

Study for the Month of August 2013

## ***The Papacy Series-Part VII***

Nathaniel Fajardo  
Whole Gospel Ministries  
PO Box 1764 Loma Linda, CA 92354  
Tel (951) 685-1956 (leave a message) email: [natfajardo777@yahoo.com](mailto:natfajardo777@yahoo.com)  
Web: [www.wholegospelministries.org](http://www.wholegospelministries.org)  
-----

### **The Reformation**

#### **Necessary Because the Roman Catholic Church had Fallen**

Christian Edwardson, *Facts of Faith*, pp. 159-172, wrote, and we quote extensively (emphasis supplied):

“The Roman church was sadly in need of a reformation, but she refused to surrender the elements that corrupted her, and slew those who tried to save her. There were two papal ordinances which especially contributed toward the terrible and widespread depravity of her priesthood (1) enforced celibacy (forbidding priests to marry), and (2) exemption of the clergy from the domain of civil law, so that government officials could not punish them for any crime.

“H.C. Lea says of the Roman Catholic clergymen:

‘No matter what crimes he may commit, secular justice could not take cognizance of them, and secular officials could not arrest him. He was only amenable to the tribunals of his own order, which were *debarred from inflicting punishment involving effusion of blood*, and from whose decisions an appeal to supreme jurisdiction of distant Rome conferred too often virtual immunity.’ – *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages, Vol. I, p. 2. New York: 1888*

“This author [H. C. Lea] makes a further statement concerning a ‘complaint laid before the pope by the imperial Diet at Nurnberg early in 1552. . . . The Diet, in recounting the evils arising from ecclesiastical jurisdiction which allowed clerical offenders to enjoy virtual immunity, adduced, among other grievances, the license afforded to those who, debarred by the canons of marriage, abandoned themselves night and day to attempts upon the virtue of the wives and daughters of the laity, sometimes gaining their ends by flattery and presents, and sometimes taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the *confessional*. It was not uncommon, indeed, for women to be openly carried off by their priests, while their husbands and fathers were threatened with vengeance if they should attempt to recover them. As regards *the sale to ecclesiastics of licenses to indulge in habitual lust*, the Diet declared it to be a regular and settled matter, reduced to the form of an annual tax, which in most dioceses was exacted of all the clergy without exception, so that when those who perchance lived chastely demurred at the payment, they were told that the bishop must have the money, and that after it was handed over they might take their choice whether to keep concubines or not.’ – *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*,’ pp. 431. 432, and Note 1. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., Riverside Press, 1884.

“Let the reader remember that those ‘complaints were made by the highest authority in the empire.’ – *Ibid.*

**NOTE:** THE DIET (From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

“The **Diets of Nuremberg**, also called the [Imperial Diets](#) of [Nuremberg](#), took place at different times between the [Middle Ages](#) and the 17th century.

One reason why there were several of them was that, to comply with the [Golden Bull of 1356](#), each [Holy Roman Emperor](#) should have summoned the first Imperial [Diet](#) after his election at Nuremberg. Apart from that, a number of other diets were held there.

The Diet of Nuremberg of 1211 elected the future emperor [Frederick II of Hohenstaufen](#) as German king.

At the Diet of 1356 the [Emperor Charles IV](#) issued his Golden Bull which regulated the election of future Holy Roman Emperors.

Important to [Protestantism](#) (and the Turks) were the Diets of 1522 ("First Diet of Nuremberg"), 1524 ("Second Diet of Nuremberg") and 1532 ("Third Diet of Nuremberg").

### **The 1522 Diet of Nuremberg**[\[edit source\]](#) | [edit](#)

This Diet has become known mostly for the reaction of the papacy to the decision made on [Luther](#) at the [Diet of Worms](#) the previous year. The new pope, [Adrian VI](#), sent his nuncio [Francesco Chieregati](#) to the Diet, to insist both that the [Edict of Worms](#) be executed, and that action be taken promptly against Luther. This demand, however, was coupled with a promise of thorough reform in the Roman hierarchy, frankly admitting the partial guilt of the Vatican in the decline of the Church.

