

23. Kane, Dan, *All Paths Save One*, (on the Internet at <http://www.lvcm.com/allpathssaveone/> PDF file, 5 February 2003)

Maccoby's (see item # 27) charge that Paul invented the Eucharist in the modern, Catholic sense, including the idea of transubstantiation reminded me that this was an idea so bitterly poked fun at by the Cathar Gnostics of the Languedoc in the 12th thru 14th centuries.

It also reminded me of this book, written by a friend and coworker of mine, a nuclear engineer, Dan Kane.

Kane is a believer, a member of a Baptist fellowship. He has a very individualistic religious sensibility and understanding. He wrote this book to bring people, especially Catholic people, to believe in Christ, the Christ he finds in the Bible. He believes the Biblical Christ to be quite different from the Catholic or the Mormon Christ.

Regarding the Eucharist, Kane has this to say (page 199):

While the Mass had been instituted by the Roman Church around 394, and attendees participated in fellowship and in the breaking of bread, just as had the early church members at Jerusalem [see Acts 2:42], the doctrine of transubstantiation was formulated some eight hundred years later by the Roman Catholic Church and affirmed at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). Thus, from its establishment in 450 A.D. till 1215, the Roman Catholic Church did not teach that the bread and wine were transformed into Jesus' body and blood! In response to the Reformers' position against transubstantiation two hundred years later, the doctrine was reconfirmed in 1551 at the Council of Trent.

When I asked Kane why the Cathars could make fun of this doctrine when it was not affirmed until 1215, he stated that it had been around for centuries as a belief expressed and held by some, but it had not been given the status of dogma, mandatory belief, until this council. That made sense. It also illustrates that something quite fluid for a long time can become crystallized if it becomes the subject of conflict or controversy.

Kane asserts something I did not know on page 201:

The Dutch scholar, Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536), reasoned that dogma must be understandable to ordinary people because God certainly would not hold someone responsible for not believing what he could not understand. He argued, too, against the doctrine of transubstantiation, calling it sophistry, and maintained that Christ is present in the Eucharist only in a spiritual sense, not in any substantial (substance) sense. These are only a very few of the very many early reformers. It should be noted that they all came from within the Roman Catholic Church, not from outside. . . .

Kane goes on to say that the church did not listen, and the Reformation proceeded.

Where Maccoby suggests that scripture supports transubstantiation as a concept from Paul's time, Kane says otherwise on page 289, where he explains:

No Scriptural Support for Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation

Some have attempted unsuccessfully to support the notion of transubstantiation with a verse from I Corinthians 11:29: "For he who eats and drinks unworthily, without distinguishing the body, eats and

drinks judgment to himself.” They argue that the word “body” in the above verse is a reference to Jesus’ body in the communion service. However, this is not the case. As has already been cautioned, it is dangerous to one’s eternal destiny to use verses out of context to support non-Scriptural positions. There simply are no verses that support the concept of transubstantiation or consubstantiation.

The keys to interpretation of verse 29 above are found in verses 33 and 34: “Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. If anyone is hungry let him eat at home (*before coming to the service*), lest you come together unto judgment” [I Corinthians 11:33-34] St. Paul is addressing a problem in the Corinthian church. Some were forgetting the serious nature of partaking in communion, which is representative of the Lord’s body and blood.

So that is the ‘Biblical’ view, according to Kane, and to me it makes sense: the bread/wafer and wine/juice, or whatever, (Ebionites used water) are symbolic, and serve as reminders of Christ’s body and blood.

I was also interested in what Kane had to say about James in Jerusalem. I wondered, for example, if he would leave that Jerusalem James undefined as Talmage did (see item # 35), or if he recognizes him as Jesus’ brother and the head of the congregation in Jerusalem. I was pleased to see that Kane is in the same camp as Eisenman (item # 15) in suggesting a unity of views between these two brothers, James and Jesus, on his page 258:

Some like to quote St. James to justify a works-based salvation. However, St. James was the oldest of Jesus’ younger brothers (more is said on this later) and would

not have preached a gospel different from that preached by his half Brother. Moreover, St. James identifies himself in the introduction to the epistle that bears his name as: *James, the servant of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ*. In epistles written by others, the title "an apostle of Jesus Christ" is generally used. Thus, this James was not one of the two original apostles named James. Also, St. James clearly identifies Jesus as deity in his salutation. This is probably because St. James did not become a believer until after Jesus' resurrection [see St. Mark 6:3-4 and I Corinthians 15:7]. If St. James had been one of the original apostles, then the Corinthians citation would have read: "After that he was seen by all the apostles." But St. Paul makes it clear in verses 5-7 that Jesus' appearing to James was separate from His appearance to the twelve. Thus, St. James could not have been one of the original twelve. Moreover, St. James is again identified as one of Jesus' brothers in Galatians 1:19. This is a post-resurrection reference since here St. James is now referred to also as an apostle by no less than St. Paul, a post-resurrection apostle himself!

