of the state."—"*Medieval Europe, Bemont and Monod, p. 120.*"

#### **1260 Years of Papal Supremacy**

Beginning in A. D. 538, the 1260 years, or the "time and times and the dividing of time," would end in 1798. This brings us to the time of the French Revolution, when, in 1793, France, the chief supporter of the Papacy for so many centuries, divorced herself from Catholicism and all religion.

"On the 23d day of November [1793], atheism in France reached its extreme point, by a decree of the municipality ordering the immediate closing of all the churches, and placing the whole priests under surveillance. . . . The services of religion were now universally abandoned. The pulpits were deserted throughout all the revolutionized districts; baptism ceased; the burial service was no longer heard; the sick received no communion, the dying no consolation. A heavier anathema than that of papal power pressed upon the peopled realm of France—the anathema of Heaven, inflicted by the madness of her own inhabitants."—"*History of Europe, Sir Archibald Alison, Vol. III, p. 23.*"

Another says of those times:

"On Nov. 26, 1793, the Convention, of which seventeen bishops and some clergy were members, decreed the abolition of all religion."—"*Age of Revolution, p. 156.*"

In Scott's "Life of Napoleon" we read:


"The churches were in most districts of France closed against priests and worshipers, the bells broken and cast into cannon, and the whole ecclesiastical establishment destroyed."—*Vol. II, p. 306.*

### A Stroke of the Sword

This was followed by a stroke of the sword in Rome in 1798. We read:

"Begun in France, the spoliation of the harlot church, and of its papal patron and head, spread quickly into the other countries of Christendom. . . . In the years 1796, 1797, French dominion being established by Bonaparte's victories in northern Italy, it bore with it thither the similar accompaniment, as of French democratism and infidelity, so too of French antipapalism. And then, Rome itself being laid open to Bonaparte, and the French armies urging their march onward to the papal capital, the Pope only saved himself and it by the formal cession in the Treaty of Tolentino of the legations of Ferrara, Bologna, and Romagna (Peter's Patrimony), together with the city of Ancona; the payment of above £1,500,000 sterling,—a sum multiplied threefold by exactions and oppression,—and the surrender of military stores, and of a hundred of the finest paintings and statues of the Vatican.


"The French ambassador wrote from Rome to Bonaparte, 'The payment stipulated by the Treaty of Tolentino has totally exhausted this old carcass: we are making it consume by a slow fire.' . . . The aged Pope himself, now left mere nominal master of some few remaining shreds of the Patrimony of Peter, experienced *in person* soon after the bitterness of the prevailing antipapal spirit. In the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican, the ante-hall to which is covered with frescoes representing the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, (was the scene ordered as a momento of God's retributive justice?) while seated on his throne, and receiving the congratulations of his cardinals on the anniversary of his election to the popedom, he was arrested (February, 1798) by the French military, the ring of his marriage with the Church Catholic torn from his finger, his palace rifled, and himself carried prisoner into France, only to die there in exile shortly after."—"*Horæ Apocalypticae*," *Rev. E. B. Elliot, A. M., Vol. III, pp. 351-353.*



In 533 A. D. came the notable decree of the Papacy's powerful supporter, Justinian, declaring the Bishop of Rome to



be the head of the church, thus giving him supremacy; and then the decisive blow struck with the sword against the Ostrogoths in 538 A. D., cleaving the way for a new order of things. Exactly 1260 years later, in 1793, came the notable decree of the Papacy's once powerful supporter, France, "the eldest son of the church," aiming to abolish state religion, followed by a decisive blow by the sword at Rome against the Papacy in 1798. Hence the last specification of this prophecy was, like all the others, fulfilled with remarkable exactness.



Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, possibly a caption or a continuation of the text above.

# The Papacy in Daniel's Second Vision

THIS power, the Papacy, is also very clearly revealed in the prophecy of the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel, the prophet's second vision of the ram, the he-goat, and the little horn which waxed exceeding great. He thus describes his vision:

"In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first. And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai. Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns: and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.

"And as I was considering, behold, a he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he came to the ram which had two horns, . . . and ran unto him in the fury of his power. And . . . there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand.

"Therefore the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host and of the stars it cast to the ground, and trampled upon them. Yea, it magnified itself, even to the Prince of the host; and it took away from Him the continual burnt offering, and the place of His sanctuary was cast down. And the host was given over to it, together with the continual burnt offering through transgression; and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it did its pleasure and prospered.

"Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said unto that certain one who spake, How long shall be the vision concerning

the continual burnt offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. 8:1-14. (Verses 10-14 are taken from the American Revised Version.)

### **An Angel Explains the Vision**

Daniel did not understand these things, and he sought for the meaning. The angel Gabriel, as in the former vision, was sent to make it plain. The angel said to the prophet:

"The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.

"And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. . . . And he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he will also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand." Verses 20-25.

The ram, then, according to Gabriel's explanation, symbolized Medo-Persia, which was about that time succeeding the Babylonian Empire as a world power; and the he-goat represented Greece, which about 200 years later, in the year 331 B. C., at the battle of Arbela, overthrew and succeeded the Medo-Persian Empire. The notable horn between the eyes of the goat is a very plain symbol of Alexander the Great. When the goat was strong, the great horn was broken, we read, and so it was. Alexander died in the very height of his power, leaving no one who could immediately succeed him. There was a struggle for supremacy among his leading generals for a score of years, when his entire dominion was divided into four parts, and apportioned to four of his leading generals, exactly fulfilling the prophecy of the four horns taking the place of the notable horn. Cassander possessed Greece and Macedon in the west; Lysimachus, Thrace, Bithynia, and a portion of Asia Minor in the north; Seleucus, Syria and Babylon in the east; and Ptolemy, Egypt in the South.

### The Little Horn Power

What power can be symbolized by the little horn that followed this fourfold division of Alexander's Empire,—the little horn that waxed exceeding great, that magnified himself even to the Prince of the host, that stood up against the Prince of princes, that took away from the Prince of the host the continual burnt offering, that trod underfoot the sanctuary of the Prince of the host, that cast the truth to the ground, that practiced and prospered? It represents Rome—Rome in all its history, in its entirety, in both its forms, pagan and papal—Rome from its beginning before the first advent of Christ down through to the second coming of Christ.

Here are the proofs: The ram, Medo-Persia, became "great;" the he-goat, Greece, became "very great;" but the little horn waxed "*exceeding great.*" The little horn therefore plainly symbolizes some power following the fourfold division of Alexander's kingdom, a power greater than either Greece or Medo-Persia. If this is not so, there is no meaning to language. Rome fulfilled this specification, and certainly not one man, as has been claimed of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was merely one of a line of Syrian kings, and by no means the greatest of them.

Again, compare this wicked but weak king with the parts of the great image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream,—the head of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the sides of brass, and the legs of iron. In a previous chapter we have already seen that these parts represent respectively Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Now when this vision of Daniel was given, Babylon was just passing off the stage of action as a world power, and was being succeeded by Medo-Persia. Hence the ram is a parallel to the breast and arms of silver, representing Medo-Persia, the brass representing Greece, and the iron Rome. So we have Medo-Persia, silver; Greece, brass; and Rome, iron; or silver, great; brass, very great; iron, exceeding great. Therefore we see a parallel between the little horn of the prophecy and the legs of iron of the great image.

Now let us also recall that King Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel saw a stone cut out *without hands*, that smote the image upon the feet that were made of the iron and clay. Here is another

parallel, for it is said of the little horn, "He shall stand up against the Prince of princes, but he shall be broken *without hands*." This language shows that the same power is involved, and it further shows that the little-horn power in some form reaches to the second coming of Christ; for according to the Scriptures, He is the stone that will smite the image upon the feet, and this smiting takes place at His second coming. Revelation 19. And the stone which became a great mountain and filled the whole earth is a symbol of the kingdom of our Lord, which shall break in pieces and destroy all earthly kingdoms, and shall stand forever.

Again, centuries before this vision was given to Daniel, Moses laid out before the children of Israel the blessings that would be theirs to enjoy if they would be obedient to God, and all the curses that would come upon them if they failed to hearken unto the voice of God and observe His commandments. He uttered a prophecy of their final scattering among all people from one end of the earth unto the other, and the final destruction of that people. History informs us now that this final scattering was done by the Roman power in A. D. 70. But listen to Moses' description of this power:

"The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, . . . a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance." Deut. 28: 49, 50.

Now hear Gabriel's description of this power symbolized by the little horn, that power which destroyed wonderfully:

"In the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up." Dan. 8: 23.

The words are almost identical. Thus Rome is symbolized, the power that brought about their final destruction and scattering among all the peoples of the earth.

But the strongest proof is this: Our Saviour applied the little horn to Rome. Observe that the power represented by the little horn is described as a desolating power, and the abomination of desolation. Dan. 9: 27. Our Saviour studied this prophecy. How did He understand it? In Matthew 24 He is telling His disciples about the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of

the Jewish nation, and giving them a final sign whereby they might know when to flee from Jerusalem and Judea into places of safe retreat when that terrible time should come. He said:

"When ye therefore shall see the *abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand :) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." Matt. 24: 15, 16.

Luke puts it thus:

"When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." Luke 21: 20.

These were the Roman armies. It was therefore the Roman power that the Saviour described as "the abomination of desolation." It was Rome in A. D. 70 that fulfilled the Saviour's prediction. This is His interpretation of this part of Daniel's prophecy, and His interpretation is infallible. No further proof is needed.

#### Every Specification Fulfilled

Thus Rome in its entirety fulfilled every specification of this prophecy. We shall speak particularly of the papal phase, for this is our theme. On seven counts, as we have seen in a previous chapter, the little horn of Daniel's first vision (Daniel 7) symbolized the Papacy. Let us now parallel the expressions describing these two horns as found in chapters 7 and 8:

Dan. 7: 25: "He shall speak great words against the Most High."

Dan. 8: 25: "He shall magnify himself in his heart." "He shall magnify himself even to the Prince of the host." Verse 11.

Dan. 7: 25: "He shall wear out the saints of the Most High."

Dan. 8: 10: "It cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them;" "How long shall be the vision . . . to give . . . the host to be trodden underfoot?" Verse 13.  
"He shall destroy wonderfully." Verse 24.

Dan. 7: 25: "He shall . . . think to change times and laws."

Dan. 8: 12: "It cast down the truth to the ground."

Dan. 7: 25: "They shall be given into his hand."

Dan. 8: 12: "And a host was given him."

Most certainly, then, if papal Rome is symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 7, the same is true of the little horn of Daniel 8; for their character and work are parallel. There is this difference, however, as has been stated before, the little horn of



Daniel 7 represents papal Rome alone, while the little horn of Daniel 8 embraces both the pagan and papal phases, but more particularly the papal.

#### **Papal Rome Fulfills the Specifications**

“He magnified himself even to the Prince of the host.” Dan. 8: 11. Has not the Papacy clearly fulfilled this in the claim that is made for the Pope? Who is this Prince of the host mentioned in the prophecy? It is our Lord Jesus Christ. In Daniel 9, where the vision of Daniel 8 is explained, He is referred to as “Messiah the Prince” (verse 25), and in chapter 8, verse 25, He is called “the Prince of princes.” Bellarmine, a great Catholic author, says:

“All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that He is over the church, all the same names are applied to the Pope.”—“*On the Authority of Councils,*” book 2, chap. 17, edition 1619 (Vol. II, p. 266).

And this essential claim of the Papacy, which magnifies the Pope even to the Prince of the host, Christ, was expressed in the following words by Rev. Jeremiah Prendergast, S. J., in a sermon in Syracuse, N. Y., March 13, 1912, as reported in the *Syracuse Post-Standard* of March 14, 1912:

“The Pope is the vicar of Christ, or the visible head of the church on earth. *The claims of the Pope are the same as the claims of Christ.* . . . Christ can forgive all sin. So can the Pope. The Pope is the only man who claims the vicarage of Christ. His claim is not seriously opposed, and this establishes his authority. The powers given the Pope by Christ were given him, not as a mere man, but as the representative of Christ. The Pope is more than the representative of Christ, for he is the fruit of His divinity and of the divine institution of the church.”

Many other similar statements might be given from Catholic authors, but we deem these sufficient.

We have already seen how the Papacy fulfilled the prediction of Daniel 7: 25, “He shall wear out the saints of the Most High,” in the awful persecutions of the Dark Ages; and the prediction of the work of the little horn of Daniel 8 is similar, the trampling of the host of God underfoot, and destroying wonderfully the people of God. It is not necessary to repeat

this again in this chapter, nor to repeat how the Papacy has cast the truth of God to the ground, in the change of the Sabbath and the perversion of many other truths.

#### **The Sacrifice of the Mass**

But the most remarkable prediction of this prophecy is that the little-horn power would take away from the Prince of the host the continual burnt offering, and tread underfoot the sanctuary of the Prince of the host, and desolate it. How has this been fulfilled?

The burnt offering was the fundamental offering of the old covenant sanctuary service. It was the basic offering, the one that made all other offerings efficacious, and therefore no matter what the offerings and how many, the burnt offering must be daily or "continual." Num. 28:3-6. It is the first offering mentioned in connection with the offerings of the sanctuary. Leviticus 1. The burnt offering in the typical service was looked upon as giving virtue to all other offerings.

On the threshold of Eden, after the entrance of sin, Abel brought as an offering of the firstlings of the flock and the fat thereof, but Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And the Lord had respect unto Abel's offering, but rejected Cain's. Why did the Lord reject Cain's offering of the fruit of the ground when in later years God commanded His people to bring the first fruits of the ground as an offering unto Him? Ex. 23:19; 22:29. Unquestionably, if Cain had first offered a burnt offering unto the Lord, God would then have accepted his offering of the fruits of the ground. The burnt offering is represented as being consumed on account of the wrath of God against sin, for "our God is a consuming fire." The first-fruits offering must follow rather than precede the burnt offering by which it is made acceptable. This is the lesson in brief of the burnt offering and the continual burnt offering, for they are propitiatory offerings typical of Christ's offering for our sins.

Now the old covenant sanctuary was a figure of the heavenly sanctuary, the sanctuary of the new covenant. In Hebrews 8:1, 2, we read:

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such a High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."

And the priests who served in the old covenant sanctuary are said to have served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." Heb. 8:5. And in still another verse the earthly sanctuary and its furnishings are spoken of as "patterns of things in the heaven." Heb. 9:23. Hence the service in the earthly sanctuary was typical, figurative of the service in the heavenly sanctuary, performed by the great High Priest of the gospel system, our Lord Jesus Christ.

The burnt offering, therefore, was typical of some offering of Christ that would make His priestly work in the heavenly sanctuary efficacious, an offering which would be at the foundation of all His mediatorial work in behalf of sinners. This every reader of the Bible knows was His offering of Himself on the cross of Calvary. By virtue of this offering He ascended up on high at the Father's right hand, to plead the merits of His shed blood in behalf of sinners. Heb. 9:11-14. His death on the cross was the antitypical burnt offering. There He suffered the wrath of God against sin. Isa. 53:4-6. This is what caused Him to cry out on the cross, "My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Matt. 27:46. And through this offering, His intercession is continual in behalf of sinners. Heb. 7:25.

