

## 2017 - 500 years after Luther (500YAL) – a Catholic Response

What has gone wrong since the time of Luther?

Part 2

Revised: 09.09.2017

---

**Point 25** Pg. 18 says: Tetzel ...declared ... (of indulgencies) ...any sin committed in the future would be forgive..

### Answer

This has proven not to be the case. Historians have shown that Tetzel never said that sins yet to be committed would be forgive now.

The New Advent website says:

The charge that the forgiveness of sins was sold for money regardless of contrition or that absolution for sins to be committed in the future could be purchased is baseless. An indulgence, ... can be applied only "to the pains of sin which are confessed and for which there is contrition". "No one", he furthermore adds, "secures an indulgence unless he have true contrition". <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14539a.htm>

---

**Point 26** Pg. 19 says: When it (the Bible) says that the wages of sin is death, there is then no torment. The Bibles says that the godless will receive their punishment according to their works (Revelation 20: 13). If someone has done may bad things, they will then be punished longer/harder.

### Answer

No torment ! – Where does the SDA get that idea from? I think the author of this pamphlet is veering off from what the SDAs actually teach on this which is that the dead will suffer until they are annihilated. SDAs believe that for the 'godless' there is no continuous torment after death, once they have been 'burned up', 'consumed by the fire', they no longer exist.

The pamphlet quotes Revelation 20: 13, however, if the SDA were only to read the previous paragraph of Revelation, that is Rev 20: 7 – 10, they will find that the Bible says:

Rev 20: 7 – 10

<sup>7</sup>When the thousand years are completed, Satan will be released from his prison, <sup>8</sup>and will come out to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of

the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together for the war; the number of them is like the sand of the seashore. <sup>9</sup> And they came up on the broad plain of the earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city, and fire came down from heaven and devoured them. <sup>10</sup> And the devil who deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are also; and they will be tormented day and night forever and ever.

SDAs will say, this passage is only referring to the Devil, didn't you read – it said the devil. However, Rev 20: 7 – 10 shows the condition of the devil in hell being 'tormented day and night' but Revelation 14 : 11 shows that the 'godless dead' also experience this same torment, day and night for ever and ever.

Rev 14: 11

<sup>11</sup> And the smoke of their torment goes up for ever and ever; and they have no rest, day or night, these worshipers of the beast and its image, and whoever receives the mark of its name."

The NIV Bible is a Calvinist Bible and the NIV Study Bible has its studies written by Calvinists – often seen as heroes by the SDA church, yet the Calvinists completely reject the SDAs interpretation for the ungodly after death. SDAs believe in 'annihilation', that the wicked who dies will be non-existent once they have been 'burned up' in hell and therefore they will not suffer for ever and ever. The NIV Study Bible commentary says on Rev 14: 11:

'Revelation offers no support for the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked.'

There is a website which list what they call the Foundational Verses For Eternal Punishment In Hell. In addition it quotes St Augustine of Hippo, 354 – 430 AD:

"who cautions us against following the example of those who, 'while not slighting the authority of the sacred Scriptures, . . . nevertheless interpret them wrongly and suppose that what is to happen will not be what the Scriptures speak of, but what they themselves would like to happen" (*City of God* 21.27).

SDAs do not like the idea that God would punish people for eternity, however, it is people who choose to separate themselves from God, because God never rejects us, it is we who reject Him. Hell is separation from God, a separation from God which is for ever and ever.

<https://blogs.thegospelcoalition.org/justintaylor/2011/10/04/ten-foundational-verses-for-eternal-punishment-in-hell>

Jim Akin explains it well when he says that the soul in hell for ever and not annihilated, giving the analogy that it is like some who has made a huge financial investment and the investment is lost, someone will say, 'I have been ruined' or 'I am ruined' or 'I have been destroyed', they do not mean they do not exist. So hell is the state of the soul, it is in a state of 'ruination', not annihilation.

The pamphlet goes on to say the more sins someone does the longer the burning in hell. The Bible does not say this. The Bible says if our works are of God then we go to heaven if our works are bad and without repentance then we go to hell. Nowhere does it say we have a longer time in hell – as already stated, hell is eternal. SDAs are trying to prove hell is not eternal, but nowhere does it say more time burning for more sins committed. Hell is separation from God. That is the torment.

---

### Point 27

Pg. 20 – 22 says: Even Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering vengeance of eternal fire. (Jude 7). ‘...the fire stopped once everything had been burned up...’. ‘..and there shall be wailing and grinding of teeth. ‘The word eternal comes from the Greek word aion..’. ‘New heave and new earth..’ ‘... and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth...Ezekiel 28: 19-19.’