So James is seen by Kane as a different person from the other two Jameses who were apostles. And he likens his apostolic status to that of Paul, both becoming apostles after the resurrection. James's role in Jerusalem is mentioned by Kane on pages 258-259:

St. James was the leader of the church at Jerusalem. This statement would be disputed by the Roman Catholic Church, of course. She claims that St. Peter was the infallible leader of the universal Church. However, as already revealed, there was no universal Church for St. Peter or anyone else to head at the time of St. Peter's life. Further proof that St. Peter was not

the infallible leader of even the apostles is recorded in Galatians 2:11-21. When St. Paul returned from Jerusalem where he had heard of St. Peter's association with the Judaizers, and the false gospel they had been spreading, St. Paul confronted St. Peter:

"But when Cephas (*Peter, see St. John 1:42*) came to Antioch, I withstood him to his face, because he was deserving of blame. For before certain persons came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he began to withdraw and to separate himself, fearing the circumcised. And the rest of the Jews (*Jewish converts*) dissembled (played the part of the hypocrite) along with him, so that Barnabas also was led away by them into that dissimulation (*hypocrisy*). But when I saw that they were not walking uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: If thou, though a Jew, livest like the Gentiles, and not like the Jews, how is it that thou dost compel the Gentiles to live like the Jews (*under the Mosaic Law*)?" [Galatians 2:11-14]

Apparently St. Peter mistakenly believed, or was led to believe by the Judaizers *claiming* to speak for St. James, that St. James did not think Jews should eat or associate with Gentiles. Thus, through fear, St. Peter began to separate himself from the Gentiles. Barnabas and others of St. Peter's associates followed suit. However, St. Paul rebuked St. Peter and the others for having abandoned the truth of the gospel [see St. John 10:16 and Romans 10:12]. Thus, again, we see that St. Peter was neither infallible nor the leader of any Church or church. Moreover, the veracity of the claim that it

was St. James who was the leader of the Jerusalem church can be evaluated by simply reading the relevant text in Chapter 15 of the book of Acts.

As recorded therein, the question being debated at the church in Jerusalem was, "What must Gentile converts do with regard to circumcision and following the Law of Moses." Certain converts from among the Pharisees insisted that Gentile converts be circumcised and subject to the Law. Various disciples put forth their positions in an open forum. Then, St. Peter stood to speak. He recounted his experience in converting Gentiles to those in attendance. Then St. Paul and Barnabas stood and told how God had performed great signs and wonders in their witnessing to the Gentiles. After all had put forth their testimonies: "... James made this answer, saying, . . . 'Therefore, *my judgment* is not to disquiet those who from among the Gentiles are turning to the Lord; but to send them written instructions to abstain from anything that has been contaminated by idols and from immorality and from anything strangled and from (*the drinking of*) blood.'" [Acts 15:13-20]

From pages 259-260:

St. James is the only one recorded in the Scriptures to have dealt with the question in a doctrinal manner by citing the relevant portion of the Old Testament being fulfilled [see Amos 9:11-12]. Also, it was *his judgment* on the matter that prevailed. And, per *his judgment and direction*, a letter explaining the conclusions reached at the meeting was prepared and delivered to those at Antioch. It is interesting to note that the Jerusalem church mentioned no requirement for baptism or communion with regard to salvation which is consistent

with the Scriptures but contrary to what many Churches teach.

I cite this at some length because in the other places where I reviewed a book addressing this relationship between the Jerusalem church and James, the brother of Jesus, I did not cite or explain the New Testament evidence for this relationship. Kane explains it well.