In the recess drafted on 9 February 1523, however, the German princes rejected this appeal. Using Adrian's admissions, they declared that they could not have it appear 'as though they wished to oppress evangelical truth and assist unchristian and evil abuses.'

### **The 1524 Diet of Nuremberg**[\[edit source\]](#) | [edit](#)

This Diet generally took the same line as the previous one. The Estates reiterated their decision from the previous Diet. The Cardinal-legate, Campeggio, who was present, showed his disgust at the behaviour of the Estates. On 18 April, the Estates decided to call 'a general gathering of the German nation', to meet at [Speyer](#) the following year and to decide what would be done until the meeting of the general council of the Church which they demanded.” (end of quote from Wikipedia).

Christian Edwardson, in *Facts of Faith*, continues:

“Professor Philip Limborch records the same fact, and adds: ‘Erasmus\* says: ‘There is a certain German bishop, who declared publicly at a feast, that in one year he had brought to him 11,000 priests that openly kept women’: for they pay annually a certain sum to the bishop. This was one of the hundred grievances that the German nation proposed to the Pope’s nuncio at the convention at Nuremberg in the years 1522 and 1523. Grievance 91.’ – ‘*History of the Inquisition*,’ p. 84.

H.C. Lea says: 'The extent to which the evil sometimes grew may be guessed from a case mentioned by Erasmus, in which a theologian of Louvain refused absolution to a pastor to having maintained illicit relations with no less than two hundred nuns confided to his spiritual charge.' – *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, pp. 567, 568.

"While the pope had ample machinery in the Inquisition for the correcting of his sinning priests, yet he was very lenient with them, except for 'heresy.' In fact, heinous depravity seemed to have been worse where the Inquisition reigned supreme."

"H.C. Lea continues:

'It is rather curious that in *Spain*, the only kingdom where heresy [of Protestantism] was not allowed to get a foothold, *the trouble seems to have been the greatest* and to have first called for special remedial measures.' – *Id*, p. 568. Of the 'remedial laws' enacted in 1255, 1274, and 1302, Lea says:

'However well meant these efforts were, they proved as useless as all previous ones, for in 1322 the council of Valladolid, under the presidency of the papal legate, [enacted still more laws]. The acts of this council, moreover, are interesting as presenting the first authentic evidence of a custom which subsequently prevailed to some extent elsewhere, by which parishioners were wont to compel their priests to take a female consort for the purpose of protecting the virtue of their families from his assaults.' – *Id.*, p. 310. 'The same state of affairs continued until the sixteenth century was well advanced.' – *Ibid*, p. 312.

'We have already seen ecclesiastical authority for the assertion that in the Spanish Peninsula the children sprung from such illicit connections rivalled in numbers the offspring of the laity.' – *id.*, p., 336.

"Such conditions seem almost unbelievable. But, when in 1900 W.H. Taft was sent to the **Philippines** to establish civil government with a public schools system there, he reported finding in those islands conditions similar to those described above. See Senate Document No. 190, 56<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session:' Message from the President of the United States, 1901 A.D.'

"If some Protestants [and mainstream Christianity] today had known the conditions existing at the time of the Reformation they would not have judged Dr. Martin Luther so critically for his harsh statements. That the Reformation was the inevitable result of the fallen condition of the [Roman] catholic Church, was acknowledged by the speakers at the Council of Trent. H. C. Lea says:

'Even in the Council of Trent itself, the Bishop of St. Mark, in opening its proceedings with a speech, January 6<sup>th</sup>, 1546, drew a fearful picture of corruption of the world, which had reached a degree that posterity might possibly equal but not exceed. This he assured the assembled fathers was attributable widely to the wickedness of the pastors [priests], who drew their flocks with them into the abyss of sin. The Lutheran heresy had been provoked by their own guilt, and its suppression was only to be hoped for by their own reformation. At a later session, the Bavarian orator, Augustine Baumgartner, told the assembled fathers that the progress of the Reformation was attributable to the blasphemous lives of the clergy, whose excesses he could not hear without offending the

chaste ears of his auditory. He even asserted that out of a hundred priests, there were not more than 3 or 4 who were not either married or concubinarians—a statement repeated in a consultation of the subject of ecclesiastical reform drawn up in 1562 by order of the Emperor Ferdinand, with the addition that the clergy would rather see the whole structure of the church destroyed than submit to even the most moderate measure of reform.’ —*An Historical Sketch of the Sacerdotal Celibacy*, pp. 518, 519.

