

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART ONE OF SEVEN

Samuele Bacchiocchi has written a direct attack against Ellen White's character and the accuracy and inspiration of her writings. He has placed it in a public newsletter on his web site, which Advent believers around the world can read. By his own claim, thousands have responded; the majority with hearty approval. His objective is to reduce confidence in those writings.

This present 28-page public rebuttal will immediately be placed on two of our web sites which have very large international coverage and are regularly viewed by thousands of Adventists.

It will also be released in tract format.

If Bacchiocchi had not flagrantly attacked the Spirit of Prophecy, this analysis would not have been written. —vf

— PART ONE —

THE MAKING OF A JESUIT PRIEST

As early as 10 or 12, a boy is often targeted for the priesthood. If he has an average intellect, he may be steered toward a monastery; if above average, into the priesthood. But those recognized as brilliant are placed in the Jesuit training program. This program, briefly described in earlier tract studies by the present author, requires years of careful training (*The Jesuits: Their Origin, Objectives, and Methods* [MB-1], *Trained to be a Secret Agent* [MB-51], *More about Secret Agents* [MB-52], and *Still More about Secret Agents* [MB-53].)

There are several instructional tracks. While many are trained for mission assignments, the most capable ones are directed into special assignments in governmental positions. In earlier centuries, they wormed their way into the courts of kings and became confessors and counselors. Since the nineteenth century, they have entered politics and governmental positions and helped to shape the affairs of nations.

Others have had their expenses paid while they earned Ph.D. doctorates. Some are hired into secular universities while others apply for positions in Protestant colleges and universities.

Some of the agents are "converted" to a Protestant denomination in their early 20s or, generally, by 25 at the latest. They attend Protestant colleges and seminaries, do a brief stint in pastoral work or in a mission work, and then attend a secular university. Once they have obtained doctorates, they are prepared to enter much higher positions in the target denomination—especially in its colleges and universities where future pastors, leaders, and theologians are trained.

In those situations in which a student is ideally situated for a special assignment, he may undergo a briefer Jesuit training program and is "converted" and baptized by the age of 15 to 17. Because his loy-

alties to Rome are solid, there are ways he will be able to obtain additional Jesuit training later. A primary opportunity occurs when he later takes his graduate and doctoral work at a secular university.

The selection of the outside university is important. It depends on how many agents are already implanted in that denomination.

If there are only a few, the church may be so conservative that it refuses to send its men to outside universities or hire graduates contaminated by such institutions.

If many agents have already been implanted, the changeover in doctrines, standards, and educational training is already well-underway; and there will be little difficulty. Some churches are so riddled with agents that they are even willing to hire teachers who obtained advanced training at Catholic universities. This is increasingly taking place in our own denomination.

— PART TWO —

THE FORMATIVE YEARS OF BACCHIOCCHI

Samuele Bacchiocchi was born on July 1, 1938 in Rome, Italy, and raised in that city. Most Adventists are baptized by the age of 12, or a little younger. There is something about that age; it is the time that spiritually minded youth want to join the church and give their lives to God.

In 1950, Samuele turned 12. But we know that he was not baptized into the Adventist Church until 1954, at about the age of 16. Perhaps he attended Adventist schools before then. At any rate, somehow there was enough money for him to attend Newbold College, in England, and then Andrews University in America. Here was an Italian who knew Latin and a remarkable amount about Rome and the Catholic Church. By his own testimony, his primary income for five years of advanced studies, after being baptized, consisted of money from the sale of, what he calls, "*Steps to Christ* booklets." He must have sold

a lot of booklets.

In 1964, at the age of 26, Samuele was hired as a worker and later sent to Ethiopia as a foreign missionary.

— PART THREE —

THE LIFEWORK OF A JESUIT AGENT

A key point is the number of implanted agents in a given denomination. The more there are, the easier it is for them to sit on hiring committees—and bring in still more. They also protect one another, when they make mistakes.

Because Jesuits have been trained to take any disguise, do anything, or teach anything, they may even marry and raise children.

An agent has several important duties, including these:

- Help bring in new agents.
- Protect existing agents.
- Obtain information that the Vatican can use.
- Influence doctrines and standards.
- Urge tolerance of variant doctrines and views.
- Help move the church toward ecumenical relations with other churches and with Rome.

It is important that teachings be homogenized, so the church will eventually enter more subservient relations with the Mother Church.

It is important that church standards be lowered. Long ages ago, Rome discovered that when the members enjoy parades, carnivals, dramatic presentations, wine, and sports, the more pliable they are toward the Church's wishes.

Diluting the distinctive doctrines helps confuse the members, so they do not know what they believe. Give the impression that the distinctive teachings are something to be embarrassed about and hidden.

Some agents receive special assignments. They are so placed so that they can produce outstanding accomplishments for Rome.

An example of a special assignment occurred many years ago in China. Jesuit agents, posing as Catholic missionaries, had found that they were not succeeding as well as they liked. So they were assigned a daring task: They took the disguise of Buddhist priests, taught Buddhist teachings, and were making rapid inroads into the favor of the Chinese emperor. But, back home, the Vatican decided that there was very real danger that their disguise might be penetrated. So the assignment was suddenly canceled. That particular assignment was recognized as leading to a dead end. (How would the Buddhist priests later get themselves—or anyone else—converted to Catholicism?)

The Church has found that it has better success when a carefully placed Protestant agent makes a few negative statements about the papacy. This totally eases suspicions, and he is able to more efficiently

carry on his work.

An outstanding example of this occurred in England during the "Oxford Movement," which extended from 1833 to 1845. Several agents, planted as professors in Oxford University, began writing and mailing out short articles. Beginning in 1833, John H. Newman, a leading Anglican minister, published his *Tracts for the Times*. Other agents added to them. Initially, the papers urged a defense of the Church of England as a divine institution. But gradually, they moved more and more toward submission of the church to Rome. In 1841, Newman published his famous *Tract 90*, which too clearly revealed his objective. It aroused strong opposition from conservative churchmen. In 1845, Newman (afterward rewarded with a cardinal's hat) and several other churchmen openly joined the Catholic Church. But the majority of the agents remained in the Church of England, and their views continued to gain ground. In 1850, an incident (the Gorham case) resulted in more conversions to Catholicism, including those of Manning and Wilberforce. Despite opposition from many in government and the press, the movement continued to spread until it ultimately diluted British Protestantism. The impact of the Oxford Movement was so strong, that the Church of England remains deadened to this day.

So, although a Jesuit may not necessarily speak in favor of Rome, he will work to eliminate confidence in the denomination's distinctive teachings and lower its standards.

A Jesuit agent is always brilliant. He may know several languages. He flatters associates and superiors. He expresses great loyalty to church leaders. He may defend some conservative teachings, generally those that Rome is not concerned about. He will generally hold liberal views about the faith and practice of the church.

He is always clever in what he does, because he is in contact with Jesuit superiors who help him think through his plans; they may even ghostwrite part or all of his articles and books. His writings are able to express great subtlety, alternating between assuring phrases of conservatism and liberal skepticism. Because of this double-tongued ability, his true positions may be difficult to pin down.

Even in his retirement years, such an agent, trusted and beloved for his years of work within the denomination, is able to continue writing articles and preaching at churches and major events. But, because he is no longer hampered by employment, he is able, in his speaking and writing, to speak more openly and directly to the point.

— PART FOUR —

THE GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY

The *Collegio Romano* (Roman College), as its

founder Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556) called it, began in 1551 in a rented house at 14 via Capitolina, on the lower northern slope of that hill, where today the via d' Aracoeli intersects the via Margana; this was an area still rural at the time and lying on the outskirts of the city, close to the Roman forum.

In order to counteract the effects of Protestantism, Loyola recognized an urgent need for a training school for secret agents which, upon graduation, could penetrate the palaces of kings, the universities, and even the leadership of Protestant churches. The plan was a daring one, but Ignatius himself received careful instruction in the woods from an "angel." With such help, it is not surprising that Loyola's teachings and methods were so devilish.

From that day in Rome in 1548, when he first discussed the project with Diego Laynez, one of his first converts, Ignatius had in mind a lengthy training program that would transform an entering student into a polished instrument in the hands of the Jesuit hierarchy.

Only the best professors would be the instructors; each one a master in a specialized field. The first scholastic year opened on February 23, 1551, with 60 students and 15 teachers. Hebrew was added to the curriculum the following September.

In the autumn of 1553, just two years after its founding, a course of higher studies was inaugurated. Foreign languages were taught, enabling native Italians to speak English, for example. They were taught secret codes and how to achieve desired objectives.

Pope Gregory VIII (lived 1502-1585; reigned 1572-1585) was the first pope to fully recognize the terrific possibilities of the new college. Anxious to determine the best way to overthrow Protestantism in northern Europe, he discovered the solution.

"Gregory had been crowned only eight months when he gave a commission to Peter Canisius to visit the Catholic princes of Germany, Austria and Poland to get their views on the best way of strengthening Catholicism in the northern countries. The answer was unanimous: more educated priests and the endowment of the German College. To the report, Canisius added his own pleadings when he came to Rome in the spring of 1573."—*Philip Caraman, S.J., University of the Nations, p. 19.*

On August 6 of that year, Gregory instituted a lavish yearly endowment for the school. It has continued on down to the present day. The various special agent schools (the German School, English School, etc.) were combined, and the institution was later named in his honor. For centuries, it has been the pope's special university for the training of outstanding priests and agents for special assignments.

That little school, the first Jesuit training school in the world, grew until it became the *Pontifical Gregorian University (Pontificia Universita Gregori-*

ana), the leading spy indoctrination school of the Jesuits. Although dozens of other Jesuit schools, on all levels, were later to be founded throughout the world, the *Gregoriana*, as it is affectionately known by its graduates, has retained its focus on training undercover agents with the most brilliant intelligence; these agents were later assigned to important positions throughout the world. Agents, already implanted, would make sure they were quickly hired in predesignated locations.

Nineteen of its graduates so distinguished themselves that they were later canonized as saints by the popes. Another 24 graduates received beatification, while 16 worked their way up the ladder of Roman political intrigue until they attained the office of pope.

— PART FIVE —

BACCHIOCCHI AT THE GREGORIANA

In the fall of 1969, Bacchiocchi entered the halls of this, the oldest and most eminent, Jesuit university in the world.

What would it be like to take a full course of studies in the Gregoriana? Who alone could go there? What kind of slavish subservience to the Jesuits and the pope would be imprinted on their souls? The following quotations afford a glimpse into this matter. They come from the book, *University of the Nations: The Story of the Gregorian University of Rome*.

"It was a rule that all scholars had to attend daily mass. They were to follow the priest devoutly . . . kneeling or standing at appropriate times (p. 7).

"Ignatius also set great store by both the formal and the regular weekly disputations held in the schoolrooms . . . They became tests of endurance, memory and fast thinking" (p. 8).

"Twelve months after its foundation, he [Loyola] wrote to Peter Canisius in Vienna and to the Jesuit superiors in Ingolstad and Louvain. He pressed them to send to Rome youths between the ages of 16 and 22 or even older, selected for their ability, good manners, sound health and capacity to undertake an exacting course of studies. Canisius, though sick, was the first to reply. He promptly pointed to the flaws he saw in Ignatius' plans: 'It is extremely difficult,' he wrote, 'to persuade the people of Austria to send their sons to Rome, for the conditions of entrance are the kind no northerners will tolerate, especially the one that requires students to bind themselves to the service of the Pope' " (p. 10)!

So you can see that the university maintains a pretty rigorous program. How would you like to have to attend mass every day? Would you want to kneel before Catholic priests? Would you want to call them your spiritual "father"? When referring to the pope, would you want to have to call him "the holy father"? Could you, as a Seventh-day Adventist, remain a Christian and still do this for five years, knowing all

the time that it was blasphemous to take such a title, in reference to a man, on your lips? Would you want to rigorously study Catholic theology for years and be tested on your mastery of its intricacies?

Even though designed for special agents, the Gregorian University was also a Jesuit priest's seminary. Here is a description of another Catholic seminary, by a young man who attended it.

It will explain why even a casual reader can quickly detect inconsistencies and errors within Bacchiocchi's reasoning. His mind was damaged by years spent in a Jesuit indoctrination center.

"When a boy enters a seminary, he begins years of the most thorough and effective intellectual indoctrination the world has ever known . . . It ends . . . with a mental rigidity and acceptance of medieval superstitions and religious concepts as archaic as those of the Buddhist monks upon the isolated, frozen mountains of Tibet."—*Emmett McLoughlin, People's Padre, p. 7.*

"We were to be taught according to the form of scholastic philosophy, which had been developed by Thomas Aquinas on the basis of Aristotelianism."—*Ibid., p. 21.*

"We had already spent six years in intensive Roman Catholic mental discipline. We now thought we were mentally free . . . We did not suspect that we had been already conditioned against non-conformism . . . We meditated on the sins of humanity and the 'truths' of the Church. We attended daily mass, and we recited the scriptural quotations of the Divine Office.

"This atmosphere prevented the slightest deviation while we progressed through a 'free' philosophy and by the light of our own 'reason' came to 'irrefutable' conclusions . . . Our Roman Catholic textbooks set up straw men with carefully chosen quotations and to our delight knocked them down and confounded the heretic. In our minds we had mastered and refuted all modern philosophy. We had studied contemporary religion and modern thought in the same manner that a student in Moscow must study American democracy."—*Ibid., pp. 21-22.*

There are three levels of training which a prospective agent undergoes, before he can graduate and be entrusted with special penetration assignments within non-Catholic organizations and denominations: *Novice*, *Scholar*, and finally *Coadjutor*. Since Baachiochi completed a full five-year course at the oldest Jesuit training school, he would have achieved the *Coadjutor* level. He would have memorized the 65 *Propositions* of the Jesuit Order, and yielded his mind and soul to the five *Underlying Beliefs*:

(1) Obedience to one's superior. "Recognize in the

superior, whoever he may be, the Lord Jesus, and in him to offer, with the highest religious devotion, reverence, and obedience to the divine majesty" (*A.J. Newman, Manual of Church History, p. 377*).

(2) "The end justifies the means." The ultimate outcome makes right whatever was needed to achieve it.

(3) The teaching of Probabilism. "An opinion is rendered probable [probably correct], if it has in its favor one or two theologians of repute" (*Newman, pp. 378-379*).

(4) "The scheme of evading responsibility for sinful and criminal conduct by the method of 'directing the intention' . . . In accordance with this, one may commit murder without burdening his conscience, if in the act his intention is directed to the vindication of his honor" or some other worthy end" (*Newman, p. 379*).

(5) "Mental reservation." He can by word or gesture tell a lie, provided the word or clause that would make the statement true is in his mind, though unspoken (*Newman, p. 379*).