On his pages 262 and 263 Kane is critical of the Catholic Church's idea of an ever-virginal Mary. Kane suggests this is the main reason Catholics must reject the idea of Jesus having actual, biological, younger half-brothers:

The Roman Catholic Church has insisted that Mary be ever virginal despite clear contradictions to this teaching provided in the Roman Catholic Bible [see St. Matthew 13:55; St. Mark 3:31; St. Luke 8:19-21; St. John 2:12; and St. John 7:3-10]. The Church posits that it was the custom of Jews to call cousins and other relatives "brothers." However, this is not true. The veracity of such an argument can be evaluated by simply reading how the word is used in the Old and New Testaments. One of the barriers to acceptance of Jesus' teaching that all men were "brothers" was Jewish tradition. Tradition taught tribal pride. Family birth records and ancestral trees were meticulously recorded, kept, and guarded in the Temple. While Jesus tried to get men to understand that in God's eyes all were brothers, most resisted this teaching and, in fact, such resistance was what caused St. Peter to remove himself from associating with the Gentiles until St. Paul rebuked him, as discussed earlier. St. Paul exhorts believers to "... avoid foolish controversies and genealogies (*familial identification*) ... for they are useless and futile." [Titus 3:9]. Moreover, while some of Jesus' followers

sometimes referred to one another as brother, those who referred to Jesus' brothers generally were not believers [see St. Matthew 13:57]. Moreover, if one accepts the thesis that biblical references to Jesus' brothers were actually His disciples, then what are we to do with St. John 2:12? "After this he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples"

Before His resurrection, Jesus' brothers rejected His claim to be the Christ, the prophesied Messiah and king of the Jews who would restore Israel to greatness. There likely was more than a little jealousy among brothers, just as there was between Joseph and his brothers who hated him so much that they sold him into slavery [see Genesis 37:5-8]. The "good" advice of Jesus' brothers is recorded in Scripture: "Now the Jewish feast of the Tabernacles was at hand. His brethren therefore said to him, 'Leave here and go into Judea that thy disciples also may see the works that thou dost; for no one does a thing in secret if he wants to be publicly known. If thou dost these things (*miracles*), manifest thyself to the world.' For not even his brethren believed in him." [St. John 7:2-5] After performing many miracles in Judea and curing a cripple on the Sabbath [St. John 5:8-16], Jesus retreated to Galilee, the area where He had been brought up and where His brothers and sisters still lived. The purpose of His retreat was not fear, though the Jews in Judea sought to kill Him. Rather, His time had not yet come to manifest Himself to the world. However, His dear, sweet brothers advised Him to go and "show off His powers" in Judea under the guise that the world cannot accept what it does not see. However, Jesus let His brothers go on ahead. He later went to the Temple where, during the procession from the Gihon Spring and in front of the

rabbis, He proclaimed Himself to be the "river of living water," as discussed in Chapter Four. It was only after His resurrection that Jesus' brothers recognized Him as Lord. In the salutation of St. Jude's epistle (Judas in English), he refers to himself as "the servant of Jesus Christ and the brother of James." St. Jude was another of Jesus' brothers.

So when did the change of heart take place? Or, as Streeter (see item # 34) suggests, was the eldest brother just taking over the family business as its hereditary leader or Caliph? Kane says it was the appearance of the resurrected Christ that turned the brothers around, as mentioned in one of the letters of Paul. Kane explains this on his page 257:

St. James did not become a believer until after Jesus' resurrection [see St. Mark 6:3-4 and I Corinthians 15:7]. If St. James had been one of the original apostles, then the Corinthians citation would have read: "After that he was seen by all the apostles." But St. Paul makes it clear in verses 5-7 that Jesus' appearing to James was separate from His appearance to the twelve. Thus, St. James could not have been one of the original twelve. Moreover, St. James is again identified as one of Jesus' brothers in Galatians 1:19. This is a post-resurrection reference since here St. James is now referred to also as an apostle by no less than St. Paul, a post-resurrection apostle himself!

So, two post-resurrection apostles, but it stops there. Kane is very upset at those claiming revelation in later times, whether they be Catholic, Mormon, Muslim or whatever. He makes his critical statements regarding Mormon revelation on page 41. He also is critical of Catholic and Mormon claims to revelation and their teachings regarding the atonement of Jesus Christ on his pages 323-324.

Although Kane's assertions will be offensive to some, he points out some who feel they are spiritual but who reject the Word of God 'as is' are dupes of the devil. His book is a very good example of the view of a person who is totally convinced that all scripture is self-consistent because it is inspired by the same God.

He totally rejects the validity of the work of the critics whose work I review on these pages. Textual Criticism is something he suggests has corrupted all but the King James and Douay versions of the Bible (p. 22). Interestingly, on his page 226 he blames Textual Criticism, in large part, for bringing the Goddess (Mary as *Queen of Heaven*) into Protestant Christianity where, prior to these new Bibles she had no place. Of course, Mormons have a married God, but that can't be blamed on new Bible versions or Textual Criticism.

Sometimes it is a good reminder that among Christians there are those who truly believe. Not blindly, but with eyes wide open, minds engaged, believing that their Bible is the Word of God, and that their spirits are in communion with their God when they live and believe in harmony with that Word.