

## Boston College Debate #2 – Was Peter The First Pope? White/Zins Vs. Sungenis/Butler

sermonaudio.com

*Did Jesus Pre-Exist*

By Dr. James White

**Bible Text:** 2 Thessalonians 2:3-12  
**Preached on:** Thursday, April 12, 2011

### Christian Answers of Austin, Texas

9009 Martha's Drive  
Austin, TX 78717

**Website:** [www.biblequery.org](http://www.biblequery.org)  
**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers](http://www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers)

Rob Zins. We would certainly like to know what it's going to be from our opponents. On the one hand Mr. Sungenis has stated over and over again frequency does not equal papacy in response to my argumentation that Paul would have made a better pope, but then he says James is not mentioned much in Scripture and look how many times Peter is mentioned. But then frequency does not equal papacy, does it?

Also, in Galatians 2, since this seems to be the issue that we're on at the moment, I want to just read to you the context so that you can have in mind what is going on. Verse 7 of Galatians 2, "But on the contrary," Paul speaking, "seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been to the circumcised (for He who effectually worked for Peter in his apostleship to the circumcised effectually worked for me also to the Gentiles), and recognizing the grace that had been given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, so that we might go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised. They only asked us to remember the poor--the very thing I also was eager to do." Notice Paul says that he had been entrusted with the gospel. In verse 11, next verse, he says, "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned. For prior to the coming," etc. etc. and, "The rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy." It is not a small issue for an apostle to say of somebody that he stands condemned. As much as our opponents wish to minimize the passage, the passage speaks for itself insofar as the seriousness of the accusation.

Now then, I had mentioned earlier that the apostles were vying for leadership after Peter had already been allegedly given the position of primacy by Jesus Christ. This was never answered. Why would they argue who would be the greatest among them after Peter had already been declared to be the greatest among them?

James at Jerusalem. He stands up in Acts 15:13 and says, "Listen to me," in the imperative. Peter does not stand up and say, "Listen to me." Can you imagine what our opponents would do if Peter had stood up and said, "Listen to me." We would still be hearing it ringing off these walls, "Peter says listen to me! Peter says listen to me! What

other apostle says listen to me but Peter? Peter is speaking with authority." But when James says it, it means nothing, it's only his opinion.

Mr. Sungenis says that Peter is given primacy and proves it by the fact that he is the one performing miracles in the book of Acts, that there are no other miracles performed by anybody else in the book of Acts to speak of. I direct your attention to Acts 8, early on, Philip at Samaria performs miracles, comes back and reports to the rest of the apostles all that God is doing in Acts 8. Also in Acts 20, Paul, who is not qualified for the papacy, brings a man back to life who has fallen out of a window. So much for nobody else performing these grandiose miracles.

We've already shown that in Matthew 18, keys equals binding and loosing and binding and loosing is repeated in Matthew 18 given to all of God's apostles and also this binding and loosing is remarked on later in the book of Luke as the preaching of the Gospel. Many Roman Catholic scholars reject the position that Peter is the rock in Matthew 16, and if you stay around long enough for the historical end of the debate which will bring forth evidence that these will be in the minority insofar as the interpretation of Matthew 16 referring to Peter as the rock, so how can it be that the established principle of the entire papacy of Rome is equally divided among Roman Catholic scholars as to what Matthew 16 is teaching? They would have you believe that this is The teaching that has been given to us from the first century on forward and they are just trying to protect this teaching. We'll show you the contrary in the next hour.

Also I'd like to mention to you that my opponent this evening, our opponent this evening, Mr. Bob Sungenis, has written of his conversion story in a book entitled "Surprised By Truth." They are selling it outside in the hallway. In his conversion story which is given in this book, "Surprised By Truth," there's a footnote at the bottom of his testimony towards the end of it, in which he says, quote, this is Bob Sungenis, our opponent this evening, "I am inspired by the holy example of the counter-Reformation apologist St. Francis de Sales. His sermons and apologetic writings converted over 60,000 Reformed Protestants back to the Catholic Church as a result of his bold proclamation of biblical truth. The story of his ministry among the Calvinists as well as the scriptural and patristic arguments he employed to combat the heresies of Calvin and Luther, can be found in 'The Catholic Controversies.'"

I just happen to have a copy of "The Catholic Controversies" with me this evening and I'd like to give you some of the information from Francis de Sales that so impressed my opponent to turn away from biblical Christianity and embrace the Romish religion. Let me give you some good Roman Catholic double-speak from St. Francis de Sales insofar as the cornerstone is concerned, and I quote, de Sales says, "Our Lord then is foundation and St. Peter also, but with so notable a difference that in respect of the one the other may be said not to be it. For our Lord is foundation and founder, foundation without other foundation, foundation of the natural, Mosaic and evangelic church, foundation of perpetual and immortal, foundation of the militant and triumphant, foundation by his own nature, foundation of our faith, hope and charity, and of the efficacy of the sacraments." But, "St. Peter is foundation too, not founder of the whole church; foundation but

founded on another foundation which is our Lord; foundation of the evangelic church alone, foundation subject to succession, foundation of the militant not of the triumphant, foundation by participation, ministerial, not absolute foundation." On and on he goes. He closes with a difference between being a foundation and being a foundation is "so great as this makes the one unable in comparison to be called a foundation by the side of the other, whilst, however, taken by itself it can be called a foundation in order to pay proper regard to the word of God." If you can follow that Peter is the foundation but not the foundation but is the foundation in the foundation and Jesus is the foundation upon which the foundation is founded, you can follow along further with Francis de Sales.

I want to turn to some of his other comments here in the time that I have closing. He says on page 209 and following, he gives some comparisons insofar as his biblical proof for the supremacy of Peter and Peter being pope at Rome. He likens the church to a ship. If the church is a ship, St. Peter is its captain. If the church is a fishery, St. Peter is first in the fishery. If the church is to draw nets, St. Peter who casts them into the sea and St. Peter is the one who draws them. Do you say the church is like an embassy? St. Peter is the first ambassador. Do you say it is a brotherhood? St. Peter is the first governor and confirmer of the rest. Would you rather have it a kingdom? St. Peter receives its keys. Would you consider it a flock or a fold of lambs? St. Peter as its pastor and shepherd-general. Etc. etc.