We might also mention the strange reasoning that highly trained Jesuits are able to apply to a passage in the Bible—or even to the decree of a pope—and make it teach something totally different than what the words obviously say. This is known as "*casuistry*." An example would be their later interpretation of the dogma of "papal infallibility" (which Pope Pius IX pushed through Vatican Council I in 1870), applying it only to certain—but not all—official statements by the popes. This strange twist was needed, in view of the well-known fact that, as Luther declared at Worms, the popes have often contradicted one another and the councils (*Great Controversy, 160*).

At the Gregoriana, Bacchiocchi specialized in theology and church history.

"For ten years we covered the History of Christianity. All we knew of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* was it must be false because it attacked the Papacy. We never saw H.G. Well's *Outline of History*—but we were prepared to refute it. We knew the historical argument for the primacy of Peter and swallowed it whole."—*Emmett McLoughlin, People's Padre, p. 23.*

If you were to ask a graduate of the Gregoriana what he learned there, he would probably tell you he was taught grammar, history, and doctrine. But there are some other things he was taught that he would not mention.

That is understandable. The Gregorian University was very careful that the uninitiated never know the peculiar Jesuit reasoning and methods of opera-

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART TWO OF SEVEN

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

tion that the students were drenched in. Only recruits willing to become dedicated special agents were permitted to enter its halls of learning.

But a special need, a special student, and a special project made it possible for something new to occur in 1973.

The special need was the placement of a man on the highest level in Adventist educational circles, in the school where every future pastor and church leader would be required to receive advance training. The special student was a young Italian Adventist, born and raised in Rome, who, for some strange reason, wanted to study at the Gregoriana. (And even stranger, he believed that the school—as closed to Protestants as is the sacred Buddhist Portola in Tibet—would accept him.)

From that which followed, it would appear that the project was twofold: Show Adventists everywhere that closeness to Catholicism was not a problem. Show Protestants that they needed to heighten the sacredness of Rome's sacred Day of the Sun instead of merely letting it be a day for churchgoing followed by recreation and sports.

In order to intensify the spotlight of interest on the future graduate, a seemingly unknown Adventist missionary from Africa, he was to be the beneficiary of seven remarkable gifts from the shrewdest political organization in the world—the Vatican, which never does anything by happenstance:

- The first (and apparently only) admission of a non-Catholic in the 422-year history (1551-1793) of the Pontifical Gregorian University. For this purpose, the special approval of the highest levels in the Jesuit Order would have to grant its approval. For such a remarkable “first” to occur, the paperwork would also have to pass across the desks of top echelons in the Vatican.

- The young Adventist would receive an in-depth five (not four) year course of Jesuit instruction. All the intricacies of the Order, needed in order to carry out his future assignments, would be laid open before him.

- In order to make him a Catholic-trained “specialist in early Sabbath-Sunday history,” it would be arranged that the young man would present his doctoral thesis on who changed the Bible Sabbath to Sunday and when it occurred. This would generate favorable excitement throughout the Adventist denomination.

- Unlike most students, he would be honored with the gift of a gold medal, by the reigning pope, for his “outstanding scholarship.”

- For the first time in its entire history, the Pontifical Gregorian University would publish a book by a Protestant.

- The book would receive the *Imprimatur* of Rome (“*Imprimatur: Romae, die 16 Iunii 1975, R.P. Hervé Carrier, S.I., Rector Universitatis. Con approvazione del Vacariato di Roma, in data 17 giugno 1975*”). “*Imprimatur*” means that everything within the book contains orthodox Roman Catholic doctrine and is safe for a Catholic to read.

- The book received a two-page preface by Vincenzo Monachino, S.J., Chairman of the Church History Department, Pontifical Gregorian University. More on what Monachino said in the preface, below.

Samuele Bacchiocchi is the first and only Seventh-day Adventist to personally receive not only a gold medal from the pope, a complete training in the Jesuit headquarter's training school, but also a Jesuit *imprimatur* (meaning accurate, doctrinally approved, and safe for Catholic readers).

It is the opinion of many that this was a carefully crafted situation, dramatically staged to produce ever-increasing levels of excitement within the Adventist Church. It was done to firmly plant an agent strategically for an important work and give him great influence. It is the belief of many that, in no way, was all this done merely as an accidental happenstance. The Vatican in Rome is the most astutely political structure in the world. It does nothing in a random manner.

Alberto Rivera, a former Jesuit agent, explained both the inner workings and special objectives of this elaborate network of intelligence gathering and doctrinal comprising:

“The first Protestant groups they [the Jesuits] moved on were the 7th Day Adventists and the Full Gospel Businessmen. Then into the Baptists, methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, etc. until they were all infiltrated, including the Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses. All the seminaries, universities, and colleges were next. The Jesuits directed Catholic Youth Action, Legion of Mary, and Knights of Columbus who pulled it off. Now all these groups are silent about Rome or claim that the Roman system is a Christian Church.

“They are winning through compromise! Almost all Protestant pastors are afraid to speak out against Rome. If they did, those planted in their churches

would attack them on command.”—*Alberto Rivera, Alberto, Part 1 (1979), The Crusaders, Vol. 12, Chino, CA, Chick Publications, p. 28.*

Here is how the graduate describes himself today on one of his web sites:

“Dr. Bacchiocchi is the first non-Catholic to have graduated from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. There, in response to his Ph.D. dissertation, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, he received a gold medal from Pope Paul VI for academic distinction. He has also earned degrees in the USA and has served as a missionary in Ethiopia. He is author of numerous articles and twelve books, and has recently retired from his role as professor of church history and theology at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. The topic of Dr. Bacchiocchi’s dissertation at the Pontifical Gregorian University was the history of Jewish Sabbath-keeping and its evolution into Christian Sunday-keeping” [*emphasis ours*].

The Gregoriana was a mecca for Bacchiocchi. He was able to make close friendships with leading Jesuits from throughout the world. He was also told of leading Protestants who, like himself, had strange close friendships with Rome.

Here at the Gregoriana he could obtain much instruction that he had missed earlier in his life. Very likely, those were happy years for Samuele, associating with so many close friends that he made among priests, bishops, cardinals, and Catholic leaders. The Gregoriana is a frequent stopover for high-ranking church leaders from all over the world field. And, I can assure you, few of those leaders had, themselves, received a gold medal from the pope.

When John F. Kennedy became U.S. president, it changed Catholicism in America. Henceforth, Roman Catholics were considered safe to have around. So it has been at Andrews since 1977, and in hundreds of Adventist meetings, as Bacchiocchi has paraded in his pontifical vestments, declaring himself to be an exemplary Adventist.

What does this strange experience and testimony of Alberto Rivera tell us?

- The penetration of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is an extremely important objective for Rome.
- By 1977, the Adventist Church had enough implanted Jesuit agents, that Rome knew Bacchiocchi would be snapped up by Andrews as soon as he graduated. Yet, frankly, he was not qualified for the position. A five-year Jesuit trainee would be automatically disqualified for any level of employment in our church, prior to 1950.
- Bacchiocchi could travel around and use his Gregorian University background to get Adventists comfortable with Catholicism and help propel the church further down the road toward it.
- Because of contacts he was told about at Rome,

Bacchiocchi would be able to quickly establish extensive contacts with leading implants in a variety of churches and religious organizations.

— PART SIX —

STATING THE OBJECTIVE OF THE BOOK

The preface to Bacchiocchi’s thesis, as published in his book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, is very revealing.

As mentioned earlier, the book received a two-page preface by Vincenzo Monachino, S.J., Chairman of the Church History Department at the Pontifical Gregorian University. The very first reason, given by the preface, for the thesis and its Jesuit publication, was this:

“The ever-increasing non-observance of the Lord’s Day . . . demands a serious re-examination of the significance of Sunday for the Christian today.”—*From Sabbath to Sunday, p. 7.*

In other words, this book will help Sundaykeepers to better value the sacredness of Sunday! —That objective is in full agreement with the aims of the papacy, as given in chapter 35 of *Great Controversy*. *It is only as Protestants value Sunday sacred, that they can be induced to join with Catholic leaders in coercing the U.S. Congress into enacting a National Sunday Law!*

The second stated reason, as given by Monachino, was this:

“The many studies on this topic, though excellent, have not given a fully satisfactory answer because of the lack of consideration of some of those factors which in the Church of the first centuries contributed to the concrete genesis and development of a day of worship different from the *Jewish Sabbath*.”—*Ibid. (italics ours)*.

There was a need to clarify that the papacy was responsible for a very early change. This concept, that the pope changed the Sabbath to Sunday as early as the second century and required all other Christian churches to yield on this point, is, for them, an important point. Yet it is a false claim.

This error exalts Roman primacy as bearing sway over the other churches much earlier than that which actually occurred. It moves the changeover to Sundaykeeping (by this I mean not merely at Rome but in all the Christian churches of the empire) back over three centuries from when it actually began to take hold (the fifth century, a century after Constantine).

This error is a key point of Bacchiocchi’s, as of August 2002 in his *Endtimes Issues, #87*. Twenty-three years after leaving Rome, he is still faithfully teaching what he was there told to teach. We shall discuss it later in this present study. In maintaining it, he even dares to boldly charge that *Great Controversy* is wrong when it tells the truth about when the changeover occurred. More on this later.

1 After repeatedly praising the “rigorous scientific
1 method and the vast horizon with which it [the book]
2 has been conceived and executed,” and the author’s
1 “singular ability to encompass various fields in order
to capture those aspects and elements related to
the theme under investigation,” Monachino returns
once again to his first and key point:

“Conscious that the history of salvation knows
not fractures but continuity, he finds in the redis-
covery of the religious values of the Biblical Sab-
bath, a help to restore to the Lord’s Day its ancient
sacred character . . . [The believers should] spend
Sunday not in outings or watching shows, but rather
to sanctify it by assisting at the eucharistic celebra-
tion and by doing acts of mercy.”—*Ibid.*, p. 8.

In other words, just as the Bible Sabbath had
religious values in Bible times, so now the Lord’s Day,
its successor for Christians, should be guarded just
as sacredly. And by so doing, the “fractures” will be
eliminated and we will once again be brought together.

The 374-page book would, in the words of
Bacchiocchi (quoted more fully shortly), be the “evo-
lution” of “*Jewish Sabbath-keeping*” into “*Christian
Sunday-keeping*.” “Evolution” is a well-known secu-
lar word, denoting progress from something inferior
to something better. In this instance, something Jew-
ish to something Christian. Are you beginning to catch
on to the Bacchiocchi objective?

— PART SEVEN —

BACCHIOCCHI AT ANDREWS

On May 18, 1977, our church leaders, through
Bert B. Beach, gave a gold medal to Pope Paul VI as
an expression of our deepest appreciation for his be-
nevolent services to mankind. The next month, Sam-
uele Bacchiocchi graduated from their papal spy
school. On June 29 of that same month, Monachino
dated his preface to Bacchiocchi’s book.

As soon as Bacchiocchi graduated from the Pon-
tifical Gregorian University, he was immediately hired
by Andrews University, so he could teach our future
ministers and church leaders for years to come. Since
about 1960, all future ministers were required to take
four quarters (12 months) of classes at the Seventh-
day Adventist Seminary, located on the Andrews Uni-
versity campus.

While at the Gregoriana, Bacchiocchi had spe-
cialized in theology and church history. This enabled
him to teach in two separate departments at Andrews.
He would, for over twenty years, have an outstanding
opportunity to influence the students under him in
many subjects.

We already have an idea what his theology was
like; for he had learned so much of it at Pope Gre-
gory’s university.

But what were his concepts of church history like?
I obtained an inkling of that in late 1980. Only a few

months of *Waymarks* had been mailed out, when I
received a phone call from a friend in Washington
State. He had called Bacchiocchi about something he
wrote or said on a tape, questioning why Bacchiocchi
had implied that there were portions of *Great Con-
troversy* which were not correct.

“Vance,” my friend said, “Bacchiocchi is fast think-
ing and talks like a machine gun. He said to me in an
irritated tone, ‘If that little old woman was here, I’d
teach her a thing or two!’ He seemed very upset about
Ellen White and *Great Controversy*.”

At about the same time, I acquired a copy of
Bacchiocchi’s book, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, which
was said to be an exact copy of his doctoral thesis. It
had been published by the Pontifical Gregorian Uni-
versity Press in 1977. Inside, I found the following;
chapter 2 opens with these words:

“The expression ‘Lord’s day’ which first appears
as an undisputed Christian designation for Sun-
day near the end part of the second century, de-
notes a day which belongs exclusively to the ‘Lord.’
Since Sunday has been traditionally viewed by many
Christians as the day of which Christ is Lord and
which is consecrated to Him, we may well begin
our historical inquiry into the origin of Sunday ob-
servance by ascertaining if Christ anticipated the
institution of a new day of worship dedicated ex-
clusively to Him.”—*From Sabbath to Sunday*, p.
17.

On later pages (pp. 111-131), Bacchiocchi labo-
riously tries to determine the meaning of “the Lord’s
day” in Revelation 1:10.

A different author, that Bacchiocchi was careful
not to quote, had earlier written this:

“It was on the Sabbath that the Lord of glory
appeared to the exiled apostle. The Sabbath was as
sacredly observed by John on Patmos as when he
was preaching to the people in the towns and cities
of Judea. He claimed as His own the precious prom-
ises that had been given regarding that day. ‘I was
in the Spirit on the Lord’s day,’ John writes.”—*Acts
of the Apostles*, 581 (cf. *7 Bible Commentary*, 955/
2:2-3).

The most detailed study on the topic, that I know
of, is one I prepared for pp. 166-169 of my book,
The Beginning of the End. There you will find a de-
tailed Bible study, referring to about two dozen Bible
verses which clearly establish that the “Lord’s day”
is the Bible Sabbath.

Yet, on pp. 111-131 of his book, Bacchiocchi as-
sures the reader that “Lord’s day” cannot have any
connection with the oft-repeated identification of the
Bible Sabbath with “the day of the Lord” throughout
the Bible (p. 112). The “Lord’s day” could be Sunday,
he said, because of three comments (made by unin-
spired writers) after the New Testament ended (pp.
112-113). Also it could mean “Easter Sunday” (p. 112)
or the “eschatological day of Christ’s parousia [com-

ing] and judgment” (p. 113); in other words, the Second Advent of Christ.

After a lengthy discussion of comments by this and that current Protestant or Catholic author, Bacchiocchi concludes that “the identification of the ‘Lord’s day’ of Revelation 1:10 with the eschatological day of the Lord (understood as the day of Christ’s judgment and parousia) appears to us as the most plausible” (p. 123). The remainder of the chapter (pp. 123-131) is occupied with this theme.

Following a variety of reasonings and references to over a dozen non-Adventist commentators, he concludes that “the expression ‘Lord’s day’ of Revelation 1:10, because of its immediate and wider context, can be best interpreted as a designation for the day of judgment and the parousia” (p. 131).