### Answer

The translation used here by the SDA has misled them. The King James Version says, ‘...and the cities about them in like manner.’ However, the New King James Version makes the text clearer. The NKJV which had 130 translators, believed in faithfulness to the original Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew texts including the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their translation of the verse goes like this:

Jude 7

‘...as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities around them in a similar manner to these, having themselves over to sexual immorality and gone after strange flesh, are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.’

The NKJV says that, ‘... the cities around them in a similar manner ....’ And the NIV Study Bible Comment says:

*‘In a similar way.* Does not mean that the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was the same as that of the angles or vice versa. This phrase is used to introduce the third illustration of the fact that God will see to it that the unrighteous will be consigned to eternal punishment..’

Most Christians think that where God is, that is, in heaven, is outside of time. Heaven is ‘outside of time’ because God has no beginning or end. This means that once someone dies and their body ‘is in the ground and their soul has returned to God who made it’, Ecclesiastes 12, then that soul is also ‘outside of time’. The soul is judged ‘instantly’ at death because the soul is outside of time. The unrighteous soul will be in the state of being separated from God, which is what hell is, separation from God is torment, and because it is outside of time cannot come to an end. So the soul in hell does not get ‘burned up’ so that it does not exist anymore. The SDA pamphlet goes on to say, ‘...and there shall be wailing

and grinding of teeth.’ This is describing the torment that is hell, not a process that will end. Being separated from God is torment. There is no evidence for annihilation in the Bible. Sodom and Gomorrah is not an example of what hell is like, it is an example that the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah is condemned, it is not an illustration of the nature of the dead. SDAs have invented doctrine on the nature of the dead in opposition to Scripture. The quote from Ezekiel 28 says that death destroys the body which become ashes ‘dead in the ground’, but Ezekiel 28 says nothing about the state of the soul separated from the body.

The SDA pamphlet goes on to say that, ‘The word ‘eternal’ comes from the Greek word aion..’, and they try to use this to mean that hell is not eternal, however, that would mean that heaven is not eternal either. This is a further invented doctrine of the SDAs.

The SDAs misunderstand the Biblical reality of the ‘new heaven and new earth’. The New Heaven and New Earth is brought about by Christ Jesus. Through His cross, access to heaven is now possible – so there is a new heaven and a new earth. The New Heaven and the New Earth is the New Jerusalem, which is already here; the New Jerusalem is the Church of Jesus Christ, it is the body of Christians which make up the Body of Christ, the Church; it is what we are Baptised into. EWTN makes this very clear:

‘With regards to the New Jerusalem, it is clear that we are dealing with an image of the Church. For just as Jerusalem was the physical capital and core of the Old Testament Kingdom of God where His presence was most directly experienced in the Temple sanctuary of this world, so by analogy the New Jerusalem is the place in which the presence of God is experienced, most especially in the worship of the Mass. A further indication that the New Jerusalem is the Church is the description of it as “a bride adorned for her husband.” The Church as the Bride of Christ runs throughout the New Testament and is most explicitly stated by St. Paul in his letter to the Ephesians: 5

22 Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. 23 For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Saviour. As the church is subject to Christ, so let wives also be subject in everything to their husbands. ....

...Now just as the prophecies of the Old Testament often have multiple, successive fulfilment, so too the prophetic work which is the Apocalypse. The New Jerusalem is the Church and as such it has been definitively established here on earth, having replaced the original Jerusalem as the centre of religious life and worship. However, it will only be fully realized in the heavenly Kingdom wherein the saints now exist in perfect happiness and which we look forward to. The final realization of the New Jerusalem will be when this world has passed away and there remains only the New Jerusalem in its perfection.’

<http://www.ewtn.com/v/experts/showmessage.asp?number=329339>

---

**Point 28**

Pg. 22 – 23 says: Infant baptism has its roots in Augustan’s original sin teaching. ‘...it is the godparents who are to believe on behalf of the infant.’ ‘...those who want to be baptised must have personal faith...’ ‘...baptism is symbolic...’.

**Answer**

No it does not. Infant baptism is Biblical. In the New Testament, whole households were baptised on the belief of the head of the household. Christ himself said of the children, the kingdom of heaven belongs to these. In Matt 19: 14 is says:

<sup>14</sup>but Jesus said, “Let the children come to me, and do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven.”

In addition, since baptism replaced circumcision, and circumcision was for babies eight days old then it is right the children should be baptised. See Col 2: 11-12.

Also see <https://www.catholic.com/tract/infant-baptism>

Whole households were baptized, the Bible tells us so:

Acts 16: 33-34

<sup>33</sup>And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their wounds, and he was baptized at once, with all his family. <sup>34</sup>Then he brought them up into his house, and set food before them; and he rejoiced with all his household that he had believed in God.