The problem with all of this, of course, is that the church is not called the ship, it's not called a fishery, it's not called a draw-net, it's not called an embassy, and if it is called the kingdom of God, it is given to Jesus Christ, not to Peter, Colossians 1:13. If it is the flock and if there is a shepherd, we read in John 10 that, "My sheep hear My voice and they follow Me." He is the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for the flock.

de Sales goes on with his biblical proof by saying that Peter is the first one to preach penance, page 271 in this book. It says that Peter "is the first catechist of the church and preacher of penance." Now the Roman Catholic Church long ago decided that penance was the improper word for Acts 2:38 but yet here it is quoted by the one who most impressed my opponent this evening, that Peter is the first one to preach penance, not repentance, not metanoia but penance, Catholic penance. This is confounded by modern Roman Catholic Bibles that have changed the word to its proper understanding of repentance, not penance.

He says Peter touches the lame and he alone. Wrong. Philip in Samaria touched the lame.

He goes on to say that in Acts 12 when Peter is in jail, they pray intensely for Peter. Why didn't they pray for James? Could it be that James was beheaded in Acts 12:1 and there's no need to pray for him unless you're Roman Catholic and you're praying for the dead.

On and on it goes insofar as this so-called biblical proof is concerned from the one whom by his own confession, convinced him of the power of the scriptural and patristic arguments employed to combat the heresies of Calvin and Luther. We think not. Thank you.

Mr. White. Referring to the entire concept of the papacy and papal infallibility, the great Princeton theologian, Charles Hodge, said, "If any in their sluggishness are disposed to think the perpetual body of infallible teachers would be a blessing, all must admit that the assumption of infallibility by the ignorant and the erring and the wicked must be an evil inconceivably great. The Romish theory if true might be a blessing; if false it must be an awful curse." It is our position that the theory is most definitely false and hence is, as Hodge put it, an awful curse for those trapped in its power.

We turn now to the fact that history itself demonstrates beyond all possible controversy that the Christian church has not historically understood that Peter was appointed by Jesus Christ to be vicar of Christ on earth, nor that he was granted a plenitude of jurisdictional authority over all the church.

The great Vatican Council of the last century taught the following as a matter of Christian doctrine. Please listen closely, quote, "At open variance with this clear doctrine of holy Scripture," as it has been ever understood by the Catholic Church, "are the perverse opinions of those who while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in his church, deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the other apostles, whether taken separately or together, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction; or of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon blessed Peter himself, but upon the church, and through the church on Peter as her minister. If any one, therefore, shall say that blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the prince of all the apostles and the visible head of the whole church militant; or that the same directly and immediately received from the same our Lord Jesus Christ a primacy of honor only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction: let him be anathema."

This is truly a monumental claim. The same council spoke of interpreting Scripture solely in harmony with the unanimous consent of the fathers. As we shall see, the very concept of such a thing as the unanimous consent of the fathers with reference to this topic is a sheer myth. No such thing exists, instead the majority of the early fathers are opposed to the Roman claims.

Before examining the large amount of evidence that speaks against the Roman claims, let us note a number of the commonly committed errors made by Roman apologists in attempting to defend their position.

Error 1 I call anachronistic interpretation. Anachronistic interpretation, that is, the reading into the early fathers ideas, beliefs and concepts that were not a part of their world and did not develop until much much later. Keep an eye out for that error.

Error 2 I call the Peter Syndrome. This refers to the propensity on the part of many Roman Catholic apologists to find any statement about Peter in the writings of an early father and apply this to the bishop of Rome. There are many exalted statements made about Peter by men such as Cyprian or Chrysostom, however, it does not follow that

these statements about Peter have anything at all to do with the bishop of Rome. The Roman apologist must demonstrate that for such statements to be meaningful, that the father under discussion believed that the bishop of Rome alone is the sole unique successor of Peter so that any such exalted language about Peter is to be applied in that father's thinking to the bishop of Rome alone. If such a basis is not provided, references to Peter are irrelevant.

Error 3 I call ignoring the broad context. This error involves the Roman apologist in asserting a particular father believed in the modern theory of Roman primacy even when that same father made statements or took actions that demonstrate that he did not, in fact, hold to any such concept.

Let me give you some brief examples of these errors. One of the most often cited passages from an early father that allegedly shows a Roman primacy is the saying of Augustine from Sermon 131, "Rome has spoken. The case is closed." I have seen this phrase used over and over again without context as evidence that Augustine held a modern Roman Catholic view of papal primacy, yet as Roman Catholic historian, Robert Eno, notes, quote, "It was at this point that the famous words of Augustine were uttered as misquoted, 'Roma locuta est; causa finita est.' Actually he said," and here's what Augustine really said, "'Already two councils on this question have been sent to the apostolic see and replies have also come from there. The case is closed, would that the error might sometime be finished as well.' But beyond any quibbling over precise words, the greater irony is the use of this 'quotation' in later centuries. We have all heard it used in the following sense: Rome has made its decision, all further discussions must cease."

Hence not only is the citation not accurate in and of itself, but the import given by many Roman apologists is inaccurate as well. Von Dollinger noted in regard to these same passages, quote, "The Pelagian system was in his eyes," that is, Augustine's eyes, "so manifestly and deadly an error that there seemed to him no need even of a Synod to condemn it. The two African Synods, and the Pope's assent to their decrees, appeared to him more than enough, and so the matter might be regarded as at an end. That a Roman judgment in itself was not conclusive, but that a 'plenary council' was necessary for that purpose, he had himself emphatically maintained: and the conduct of Pope Zosimus could only confirm his opinion."

Von Dollinger mentions Pope Zosimus, and well he should have, for Zosimus provides us with a glowing example of how a father like Augustine can be misused by less than honest historical apologists. Upon becoming pope in 417, Zosimus reversed the course of his predecessor and fell into the sway of Pelagius and Celestius. JND Kelly notes, quote, "In brusque letters he informed the African episcopate that both heretics had cleared themselves, criticizing the action taken against them as over-hasty and based on unscrupulous witnesses. The outraged reaction of the African bishops who frankly told him that Innocent's sentence must stand, forced Zosimus to beat a retreat. The pope had no option but to make a complete climb down. An address to the bishops of east and west, a lengthy document known as his tractoria in which reversing his previous stand, he anathematized the Pelagians and their teachings." In fact, it is in this context that

Augustine said when faced with Zosimus' about-face, "Christ has spoken. The case is closed." So much for the first citation proving papal primacy.

We note that not only does this incident illustrate how easy it is to proof-text the fathers without reference to the real meaning of their words, but we shall see that Zosimus will provide us with another example of the truth of our denial of the historicity of the concept of papal supremacy which we shall examine later.