And that one offering was all-sufficient for the redemption of lost men. Observe how explicit the Bible is on this point:

"Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this He did *once*, when He offered up Himself." Heb. 7:27.

"So Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9:28.

"But this Man, after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10:12.

"For by *one* offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10:14.

"Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin *once*." Rom. 6:9, 10.

### The Continual Burnt Offering

We now ask how the Papacy has fulfilled this part of the prophecy, of the taking from the Prince of the host the continual burnt offering. It has been done in the so-called sacrifice of the mass. Though the Scripture emphasizes the truth over and over that *one* sacrifice was all sufficient, it is an essential doctrine of the Catholic Church that in the mass Christ is offered as truly as He was on the cross of Calvary, and that the sacrifice of the mass is just as efficacious for the forgiveness and remission of sins as was the offering on the cross. Indeed, the Catholic Church has long held an anathema over the head of any one who should call the eucharist a memorial only of Christ's death, and not a sacrifice. For example:

"If any one saith that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving; or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a *propitiatory sacrifice*; . . . and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, and satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema."—*Canon 3, published in the 22d session of the Council of Trent; "Dogmatic Canons and Decrees," p. 143.*

The creed of Pope Pius IV is the authentic creed of the Roman Catholic Church, and from that we quote the following:

"I also profess that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."—*Article VI.*

### A Counterfeit of the Cross

This so-called sacrifice of the mass is simply, then, a counterfeit of the sacrifice of the cross. The New Testament plainly teaches that Christ's offering, *once* made, is propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and that there can be no other satisfaction for sins but that alone. In this casting to the ground of the truth of God, the most essential truth of the gospel, the Papacy has taken away from the Prince of the host (Christ) the continual burnt offering. It has led the people to

look away from the true to the false, and the prophecy has been most plainly fulfilled.

And likewise has the sanctuary of the Prince of the host been desolated. The sanctuary of the gospel system is in heaven, as we have already seen. Therein is serving the only priesthood of the gospel, and there is the only confessional, the "throne of grace" (Heb. 4: 16), and there is the "one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. 2: 5.

But the Papacy has a sanctuary system of its own, which it claims is the antitype of the earthly. It has a priesthood of its own, a chain of mediators of its own, a confessional of its own, a repentance (penance) of its own, a sacrifice of its own, the mass; and thus has the heavenly sanctuary system been counterfeited and desolated; for man has been directed away from the heavenly to an earthly system, and in that way the heavenly has been desolated and trodden underfoot.

We can tread Christ underfoot, according to the Scripture, even though He is in heaven, by misrepresenting Him and doing despite to His work. Heb. 10: 29. But Bible prophecy teaches that when the 2300 days (years) end and the cleansing of the sanctuary begins, there goes to all the world a message which especially places the heavenly sanctuary service in its true light, and thus brings it out from under the feet of the apostate. The true light of the sanctuary is the true light for the people of God in the last days.



# The Beast and His Number ---

## 666

THE Papacy is frequently brought to view in the prophecies of the book of Revelation. That power is very clearly symbolized by the composite beast of Revelation 13, which John the prophet in holy vision saw coming up out of the sea. He thus describes it:

"I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.

"And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshiped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshiped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?

"And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

"If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six." Rev. 13: 1-10, 18.

### Points of Identification

It is not difficult to determine what power is symbolized by this beast; for here are a number of plain identification marks:



1. It is a composite beast, that is, it is composed of parts of the four beasts which Daniel saw in vision, namely, the lion, bear, leopard, and the great and terrible beast with ten horns. This beast has the mouth of a lion, the feet of a bear, the body of a leopard, and ten horns.

2. The dragon gave him his seat, that is, his capital, or headquarters.

3. The dragon gave him his power and great authority.

4. He blasphemous the name of God.

5. He blasphemous God's tabernacle, that is, the heavenly sanctuary.

6. He makes war with the saints, and overcomes them.

7. He enjoys supremacy for forty-two months, that is, 1260 years.

8. His number is 666.

Papal Rome, and no other power, fulfills these specifications to the letter. We will examine the points in order:

#### **A Composite Beast**

1. Being composed of parts of the four beasts of Daniel 7, which we have seen symbolized respectively, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome (pagan), it is plain that it is to be counted as a fifth power, that is, a power following pagan Rome, which is symbolized by the fourth beast of Daniel's vision. The Papacy fulfilled this as to time, but there is a great deal more in this feature than the element of time, as we shall later see.

#### **The Dragon's Power and Seat**

2. The dragon gave him his seat. Moffatt's translation reads, "To him the dragon gave his own power and his own throne." That place which had been the seat of the dragon became the seat, throne, or headquarters of the beast. What is represented by the seven-headed, ten-horned dragon? First it must be plain to the reader that there is a relation between the dragon and the other beast, for they both have seven heads and ten horns. The dragon is brought to view in the previous chapter, Revelation 12. We read:

"There appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of

twelve stars: and she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads: . . . and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God and to His throne." Rev. 12:1-5.

The man child in the prophecy is plainly the Lord Jesus; for it is said of Him, "He shall rule them [the nations] with a rod of iron." Rev. 19:15; Ps. 2:8, 9. In the twelfth chapter of Revelation is a line of prophecy reaching to the end of time, and these words regarding the man child relate to our Saviour's first advent when He came as the "man child."

The woman of Revelation 12 is plainly a symbol of the church in all ages. All through the Bible a woman is taken to represent a church, a pure woman, the true church; a corrupt woman, God's people in apostasy. The Jewish church was likened unto a woman. Jer. 6:2. New Testament writers likewise use the same figure. 2 Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:23. In this prophecy of Revelation 12 the woman is clothed with the light of heaven, and upon her forehead is a crown of twelve stars, representing very clearly the twelve apostles, the first chosen heralds of that light. The apostle Paul said, in writing to the Corinthians, "God hath set some in the church, *first* apostles." 1 Cor 12:28. In Revelation 12 the church is traced through the centuries from the Saviour's first advent to the second, and the last verse describes the true church in the very last days, "The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the *remnant of her seed*, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Verse 17.

#### The Dragon Cast Out

What, then, is the dragon? In verse 9 of Revelation 12 we read, "The great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan: . . . he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." The devil is a fallen angel, as taught here and throughout the Bible. We are told that he was very beautiful. Eze. 28:12, 17. He is not a creature with

seven heads and ten horns. One head is all sufficient, and he has no horns.

This figure of the dragon has a twofold application. The dragon spirit is the spirit of the devil, and the lamblike spirit is the spirit of Christ. The dragon and the lamb are contrasted in the book of Revelation. The dragon with seven heads and ten horns is a symbol of some earthly power, while the spirit back of it is the devil's spirit. It is a plain symbol of that power which was the world power at the time of our Saviour's first advent, when He came into the world as the "man child," through which power Satan, the real dragon, worked, seeking to accomplish the destruction of Christ, the "man child."

What was the world power when Judea was under its iron heel? It was Rome, pagan Rome. In Luke 2:1 we read, "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." In response to the edict, Joseph and Mary went to their home town to be enrolled. Rome ruled the world, and it was through that power that Satan worked to destroy the "man child." While it was through Jewish hatred and malice that Jesus was crucified, the Jews had no power to inflict capital punishment. This power was in the hands of Rome. Jesus was tried and condemned before a Roman judge. Roman soldiers drove the nails through His hands and feet. Roman soldiers erected the cross. Roman soldiers disputed at the foot of the cross about His garments, and were watching His tomb on the morning of the resurrection. Hence while the dragon is primarily Satan, secondarily it represents in symbolic form the Roman power through which Satan worked to destroy the man child. Now the prophecy says, "The dragon gave him [the beast] . . . his seat" (Rev. 13:2), or his own seat or throne, as we read in another version. What was the seat of pagan Rome? It was the city of Rome. Therein was the throne of the emperors. Every reader of history knows that the seat of the Roman Empire was moved from Rome to Constantinople, and Rome became the seat of the Papacy, the seat of the popes, and they sat in the city of the emperor and exercised power in both church and state. This is a clear point of identification of the beast power.

### **Power and Great Authority**

3. The dragon gave him power and great authority. How was this fulfilled? Where did the Papacy get its great power, which it used, for example, in putting to death so many heretics? First of all, from the decree of Justinian, emperor of Rome in 533 A. D., which acknowledged the Pope to be the head of the universal church and the corrector of heretics. This is a remarkable fulfillment of the prophecy. It is not denied that Satan, the real dragon, brought it about; it was done by Satan working through earthly powers.

### **A Blasphemous Power**

4. He blasphemed the name of God. This has already been considered in the chapter on the little horn of Daniel 7. For a man to assume the name of God and the very prerogatives of God, is blasphemy, and this feature has been most strikingly fulfilled in the blasphemous assumptions of the head of that power.


5. He blasphemed God's tabernacle. As has been seen in the chapter on the little horn of Daniel 8, this has been fulfilled in a counterfeit earthly sanctuary service, which has drawn the eyes of the people from the true to the false.

### **A Persecuting Power**

6. He made war with the saints, and overcame them. Nor is it necessary to repeat the facts of a previous chapter on the awful persecutions of the past under papal rule. Millions of martyrs sleeping in the dust of the earth are silent witnesses of the fulfillment of this feature of the prophecy.

### **Time of Continuance**

7. "Power was given unto him to continue forty and two months." This same period of time is spoken of in Revelation 12: 6 as 1260 days and in the 14th verse as a "time, and times, and half a time," or three and one-half prophetic years. As Bible prophecy allows 30 days to the month, or 360 days to the year, the 42 months equal 1260 days. Always in symbolic prophecy one day represents a year. (See Num. 14: 34; Eze.



The Pope's Tiara -- The Triple Crown

4: 6.) As was pointed out in the chapter on the little horn of Daniel 7, this period of time began in the year 538 A. D. and ended in 1798, in which year the Papacy, after enjoying ecclesiastical supremacy for 1260 years, received a deadly wound from the hands of France, which had been her chief supporter for so many centuries. This deadly wound is to be healed, and it is now fast healing. The Papacy is again a mighty power in Europe.

**The Number of the Beast**

8. His number is 666. "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred threescore and six." Rev. 13: 18. It is certainly very significant that the Papacy has herself chosen a Latin phrase expressing the essential claim of the Papacy as to its head, the Pope, who is a man, the numerals of which phrase total exactly 666. It is the Latin phrase, "Vicarius Filii Dei," meaning vicegerent of the Son of God, or vicar of the Son of God, which words, Vicarius Filii Dei, are used by the cardinal who imposes the tiara at the coronation of a pope.

V	.....	5
I	.....	1
C	.....	100
A	.....	not a numeral
R	.....	not a numeral
I	.....	1
U	.....	5, same as V (see below).
F	.....	not a numeral
I	.....	1
L	.....	50
I	.....	1
I	.....	1
D	.....	500
E	.....	not a numeral
I	.....	1
Total		666

As to the letter "U" equaling "V," a word of explanation might be helpful to some. Webster's Dictionary says of the letter "U: "



"The twenty-first letter and fifth vowel of the English alphabet . . . is a cursive form of the letter 'V,' with which it was *formerly used interchangeably.*"

Another says:

"The letters F, U, W, and Y are all from the Phœnician 'Wau' or 'Vau!' and the Phœnician 'Vau' is shaped somewhat like our common Roman 'Y.' The letters 'V' and 'U' are graphic varieties only, that is, different ways of picturing the same sound. Till the sixteenth century 'V' was used for 'U' because it was more easily chiseled, on account of its straight lines and angles. They had the same sound in Latin, in Norman French, and in English, down to the Elizabethan period (1588-1603). They were counted as one in all alphabetical arrangements till recently, just the same as 'i' and 'j' were counted one. 'W' in the French is 'VV.' Hence 'U' and 'V' are one and the same thing."

But there is a meaning in the arrangement of the letters in the Greek of Revelation 13:18. The Greek letters used for 666 are chi ( $\chi$ ), xi ( $\xi$ ), sigma ( $\varsigma$ ), the first and last letters in the Greek word *Christos* ( $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ), with the sign ( $\xi$ ) of the serpent in between, signifying a false Christ — antichrist.

Now compare these specifications with the little horn of Daniel 7, which, as we have seen on seven counts, is symbolical of the Papacy. The little horn followed pagan Rome; so does the beast of Revelation 13. The little horn speaks great words against the Most High; the beast has a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies. The little horn wore out the saints of the Most High; the beast made war with the saints and overcame them. The little horn continued for a time, times, and the dividing of time; the beast, for forty-two months. Plainly, then, they both represent the same power, namely, the Papacy.



# The Mother Harlot Church

THE Papacy is again very clearly represented in the seventeenth chapter of Revelation by the woman sitting upon the scarlet-colored beast, which had seven heads and ten horns:

"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. . . . 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 the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." Rev. 17: 1-6.

## A Symbol of the Church

A woman is a symbol of a church. If it is a pure woman, as in Revelation 12, it represents the true church of Christ; and if it is a fallen woman, as here, it represents a fallen and apostate church. Some have taken the woman to symbolize the city of Rome, because the ninth verse reads, "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth," and further because the last verse of Revelation 17 says, "The woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." But a moment's reflection on certain other expressions in the prophecy will lead us to realize that the city is symbolical:

First, on the forehead of the woman is the word "Babylon." In Revelation 14 we have the three angels' messages, the second of which is, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen," and the complement

of this message is found in Revelation 18. In the fourth verse we read, "Come out of her, My people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Now the connection in Revelation 14 shows that the message, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen," "come out of her, My people," goes to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. Whatever Babylon is, it is found in all the world, in every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. It does not seem reasonable that the Lord would send a message to Americans, for example, saying, Come out of the city of Rome, when they had never been in it.

Second, the woman is accused of committing fornication with the kings of the earth. Rev. 17:2. Now it is manifestly proper for any literal city to ally itself with the kings of the earth, and traffic with them. But when the church allies herself with the kings of the earth, and marries the state, and uses the state for the furtherance of her aims, then the Lord reckons that church a harlot, committing fornication with the kings of the earth.

Third, as to the mountains upon which the woman sitteth, the tenth verse says, "They are seven kings [R. V. and all other modern translations]: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space." This would be strange language to apply to the literal hills or mountains on which the literal city of Rome is built, "five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come," but it is perfectly understandable when applied to symbolic Babylon, one phase of which is represented by the woman on the scarlet-colored beast.

#### **The Call Out of Babylon**

Fourth, it will be observed that God calls His people out of Babylon after the fall. Now this would seem more strange than the other,—strange that God would call His people out of a literal city after its fall, to save them; for if it were a literal city, its fall would be literal, as destruction by fire, for example; and to save them God would have to call them out before the fall, as God called Lot out of Sodom before its destruction by fire. But here they are called out after Babylon's

fall, showing that Babylon is symbolical, and that this is a moral or religious fall; for Babylon represents the religious residences of the people of God. Now the city of Rome may be embraced in Babylon as the center of a false religion which is found in all the world, as ancient Babylon was the center of a false religion in contrast with the religion of the true God at Jerusalem, a false religion which stretched to the ends of the earth.

