**“The Headship of the Church” 1 The Present Truth 10, 47, pp. 741, 742.**

**JESUS HIMSELF, OR A PAPAL REGENT**

IN the Scriptures the church of Christ is described under the figure of the human body as God made it. The relationship between Christ and his church is shown and illustrated by the relationship that exists between the human body and its head: and the relationship between Christ and the members of his church is illustrated by the relationship between the members of the human body and the head of that body as God has placed it. {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.1}

“The church is His body.” Ephesians 1:22. “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” 1 Corinthians 12:27. The members of His church are “members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones.” Ephesians 5:30. Christ is, the head of this body, which is His church. For “He is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead.” Colossians 1:18. “God raised Him from the dead ... and gave Him to be head over all things to the church, which is His body.” Ephesians 1:19-23. And it is Christ *Himself*, too, who is head of this church. Not Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ Himself, in His own proper person. This is certainly true, because in stating this same thought under the figure of a *building*, the word declares that Christ “*Himself*” is the chief corner stone, “the *head*-stone of the corner.” And here are the words: “Ye are God’s building.” 1 Corinthians 3:9; Ephesians 2:21, 22, 10, 20. {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.2}

Yet the claim of the Papacy is, that *a man* is head of the church of Christ. The claim of the Catholic Church is that the head of *that* Church is the head of the church of Christ. The claim of the Church of Rome is that the Bishop of Rome is head of the church of Christ—in the place of Christ—as the “representative,” the “substitute,” the “vicar,” the “regent,” of Christ. Here is the authoritative statement:— {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.3}

Says the Council of Florence (1430), at which also were present the bishops of the Greek and the Latin Church: “We define that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and we declare that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, was given him by Jesus Christ our Saviour, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church.” {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.4}

The Pope is here called the *true vicar* or representative of Christ in this lower kingdom of his church militant; that is, the Pope is the organ of our Saviour, and speaks his sentiments in faith and mnorals.—*Cardinal Gibbons, in The Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 154, 155*. {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.5}

It was the Council of Chalcedon 451, that first addressed the bishop of Rome as “the head, of whom we are the members.” {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.6}

Let us look at this claim of the Catholic Church in view of the statements made in the Scriptures on this point. As we have seen, the church of Christ is His body in this world, and He is its head. God is the builder of this body, the church of Christ, as He was the builder of the human body in the beginning; for “God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him.” Now, take a human body as God made it, with the head in its place as God set it. In the place of that head, which God gave to that body, you put a “representative” head—a substitute head. In the place of the true head, which God set to that body, you put a “regency” head—another head to occupy the place in the absence of the true head—then what have you? Take away the head from a human body, and you have left only *a dead body*. This is the very first and only result of taking away the head. And even though you set another head on this headless body, it is still only a dead body. {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.7}

Now this is precisely the case of the Church of Rome. It was once the church of Christ; its members were members of the body of Christ; and Christ was its head. It had life from Christ, its living head, the life which is by faith, so that its “faith was spoken of throughout the whole world.” Romans 1:8. But there came “a falling away.” 2 Thessalonians 2:3. The bishops and councils of the church put away Christ, the true head whom God had set, and put another, *a man*, in His place, as head of that church. The putting away of Christ, its living head, left it only a lifeless body; and the putting of another head in His place did not, and could not, give life to that lifeless body. So far as spiritual life is concerned—the real life of the church of Christ—the Church of Rome is as destitute of it as is a human body with its own head cut off and another head put on in its place. Thus the Church of Rome is destitute of the life that vivifies the church of Christ, and partakes only of the elements of death. The only hope for it, or for those who are connected with it, is to recognise that it is indeed spiritually dead, and have Christ, the life-giver, raise them from the dead, and connect them with himself as their living head, that thus they may live indeed. {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 741.8}

Warning was given against this very course of that church in the first days of the church of Christ, and the same warning is yet given. In the second chapter of Colossians it is written: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in Him, *which is the head* of all principality and power.... Let no man beguile you of your reward in a *voluntary* humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and *not holding* *the head*, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, *why*, as though living in the world, *are ye subject to ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men?* Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting [punishing, margin] of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh.” Verses 7-10, 18-23. {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 742.1}