So, according to Bacchiocchi, Christ spoke to John on the great day of judgment. Does that make sense?

As soon as Bacchiocchi arrived at Andrews, he quickly established an extremely warm friendship with Dr. James P. Wesberry, executive director of the Lord’s Day Alliance USA (LDA), headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. To Adventists, the entire situation seemed most startling. Here was the leading Protestant organization in America dedicated to enacting a National Sunday Law—and one of our university professors had started working with him on a joint project.

What was the project? Holding seminars for non-Adventist Protestants in cities and towns throughout the United States, sponsored by the LDA. This continued for years.

What was the stated objective of the project? At each meeting, through rousing speeches, Bacchiocchi and an LDA representative would encourage the audience to value more highly their weekly day of rest—their “sabbath,” whether it be Saturday or Sunday. Biblical, historical, and sociological data was presented, showing that, by returning to the weekly rest day, America’s moral problems would more easily be resolved.

Of course, you and I know that when Protestants in America decide to value Sunday sacredness enough, they will want to enact a National Sunday Law. And when that happens, the papacy will be magnified, since Sunday sacredness is the “child of the papacy.” If you have any doubt about the truth of this paragraph, read chapter 35 (pp. 563-581) of *Great Controversy* again!

“Protestants little know what they are doing when they propose to accept the aid of Rome in the work of Sunday exaltation. While they are bent upon the

accomplishment of their purpose, Rome is aiming to re-establish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. Let the principle once be established in the United States that the church may employ or control the power of the state; that religious observances may be enforced by secular laws; in short, that the authority of church and state is to dominate the conscience, and the triumph of Rome in this country is assured.”—*Great Controversy*, 581.

“Marvelous in her shrewdness and cunning is the Roman Church. She can read what is to be. She bides her time, seeing that the Protestant churches are paying her homage in their acceptance of the false sabbath and that they are preparing to enforce it by the very means which she herself employed in bygone days. Those who reject the light of truth will yet seek the aid of this self-styled infallible power to exalt an institution that originated with her. How readily she will come to the help of Protestants in this work it is not difficult to conjecture. Who understands better than the papal leaders how to deal with those who are disobedient to the church?”—*Great Controversy*, 580.

Close contacts with the LDA and important Protestant leaders on various levels continued. Bacchiocchi became our self-appointed champion at lectures, meetings, and conventions. His message was that every Christian should observe a sabbath, one day in seven for spiritual rest. A weekly rest day was the only way in which true rest in Christ could be obtained. Frankly, even Muslims would appreciate Bacchiocchi’s meetings.

“How wonderful,” thought some of our leaders. Bacchiocchi is bringing the other churches to the importance of the Bible Sabbath. Far from it; he was urging Protestants and Catholics to protect their weekly rest day from desecration. Just one step from a call for a National Sunday Law.

About 1980, while we were still living in southern Illinois, the LDA held a widely advertised meeting in Marion, Illinois. Although we lived over 35 miles away, a flyer emphasizing the importance of keeping sacred one’s weekly rest day was sent to us in the mail. Bacchiocchi was the featured speaker. “Rest for Human Restlessness” was his theme. The subheads talked about the importance of returning to our weekly rest day.

At about the same time, the *Lake Union Herald* applauded his efforts. One article had a photo of him in his full pontifical university regalia—a black robe with a very large metal sunburst image over his chest—standing before an Adventist audience.

The sun image appeared to be about 7 inches in diameter and had large spiky rays extending about 2

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART THREE OF SEVEN

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

W inches out of the central sun on all sides. In the article, Bacchiocchi was reported to have said to the audience (some of whom seemed a little nervous about the robe and sun image), “Oh, this doesn’t bother you, does it?” With a reassuring smile he continued his presentation. He knew what he was doing.

Here is Bacchiocchi, traveling around America, representing the LDA, with a brilliant gold image of the sun god on his chest, urging people to keep holy their weekly rest day. What does that tell you? What day is he calling everybody back to?

All the while, some of our leaders thought it a great honor to have such a distinguished graduate in our midst, representing the finest in Adventism to our future pastors and administrators at Andrews and holding meetings for Protestants to make friends for our church.

During those 23 years from 1977 to 2000, Bacchiocchi continued on at our leading seminary. During that time, he opposed certain liberal errors, such as women’s ordination. But, intriguingly, they were always the ones that Rome opposes.

On September 19, 1987, Pope John Paul II completed his second “pilgrimage” to the United States (the first was in 1979). The Church alone spent more than \$22 million on the 10-day trip. Sixteen thousand accredited journalists covered the event.

As you might expect, our denomination felt the need to praise the pope. So, three months later, in the December issue of our *Signs of the Times*, a full-length admiring article was printed.

Oh, yes, and it was written by Samuele Bacchiocchi. Who did you expect?

Shortly afterward, we reprinted the article in *Appreciating the Pope* [WM-207]. Here are a few excerpts from this fawning article:

“To foster his role as the moral and spiritual leader of mankind, the Pope regularly welcomes delegations and leaders to the Holy See [the papal name for the pope’s headquarters] from Christian and non-Christian religions. Last year, for example, hundreds of leaders of all the major world religions accepted the pope’s invitations to come to Italy and participate with him at Assisi in a special prayer service for world peace.

“Millions around the world who saw the Pope on their TV screens, leading world religious leaders in that prayer service for world peace received a clear message: The Pope is accepted by world religious leaders as the champion of the spiritual aspirations

of all peoples . . .

“The Pope is succeeding admirably today in being widely accepted as the *Papa urbis et orbis*, the spiritual Father [printed with a capital “F”] of Rome and the world . . .

“To them [the Evangelicals] the Pontiff has become, as Martin E. Marty puts it, ‘a walking fortress of faith’ in the midst of a godless society’ (*TV Guide*, Sept. 5, 1987) . . .

“The reason is simple. Most Christians resent tyranny but welcome the voice of authority, certainty, and assurance. They want to hear from their church leaders, ‘This is the way, walk you in it!’ When they fail to hear this voice of authority from the Scriptures as proclaimed by their pastors, they become attracted to the Pope, who claims to offer the infallible interpretation of Scripture . . .

“John Paul challenged Americans to remember their ‘responsibility for justice and peace in the world’ . . . By championing these legitimate human aspirations with zeal, dignity, and devotion, the Pope has become for many the symbol of the noblest aspirations humanity must struggle to achieve.

“John Paul has been warmly received in the United States and the world over, because he practices well both statecraft and soul-craft. To devout Catholics he is the symbol of their piety, certainty, and assurance of salvation amidst the conflicting teachings and values of our time. To evangelicals, he is a man of faith and courage, willing to withstand secular, humanistic pressures. To mainstream Protestants and people in general, he is the champion of peace on social justice.”—*Samuele Bacchiocchi*, “Why Did the Pope Visit America Again?” *Signs of the Times*, December 1987, pp. 18-21.

This article, one of the most flattering about a pope ever to appear in an Adventist journal, was clearly designed to awaken sympathetic interest for Catholicism on the part of the hundreds of thousands of Adventists and non-Adventists who read this monthly “evangelistic outreach” magazine, paid for from the sacrificial offerings of faithful Advent believers.

Yet, all through those years, Bacchiocchi had little to say in appreciation of the Spirit of Prophecy. He still doesn’t.

The next year (1988), Bacchiocchi published his book, *Divine Rest for Human Restlessness*, which included this glowing foreword by the head of LDA:

“A Seventh-day Adventist, he was graduated from the Gregorian University in Rome, the first non-

Catholic to do so and with *summa cum laude* [highest honors]. For his brilliant academic achievement he was awarded a gold medal donated by Pope Paul VI. His ecumenical spirit matches his vast academic achievements.”—*Dr. James P. Wesberry, Executive Director, Lord’s Day Alliance, p. 7.*

In the early 1990s, Bacchiocchi started a little “sideline.” He began collecting the names and addresses of Seventh-day Adventists—not only those who were members, but also those who, though faithful to the message, had separated from the denomination. Why did he want to collect such lists? No one knows. Bacchiocchi said he bought and sold name lists for a little income on the side. In fact, he was so involved in this project, that he somehow had enough money to pay someone to enter new names and addresses onto his ever-growing lists.

Although denominational workers are listed in the Adventist *Yearbook*, it is difficult to obtain many of the members’ names; it is quite difficult to obtain those of faithful believers who are no longer on church rolls. But Bacchiocchi was busily collecting as many as he could get for some purpose.

Why would the graduate of a Jesuit spy-training school be interested in collecting the names of Seventh-day Adventists?

“You have been taught your duty as a spy, to gather all statistics, facts and information in your power from every source; to ingratiate yourself into the confidence of the family circle of Protestants and heretics of every class and character . . . among the schools and universities, in parliaments and legislatures, and in the judiciaries and councils of state, and to ‘be all things to all men,’ for the pope’s sake, whose servants we are unto death.”—*Inductive and Extreme Oath of the Jesuits (1883), quoted in Eric J. Phelps, Vatican Assassins, p. 83.*

— PART EIGHT —

BACCHIOCCHI ENTERS “RETIREMENT”

On July 1, 2000, when Samuele Bacchiocchi turned 62, he immediately resigned from his denominational position at Andrews, totally losing his means of support. In August 2002, he wrote this:

“I wish that I could receive at least one pay check at this time. The truth is that since I took an early retirement at the age of 62 on July 1, 2000, in order to devote myself more fully to Biblical research and lecturing, I receive no pay check at all at this time. I need to reach the age of 65 before I will receive the Social security and sustentation benefits.”—*Bacchiocchi, Endtime Issues, #88, p. 8.*

Although Bacchiocchi has no apparent means of support, he is mysteriously doing very well financially.

After 23 years at the Seminary, he was able to resign early; for he had left behind a solid group of associates whom he knew would continue teaching the students as he had done.

Now it was time to broaden his ministry to a far wider number of our people. Bacchiocchi had enough contacts in place that he quickly started speaking at meetings throughout the United States and overseas. In addition, he started an e-mail newsletter, in which, little by little, he carefully began teaching his “advance positions,” as he thought the readers were ready for them.

He calls these installment newsletters, “*Bible studies*.” But they generally consist of his speculations about various topics.

— PART NINE —

THE ANTICHRIST AND LITTLE HORN

Daniel spoke of the little horn (Dan 7-8), Paul spoke of the man of sin (2 Thess 2:3), and several terms in Revelation are used for that same organization. Of the four times the antichrist is mentioned in the Bible, all are in two of John’s epistles: 1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; and 2 John 7.

In his summer 2002 *Endtime Issues, #86*, Bacchiocchi declares that the antichrist of Bible prophecy includes not only the papacy, but also Islam. He then attempts to show that the antichrist is not so much Rome, but primarily Islam!

Of course, such talk, coming from one who 15 years earlier wrote the most flattering praise for the pope, seems strange. If Bacchiocchi was an emissary of Rome, why would he speak negatively about Rome?

However, it is a well-known fact that Jesuit agents are under orders by their superiors to do whatever it takes in order to achieve their ultimate objective—even if it requires, from time to time, a verbal attack on the Vatican and the pope himself!

“My son, heretofore you have been taught to act the dissembler: Among Roman Catholics to be a Roman Catholic, and to be a spy even among your own brethren; to believe no man, to trust no man.

“Among the Reformers, to be a Reformer; among the Huguenots, to be a Huguenot; among the Calvinists, to be a Calvinist; among the Protestants, generally to be a Protestant. And obtaining their confidence, to seek even to preach from their pulpits, and [if necessary to complete your disguise] to denounce with all the vehemence in your nature our Holy Religion and the Pope; and even to descend so low as to become a Jew among the Jews—that you might be enabled to gather together all information for the benefit of your Order as a faithful soldier of the Pope.”—*The Jesuit Oath, in ibid., p. 82.*

Throughout his study on the antichrist, Bacchiocchi compares and contrasts Catholicism with Islam, in an effort to show that the Biblical antichrist has primarily consisted of Islam down through the centuries, and hardly anything else.

A primary objective of the Jesuits has consistently been to eliminate papal Rome from Bible prophecy.

The following data on futurism and preterism is from a forthcoming book by the present author:

Francisco Ribera, in 1537-1541, developed what we today call *Futurism*. He declared that the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation would not be fulfilled until the very last days when, for 2300 literal days or about 7 years, an antichrist would appear. It was theorized that, at that time, a Jewish temple would be rebuilt in old Jerusalem. (In reality, the Muslims will never permit such a temple to be built on the Temple Mount.)

Samuel Maitland, William Burgh, John Darby, James Todd, and John Henry Newman were later leading Protestant theologians who infiltrated Jesuits used to spread this error throughout modern Protestantism. The Plymouth Brethren, the High Church Oxford Movement in the Anglican Church, and the Scofield Bible especially helped in this work.

A variant of this futurism was the development of dispensationalism, one form of which pushes many of the prophecies to the last days, to be fulfilled by the Jewish people.

Another Jesuit, Luis de Alcazar (1554-1613) developed the opposite position, known as *Preterism*. This is the teaching that the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation were fulfilled in ancient times by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Nero, and/or pagan Rome.

Hugo Grotius, of Holland, and Hammond, of England, helped further this error. Anti-Christian, German rationalists heavily endorsed it. This included J.G. Eichhorn, H.G.A. Ewald, G.C.F. Lucke, W.M.L. De Wette, Franz Delitzsch, and Julius Wellhausen. Since 1830, many British and American Bible teachers have taught it to their students.

Pursuing a similar line of reasoning, Samuele Bacchiocchi tries to prove that the Biblical antichrist is actually Islam, more than anything else.

Actually, Bacchiocchi sees the antichrist as including a great variety of people.

“John sees the antichrist as a principle of hostility and opposition to God.”—*Endtime Issues*, #86, p. 17.

Bacchiocchi then turns his attention to the little horn of Daniel 7—and decides that it applies directly, not only to the papacy, but to Islam.

“Truly, the description of the Little Horn as a power that began small but became exceedingly powerful fits well not only the Papacy, but also Islam.”—*Ibid.*, p. 18.

However, Bacchiocchi adds that the little horn applies more to Islam than to the papacy. Regarding the uprooting of three horns, “this distinguishing mark fits better Islam than the Papacy” (*ibid.*). Along with this, he says that, “comparing to the Papacy, Islam has persecuted Christians far more intensively

and extensively” (*ibid.*, p. 20).

So one can see the direction in which Bacchiocchi is headed: The little horn of Daniel applies primarily or only to Islam.

— PART TEN —
THE 1260 YEARS

Next, Bacchiocchi attacks our historic position on the 1260-year prophecy. Because it is quite obvious that Islam cannot be contained within a 1260-year time period between A.D. 538 and 1798, Bacchiocchi must figure out a way to change that extremely important prophecy.