The woman is symbolical of a church. What church? This seven-headed, ten-horned beast, as it first comes into the prophecies (Revelation 12), represents the pagan Roman Empire, as we have seen in the previous chapter on Revelation 12. The seven heads likely cover Babylon in its entirety, from ancient Babylon to the end of time, but the pagan head was the ruling head of the beast at the time of our Saviour's advent and for several centuries after. This is the time that is first covered in the prophecy under consideration.

What church is represented? Plainly, the church that made a conquest of the Roman Empire, the church whose religion became the established religion of the Roman Empire, the church that committed spiritual fornication by marrying herself to the state, the Roman Empire, and that sat astride the beast, controlling it to her own ends, as a result of which that church persecuted dissenters to such an extent that she is represented as being drunken with the blood of saints and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. It is a very plain symbol of the Roman Church.

#### **The Cause of Persecution**

This union of church and state is exactly what caused the persecutions of the Middle Ages. The church got hold of the civil machinery of the state. The church would condemn a man as a heretic, and then the church would simply turn that heretic over to the state to be executed, and the officers of the state were obliged to carry out the sentences of the church. Hence the significance of the woman (the church) sitting on the beast (the state), and then being, in consequence thereof, drunken with the blood of the saints.

**Why Called a Harlot?**

But why does the Lord reckon the Roman Church a harlot? The reasons are very plain:

First, according to the New Testament, Christ is the one and only head of the church. Col. 1: 18; Eph. 5: 23-32; 2 Cor. 11: 2. In apostasy the church took unto herself another husband, the Pope, contending that the church should have a visible husband, or head. This cannot be justified on the ground that other churches have heads, directors, or leaders. The Catholic Church claims that the Pope is the visible head, in Christ's place, His vicegerent. "The claims of the Pope are the same as the claims of Christ," says one Catholic priest. And Cardinal Bellarmine, the great Catholic author, says:

"All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that He is over the church, all the same names are applied to the Pope."—*On the Authority of Councils*, book 2, chap. 17, edition 1619 (Vol. II, p. 266).

Suppose a husband should go into a far country to receive an inheritance, and while he was gone his wife should contend that she was justified in taking another husband, inasmuch as her first husband had become invisible. Of what would she be guilty? The woman on the first count would be adjudged guilty of fornication.

**The Church a Harlot**

Second, the woman (the church) is accused of committing fornication with the kings of the earth. What does this mean? The church married the state, the Roman Empire. Now Christ is the husband of the church. He says to the church, "I am your husband, the source of your strength. You are to depend on Me for your support, for your power;" so when the church unites herself to the state, let it be whatever church it may, God is obliged to reckon that church a harlot. This is illustrated in the history of ancient Israel. The Lord says, "I have likened the daughter of Zion to a comely and delicate woman" (Jer. 6: 2); and in Jeremiah 31: 32, where the Lord is speaking of his relation to ancient Israel, He says, "I was a husband unto them."

But Israel, instead of depending upon God for power and strength, united herself with the Assyrians against the Syrians, and the Lord through the prophet Ezekiel said, "Thou hast played the whore also with the Assyrians. . . . yea, thou hast played the harlot with them." Eze. 16:28. Now observe the figure of this prophecy. The woman (the church) is sitting upon the beast (the state), and of course controlling to her own end, until she is drunken with the blood of martyrs. This is the fruitage of church-state unions. It is the reason for the persecutions of past ages. The Catholic Church is not the only church that has persecuted because of violating this principle. Witness, for example, the persecutions of the Baptists and the Quakers when the Congregational Church became the state church of the New England colonies; and the persecution of the nonconformists in England. There are numerous examples. These are the reasons that the Lord reckons the church a harlot.

#### **Why "Babylon" on Her Forehead?**

Why does God call this woman "Babylon"? Evidently in the religious system symbolized by her there is a continuation and perpetuation of the religion and principles of ancient pagan Babylon, though in a new form. The reader of church history will find no difficulty in understanding why God puts the word "Babylon" upon the forehead of the woman on the scarlet-colored beast. Beginning immediately after the death of the apostles,—indeed, it was in embryo before Paul's death (2 Thess. 2:3-7),—and continuing for several centuries, there was a falling away, an apostasy, from the religion and worship of Christ and the apostles.

One of the principal reasons for this apostasy, as given by a number of historians, was an amalgamation between Christianity and paganism. Pagan rites were imitated and blended with the Christian worship. Festal days which had been observed among the pagans since the days of ancient Babylon, were brought over into the church, and made to commemorate events in the life of Christ. Christian churches were remodeled and patterned after pagan temples, and likewise the priestly



service connected therewith. This was done, it was contended, to make easier the conversion of the pagans. Mosheim says:

“The Christians were pronounced atheists, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. . . . To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought they must introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people; so that they could maintain that they really *had* all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms.”—*“Ecclesiastical History,” cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 3.*

And the same author says of the church in the second century:

“A large part . . . of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries.”—*Id., sec. 5.*

### **The Two Great Mysteries**

In the pagan worship there were the two great Eleusinian mysteries, connected with which there were elaborate initiatory rites and much ceremony. In this amalgamation the Lord's Supper was made the greater mystery and baptism the lesser, and initiatory rites to the celebration of the former. Both of these ordinances were corrupted and perverted, and made to resemble the two heathen mysteries, so that when the pagans came into the church, they found likewise two mysteries.

In a previous chapter we have spoken of the Christmas festival as illustrative of this point, and also of the Sunday festival. As the Catholic missionaries went out among the pagans, they found them also observing in the spring of the year, about the time of the spring equinox, for they were sun worshipers, a festival in honor of the Babylonian sun goddess Ishtar, the goddess of spring, a festival which had come down from Babylon through Greece and Rome. In the Babylonian mythology we read that a large egg fell from heaven into the river Euphrates. The fish rolled it to the banks, and the doves sat upon it and hatched it, and out came the goddess Ishtar, or Easter, and hence the egg became the symbol of Astarte, or Ishtar. So from Babylon of old the egg has always been connected with the festival of Easter.

Buns also figured in the Babylonian rites, as they do now. The buns were used in the worship of the goddess Easter, the queen of heaven, hundreds of years before the Christian era. Says Bryant:

"One species of sacred bread, which used to be offered to the gods, was of great antiquity, and called 'boun.'"—*Mythology*, Vol. VI, p. 373.

The children of Israel were surrounded by the Babylonian sun worshipers, and in apostasy they would participate in the worship of the pagans. Jeremiah speaks of this:

"Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven." Jer. 7: 17, 18.

This queen of heaven was the goddess Ishtar, or Easter.

#### Lent of Pagan Origin

This festival in honor of the sun goddess was preceded by a fast of forty days. This fast, remember, was in the spring of the year. It can be proved that Christ's fast of forty days was in the fall of the year. We quote the following from Hislop:

"The forty days' abstinence of Lent was directly borrowed from the worshipers of the Babylonian goddess. Such a Lent of forty days, 'in the spring of the year,' is still observed by the Yezidis, or pagan devil worshipers of Koordistan, who have inherited it from their early masters, the Babylonians. Such a Lent of forty days was held in the spring by the pagan Mexicans, for thus we read in Humboldt [*"Mexican Researches,"* Vol. I, p. 404], where he gives account of Mexican observances: 'Three days after the vernal equinox . . . began a solemn fast of forty days in honor of the sun.' Such a Lent of forty days was observed in Egypt, as may be seen on consulting Wilkinson's '*Egyptian Antiquities.*'"—*The Two Babylons*, pp. 104, 105.

#### Pagan Festivals Brought into the Church

These Babylonian or pagan festivals were brought over into the Christian church to commemorate events in the life of Christ. Why was this done? Hislop gives the reason thus:

"To conciliate the pagans to nominal Christianity, Rome, pursuing its usual policy, took measures to get the Christian and pagan festivals

amalgamated, and by a complicated but skillful adjustment of the calendar, it was found no difficult matter, in general, to get paganism and Christianity, now far sunk in idolatry, . . . to shake hands."—*Id.*, p. 105.

Again the author of "The Two Babylons," page 113, says:

"The Feast of the Nativity of St. John is set down in the papal calendar for the 24th of June, or midsummer day. The very same period was equally memorable in the Babylonian calendar as that of one of its most celebrated festivals. It was at midsummer, or the summer solstice, that the month called in Chaldea, Syria, and Phenicia by the name of 'Tammuz' began; and on the first day—that is, on or about the 24th of June—one of the grand original festivals of Tammuz was celebrated. . . . When the Papacy sent its emissaries over Europe, toward the end of the sixth century, to gather in the pagans into its fold, this festival was found in high favor in many countries. What was to be done with it? Were they to wage war with it? No. This would have been contrary to the famous advice of Pope Gregory I, that by all means they should meet the pagans half way, and so bring them into the Roman Church. The Gregorian policy was carefully observed; and so midsummer day, that had been hallowed by paganism to the worship of Tammuz, was incorporated as a sacred Christian festival in the Roman calendar."

Hence the reader can plainly see why God through this prophecy places "Babylon" on the forehead of this woman symbolical of the Roman Church.

Babylon also stands for lawlessness, a trampling underfoot of God's law and Christ's teachings, and this was certainly done in the great falling away and apostasy that produced the system represented by the woman on the beast. No ordinance of the Lord Jesus was left unchanged, and the commandments of God were supplanted by the traditions and commandments of men.

#### **Meaning and Origin of the Name**

We find the origin of the word "Babylon" in Genesis 11. After the flood, God had commanded the people to scatter abroad on the face of the earth; but instead they disobeyed, and began to build a tower to reach unto heaven, and as a result God confounded their language, and the tower was therefore called "Babel," or Babylon. So Babylon, it is plain, represents rebellion, disobedience, transgression of God's law; for let this plain truth be noted, that when in the last days people hear the mes-

sage, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, . . . come out of her, My people," and they respond to the call and come out, they are described thus: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. Keeping the commandments of God is just the opposite from what is done in Babylon.

As we have previously seen, the Christian church is symbolized in Revelation 12 by a woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars. This chapter gives a line or chain of prophecy of the Christian church from its establishment at Christ's first coming to His second coming. The last verse speaks of the true church in the very last days in these words:

"The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17.

The word "remnant" implies the last end and a small piece. In the book of Revelation the remnant church in the last days is contrasted with Babylon. The remnant comes out of Babylon, and keeps the commandments of God; and this, according to Revelation 12:12, is a preparation for the second coming of Christ. There are other reasons why the Lord calls the woman (the church) Babylon. A volume might be written, but this must suffice.



## Two Great Mysteries

WHY has the woman of Revelation 17:3-6 written upon her forehead the word "MYSTERY"? This word connects Babylon, the woman, with the great falling away of which the apostle Paul spoke in writing to the church of his day at Thessalonica. He said:

"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 worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God ["setteth himself forth as God," R. V.]. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now you know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the *mystery* of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth [hindereth] will let [hinder], until he be taken out of the way." 2 Thess. 2:3-7.

We have referred several times to the great apostasy which occurred after the death of the apostles, and the reasons therefor. The apostle Paul could see it in embryo in his day. That apostasy produced a religious system, symbolized in Revelation by a woman on whose forehead was the word "MYSTERY," and called by the apostle Paul "the mystery of iniquity," or lawlessness,—a religious system at the head of which one would sit claiming the very prerogatives of God Himself. This is fulfilled clearly in the Papacy; for that was the religious system developed as a direct result of that great apostasy, and the Pope has certainly set himself forth as God, as has already been seen by quotations from Catholic authors. We are well aware that the Catholic Church claims to be apostolic, but it is very, very far from that. There is no resemblance between the Catholic Church as it has been known for centuries, and the apostolic church. This apostate church is the fruitage of a departure from the "commandments of God and the faith of

Jesus," the outgrowth of the post-apostolic apostasy, caused by an amalgamation between paganism and Christianity.

### **What Is the Special Significance?**

But what is the special significance of the word "mystery" on the forehead of the woman? It signifies a system that is a counterfeit of the gospel, which is called by the apostle Paul "the mystery" (Rom. 16:25), "the mystery of Christ" (Eph. 3:4), "the mystery of the gospel" (Eph. 6:19), "the mystery of godliness" (1 Tim. 3:16), and "the mystery of God." Rev. 10:7. According to these scriptures, the mystery of God is the gospel. The mystery of iniquity characterizes another religious system, a counterfeit gospel.

Now let us note the principal pillars of the gospel:

1. *God.*—The gospel begins with Him. It is sometimes called the gospel of God.

"God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16.

2. *Christ's Sacrifice.*—

"Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree." 1 Peter 2:24. "That He by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. 2:9. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9:28. "But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10:12.

3. *Christ as Head of the Church.*—

"In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins." "He is the head of the body, the church." Col. 1:14, 18.

4. *Christ's Mediatorial Work by Virtue of His Sacrifice.*—

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9:12. "Wherefore He is able to save them to the uttermost who come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 7:25. "Whatsoever ye ask in My name, that will I do." John 14:13. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. "There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. 2:5.



5. *Repentance.*—

“Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Acts 2:38.

6. *Confession of Sins.*—

“If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” 1 John 1:9.

7. *Forgiveness of sins.*—

“Bless the Lord, . . . who forgiveth all thine iniquities.” Ps. 103:2, 3.

8. *Justification.*—

“Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Rom. 5:1. “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. 4:4, 5.

9. *The Law of God.*—The gospel is a provision to take away sin. The law gives us a knowledge of sin. Rom. 3:20. Hence the law and the gospel go hand in hand.

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. “By the law is the knowledge of sin.” Rom. 3:20. “Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law.” Rom. 7:7.

10. *Baptism.*—Baptism is the door into the church, Christ’s body.

“We are all baptized into one body.” 1 Cor. 12:13. “Repent, and be baptized.” Acts 2:38. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Mark 16:16.

### Every Step Counterfeited

Now let the reader observe that every step in the work of the gospel is counterfeited by the papal system:

1. *God.*—The Pope is called God. Recall the quotations on this point already given, and it will be necessary to give only a few more. Augustinus de Ancona, known also as Augustinus Triumphus, a notable theologian of the Augustinian order, in the book, “On an Appeal From a Decision of the Pope,” says:

“Therefore the decision of the Pope and the decision of God constitute one [i. e., the same] decision, just as the opinion of the Pope

and of his disciple are the same. Since, therefore, an appeal is always taken from an inferior judge to a superior, as no one is greater than himself, so no appeal holds when made from the Pope to God, because there in one consistory of the Pope himself and of God Himself. . . . Therefore no one can appeal from the Pope to God, as no one can enter into the consistory of God without the mediation of the Pope, who is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper of the consistory of eternal life; and as no one can appeal to himself, so no one can appeal from the Pope to God, because there is one decision and one court [curia] of God and of the Pope."

