

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XXI.

JULY, 1917.

No. 3.

---

## WHY DO CATHOLICS ACCEPT THE DEITY OF CHRIST?

During the last two weeks of the Sunday campaign in Boston a small tract, or pamphlet, was distributed by mail, apparently by courtesy of the "Massachusetts State Council, K. of C.," since it was published by them, as stated on the title page. The tract is entitled "The Divinity of Christ," with the further information: "One of a Series of Lectures on the Fundamentals of Faith, Delivered in the Brooklyn Academy of Music before the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, by Rev. Walter Drum, S. J., Professor of Scripture, Woodstock College. Imprimi Potest: A. J. Maas, S. J., Praep. Prov." On the second page we read: "Nihil Obstat: Patrick J. Waters, Ph. D., Censor Librorum." Below this: "Imprimatur: William, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston. November 2, 1916." The tract is officially censored and sanctioned, as you see. From a footnote on page three we gather that this lecture was delivered in December, 1915.

Naturally, the tract was read from cover to cover to ascertain if perchance there might be something new under the Jesuit luminary. But herein we were disappointed, which was to be expected. It is the same sleight-of-hand performance that these Jesuits, those brilliant logicians, have always practised to the confusion of their audiences. On receipt of the tract one was led to speculate, too, why these courteous Knights of Columbus distributed this tract at this particular time. Perhaps it was "Billy" Sunday's fervent and enthusi-

astic insistence on the doctrine of the divinity of Christ as a primary doctrine of the Christian religion, for which he brought proof, why his audiences should accept it, from the Word of God, inerrant and infallible. This tract seems to be a silent instruction to the faithful by the cardinal that Roman Catholics do not believe in the divinity of Christ because the *Bible* says so, but because the Roman Catholic *Church* says so. One has a vague suspicion that this circumstance prompted these Knights of Columbus to send out that tract at that time, for "Billy" Sunday was insisting valiantly on the divinity of Christ at that time. This Jesuit manipulates his subject in a very ingenious manner. We shall attempt to give a short *résumé* of the tract. Bear in mind throughout that the Jesuit is speaking of the divinity of Christ, at least that is the title of his address.

The author first treats of the "early heresies" respecting the divinity of Christ. Quite naturally, by the way, he uses the question of our Lord, "What think ye of Christ?" as a sort of text. "The answer of the traditional school" (by this he means the "Catholic School of Theology") "is this: He is very God and very Man." Our Lutheran Church has claimed that as the Scriptural answer to that question. But the author does not claim that this doctrine is Scriptural; he does not take the Word of God as proof for it, as you will presently see.

In referring to "early heresies" he speaks of Arius, of Nestorius, of Eutyches, of the three patriarchs of the Orient: Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, Athanasius of Antioch, and of Photius. There is nothing to criticise in his presentation of these heresies as far as one can see. But what attracts one's attention in this connection is the manner in which he speaks of the councils at which these heresies were discussed and the orthodox, Christian doctrine defined. He speaks of "the *infallible* declaration of the *Church* in the Council of Nicaea, 325"; "the *infallible Church*, which in the Council of Ephesus (431 A. D.)"; "the *infallible*

Council of Chalcedon (451 A. D.).” But when he comes to the council which dealt with the heresy of the three patriarchs, he speaks of “the Council of Constantinople (680 A. D.).” He omits the “infallibility” there. Why? Is it because this council condemned the heresy of Honorius, the Roman bishop, and because the “infallible” Leo II hurled anathema at, and denounced, this his “infallible” predecessor?! It would seem, unless it was an accidental omission, that the author was in doubt regarding the complete infallibility of this council and omitted the designation. His audience would not notice the omission anyway.

The next chapter in the tract draws our interest, since in it the author intends to bring the proof for the divinity of Christ. To the question why he believes in the divinity of Christ he replies: “I believe in the divinity of Christ on the authority of God revealing.” You will note that phrase “God revealing.” When we have come to the end of the tract, you will probably discover what he means by that term. At this point he goes through three steps of reasoning.

*First Step:* “The motive of divine faith is only the authority of God revealing,” not the authority of man. “Infallible though the authority of the Catholic Church be in teaching of faith and morals, it is not the motive of divine faith. . . . We believe in the divinity of Christ because God reveals that truth to us.” Note here that he has introduced the “infallible authority of the Catholic Church.”

*Second Step:* “But how do you know that God reveals to us the divinity of Christ?”—he asks himself the question. Answer: “Because the Church teaches me that God reveals the divinity of Christ.” You notice that the “infallible authority of the Catholic Church” is being pushed into the foreground.