Near the end of his *Endtime Issues*, #86, Bacchiocchi declares that our historic position on the 1260-year prophecy is incorrect. But he says that he received such a torrent of responses to that newsletter (of which he claims 95% agreed with his skepticism), that he spends most of #87 amplifying his theories that Ellen White's writings, especially *Great Controversy*, were full of errors needing his (Bacchiocchi's) corrections.

Just now, we will focus on what he has to say about the 1260-year prophecy. In order to build his case concerning this, Bacchiocchi interweaves several arguments in #86, pp. 21-22, and #87, pp. 11-16:

- The 1260 years do not start in A.D. 538.
- The 1260 years do not end in 1798.
- Ellen White was in error when she wrote about that time period in *Great Controversy*.
- The 1260 years is symbolic and is not 1260 years in length!

The 1260-year prophecy is extremely important, and helps identify the little horn. *The following section is excerpted from a forthcoming book by the present author:*

A.D. 508, 538, AND 1798

The historical basis for 508—What happened in 508 that made it important, as the beginning of the 1290-year prophecy?

About the year A.D. 508, Clovis, king of the Franks, was converted to Catholicism and the victory over the Goths occurred. The conversion of the Franks (France) and Goths (Germany) would, in later centuries, result in greatly strengthening papal supremacy; so this was an important date. We have always marked this as the beginning of the important 1290-year prophecy (Dan 12:11). Both the 1290- and 1260-year prophecies end in 1798. The 1335-year prophecy of the next verse (Dan 12:12) also begins at 508 and reaches to 1843. This view is a correct historical fulfillment, and agrees with our historic beliefs. The “daily” is applied to what happened when the 1290- (instead of 1260-year) year prophecy be-

gan and establishes the A.D. 508 date. It dovetails nicely with the A.D. 538 date which began the 1260-year prophecy.

The historical basis for 538—The 1843 chart links “538” with the plucking up of the three horns and the “commencement of papal supremacy.” This position is based on the prophecy in Daniel 7:25 and the uprooting of the third horn (Dan 7:8, 20, 24). It focuses on what happened when the 1260 years began.

According to our historic position, the missing phrase accompanying “continual” (*tamid*) is “paganism,” or “pagan supremacy,” which papal Rome took away at the beginning of the 1260 years. In A.D. 538, Emperor Justinian’s general, Belisarius, uprooted the third horn (the Ostrogoths). It is a known fact that, by this act, papal Rome eliminated pagan supremacy in the West.

In another sense, the papacy replaced the pagan abomination, which had extended back in history to Cain, with a papal abomination which masqueraded as the true worship of God.

How did the papacy take away paganism?—Historians tell us that part of the way the papacy took away paganism was by absorbing its essential elements. (See the present author’s book, *Mark of the Beast*, 22-25, for quotations by historians which verify this.) This is what made it Satan’s masterpiece of deception. It was just the old pagan religions and repression, masquerading as Christianity. The pagan abomination was transferred into something more deadly.

The Biblical basis for the date A.D. 538—What is the Bible evidence for beginning the 1260 years in 538? The critics charge that there is none. In reply, **it has to be something which can be confirmed by historians.** Determining the starting point is crucial. Some think the historical event is the taking away of the daily in Daniel 8:11. But that does not provide a definitive date, since the papacy was growing in power and influence from A.D. 330 (when Constantine moved to Constantinople) onward.

The starting point for the 1260 years is clearly given to us twice in the previous chapter (Dan 7:8, 20). It is **the plucking up of the third horn.** That event is solidly fixed by historians as occurring in A.D. 538. None can question the dating of that event: the overthrow of the Ostrogoths.

The historical importance of 538—It is charged by some that 508 and 538 are not significant, since the papacy had supremacy centuries earlier. That is a standard papal claim that its supremacy extends back to only a short time after the apostles died. But

that claim is not correct. Our historic dates for the beginning of the 1290- and 1260-year time spans stand solid. **Not until the papacy had power over the nations did it have supremacy**—and this did not happen until those dates.

When did the papacy replace paganism?—In order to better understand the relationship between the 508 and 538 dates, we need to understand that the papacy was growing in power for centuries. **The full supremacy of the pope did not occur until 508 and 538.** Five events marked important turning points in the gradual increase of the power of the Roman bishop.

The first date was in A.D. 195, when Pope Victor demanded that all the Christian churches obey his decree to henceforth observe Easter on Sunday (instead of the day in the week on which the Jewish Passover fell). The other churches were astonished at his audacity. Never before had one Christian church tried to lord it over the others. It is significant that this first attempt at gaining the supremacy was fought over Sunday sacredness, even though it was only for the yearly Easter service. Significantly, it was the Roman bishop who was championing it. Thoughtful historians recognize that, from its earliest days, the strongest claims of the Roman bishop to supremacy were based on its exaltation of Sunday. *Yet, in spite of Pope Victor’s demands, the other Christian churches refused to yield to his supremacy.* Contrary to pro-Catholic claims, papal supremacy does not date back to those earlier centuries.

The second date was in A.D. 321. Even though it did not mention the Christian religion, Constantine’s monumental Sunday Law of 321 was a major achievement for Pope Sylvester I. His close adviser, Eusebius, admits that they, the papal authorities, influenced the emperor to enact that law (*Great Controversy*, 574). But its enactment did not give the papacy supremacy. The Sunday Law was carefully worded to placate both the Mithraites and the half-converted Christians.

The third date was in A.D. 330, when Constantine I, nine years after issuing his first Sunday Law (A.D. 321), moved the capital of the Roman Empire to faraway Byzantium, which he renamed Constantinople. This greatly increased the position of the pope, but he still lacked civil power. The papacy could not gain the supremacy until it became a church-state.

The fourth date was A.D. 508, when Clovis, king of the Franks (modern France), was nominally converted along with his subjects. That territory had been the strong Roman province of Gaul. Imperial forces

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART FOUR OF SEVEN

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

conquered the Goths at about the same time. We date the 1290 years from this time. Pope Vigilius became, at that time, an important new leader in the West.

The fifth date was A.D. 538, when the third of the three horns was overthrown. In 493, the Heruli had been conquered; in 534 the Vandals were eliminated; and, in 538, the Ostrogoths vanquished. For the first time, all the tribes opposing the pope had been crushed. The emperor, Justinian, lived far away in Constantinople; and he and his successors did not henceforth interfere in papal activities.

We date the 1260 years from this point. **At last, the papacy had become a church-state, controlling territory in its own right. Truly can it be said that A.D. 508 and 538 marked the historical beginning of papal supremacy.**

Historians are agreed that the papacy was increasing in power for several centuries. But A.D. 508 and 538 are crucial. Both dates combine to mark the transition to papal supremacy. The way it is worded, the 1843 chart lists both as key events (more on this later). **From 538, onward, the papacy surged forward in its blasphemous claims and tyrannical rule.**

Pagan supremacy—Exactly what was the “continual” (the *tamid*) that the papacy took away in 538? In one sense, it was the desolating abomination of paganism. In another sense, it was *pagan supremacy*. The supremacy of paganism essentially ended in 538 and was replaced by papal ascendancy.

It is claimed that our traditional view is incorrect, because the papacy is said to have had full supremacy prior to A.D. 538. The historical facts, given above, shows that charge to be incorrect. But there is also other evidence:

Who uprooted the three horns?—It is an intriguing fact that *the papacy did not uproot even one of the three horns*. It did not do this—and the reason was that, prior to the beginning of the 1290 and 1260 years, it did not yet have the supremacy to do so. It lacked the civil power and force of arms.

Emperor Justinian sent General Belisarius all the way from Constantinople to conquer those western heathen tribes, and Belisarius did it with remarkable success against great odds. Historically, the papacy did not take away the horns. They were, as Daniel explains, subdued before it (Dan 7:20). However, Justinian had Belisarius do it at the request of the pope. It was in this sense that the papacy “took away” paganism (“He shall subdue three kings”; Dan 7:24).

The result is the same. By 538, the papacy was freed from outside interference and able to track down and destroy Christians over a wide area, as predicted in Revelation 12.

The A.D. 538 transition—When the Heruli and confederated tribes under the Heruli chief, Odoacer, removed the last Western Roman Emperor, Romulus Augustulus, from his throne in Rome in A.D. 476, the barbarian tribes overran the Roman Empire.

At this point, a struggle for theological and political power began by the Roman Catholic papacy against, not only paganism but also, Arianism. The conversion of Clovis, the king of the Franks (in Gaul, modern France), to Catholicism brought a powerful support to the papacy.

A.D. 538 marked a pivotal turning point, for in that year the Arians were driven out of Rome. It came about in this way:

The Arian Heruli had controlled Rome for a number of years. In A.D. 488, the Eastern Roman Emperor, Zeno, asked Theodoric, head of the Arian Ostrogoths, to conquer the Heruli, which he did.

Then **General Belisarius conquered the remaining Arian powers, the Vandals in North Africa (534) and the Ostrogoths in Italy (537-538).**

In A.D. 538, the Roman Catholic emperor, Justinian, ordered all citizens of the empire to become Roman Catholic within three months, or leave the empire. Those who refused, both Arians and pagans, had their property confiscated. (See Sumerbell, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 310-311.)

Another major event occurred **that same year (A.D. 538): Roman Catholicism promulgated the first religious Sunday law. This was the 28th canon of the Third Council of Orleans, France, which convened that year. It was the first Sunday law to forbid rural agricultural labor** (*J.N. Andrews, History of the Sabbath, 2nd ed., p. 372*).

A.D. 538 was clearly the key date, although advances and setbacks occurred for quite some time, both before and afterward. Prior to 538, the papacy gradually moved toward supremacy. After that date, from time to time it gained increased supremacy. (For example, in 756, the Frankish king Pepin waged two military campaigns against the Lombards who had captured central Italy, liberating the area for papal rule.) But 538 marked the transition.

Did the Vandals and Ostrogoths return later?—It has been suggested that these two tribes were not fully subdued by A.D. 538. But Robert Browning, in

his recent book, *Justinian and Theodora*, describes in detail what happened. In 534, the Vandals were totally vanquished by Belisarius and “the Vandals as a people vanished from the face of the earth” (*Browning, pp. 24-25*). In the spring of 538, Belisarius conquered the Ostrogoths; and, shortly thereafter, “the Ostrogothic kingdom had ceased to exist” (*ibid., p. 114*).

When did the pagan little horn become the papal little horn?—In Daniel 8, the little horn power arises as the next major power, supplanting the four Grecian territorial kingdoms, as it gradually conquers them (Dan 8:9). But, at some point in history, this pagan power (Imperial Rome) becomes the papal power (the papacy). When, historically, does this occur? There are three primary events which led to the transition. Historians recognize them as highly significant.

The first event occurred in A.D. 330, when, nine years after his first Sunday law of A.D. 321, Constantine I journeyed east and turned the little town of Byzantium into his magnificent new capital which he named Constantinople (modern Istanbul). It was 1,150 miles due east of the city of Rome. In so doing, the emperor gave the pope enormous influence over the Italian peninsula. But make no mistake; although his capital was far away to the East, Constantine and his successors still governed the entire empire and Italy was still harassed by Gothic tribes from the north. Although the pope had more power, he was still politically very weak.

The second event is the year A.D. 508. At about that time Clovis, king of the Franks, was converted to Catholicism and the victory over the Goths occurred. This was a significant date in the gradual increase of papal power. The conversion of the Franks (France) would, in later centuries, greatly strengthen papal supremacy; so it was an important date. We recognize it as the beginning of the 1290 years.

The third event marked the beginning of full papal control, a control which it extended throughout Europe and held for centuries. In A.D. 538, the uprooting of the third opposing horn (the Ostrogoths) occurred. We date the beginning of the 1260 years to this year. This was the most important date of the three, marking the rise of the papal power for two reasons: First, for the first time, the papacy had both religious and political power. The harassment of pagan forces was immensely lessened. Second, this event (the uprooting of the third horn) was specifically mentioned three times in prophecy (Dan 7:8, 20, 24).

Special power during the 1260 years—It was given its religious power over the nations at exactly the time predicted—during the 1260 years (Dan 7:25). It is significant that the 1260-year prophecy is men-

tioned twice in Daniel (Dan 7:25; 12:7) and five times in Revelation (11:2, 3; 12:6, 14; 13:5). It is the primary time span marking papal authority.

The 1260 years began in A.D. 538. In 533, Justinian recognized the pope’s ecclesiastical supremacy as “head of all the holy churches” in both East and West. In 538, the Ostrogoths were defeated and the papacy was freed from the domination of the Arian kings in the West; so the papacy could henceforth grow in power, unhindered by anyone.

Having attained full power and authority in the West, the papacy entered upon its 1260 years of dominance in Europe. This date, A.D. 538, is solidly established as the beginning of the 1260-year prophecy.

1798 and the end of the 1260 years—Just as a cluster of events surrounded the A.D. 538 transition of the papacy into supremacy, so several events clustered about 1798, when both the 1260 and 1290 years ended. On February 10, 1798, Napoleon’s general, Alexander Berthier, entered Rome and proclaimed Rome to be a republic. The aged Pope Pius VI, refusing to recognize the proclamation, fled for refuge first to Siena and then near Florence. He there set up a small curia to administer the church. But it was for nought, for he was captured and the papacy was abolished. All of Europe was astonished: The papacy was gone.

Russia and Austria decided to restore the pope to his pontifical throne. But even that desperate attempt failed. The pope was hurried from prison to prison in France. The objective of Napoleon was to permanently end the papacy. Pius VI was 81 years old and ill when he was seized. On August 17 (some historians say August 29), 1799, he died in the French fortress of Valence, France. All Europe recognized that the papacy was dead.

The 1798 captivity was unique in at least two ways: First, it came as the climax of several centuries of decline in the influence of Catholicism on the minds of Europeans. Second, it was not merely a military or political coup, but a stroke deliberately intended to forever terminate the papacy.

A.D. 1798 marked the end of papal supremacy—The papacy had been losing political and religious power since the sixteenth century, yet it had continued exerting a strong influence over nations all the way up to the end of the eighteenth century.

How did it maintain that supremacy during that long period of time? Speaking of 1798, we are told:

“In many of the nations of Europe the powers that ruled in church and state had for centuries been controlled by Satan through the medium of the papacy.”—*Great Controversy, 268-269*.

But 1798 marked a significant changeover.

“Though a new pope was soon afterward elected,

1 the papal hierarchy has never since been able to
2 wield the power which it before possessed.”—*Great*
3 *Controversy*, 266.

The remarkably successful revolution in America (1776-1781) encouraged the French to try to do it also; but, lacking Christian principles, they utterly failed. However, throughout the nineteenth century, nation after nation in Europe moved into representative monarchies or full democracies. The papacy could not regain its lost supremacy.