And as with Jewish circumcision, the child is circumcised on the faith of the parents, believer’s circumcision, so too the child is baptised with the faith of the parents, it is believer’s baptism because, the parents are believes as are the Jewish parents believer’s in circumduction. In addition, in the Jewish circumcision celebration there are godparents – witnesses who will foster the child in the faith as well as the parents. Did the child being circumcised have personal faith? – it was the faith of the parents who bring the child up in the faith having joined the community of God’s select through circumcision, so too, the child having been baptised is also brought up in the faith. SDAs need to learn that the Catholic baptismal practice is both Biblical and has strong Jewish roots. Remember, Baptism replaced circumcision. Circumcision on the whole is for babies, eight days old, so too is baptism for Christian parents’ babies, but adult baptism is also another way someone joins the Body of Christ – His Church.

Baptism is not symbolic but a real event, a real change takes place. SDAs do not see Baptism as a sacrament, an act of God on the soul. A sacrament, like baptism, is not a mere human action, but God acting on the soul through the act of baptism, where God pours His

Grace upon the soul, through the act of being baptised. SDAs refuse this Saving Grace for their children.

---

**Point 29** Pg. 23 says: ‘...believed that a child was born with sin.’ ‘...But the small child has not done anything wrong...’ ‘... sin is the transgression of the law...’ ‘The son should not bear the iniquity of the father. Ezekiel 18: 20.’

**Answer**

Again, SDAs fail to understand Scripture and what happened to Adam and Eve when they first sinned. The Bible tells us that since Adam and Eve sinned, all have sinned.

1 Cor. 15:22

For just as in Adam all die, so too in Christ shall all be brought to life,

So, Baptism frees us from the First Sin committed by Adam, the First Sin of Adam being called man’s original sin; the original sin and personal sin is washed away in Baptism, in the name of the Trinity: in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. SDAs use Ezekiel 18 to contradict the New Testament on Baptism which shows how the SDA misuse the Bible.

See:

[http://www.ewtn.com/v/experts/showmessage\\_print.asp?number=321769&language=en](http://www.ewtn.com/v/experts/showmessage_print.asp?number=321769&language=en)

---

**Point 30** Pg. 24 – 25 says: ‘Confirmation was introduced by the Catholic Church in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.’ ‘Martin Luther did away with confirmation...’ ‘*Infant baptism and confirmation are traditions enacted by people. They are a form of substitution for Biblical baptism. This is just how the Devil works. He substitutes Biblical truth with counterfeit,..*’ ‘...Let us follow Biblical baptism and not the baptism according to Catholicism or apostate Protestantism.’

**Answer**

No, Confirmation was not ‘*introduced in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.*’ Confirmation is the laying on of hands by an Apostle on an already baptized person for that individual to receive the Holy Spirit. The Bible is clear on the laying on of hands to receive the Holy Spirit. See what Saint Peter, the Apostle and first Pope and St John, the youngest of the Apostles, did in Samaria.

Acts 8: 14-17

14 And now the apostles at Jerusalem, hearing that Samaria had received the word of God, sent Peter and John to visit them. 15 So these two came down and prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit, 16 who had not, as yet, come

down on any of them; they had received nothing so far except baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus. 17 Then the apostles began to lay their hands on them, so that the Holy Spirit was given them,

In the same way that baptism is a sacrament, so too is confirmation. In confirmation the Holy Spirit comes upon the soul of the person being confirmed by the Bishop. Again, confirmation is not symbolic but a real event, a real change takes place. SDAs do not see confirmation as a sacrament, an act of God on the soul. A sacrament, like baptism or confirmation, is not a mere human action, as suggested by SDAs, but God acting on the soul through the act of confirmation, where God pours His Grace upon the soul, through the act of being confirmed. SDAs refuse this Biblical Saving Grace of confirmation for their children.

The Acts of the Apostles tells us that when one of the Apostles dies, someone is elected to take his place and the other Apostles lay their hands on them. So by the laying on of hands from the Apostles we have what are called Bishops. As the Church grew so more Bishops were needed and so more were made. In the same way that Saint Peter was the Head Apostle and was the Bishop of Rome, so too the current Pope is Apostle Peter's successor, and the Bishop of Rome.

Confirmation is clearly Biblical but the SDAs do not have this Biblical practice. SDAs do not have Bishops so they cannot have confirmation. SDAs fall short of proclaiming the Bible in all its fullness.

The SDA church claims Martin Luther did away confirmation, yet confirmation is shown to be Biblical. As shown in above Points, Luther did away with many books of the Bible. He also wanted to get rid of the Epistle of James and the Book of Revelation because it did not fit in with his own person view, but some of his friends persuaded him to keep these two books in his re-design of the bible. It is this which makes a man-made unbiblical church. The SDA pamphlet claims that being 'unbiblical' is the work of the Devil. So that is Martin Luther's work then, the Devil's work, upheld by the SDA, the rejection of Biblical confirmation, the rejection of Peter appointed by Christ as Head of His Church, the rejection of Christ breathing on the Apostles telling them when they to forgive sins they are forgive, the rejection of Christ's words – "This is My Body, this is My Blood." It seems to me the Catholic Church embrace the whole of scripture while Luther and those who follow his teaching, including the SDA, reject a whole lot of scripture. It seems to me that it is Luther, and those who follow him, who have the counterfeit Bible, the counterfeit teaching and the counterfeit church.