And in the "Decretum of Gratian" we read:

"It is shown with sufficient clearness that by the secular power the Pope cannot in any way be bound or loosed, who it is certain was called God by the pious leader Constantine, and it is clear that God cannot be judged by man."—*Part 1, div. 96, chap. 7.*

#### An Offering Once for All

2. *Christ's Sacrifice*.—The papal system has a sacrifice of its own, the sacrifice of the mass, so-called. It has been shown by quotations from Catholic works that this is held in the teaching of Romanism as a sacrifice just as propitiatory in its nature as the sacrifice of Christ on the cross of Calvary. In spite of the fact that the Bible says that "Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. 9:28); that He "needeth not daily . . . to offer up sacrifice, . . . for this He did *once*" (Heb. 7:27); that "by *one* offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:4); that "now *once* . . . hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. 9:26); that "this man, after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God" (Heb. 10:12); and that "in that He died, He died unto sin *once*" (Rom. 6:10) (observe how the Scriptures repeat the words "*once*," "*one sacrifice*," and "*once for all*"),—in spite of all these plain scriptures the Roman Church teaches that Christ is sacrificed in the mass as truly as He was on Calvary, and that it is just as effective for the forgiveness of sins for both the living and the dead. What a blasphemous counterfeit! The abomination of it is expressed in the following striking words of another:

"Oh, what a tremendous, blasphemous, God-dishonoring lie is Rome's sacrifice of the mass! The Creator of the world, the Redeemer

of mankind, and its future Judge, contained in a few ears of wheat, manufactured into a wafer, flattened by an iron, and given existence to, divine and human, by a wretched, corruptible, and corrupting worm of the earth, called a priest of Rome! And not one Christ only, but millions; and not by one priest only, but by hundreds of thousands; and not on one day only, but every day and hour in the year; and not in one year only, but throughout centuries! If there could by any possibility be any spiritual existence in the wafer-lie, it would be that of Satan himself; for out of hell there is no greater abomination than this blasphemous pretence of lying popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, and friars, that they can create myriads of gods, yea, of the God of heaven and earth, the King of kings, the Lord of lords, by their wizard words and incantations in the spurious sacrifice of the mass."—*Rome, Antichrist, and the Papacy,* Edward Harper, pp. 76, 77.

### **A Perfect Redemption**

The Scriptural truth on this question has been expressed also in the following words:

"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 none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."—*The Thirty-first Article of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England; "Sermons, or Homilies, Appointed to be Read in the Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth,"* p. 580.

3. *Christ as Head of the Church.*—According to the Bible, Christ is the only head. We read, "I have espoused you to one husband." 2 Cor. 11: 2. Has not this been counterfeited?

"All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that He is over the church, all the same names are applied to the Pope."—Bellarmine, "*On the Authority of Councils,*" Vol. II, p. 266.

The Pope has been called, not by Protestants, but by Catholics, "The vicar of Christ," "High priest," "The head of the church," "The foundation of the building of the church," "The bridegroom of the church," etc.

### **One and Only Mediator**

4. *Christ the One and Only Mediator.*—The papal system has an endless chain of mediators. Is not the Catholic taught,

yea, required to pray to the "saints," that they may make intercession for him in heaven? He is taught to beseech the virgin Mary, and Michael the archangel, and John the Baptist, and the holy apostles Peter and Paul, that he may have absolution. And above all, he is taught that the virgin Mary is as powerful a mediator in heaven as Christ Himself.

We quote the following from "The Glories of Mary," translated from the Latin of St. Alphonsus Liguori, founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, first American edition, James B. Kirker. This translation has the imprimatur of Cardinal McCloskey in these words, "This new and improved translation of 'The Glories of Mary' having been duly examined, is hereby approved of. John, Archbishop of New York, New York, Jan. 21, 1852." The quotation follows:

"The kingdom of God consisting of justice and mercy, the Lord has divided it: He has reserved the kingdom of justice for Himself, and He has granted the kingdom of mercy to Mary, ordaining that all the mercies which are dispensed to men should pass through the hands of Mary, and should be bestowed according to her good pleasure."—*Page 27.*

"O Mary, we poor sinners know no refuge but thee. Thou art our only hope."—*Page 130.*

"Do not say that thou canst not aid me; for I know that thou art omnipotent, and dost obtain whatever thou desirest from God."—*Page 78.*

"Behold, O mother of my God, Mary, my only hope, behold at thy feet a miserable sinner who implores thy mercy. Thou art proclaimed and called by the whole church and by all the faithful, the refuge of sinners; thou art my refuge; it is thine to save me."—*Page 88.*

"Thou art the dispenser of all graces."—*Page 672.*

#### Prayer to the Virgin

In a little work, "The Purgatorian Consoler," appears the following prayer, in such high repute at Rome that the Pope offered an indulgence of three hundred days as often as the prayer is recited "with a contrite heart, before a picture or image of the Blessed Virgin: "

"Most Holy Immaculate Virgin, and my Mother Mary, to thee, . . . the queen of the world, the *advocate, the hope, the refuge of sinners,* I have recourse to-day, I who am the most miserable of all. I wor-

ship thee, O Great Queen, and I thank thee for all the graces which thou hast hitherto granted me, and especially I thank thee for having delivered me from hell, which I have so often deserved. . . . I place all my hopes in thee, and I confide my salvation to thy care. . . . And since thou art so powerful with God, do thou deliver me from all temptations, or rather obtain me strength to triumph over them until death. . . . Through thee I hope to die a good death. My Mother, by the love which thou bearest to God, I beseech thee to help me always, but especially at the last moment of my life leave me not until thou seest me safe in heaven, blessing thee and singing thy mercies for all eternity. Amen."

These are the anti-gospel mediators.

5. *Repentance*.—There is a vast difference between repentance and penance. Repentance is a godly sorrow for sin, which accepts the fact that Christ makes full atonement for sins. It believes the Scriptural statement that "Christ . . . hath once suffered for our sins." 1 Peter 3:18. Repentance leads one to accept justification wholly through faith in Christ, "without works." Rom. 4:6. On the other hand, penance calls for works of one kind or another to atone for one's own sins. Martin Luther, for example, was arduously going up Pilate's stairs on his knees in Rome to secure absolution from sins when he heard the voice of God saying, "The just shall live by faith," which started his mind in the paths of the Reformation. Repentance is of the gospel. Penance is its counterfeit.

6. *Confession of Sin*.—The gospel confessional is the throne of grace in the heavenly sanctuary, and under the gospel every individual has the privilege of coming directly to God through the one mediator, Jesus Christ, to confess his sins. Heb. 4:16; 1 John 1:9. The priestly confessional is the opposite. The words of Christ in John in regard to the remission of sins are misinterpreted and misunderstood; for not one of the apostles taught anything else than that the individual sinner should come directly to God for the forgiveness of sins. Not one of them ever hinted or ever claimed that he had been given power to forgive sins. Even Peter said to the Simon who thought he could buy the Holy Spirit with money, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and *pray God*, if perhaps the thought of

thine heart may be forgiven thee." Acts 8:22. The priestly confessional is the opposite of this.

7. *Forgiveness of Sin.*—God forgives the sinner direct through the merits of the shed blood of Christ, the offering for sin. 1 John 1:9; Ps. 103:3, 4. Priestly absolution is the counterfeit.

8. *Justification by Faith.*—The keynote of the gospel of Christ is justification, or righteousness, by faith. Rom. 5:1; Gal. 2:16; Rom. 4:4-6. The opposite of this is a system of works. Was there ever in all the world such a system of justification by works as the papal system? A volume could be offered in support of this. The Catholic is taught that good works can be stored up in the form of masses, almsdeeds, indulgences, etc., as a fund from which to draw for the relief of souls in purgatory; that works of satisfaction done by a person in this life can be deposited in the hands of the virgin Mary in behalf of souls whom it is her good pleasure to deliver from the pains of purgatory; and that if a person does this, he puts the souls delivered from purgatory by his prayers under perpetual obligation to himself. One author says:

"The Blessed Virgin and all the saints in heaven . . . will become intercessors for you before the throne of God in a most special manner. Those souls will themselves, from a sense of gratitude, take a particular interest in your welfare, both temporal and spiritual, and promote the same by their prayers to the best of their power even whilst detained in purgatory. You shall not have to pass through purgatory, or at least you will not stay there very long."—*Charity for the Souls in Purgatory,* Michael Muller, C. S. S. R., p. 181.

9. *The Law of God.*—The law of God is embraced in the work of the gospel. The law gives a knowledge of sin, and the gospel cleanses. The papal system has a law of its own. We have already seen in a previous chapter that the Papacy has attempted to change the Sabbath commandment, and boasts that this was done through its divinely bestowed power. It does not hesitate to acknowledge that it has expunged one commandment from the decalogue. Much proof of this has already been offered. In most Catholic catechisms in circulation, the second commandment, concerning the making of and bowing down to



images, is not found, and the tenth commandment is divided into two, so as to complete the ten. It will help us to see the law of ten commandments, the law of God, side by side with this other mutilated law.

### **Scriptural Baptism: Its Meaning**

10. *Baptism*.—This is another part of the gospel. Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized." Acts 2:38. Do we find this part of the gospel, the mystery of God, counterfeited in the mystery of iniquity? Yes, in sprinkling and other spurious forms of baptism, so-called. Baptism comes from the Greek word *baptizo*, meaning to dip, plunge, submerge, sink, immerse, etc. The word "sprinkle" comes from the Greek word *rantizo*, and is not used with reference to water baptism. This is generally acknowledged by scholars. In "The Lexicographer's Easy Chair" column of the *Literary Digest* of March 7, 1925, there is given the following in answer to a question on this point:

"The word 'baptize' came into English from the Old French 'baptiser,' from the Latin 'baptizo,' and ultimately from the Greek 'baptizo,' from 'bapto,' dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkling is not to be associated with it."

To speak of being baptized by sprinkling, then, is an incongruity. It would be just as sensible to speak of burying a man's body by elevating it on a pole. Immersion was the original form of baptism. It signified faith in the death and resurrection of Christ (Rom. 6:1-6), and that the person died to the old man of sin, the past life, buried the old man, and arose and put on the new man in a spiritual resurrection, to walk in a new life, the life of Christ.

And it is also the testimony of church historians that immersion was the original mode. Neander, one of the best of church historians, says:

"Baptism was originally administered by immersion, and many comparisons of St. Paul allude to this form of administration: the immersion is a symbol of death, of being buried with Christ, the coming forth from the water is a symbol of the resurrection of Christ, and both taken together represent the second birth, the death of the old man and a resurrection to a new life."—*Rose's Translation*, p. 197, edition 1843.

# The Law of God

## AS GIVEN BY JEHOVAH

### I

Thou shalt have no other gods before Me.

### II

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me, and keep My commandments.

### III

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.

### IV

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

### V

Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

### VI

Thou shalt not kill.

### VII

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

### VIII

Thou shalt not steal.

### IX

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

### X

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.

(Ex. 20: 3-17.)

## AS CHANGED BY MAN

### I

I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt not have strange gods before Me.

### II

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

### III

Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.

### IV

Honor thy father and thy mother.

### V

Thou shalt not kill.

### VI

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

### VII

Thou shalt not steal.

### VIII

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

### IX

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.

### X

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.

(Butler's Catechism, page 28.)

Conybeare and Howson, Episcopal clergymen, in "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," page 361, give similar testimony:

"It is needless to add that baptism was . . . administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism . . . has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."

And then again, commenting on Colossians 2:12, and rendered by them, "With him therefore we were buried by the baptism wherein we shared His death [when we sank beneath the waters]," they say in a footnote:

"This clause, which is here left elliptical, is fully expressed in Colossians 2:12. . . . This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."—*Page 497.*

Sprinkling and pouring, then, like the Sunday institution, are outgrowths of apostasy. They came into the church in the great falling away that developed the mystery of iniquity, and are a part of it. They properly belong with popery, the mass, penance, auricular confession, priestly absolution, justification by works, etc., which make up a counterfeit gospel.

The truth here set forth is very forcibly expressed by J. A. Wylie in "The Papacy Is the Antichrist," page 88:

"Popery has a god of its own, even him whom the canon law calls the 'Lord our God.' It has a savior of its own, the church, to wit. It has a sacrifice of its own, the mass. It has a sanctifier of its own, the sacrament. It has a justification of its own, that even of infused righteousness. It has a pardon of its own, the pardon of the confessional. And it has in the heavens an infallible, all-prevailing advocate unknown to the gospel, the mother of God. It thus represents to the world a spiritual and saving apparatus for the salvation of men; and yet it neither saves or sanctifies any one. It looks like a church; it professes to have all that a church ought to have; and yet it is not a church. It is a grand deception—the 'all deceivableness of unrighteousness.'"

#### **Who Are the Daughters?**

The Roman Church, then, is the mother of harlots. She has daughters. Who are they? This is an important question; for they constitute a part of Babylon, out of which God's people

are called in the last days. These daughters are churches, of course, which separated from the mother church; and violating the same principles, the Lord has to reckon them a part of Babylon.


Why was it necessary for the Lord to reckon the Roman Church a harlot? One reason, it will be remembered, was that she committed fornication with the kings of the earth. The woman, the church, married the state, and thus the Lord, who is the husband of the church, counted the church as having committed adultery with another husband. This, we repeat, is clearly presented under the figure of the woman (the church) seated on the beast (the state).

When did the daughters separate from the mother? Our minds are naturally led by the prophecy to Reformation times. The Reformers were undoubtedly men of God, but eventually their followers became satisfied with what light they had, and would advance no farther. The Reformers themselves antagonized each other, and their followers became Lutherans, Calvinists, and such like, until each phase of advancing truth developed a separate denomination, and the many denominations, with their many tongues, became a very fitting antitype of the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel, where Babylon first got its name. And some of these churches violated the same principle that the mother church violated, joining themselves to the state, so that one church became the state church of one country, another of another country, and so on.

The following is a very interesting comment from a Catholic catechism:

"If the Church of Rome were ever guilty of idolatry in relation to the saints, her daughter, the Church of England, stands guilty of the same, which has ten churches dedicated to Mary to one dedicated to Christ."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*, p. 16.

The scope of this book will not allow us to go farther in this line. There is very much more to this phase of Babylon, as will be seen in the next chapter.



- Our Country in Prophecy

# The Image to the Beast

"THE third angel followed them [or went with them, that is, with the two previous angels], saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Rev. 14: 9, 10.

We have seen what the beast is. What is the image to the beast? In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation two beasts are brought to view, one a composite beast, symbolical of the Papacy, as we have proved; and the other a beast having two horns like a lamb, which the prophet saw coming up out of the earth.

"I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he . . . deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. . . . And he causeth all . . . to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark." Rev. 13: 11-17.

What power is symbolized by this beast? It is in the country represented by this beast that the image to the beast is made.

There are here, as with the previous beast, certain specifications or identification marks which will serve to identify the power thus symbolized.

## Identification Marks

1. *The Time of Its Rise.*—John in holy vision has seen the composite beast come up out of the sea, has seen it make war with the saints and overcome them, has seen it take into captivity the saints of God in persecution, and slay them with the



sword, the arm of the state. He has seen that power, that is, the Papacy, which is symbolized by the composite beast, as we have noted in a previous chapter, enjoy a career of 1260 years, and then itself go into captivity, receiving a deadly wound.