This is the Divine warning against the spirit that made the Papacy, against the Papacy itself, against all its workings, and against its very nature. Men, fleshly-minded men, ambitious men, in the church, not being dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, holding the rudiments of the world and *not holding the head*—these were the men who put away from the people Christ, the true and living head, and put a man, one of their own sort, in His place. And to supply the lack of Him and His life they imposed upon the people a host of forms and ordinances, and commandments and doctrines of men, and voluntary humilities, and will-worshipping, and punishings of the body in penances and pilgrimages, and worshiping of angels, and saints, and dead people called saints. And this is the body of which Leo XIII., pope is the head. This is the Church of Rome with a man as its head, in the place of Christ. This is the Catholic Church. And this is how the bishop of Rome obtained his “regency of God on earth.” {PTUK November 22, 1894, p. 742.2}

A. T. JONES.

**“The Infallibility of the Pope” The Present Truth 10, 48, pp. 758, 759.**

**WHERE DOES IT COME FROM? AND HOW DOES HE GET IT**

IN order to answer these questions more fairly and fully, let us see what is the exact statement of the claim as officially and “infallibly” pronounced. Here it is:— {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 758.1}

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of the Christian people, we, the sacred council, approving, teach, and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when discharging the office of pastor, and teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church—he, by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed the His church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the said Roman pontiff are of themselves unalterable and not from the consent of the church. {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 758.2}

Consequently, Catholics believe that the Pope is infallible when he teaches the faithful *ex cathedra*, that is, “*from the chair*” of St. Peter, in matters of *faith* or *morals*.—*Catholic Belief, p. 69*. {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 758.3}

From this it is seen that there is no claim that infallibility attached to the Pope except when he speaks “*ex cathedra*, that is, from the chair of St. Peter;” and he speaks “*ex cathedra*” only when he speaks (a) “as the father and doctor of all Christians;” (b) “discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians;” (c) and then only as he speaks on a question of faith or morals. That is to say: If he speaks or writes only as a priest, a bishop, or a theologians, he is not claimed to be infallible, nor is that which is so spoken or written claimed to be infallibly true. If he speaks about the weather or the crops, or the loss of his temporal power, or politics generally, or his great “love for Protestants”—in none of this is it claimed that infallibility attaches to him or anything that he says. {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 758.4}

From the dogma itself it is perfectly clear that it is not claimed that infallibility attaches to *the man* at all, who happens to be a Pope, but that it attaches to *the Pope* who happens to be a man. For instance, Joachim Pecci happened to become a Pope. When he was just plain Joachim Pecci and nothing else, no hint of a claim of infallibility ever attached to him. And if he had always remained plain Joachim Pecci no hint of any such thing, in the mind of anybody, would have ever attached to him. When he became “Father Pecci,” a priest, it was the same way; when he became Bishop Pecci, it was the same way; when he became Archbishop Pecci, it was still the same way; and when he became Cardinal Pecci it was yet the same way—in none of these positions was any thought of infallibility ever connected with him in the mind of anybody. And if he had always remained in any one of these positions, no thought of infallibility ever would have been connected with him. {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 758.5}

It is perfectly plain, then, that outside of the office of Pope there is no thought of infallibility connected with the man who happens to become Pope. As priest, or bishop, or archbishop, or cardinal, no vestige of it attaches to him in the mind of anybody. Yet it was by a vote of 363, against *two*, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, that the doctrine was established that infallibility does attach to him when he happens to become Pope. This, too, while not one of the 363 made any kind of claim of infallibility on his own part! {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 758.6}

In this, therefore, we are treated to the absurd suggestion that 363 elements of absolute *fal*libility could *in*fallibly settle the doctrine that *in*fallibility is connected with one of their own absolutely fallible selves when he happens to be made Pope!—No, this is not quite the full statement of the case yet; for when the 363 had voted it, it was not infallibly fixed until the Pope had *ex cathedra* proclaimed it. That is to say, the 363 fallibles voted it infallibly so, then he of whom, till this, it was not *infallibly* so, proclaimed it infallibly so, and thus it became infallibly so. In other words, 363 fallibles voted his infallibility when he speaks *ex cathedra;* but this could not be infallibly certain till he himself had infallibly proclaimed it; and he could not infallibly proclaim it until it was infallibly so! *Like produced totally unlike. Out of nothing* SOMETHING CAME! {PTUK November 29, 1894, p. 759.1}

A. T. JONES.