#### “SALE OF INDULGENCES” AROUSED THE PROTEST

“The subject of indulgences is of great importance at this time, for the strenuous protest of Romanists against any discussion of this subject has changed both our schoolbooks and our encyclopedias. We therefore invite the reader to careful investigation of this subject. The grossest doctrines that ever disgraced the church of Rome, usually began as apparently innocent injunctions, which developed for centuries into the final monstrosity. This was the case with ‘indulgence.’ It began simply as a release from some ecclesiastical punishment.

“The Catholic authorities today teach that there are *two* kinds of punishments for sin, *one eternal* and the *other temporal*. Dr. M.J. Scott, S.J. [Jesuit], says:

“The forgiveness of sin is. . . . the remission of the eternal chastisement. . . . “After the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted there remains the temporal chastisement. . . . which must be suffered either here or . . . hereafter . . . by the suffering of Purgatory.’ — *The Things Catholics Are Asked About*, p. 145. New York: P.J. Kennedy and Sons. 1927.

“The debt in purgatory may be settled in this life by penances, masses, or by indulgences. On the cost of having masses celebrated see ‘Fifty Years in the Church of Rome’ by Carlos Chiniquy, chap. XXV. Catholic authors admonish a Catholic to settle his account with the church in this life, for when he dies ‘his family might have hundreds of Masses offered up for his soul,’ before it affects him in purgatory.’ ---*Things Catholics Are Asked About*, p. 147. As some Catholics may be unwilling to pay such sums for their deceased relatives, Dr. J.T. Roche warns them:

“The last will and testament of a Catholic in which there is no provision made for Masses gives evidence of an oversight which is truly deplorable. Children and heirs-at-law are the same the world over. In many instances they are dissatisfied with the bequests made to them individually. Their disappointment precludes the possibility of having Masses said for the dead testator. Some of them are so selfish and grasping that they cannot think of parting with even a small portion of their inheritance to comply with what is clearly a duty.’ — ‘Masses for the Dead,’ pp. 23, 24. (This booklet bears the sanction of the Catholic Church and its censor).

#### THE POPE’S SPIRITUAL BANK

“The Roman Catholic Church teaches that a person can by his good works and penances, pay off his own debt, and have some to spare. These extra good works form a Spiritual Bank from which the pope can draw for the benefit of those who lack, as the following quotations show. Dr. M. J. Scott [Jesuit] says:

‘A sinner has it in his own power to merit forgiveness and mercy while he lives.’ – *‘Things Catholics Are Asked About,’* p. 148.

“Rev. J. Procter writes: ‘Some holy ones of God more than satisfy the debt of temporal punishment which they owe to the Eternal Father. . . . All these ‘satisfactions,’ these merits, these uncalled-for penances, are not lost, nor are they useless and in vain. They form a spiritual treasure-house, a ‘bank,’ we have called it, upon which the Church can draw for the benefit of her needy children.’ – ‘*Indulgences,’ (Roman Catholic),* p. 9. *London: Catholic Truth Society.*

“Canon Law says:

‘To the Roman Pontiff is committed by Christ the entire spiritual treasury of the Church, wherefore only the Pope and those whom he has given participation in the power by law, have the ordinary power to grant indulgences.’ (Canon 912).’ – *‘The New Canon Law,’ Rev. Woywod, O.F.M., pp. 143, 144. New York: 1918.*

“The Catholic Encyclopedia testifies:

‘According to Catholic doctrine, therefore, the source of indulgences is constituted by the merit of Christ and the saints. This treasury is left to the keeping, not of the individual Christian, but of the Church. This treasure He. . . . entrusted to Blessed Peter, the key bearer, and his successors,’ – *‘Vol. VII, pp. 785, 784.*

‘By a plenary indulgence is meant the remission of the entire temporal punishment due to sin so that no further expiation is required in purgatory. A partial indulgence commutes only a certain portion of the penalty. An indulgence is valid both in the tribunal of Church and in the tribunal of God.’ – *Id., p. 738.*

‘When the church, therefore, by an indulgence, remits this penalty, her action, according to the declaration of Christ, is ratified in heaven.’ – *‘Id., p. 785.*

‘Here, as in many other matters, the love of money was the chief root of the evil; indulgences were employed by mercenary ecclesiastics as a means for pecuniary gain.’ – *Id., p. 787.*

“We shall now enter into a careful examination of the two questions: (1) whether Catholic authorities, before the Protestant Reformation, had begun to represent indulgences as actual remission of sin; and (2) if these indulgences could be purchased with money. Professor William E. Lunt says of the period following 1095 A.D.:

‘The commercialization of indulgences began with those issued in connection with the **Crusades.**’ – *‘Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages,’ Vol. I, p. 115 Columbia University Press, 1934.*

‘Boniface the IX (1389-1404) issued several bulls of plenary indulgence to aid the building of the dome of the cathedral at Milan. In the course of the fifteenth century plenary indulgences for similar purposes became common. . . . One third or one half was the share most commonly taken by the pope, occasionally it amounted to two thirds.’ – *‘Id., p. 114.*

‘The general Summons of **Pope Innocent III** to a Crusade A.D. 1215 [requested of all civil rulers] for the remission of their sins [to furnish soldiers. To all who joined in the Crusade, and also to those who could not go themselves, but who paid the expense of sending a substitute, the pope declared:] ‘We grant full pardon of sins.’ [To those who went at their own expense, he promised not only] full pardon of their sins [but he says:] ‘We promise them an increase in eternal salvation.’ ---‘ *Bullarium Romanum, edito Taurinensis*,’ Vol. III, p. 300; copied in ‘*Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*,’ E.F. Henderson, pp. 337, 339, 343. London: 1892.

“This papal permission to secure an indulgence by paying for a substitute in one’s place, to fight in the Crusades, soon developed into a system of paying for indulgences. Another means of enormous income to the Holy See was started by **Pope Boniface VIII**, by inaugurating the ‘Jubilees’ with their indulgences. We read of these:

‘Jubilees. ---On the 22<sup>nd</sup> February of the present Year 1300, he issued a Bull, granting a full Remission of all Sins to such as should in the present Year, beginning and ending at Christmas, or in every Hundreth Year, visit the Basilica of the two apostles St. Peter and St. Paul [on fifteen different days].’ – Bower’s ‘*History of the Popes*,’ Vol. VI, year 1300, p. 474.

“Herbert Thurston, S.J., in his book: ‘The Roman Jubilee,’ fearing the sanction of the Catholic Church, and of its ‘censor,’ says:

‘And the same year, since a solemn remission of all sins, to wit, both of guilt and of penalty (*solemnis remissio omnium peccatorum, videlicet culparum et paenarum*), was granted by Pope Boniface to all who visited Rome, many—both Christians and Tartars—came to Rome for the aforesaid indulgence.’ ---‘*Id.*, p. 12. London and Edinburgh: 1925, abridged edition.

“Of the Jubilee of 1450 we read:

‘Large sums of money were brought as offerings by the pilgrims, and we learn that money was scarce at this time, because ‘it all flowed into Rome for the Jubilee’. . . . Early in the following year the Pope. . . . dispatched legates to certain foreign countries, to extend the Jubilee indulgence to the faithful who were unable to visit Rome. The conditions usually enjoined were a visit, or a series of visits, to the cathedral of the Diocese, and an alms to be offered there for a special intention.’ – *Id.*, p. 27.