All this time, in vision, John has been looking out upon the sea; and now, having seen the composite beast go into captivity, receiving the deadly wound, he turns his eyes in the opposite direction, and sees another beast just coming up out of the earth. When did the papal beast go into captivity? When did it receive the deadly wound? At the end of its supremacy, that is, in 1798, at the close of the 1260 years. This establishes the time of the rise of the other beast, for it was just coming up when the other beast was taken into captivity. It was, so to speak, an infant nation in 1798.

2. *The Place of Its Rise.*—The papal beast came up out of the sea; the other beast came up out of the earth. There is surely a meaning in this. The sea and the earth are contrasted. What is the symbolic significance of a beast which represents an earthly power, coming up out of the sea?

Water in figurative prophecy represents peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues. This is proved in the book of Revelation itself. As recorded in chapter 17, John sees in vision a woman sitting on the water (verse 1), and the angel, explaining the matter to him, said, "The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Verse 15.

Daniel in vision saw four great beasts come up out of the sea, and the angel Gabriel, in explaining the vision to him, said, "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings [kingdoms], which shall arise out of the earth." Dan. 7:17. And the winds were striving upon the great sea. Verse 2. Since waters represent peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues, the wind would fitly represent political commotion and strife, stirring the peoples.

So in the seventh chapter of Revelation, the four angels are commissioned to hold the winds until God's people are sealed in their foreheads. Rev. 7:1-3. Hence a beast coming up out of the sea represents an earthly power arising in that

part of the earth peopled by multitudes, nations, and tongues. Nations that arose, for example, are symbolized by beasts coming up out of the sea. Therefore the prophecy obliges us to look away from the Old World, the Eastern Hemisphere, to find the place where the two-horned beast was to arise. It would arise in a place where there were not peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues.

3. *The Manner of Its Coming Up.*—It comes up quietly, as a plant grows out of the earth, silently, unobtrusively. It does not come up as did the four beasts of Daniel's vision (Daniel 7), out of a turbulent sea. It does not come up by overthrowing other powers.

4. *The Character of the Power.*—On the heads of the dragon of Revelation 12 there were crowns; on the horns of the beast of Revelation 13 there are crowns; but there are no crowns on this other beast, either on the head or on the horns. What do crowns signify? Monarchy, of course. Then the beast in question does not represent a monarchical form of government, but the opposite, a republican form.

5. *The Beast Is Lamblike.*—This beast, when it first appears, that is, in the early part of its history, is lamblike. It has two horns like a lamb. It manifests the spirit of the lamb in contrast with the previous beast, the papal beast, which manifested the spirit of the dragon. The spirit of the dragon is the satanic spirit. This spirit was manifested by the composite beast in the awful persecutions of the Dark Ages. But what was the cause of the persecutions? It was the natural fruitage of a church-state union. The following from the "Catholic Encyclopedia" is clear on this point:

"The principal teachers of the church held back for centuries from accepting in these matters the practice of the civil rulers; they shrank particularly from such stern measures against heresy as torture and capital punishment, both of which they deemed *inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity*. But in the Middle Ages, the Catholic faith became alone dominant, and the welfare of the commonwealth came to be closely bound up with the cause of religious unity. King Peter of Aragon, therefore, but voiced the universal conviction when he said: 'The enemies of the cross of Christ and violators of the Christian law are likewise our enemies and the enemies of our kingdom, and ought

therefore to be dealt with as such."—*Volume VIII, art. "Inquisition," page 35.*

### **The Church Uses the Civil Power**

The church had the use of the civil arm of the state to correct and exterminate heretics. This is suggested in the figure of the woman sitting on the beast in Revelation 17; and the result was, the woman was drunk with the blood of the martyrs. So the dragon spirit was manifested through and because of a union of church and state. Now since this other beast manifests the spirit of the lamb, what are we justified in concluding further as to the character of the power symbolized by this beast? This, plainly, that it represents a government wherein at its beginning there is no union of church and state, and therefore no persecution.

This is also evident from the fact that it is said in the prophecy that in the nation symbolized by the two-horned beast, there is "made" an image to the beast. What is the beast? It is the Papacy, as has been proved. But what was the Papacy during the 1260 years of the prophecy? A union of church and state, with the church supreme and using the power of the state for her despotic and persecuting purposes. What, then, simply speaking, is an image to the beast? It is a union of church and state, or of religion and the state.

Observe again, that the image of the beast must be "made;" for it was said to them that dwell on the earth that they should "make" an image to the beast. And where only could such an image be made save in a country where at first there was no such thing? This proves that the beast represents a nation wherein, at the beginning, at least, church and state are separated.

Summing up this evidence, then, the two-horned beast symbolizes a nation, first, that was just coming up in 1798 when the papal beast received its deadly wound; second, a nation that was coming up at that time, not in the Old World among the peoples, nations, and tongues, but in a part of the earth vacant and unoccupied by the nations, peoples, and tongues; third, a nation that at that time and in the New World was coming up quietly and peaceably; fourth, a nation that was not monarchical

in form; and fifth, a nation wherein there is no union of church and state, no religious persecution. What nation fulfilled the specifications of this prophecy? One and one only — the United States of America.

### Does It Point to Our Country?

We shall now see whether our country does indeed fulfill the prophecy:

1. *The Time.*—Our country, as a nation, could not, of course, be reckoned as a nation, but only as a confederation of States, till its Constitution was ratified or adopted, and that was in 1789. Hence in 1798 it is described as coming up, or taking its place among the nations.

2. *The Place.*—It arose in that part of the world that could be fittingly symbolized by the earth, since powers arising in the Old World are represented as coming out of the sea. Its territory was not occupied by people, multitudes, nations, and tongues.

3. *The Manner of Its Coming Up.*—This is worthy of special notice. A few words from history will emphasize the point. G. A. Townsend, in "The New World Compared With the Old," page 462, says:

"Since America was discovered, she has been a subject of revolutionary thought in Europe. The *mystery of her coming forth from vacancy*, the marvel of her wealth in gold and silver," etc.

On page 635 he says:

"In this web of islands, the West Indies, began the life of both [North and South] Americas. There Columbus saw land; there Spain began her baneful and brilliant Western empire; thence Cortez departed for Mexico, De Soto for the Mississippi, Balboa for the Pacific, and Pizarro for Peru. The history of the United States was separated by a beneficent Providence far from this wild and cruel history of the rest of the continent, and *like a silent seed we grew into empire.*"

About 1850 a writer in the *Dublin Nation* said:

"In the West an opposing and still more wonderful American empire is emerging. We islanders have no conception of the extraordinary events which, *amid the silence of the earth*, are daily adding to the power and pride of this gigantic nation."

The expressions, "the mystery of her coming forth from vacancy," emerging "amid the silence of the earth," and "like a silent seed" growing into an empire, are certainly in line with the prophecy of the rise of the United States of America.

### **A Non-Monarchical Government**

The fourth and fifth may well be combined. Certainly this country has fulfilled the specification here mentioned. The prophecy calls for a non-monarchical form of government, and this country answers. And more, it calls for a government wherein there is no union of church and state, and of course every one knows that the separation of church and state is one of the fundamental principles of our government.

This leads us to ascertain what can be represented by the two lamblike horns. Horns might be taken to represent power or the source of power. Is it not significant that at the very foundation of our government there are two lamblike principles, civil and religious liberty, and these two principles have been the source of this country's greatness; and because of them, our country's influence has extended to all the world? The first one we find enunciated in the preamble of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

And the second (not second in importance, but second in being incorporated into the fundamental law of the land) is found in the First Amendment to the Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Now these are indeed lamblike principles; for they were enunciated by Christ when He was on earth, in the memorable words, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:21. This government was the first in the history of the world to adopt this principle fully.

# The Beast in the Making

THE image to the beast, then, will be made in this country. What will constitute the image to the beast? What steps will be taken in its making? These questions can best be answered by considering the questions, What constituted the beast? and what steps were taken in the making of the beast? for an image is a likeness, and it is reasonable to infer that the steps taken in the making of the beast will be taken in the making of the image.

Speaking simply, the beast was a union of church and state, but that was the climax of the growth of centuries, the foundation being laid largely in the time of Constantine. Draper, in his "Intellectual Development of Europe," says:

"To the reign of Constantine the Great must be referred the commencement of those dark and dismal times which oppressed Europe for a thousand years. It is the true close of the Roman Empire, the beginning of the Greek. The transition from one to the other is emphatically and abruptly marked by a new metropolis, a new religion, a new code, and, above all, a new policy. An ambitious man had attained to imperial power by personating the interests of a rapidly growing party. The unavoidable consequences were a union between the church and state; a diverting of the dangerous classes from civil to ecclesiastical paths, and the decay and materialization of religion." — *Chap. 9, par. 24 (Vol. I, p. 278).*

## Steps in Apostasy

What were the steps?

The first step was a falling away, an apostasy from the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The reasons for the falling away have been given in previous chapters. In the days of the apostles the church was in its purity, and baptized by the Holy Ghost, it went forth conquering and to conquer. But the church apostatized, lost this power of the Spirit, and as is usually the case, reached out for the power of the state.

The second step was taken when there arose in the church a desire for a theocratic government. Neander, speaking of Constantine's time, says:

"There had in fact arisen in the church a false theocratical theory, . . . originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which . . . brought along with it an un-Christian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which easily resulted in the formation of a sacerdotal state, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way. This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent upon him by their disputes and by their determination to make use of the power of the state for the furtherance of their aims."—*Vol. II, sec. 2, part 1, pars. 2, 3.*

### **Theocracy Defined**

A true theocracy is a government of God. The government of Israel, for example, was a true theocracy. By mighty signs and wonders God led Israel out of Egyptian bondage, and at Sinai entered into a covenant relationship with them. He became their Ruler, and ruled by giving His own law and revealing His will in divers manners by the prophets until Samuel the prophet. In the days of Samuel, Israel desired a king, and while in spirit they rejected God as their King, He still acknowledged His people and guided the nation. And when, because of sin, the kingdom could no longer exist, God sent His message to the last king, saying,

"Thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, . . . thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same. . . . I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is; and I will give it Him." Eze. 21: 25-27.

When this prophecy was uttered, Israel was subject to Babylon. Medo-Persia succeeded Babylon, and the kingdom was overturned the first time. Then Greece succeeded Medo-Persia, and it was overturned the second time. Then came Rome after Greece, and it was overturned the third time, and under Roman rule the kingdom of Israel was destroyed.

In the words, "It shall be no more, until He come whose right it is; and I will give it Him," Christ is doubtless the person



referred to. This does not refer to His first coming; for when He was here the first time, He said, "My kingdom is not of this world;" and when some thought to take Him by force and make Him King, He withdrew to the mountain alone. He said to His disciples,

"When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory." Matt. 25:31.

This kingdom of His is not to be in this present evil world. It will be established fully after sin and sinners are destroyed, when the nations become like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, and the winds of God's judgments carry them away, so that there will be no place for them. Dan. 2:34, 35.

In passing let us say that no one should take this prophecy as holding out the hope of Christ's reigning over the literal Jews or sitting on the literal throne of David in old Jerusalem, which is in bondage with her children. Gal. 4:25, 26. This is not the teaching of the New Testament. The Gentile who becomes a Christian, being circumcised in heart, becomes a subject of that kingdom; for he is an Israelite indeed, and an heir according to the promise. Gal. 3:29; Acts 15:13-17.

#### **Christ's Kingdom Not of This World**

It is evident from these scriptures that Christ's kingdom is not of this world. Therefore in this present evil world a true theocracy can never exist, and it follows that every theocracy, from Christ's day till His second coming, has been a false theocracy. In a theocracy, the church and the state are blended in one administration. The church is supreme, and the state is subordinate. In a false theocracy, men set themselves up as the representatives of God, and claim that God rules through them. They make laws, and call them the laws of God, and also place their own interpretation upon God's laws, and demand that the state enforce them as the laws of God. They take Christ by force, so to speak, and make Him King, and persecution is always the result, as seen, for example, in the history of the Papacy and in America in colonial days. Such is the fruitage of a false theocracy.

The bishops of Rome contended in Constantine's time that the ideal government was a theocracy, and that as the Roman Church was the only true church, she ought to be the supreme ruler in both ecclesiastical and civil matters, and if such a union could be brought about, it would usher in the kingdom of God.

#### **A False Theocracy Set Up**

The bishops were sure that their time was the antitype of the times of Moses, when the true theocracy of Israel was formed. The Roman Church was the antitypical Israel, and Constantine was the second Moses, who delivered them from persecution and bondage, while Maxentius was the antitypical Pharaoh. When Constantine marched against Maxentius, it was the new Moses marching to deliver Israel, the church. The army of Maxentius was defeated and many drowned in the river, and that was the Red Sea swallowing up the hosts of Pharaoh. When Maxentius was crowded off the Milvian bridge and was drowned, that was "the horse and his rider" being thrown into the sea. Ex. 15:21.

After the passage of the Red Sea, we read that Moses pitched a tabernacle outside of the camp of Israel, where he went to talk to the Lord, and where he received instruction from God as to His will concerning Israel. Exodus 33. Constantine, to play his part, likewise erected a tent outside his camp, and there he would repair and pretend to have communications from the Lord. It is said that Constantine's mother went to Jerusalem and secured the nails of the cross of the Saviour, and sent them to Constantine with the instruction that some of them be made into bits for the bridles of his war horses. Then the bishops were sure that the kingdom of God had been established; for did not Bible prophecy say, "In that day shall there be upon the bridles [margin] of the horses HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD"? Zech. 14:20. Then when Constantine died and his empire was divided between his three sons, this was "the saints of the Most High" taking the kingdom. Dan. 7:18, 22.

The third step taken in the making of the beast was an imperial decision as to what constituted the true religion of the Roman Empire. Constantine's predecessors were persecutors

of the church, and under the decree of Diocletian, the church property of the Christians had been confiscated by the state. In 313 A. D. Constantine and Licinius issued the Edict of Milan, which granted liberty of worship to all sects of Christians, and it also said that the confiscated church property should be restored "to the whole body of the Christians."

This did not suit the Catholic Church, for they thought they were the only Christians, and immediately a contention was raised as to who were meant in the decree of Milan. Christendom was divided between Catholics and Arians, and the Catholics reckoned the Arians as heretics, and contended that they had no right to the restoration granted by the edict. To settle this controversy, Constantine issued an edict in which he said that the church property should be restored to the "Catholic Church of the Christians." This was an imperial decision, making the Catholic religion the legal religion of the Roman Empire, and a very great step in the making of the beast.

The fourth step was the enforcement of a new Sabbath day. It has been previously shown that the bishops were working to establish a theocracy, antitypical, as they thought, of the theocracy of Israel. It will be remembered that God commanded Israel at Sinai to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. This antitypical theocracy demanded an antitypical Sabbath. The very first Sunday law ever enacted was that of Constantine in A. D. 321, and this was a part of the church-state régime of that day. Sunday enforcement is always a prominent part of any theocratic government, because a Sunday law is a religious law, and a religious law enforced by the civil arm is plainly a violation of the principle of separation of church and state.