*Third Step:* “But the Church may err when she teaches that God reveals the divinity of Christ.” Answer: “The Church may not err in faith and morals, because she is infallible in faith and morals.” Adroitly the scene has been

shifted! While "God revealing" moves into the background, the "infallibility of the Church" moves into the foreground.

The sum and substance of this reasoning process is that it will be necessary to prove the infallibility of the Church as the rule of faith and morals, in order to be able to prove that Christ is "very God and very Man." In other words: Seek ye first the infallibility of the Church, and the divinity of Christ will be added thereunto! But what about the Word of God as revealed in the Bible? Is not this the first source of knowledge for this doctrine? So we believe, but not the Jesuit. Hear his judgment of this one and only source of every doctrine of the entire Christian religion: "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible—with no support or stay, dangling in the air—is no rule of faith whatsoever. For a rule is fixed in its measure; and the unsupported Bible is made by Protestant Biblical scholars to be adaptable to any measure you please. . . . Among Catholic theologians, things are altogether different. The infallible Church is a fixed rule of faith." How ingenious! Since "a rule is fixed in its measure," the Bible, in order to be a rule of faith, must be fixed by the "infallible Catholic Church," and no one may believe anything that the Bible teaches unless the Church permits him to believe it. The Jesuit says that the Church teaches that God reveals things in the Bible. But you must not take God's Word for the things He tells us there. You must let the Church lead you through the intricacies of His Word. And whatever the Church says is all right you may believe. In this manner our brilliant scene-shifter has pushed the authority of the Word of God out of sight, and you are now staring at the "infallibility of the Catholic Church," which is over and above the Bible. In fact, there was no Bible when the infallibility of the Church was established!

He says: "The Bible, the collection of books which Luther set up as the be-all and end-all of the teachings of Christ, the sole depository of revealed truth,—this Bible was not in existence until the year 220 of our era. True, the separate

books existed before that time. But the separate, disunited books were not the Bible, until some authority outside of each book brought them all together into one authoritative collection." And who was that "authority outside of each book"? Just follow the subtle argument of the Jesuit! "The separated and disunited books did not exist until after the Church began to be. The Church began to be during the lifetime of Christ; it was completed in its foundation by the time of His ascension, about 29 A. D." However, all scholars agree that the Gospel of Matthew did not exist before 45 A. D., and that of John belongs to the period of 100—110 A. D. Therefore, "there is no Bible on which to found our acceptance of the divinity of Christ";—therefore, "unless the Church give me the Bible, and tell me that the Bible teaches the divinity of Christ, I have no proof on which to ground my faith in this fundamental doctrine." Consequently this doctrine is a part of the Christian creed by grace of the Roman Catholic Church! And if the Church chose to tell the faithful that the Bible did not teach such a doctrine, the faithful were bound to believe this, because the Church brought these separate and disunited books into an authoritative collection, and by doing so originated the Bible. And the Church is infallible, while the Bible is not!

Throughout the next pages of his argument the Jesuit undertakes to show how the Church existed before the Bible. The Bible in this argument is reduced and discredited beyond recognition, whilst the infallibility of the Church arises out of the débris of this demolition with a luster that is startling. But let us follow him briefly in this action.

Under the heading "Only Historical Evidence" the author tries to prove that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John "are historical documents, worthy of acceptance by a prudent man as narratives of facts, and not of fiction." However, "we do not assume these documents as part of the Bible; there is as yet no Bible. We do not give these documents any divine authority." No, they are mere "human documents"; and later he places them alongside Caesar, Livy, Thucydides,

Demosthenes, Sophocles, Plato, etc. He uses three tests in this connection to establish the "historical worth" of these "human documents," viz., text evidence, evidence of versions, evidence of use in other trustworthy sources.

*First Test: Test Evidence.*—“We have 2,467 Greek manuscripts of the original text of these four documents which trace the text back to about A. D. 350.” He refers in this connection to the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts as being the oldest, for all scholars agree that they were written about that time, A. D. 350, or 240 years after John wrote. But our author leads us back further by a clever invention. In comparing the two oldest manuscripts, the Sinaitic and the Vatican, it appears that, “although they agree substantially,” they contain “minor differences, which cannot have taken place in less than a generation,—say thirty years.” Strikes us as a rather short generation! But never mind that; it brings us down to the year 320, and there is where we stop with the text evidence.