My second example of a common error made by Roman apologists is found in the words of the Council of Chalcedon, often quoted in Roman works, "Peter has spoken through Leo." We are told that here we have clear evidence of the belief that the early church viewed Leo as the unique and supreme successor of Peter, yet is this the case? Not at all. If we take the time to examine the issue, we discover that, first of all, that Leo had written his work, the Tome, prior to the synod held in 449 but it had not caused that synod to follow Leo's position. Leo sent his legates to Chalcedon with a letter that instructed the council not to bother deliberating since his Tome was a sufficient statement of the faith.

John Meyendorff, the great Orthodox historian, noted regarding this, quote, "No wonder that his legates were not allowed to read this unrealistic and embarrassing letter before the end of the sixteenth session, at a time when acrimonious debates on the issue had already taken place! Obviously, no one in the East considered that a papal fiat was sufficient to have an issue closed. Furthermore, the debate showed clearly that the Tome of Leo to Flavian was accepted on merits, and not because it was issued by the pope. Upon the presentation of the text, in Greek translation, during the second session, part of the assembly greeted the reading with approval ('Peter has spoken thus through Leo!' they shouted), but the bishops from the Illyricum and Palestine fiercely objected against passages which they considered as incompatible with the teachings of St. Cyril of Alexandria. It took several days of commission work to convince them that Leo was not opposing Cyril. The episode clearly shows that it was Cyril, not Leo, who was considered at Chalcedon as the ultimate criterion of christological orthodoxy. Leo's views were under suspicion of Nestorianism as late as the fifth session, when the same Illyrians, still rejecting those who departed from Cyrillian terminology, shouted: 'The opponents are Nestorians, let them go to Rome!' The final formula approved by the council was anything but a simple acceptance of Leo's text. It was a compromise, which could be imposed on the Fathers when they were convinced that Leo and Cyril expressed the same truth, only using different expression." And a footnote is provided to the above shout of the fathers which reads, quote, "The acclamation 'Peter has spoken thus through Leo' often quoted as a triumph of Roman authority seems to have actually been a defensive reaction against objections by the Illyrians."

So here we have what was, in fact, a defensive reaction raised in defense of Leo's position against the objections of many of the bishops present, taken by many modern Roman Catholic apologists as evidence of a primacy that the very Council of Chalcedon not only denied by its very existence but by its famous Canon 28 which we shall examine at a later point.

Now in the brief time I have available to me, I shall attempt to address two major topics. First, I shall very briefly address the issue of the patristic interpretation of the key passages upon which the papacy claims to be founded, and will demonstrate that the modern Roman interpretation of these passages flies in the face of the patristic understanding. Then I shall begin presenting just a sampling of the large body of evidence that demonstrates that the early church did not view Peter as the vicar of Christ in the Roman understanding and, hence, they did not see the bishop of Rome as the sole successor of Peter nor the head of the universal church with jurisdictional authority over all of Christ's flock.

We turn to the pivotal passage you may be getting tired of by now, Matthew 16. When we look at the patristic information regarding this passage, we find a wide variety of interpretations. It is easy to understand why many Roman Catholic scholars felt it necessary to leave communion with Rome following Vatican I, for any person even slightly familiar with patristic interpretation and slightly concerned about being truthful would never ever say that the church has always interpreted this passage as it is interpreted by that council.

The first thing to note is that there simply is no one understanding of this passage in the early fathers and what is the importance of this? Dr. Salmon said, quote, "But none of these can be reconciled with the interpretation which regards this text as containing the charter of the church's organization. A charter would be worthless if it were left uncertain to whom it was addressed or what powers it conferred. So that the mere fact that the fathers differed in opinion as to what was meant by 'this rock,' and that occasionally the same father wavered in his opinion on this subject, proves that none of them regarded this text as one establishing a perpetual constitution for the Christian church."

Next we note that the central aspect of Rome's understanding of this passage, specifically the identification of Peter as the rock, is in fact the minority understanding of the early church. The French Roman Catholic Lanois surveyed the patristic evidence and found 17 citations supporting the concept that Peter is the rock of Matthew 16. Please note that this does not mean that all 16 of these fathers also felt that this meant that the bishop of Rome was a pope but only that they saw Matthew 16 and the phrase "this rock" as referring to Peter, however, Lanois found 16 citations that identified the rock as Christ himself; he found eight that identified all the apostles together as forming the rock of Matthew 16; and he found 44 citations indicating that the rock of Matthew 16 was the confession of faith made by Peter in Jesus Christ. Now if we add these numbers together, we find that the Roman position which claims to have always been the faith of the Catholic Church, actually represents in Lanois' survey 20% of the fathers, 80% of the time, then, the early fathers expressed in Vatican I's words, perverse opinions at the very best.

I might note in passing that even as late as the Council of Trent, one can find that council referring to this passage as referring to the faith that Peter expressed, but should one Roman Catholic survey not be enough, we turn to Jesuit Maldonotus who writes, quote, "There are among ancient authors some would interpret 'on this rock,' that is, on this faith or on this confession of faith in which thou hast called him the Son of the living God, as

Hilary and Gregory N. and Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria. You see, in Augustine going still further away from the true sense, interprets 'on this rock,' that is, on myself, Christ because Christ was the rock, but Origen, 'on this rock,' that is to say on all men who have the same faith."

Was Maldonotus correct? Well, let's look, for example, at Hilary's statement regarding Matthew 16:18 as found in his work ??, book vi, chapter 37, quote, "This faith it is which is the foundation of the church; through this faith the gates of hell cannot prevail against her. This is the faith which has the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Indeed, as one reads all of chapter 37, one finds Hilary referring to each of the prime texts upon which the papacy is built, including John 21 and Luke 22, and yet not once mentioning the papacy.

Can you imagine a modern Roman apologist citing all three of these passages and not mentioning the papacy? From whence cometh this perverse notion that the passage here refers to the faith of Peter's confession, not to Peter himself? Was it not as we've been told, the common belief of Christians for centuries before this passage referred to Peter thus establishing the papacy? How could Hilary be ignorant of such a fundamental concept and how could he be joined by the likes of John Chrysostom or Gregory N.? How could these great men and preachers be ignorant of such a basic truth unless perhaps it's not such a basic truth at all?

And what of the great Augustine? Surely many are aware of his statement in his *Retractiones* regarding this passage and its meaning, and I shall not take the time to read it yet once again. I would point out, however, that Augustine left his readers to decide how they would interpret the passage. May I ask us all to think seriously about what it means that the great Bishop of Hippo, Augustine, could think that how one views this passage is a matter of freedom when Vatican I tells us it is a matter upon which the anathema can and should be used. Can we not see in this the tremendously huge amount of evolution that has taken place between the early part of the fifth century and the latter part of the nineteenth? Indeed we can.