There may well be an underlying reason why SDAs reject sacraments, such as Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist as the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is because sacraments reveal the true nature of the soul; that the soul is acted upon by God in a special way, it is the soul which receives God's Grace, it is in the soul where the guilt of our sins lie, and, as Jesus said, where sin has its root. But SDAs reject the soul as something special and animated by God. Rather they believe that the soul is just air, they say, "Adam

became a living soul, not that he had one". That is why SDAs think the soul 'knows nothing once dead', but we know that it is the body which knows nothing once dead, the 'soul returns to God who gave it', Ecclesiastes 12, and the soul is animated, effected by the Grace of God, such as in Confirmation. There are seven Sacraments in all.

Throughout the pamphlet the SDA church has used Luther and Protestantism to attack the Catholic Church then, on page 25, the SDAs attacks Protestants who reject SDAs interpretation of Scripture, calling them apostate Protestants. Of course the SDAs are the real apostates with their counterfeit teaching.

---

**Point 31** Pg. 25 says: '...true baptism is not infant baptism/sprinkling...'

**Answer**

Both the Old and New Treatments refer to 'living waters', which for the people of that time meant 'live rivers', flowing water or running streams, not a bowl or jug of water. It certainly did not mean stagnant water.

There is a very early document which records the early Church's basic beliefs and practices. The document is called The Didache. The word Didache means 'Teaching'. The document is also known as The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, and is a brief anonymous early Christian treatise, dated by most modern scholars to the first century, AD 70. The first line of this treatise is "The teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles (or Nations) by the twelve apostles".

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/didache-roberts.html>

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/didache.html>

Chapter 7 of the Didache, says on Baptism:

And concerning baptism, baptize this way: Having first said all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if you have no living water, baptize into other water; and if you cannot do so in cold water, do so in warm. But if you have neither, pour out water three times upon the head into the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism let the baptizer fast, and the baptized, and whoever else can; but you shall order the baptized to fast one or two days before.

So, clearly the early Church baptised with water from a bowl or a jug three times. This is how many Christians are baptised and it is a valid baptism. Not many SDAs go down the local river to be baptised in 'living water', but SDAs seem to expect Catholics to do so. Again, a false allegation by the SDA church.

---

**Point 32**

Pg. 25 – 27 says: ‘...Luther stood on his feet and realised he was crawling on his knees in order to obtain salvation; he thought works could save him.’

**Answer**

The Catholic Church has never taught salvation but works. Catholics believe we are saved by God’s grace but we have to respond to God’s grace with a yes. SDAs and other Protestants believe that we are saved by Faith Alone. However, Faith Alone doctrine is unbiblical. Catholics believe we are saved by faith and love, faith and action together, just as the Bible tells us. The only mention in the Bible where the word alone is linked to the word faith is where the Bible says: **NOT BY FAITH ALONE.**

James 2: 24

<sup>24</sup>You see that a man is justified by works and not by faith alone.

So, we are saved by faith and works together, just like the Catholic Church teaches. Let us read James in context:

James 2: 14-266

<sup>14</sup>What does it profit, my brethren, if a man says he has faith but has not works? Can his faith save him? <sup>15</sup> If a brother or sister is ill-clad and in lack of daily food, <sup>16</sup> and one of you says to them, “Go in peace, be warmed and filled,” without giving them the things needed for the body, what does it profit? <sup>17</sup> So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.

<sup>18</sup> But someone will say, “You have faith and I have works. ” Show me your faith apart from your works, and I by my works will show you my faith. <sup>19</sup> You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder. <sup>20</sup> Do you want to be shown, you shallow man, that faith apart from works is barren? <sup>21</sup> Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar? <sup>22</sup> You see that faith was active along with his works, and faith was completed by works, <sup>23</sup> and the scripture was fulfilled which says, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness”; and he was called the friend of God. <sup>24</sup> You see that a man is justified by works and not by faith alone. <sup>25</sup> And in the same way was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works when she received the messengers and sent them out another way? <sup>26</sup> For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, so faith apart from works is dead.

So, faith alone is dead faith and a dead doctrine. Luther and the SDAs are preaching their own version of the Bible, not what the Bible teaches. Luther and the SDAs are teaching a dead faith – not a living faith. The Catholic Church never says we can save ourselves. We always need the Grace of God to be saved, but we have to respond to the grace in order to be saved.