*Second Test: Evidence of Versions.*—Here we have 8,000 versions to work with. Of these St. Jerome’s Latin version of the four documents dates from the year 383. That sets us back a peg, but merely to take a bigger jump. Jerome’s Latin version was a revision of the Old Latin version. Here we make a big discovery. This old Latin version “was carefully used by St. Cyprian in the middle of the third century, by Tertullian in A. D. 181—189, by the Scillitan martyrs of Carthage in A. D. 180.” This brings us down to the year 150, or about forty years after John’s death; for you must allow at least thirty years of use up to the time of these martyrs. So one guesses anyway, because there is no demonstration by the author how he gets to the year 150 from the year 180, unless he subtracts a generation’s use.

But the year 150 is not yet our limit. “Now compare the second-century text of the Latin Church (Old Latin

version) with the fourth-century text of the Byzantine Church" (the Sinaitic Greek text, most likely). By this process we arrive at the year 135. How does he get there? By way of "substantial agreement," and "accidental differences," and by calling on the Syrian Church for aid, "which translated these four documents into Syriac about the year 150 of our era." Then, though these translations from the original Greek agree substantially, "they disagree in accidental matters." "To explain the accidental differences we must allow at least fifteen years." But among the Greek manuscripts he allowed thirty years for such differences! Why fifteen here? The author does not tell us. Perhaps he was afraid that his calculations would bring the writing of these four documents within the lifetime of Christ. That would be disastrous to this Jesuit's invention for proving that the Church was before the Bible. Anyway, with the subtraction of the above fifteen years allowed for these discrepancies, we arrive at the year 135, or within twenty years of John's death. But our author takes us down another step. You see, the Old Latin and Syriac versions "agree in many accidentals in which they disagree from the Greek text Aleph B, a text that we have tracked down to A. D. 320." Consequently, there must have been "an archetype Greek text at least fifteen years earlier than the previous text." Subtract 15 from 135, and you will have the year 120, or ten years after the death of John. From that period onward "the text of the four Gospels was admitted to be historical by the Church substantially as the text now is." *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

*Third Test: Evidence of Patristic Use.*—"It would take too long to give the third class of evidence of this historic acceptance. Suffice it to say that our three documents of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are used as authoritative by St. Clement of Rome, A. D. 93—95; St. Ignatius of Antioch, A. D. 110—117; St. Polycarp of Smyrna, about A. D. 117." He also cites a few other fathers of a later period. He feels

that he has sufficiently established the historical worth of the four documents by the two previous tests. And we feel relieved that he has cut it short.

It is not necessary to go into detail about the next chapter. He there contrasts the four Gospels with profane documents, as Caesar, Livy, Demosthenes, Plato, Sophocles, Euripides, Horace, Lucretius, etc., and points out dramatically that no one doubts the authenticity of these classics. "Now, no prudent man ever thinks of denying these profane works to the authors they are assigned to. . . . Therefore, in the name of sanity and prudence, no man has the right to deny the historical worth in substance of these four documents. There is *the first step in our proof of the infallibility of the Church.*" (Italics ours.)

But what about proof for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ? Oh, as far as we see, that is only blind to display the beauty of the dogma of the infallibility of the Church. Every Jesuit's hobby is this dogma. And did he not tell us that one first had to prove the infallibility of the Church, in order to be able to establish the doctrine of the divinity of Christ? Well, he is on his way.

After having "proved" the historical worth of these four Gospels, which, as you will remember, are mere "human documents," he continues to give an outline of the facts contained in these documents. It is very, very meager information which they offer. Give attention!

First: They contain information about "an historical person named Jesus, . . . who had a message from God the Father to give to all the world."

Secondly: This Jesus "prophesied His resurrection; and appealed to the resurrection in proof of the truth of His claim that He was the Ambassador of God the Father," from whom He had a message for the world.

Thirdly: "He arose from the dead to fulfil His prophecy in proof of the truth of His claim to the divine ambassador-



ship, to the message from the Father, and to the right to give that message to the world." Our author speaks about a "message," but he never tells us what this message really contained. He seems loath to tell it; instead, he takes a healthy swing at higher criticism, and annihilates it with Jesuitical scorn. While going through these mental acrobatics, you marvel and forget all about the contents of that "message."

Finally: "Both before and after His resurrection, Jesus consigned . . . that message unto a teaching body, which He said was Infallible, Indefectible, One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Petrine."