“During one of these Jubilees, we are told, there were millions in Rome, and **the plague** that had broken out carried off innumerable victims. [Bubonic plague, called “Black Death,” claimed an estimated 75 million lives. See History.com on web]. Graves were to be seen all along the roads. H. C. Lea declares:

‘The pilgrim who went to Rome to secure pardon came back much worse than he started.’ And any one who joined the ‘crusades’ against the Turks or the ‘heretics’ to gain a ‘plenary indulgence’ if he came back alive, ‘was tolerably sure to return a lawless bandit.’ – ‘*The Inquisition of the Middle Ages*,’ Vol. I, pp. 42, 43.

“**Pope Alexander VI** ordered a Jubilee in 1500, but great as the crowds were who sought the papal indulgence at Rome, there remained a still greater number in the

British Isles, 'who were prevented from seeking Rome'; and so the pope issued another 'Bull dated 9 December 1500,' proclaiming a Jubilee in 1501 for Britain. Professor William E. Lunt quotes the following from Polydore Vergil's 'Historiae Angliae':

'A Chronicler's Account of the Sale of Indulgences in England. --- It was not gratuitous liberality, for Alexander. . . . had declared what was the price of his grace for providing for the salvation of men.' – 'Records of Christian Sources and Studies,' No. XIX, 'Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages,' Vol. II, p. 477.

"Professor Lunt informs us that this Papal Bull is found in the 'British Museum, Cottonian MS, Cleop. E. III, fol. 157V,' 'as entitled by Gaidner, *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, II, 93-100,' from which we quote the following:

'The Article of the Bull of the holy Jubilees of full remission and great joy granted to the realm of England, Wales, Ireland, and Garnesey, . . . . by granting of great indulgences and remission of sins and trespasses.' Those who 'at any time after the publication hereof to the last evening of the Octaves of Easter next coming, truly confessed and contrite, visit such churches as shall be assigned. . . . and there put into the chest for the intent ordained such sum of gratuity of money, gold or silver, as is limited and taxed here following in the last end of this paper, to be spent for the defense of our faith, shall have the same indulgence, pardon, and grace, with remission of all their sins, which they should have had if they had gone personally to Rome in the year of grace.' ---*Id.*, pp. 478, 479.

"Then follows the tax list:

'Tax that every man should put into the chest that will receive this great grace of their jubilee. First, every man and woman, . . . . having lands, tenements, or rents, amounting to the yearly value of (lira) 2,000 or above, must pay, or cause to be paid, . . . and effectually, *without fraud or deceit* [!!], put into the chest. . . . lawful money current in that country where they be [lira] 3, 6s. and 8d.\* 'Also, every man and woman having tenements and rents to yearly value of Lira 1000 or above, to the sum of Lira 2,000 exclusive, must pay for themselves and their wives and children 40s.' – *Id.*, pp. 481, 482. "This sliding scale goes down to the payment of 12d. [\*L1 is \$ 4.80, 1s. is 24 cents, and 1d is 2 cents—Footnote].

'The Pope. . . . granted full authority and power to the venerable father in God, Jasper Powe, his orator and commissary, to absolve [any one who] hath committed *simony*, . . . . with all those that occupy evil gotten goods, all usurers, and all such that *wrongfully and unlawfully* occupyeth or withholdeth other men's goods, . . . . that they may lawfully keep and occupy the same goods, first making composition for the same with said commissary of some certain sum of money to be spent in the foresaid holy use.' –*Id.*, pp. 482, 483.

"Hon. Thomas E. Watson, U.S. Senator from Georgia, writes:

'Claude de Espence was Rector of the University of Paris in the sixteenth century. He published a 'Commentary on the Epistle to Titus.' He was [a] devoted Roman Catholic

and his standing was high in the church. . . . Here is what he wrote and published about the 'Tariff on Sins':

'Provided money can be extorted, everything prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money. . . . They give permission to priests to have concubines. . . . There is a printed book which has been publicly sold for a considerable sum, entitled 'The Taxes of the Apostolical Chancery,' from which one may learn more enormities and crimes than from all the books of the Summists. And all these crimes, there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while Absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought.'