#### **The Growth of Sunday Laws**

That first Sunday law which forbade certain classes of city artisans from doing work on Sunday, but allowed all country people to continue their work as formerly, was only an entering wedge. It was soon seen that it was inadequate to the wants of the bishops. At a convention held at Carthage, they resolved to petition the emperor "that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast days to some

other days of the week."—*Neander's "Church History," Vol. III, p. 405.* And the reason they gave for asking this favor was, "The theater was vastly more frequented than the church."—*Id.* Many preferred to witness the exciting scenes of the public playhouses rather than attend church and listen to the dry discourses of the preachers. Hence a law was demanded to make people attend church instead of the circus. Neander says:

"Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."—*Id., Vol. III, p. 404.*

Church members did not have Christianity enough to keep them away from public shows when they ought to have been at church, so the state was asked to take away the opportunity to do wrong, in order that they might be Christians.

"Church teachers . . . were, in truth, often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church."—*Ibid.*

Hence one step after another was taken in Sunday legislation, and the historian Neander significantly says, "*In this way the church received help from the state for the furtherance of her ends.*"—*Id., p. 405.*

\*Observe that it was "in this way" that the church got hold of the state. So the Sunday sabbath was indeed the mark of that church-state union which in the prophecy of Revelation 13 is symbolized by the beast.

The fifth step was the complete union of church and state, the church presiding over the state, using it for the furtherance of her aims; and when the combination was given life, it resulted in the persecution of the Dark Ages. Such was the beast complete.

# The Making of the Image Beast

WE have already proved that the two-horned beast which makes an image to the papal beast is the United States of America, dominated by a church or by a combination of churches. Now by the law of analogy it is reasonable to conclude that the steps which were taken in the making of the beast will be taken, to some extent at least, in the making of the image to the beast; for the meaning of the word "image," as here used, is "likeness."

It can be said with certainty that already some of the steps have been taken, and the process is developing which will eventually culminate in the full-fledged image. After that it will be given life, which means persecution to conscientious dissenters, as it did in the Dark Ages.

First, there is a falling away spiritually on the part of the churches. History is repeating itself. Modern Babylon, the Babylon of the book of Revelation, is comprised of churches, symbolized by the mother and her daughters in Revelation 17. In the last days, that is in our day, the message is due, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, . . . come out of her, My people." Rev. 18:1-4.

Second, as in the making of the beast, there has arisen in the churches of this country a desire for a theocracy, a government in which religion and the state will be united, and one in which religious laws will have a legal basis and be enforced upon the people. The beast of Revelation 13:11-17, which we have seen to be symbolical of America, had two horns like a lamb, but finally spoke as a dragon. This foretells apostasy from the principles of civil and religious liberty which have really made the nation great.

Our forefathers, the founders of the nation, the men who gave us our Constitution, had seen the evils of theocratic governments in the persecution of the so-called heretics in medieval

times, and closer to them still, in the persecution of the Quakers and Baptists in colonial days. They were determined that this history should not be repeated. George Washington said:

"Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen, is accountable to God alone for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."—*Reply to Baptists of Virginia, 1789.*

Thomas Jefferson said:

"Almighty God hath created the mind free; all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as was in His almighty power to do."—*Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, 1785.*

James Madison said:

"Religion is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from civil government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both."—*Letter to Edward Everett, 1823.*

And U. S. Grant said:

"Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution. Keep church and state forever separate."—*Speech at Des Moines, Iowa, 1875.*

### **Principles of Our Government**

These were the principles of government advocated and taught by the founders of this great nation, and these principles were incorporated into the fundamental law of the land. This was very clearly and forcefully expressed by the late Dr. Minot J. Savage, of New York City:

"When the thirteen colonies achieved their independence and the United States were formed, this government—the first great instance in history—planted itself purely on secular ground. The United States as a nation is not a religious nation, it is not a Christian nation, it is not a Catholic nation, it is not a Protestant nation; it is a secular nation. With clear eye and deliberate purpose it refused to have anything to do with the establishment of anybody's religion. It took the ground that its business was to look after the affairs of this world."—*Public Opinion, July 13, 1889.*

But secular government was not pleasing to some who were of a theocratic mind. They called this an infidel nation, because God, and Christ, and the Bible, and the Christian religion were not recognized in the Constitution, and this idea remained in the minds of some churchmen, and was handed down, so to speak, and was imbibed by others.

In the year 1863 was organized the National Reform Association. The nation was infidel, un-Christian, and it must be reformed; and this association was going to endeavor to do it by having the Constitution recognize God, and Christ as King. They were going to take Him "by force and make Him King." The purpose of that association, which now in 1927 has many allies, is expressed in Article II of the National Reform Constitution:

"To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniably legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

It may be a source of wonder to the reader that these clergymen (for clergymen they are) cannot see that if their program were carried out, the First Amendment of our national Constitution, which forbids to our government the making of laws respecting religion, would be nullified, that the Christian religion would be the legal religion of our country, and that the nation would be obliged to force that religion and its laws upon all its citizens; in fact, that in this country there would be in principle a union of church and state. They do see it, and it is exactly what they desire. In giving reasons for desiring this amendment, Mr. M. A. Gault, then one of the district secretaries, said:

"We need it to correct our most unfortunate attitude under the First Amendment, which restrains Congress from prohibiting the free exercise of any false religion."

And then he named certain religions which he regarded as false.

It must be plain to any one that if their program were carried out, religious liberty would be dead in this country. It



has been one of the fundamental principles of our government that it is not the business of the state to determine what is true and false in religion, and so all have the liberty to choose any religion or no religion, and the state has no concern so long as they conduct themselves as good citizens; but if these principles of the National Reform Association were adopted, the principles which have made this nation great in the eyes of all the world would be surrendered. The national government would have to decide what is true religion and what is false, and it would then have its national creed, and of necessity that creed would have to be enforced upon the people. The result would be a going back, not only to colonial days, but to the Dark Ages.

#### **National Reform Aims**

This is not overdrawn. From the *Christian Statesman* of Jan. 13, 1887, the organ of the National Reform Association, we quote the following:

“Our remedy for all these malific influences is to have the government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God’s authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it.”

Was the Papacy ever more than this? Now if this principle were adopted, our national Congress would be obliged to interpret God’s law, and then the State’s hand would be laid upon any religion that would not line up with that interpretation. And this is exactly what is desired by the National Reformers and their allies. This is shown by the following statement made in New York City, by a professional National Reformer:

“Congress should be the interpreter of God’s law in the same sense that Congress interprets the Constitution. Nor would this result in a state church. What we desire is the union of religion and the state.”

Then in noting the objection “that Congress could not interpret the law of God so as to please members of all denominations,” he answered that “it would come a little hard at first, but in the end it would work satisfactorily.”

Suppose these principles were carried out in this government, would we not have here an image to the beast? Most assuredly. But let us go farther. In a National Reform Con-

vention in Pittsburgh in 1874, Prof. C. A. Blanchard enunciated the fundamental principle of the National Reform Association in these very plain words:

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion.”

Was the Papacy in its palmiest days ever more than this in principle? It never was. Those are the principles of the beast. Such a government would be a theocracy. They desire a theocratic government, as did the bishops of Rome in Constantine's day, when the beast was formed.

### **A Theocracy Desired**

A theocracy is exactly what is desired. In a speech made by Jonathan Edwards, D. D., in a National Reform Convention, held in New York City in February, 1873, he said:

“We want state and religion; and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of the State require religion, it shall be religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. We use the word ‘religion’ in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.”

In the year 1885, the W. C. T. U., though doing most excellent work along the lines of temperance, became a supporter of the principles of the National Reform Association. In a Monthly Reading of 1886 we find this expression with reference to this matter:

“A true theocracy is yet to come, and the enthronement of Christ in law and lawmakers.”

The second step in the making of the beast was the effort for a theocracy, and this is the second step in the making of the image, and the step has been taken. Let the reader remember that the end of this step has not yet come; but there are a number of organizations which are allied with the National Reform Association, and they have at this present time their religious-political lobbies under the eaves of our national capitol, and are leaving absolutely no stone unturned in the effort to engraft their principles on our government.

**A Christian Nation**

The third step in the making of the beast was an imperial decision making the Catholic religion the religion of the Roman Empire. This step has been taken in the making of the image beast. The National Reform Association started out to make this a Christian nation, in a legal sense of the term. Fundamentally this nation has not been a Christian nation. It has been a secular nation. This is expressed in Article II of the treaty our country made with Tripoli in 1797:

“As the government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Mussulmans,” etc.

Also the supreme law of the land said that “no religious test” should “ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;” and that Congress should “make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

But this principle was utterly subverted in a decision of the Supreme Court in 1892, in the case of the Trinity church of New York City against the United States of America. This church had secured a rector from Europe. This was held to be a violation of the Alien Contract Labor law. The New York State Court of Appeals decided against the church. It was appealed to the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court rendered a decision in favor of the church, reversing the Court of Appeals of New York. In that decision the Supreme Court declared it to be the “meaning” of the Constitution of the United States that it is “the voice of the entire people” of the nation, speaking in “organic utterances” that “this is a religious people,” that “*this is a Christian nation,*” and that “the establishment of the Christian religion” was “one of the purposes” of those who framed the Constitution and made the nation.

This decision pleased the National Reformers; for it was in perfect line with the program of a Christian theocratic government. Just before Thanksgiving Day of that year, 1892, the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the National Reform Association, printed the following article:

“CHRISTIAN POLITICS

“THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

“THE GREATEST OCCASION FOR THANKSGIVING

“‘This is a Christian nation.’ That means Christian government, Christian laws, Christian institutions, Christian practices, Christian citizenship. And this is not an outburst of popular passion and prejudice. Christ did not lay His guiding hand there, but upon the calm, dispassionate, supreme judicial tribunal of our government. It is the weightiest, the noblest, the most tremendously far-reaching in its consequences of all the utterances of that sovereign tribunal. And that utterance is for Christianity, for Christ. ‘A Christian nation!’ Then this is Christ’s nation; for nothing can be Christian that does not belong to Him. Then His word is its sovereign law. Then the nation is Christ’s servant. Then it ought to, and must, confess, love, and obey Christ. All that the National Reform Association seeks, all that this department of Christian politics works for, is to be found in the development of that royal truth. ‘This is a Christian nation.’ It is the hand of the second of our three great departments of national government throwing open a door of our national house, one that leads straight to the throne of Christ.”

This shows that the National Reformers recognized in this decision a national judicial sanction for all they had ever asked in the way of religious legislation. They recognized that in principle all they desired to obtain in an amendment to the national Constitution was wrapped up in this decision, and unto this hour it is being used in all their religio-political propaganda.

**Pleased the Catholics**

This decision also pleased the Catholic Church; for it was in perfect accord with the essential principles of the Papacy. It pleased the Papacy because the Constitution was interpreted after the Catholic principle of government and rejection of the Protestant principle. Prior to this, the Catholic Church looked upon this government as no government at all, and predicted its entire failure if the Constitution was forever interpreted after the principle of separation of church and state.

In the *Catholic World*, the representative Catholic review of this country, for the month of September, 1871, page 736, was printed a leading article, in which the Constitution of the United States was referred to in the following words:

"As it is interpreted by the liberal and sectarian journals that are doing their best to revolutionize it, and is beginning to be interpreted by no small part of the American people, or is interpreted by the Protestant principle, so widely diffused among us, . . . we do not accept it, or hold it to be any government at all, or as capable of performing any of the proper functions of government; and if it continues to be interpreted by the revolutionary principle of Protestantism, it is sure to fail. . . . Hence it is we so often say, that if the American Republic is to be sustained and preserved at all, it must be by the rejection of the principle of the Reformation, and the acceptance of the Catholic principle by the American people."

But when the Constitution was interpreted by the Catholic principle, as it was in the Supreme Court decision of 1892, a change in attitude of the Catholic Church was plainly observed. In a very short time after that decision, written by Justice Brewer, a letter from the Vatican, announcing the plans of Leo XIII respecting the United States, said:

"What the church has done in the past for others, she will *now* do for the United States."

#### **An Apostolic Delegate**

Very shortly after this announcement from the Vatican, an apostolic delegate was sent from the Vatican and established at the capital of the United States. Within a year, at the World's Catholic Congress (Sept. 5, 1893), Chicago, this same apostolic delegate — Satolli — delivered to the Catholics of America the following message from Leo XIII:

"In the name of Leo XIII, I salute the great American Republic, and I call upon the Catholics of America to go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth, and in the other the Constitution of the United States. . . . Bring your fellow countrymen, *bring your country*, into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness — Christ and His church. Here you have a country which will repay all efforts, not merely tenfold, but aye! a hundredfold. And this no one understands better than the immortal Leo. *And he charges* me his delegate, to speak out to America words of hope and blessing, words of joy. Go forward! in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth,— the Bible,— and in the other the Constitution of the United States."

In a little over a month after this (Oct. 18, 1893), at the jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons, celebrated in Baltimore, Archbishop Ireland exclaimed:

"I preach the new, the most glorious crusade—church and age! Unite them in hand and heart, in the name of humanity, in the name of God. Church and age! . . . Rome is the church; America is the age."

Within less than a year after this (Sept. 21, 1894), Bishop Keene, on his return from Rome, announced:

"The policy of the Pope, in view of the late overtures in Italy, is the union of the church with the great democratic powers of the future—that is, America and France. This is his hope, and toward it all his remarkable energies are bent."

### The United States a Catholic Nation

Three days later (September 24) the newspaper dispatches stated that Bishop Keene was "the bearer of a rescript from Pope Leo XIII," of which the following was the import:

"The papal rescript elevates the United States to the *first rank as a Catholic nation*. Heretofore this country has stood before the church as a missionary country. It had no more recognition officially at Rome than had China. By the new rescript the country is freed from the propaganda, and is declared to be a *Catholic country*. The importance, not only to Catholics, but to all citizens of the United States, of this *radical change* in the relations to Rome of the church in America, can scarcely be overestimated."

The third step has therefore been taken in the making of the image to the beast.

The fourth step in the making of the beast was the enactment of the first Sunday law, that of Constantine in A. D. 321. The fourth step in the making of the image will be the enactment of a national Sunday law by our country. This step has not been fully taken, but Bible prophecy informs us that it will be. The enactment of a national Sunday law is the ambition of the National Reform Association and of all its allies, and toward it they have been working hard and faithfully for many years, endeavoring to get our national Congress committed to the principle of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws, introducing in these many years hundreds of Sunday bills, all of which to date have been defeated.

### No Real Sunday Law Yet Passed

Our national government has never passed a real Sunday law. The nearest that it has come to it was in passing, in the

year 1892, a proviso in the \$5,000,000 appropriation bill to the World's Fair in Chicago, that the gates of the fair should not be opened to the public on Sunday. This was secured by the National Reform Association, backed by nearly all the churches of America. They flooded Congress with their petitions, threatening political boycott to any Senator or Representative who would not vote for it. Their petitions were sent in by the wholesale. They were not made up of individual signatures, but the membership of whole churches and societies was sent in and sometimes duplicated; and because of this method, one Congressman was constrained to say, "Figures won't lie, but liars will figure."