Pius IX (1846-1878) tried desperately to re-establish that power, with his 1854 Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary; his infamous *Syllabus of Errors* (the “*Index*”), in which he listed all the principles of religious freedom and modern science as heretical; and his mammoth debacle, which is a shame to every Catholic leader since then: his *Dogma of Papal Infallibility*, which he rammed through the Vatican I Council (1869-1870) on July 18, 1870. But those actions were but the desperate attempts of a loser to regain power.

In the midst of Pius IX’s reign, Victor Emmanuel II, king of Sardinia, captured Rome, united Italy, and declared himself its king. In the process, the States of the Church, which included part of central Italy, were taken from the pontiff. But that was just an aftermath to an earlier lost majesty and power over the nations.

The healing of the wound—In connection with the above paragraph, it should be mentioned that Mussolini’s *Treaty of the Vatican* with Pope Pius XI (through Cardinal Gasparri) on February 11, 1929, is generally thought to be the “healing of the wound,” the restoration of papal supremacy. On that date, the Vatican was given 108.7 acres of land.

In truth, the real healing of the wound and restoration of that supremacy will occur when the U.S. National Sunday Law is enacted, to be followed by enactment of Sunday Laws by nations throughout the world. Only then will the predicted papal supremacy over the nations again occur (read *Great Controversy*, 448-449, 580-581). (For historical data on the 1929 event, see our *Mark of the Beast*, pp. 32-33.)

“Protestants little know what they are doing when they propose to accept the aid of Rome in the work of Sunday exaltation. While they are bent upon the accomplishment of their purpose, Rome is aiming to re-establish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. Let the principle once be established in the United States that the church may employ or control the power of the state; that religious observances may be enforced by secular laws; in short, that the authority of church and state is to dominate the conscience, and the triumph of Rome in this country is assured.”—*Great Controversy*, 581.

Relation of 1798 to the American Revolution—Another important event also occurred close to the year 1798. You will want to carefully read *Great Con-*

troversy, 439-440. It explains that the Revelator predicted that, at about the same time that the papacy would come to its end, an important new nation would be rising “out of the earth”—where there were few people (Rev 13:1-11).

“What nation of the New World was in 1798 rising into power . . . The application of the symbol admits of no question. One nation, and only one, meets the specifications of this prophecy; it points unmistakably to the United States of America.”—*Great Controversy*, 440.

It is important that we not forget this linkage. The year 1798 not only marks the end of papal supremacy, but also the rising of America to what eventually would become an international power overawing all other nations on earth. A recent news report stated that the U.S. is now militarily stronger than the next 16 most powerful military nations in the world combined! That is incredible.

That concludes the excerpted section from a forthcoming book by the present author.

Regarding the 1260-year prophecy, Bacchiocchi also tries to downplay the terrible persecution by the papacy that was predicted. But the verdict of history is quite different:

“Compared with the persecution of heresy in Europe from 1227 to 1492, the persecution of Christians by Romans in the first three centuries after Christ was a mild and humane procedure.”—*Will and Ariel Durant, The Age of Faith*, p. 784.

Writing of the persecution of French Huguenots in 1685 under King Louis XIV, Durant makes a similar, equally amazing comparison:

“This holy terror of 1685 . . . was far worse than the Revolutionary terror of 1793.”—*Will and Ariel Durant, The Age of Louis XIV*, p. 73.

Is the 1260-year prophecy symbolic?—After taking the reader through involved reasoning to conclude that the 1260-year prophecy began in A.D. 451 or as late as 756 and ended in 1870 (1419 years or 1114 years, not 1260), Bacchiocchi concluded by claiming that the 1260 years is totally symbolic and is without years in length! He says the 1260-year prophecy is actually not a time span, but is symbolic of half of a perfect number 7.

This is the type of Jesuit reasoning that we find in Jesuit writings. Everything is confused and designed to mystify the reader, so he can more easily be caught in a net of Catholic deception. An ultimate goal of the Jesuits is to remove the papacy from every Bible prophecy. The 1260 years is one of those Bible prophecies.

In *Endtime Issues*, #86, under the heading, “*The Time of the Domination of the Antichrist*,” Bacchiocchi mystifies the 1260 years into a marvelous nothingness:

“In Daniel 7:25 and 12:7, the three and a half years are the time when the Antichrist power oppresses the saints of the Most High.”—*Endtime Issues*, #86, p. 21.

He then says this:

“A more satisfactory interpretation of the prophetic period of three and a half years is suggested by its symbolic usage to represent, on the one hand the time of domination of the Antichrist, and on the other hand the protection of God’s people in time of persecution.”—*Ibid.*, p. 22.

“Three and a half is half of seven, which is the number of God’s completion and perfection, Half of seven suggests incompleteness and limitation.”—*Ibid.*

Bacchiocchi then mentions that Elijah’s famine and Christ’s ministry each lasted only three and a half years.

“The attacks against Christ lasted only three and a half years. Why? Because half a week stands for incompleteness, limitation. The forces of evil were limited by God and could not accomplish the complete destruction of Christ and His work.”—*Ibid.*

This is the kind of strange reasoning we find in papal documents: Because Christ’s ministry lasted three and a half years, therefore He was only partly destroyed! Perhaps Jesuits may believe that Christ was partly destroyed at Calvary, but we don’t.

It is amazing how frail mortals imagine that they can “correct” the Inspired Writings; After sitting in infallible judgment on pages in *Great Controversy*, only a few pages away he is spouting ridiculous speculations which reveal a shallow mind.

You will recall that we earlier mentioned that Francisco Ribera, in 1537-1541, developed the error of *Futurism*, declaring that the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation would not be fulfilled until seven literal years in the last days. Bacchiocchi’s theory sounds something like that.

At one point in #87, Bacchiocchi says, “What I am suggesting is only a proposed interpretation, not a dogmatic position. What I am doing is thinking aloud.”—He is urging major changes in the Spirit of Prophecy and our doctrinal positions; yet he says he is proposing suggestions or thinking aloud! If that is all he is doing, Bacchiocchi needs to turn off his computer and start reading the Inspired Books. They are the only ones which can get him back on the right track.

— PART ELEVEN —

**ATTACK ON THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY
BACCHIOCCHI: EGW IS IN ERROR**

In order to strengthen his rejection of the dating of the 1260-year prophecy, Bacchiocchi interweaves

a direct attack on Ellen White’s writings. In order to do this, he uses the words, “papal supremacy,” very loosely.

Two “errors” “corrected” in the 1911 Great Controversy—He claims that her book, *Great Controversy*, is filled with errors which he does not have time to mention. Then he cites two examples of errors in the 1888 edition which were corrected in the 1911 edition. We will discover that they are not errors after all!

The first “corrected error”—Bacchiocchi claims that “papal supremacy” actually began long before A.D. 538. Here is the first supposed “error” in *Great Controversy* that he says was corrected in the next edition of that book:

“The 1260 years of papal supremacy began with the establishment of the papacy in A.D. 538, and would therefore terminate in 1798.”—*Great Controversy*, 1888 ed., p. 254.

“The 1260 years of papal supremacy began in A.D. 538, and would terminate in 1798.”—*Great Controversy*, 1911 ed., p. 254.

The 1911 statement may appear to be a little clearer, but it actually says essentially the same thing.

Papal supremacy was fully established in A.D. 538; that is what both passages say. And it is the truth. For centuries, the papacy had been moving closer to that supremacy. By 538, the objective was attained. By that date, it was fully established as the religio/political powerhouse of the western half of the empire. In later years, that supremacy increased even more in strength. That is what we learn from history and from both editions of the above passage.

But Bacchiocchi says no.

“The development of the ‘supremacy of the papacy’ began long before 538.”—*Bacchiocchi, Endtime Issues*, #87, p. 11.

We agree that movement toward that supremacy began earlier. But it did not arrive until 538.

Bacchiocchi then cites his Gregorian doctoral thesis as proof:

“In my dissertation I have shown that the development of the papal primacy began already in the second century, when the Pope exercised his ecumenical authority by imposing on Christian churches at large Easter-Sunday, weekly Sunday, and by condemning various movements like the Montanists [early Christians who opposed worldliness].”—*Ibid.*

If that is what is written in his doctoral thesis, it surely must be full of flaws. Bacchiocchi’s thesis was apparently written to please his instructors at the Gregoriana. Little wonder that the pope gave him a medal for his defense of Catholic errors. But notice

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART FIVE OF SEVEN

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

these historical facts which contradict the above paragraph:

- There were no “popes” in the second century.
- The leader of the church at Rome had no “ecumenical authority” over the other churches in the second century.

- The other churches rejected his attempt to exercise authority in regard to Sabbathkeeping and all other matters. In A.D. 195, when Victor I (189-190), bishop of the church at Rome, issued an order for all the churches of Christendom to hold their yearly commemorative gatherings, in honor of Christ’s spring resurrection, on a Sunday instead of the Jewish pass-over (Nisan 14)—they rejected his overtures toward inter-church domination.

- Although not mentioned in his *Endtime Issues*, #87, Bacchiocchi primarily bases his case on a pseudopigraphal writing (a fake letter), supposedly written by Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, which was inserted into manuscripts of Irenaeus’ book, *Against Heresies* (composed c.A.D. 175-189).

This false document says that the church at Rome is “the very great, the very ancient and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul,” and that “it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority; that is, the faithful everywhere” (*Irenaeus, Adversus haereses* 3, 3, 1, *Anti-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1, p. 415; quoted in Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday, 209*).

The above statement is obviously a fraudulent manuscript, brought forward centuries later by the papacy as additional evidence that it had primacy over the Christian churches all the way back to within a hundred years after the New Testament ended! Read the statement again. The very wording is a patent fraud.

“Notwithstanding that vice prevailed, even among the leaders of the Roman Church, her influence seemed steadily to increase. About the close of the eighth century, papists put forth the claim that in the first ages of the church the bishops of Rome had possessed the same spiritual power which they now assumed. To establish this claim, some means must be employed to give it a show of authority; and this was readily suggested by the father of lies. Ancient writings were forged by monks. Decrees of councils before unheard of were discovered, establishing the universal supremacy of the pope from

the earliest times. And a church that had rejected the truth greedily accepted these deceptions.

“The few faithful builders upon the true foundation (1 Corinthians 3:10, 11) were perplexed and hindered as the rubbish of false doctrine obstructed the work. Like the builders upon the wall of Jerusalem in Nehemiah’s day, some were ready to say: ‘The strength of the bearers of burdens is decayed, and there is much rubbish; so that we are not able to build.’ Nehemiah 4:10. Wearied with the constant struggle against persecution, fraud, iniquity, and every other obstacle that Satan could devise to hinder their progress, some who had been faithful builders became disheartened; and for the sake of peace and security for their property and their lives, they turned away from the true foundation.”—*Great Controversy, 56*.

Either Bacchiocchi is a Jesuit agent, peddling their lies or the poor guy was brainwashed during his five years at the pope’s university and cannot be trusted to provide reliable information on either theology or church history. Take your choice.

Albert H. Newman (no relation to Cardinal Newman) wrote an outstanding two-volume, *Manual of Church History*. In the section on Victor and the Easter controversy, Newman summarized Irenaeus’ true position on it, based on authentic documents he penned, revealing that Irenaeus bitterly opposed Victor’s attempt to lord it over the other local churches and try to enforce the keeping of Easter Sunday.

“Irenaeus looked upon the Church as an organic unity . . . He nowhere lays stress upon episcopacy as a divine institution, but makes the liberty and independence of each church (including a city with its surrounding villages) the fundamental principle of the ecclesiastical constitution.”—*Newman, Manual of Church History, Vol. 1, p. 252*.

Newman goes on to explain that Victor was “arrogant enough to break off communion with the other churches” because they would not accept his Easter Sunday theory. “Irenaeus,” he says, “censures severely his intolerant conduct” (*ibid.*).

The second “corrected error—The second “glaring mistake” that Bacchiocchi says Ellen White made in the 1888 edition, which he says was corrected in the 1911, was this:

“The infliction of the deadly wound points to the abolition of the papacy in 1798.”—*Great Controversy, 1888 ed., p. 554*.

“The infliction of the deadly wound points to the downfall of the papacy in 1798.”—*Great Controversy, 1911 ed., p. 579*.

Once again, both statements say the same thing. We earlier found that, in 1798, General Berthier took Pope Pius VI captive and abolished the papacy. All Europe recognized that the downfall of the papacy had occurred. Everyone was shocked. *The papacy was gone!* All other papal crises, before and after, were as nothing compared with this.

Consider what happened to the Vatican and the city of Rome:

“The French imposed severe military levies and imposts upon Rome and carried the most valuable works of art to Paris; and Rome was subjected to a pillage unsurpassed by those of the Goths, Vandals or Normans centuries before. Priestly robes were burned for the gold in their embroidery; palaces and churches were ransacked, and their treasures of art were carried away or destroyed. The Romans . . . rose against the French, but were reduced to submission with terrible loss of life.”—*I.S. Smith, Standard History of the World, Vol. 7, p. 3416.*

It was not until September 18, 1801, that Bonaparte made a treaty, called the *Concordat* with a new pope (Giovanni Angelo Braschi; Pius VII; 1800-1823), thus establishing him on his throne in the midst of a gutted city.

Is *Great Controversy* “full of error”?—Bacchiocchi claims that this invaluable book has error running all through it. He says that he will not take time to cite it all, but will only mention two examples (quoted above). We have found that both “corrections” were not corrections.

About a decade ago, the present writer closely compared the 1888 edition with the 1911 edition; and, aside from some of the cited historical quotations, he could not find one significant change, not one.

Check it out for yourself: Take a copy of our paperback 1888 edition (which is an exact duplicate of the original) and compare it, paragraph by paragraph, with the 1911. Aside from the historical quotations, you will find no changes of significance, nothing.

What about those historical quotations? Different ones were at times quoted in the 1911, when the ones Ellen White had quoted in the 1888 could not be located (so source references could be attached to them).

Another difference was that all the 1888 edition quotations from J.H. Merle D’Aubigné, were taken from one English translation of his *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* while those in the 1911 were taken from a different English translation. The reason: After 1888, D’Aubigné officially approved a different English translation (because he was given royalties from its sale).

Bacchiocchi says early Sabbathkeeping untrue—Bacchiocchi next tells us there is a need for further corrections in the Spirit of Prophecy books,

and cites two examples.

You will recall that, earlier in this study, we learned that Monachino, in his preface to Bacchiocchi’s book, cited the two objectives of the thesis and book: (1) To prove that the papacy changed the Sabbath to Sunday as early as the second century, and that all Christians obediently accepted the change. (2) Sunday-keepers should hallow and honor Sunday more than they now do.

It is the first of those two objectives that Bacchiocchi is promoting in this attack on *Great Controversy*, pp. 52 and 53, which says the opposite.