Stephen Ray, in his book *Crossing the Tiber*, speaking of Protestant 'alone doctrine' such as faith alone or scripture alone, says of: believing, confessing, repentance, baptism, works, grace, righteousness, the Cross,

'Can we cut out any one of these of the list and proclaim it alone as a means of salvation? Can we be saved without faith? without grace? without repentance? without baptism? without the Spirit? These are all involved and necessary; not one of them can be dismissed as a means of obtaining eternal life. Neither can one be emphasised to the exclusion of another. They are all involved in salvation and entry into the Church. The Catholic Church does not divide these various elements of salvation, overemphasising some while ignoring others; rather, she holds them all in their fullness. (*Crossing the Tiber*: Pg. 100 -101.)'

Read more here about : *Aren't we saved by Faith Alone?*

<https://www.catholic.com/magazine/print-edition/arent-we-saved-by-faith-alone>

### **Note:**

The following website commentary entitled: *History or Her Story*, comments on Ellen Whites book *The Great Controversy*, and shows that Ellen White had not a clue about Martin Luther's real life as her accounts of them bears no resemblance to the facts. She invented many and plagiarizes false accounts, so too, the SDA booklet entitled: *500 Years after Luther!* perpetuates these same false accounts. Why? Because SDAs have to keep to Ellen White's accounts and teachings otherwise they are no longer SDAs.

<http://www.nonsda.org/egw/egw73.shtml>

For more info see: **Faith Alone**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9SMWkbi7F5U>

by Steve Ray

---

### **Point 33**

Pg. 28 says: '...The Reformers understood what it meant to accept salvation in Christ Jesus. '...Anabaptists,... Luther..., Huss..., Wesley..., Miller...,'. 'What about us? Well, we have learned a little about each of these and so we are more knowledgeable than those who have gone before us.'

### **Answer**

No, the Reformers did not understand what it meant to accept salvation in Christ Jesus. As mentioned above in Point 30, Anabaptists, Luther, Huss, Wesley and Miller, all reject the word of God and the words of Christ with their:

‘... rejection of Peter appointed by Christ as Head of His Church, the rejection of Christ breathing on the Apostles telling them when they to forgive sins they are forgive, the rejection of Christ’s words – “This is My Body, this is My Blood.”

After trying to convince the reader that they must believe the teachings of those listed such Luther, the SDA pamphlet goes on to say the author of the pamphlet is greater than their teachers. Of course this is unbiblical. Jesus says that no man is greater than his master. From Point 1 in this response it has been shown that the beliefs of these teachers listed and that of the SDA are completely flawed, especially Ellen White and William Miller, founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. SDAs are quite prepared to use the teaching of others such as Anabaptists, Luther, Huss, Wesley, and then to reject them when it suits them, a sure sign that the SDAs are a pick and choose man made movement.

SDAs beliefs have changed over time, such as their ‘Shut Door doctrine’, which was that all Protestants who did not believe in their prediction of the Second Coming of Christ, during any of the dates the SDAs gave including the 22 October 1844 date, were doomed to damnation for ever and that salvation was no-longer open to those who rejected what Ellen White said, because salvation had ‘Shut its Doors’, heaven had ‘Shut its Doors’ on such Protestants. This of course made a huge problem for the SDAs when Christ did not come after they said he would, because now they had condemned everyone who did not believe what they were saying, when they were the ones who were in the wrong and gave false prophecy leading many astray. For more information of the ‘Shut Door’ teaching of the SDA church click here: <https://www.nonegw.org/shutdoor.html>

---

**Point 34** Pg. 28 – 30 says: ‘...The Catholic Church has changed God’s Ten Commandments.’

**Answer**

No, the Catholic Church did not change the Ten Commandments. Careful reading will show that Protestants have created the Second Commandment by moving the numbering around and they put women in at the bottom of the Ten Commandments making women out to be the property of men.

The following website shows that:

‘There are five key points to be made concerning this common misunderstanding among Protestants as well as many quasi-Christian sects. Please click here to find out more.’

‘The inspired author of Deuteronomy now makes the distinction between wife and property sharper by using two different Hebrew words for “covet” and “desire” and by only using the word “covet” with regard to the wife. The two separate commandments now become undeniable.’

<https://www.catholic.com/magazine/online-edition/did-the-catholic-church-change-the-ten-commandments>

---

**Point 35** Pg. 31 says: ‘...The Catholic Church unequivocally states that they have changed the day of rest.’ ‘ Emperor Constantine was the first to institute Sunday as the day of rest by law in 321 AD.’

### **Answer**

The SDA church does not believe that St Peter was appointed by Christ as Head of the Church. Neither do they accept the person who was elected to take St Peter’s place after St Peter was crucified upside down in Rome, who was called Clement. SDAs reject what is called Apostolic Succession. Yet, that is God’s design for His Church.