In this affair the state became a servant of the church, and the National Reformers were well pleased. They felt their power. In a sermon preached shortly after this, at Pittsburgh, Pa., the minister said:

"That the church has weight with great political or governing bodies has been demonstrated most effectually in the late World's Fair matter, when the United States Senate, the highest body in the country, *listened to the voice of religion*, and passed the World's Fair \$5,000,000 appropriation bill, *with the church-instituted proviso* that the gates of the great exposition should not be opened upon Sunday. . . . The church is gaining power continually, and *its voice will be heard in the future much oftener than in the past.*"

And another said:

"I have learned that we hold the United States Senate in our hands."

Now it will be remembered by the reader that it was "*in this way*" that the Roman Church in Constantine's day got hold of the power of the state for the furtherance of her aims, and the result was a union of church and state, symbolized by the first beast of Revelation 13. And again it will be largely "*in this way*," that is, in the securing of the enactment of Sunday laws, that the church will get hold of the power of the state, which will result in the making of the image to the beast.

#### **Would Mean Persecution**

The fifth step is a union of religion and the state and persecution of dissenters. The National Reformers acknowledge



that if their program eventually succeeds, it will mean persecution for conscientious dissenters, and so it will, surely. A prominent National Reformer once said:

"Now, we are warned that to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh Day Baptists who would be sufferers under it."

Then putting all the above in the class with atheists, he said:

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic; for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. . . . I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man."—*Proceedings of the National Reform Convention, 1873, p. 60.*

Hence it is plain that religious liberty would be no more, and our land would become, not a haven for the oppressed, but a land of the oppressor.

But how contrary is all this to the fundamental principles of our government! The principle of civil government as adopted in the early days of our nation is expressed very clearly in the following paragraph, and it would be well if we would treasure it in our minds and hearts:

"Those who drew the plan of our national government, built the system upon the principle that religion and civil government were to be kept entirely distinct; and for the most part, the State governments are constructed upon the same theory. The general character of both is that they neither affirm nor deny any doctrine in respect to God, and they command no duty as a religious duty. They deal with the temporal rights and obligations of citizenship, without any reference to the question whether the citizen is a religionist or not. His religious faith is no part of his citizenship, and no criterion of his rights. It confers upon him no immunities, and imposes no disabilities. It is a matter between himself and his God, and with it the civil authority does not concern itself. He is not forbidden to be an atheist and he is not commanded to be a Christian. He forfeits no rights by being one, and gains none by being the other; and as between these two extremes of opinion, the state does not undertake to decide which is the true and which is the false opinion. Such is the great American principle in respect to the sphere of civil government."—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

And now it certainly will require no mental labor for any one to see that if the program of these reformers succeeds,

there will be a repudiation of the principles which have made this the greatest of all nations. There are many good Christian people who are in the dark in these matters. They seem to take it for granted that whatever the churches inaugurate is all right; but we ought not to forget that it was great churchmen and a great church who made the beast and were responsible for all the persecution of the Dark Ages; and churches and churchmen will be the leaders in the making of the image to the beast. There are many who do not see the evil principle in the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws. This will be considered in another chapter.



C. E. A. Dumaresq, Artist

Signing the Declaration of Independence

# The Mark of the Beast

THERE is a message of warning for the last days against these very things, the evils of which we have been trying to set before the reader. In Revelation 14:9, 10, we read this solemn and important warning:

“The third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation.”

That this is a warning message for the times in which we live is evident from the following considerations:

First, the wine of God's wrath that will be poured out upon the rejecters of this message is the seven last plagues; for in Revelation 15:2 we read:

“I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up *the wrath of God.*”

Now they are not simply seven plagues, but the seven *last* plagues, hence they are the last judgments that are to be poured out upon this sin-cursed earth. They are therefore poured out just before the end — just before the second coming of Christ. Rev. 16:17-21. It is evident, then, that this message of warning goes to the world just before the end of time.

Again, John in holy vision saw going to all the world the three angels' messages of Revelation 14:6-14, and when they had gone and done their work of gathering out a people keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus (Rev. 14:12), he saw Christ come; for he says:

“I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on His head a golden crown, and in His hand a sharp sickle.” Verse 14.

Hence these messages go to all the world in the last days, and their work culminates in the coming of the Lord, when He comes to reap the harvest of the earth.

Here is a warning against the worship of the beast and the image beast, and the reception of the mark of the beast in the forehead or in the hand. It is plain that the mark of the beast is a distinguishing feature of the worship of the beast and his image. We have seen in a measure what is the beast and what will constitute the image beast. What is the mark of the beast?

#### **The Mark of the Beast and the Seal of God**

In the prophecies of the book of Revelation there is contrasted with the mark of the beast, the seal of God to be received in the foreheads of God's people. The question as to what is the mark of the beast can be best answered by ascertaining what the seal of God is; for whatever the seal of God is, the mark of the beast is its counterfeit. The seal of God is the genuine, the mark of the beast is the false.

There is in Revelation 7 a prophecy which is a parallel to the prophecy of the three messages of Revelation 14, which messages warn against the reception of the mark of the beast in the forehead or in the hand. The prophet John says:

"I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree. And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, *till we have sealed the servants of God in their foreheads.*"  
Rev. 7: 1-3.

That the sealing work here mentioned is a work for the last days, is evident from the following considerations:

First, this sealing work is mentioned in connection with the prophecy of the seven seals. It is a work that is done immediately before the opening of the seventh seal; for the first verse of Revelation 8 (the sealing is in Revelation 7) says, "When he had opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour." The seven seals is a line of prophecy covering the time from the first advent of Christ to the second. What could cause silence in heaven? Who makes sound in heaven? The angels, in singing praises

to God and resting not day nor night. Now our Saviour, in speaking of His second coming, said, "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and *all the holy angels with Him,*" etc. (Matt. 25: 31), then there will be silence in heaven. So, then, this sealing work is a work done in the earth just before the second coming of Christ.

#### Time of the Sealing

Again, the time of this sealing work is made evident from the holding of the four winds. These are not literal winds, of course. In symbolic prophecy, as we have seen, water is used to represent multitudes, peoples, nations, and tongues (see Rev. 17: 15), and therefore winds denote political commotion and strife among the nations and peoples and tongues. The four winds cover the entire earth, so that if they were let loose, there would be universal war and confusion. There will be such a war, and it will be in progress when Christ comes. Rev. 16: 12-20. It is the battle of Armageddon. Oftentimes the Great War of 1914-18 is spoken of as Armageddon, but it was not the Armageddon of Bible prophecy. That is yet future.

John saw an angel come from the east, and that angel commanded the four angels to hold the four winds till the sealing work was done. When it is done, the angels will let the winds loose, and the result will be Armageddon; but since Armageddon will be in progress when the end comes, it is plainly evident that this sealing work is a special work for the last days before the coming of the Lord. It is exactly synchronous with the third angel's message. That message which warns against the reception of the mark of the beast in the forehead or in the hand, carries with it the seal of God to be received in the foreheads of those who will accept the three angels' messages, those who will come back to the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. It is therefore a last-day work.

What, then, is the seal of God?

First, what is a seal? The Greek word used here is defined as "mark," "sign," etc.

Second, how is a seal used? It is used to render valid or authentic any proclamation, document, charter, or the like, that

any power, person, or authority may wish to make or promulgate. It is the mark of authority.

Third, the idea that a seal and authority are inseparable. It will be remembered that in Esther's time Haman led King Ahasueras to issue a decree that at a certain time all the Jews in his kingdom should be put to death. In Esther 3:12 we read, "In the name of King Ahasuerus was it written and *sealed* with the king's ring." The seal gave the writing its authority. Again, in the days of Ahab, Jezebel desired to get rid of Naboth, that Ahab might have his vineyard, and the scripture says, "So she wrote letters in Ahab's name, and *sealed* them with his seal." 1 Kings 21:8. Again the seal was the mark of authority.

#### **The Seal and the Law**

Fourth, the seal of God must be connected with His law, and with that part of the law which contains the mark, or sign, of the authority of God. God's law does have such a seal. In Isaiah 8:16 we read, "Seal the law among My disciples." The inference in the prophecy is that God's seal, that which shows His right to rule, has been in some way taken out of the divine law, and now God asks His disciples to put the seal back into the law. And if the reader will take the pains to read this entire prophecy of Isaiah 8, he will find that it applies to the last days, when the true disciples are looking for the Lord to come.

Fifth, what is God's authority? What right has He to command us and punish us for disobedience? Because He is the Creator, and we are His creatures. So His authority rests upon the fact that He is the Creator. This will be denied by no one.

Sixth, in the beginning, when God had created all things, what did He sanctify, or set apart, as a memorial, or sign, of all His wondrous works? It was the Sabbath, the seventh-day Sabbath, the Sabbath day of creation week, the day on which the Creator rested, the day that He blessed and sanctified, and later enshrined in His law. That is His seal, or mark of authority.

The fourth commandment of the decalogue contains the seal of God's law. The Bible uses the words "seal," "mark," and "sign" interchangeably. Rom. 4: 11. In Ezekiel 20: 12, 20, God calls the Sabbath His "sign." It is His seal, the seal of His law, and it has been tampered with, as we have previously pointed out.

It is sometimes said that the Sabbath commandment of the decalogue is the least important of all the commandments. This, of course, Satan likes men to believe. The truth is, it is of great importance, for it reveals the Author of all the ten as the Creator. If all men from the beginning had kept the Sabbath as God designed, there would never have been on earth a heathen or an idolater. Satan has known where to attack God's law in leading men away from God, and he is still working along the same line; he strikes directly at God's right to rule, by denying that He is the Creator.

#### **The Seal, When and How Received**

Seventh, the seal is to be received in the forehead. Of course that does not mean that there is going to be a visible mark written upon the forehead of every one of God's people. The forehead is used to signify the mind. The apostle Paul said, "With the mind I myself serve the law of God." Rom. 7: 25. It is most significant, then, that the very first word of that commandment which reveals God as its Author, the fourth commandment, is "*Remember.*" How do we remember? It is with the mind. And moreover, it is with the spiritual mind, that is, with the mind of the new man, the born-again man; for the scripture says, "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8: 7.

Here, then, is a prophecy to the effect that in the last days the attention of the people will be called to the sign, or mark, of God's authority to give the law which has been tampered with through apostasy, and His true disciples are going to "remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," and come back again to the keeping of all the commandments of God and likewise the faith of Jesus. These will accept the three angels' messages of Rev-



elation 14: 6-14, refusing to worship the beast and his image and to receive the mark of the beast in the forehead or in the hand.

### **The Mark a Counterfeit Sabbath**

What, then, is the mark of the beast? It is the counterfeit Sabbath, the Sunday institution. And it is certainly worthy of notice that the Catholic Church holds up this supposed change of the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first day as a sign of her authority and power to command men under penalty of sin. In a Catholic catechism, "An Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," by the Rev. Henry Tuberville, D. D., recommended by the Right Reverend Benedict, bishop of Boston, we read the following:

"*Ques.*—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

"*Ans.*—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of."

In reply to a letter of Oct. 2, 1895, to Cardinal Gibbons, asking if the Catholic Church claims the change of the Sabbath as her mark, the following was received:

"Of course the Catholic Church claims that the change was her act, and the act is a mark of her ecclesiastical power and authority in religious matters.

(Signed) "H. F. THOMAS,  
"Chancellor for the Cardinal."

How is the mark of the beast to be received in the hand? What do the hands represent? Work. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." Eccl. 9: 10. When one rests on the first day as the Sabbath of God, after, of course, having had the opportunity of knowing the truth as to the seal of God, he begins to receive the mark of the beast in the hand. But the prophecy plainly intimates that the mark will be enforced. Rev. 13: 16, 17. The image of the beast will be completed and the mark of the beast will be enforced through a national Sunday law. This will be the crisis. The Sunday law campaign is in perfect line with the prophecy. It is the mark of the beast that the National Reform Association is seeking to enforce. It will eventually succeed, but its triumph

will not last long. It will be ended by the close of human history and the second coming of Christ.

In Revelation 13:17 we read "that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark of the beast," etc. Some of my readers will doubtless be astonished to learn that some have already begun to talk in line with this prophecy. While this is being written, there is before the legislature of one of the States a bill providing for the confiscation of the property of any who may be found guilty of violating the Sunday law.

A few years ago, the Rev. Dr. Bascom Robins, of Burlington, Kans., in delivering a series of lectures on the decalogue, made the following statements in regard to Sunday observance:

"There is a class of people [meaning seventh-day observers] in this country who will not keep the Christian sabbath [meaning Sunday] unless they are forced to do so, but that can be easily done. We have twenty million men, besides women and children, who want this country to keep the Christian sabbath. If we [first-day observers] would say we will not sell anything to them, we will not buy anything from them, we will not work for them or hire them to work for us, the thing could be wiped out, and all the world would keep the Christian sabbath."

In the month of December, 1899, a prominent National Reformer, speaking in a popular church in New York City on the enforcement of Sunday, argued "amid handclapping of approval" (the reporter says he gives exact words) that "those who persist in violating God's sabbath [meaning Sunday] should be put to death."

The people of this country are facing a tremendous issue on this question, and all ought to be awake to the meaning of the present Sunday blue law agitation, and oppose it with all their might.

# The Character of Sunday Laws

SUNDAY laws are religious laws, and it is no business of the state to enforce religious laws. If it be proper for the state to enact and enforce one religious law, it is proper and right to enact and enforce any number of religious laws. This would mean a complete union of church and state, and this is the principle that is violated in Sunday law enactment and enforcement.

That these laws are wholly religious in their nature no one can successfully deny. What is the object of a Sunday law? It is to protect a supposedly sacred day from desecration. If Sunday were not believed to be the Sabbath day, would there ever be such a thing as a Sunday law?

Plainly, a law which makes a man a criminal for doing certain things on Sunday, which acts are regarded as perfectly civil on any other day of the week, is a religious law. And the very wording of our present State Sunday laws shows them to be religious. What is the meaning in the statutes prohibiting "worldly business," and permitting "works of necessity and charity," except from a religious standpoint? Certainly these prohibitions in Sunday laws are based upon the idea that it is wrong to do on Sunday the things prohibited. To say that they are civil laws is to deny every fact in the history of Sunday legislation.

The late Rev. W. F. Crafts, so ardent in endeavoring to secure the enactment of Sunday laws, said:

"A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out."—*Hearing on Sunday Rest Bill,* Dec. 13, 1888, p. 21.

Dr. Joseph Cook, in Boston Monday Lectures, in 1887, said:

"The experience of centuries shows that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship."

And the character of these laws is seen further by the influence that usually produces them.