The Roman interpretation of Matthew 16 is vulnerable on many other points as well, in fact, it requires of us faith and a long intricate and highly questionable chain of propositions. First, Jesus must be referring to Peter as the rock. Second, this must involve a giving of authority to Peter that is given to no one else. Third, this passage must somehow provide to us something about successors for the Roman position to have any meaning at all, yet the idea of succession in Matthew 16 is simply absent from the understanding of the early fathers. As Oscar Cullmann said, quote, "We thus see that the exegesis that the Reformation gave was not first invented with their struggle against the papacy, it rests upon an older patristic tradition." And the great historian Von Dollinger in his work "The Pope and the Council" said, quote, "Of all the fathers who interpret these passages in the gospels, Matthew 16:18, John 21:17, not a single one applies them to the Roman bishops as Peter's successors. How many fathers have busied themselves with these texts, yet not one of them whose commentaries we possess, Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Cyril, Theodoret, and those whose interpretations are collected in *catenas*, has dropped the faintest hint that the primacy of Rome is the

consequence of the commission and promise to Peter! Not one of them has explained the rock or foundation on which Christ would build his church, of the office given to Peter to be transmitted to his successors; but they understood by it either Christ himself or Peter's confession of faith in Christ, often both together. Or else they thought Peter was the foundation equally with all the other apostles, the twelve being together the foundation-stones of the church. The fathers could the less recognize – listen closely – in the power of the keys, and the power of binding and loosing, any special prerogative or lordship of the Roman bishop, inasmuch as – and listen very closely, gentleman – what is obvious to anyone at first sight, they did not regard the power first given to Peter and afterwards conferred on all the apostles as anything peculiar to him or hereditary in the line of Roman bishops – and listen closely – they held the symbol of the keys as meaning just the same as the figurative expression of binding and loosing."

To this we add the authority of ?? who noted that until the time of Innocent III in the twelfth century, over a millennia after Christ, quote, "The understanding of these Petrine texts by biblical exegetes in the mainstream of the tradition was universally non-primatial." That is, not with reference to a primacy of the pope in Rome.

As time is fleeing, we pass in the interpretation of biblical passages to the numerous statements and actions by early fathers and councils which demonstrate to the unbiased, and I would pray today even to the biased observer, that the Roman concept of Petrine primacy preserved in the person of the bishop of Rome is a belief that was not at any time in the past, nor is it today, the universally held belief of the Christian people. I begin with the fact that is often overlooked by defenders of the Roman concept.

Joseph F. Kelly in "The Concise Dictionary of Early Christianity" said, quote, "it is likely that in the earliest Roman community a college of presbyters rather than a single bishop provided the leadership." This is echoed by Ferguson, "The Encyclopedia of Early Christianity," and the eminent church historian, JND Kelly concurs saying with reference to an alleged early pope, quote, "His actual functions and responsibilities can only be surmised for the monarchical or one-man episcopate had not yet emerged in Rome." This is in reference to a period all the way into the middle of the second century.

Ask yourself this question: if Vatican I was right and if Christians have always believed that Peter alone was given the primacy and that Peter alone was given the keys and that Peter's successors are alone to be found in fullness in the bishops of Rome, why would the church at Rome go for nearly a full century without a single bishop as leader, instead using the primitive and most biblical concept of a plurality of elders?

John Henry Cardinal Newman, probably the most noted Roman Catholic scholar of the nineteenth century in his work "An essay on the development of Christian doctrine," quoted approvingly from Barrow's 1836 work against Papal supremacy. He noted that it was quite right for the Protestant to point out that there are historical facts that are contrary to a functioning, widely recognized Papacy in the early Church. For example, he agreed with Barrow that had the pagans been aware of the institution of the Papacy, they would surely have raised great objections to it, but such objections are not to be found

anywhere. And very importantly he quoted with approval Barrow's statement, quote, "It is most prodigious that, in the disputes managed by the Fathers against the heretics, the Gnostics, Valentinians, &c., they should not, even in the first place, allege and urge the sentence of the universal pastor and judge, as a most evidently conclusive argument, as the most efficacious and compendious method of convincing and silencing them." Note what Newman admits, that it is decisive that the early fathers when debating against the heretics such as the Gnostics, did not appeal to the papacy as judge and arbiter of theological issues. But if modern Roman claims are correct, how can this be? Is not the papacy the ancient and constant faith of the universal church? Have not Christians always understood the Scriptures as teaching the existence of the papacy of Rome? The silence of the church in this instance is devastating evidence against papal claims.

The Council of Nicea provides us with yet another fact that is contrary to papal claims. It is to be found in Canon VI of that council and it reads as follows, quote, "Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis prevail, that the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction in all these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the Churches retain their privileges." Notice that the Bishop of Rome is not here given universal sovereignty but is instead seen as an equal, one with jurisdiction in a particular geographical area and, folks, that geographical area was limited, not worldwide.

?? noted regarding the Council of Nicea that, quote, "The first ecumenical council knew nothing of the doctrine of papal supremacy." And with reference specifically to the language of Canon VI, quote, "It is not what would be natural on the part of any assembly of Christian bishops who believe that Christ had given to the Roman See a plenitude of jurisdiction which differed not only in degree but in kind from that of any other See whatsoever."

In Canon VI, nothing is mentioned about Peter or the vicar of Christ. Indeed, I note in passing that the first man audacious enough to allow himself to be called vicar of Christ seemingly was Gelasius I in 495, half a millennia after Christ came to earth and 450 years after the true Vicar of Christ came to earth, that being the Holy Spirit of God. But as Kelly notes, the use of the title vicar of Christ did not become current for popes until the reign of Hadrian IV in the middle of the twelfth century.

Now returning to the topic of the Council of Nicea, I wish to point out that here in probably the most important council in all of church history we not only do not find any papal supremacy, we find quite a bit of evidence that is contrary to such claims. First, why did no one inform Constantine that all he had to do was send word to the bishop of Rome and obtain an infallible ruling from the vicar of Christ in the person of the pope so that all Christians everywhere would obey? Obviously because no one had thought such a thought. Constantine called the council together, again seemingly ignorant that he should have let the bishop of Rome do that, and again no one seemed to mind as they had never thought that they needed the bishop of Rome to do such a thing in the first place.