The Acts of the Apostles tells us that when one of the Apostles dies, someone is elected to take his place and the other Apostles lay their hands on them. So by the laying on of hands from the Apostles we have what are called Bishops. As the Church grew so more Bishops were needed and so more were made. In the same way that Saint Peter was the Head Apostle and was the Bishop of Rome, so too the current Pope is Apostle Peter’s successor, and the Bishop of Rome.

There is a very early document which records the early Church’s basic beliefs and practices. The document is called The Didache. The word Didache means ‘Teaching’. The document is also known as The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, and is a brief anonymous early Christian treatise, dated by most modern scholars to the first century, AD 70. The first line of this treatise is "The teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles (or Nations) by the twelve apostles".

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/didache-roberts.html>

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/didache.html>

The Didache, Chapter 14. Christian Assembly on the Lord's Day, says:

But every Lord's day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one who is at odds with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: "In every place and time offer to me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, says the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations."

Justin the Martyr wrote the following to a Jewish friend:

"But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead" (*First Apology* 67 [A.D. 155]).

The Bible also tells us that the Apostles gathered together on the First Day of the week, Sunday, to break bread.

Acts 20: 7

On the first day of the week we came together to break bread. Paul spoke to the people and, because he intended to leave the next day, kept on talking until midnight.

If the first Christians gathered on the First Day of the week to 'break bread', as in Acts 20: 7, then so should all Christians, including Seventh Day Adventists?

What is so special about the First Day of the week that the Apostles should gather together and break bread on that day and not Saturday?

The answer is clear, the First Day of the week, Sunday, is the day of salvation, the day when Christ rose from the dead and conquered death. Christ saved the world from sin on the Cross but he saved us from death by conquering death through His Resurrection. Christians are people of the Resurrection. It was God who chose the First Day of the week, Sunday, for salvation, not man, not Constantine, but God alone. Sunday is the day of the week when the greatest event ever in the history of all creation happened, the Resurrection of Christ. By our Baptism we go down into the water to die with Christ, we come up out of the water to rise with Christ. Our Baptism shows us we are people of the Resurrection.

Christ came into the world to die and to Rise again that we may have salvation. Sunday is the DAY of SALVATION, and so Sunday is the Lord's Day, the Day of His Victory. What did God create on Day One of Creation? – He created 'light', physical light. With Christ's Resurrection, there is a New Creation in Christ Jesus. He is the Light, the True Light, not a created light but the True Light, the Light of the New Creation, the Light which overcome the darkness of sin and death. Christ gave us a New Covenant. Saturday is the sign of the Old Covenant. Sunday is the First Day of the New Creation, the day of the Light of Christ.

SDAs reject this otherwise they would celebrate Christ's Victory of the Day of His Victory, Sunday. SDAs not only condemn Sunday gathers, that is they condemn most Christians, claiming they are breaking God's Commandments by not keeping the Saturday Sabbath, SDAs also claim that Sunday worship is worship of the Devil and so Catholics and others who gather on Sunday are devil worshipers and have the mark of the beast and that in the end God will judge Sunday gathers and condemned to hell while Saturday gathers, such as SDAs, are saved for heaven. This is how SDAs make their church members fear Sunday gatherings. SDAs claim that you are not loving God's law if you do not keep Saturday gatherings.

So, we have the Bible which tells us that the Apostles kept the Sunday to celebrate the Resurrection by breaking bread, we have the Didache written 70 AD telling us that Sunday is the day to gather and celebrate the Resurrection by breaking bread, and we have James the Martyr of 155 AD telling us the Sunday is the common day for Christians to meet, why? - because Christ rose that day.

So, the SDAs are wrong again, it was not Emperor Constantine who changed the observance from Saturday to Sunday. Christ Himself, the Apostles and those whom they ordained, who kept Sunday Special, because God Himself made Sunday Special – by His Resurrection.

Christ promised He would rise on the third day – so He kept Sunday special because He kept His promise.

For more info click here:

<https://www.catholic.com/tract/sabbath-or-sunday>

<https://www.catholic.com/qa/did-the-early-church-move-the-sabbath-from-saturday-to-sunday>

SDAs claim that the Catholic Church WAS NOT founded by Christ on the Apostles, but by the Roman Emperor Constantine, a pagan who became a Christian and in 321 AD, they claim, Constantine changed Saturday Sabbath to Sunday. If the Catholic Church was founded by Constantine at this date then the SDAs cannot accuse the Catholic Church of changing the day of the week from Saturday Sabbath Rest to Sunday because we have both Biblical and other writings of early Christians which shows that the First Christians were keeping Sunday special long before Constantine. However, Constantine did not found the Catholic Church, all Constantine did was to make laws which protected the First Christians of the Catholic Church founded by Christ on the Apostles from being prosecuted or worse, killed, for not worshiping pagan gods.