"During nearly all American history the churches have influenced the States to make and improve Sabbath laws."—*Rev. W. F. Crafts, in the Christian Statesman, July 3, 1890.*

#### Object of Sunday Laws

Again, what is one of the objects of Sunday laws on the part of the churches? It is expressed in the following from Rev. S. V. Leech, D. D., in the *Homiletic Review* for November, 1892:

"Give us good Sunday laws, well enforced by men in local authority, and our churches will be full of worshipers, and our young men and women will be attracted to the divine service. A mighty combination of the churches of the United States could win from Congress, the State legislatures, and municipal councils, all legislation essential to this splendid result."

And at this present time (1927) various organizations are engaged in a campaign for more stringent Sunday laws, prohibiting automobiling, games, sports, etc., so that the people will not be so taken up with these things that they cannot attend church.

#### Sunday Laws Religious

These were the reasons given for Sunday laws in the fourth century after Christ. History is repeating itself. The object is to force people indirectly to come to church. The state is asked to enact religious laws in the interest of the church.

The Sunday law advocate says:

"The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday newspaper, and allow the *hour of worship* to go by unheeded."

Therefore he wants a law prohibiting the publishing of newspapers on Sunday. Again he says:

"The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so *break up a great many congregations.*"

Therefore the Sunday law advocate wants to prohibit all Sunday traveling. Is not all this sufficient proof that a Sunday law is a religious law? It is absolutely nothing else.

Their religious character is also seen in their origin. The Sunday laws of the various States of our country had their immediate origin in the Sunday laws of the old colonial days, the days of theocratic state-church governments; and they in turn had their origin in the Sunday law of Charles II, and certainly no reader of history will deny the religious character of that law. Its avowed purpose was to secure the religious observance of the "Lord's day." America's first Sunday law was enacted in Virginia in 1610. It read:

"Every man and woman shall repair in the morning to the divine service and sermons preached upon the Sabbath day, and in the afternoon to divine service, and catechising, upon pain for the first fault to lose their provision and the allowance for the whole week following; for the second, to lose the said allowance and also to be whipt; and for the third, *to suffer death.*"

In 1623 there was another law passed, as follows:

"Whosoever shall absent himself from divine service any Sunday, without an allowable excuse, shall forfeit a pound of tobacco, and he that absenteth himself a month shall forfeit 50 lbs. of tobacco."

And all these Sunday laws go back for their origin to the Sunday law of Constantine, the first ever enacted, and this was plainly a religious law. There are even unto this day on the statute books of some of the States, Sunday laws which have come directly down from colonial days. No one ever contended in those days that they were civil laws. They were a part of the church-state régime of those days, whence we get the expression "blue laws."

It might be said concerning the Sunday blue laws, that they were foisted upon the public by the Rev. Samuel Peters. Three of them, for example, read as follows:

"No one shall run on the Sabbath day, or walk in the garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

"No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath day.

"No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting day."

Though these laws were worded by Dr. Peters, and though they should not be quoted as historical, still we must acknowledge that, though not absolutely correct in detail, they are in spirit

true records of old Puritan laws which were enacted to enforce the strict and decorous observance of the Sabbath, and which were valid not only in Connecticut and Massachusetts, but in other New England States. A glance at the historical records of any old town or church will give plenty of proof.

Thus in New London, Conn., we find, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, a wicked fisherman fined for catching eels on Sunday; another "fined 20 shillings for sailing a boat on Sunday;" while in 1670 two lovers, John Lewis and Sarah Chapman, were accused of and tried for "sitting together on the Lord's day under an apple tree in Goodman Chapman's orchard." And many more such like cases.

This should lead us to consider the logic of Sunday enforcement. If the state has the right to say a man shall observe a certain day because that day is looked upon as the Sabbath, it has a perfect right to say exactly how it shall be observed. It has a right to say that a person shall spend a certain number of hours in reading the Bible, in prayer, in divine service, etc. The logic of Sunday enactment was followed in colonial days, and in such laws the state comes in between the individual and God.

If the state has a right to make a distinction in days on religious grounds, it has the same right to make a distinction in churches; and if this principle were followed to its logical conclusion, it would justify the state in declaring by law one church to be the church of the state, and compelling all to support that church.

If it be right and proper for the state to enact and enforce one religious law, it is also right to enforce any number, as was done in colonial days, when along with Sunday enforcement went laws for the support of the state church, laws forcing all parents to have their children sprinkled, laws forcing church attendance, etc. The state steps outside of its legitimate sphere when it enacts a Sunday law.

In 1829 and 1830, numerous petitions had been sent in, praying for the abolition of Sunday mails. The petitions were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of

each house. March 19, 1829, the Senate Committee rendered its report, written by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, from which we quote as follows:

#### **The Proper Object of Government**

"It should, however, be kept in mind that the proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy. . . . It is not the legitimate province of the legislature to determine what religion is true or what false. . . . The petitioners for its discontinuance [Sunday mail] appear to be actuated by a religious zeal, which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere; but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than to a civil institution. . . . Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. . . . If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum. . . . Let the national legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World. Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion for enforcing religious observances. Let the professors of Christianity . . . combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant, . . . to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Saviour. . . . Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance the true interests of religion than any measure which they may call on Congress to enact."

The report was concurred in by the Senate, and the committee discharged from further consideration of the matter.

Mr. Johnson's term as Senator having expired, and he having been elected a member of the House of Representatives, and being appointed to the chairmanship of the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, it fell to his lot early in March, 1830, to write a similar report upon the same subject for presentation to that body, concluding with these words:

*"Resolved,* That the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject."

The report was concurred in without vote.

This was the view taken of the subject of Sunday legislation



by both houses of Congress in the earlier history of our country ; and it is the view that ought to prevail to-day.

Nor are statesmen the only ones who see the question in this light. We thank God, there have been and still are some preachers who, though keeping Sunday as the Sabbath, have decried the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws by the state. Mr. Spurgeon said :

“ I am ashamed of some Christians because they have so much dependence on Parliament and the law of the land. Much good may Parliament ever do to true religion, except by mistake ! As to getting the law of the land to touch our religion, we earnestly cry, ‘ Hands off ! Leave us alone ! ’ Your Sunday bills and all other forms of act of Parliament religion seem to me to be all wrong. Give us a fair field and no favor, and our faith has no cause to fear. Christ wants no help from Cæsar. I should be afraid to borrow help from government. It would look to me as if I rested on an arm of flesh, instead of depending on the living God. Let the Lord’s day be respected by all means, and may the day soon come when every shop shall be closed on the Sabbath, but let it be by the force of conviction, and not by the force of the policeman ; let true religion triumph by the power of God in men’s hearts, and not by the power of fines and imprisonments.”

#### **Sunday Laws Wrong**

We hold that Sunday laws are wrong :

Because Sunday, as a day of rest, is a religious institution.

Because legislation in reference to a religious institution is religious legislation, and the passing of such laws is a long step toward the union of church and state.

Because, while often urged as humanitarian measures, their real and ultimate object is the compulsory observance of the day.

Because they are both un-American and un-Christian.

Because they require that men should render to Cæsar that which belongs to God.

Because they are a violation of that just principle and inhibition of our national Constitution against the passage of any law establishing religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Because they make criminals of a class of citizens against whom no criminal charge ought to lie.

Because they make criminal on Sunday acts which on any other day of the week are considered perfectly lawful and

right. Honest toil and innocent amusement, while not consistent with proper Sabbath observance, are not crimes on any day. Crimes are not determined by the day of the week upon which they are committed.

Because the penalizing of religious beliefs and inoffensive religious practices are no part of the business of the state.

Because they are convenient tools for the inquisitor, and are persecuting in character. They imply that certain men have a right, not only to interpret God's law for their fellow men, but to execute vengeance upon those whom they pronounce transgressors of that law.



Suffering for Conscience' Sake

# The Drift Toward Rome

THE underlying principles of the National Reform Association and its many allies are papal rather than genuine Protestant principles. The prophecy of Revelation 13 concerning the making of the image-beast portends a repudiation of Protestant principles, that is, of the separation of church and state, and necessarily a drift by apostate Protestantism back to Rome. This is exactly what is taking place.

The principle of religion and state or church and state is essentially a Catholic principle. Pope Leo XIII in 1903 said :

“It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for state and church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced.”—“*The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*,” p. 323.

“It follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man.”—*Id.*, p. 161.

The Encyclical *Quanta Cura*, published by Pope Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1864, was accompanied by a syllabus containing a summary in eighty various propositions condemned by that pontiff. Among the eighty were the following, which were condemned :

“Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason.”

“The church ought to be separated from the state, and the state from the church.”

## National Reforms in Harmony With Rome

Hence the National Reform Association is working in perfect accord with Catholic principles of government, and not with Protestant. And without doubt the Pope is inwardly pleased, to say the least, at the drift of affairs in this country. Some one has put it in verse as follows :

"Aha, says he, these Protestants are ceasing to protest;  
 They're coming back to use my plans which once they did detest.  
 Hear how they cry for church and state, which is my very life,  
 They'll ask me soon to aid their scheme and join them in the strife.  
 A law of creeds is just the thing the churches' power to show;  
 'Twas thus I silenced heretics in ages long ago.  
 Some say 'tis sin to firmly bind the consciences of men;  
 But if they move as I expect, 'twill soon be done again.  
 If they should form a sacred trust, it would be fine indeed;  
 My skill from long experience would precisely meet the need.  
 To bring the best millennium, they spend their time and money,  
 But when the mill begins to grind, they'll find 'tis not so funny."

### **The Drift Toward Rome**

This drift toward Rome on the part of Protestantism has been very noticeable in the last twenty years, and has occasioned many comments, but it is in perfect accord with the prophecies of the book of Revelation. The late Justice Brewer, who, as we have already noted, rendered the so-called "Christian nation" decision, said:

"The present century has been one of denominational rivalry and strife. The next will be one of Christian unity. . . . The ancient enemies, Catholicism and Protestantism, are drawing closer together."—*From a lecture on "The Twentieth Century From Another View."*

The *Watchman*, a Baptist periodical, said in 1903:

"During the last twenty-five years, there has been a decided '*rap-prochement*' of public opinion in the United States toward the Roman Church."—*Quoted in the Literary Digest, Aug. 22, 1903.*

Dr. Newman Smyth said a few years ago, in speaking on the desire for church unity among the Protestant churches:

"The reunion of the Protestant churches would be the completion of but one column of the triumphal arch of the one true church. The other column stands apart—the Roman Church—its base, as it claims, the rock on which the church is founded, built on the memorial stones of the ages, unshaken in its massive proportions. Shall the two columns forever remain apart? Rather, has it not already come to the point where on either side may be discerned the beginning of the curve which, when carried to completion, shall make the one perfect arch?"

The *Independent* (New York) has also said, editorially:

"There are two great religious forces in this country, the one the Protestant churches, and the other the Catholic Church; . . . the two are less mutually hostile than they were. Protestants forget to protest.

Catholics know that they are not the total Christian church. The two agree more than they differ. They will come closer together. Already they tolerate each other; by and by they will recognize each other and affiliate in good work, as now Presbyterians and Methodists do."

And it is also plain that the Protestant churches are drifting back to Rome in various observances, like Lent, for example. A few years ago a prominent Lutheran clergyman of Philadelphia, in commenting on the observance of Lent, said:

"I have noted in recent years that the observance [of Lent] is becoming more general in our denomination. In fact, forms of religion seem to be gaining. We are all approaching, in some degree, the Roman Catholic."

Dr. Patten, once president of Princeton University, speaking of this trend also among Presbyterians, said:

"Some Presbyterians have gone so far as to observe Good Friday. It has come to this, that the question is not, How soon will Presbyterians observe holy week? but how soon will they have holy water?"

This, we repeat, is all in line with the prophecies of Revelation. The prophet saw at last the mother and daughters working together, and they together constituted Babylon. The great apostate Protestantism in making the image-beast becomes the third division of that great symbolical city, "The great city was divided into three parts." Rev. 16: 19.

These three parts are symbolized by the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet (Rev. 16: 13), the dragon representing the heathen religions, the beast Catholicism, and the false prophet (the same as the two-horned beast of Rev. 13: 11-17. Compare Rev. 13: 14 with Rev. 19: 20) representing apostate Protestantism.

#### **The Father's Promise to Christ**

There is a time not far distant when Protestantism will reach her hand entirely across the gulf to grasp the hand of Romanism, and the two will work shoulder to shoulder in the closing days of earth's history. The two-horned beast, though at first manifesting the disposition of a lamb, will speak as a dragon. This will mean persecution to the people of God, but it will not last long. At the end, John in holy vision saw those

who had gotten the victory over the beast and his image and his mark, stand on the sea of glass, singing the song of victory. Rev. 15: 1-3.

As compared with the teeming millions of earth, God's people have always been a little flock. But the time is near when the Father will fulfill to the Son the promise of Psalms 2: 8, 9:

"Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

In view of the rapid reproach of that day, the divine counsel is:

"Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him." Ps. 2: 10-12.

Who is sufficient for these things? "Who shall stand when He appeareth? for He is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap." Mal. 3: 2. The answer is found in Psalms 15: 2-5:

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbor, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor. In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoreth them that fear the Lord. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not. He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved."





## OTHER PUBLICATIONS ON RELATED SUBJECTS

### **Was Peter the First Pope?**

The keystone in the arch of papal claims is a succession of popes from St. Peter to the present time. This claim is not supported by history. Some of the popes listed in the succession were guilty of heresy, some were impostors, and the election of some was doubtful. Nor is the position claimed for Peter as head of the church established by the Scriptures. This claim is well disputed in this pamphlet of 24 pages. Price, 5 cents.

### **Sunday: Origin of Its Observance in the Christian Church**


Contains interesting information concerning the change from the seventh to the first day of the week as a day of worship by the Christian church. Quotations from historical documents, backed by sound arguments, make this little pamphlet of 30 pages a great help in meeting this question. Price, 5 cents.

### **Rome's Challenge**

The papacy claims the right of the church to change the Sabbath, and by virtue of this right has thought to change the day of worship from the seventh to the first day of the week. The Catholic Church has issued a challenge to the Protestant churches, claiming that they are admitting the power of the church to change the Sabbath by keeping the day declared holy by that church. This challenge, with interesting supplementary material, is given in this pamphlet of 31 pages. Price, 5 cents.

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.  
TAKOMA PARK - - - WASHINGTON, D. C.





## Our Day in the Light of Prophecy

BY W. A. SPICER

**F**OURTEEN major lines of Bible prophecy culminate in the times in which we are living. The great truths of the Bible concerning the present time are clearly told, the Bible being its own interpreter. The fulfillment of these prophecies given thousands of years ago is one of the strongest arguments for the inspiration of the Bible.

380 pages, with 154 beautiful illustrations. Bound in cloth, \$3; half leather, \$4; full leather, \$5.

## Two Great Prophecies

**T**HIS little brochure contains the books of Daniel and the Revelation, with explanatory notes to make clear the meaning of the Scripture. Appropriate illustrations and diagrams add interest to the reading of the text. Paper covers. Price, 25 cents.

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.  
TAKOMA PARK - - - WASHINGTON, D. C.