'In the British Museum are two small volumes which contain the Pope's Chancery Taxes, and His Penitential Taxes. These books---in manuscript bound in vellum---were taken from the archives of Rome, upon the death of **Innocent XII**. The Prothonotary, Amyon, was the abstractor. One of the booklets bears date, '6 February, 1514': the other '10 March, 1520.' The inscription is '*Mandatum Leonis, Papa X.*, '---which, freely rendered, means that the compilation of these Taxes was ordered by **Pope Leo X.**' ---*The Watchman*, 'October, 1928, Vol. II, No. IX, pp. 275, 276.

FOOTNOTE: \*Of these 'Tax Tables' forty-seven editions were issued, eighteen at Rome itself. They itemize all classes of sins: 'simony,' 'perjury,' 'murder,' 'rape,' etc., by stating the exact amount of 'tax' for 'absolution' of each class of crime. See 'Spiritual Venality of Rome,' Rev. Joseph Vendham, M.A., 'Traffic in Pardons,' George Hodson, and 'Philosophical Dictionary,' Voltaire, Vol. II, pp. 474-478. See also 'The Pope and the Council,' Dollinger, pp. 351-353.

#### "POPE COULD EMPTY PURGATORY

"Henry Charles Lea says:

'An enthusiastic Franciscan taught at Tournay, in 1482, that the pope at will could empty purgatory. . . . The same year . . . the church of Saintes, having procured a bull of indulgence from **Sixtus IV**, announced publicly that, no matter how long a period of punishment had been assigned by divine justice to a soul, it would fly from purgatory to heaven as soon as three sols were paid in its behalf to be expended in repairing the church. . . . The doctrine. . . . was pronounced to be unquestionable Catholic truth by the Dominican Silvestro Mozzolino, in his refutation of Luther's Theses, dedicated to Leo X. (F. Silvest, *Prieriatis Dialogus*, No. 27.) As Silvestros was made general of his order and master of its sacred palace, it is evident that no exceptions to his teaching were taken at Rome. Those who doubt that the abuses of the system were the proximate cause of the Reformation can consult Van Espen, *Jur. Eccles. Universi P. II.*, tit. vii., cap. 3, No. 9-12.' ---*History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, Vol. I, p. 43, note.

"Some Roman Catholics writers claim that the 'taxes' charged in those 'Tax Tables' were simply registration fees for the absolutions or pardons granted. If this were true, why are they called 'taxes,' and why should the registration fee for one man be fifty times as much as for another that had committed the same sin? Or why should registration fees vary so greatly for the different sins?

"William Coxe, F.R.S., F.A.S., speaking of the time of Luther, says:

‘The sales of indulgences gave rise to the schism of a great part of Europe from the Church of Rome. Indulgences, in the earlier ages, were merely a diminution of ecclesiastical penances, at the recommendation of confessors or persons of peculiar sanctity. This license soon degenerated into an abuse, and being made by the popes a pretext for obtaining money, was held forth as an exemption from the pains of purgatory, and afterwards as a plenary pardon for the commission of all sins whatsoever; and this unchristian doctrine\* was justified on the principle no less absurd than impious and immoral.

‘With a view to replenish the exhausted treasury of the church, **Leo X** had the recourse to sale of indulgences, expedient which had been first invented by **Urban II**, and continued by his successors; Julius II had bestowed indulgences on all who contributed towards building the church of St. Peter, at Rome, and Leo founded his grant on the same pretence. But. . . this scandalous traffic had been warmly opposed in Germany. . . These indulgences were held forth as pardons for the most enormous crimes; they were publicly put up for sale, and even forced upon the people, and **Tetzel** and his coadjutors indulged themselves in drunkenness, and every species of licentiousness, in which they squandered their share of the profits, and not infrequently produced indulgences as stakes at the gaming table.’—‘*History of the House of Austria*,’ Vol. I, pp. 384-386.