The current bishop of Rome at that time, Sylvester, did not attend, pleading old age, but sent two presbyters in his place. History records that Rome had little or nothing to do with the events of Nicea. It was not the bishop of Rome who undertook the defense of the Nicene faith during the years of Arian ascendancy that followed Nicea, but Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria. Indeed, one might note in passing that while Athanasius was forced from his See five times yet remained unbowed, Liberius the bishop of Rome yielded and signed the Arianized Sirmian Creed.

Be that as it may, the very fact that the Council of Nicea was convoked is a strange thing indeed if, in fact, Roman claims are true. Would it not have been much easier to simply ask the pope for a ruling on such a central doctrine? But history will not allow for such simplicity. Even when Nicea had concluded in its proceedings, its creed had to fight for survival for 60 years thereafter despite the fact that Roman bishops, excluding Liberius' lapse defended it. Again it is plain that just because the bishop of Rome took a particular position, was no guarantee that all the Christians would follow suit. And why is this? Because all the Christians did not look to the Roman bishop as the final authority in matters of faith and morals.

Over a century later, we find more indication of the absence of absolute papal supremacy at the Council of Chalcedon. Here we find the famous Canon XXVIII, a Canon that Rome resisted and for obvious reasons. I read to you in part, quote, "We do enact and decree the same things concerning the privileges of the most holy church of Constantinople which is new Rome, for the father has rightly granted privileges to the throne of old Rome because it was the royal city, and the 150 most religious bishops gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, justly judging that the city which is honored with the sovereignty and the senate and enjoys equal privileges with the old imperial Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters also be magnified as she is and ranked next after her." Note well what is said here. First it is said that the fathers granted privileges to Rome. On what basis? Because of Matthew 16 and the bishops of Rome being the successor of Peter and Isaiah 22 and all that stuff? No, indeed, the privileges were granted to Rome because it was the royal city and now Constantinople being the seat of government, assumed such privileges which are bestowed logically on the church that resides in the capital of the empire.

It is highly instructive to note the reaction of Rome to this Canon. When it was proposed to the Roman legates at the council, they indicated that they had no instructions from Rome and withdrew. The Canon was passed in their absence. The next day when they objected, their objections were dismissed. The commissioners bluntly declared the issue closed. All was confirmed by the Council, they said, explicitly denying any papal right of veto. When Pope Leo heard about this, he was angry and rejected the Canon but on what ground did he reject it? This is very important. He did so on the basis of allegedly defending the older patriarchates Alexandria and Antioch, and by so doing, of course, he was protecting Roman claims as well. Leo did not refuse to recognize the Canon because it had been passed without his consent, but because he said that the Canons contradicted the decrees of Nicea which he said would last forever and could be altered by no one.

Did this end the dispute? Not at all, in fact, the pope's resistance to the Canon had no effect. The Quinisext Council in 681 confirmed all the Chalcedon Canons without exception and the Council of Florence repeated the same order found in the Canon with Constantinople second. The Canon appeared in the *sintagma* in 14 titles in the sixth century and all later Byzantine collections and even in some sixth century copies of the oldest Latin canonical collections.

Another indication from the councilor action takes us back to good old Pope Zosimus that we mentioned before. I quote again from Meyendorff, quote, "Finally in Africa the disciplinary claims of Rome were passionately rebuked in 418. Examining the case ?? deposed in Africa and received in Rome by Zosimus, the African bishops formally forbade appeals beyond the See. Furthermore, writing to Pope Celestine in 420, the Africans proclaimed what amounted to a formal denial of any divine privileges of Rome. Who will believe, they stated, that our God could inspire justice in the inquiries of one man only, that is the pope, and refuse it to innumerable bishops gathered in council."

The fierce independence of North African bishops had a long history going back to the great martyr bishop of Carthage, Cyprian. Very shortly before his martyrdom, Cyprian presided over the seventh council of Carthage which gives us the following information and I quote, "For neither does any of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another."

It is easy to recognize the reference to Stephen, the bishop of Rome with whom Cyprian had clashed in previous years, in the rebuke of the title bishop of bishops. Why is this important? Cyprian is truly one of the greatest obstacles to any serious acceptance of Roman Catholic claims regarding papal primacy. While he is often cited by Roman apologists, it is only at the expense of the fullness of his teaching that this is done. You see, Cyprian was one of the minority of early fathers who saw Peter as the rock of Matthew 16. Indeed, he saw Peter as the symbol of ecclesiastical unity and because of some of his words if relieved of their context, can lend support for the Roman contentions, he's often cited. However, a full examination of Cyprian's words and actions is the death knell for Roman pretensions.

First, we know Cyprian's rejection of Stephen's claims to authority of the North African Sees in his own words, quote, "Neither can it rescind an ordination rightly perfected. The ?? after the detection of his crimes and the bearing of his conscience even by his own confession, went to Rome and deceived Stephen, our colleague, placed at a distance and ignorant of what had been done and of the truth to canvas that he might be replaced unjustly in the episcopate from which he had been righteously deposed."

Cyprian specifically rejected the intrusion of Stephen. How can this be if Cyprian saw Peter as the rock? The answer is devastating to Roman claims. Cyprian believed it, every bishop, himself included, was fulfilling the role of Peter as the rock. In Epistle 26 of Cyprian, he makes this very claim, citing Matthew 16:18 with a reference to all bishops

nowhere mentioning the bishop of Rome alone. Such passages led Meyendorff to note, quote, "In fact, however, Cyprian's view of Peter's chair was that it belonged not only to the bishop of Rome but to every bishop within each community, thus Cyprian used not the argument of Rome and primacy but that of his own authority as successor of Peter in Carthage."

We can only agree wholeheartedly with the words of Dr. Cox who commenting on Cyprian's treatise on the unity of the church said the following, quote, "Compare this treatise of Cyprian, then, with any authorized treatise on the subject proceeding from modern Rome, and it will be seen that the two systems are irreconcilable. Thus, in few words, says the Confession of Pius IV.: 'I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.' This is the voice of Italy in the ninth century; but Cyprian speaks for Ecumenical Christendom in the third, and the two systems are as contrary as darkness and light."

It is no wonder, then, that Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea, could write to Cyprian joining in his condemnation of Pope Stephen, speaking of those who are at Rome vainly pretending the authority of the apostles and making schism from the peace and unity of the church, and he would go on to say, quote, "I am justly indignant of this so open and manifest folly of Stephen, that he who boasts the place of his episcopate and contends that he holds the succession from Peter on whom the foundations of the church were laid should introduce many other rocks and establish new buildings of many churches."