• Bacchiocchi says the following statement is in error:

“In the first centuries the true Sabbath had been kept by all Christians. They were jealous for the honor of God, and, believing that His law is immutable, they zealously guarded the sacredness of its precepts.”—*Great Controversy, 52.*

Bacchiocchi was taught at the Jesuit university that nearly all Christians were keeping Sunday in the second century A.D.

• Bacchiocchi claims that Ellen White taught: (1) All Christians kept the Bible Sabbath before the time of Constantine. (2) No Christians kept Sunday until the time of Constantine.

He says this sentence proves his point:

“In the early part of the fourth century the emperor Constantine issued a decree making Sunday a public festival throughout the Roman Empire.”—*Great Controversy, 53.*

Bacchiocchi, considered to be a Jesuit-trained expert on the Sabbath in the early church, is wrong again. Here are the facts:

(1) Ellen White wrote, “In the first centuries the true Sabbath had been kept by all Christians.” That is true. Although worldlings, professing faith in Christ, kept Sunday at Alexandria and Rome, genuine Christians continued to keep the true Bible Sabbath in the first centuries.

Two church historians who wrote a full hundred years after the time of Constantine’s Sunday edict declared that all Christians, with the exception of those in Alexandria, Egypt, Rome, and Italy, were still keeping the Bible Sabbath. (Their statements will be quoted shortly.) So Ellen White was correct in her statement.

(2) Bacchiocchi charges that Ellen White claimed that no Sundaykeeping in Christendom occurred until the time of Constantine.

But she never said that in her *Great Controversy*, p. 53, statement, above, which he quoted or anywhere else. She never said that no professed Christians kept Sunday before the time of Constantine.

Bacchiocchi was careful not to quote the complete passage on p. 52 (quoted soon), which disproves his charge.

1 But, first, let us consider the structure of most of
2 *Great Controversy*, chapter 3 (*The Apostasy*). Ellen
3 White introduces it with the statement:

4 **“Little by little, at first in stealth and silence, and then more openly** as it increased in strength and gained control of the minds of men, ‘the mystery of iniquity’ carried forward its deceptive and blasphemous work. **Almost imperceptibly** the customs of heathenism found their way into the Christian church.”—*Great Controversy*, 49:2.

That is how the changeover to Sunday—as well as the other apostasies—was done.

Read the entire paragraph. Then, beginning on p. 51, she lists item after item that was changed: Bible forbidden (p. 51), the worship of idols (p. 52), the change from Sabbath to Sunday (pp. 53-54), etc.

It is for this reason that 52:0 speaks of a general council, convened to establish image worship and, then, in 52:1, begins discussion of the change of the Sabbath to Sunday.

Bacchiocchi quotes three sentences from that paragraph and one sentence from the next page (quoted above).

But that introductory paragraph to the change of the Sabbath says something quite different. Here is nearly all of it. She has finished talking about later councils, commanding idolatry, and returns us to the earliest centuries:

“The spirit of concession to paganism opened the way for a still further disregard of Heaven’s authority. **Satan, working through unconsecrated leaders of the church, tampered with the fourth commandment also, and essayed to set aside the ancient Sabbath**, the day which God had blessed and sanctified (Genesis 2:2, 3), and in its stead to exalt **the festival observed by the heathen** as ‘the venerable day of the sun.’ **This change was not at first attempted openly. In the first centuries the true Sabbath had been kept by all** [genuine] **Christians**. They were jealous for the honor of God, and, believing that His law is immutable, they zealously guarded the sacredness of its precepts. But **with great subtlety Satan worked through his agents** to bring about his object. That the attention of the people might be called to **the Sunday, it was made a festival** in honor of the resurrection of Christ. Religious services were held upon it; yet it was regarded as a day of recreation, **the Sabbath being still sacredly observed.**”—*Great Controversy*, 52:1.

You have just read a clear, accurate statement on Sabbath- and Sundaykeeping by Christians, prior to the time of Constantine.

The reader is introduced to Constantine’s cooperation with church leaders on p. 53:1. He issued an edict decreeing Sunday sacredness, yet—

“While **many** [not all] God-fearing Christians were gradually led to regard Sunday as possessing a degree of sacredness, **they still held the true Sab-**

bath as the holy of the Lord and observed it in obedience to the fourth commandment.”—*Great Controversy*, 53:1.

According to that statement, even after Constantine’s time, most Christians continued worshipping God on the Bible Sabbath; and some observed both days.

Here are the two remarkable statements, by reliable historians, which prove this. Both were written about one hundred years after Constantine issued his Sunday law:

“Although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this.”—*Socrates Scholasticus, Ecclesiastical History* 5, 22; *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2*, 2:132. [This statement was written about A.D. 440. He was not the famous Greek philosopher, Socrates of Athens (469-399 B.C.).]

“The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria.”—*Sozomen*; *Ecclesiastical History* 7, 13; *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2*, 1:159. [Sozomen lived c.A.D. 400-c.447.]

Strand, an Adventist church historian, wrote this confirmation:

“The situation in Rome and Alexandria, however, was not typical of the rest of early Christianity. In those two cities there was an evident early attempt by Christians to terminate observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, but elsewhere throughout the Christian world Sunday observance simply arose alongside observance of Saturday.”—*Kenneth Strand, “The Sabbath and Sunday from the Second through Fifth Centuries,” in The Sabbath and Sunday in History*, p. 323.

Quoting Hippolytus of Rome and Origen of Alexandria, Strand adds that it was not until the fifth century that all the Christians in those two cities—Rome and Alexandria—stopped observing the Bible Sabbath.

Contrary to what Monachino and Bacchiocchi would have us believe, the seventh-day Sabbath was such an obvious Bible teaching that, *for centuries*, Christians continued to faithfully hallow it.

“Not all Christians in those two cities abandoned the Sabbath immediately and totally during the second century. By the time of Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen in the fifth century, however, it is clear that the omission of special Saturday worship services was an established fact having some degree of antiquity.”—*Ibid.*, p. 324.

Great Controversy, pp. 52-53, is in total agreement. All true Christians were keeping the Bible Sab-

bath even after Constantine's time, but they began observing religious services on Sunday in honor of the resurrection while using the rest of the day for recreation.

Think not that, because Bacchiocchi ignores them, that Socrates and Sozomen were fictional characters. Both were major fifth century church historians.

"In the following [fifth] century Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, each in his own way, continued the Church History of Eusebius to his own time. These include accounts of the great Christological controversies, and of the struggle of Christianity with paganism during the fourth and part of the fifth centuries . . . Cassiodorus, a Roman statesman, had the Church Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret translated into Latin by Epiphanius . . . This so-called 'Tripartite [triple] History,' along with that of Eusebius, formed the chief authority on ancient church history throughout the Middle Ages . . . The works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, like that of Eusebius, are available in excellent translations in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*."—*Albert Henry Newman, A Manual of Church History, Vol. 1, pp. 12-13.*

But, in strong contrast, Bacchiocchi was taught by his Jesuit instructors that, because of the authoritative supremacy of the Roman pope, nearly all Christians had abandoned the Bible Sabbath and were keeping Sunday as early as the second century—within 50 years after the time of the Apostle John!

The Jesuit/Monachino/Bacchiocchi objectives are (1) to extend the authoritative supremacy of the papacy back to nearly the time of the Apostles; (2) to downgrade the Bible Sabbath as contemptible in the eyes of the believers, by the time John had died; and (3) to exalt Sunday as sacredly observed by the very earliest Christians.

Did you notice that, earlier in this study, we found that a key objection of Bacchiocchi against our 1260-year interpretation is—that it does not give the papacy supremacy until A.D. 538?

It is my personal belief that Bacchiocchi, who spends a great deal of time holding seminars, can pour out such a volume of carefully contrived newsletters month after month, because he has several ghostwriters helping him. His contacts with the Vatican did not end when he was hired at Andrews. *Endtime Issues, #87*, dated August 1, 2002, contained 24 full-size pages. *Issues, #88*, appearing 20 days later, on August 21, had 29 pages. Yet in the back of his *#87*, he listed five two-day seminars he would be holding between those two newsletters:

August 2-3 in Detroit, Michigan; 9-10 in Miami, Florida; 16-17 in Dallas, Texas; 23-24 in Toronto, Canada; 30-31 in Gentry, Arkansas (*#Endtime Issues, #87, pp. 21-22*). He also listed 8 new audio cassettes and 4 videos he has just completed (*ibid, pp. 22-23*).

Bacchiocchi is doing all this at the age of 62 when others around him are nearing retirement. He is in the midst of a continuing, ongoing heavy schedule of meetings, seminars, and the preparation of tapes and videos; and he must take time to schedule all this. In the midst of all that, those lengthy newsletters, with their extensive references to a variety of sources, are churned out.

"Did Sunday originate with the power of the State?"—That is the ingeniously worded title of Bacchiocchi's next charge of error against *Great Controversy*. In order to prove his point, he quotes this sentence:

"It was on ["in" in *Great Controversy*] behalf of the Sunday that popery first asserted its arrogant claims; and its first resort to the power of the state was to compel the observance of Sunday as 'the Lord's day.' "—*Great Controversy, 447 [pp. 446-447 in Great Controversy]*.

Note my bracketed corrections in the above Bacchiocchi quotation. Here, as in a number of other places in his newsletters, Bacchiocchi's helpers, not as acquainted with English and the Spirit of Prophecy as well as Bacchiocchi and American Adventists would be, do not write too accurately.

Bacchiocchi then quotes a second "erroneous" passage:

"Royal edicts, general councils, and church ordinances sustained by secular power were the steps by which the pagan festival attained its position of honor in the Christian world."—*Great Controversy, 574.*

He then explains the way in which the above two quotations are in error:

"Both statements just cited are inaccurate, because the secular power of the state did not influence or compel Christians to adopt Sunday during the second and third centuries."—*Endtime Issues, #87, p. 15.*

According to Bacchiocchi, Ellen White teaches that Sundaykeeping originated with the power of the State, and that second-century Christians got the Roman government to enact ordinances doing this. That charge is ridiculous. Notice that the very next sentence in her statement refers to a fourth-century edict:

"The first public measure enforcing Sunday observance was the law enacted by Constantine."—

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART SIX OF SEVEN

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

Great Controversy, 574.

The present writer has also done extensive research into the history of the change of the Sabbath, but he did not have Jesuit research assistants. (See his 256-page book, *Beyond Pitcairn*, written after he completed over 120 pages of Sabbath tracts on the subject).

The truth is that Sundaykeeping originated with Persian Mithraism, which compromising half-baptized “Christians” at the “Christian” seminary at Alexandria, Egypt, were the first to copy. This worldly innovation then moved to Rome, where, in order to increase their influence, Roman church leaders demanded without success that the other churches worship on Sunday. So they next introduced Sunday as a resurrection memorial, to be observed voluntarily along with the Bible Sabbath. It is historically true that “it was in behalf of the Sunday that popery first asserted its arrogant claims.”

Then, two years before Constantine eliminated the last of his rivals (Licinius, head of the Eastern half of the empire), Roman church leaders induced him to issue the first of his six Sunday laws. It is historically true that the papacy’s first resort to the power of the state was to compel the observance of Sunday as “the Lord’s day.” Prior to Constantine, the Christian church never—not once—had any power with the government!

After the fourth century, “royal edicts, general councils, and church ordinances sustained by secular power were the steps by which the pagan festival attained its position of honor in the Christian world.”

Once again, Ellen White is right.

Yet Bacchiocchi claims that the above-quoted two passages (*GC* 446-447 and 574) are not historically correct!

I am gaining the impression that Bacchiocchi, in his newsletters, is feeding Adventists a pack of falsehoods. We are confronted with a phalanx of writers, some doing research while others busily put it in written form and then send handfuls of it to Bacchiocchi to mail out over his name.

As it was before, so it will be again.

“The few faithful builders upon the true foundation (1 Corinthians 3:10, 11) were perplexed and hindered as the rubbish of false doctrine obstructed the work.”—*Great Controversy*, 56.

“Those were days of peril for the church of Christ. The faithful standard-bearers were few indeed. Though the truth was not left without witnesses,

yet at times it seemed that error and superstition would wholly prevail, and true religion would be banished from the earth.”—*Great Controversy*, 55.

This is what we get when we hire a Jesuit-trained “Adventist” to teach error to our future church workers for 23 years at Andrews and then, upon retirement, to focus on giving the rest of us all those errors. At least, we are now discovering what he has been teaching our pastors and leaders all those years.

The ecumenical councils—This man, in his newsletters, repeatedly avowing highest respect for Ellen White and her writings, asks “Was the Sabbath condemned by ecumenical councils?” and then quotes this “error”:

“Through half-converted pagans, ambitious prelates, and world-loving churchmen he accomplished his purpose. Vast councils were held from time to time, in which the dignitaries of the church were convened from all the world. In nearly every council the Sabbath which God had instituted was pressed down a little lower, while the Sunday was correspondingly exalted.”—*Great Controversy*, 53.

Bacchiocchi says she is wrong because there were only seven ecumenical councils and the Sabbath was not mentioned in their official reports.

Consider this:

First, historical records were repeatedly changed. Fraudulent documents were added and genuine ones were removed.

Second, many things were discussed and urged at the ecumenical, and other, councils which were not entered as official actions. Go to any local church board meeting and listen to everything that is said (all the while you would like to go home because it is getting past 10 p.m.) and then read the official minutes which contain only a few lines. “In nearly every council the Sabbath which God had instituted was pressed down a little lower, while the Sunday was correspondingly exalted.” It is true, even though the Vatican-doctored records do not reveal all of it. For over a thousand years, church records were left to the tender mercies of Catholic leaders. And we know what kind of men they were like.

Luther in Rome: “Everywhere he looked upon scenes that filled him with astonishment and horror. He saw that iniquity existed among all classes of the clergy. He heard indecent jokes from prelates, and was filled with horror at their awful profanity, even during mass. As he mingled with the monks and citizens he met dissipation, debauchery. Turn where he would, in the place of sanctity he found profanation. ‘No one can imagine,’ he

wrote, ‘what sins and infamous actions are committed in Rome; they must be seen and heard to be believed. Thus they are in the habit of saying, ‘If there is a hell, Rome is built over it: it is an abyss whence issues every kind of sin’ ” (D’ Aubigné, bk. 2, ch. 6).”—*Great Controversy*, 125.

Third, she did not say “ecumenical councils.” There were many large councils; probably many of these were too embarrassing to permit their records to remain in existence.

Fourth, major church councils did mention it. For example, the very first religious law enacted by the Catholic Church in western Europe is to be found in the 28th canon (church law) of the Third Council of Orleans, France, which was held in A.D. 538. Notice the date: A.D. 538—when the 1260 years began! This law was the first to prohibit agricultural work on Sunday in rural areas. J.N. Andrews, in his *History of the Sabbath*, mentioned it (pp. 372-373), but Bacchiocchi’s handlers could not find that book in the Vatican archives. They probably consigned that 1873 book to the flames long ago.