Note that peculiar term "teaching body." From this point to the end he operates with that term. He states that Jesus consigned His message from the Father to a "body of living teachers"; to this "teaching body" He gave the right to hand down this message to all the world; and to this "teaching body" He gave the qualities above-mentioned. You cannot escape the author's intention in introducing this term. He plants this term in the minds of his listeners, and by his frequent use of it, it becomes an established thing.

Regarding the qualities of this "teaching body," he asks the question, "How shall we establish these qualities that belong to the living teaching body which Jesus gave to the world?"

First, "The teaching body is infallible."—"To prove this essential attribute of Christ's teaching body, the following facts, given by Matthew and Mark, are of paramount importance":—

Just before His ascension Jesus said to His eleven apostles: "All power hath been given Me in heaven and upon earth. Therefore go ye, make disciples of all nations, baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world." (Author's own translation from the original Greek.)

Again, while ascending, Jesus "gave this solemn message to the same body of teachers: 'Go ye to all the world, preach the Gospel to all creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned.'"

Now let us see the deductions. "All power hath been given Me in heaven and upon earth," says Jesus. "Something most important is to follow," says Jesuit Drum. "The faith of the world will be put to the test. Therefore the world is told that 'all power is Christ's.' *With this all-power He proceeds to make His living body of teachers to be infallible.*" (Italics ours.)

Among the duties which Jesus imposed upon this "teaching body" there is one which is of paramount importance, says our author, *viz.*, "Teach them (after baptism) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And since the Lord adds: "Lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world,"—"He, the Ambassador of the Father, will ever be at hand to prevent them from error. They will be infallible in this teaching. . . . Moreover, Christ made acceptance of the message of that teaching body the condition of salvation, and rejection of that teaching the condition of damnation." Proof: "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." (The words "and is baptized" are omitted by the author at this place.) "If that teaching body could err in handing down His message, denial of His message would be a condition of salvation, and acceptance of His message would be a condition of damnation. That were impossible, unspeakable. . . . Therefore, He made that teaching body infallible." As lucid as mud, as far as we can see!

Secondly, "Jesus made that teaching body to be indefectible." As proof for this quality he brings these words of our Lord: "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I shall build My Church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." To which the author adds: "The gates of hell shall never prevail against that teaching body: it is in-

defectible." To drive home this argument, the author here introduces a pious story of the boyhood days of Newman: "Mother, what Church is the oldest Church?" "Oh, the Roman Catholic Church is the oldest Church." "And why is the Roman Catholic Church not the true Church?" "Because it left the truth in the fifth century." "Oh, then, mother, the gates of hell prevailed against it, didn't they?" Oh, no; "the gates of hell shall not prevail against that Church," exclaims the author. *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

This completes the establishment of these two qualities, which are "so essential that they are called the attributes of this teaching body." He then proceeds to discuss the remaining qualities, which are called "notes, — marks that are visible characteristics of this teaching body."

The first mark: "The teaching body is One." Why? "Christ did not say, 'Go, follow Henry the Eighth when he throws over the jurisdiction of the pope'; and at the same time contradict Himself and say, 'Go follow the Pope of Rome.'" (Christ said, of course, "Follow the Pope of Rome!") Hence, "that teaching body must be one in jurisdiction." Again, "Christ did not say, 'Follow the New York Presbytery; deny the virgin birth of Jesus; deny the physical resurrection of the Savior'; and at the same time contradict Himself by saying: *Be a Catholic*; believe in the virgin birth and the resurrection.'" (Italics ours.) Hence, "that teaching body must be one in doctrine, because its doctrine is the message from the Father unto Christ." Hence, the teaching body must be one in jurisdiction and one in doctrine. He loses many words over the unity in doctrine, but about the "jurisdiction" he merely makes the plain statement.

The second mark: "The teaching body must be holy." Why? "Because it is founded by Christ to teach His doctrines, and only His doctrines. Those doctrines must be holy." And because it is holy, it "cannot deny the miracles of the Lord, cannot degrade the Lord to the low grade of a dupe, — as do the Anglican clergyman Lake of Harvard, the Lutheran

clergyman Schweitzer of Strassburg, and others." Wherever he can drag in Luther or a Lutheran, he makes it a point to do so.