Such are but a few of the many historical facts that could be presented to you this evening. We could bring in Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, Ignatius' letter to the Roman church, Irenaeus' rebuke of the impetuous victor, Tertullian's mocking use of the phrase "pontifex maximus," and many more items all of which demonstrate that the concept that Peter was chosen by Christ as the vicar of Christ on earth, the head of the universal church, and that his successors are solely the bishops of Rome, is a historical novelty that took many centuries to develop. It is a claim that flies in the face of the early Christian leaders and as such is without merit. Thank you very much.

Mr. Butler. In the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. Lord, I just come before you as one wanting to be used today and I pray that you would lead me and help me to bring forth these truths of your church for 2,000 years. I ask that you would articulate these things through me in the name of Christ. Amen.

One of the things that James had brought up, which I think is very very important, is the councils. When I was an evangelical, I accepted many parts of the councils. For example, the first council of Nicea in 325, it said that Jesus Christ was God. The second council, first Constantinople in 381 said that the Holy Spirit was God. The fourth ecumenical council in 451, Chalcedon, said that Jesus Christ was fully divine and fully human. The seventh ecumenical council in 787 at the Council of Nicea said that Jesus had two wills and two operations. So I accepted all those different things that were coming out of the councils but out of the councils are also coming things that have to do with Peter, and

that's what we're gonna look at. We're gonna look at not only in the councils but things that they're talking about Peter, we're gonna look at the papal jurisdiction where the West is asked to intervene in the East on all types of doctrinal and authoritative things, and thirdly, we're gonna look at the bishop of Rome, and I believe because he has the power of the keys, that he will have the line item veto on the canons that are coming down through the councils.

John Meyendorff, the Orthodox scholar, he says, "Curiously enough, the ecclesiological problem was never posed as a real issue in the medieval debate between Constantinople and Rome. Only in 1204 after the sack of Constantinople did Byzantine theologians begin to discuss seriously the origin of the power which the popes claimed to have had." It wasn't an issue until about the year 1204 for the Byzantine church. I belong to the Eastern Catholic Church and one of the reasons that I came into the Catholic Church after studying Orthodoxy was I found these different principles that I had to be united with Peter.

The first instance of this happening is Clement of Rome. The Corinthian church, this is around the year 95, had appealed to Rome to make a decision. Rome was 600-800 miles away. They could have gone to Ephesus where John was still living and had them take care of the situation but they appealed to Rome. Why would they be appealing to Rome very early in the church? Rome writes back excusing themselves for not writing back in time but they say this, "Accept our counsel and you'll have nothing to regret. If anyone disobeys the things which have been said to them, Jesus through us, let them know that they will involve themselves in no small danger. We, however, shall be innocent of this sin and will pray with entreaty and supplication that the Creator of all may keep unharmed a number of his elect."

Protestant patristic scholars are saying something quite different than what Mr. White is saying. For example, J. B. Lightfoot says this, "It may perhaps seem strange to describe this noble remonstrance as the first steps toward papal domination, and yet this is undoubtedly the case." Monsignor B., an Anglican scholar, says that this is the epiphany of the Roman primacy. Harnack, a liberal scholar, says, "Yet it might not be unreasonable to infer from these words that the Roman church was already conscious of some degree of external responsibility such as does not have appeared to have been realized by geographically neighboring churches of Philippi. As we shall see, it will not be long before the thought which seems to underlie in the Clementine consciousness a responsibility that the Roman church has this authority."

Now many times what Protestant scholars have tried to do is they've tried to separate the church of Rome from the bishop of Rome, and I'm going to be addressing that in a little while. But one of the things that Dionysius of Clement, he writes a letter to Pope Soter in about the year 180 and shows the connection between the two.

Now the next instance that we have of papal jurisdiction, the West interfering in the East, remember now we have four patriarchal sees. Rome is number 1, Alexandria is number 2, Antioch is number 3, and Jerusalem is number 4. Victor in the year around 180, he

wants to coincide, he had most of the church was agreeing that they would take the Easter holiday, the Easter days, and put them into one so everybody would have the same kind of doctrine on this type of thing. But what does he do? There is a different bishops out of Asia that do not want to agree with the bishop of Rome on this and what does he do? He excommunicates all of the Asiatic churches. What gives him the authority to excommunicate all of these Eastern churches if he didn't have this authority? Now later on Irenaeus will come back and he will talk Victor out of doing this because of the sake of unity, but what gives him that authority in the year 180 to be involved in the Eastern Sees if he doesn't have this authority? This later will be agreed upon at the Council of Nicea. They will go with the Roman part on Easter, and also at the Council of Arles in 314.

But just to dispel this distinction between the bishop of Rome and the church of Rome, Ignatius, he says where the bishops are, there the people are. Where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church. Ignatius always in all his different letters and different things, is always talking about the bishop having this major role. So there's no differentiation between the two.

Irenaeus when he talks about the Roman church, he talks about the succession that came down, that the church was founded on Peter and Paul but the succession that he talks about comes up, he lists a whole bunch of different popes after Peter, the succession that he talks about comes from Peter's succession. There's no succession from Paul.

But just to show you this, Tertullian, he speaks of Peter baptizing in the Tiber. Clement of Alexandria speaks of Peter apart as proclaiming the word publicly at Rome. The poem against Marcion tells about Peter bathing Linus, take his place and sit on the chair whereon himself had sat. The word "chair" in ecclesiastical language always means episcopal throne. Wherever the chair of Peter is spoken of, it means that he sat on the chair as the bishop of the See. Caius in the year 214 calls Pope Victor 13<sup>th</sup> bishop of Rome after Peter. Hippolytus calls Peter as the first bishop of Rome. St. Cyprian speaks of the place of Peter. Vermillion speaks of the succession of Peter and the chair of Peter. Eusebius in 314 says that Peter was 25 years bishop of Rome. He called Linus the first after Peter to obtain the episcopate and Victor the 13<sup>th</sup> bishop of Rome. The Council of Serdica honors the memory of the Apostle Peter by referring appeals to the head to the See of Peter. St. Athanasius calls Rome the apostolic throne. Pope Julius speaks of the doctrines received by him from Peter. Pope Damasus speaks of the apostolic chair in which the holy apostle sitting taught as successors and how to guide the helm of the church. St. Ambrose speaks of Peter's chair and the Roman church where Peter first of the apostles sat. St. Jerome speaks of the chair of Peter, the apostolic chair, and states that St. Peter held the episcopal chair for 25 years at Rome. St. Augustine tells us of a number of bishops from the chair itself of Peter, the chair of the Roman church in which Peter first sat. I could continue on and on. I have 25 different quotes just to show you that type of thing, that there is no distinction between the church of Rome and the bishop of Rome.