Because the Catholic Church has Apostolic Authority, give to the Apostles by Christ Himself, so the Catholic Church has authority from Christ to arrange the way its members should live and has authority to provide authentic Christian teaching. SDAs reject this authority and this authentic Christian teaching. As the Bible says, "keep to the traditions of the Apostles" – traditions here does not mean man-made traditions, it means the spoken word of God, not just the written word of God in the Bible since not all was recorded there as the Bible tells us, but tradition here means the spoken word of God through the Apostles, which still lives on in the Church. This is what the Catholic Church means when it mentions the word traditions, not man-made but God made, God's word not written down. It was after all St Peter who decide that circumcision was no- longer required for someone to become a Christian and yet circumcision was the sign of the Covenant made by God with Abraham, circumcision was how someone became a member of God's elect, yet the appointed man of Christ, St Peter, changed the decree, changed the sign of the Covenant for Christians – because Christ said of Peter, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven – and I want to be a member of that Church – The Church of Jesus Christ – Catholic Church.

The historical evidence is that the Apostles and first Christians were in fact Catholic. Read this Letter to Adventists by James Likoudis.

<http://www.ewtn.com/library/ANSWERS/LETADVEN.htm>

**Historically, was Constantine the founder of the Catholic Church?** Protestants fail to validate their arguments in regard to this and keep pushing fake history. For instance, Constantine did not make Christianity or the Catholic Church a state religion. All Constantine did was to make it legal to practice Christianity where before it have been

illegal, period, that is all he did. For proof of this read Jon Sorensen :

<https://www.catholic.com/magazine/online-edition/constantine-has-been-beaten-to-death>

And see this by Jim Akin: <https://www.catholic.com/video/did-the-emperor-constantine-found-the-catholic-church>

You will see that the early Christians, that is, Catholic Church, in 325AD, conquered Constantine's heretical errors, which shows the Church had power over Constantine, not Constantine over the Church, as Protestants claim.

---

**Point 36** Pg. 33 says: '...Council of Trent ...the argument that prevailed ...was the changing of the Sabbath (the day of rest). ...'

#### Answer

This may well be one of the most pivotal subjects to point out to SDAs. SDAs main focus is on their keeping the Jewish Sabbath day, the seventh day of the week, Saturday, based on Ex 20: 8-11. They fail to see what the Sabbath is really all about because they have not taken the Bible as a whole. Deuteronomy 5: 13 – 14, tells us that the Sabbath is for resting and worshiping God but then Deuteronomy 5: 15 goes on to tell us what the real purpose of the Sabbath rest is.

Deut. 5:15

Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the LORD your God has commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.

So the real purpose of the Saturday Sabbath is to remember that the Israelites were slaves in Egypt and that they had been freed by God Himself. Sabbath is about the Chosen People remembering that they have been freed from slavery in Egypt, in other words, every Sabbath is a Passover for them. The Sabbath of the Old Testament and the Passover in the Old Testament in truth is a prefiguring of Christ, the True Saviour of the World, who saved us from slavery to sin and death, accomplished by Christ at His Resurrection on the First day of the Week, Sunday. So, for the Christian, the True Sabbath of Christ is Sunday, the day of Resurrection, the day when we remember our salvation from slavery to sin and death.

SDAs say that Christ kept only the Saturday Sabbath, therefore so should we all, however, Christ could not keep the Saturday Sabbath until he had accomplished His mission and then Christ kept the true Christian Sabbath, Sunday, as he promised He would, by rising from the dead, when he brought us out of slavery with 'outstretched arms', by His Cross and Resurrection we have been freed from sin and death. So too are we, as Deuteronomy calls us to, to keep and remember our being freed from slavery by Christ on the Day Christ freed us, Sunday.

The True Christian Sabbath is the Sabbath of Jesus Christ, Sunday, the First Day of the Week. In the Mass the Catholic Church celebrates the Passover of Jesus Christ and keeps the True Sabbath of Christ, Sunday.

---

**Point 37** Pg. 34 – 35 says: ‘...Martin Luther dared to stand up against and reprove the Catholic Church, which he later abandoned. He did not have a clear understanding of God’s law being changed, including the change of the day of rest...’ ‘...Protestants have gone wrong regarding the day of rest...’.

### **Answer**

One of the main problems with Protestantism is that every church decides for itself what it wants and they admit they or others are wrong. Within 50 years of Luther the Protestants were saying that the fact they cannot agree among themselves would be proof they were not of God’s plan for the Church.