The third mark: "The teaching body must be Catholic." Why? "Go teach *all* nations!" "I will be with you *all days!*" Note this: "It is not founded in 1520 by Luther, for some Germans; not founded in 1534, by Henry VIII, for England; not founded in 1560 by John Knox, for Scotland; not founded in 1606 by John Smith, for scores of kinds of Baptists; not founded in 1739 by John Wesley, for scores of kinds of Methodists. No, ten thousand times, no! That teaching body is founded by Christ for all times and all nations." How dramatic and what holy Jesuitical zeal! And the year 1520? Luther never had the intention of founding a Lutheran Church, and protested vehemently against his followers calling themselves Lutherans. What Luther did do was to annihilate that damnable "teaching body" by casting it down from its arrogated throne, and placing the Word of God where it belonged, and where God would have it be, in the hearts of His people.

The fourth mark: "The teaching body must be apostolic, founded on the Apostles." But the author hastens to modify the expression "founded on the Apostles" by saying, "That teaching body must be Petrine, founded on Peter." This "supplements the mark of apostolicity." Proof? Those words of the Lord when He "rewarded the faith of Simon, Son of John, by setting him as foundation stone to the apostolic body of teachers: 'Thou art Kefa.' He did not say, 'Thou art Peter.' He said, 'Thou art Kefa,' which means a *rock*, 'and upon this Kefa, this rock, I shall build My Church.' . . . This is the only sane, germane interpretation of these words. The new name Kefa, given to Simon, meant rock; for he was to be made the rock on which this teaching body was builded by the Christ. . . . That teaching body must be built on Kefa, on the Rock, on Peter, *not on the Bible! There was no Bible to build on until nearly two hundred years later, and then the Bible was given out by the Petrine teaching body.*" (Italics

ours.) However, according to this logic Peter never erred, he never fell. Peter's denial, for instance, occurred after he had been made the "foundation stone to the apostolic body of teachers." How do you explain that according to this Jesuitical reasoning? After Christ's ascension he also erred, for which Paul took him severely to task. Peter thus was fallible in his infallibility!

And the Bible? We have the Bible by grace of this "teaching body," which of course is the Roman Catholic Church. The "Bible was given out by the Petrine teaching body," and since the Pope is the successor of Peter, we have the Bible by grace of the Pope of Rome. It is not the inspired Word of God until the Pope says so, and whatever he admits of being thus inspired.

After having thus delineated the "teaching body," Jesuit Drum says: "Now find that teaching body. It is indefectible! It must exist to-day! Is there any teaching body to-day that dares claim these essential attributes, and these four marks, especially the last, the Petrine? . . . There is only one Church that ever dared, or will ever dare, claim to be such, and that is the Catholic teaching body." You will recall that we called your attention to the insidious manner in which the term "teaching body" was introduced into the argument. You now see that our author has arrived at the point where he says that this "body of teachers" is the Roman Catholic Church, which means the Pope, since he as successor of Peter is the "foundation stone" of this "teaching body." And since the Church is not apostolic unless it is Petrine, the message which Christ gave to the Church is given to the Pope.

But where, one may ask, is there in all this the proof for the divinity of Christ? Well, do you not see? The teaching body is infallible, indefectible, one, holy, catholic, apostolic = Petrine, therefore Christ is very God and very Man! *Quod erat demonstrandum*. That is as clear as the Missouri River. Any one can see that! If you have followed this Jesuit line of argument to the end, you most likely find yourself "dangling

in the air," attached to a balloon of Jesuitry. The best thing to do is to take the two-edged sword of the Word of God and cut the rope.

This tract is a fair sample of the modern way of robbing the people of the sure Word of God. These Jesuits are going up and down the land and fooling the people with their sleight-of-hand performances, making fools of their audiences, and casting thousands into damnation. By their adroit scene-shifting they slip the Word of God out of sight, and push the fiction and fraud of an infallibility in its place. These are the arts and sciences of the devil, who stalks about in the garb of these Jesuits, and dupes thousands into eternal damnation.

"The Word they still shall let remain, and not a thank have for it." Indeed, the Word of God, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word of God, is good enough for us. That Word must be preached, and that Word is the foundation of our Christian faith. There we learn all that is necessary for our faith and salvation. If a Jesuit—and all his crew—prefers to prance around on the covers of that Bible, he may have the Satanic pleasure, though it must grieve every honest and good Bible Christian to witness so many thousands being led into hell by his antics. Lutheran Christians will prefer to wade right into the ocean of proof for the divinity of Christ in the Bible, and there learn what God Himself says of His Son, that He is our Savior, who became our Brother in the flesh and died for the whole world, for our sins, upon the cross as very God and very Man, and commanded us to preach Him, and Him only, to the salvation of the souls of many. Our teaching body is the Word of God, and the foundation stone to this teaching body is Jesus Christ Himself.

Boston, Mass.

G. E. HAGEMAN.

---