Now in the year around 260, one of the first things that we see is the pope intervening again, papal jurisdiction. The Alexandrian See had written the pope, St. Dionysius, and

he says, "I wrote to Pope Sixtus because I'm writing to you so that I might not err." Why would he be writing to the bishop of Rome on a certain thing, on papal jurisdiction which is part of the Vatican I document, why would he be doing that?

Aurelian in the year 265, he is a pagan emperor and it was regards to the third greatest See, the Council of Antioch. Paul of Samosata, he had fallen from the episcopate and from the true faith as already said. Domnus was the person that had succeeded him and he didn't want anything to do with it and so what he does is he refers it to the Roman See to take care of the whole situation. Why would they be doing that the number 2 See, Alexandria, the number 3 See, Antioch?

Now Cyprian and Vermillion, they resisted the papal decisions of both what Rome was claiming but they do write, showing that they believed that Peter has this foundation. For example, Bishop Vermillion, he is protesting against heretical baptism and he says, "He," that is, Stephen, the bishop of Rome, "who so boasts about the place in his bishopric and insists that he holds the succession from Peter on whom the foundations of the church were laid."

Cyprian writing to Pope Cornelius says, "After all this, they in addition having had a false bishop ordained for them by heretics, dared to set sail and to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons to the chair of Peter and the principal church, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise. They fail to reflect that those Romans are the same as those whose faith was publicly praised by the apostle to [unintelligible]." The point being is, even though there were different people from different Sees from the East arguing about different things with the bishop of Rome, they at least admitted this principle that they had this rock position.

Now another thing that is not usually brought up. There was a bishop from Aurel and his name was Marcionus and Cyprian could not resolve the situation, in fact, he gets the bishop from Lyon also to try to resolve it, but finally what do they do? They refer it to the bishop of Rome because he has that jurisdiction. Why would they be doing that? Because they didn't have that authority.

Now many, the first council that we're going to be going into is Arles and here is what it says in a synodical epistle, writing, the father is writing to Pope Sylvester in 314, it says, "The place in which the apostles daily sit in judgment and their blood without ceasing witnesses to the glory of God."

Our next council is the Council of Nicea in 325. We would call that an ecumenical council. Mr. White has quoted Canon VI but he forgets to tell you something. Before, in Canon VI it says, "Let the Asian customs of Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis prevail that the bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction of all these, since the like is customary for the bishop of Rome also," but he forgets to tell you what in the Latin version what it said before. It says, "Rome has the primacy." This was even read at the fourth general council of Chalcedon. This is from Philip Schaff's work on page 15 acknowledging this, ?? which was a legate of the Roman church at the fourth council gets up and reads the documents

in Latin and he says in reading Canon VI, "Rome has the primacy." He had forgot to tell you that.

Now the East and the West have a certain way of, you know, there's a mindset but the Arabic Canons even though there's only 20 different Canons at the Council of Nicea, from the Arabic Canons they had more, but what it would show us is how did the East view this Peter and here's what it says of the care and the power which a patriarch has over the bishops and the archbishops of his patriarch and over the primacy of the bishop of Rome overall, then it goes on to say, "He is head and prince of all the patriarchs inasmuch as he is the first, as was Peter. To him power is given over all Christian princesses and over all the people and he who is the vicar of Christ our Lord over all people and over the whole Christian church and whoever shall contradict this is excommunicated by the synod. This is the Eastern frame of thinking. This is what they're acknowledging.

You know, Mr. White says the first time it's ever brought up is in the year 495. This is from the Eastern part of the church in the year 325 at the first council saying he's the vicar of Christ on earth. Then we move to the council of Sardica. The council of Sardica is the year about 343 and what happens is at the council of Sardica, Julius says that there were a couple of Arian councils going on, Tyra and Antioch, and with one swipe he says, "I cancel those councils, I depose all the Arian bishops, I reinstate Athanasius." What gives him the authority to be able to do that? I mean, Pope Julius says this, "Because Christ said to Peter, 'You are Peter and I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' the Roman church has on account of a privilege uniquely granted to it the power of opening and closing the gates of the kingdom of heaven to whom it wishes." This is in the year 341, a pope saying that.

Now at the Council of Sardica, what we have is bishops from the East and the West coming from Arabia, Crete, all of Egypt, and do you know who presides over that, of that council? Athanasius is the one that presides over the Council of Sardica and here's what happens in the Canons that are brought down. "If a judgment be passed upon any bishop and he thinks he has sufficient grounds for referring the matter to another judgment, let us honor the memorial, let us honor the bishop of Rome." It's the bishop of Rome that has that judgment. Then it goes on to say if there is a successor, and they're trying to nominate a successor in these different areas and the bishop of Rome had not decided the appeal, that the bishop of Rome had the authority not even to allow any successor to be brought forward. So the point being is as a Byzantine Catholic, this was even realized at the Council of Trullo in 692 by the Eastern part of the church. We realize these different Canons. We accepted these different Canons that Rome had set down.

The Council of Sardica says, "For this seems to be the best most suitable if the priest of the Lord and every province refer to the head, that is to the apostolic See of Peter." Why would they even be saying that if there's nothing about this Peter?

Now there are some other little local councils that are happening, not ecumenical councils as such. At the Council Aquila it says, "Should you be petitioned not to suffer the head of

the Roman world, the Roman church to be thrown into confusion flows unto all the rights of venerable communion." That's a little council and guess who is presiding over it? Ambrose is presiding over this council. In the second ecumenical council, the Council of Constantinople in 381 it says, "In the father's writing," and you can see this through Theodoret's writings, the synodical epistles, both Damasus and the bishops assembled at Rome, the Eastern fathers say, "You have summoned us as your own members by the letters of the most religious emperor." And the pope in his reply says, "Most honored children, in that your charity accords to the apostolic See the reverence due, you confer your greatest honor on themselves." The Council of Milan in the year 391. Again, Ambrose is involved, "But if they will not believe the doctrines of the priests, let them believe Christ's oracles, let them believe the admonitions of angels who say, 'For with God nothing is impossible.' Let them believe the apostles creed which the Roman church has always kept undefiled."