“Professor Coxe continues in a footnote:

‘We subform the form of absolution by Tetzel: ‘May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by his authority, by that of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; and then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be, even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Holy See; and as far as the keys of the holy church extend, I remit to thee all punishment which thou deservest in purgatory on their account; and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which thou possessest at baptism; so that when thou diest, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delight shall be opened; and if thou shalt not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,’ *Seckend. Comment Lib. I, p. 14.*’—*Id, p. 385.*

“The author has several photographic reproductions of these ‘Indulgences.’ The ‘Congregation of the Propaganda’ at Rome, 1883, published a book called ‘II Tesoro dele sacre Indulgence,’ which attempts to justify the sale of indulgences by monks at the at the time of Martin Luther. (Chap. III).

“Dr. William Robertson gives the same facts in the ‘History of the Reign of Emperor Charles the Fifth,’ Vol. I, pp. 460-463, as having been quoted from Dr. Coxe. In a footnote Dr. Robertson adds the following of Tetzel’s arguments:

‘The souls confined in purgatory, for whose redemption indulgences are purchased, as soon as the money tinkles in the chest, instantly escape from that place of torment and ascend into heaven. . . . For twelve pence *you* may redeem the soul of your father out of

purgatory; and are you so ungrateful that you will not *rescue* your parent from torment?’  
‘--- *Id.*, p. 462.

### TURNING THE TABLES ON TETZEL

“John Dowling, D.D., relates:

‘A gentleman of Saxony has heard Tetzel at Leipsic, and was much shocked by his impostures. He went to the monk, and inquired if he was authorized to pardon sins *in intention*, as such as the applicant intended to commit? ‘Assuredly,’ answered Tetzel; ‘I have full power from the Pope to so.’ ‘Well,’ returned the gentleman, ‘I want to take some slight revenge on one of my enemies, without attempting his life. I will pay you ten crowns, if you will give me a letter of indulgence that shall bear me harmless.’ Tetzel made some scruples; they struck their bargain for thirty crowns. Shortly after, the monk set out from Lepsic. The gentleman, attended by his servants laid wait for him in a wood between Justerboch and Treblin,---and fell upon him, gave him a beating, and carried off the rich chest of indulgence-money the inquisitor had with him. Tetzel clamored against this act of violence, and brought an action before the judges. But the gentleman showed the letter signed by Tetzel himself, which exempted him beforehand from all responsibility. Duke George who had at first been much irritated by this action, upon seeing this writing, ordered that the accused should be acquitted. ‘ – *History of Romanism*,’ p. 445. *New York: 1870.*

“Some people finally began to feel that, if the pope could empty purgatory at will, he must be very hard-hearted to leave so many millions in the flames just because the people did not buy sufficient indulgences to free them! Was not the pope more concerned about the souls of his spiritual children in purgatory, than about the building of a magnificent church at Rome? Should not be the shepherd more concerned about his sheep than about their wool? People had begun to break the shackles and think for themselves. A storm was brewing, only waiting for someone to take the lead.

“When God’s hour strikes, He always has His instruments ready for action. **On the 31<sup>st</sup> of October, 1517**, Dr. Martin Luther stepped up to the beautiful castle Church at Wittenberg, and nailed on its door the ninety-five theses he had written against the sale of indulgences. In two weeks ‘these propositions were circulated over all Germany. . . . In a month they had made the tour of Europe.’ – *History of Protestantism*,’ J. A. Wylie, Vol. I, chap. X, p. 267.

“We shall now leave with the reader to decide, whether or not sufficient proof has been given of the corrupt condition of the medieval church to justify a Reformation. When the [Roman Catholic] Church refused to reformed, turned against the Reformers, and bitterly opposed all attempts to place **the Bible in the hands of the common people**, then the time had come to *separate* from her communion, and establish churches where the people would be *fed with the word of God*, and where there was *liberty to obey it.*” –

The above quoted from *Facts of Faith* by Christian Edwardson, pp. 159-172, Southern Publishing Association, Nashville 8, Tennessee, printed in the U.S. A. 1943.