In 1519, more than a year after Martin Luther wrote his ninety-five thesis, writing to Pope Leo X, he said:

‘“I never approved of a schism, nor will I approve of it for all eternity... The Roman Church is more honoured by God than all others is not to be doubted...Though nowadays everything is in a wretched state, it is no ground for separating from the Church. On the contrary, the worse things are going, the more should we hold close to her, for it is not by separating from the Church that we can make her better...There is no sin, no amount of evil, which should be permitted to dissolve the bond of charity or break the bond of unity of the body” (Patrick O’Hare in *The Facts about Luther*, 356. Ref in *Crossing the Tiber* by Stephen K Ray)’

Again, in his book, *Crossing the Tiber*, Stephen Ray quotes *The Facts about Luther* by Patrick O’Hare, he quotes:

‘Swiss Reformer John Calvin (1509 – 1564) wrote to Philip Melanchthon (1497 – 1560, Luther’s theologian): “it is indeed important that posterity should [not] know of our differences; for it is indescribably ridiculous that we, who are in opposition to the whole world, should be, at the very beginning of the Reformation, at issue among ourselves”.’

It is important to understand that in the Catholic Church, doctrines do not change but they do develop in greater understanding, especially if they are challenged and therefore need to be more defined in order to defend their validity as doctrine. The Catholic Church is often accused of inventing or adding beliefs not found in the Bible but really it is defining beliefs already held which have a Biblical basis to it. An obvious example of this would be ‘The Immaculate Conception’, based on the Biblical text of the Gospel, Luke 1: 28, which tells us that Mary was: ‘Full of Grace’, therefore she was never ‘Lacking Grace’, so she cannot be

with sin, since sin is a lack of Grace, but also she was 'FULL' of Grace, meaning there was no space for sin, not even original sin. The Bible does not tell us that she became full of grace, but that she 'was full of grace'. The Bible tells us that God made her this way since heaven declares: 'Hail Mary, full of Grace". It comes from pondering the Word of God in its fullness. Such doctrines are moved by the Holy Spirit.

It is also important for Protestants and especially SDAs to read the Church Fathers, those who were appointed by the Apostles and their Apostolic decedents. Then they will see that what the Catholic Church teaches is both Biblical and historically First Christian Teaching. A good introductory book on the Church Fathers is: *Who Where the Church Fathers*, by Marcellino D'Ambrosio.

The SDAs pamphlet is all about celebrating Luther after 500 years but SDAs are more Zwingly or John Calvin than Luther. Luther believed in sacraments including the Sacrament of the alter, both Luther and Calvin believed in infant baptism, SDAs do not. So it is a real pick and mix.

Holding Luther up as an example for Christians to follow is problematic with Luther adding to the word of God in his translation of the Bible into German. Stephen Ray says in his book, *Crossing the Tiber*:

'Martin Luther, in translating the Book of Romans into the German language, inserted the word "alone" to explain the word "faith" (e.g., Rom 3: 28; 5: 1) where the Greek original did not call for it. The pivotal text was Rom 3: 28. The inclusion of the word "alone" radically altered the meaning of the text and Pauls thought. Calvin said the whole of the Reformation would stand or fall on that verse and the newly devised interpretation. This has become part of the Protestant tradition, an example of how Protestants have added to the word of God...'

Luther actually deplores Protestants deciding their own doctrines base on their own interpretations of scripture, as Stephen Ray in *Crossing the Tiber*, shows:

'In his *Commentary on the Psalms*, Martin Luther wrote, "Scriptura sui ipsis interpres", or in English, "The Bible is its own interpreter." It is not difficult to see where that idea led. Even Luther quickly saw the devastating effect. He wrote, "There are almost as many sects and beliefs as there are heads; this one will not admit Baptism, that one rejects the Sacrament of the alter; another places another world between the present one and the day of judgement; some teach that Jesus Christ is not God. There is not an individual, however clownish he may be, who does not put forth as prophecies his own ravings and dreams" (cited in Leslie Rumble, *Bible Quizzes to a Street Preacher* [Rockford Ill.: Tan Books, 1976], 22) See Also O'Hare, *Facts about Luther*, 208. In a letter to Heinrich Zwingly, Martin Luther conceded that reformers would again have to take refuge in the Church councils in order to preserve the unity of the faith on account of the many interpretations that were given to the Scriptures (see Epis. *ad Zwingly*).

The legacy of the Reformation is more than twenty-three thousand different sects and schisms (denominations), with a new one starting every day, according to the World Census of Religious Activities (New York: U.N. Information Centre, 1989). Any unity now would be possible only through a sovereign act of God. The unity of the Church in the New Testament, and for the first ten centuries, was understood to be an organic, visible unity. Apostolic tradition and the teaching authority of the Church were the internal "cement". '

Note: there is an old online version of The Facts about Luther, in pdf format but it takes a long time to download as it is 367 pages long.

<http://www.catholicapologetics.info/apologetics/protestantism/aboutluther.pdf>

---

**The Rest Of This Response - Part 3 - Is Still Being Written.**