Bacchiocchi’s point appears to be that the papacy was such a nice organization, it did not persecute Sabbathkeepers in later centuries.

DID THE WALDENSES KEEP THE SABBATH?

Bacchiocchi starts this complaint in this way:

“A second example of existing inaccuracies in the *Great Controversy*, is the reference to the observance of the Sabbath by the Waldenses.”—*Endtime Issues*, #87, p. 17.

Bacchiocchi then quotes these two sentences:

“Through ages of darkness and apostasy there were Waldenses who denied the supremacy of Rome, who rejected image worship as idolatry, and who kept the true Sabbath. Under the fiercest tempests of opposition they maintained their faith.”—*Great Controversy*, 65.

Bacchiocchi then mentions an inconsistency in what she wrote in that book:

“This statement suggests that Sabbathkeeping was common among the Waldenses. Most likely Ellen White believed that *only some* of the Waldenses kept the Sabbath, because later she writes about them saying: ‘Some of whom were observers of the Sabbath.’ ”—*Endtime Issues*, #87, p. 17; quoting *Great Controversy*, 577 [*Italics his*].

Once again, Bacchiocchi is wrong and Ellen White is right. In her first statement, she says “there were Waldenses . . . who kept the true Sabbath.” Her second says the same thing: “Some of whom were observers of the Sabbath.”

Earlier, we mentioned life at the Gregoriana. Keep in mind that it was a Jesuit priest’s seminary that Bacchiocchi attended. We cannot expect Bacchiocchi and his writing team at the Vatican to know the truth about the Waldenses. If you want a low-grade educa-

tion, attend the Pontifical Gregorian University or a nearby Catholic university. The true history of the early centuries has been eradicated from the archival materials on which their textbooks are based. Each generation of Catholic professors is taught error by teachers who learned it from the preceding generation of misled instructors. Catholic teachings are a hodgepodge of human opinions, theories, and decrees—designed to protect those teachings. The first great Babel, a monument to the greatness of men, collapsed long ago; Revelation 17 tells us that, ere long, its spiritual daughters will also fall.

But, returning to the Waldenses, some of them did keep the Bible Sabbath.

“They [the Picards, or Waldensian Brethren] do not celebrate the feasts of the divine Virgin Mary and of the Apostles; some [observe] only the Lord’s day. Some indeed celebrate the Sabbath with the Jews.”—*J.J. Ignatio von Dollinger, ed., Beitrage zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters, Vol. 2, p. 662; quoted in SDA Source Book, p. 897.*

Immediately after the above quotation, the *Source Book* editors make this comment:

“The Picards, representing a fusion of certain old-line Waldensian elements with the Hussites in Bohemia and Moravia, were called also Waldensian Brethren or simply Waldensians. Today a prevalent misconception limits the name Waldenses to a people still living in the Italian Alps. These Waldensians are merely the modern remnant of a medieval movement that once included evangelical dissenters of many names in many parts of Europe . . . This source document furnishes contemporary proof that some of the Waldenses observed the Sabbath.”—*Ibid.*

Rome is determined to blot out all record of Sabbathkeeping in the early centuries. Their boy, Samuele, is doing what he can to help them.

SABBATHKEEPERS OR SANDAL WEARERS

The papacy is deeply anxious to discredit, not only their Sabbathkeeping, but also the fact that they extend back to the fourth century and beyond.

So Bacchiocchi brings forth an error that has been tossed around from time to time. It is known that some ancient writings refer to the Waldenses as the *insabbati*. But Bacchiocchi says “the term has no connection to Sabbathkeeping” (#87, p. 17). He quotes another Andrews’ theologian as evidence that “sandal” (loose-fitting shoe) is *sabbatum* in Latin, and *sabot* in French.

“The sandals were an outward sign of their being imitators of the apostles in living the *vita apostolica* [apostolic life] and the justification of their preaching the gospel’ (*Daniel Augsburg, “The Sabbath and the Lord’s Day during the Middle Ages,” in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 154*). In other words, the Waldenses were often called *insabbati* (sandal wearers) because many of

them wore sandals.”—*Endtime Issues*, #87, p. 17.

“In the past, some uninformed readers have taken this term [*insabbati*] to mean that the Waldenses were Sabbathkeepers. It is possible that Ellen White was influenced by this old interpretation.”—*Ibid.*

Seriously, now, this is a little ridiculous. The idea that the Waldenses wanted to show off their humility and self-righteousness by wearing sandals is the kind of imaginative fabrication the Jesuits would ascribe to the heretics. In the Dark Ages, they told people that the Waldenses had pointed teeth and ate their children.

In order to embroider the story even more, it is said (and believed by Augsburg and Bacchiocchi) that the Waldenses were very anxious that everyone recognize them when they walked down the street; so they cut away part of the front top of the sandals and inserted a design like a shield which told everyone their identity. This was done to show their holiness.

What were the Waldenses really like? Read chapter 4 in *Great Controversy*. They were sincere people who, from childhood, were trained to be guarded, not reveal their identity, and search for souls. Here is the truth of the matter:

“To have made known the object of their mission would have ensured its defeat; therefore **they carefully concealed their real character . . . With naked feet** and in garments coarse and travel-stained as were those of their Master, they passed through great cities and penetrated to distant lands.”—*Great Controversy*, pp. 71-72.

Now for more facts: The Latin words for “sandals” are *crepida* and *solea*, not *sabbatum*. The Latin word for “Sabbath” is *sabbatum*.

You will not find *sabbatum* as the Latin word for “shoe” or “sandal” in Lewis and Short’s exhaustive *Latin Dictionary*. Instead you will find *sabbatum* (“Sabbath”) and variations of it (“Sabbathkeeping,” etc.).

The French *sabot* comes from Old French *bot*, *bote* (“boot”), and Middle French *savate*, “old shoe” (*Barnhart Concise Dictionary of Etymology*). It is of interest that *zapata* is “shoe” in Basque, which linguists recognize to be a totally unique and extremely ancient language. That may be the origin of *sabot*.

The Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible translates “Sabbath” as *sabbati*. Rome was persecuting the sect called *Insabbati* at that very time.

Commenting on this Catholic legend, J.N. Andrews quotes a historian, Robinson, who refutes the sandal theory:

“They were [said to be] called so from *Sabot* or *zabot*, a shoe, because they distinguished themselves from other people by wearing shoes marked on the upper part with some peculiarity. Is it likely

that people who could not descend from their mountains without hazarding their lives through the furious zeal of the inquisitors should tempt danger by affixing a visible mark on their shoes?”—*Robinson, Ecclesiastical Researches*, pp. 303-304; quoted in *J.N. Andrews, History of the Sabbath*, p. 408.

Desperate to avoid the truth that the Waldenses kept the Bible Sabbath, another Catholic legend was that *insabbati* meant that they circumcised their children.

They were called “*Insabbati*, not because they were circumcised, but because they kept the Jewish Sabbath.”—*Goldstatus (1576-1635)*; quoted in *ibid.*, p. 410. [*The original is in Latin, and says “they were called insabbati (qui aliis Insabbati) . . . “because they kept the Jewish Sabbath” (Sabbato judaizarent).*]

Writing about the Waldenses, Usher said:

“Many early writers asserted the observance of ‘the Saturday for the Lord’s day’ by the people who were called *Sabbati*.”—*Archbishop Usher*; quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 410-411.

DO THE WALDENSES GO BACK TO THE FOURTH CENTURY?

Bacchiocchi to the attack again:

Another inaccurate statement about the Waldenses is found in the *Great Controversy*, pp. 65-66:

“Behind the lofty bulwarks of the mountains . . . the Waldenses found a hiding place. Here the light of truth was kept burning amid the darkness of the Middle Ages. Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith.’ The problem with this statement is that the Waldensian movement was established by Peter Valdes [Waldo] in 1173. This means the Waldenses did not exist for ‘a thousand years.’ ”—*Endtime Issues*, #87, p. 17.

The furthest back in history to which we can trace the people, later known as the “Waldenses,” was the fourth century; this would be the time of Constantine and Bishop Sylvester I of Rome. They were faithful believers who not only protested the apostasy, but separated from it.

“In the fourth century, Helvidius, a great scholar of northern Italy, accused Jerome, whom the pope had empowered to form a Bible in Latin for Catholicism, with using corrupt Greek manuscripts (*Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 6, p. 338).

“How could Helvidius have accused Jerome of employing corrupt Greek manuscripts, if Helvidius had not had the pure Greek manuscripts?”

“And so learned and so powerful in writing and teaching was Jovinian, the pupil of Helvidius, that it demanded three of Rome’s most famous ‘fathers’—Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose—to unite in opposing Jovinian’s influence. Even then, it needed the condemnation of the pope and the banishment of the emperor to prevail.

“But Jovinian’s followers [the Waldenses] lived on and made the way easier for Luther.”—*Benjamin Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 33.*

Pilichdorf, a thirteenth-century writer, wrote:

“The persons who claimed to have thus existed from the time of Pope Sylvester were the Valdenses.”—*Pilichdorf, Contra Valdenses (Against the Waldenses), quoted in Bibliotheca Patrologia, Vol. VIII, p. 312; quoted in George S. Faber, History of the Ancient Valdenses and Albigenses, p. 275.*

Sylvester I (Jan 314-Dec 335) was pope during most of Constantine’s reign and directly involved in getting him to enact his six Sunday laws.

“The Valdenses of Piedmont derived themselves from a person named Leo; who, in the time of the Emperor Constantine, execrating the avarice of Pope Sylvester and the immoderate endowment of the Roman Church, seceded from that communion, and drew after him all those who entertained right sentiments concerning the Christian religion.”—*Faber, ibid., p. 276.*

“The standing belief of the Vaudois [is] that their Communion descends in a direct, unbroken line from the Apostles.”—*Ibid., p. 277.*

The Waldensians (or Waldenses), also known as the Vaudois (the French word for them; pronounced “VAW-doh”), were a distinct group of earnest Christians, with their own Bible, as early as the early part of the fourth century, in the time of Constantine.

“The [manuscript] *Nobla Leyçon*, which dates from the year 1100, goes to prove that the Waldenses of Piedmont did not owe their rise to Peter Waldo of Lyons, who did not appear till the latter half of that century (1160) . . . Their greatest enemies, Claud Seyssel of Turin (1517) and Reynierius the Inquisitor (1250), have admitted their antiquity, and stigmatized them as the most dangerous of all heretics, because the most ancient.”—*J.A. Wylie, History of the Waldenses, pp. 3-4.*

Here is a parallel passage:

“There are modern writers who attempt to fix the beginning of the Waldenses from Peter Waldo, who began his work about 1175. This is a mistake. The historical name of this people, as properly derived from the valleys where they lived, is Vaudois. Their enemies, however, ever sought to date their origin from Waldo . . .

“There remains to us in the ancient Waldensian language, *The Noble Lesson (La Nobla Leyçon)*, written about the year A.D. 1100, which assigns the first opposition of the Waldenses to the Church of Rome to the days of Constantine the Great, when Sylvester was pope . . . Thus, when Christianity, emerging from the long persecutions of pagan Rome, was raised to imperial favor by the Emperor Con-

stantine, the Italic church in northern Italy—later [called] the Waldenses—is seen standing in opposition to papal Rome.

“Their Bible was of the family of the renowned Italia. It was that translation into Latin which represents the Received Text. Its very name, ‘Italia,’ is derived from the Italic district, the regions of the Vaudois.

“Of the purity and reliability of this version, Augustine, speaking of different Latin Bibles (about A.D. 400) said:

“ ‘Now among translations themselves the Italian (Italia) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression.’

“The old Waldensian liturgy which they used in their services down through the centuries contained ‘texts of Scripture of the ancient version called the Italic.’ ”—*Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, pp. 34-35.*

It was the Waldensian faith and their Bible which laid the foundation for the later Protestant French Bible. Leger said that Olivétan’s French Bible of 1537 was “entire and pure,” because its ancestry was not a papal production, but the Waldensian Bible—dating back to the earliest times.

“I say ‘pure’ because all the ancient exemplars, which formerly were found among the papists, were full of falsifications, which caused Bèza to say in his book on *Illustrious Men*, in the chapter on the Vaudois [the French word for “Waldenses”], that one must confess it was by means of the Vaudois of the Valleys that France today has the Bible in her own language.

“This godly man, Olivétan, in the preface of his Bible, recognizes with thanks to God, that since the time of the apostles, or their immediate successors, the torch of the Gospel has been lit among the Vaudois, and has never since been extinguished.”—*Leger, General History of the Vaudois Churches, p. 165.*

The Waldensians existed from the earliest times in the territory now known as northern Italy. But we are told that, when intense persecution came to them, some apostatized, others moved farther into the Italian Alps, while still others carried the faith to foreign lands.

“Some claimed Claude, Bishop of Turin (A.D. 822-839), as their founder; others held that they were the successors of a small group of good men who had protested against the degradation of the Church in the days of Sylvester and Constantine. Later historians think the nucleus of the Italian Waldensians was the *False Humiliati* while still others have connected them with the followers of Arnold

Reply to Bacchiocchi's August 2002 Attack

PART SEVEN OF SEVEN

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

of Brescia. It is certain, at all events, that the later Waldensians of Piedmont were a fusion of various sects and that they were a formidable group.”—*Ellen Scott Davison, Forerunners of Saint Francis and Other Studies, pp. 252-253.*

“They are called Vaudois, not that they descended of Peter Valdo of Lyons, but because they are original inhabitants of the valleys. For the word, Vaudois, or Valdenses comes from the word *val*, which signifies a valley.”—*Perrin, p. 288.*

REVISION OF GREAT CONTROVERSY NEEDED

In his *Endtime Issues, #86-87*, Bacchiocchi has tried to rip to pieces several teachings of historic Adventism while destroying our confidence in the book, *Great Controversy*. Here are a few of his charges:

- The antichrist is primarily Islam, not just the papacy as given in *Great Controversy*.
- The 1260 years did not start in A.D. 538 and end in 1798, as stated in *Great Controversy*. Indeed, the time span is symbolic of “half of perfection.”
- Contrary to what *Great Controversy* says, the earliest Christians, after the time of John, kept Sunday.
- The later Catholic councils did not condemn Sabbathkeeping.
- The Waldenses never kept the Sabbath, liked to walk around in fancy shoes to show off their humility, and originated only a few centuries before the time of Luther.

In view of all the purportedly terrible errors in *Great Controversy*, which Bacchiocchi has uncovered, he tells us:

“The sample of statements we have just examined, suffice to show that there are still inaccuracies in the *Great Controversy* that ought to be corrected. A new revision would enhance its credibility among knowledgeable readers and would strengthen its evangelistic effectiveness.”—*Endtime Issues, #87, p. 17.*

Bacchiocchi and his associates would just love to get their hands on *Great Controversy*, and be placed in charge of carrying out that revision. He then says:

“The examples of inaccuracies, discussed so far, have been of a historical nature . . . After all, Adventists are committed to search and proclaim truth, and not to cover up traditional inaccurate interpretations.”—*Ibid., p. 18.*

The points Bacchiocchi has attacked so far are not merely “historical incidents.” They are major Seventh-day Adventist beliefs. He next attacks other doc-

trinal beliefs.

CHANGING COLOSSIANS 2:14

Bacchiocchi wipes out our historical position on this important verse.

“Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross.”—*Colossians 2:14.*

And he says he first wrote his theory about this verse in his Gregorian thesis, published in 1977 before he was hired by Andrews. Yet they still hired him!

“The very first challenges I faced when my dissertation *From Sabbath to Sunday* came off the press, had to do with my interpretation of Colossians 2:14.”—*Endtime Issues, #87, p. 18.*

Bacchiocchi declares that the “handwriting of ordinances” was not the ceremonial law, but the record book containing our sins!

“What was nailed to the Cross was . . . the record-book of sin, or the certificate of sin-indebtedness.”—*Ibid., p. 19.*

“By this daring metaphor, Paul affirms that through Christ, God has ‘cancelled,’ ‘set aside,’ ‘nailed to the cross’ ‘the written record of our sins which because of the regulations was against us’ . . . What God destroyed on the Cross was not the *legal ground* (law) for our entanglement in sin, but the *written record* of our sins.”—*Ibid. [emphasis his].*

“The function of the metaphor of the nailing to the Cross the record of our sins, is simply to reassure believers of the totality of God’s forgiveness . . . Christ has provided complete redemption and forgiveness.”—*Ibid.*

Astounding! And we have let him teach such to our future pastors since 1977?

“Initially, this interpretation was challenged by concerned Adventists . . . Over the years, however, the resistance has subsided. Today, I do not know of a single Adventist scholar who still holds to the traditional interpretation of this text.”—*Ibid.*

That last sentence leaves us breathless. Obviously, if the books of record in heaven were destroyed in A.D. 31, then there can be no judgment afterward! Everyone—past, present, and future—will be saved!

The Bible frequently speaks of the books of record in heaven and *Great Controversy*, 482-487, mentions those books well-over a dozen times. You need to read it for yourself.

To do away with the record of sins—has the same effect as doing away with the necessity of obedience to God’s holy Ten Commandment law! If no records

are kept anymore, you can do as you like. Indeed, according to Bacchiocchi's view, all the records going back to Adam and Cain have also been blotted out!

Bacchiocchi sounds like a true Southern Baptist. Yet that is understandable; Jesuits penetrated them long ago.

Bacchiocchi's conclusion is a premonition of how his later attacks against the Spirit of Prophecy will be structured. He eliminates not just a paragraph here and there; Bacchiocchi eliminates the authority of all her writings. In studying out any point of belief, as far as he is concerned, the Spirit of Prophecy is of no value. Bacchiocchi's mind and conclusions can be trusted, but not what Ellen White says.

"Respect for Ellen White's recognition of the exclusive and normative authority of the Bible demands that any investigation that attempts to understand more fully the teachings of the Bible should be tested by its faithfulness to the Biblical text, not by EGW's statements regarding the subject."—*Ibid.*, p. 20.

It is a wonderful thing that Bacchiocchi, a frail, fallible human can sit in judgment on the Inspired Writings of Ellen G. White and considers himself very able to judge the proper meaning of a Bible passage. He totally rejects the possibility that her books could explain the meaning of the Bible as well as he can. Because Ellen White's writings are not reliable, we must stick with his interpretations of both the Spirit of Prophecy and the Bible.

Regarding the supposed "errors" in the Spirit of Prophecy, he adds:

"We have found that the corrections were not 'peripheral,' but significant. Furthermore, there are still [other] glaring mistakes that need to be corrected. In the light of this fact, it is unwise to criticize [Bacchiocchi] an Adventist scholar who proposes a new interpretation of the 1260 days that could ultimately make our Adventist interpretation more credible and defensible."—*Ibid.*

Bacchiocchi is telling his readers that, since there are such a multitude of "glaring mistakes" in the Spirit of Prophecy, they should not fuss with him for trying to new-model our doctrinal teachings.

Bacchiocchi teaches that the Inspired Writings (both the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy) are to be tested by scholars with Ph.D.s. He believes he is qualified to critically evaluate both *Great Controversy* and Colossians 2:14—and arrive at theories entirely different than our historic beliefs.

The truth is that God gave us the Spirit of Prophecy so we would have an Inspired commentary on the Bible. He knew that so many winds of false doctrine would be blowing in these last days that we would need this help! Are we humble enough to accept it? Are we willing to submit our theories to the test of what is plainly written in the Word of God? If

not, ere long we will stumble and wander off into darkness.

Do not, I beg you, join the Bacchiocchi camp of doubters and speculators! It is not worth it. Your soul's salvation is too important.

SUBTLE ATTACKS ON THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

Bacchiocchi uses the same "they're picking on me," and "divide and conquer" techniques that Lucifer used in heaven, in order to win as many angels as possible over to his side.

Bacchiocchi tries to frighten the reader with fears he never had before:

"If Biblical research can only be conducted in strict adherence to the interpretations found in Ellen G. White's writings, then no original investigation of Scripture is possible in the Adventist Church."—*Endtime Issues*, #88, p. 1.

He says we need to stand up for our rights, for we will lose them if we unswervingly believe in the Spirit of Prophecy:

"Are Ellen G. White's writings to be used as a helpful guide in the study of the Bible or as a straightjacket to ensure that no deviation occurs from historical interpretations? Are we as Adventists free to investigate the Scriptures or are we boxed into a system of beliefs that admits no independent Biblical research?"—*Endtimes Issues*, #88, p. 1.

Because of confidence in her writings, we are in danger of falling over a theological cliff.

We are locked-in to a collection of mere "traditional interpretations" carrying no weight at all (*ibid.*). We must "address the critical and serious question of the role of Ellen White in resolving doctrinal and historical disputes" (#88, p. 2). We have elevated her to "a kind of Madonna, similar to the veneration of Mary in the Catholic Church" (#88, p. 4). "A significant number of our Adventist fellow believers still hold to an idealized and glorified view of Ellen White" (#88, p. 3). There is "a significant number of our Adventist fellow believers" who are "taking extreme positions" (#88, p. 3).

Bacchiocchi says that if he accepts her writings as fully inspired, he will have no "right to conduct a new investigation of these texts" (#88, p. 1). According to that, if you accept the New Testament as fully inspired, you dare not think about a passage in the Old Testament. "We have brilliant Adventist scholars today who are not free to examine Scripture because of the constraints of the Spirit of Prophecy" (#88, p. 26). Notice the word, "brilliant."

According to Bacchiocchi, our *Statement of Fundamental Beliefs* is wrong because "our church wishes to affirm two conflicting beliefs" (#88, p. 26). These would be Fundamental Beliefs #1 and #17 (#88, p. 26).

Bacchiocchi thinks it is terrible that hundreds of

thousands of believers are happily reading their Bibles with the Spirit of Prophecy and finding instruction, peace, and encouragement.

He explains that there is an evil plot, "a policy of concealment" (#88, p. 24), to keep believers from learning "the truth about Ellen White" (#88, pp. 9, 29, 30). This conspiracy theory is repeatedly mentioned (#88, pp. 3, 4, 9, 24, 29, 30; #89, pp. 4, 6, 9).

If the Adventist denomination chooses to stick with the Spirit of Prophecy, it is superstitious and blind. "Any religion that discourages fresh investigation and settles all differences by silencing differing viewpoints ultimately becomes victim of superstition and blind credulity" (#88, p. 7). Since such a faith should be abandoned, he needs to pack up and get out.

Well, now you have had an opportunity to see what this graduate of Jesuitism is really like. You now know the dark undercurrent beneath his years of smiles, back pats, and flattery. Bacchiocchi has an agenda. He is determined to separate our people from the Spirit of Prophecy writings.

For 23 years, he worked earnestly at Andrews University, to mold students and fellow teachers into an anti-Ellen White attitude. As we have observed in the quotations above, he has used tactics he learned at the Gregoriana—fear, pride, and deceit—to instill objectives he was taught at Rome.

The Vatican fears Seventh-day Adventists more than any other group in the world. In their literature, they openly declare that all Protestants, except the Adventists, are little more than half-baptized Catholics.

It is the Adventists that must be infiltrated and compromised. It is they who must have their doctrines safely diluted. Rome well-knows that this can only be done if our reliance on the Spirit of Prophecy writings is eliminated.

Back in 1982, the present writer received a handwritten letter from a believer in southern California. Having read some of our tracts about the Jesuits, she wrote to tell us her father's experience.

He was a Seventh-day Adventist minister who worked in southern California back in the 1920s. It so happened that he had a close friend who was a Roman Catholic priest. One day, the priest told him that his church had been trying to penetrate the Adventist Church with agents for years; but that our prophet, Ellen White, would always finger them. She would identify them to our leaders, and they would be discharged or not hired.

But then, the priest added: Since Ellen White died, we have been able to slip them in. It was only because of an extremely warm friendship, that such an incredible disclosure could be made. The priest knew he would not get in trouble for having told it.

For over 450 years, the Jesuits have made it their

studied objective to infiltrate every court, legislature, college, university, and denomination. Steadily this work has been carried on.

There are those among us who laugh at the possibility that the Jesuits have penetrated us. But the evidence is not difficult to see. Every compromised organization relaxes its verbal attacks on Rome. It begins talking about the need for closer contacts with the Vatican. The unique doctrines are smoothed off and become insipid. "Acceptance," "toleration," and "loyalty to the church" become key words, replacing "standards," "historic beliefs," and "loyalty to God's Word."

This has been our experience for a number of years now.

Bacchiocchi has done his best to further the cause, and the Vatican must surely appreciate their Protestant student. But they early recognized his intensity of dedication and ability to use patient subtlety; or, unlike other Gregorian University students, they would not have had the pope give him a gold medal.

But in order to accomplish the needed goal, confidence in Ellen White must be eradicated.

THE 1919 BIBLE CONFERENCE

I will not take the space to here to discuss the 1919 Bible Conference. You will find a write-up on it in my tract study, *Analysis of the 1919 Bible Conference [WM-537-539]*. Ellen White had died four years earlier, and W.W. Prescott and A.G. Daniells felt it safe to express some skepticism of her; they tried to induce skeptical comments from the others present at that meeting.

Keep in mind that Daniells was the one who refused to stop eating meat; he told P.T. Magan that Ellen White was wrong in saying our people should not live in the cities. He was the mastermind behind the push to get Loma Linda accredited. As for Prescott, he was continually writing skeptical letters about her, from about the turn of the century onward.

Ellen White denounced sin while exalting overcoming faith in Christ and obedience to the law of God. Those who did not like those messages did not like her. So it is today.

In conclusion, Bacchiocchi wishes to assure you that he and his associates have labored earnestly at Andrews University to teach students—the men who are now in charge of our church—the same things he is now trying to tell you.

"What I wrote in the last newsletter about the nature of Ellen White's inspiration and the limitation of her authority on historical and doctrinal questions is essentially what our Adventist church has been trying to communicate during the past 20 years."—*Endtime Issues*, #89, p. 4.

SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS

“The enemy of souls has sought to bring in the supposition that a **great reformation** was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in **giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith**, and engaging in a process of reorganization.

“**Were this reformation to take place, what would result? The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. Our religion would be changed.** The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization would be established. **Books of a new order would be written. A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced.**

“The founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful work. The Sabbath of course, would be lightly regarded, as also the God who created it. **Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement.**

“The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, but God being removed, they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. **Their foundation would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure.**

“**Who has authority to begin such a movement?** We have our Bibles. We have our experience, attested to by the miraculous working of the Holy Spirit. **We have a truth that admits of no compromise. Shall we not repudiate everything that is not in harmony with this truth?**”—*1 Selected Messages, 204-205.*

“**When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth.** No after suppositions contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained.

“**Men will arise with interpretations of Scripture which are to them truth, but which are not truth.** The truth for this time God has given us as a foundation for our faith. He Himself has taught us what is truth.

“**One will arise, and still another, with new light, which contradicts the light that God has given** under the demonstration of His Holy Spirit.

“A few are still alive who passed through the experience gained in the establishment of this truth. God has graciously spared their lives to repeat, and repeat till the close of their lives, the experience through which they passed even as did John the apostle till the very close of his life. And the standard bearers who have fallen in death are to speak through the reprinting of their writings. I am instructed that thus their voices are to be heard. They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time.

“**We are not to receive the words of those who**

come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as proof around their asserted theories. **This has been done over and over again** during the past fifty years. And while the Scriptures are God’s Word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such application moves one pillar from the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, is a great mistake. He who makes such an application knows not the wonderful demonstration of the Holy Spirit that gave power and force to the past messages that have come to the people of God.”—*1 Selected Messages, 161.*

“Satan is . . . constantly pressing in the spurious—to lead away from the truth. **The very last deception of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God.** ‘Where there is no vision, the people perish’ (Proverbs 29:18). **Satan will work ingeniously, in different ways and through different agencies, to unsettle the confidence of God’s remnant people in the true testimony.**”—*1 Selected Messages, 48 [see 2 SM 78 for context].*

“There will be a hatred kindled against the testimonies which is satanic. The workings of Satan will be to unsettle the faith of the churches in them, for this reason: **Satan cannot have so clear a track to bring in his deceptions and bind up souls in his delusions if the warnings and reproofs and counsels of the Spirit of God are heeded.**”—*1 Selected Messages, 48.*

“**We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith.**”—*Counsels to Writers and Editors, 32.*

“**It does not become anyone to drop a word of doubt here and there that shall work like poison in other minds,** shaking their confidence in the messages which God has given, which have aided in laying the foundation of this work, and have attended it to the present day, in reproofs, warnings, corrections, and encouragements. To all who have stood in the way of the *Testimonies*, I would say, God has given a message to His people, and His voice will be heard, whether you hear or forbear. **Your opposition has not injured me; but you must give an account to the God of heaven, who has sent these warnings and instructions to keep His people in the right way.** You will have to answer to Him for your blindness, for being a stumbling block in the way of sinners.”—*1 Selected Messages, 43.*

“**When you find men questioning the testimonies, finding fault with them, and seeking to draw away the people from their influence, be assured that God is not at work through them . . . They find fault, and condemn the very means that God has chosen to fit up a people to stand in the day of the Lord.**”—*1 Selected Messages, 45.*