We can see different, you know, different jurisdictional things that are happening. At the Council of Ephesus, it's the third ecumenical council, here's what the words are saying, "We being necessarily impelled thereunto the Canons and by the letter of the most holy father and colleague, Celestine, bishop of the Roman church, with many tears have arrived at the following sentence again him. Our Lord Jesus Christ who has been blasphemed by him defines by the present most holy synod that the same Nestorius is deprived of episcopal dignity and all the sacerdotal rights." And it goes on to say, "It is doubtful to no one, nay, it is known to all the ages that the holy and blessed Peter, the prince and head of the apostles, the pillar in the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church received from our Lord Jesus Christ the Savior of the human race, the keys of the kingdom and that to him was given the power of loosing and binding sins, who up to this time and always has lived in the power of his successors and representatives. Therefore our holy and most blessed pope, bishop Celestine has sent to this synod." Then it also goes on to say, "The members are joined to the head for the beatitude is not unaware of the head of all the faith and the head of the apostles is the blessed Apostle Peter."

Now one of the things that I'm going to do and I'm going to cover this, but I'm gonna go through the line item detail. What the line item detail is this and it's only the bishop of Rome who has this right. In the Council of Nicea, the first ecumenical council, most Protestant acknowledge the first four. It says this, "For inasmuch as all things concerning the divine mysteries has been enforced by an ecclesiastical prophet which pertaineth to the strength of the holy Catholic and apostolic church, we report to the Roman See having translated them from the Greek. Whenever, then, we have ordained the Council of Nicea, we pray we may be confirmed by the fellowship of your countenance." The bishop of Rome had to confirm the final Canons.

Pope Julius writing, you can see this in Athanasius' in apology 35, "for if we, as you say, Athanasius and Marcellus did some wrong, the judgment ought to have been given according to the ecclesiastical canon and not that you should have written to all of us so that your justice might have been decreed by all, for if the bishops who were the sufferers and it was not obscure churches which were ruled by apostles and person, with regard to

the church at Alexandria in particular, why did you not consult us? Do you not know that this was the custom to first write to us so for that is just to be defined from hence?"

I studied the Eastern part of the church. Socrates, the great Byzantine theologian says, "Since the ecclesiastical canon ordered the churches shall not make any canons against opinions of the bishop of Rome." ?? the year 440 is saying that it was a sacerdotal law that it be done according to the will of the Roman bishop was null and void.

When Julius was present again at the Council of Antioch, in one swipec of the hand he said it's no longer a council. The bishop of [unintelligible] although the ecclesiastical canons orders the churches that the church may not make decisions without the bishop of Rome.

Now what's my point on this? The point is that the second ecumenical council, Canon III it said Rome has the primacy, Constantinople has the second place. They wanted to replace Alexandria See number 2 and Antioch See number 3 with Constantinople and what happens is this, the bishop of Antioch signs the agreement, the bishop of Alexandria signs the agreement, but when it got to the bishop of Rome he said, no, and he would not sign the agreement. Why? Because he has the right to be able to strike any canon. He has the line item veto on anything that's coming down on the councils.

This later on is affirmed by Pope Damasus. He says no, which is 382, the next year. Pope Boniface in 418. Now Mr. White would make you think like, well, this was given to the different Sees and it was trying to take away from Rome. No, this was causing major confusion for the See that had risen in 325 to take basically take the whole world, they had become a major See and the bishop of Rome will not allow this to happen. Then what happens is the Council of Chalcedon in 451, there are 600 bishops that arrived at the council, 150 of them were all from the East, and they try to submit a canon known as Canon 28, and the same canon that was submitted back there in the council in 381 at Constantinople, an ecumenical council, this is gonna be the fourth ecumenical council, said let Constantinople have the new Rome. What happens is Pope Leo says, "No, it cannot be done." And every person from that was even involved in the church during that time agrees with this and the patriarch of Constantinople writes and said, "You know, I really wanted this canon to get in but I was getting a lot of pressure from a lot of the other bishops." The emperor says, "You know, this is in your right and we're glad that we're following your rule." There's four or five other people that are around this and so the council at Chalcedon says this, the fathers ask, "Honor then, we pray, our judgments with your decree, that as we have been united to our head in agreeing to what was right, so the head too may confirm the becoming act of the children so will our pious princesses be pleased who has ratified as a law whatever your holiness has determined," writing to the bishop of Rome. "You have been for us the interpreter of the voice of the blessed Peter. You have bestowed on us the blessing of this faith. We bring to your notice the fact that we have decreed several other matters, the 28<sup>th</sup> canon, in the interest of peace and [unintelligible] and ecclesiastical affairs and confirmation of the statutes of the church, knowing that your holiness will confirm or approve." But what happens to the 28<sup>th</sup> Canon? We know Theodore ??, a Greek historian 100 years later and John ??, a Greek

historian in the year about 550, write that there were only 27 Canons. Mr. White had mentioned Dionysius. He exegis. He writes right in his writings that there's only 27 Canons.

So the point being is why does the pope have this right in the church? It's because he's been getting, not only did he strike Canon 3 down, not only did he strike Canon 28 down, but in later on and we see that after Pope Leo does, Gelatius does in 495 and also ?? does in the year 14, all of these people reject Canon 28 and it would have kept harmony in the church if we had just allowed for Constantinople to be the new Rome. But Leo hearkened back to Nicea saying that Alexandria and Antioch, that we couldn't change the creed or the Council of Nicea. So the point being is in many of these different councils that are going down, it's Leo that has this right to do whatever he wants in the church. Why? I believe he has the keys. He has that authority to be able to do that whenever he chooses.

Now what happens is Constantinople grew in the eighth ecumenical council in about the year 869 in Canon 21, it is allowed for Constantinople to be the new Rome because the accommodation principle, the pope thought it was alright to put it in. So the point I'm trying to say is this at every one of these different councils, why does the pope have this right to be able to strike or not strike a line item veto?

Now going to the fourth ecumenical council, what happened at the fourth ecumenical council is this, the fathers got up there talking about Peter and they say, "Peter has spoken through Leo." We can see it in the sixth ecumenical council, "?? has spoken through Peter." Both times.

So Christ, Leo speaking through Peter but let me just give you the surroundings of the different people that are saying something. This is patriarch Flavian which was a patriarch at the fourth ecumenical council. "The matter needs only your single decision and all with the settled and peace and quietness. Your sacred letter with God's help completely suppressed the heresy which has arisen and the disturbance it has caused, and so the convening of a council which is in any case difficult, will be rendered superfluous."

?? gets up and he says, "Rome has the primacy." This is cried out at the council, "Wherefore Leo the most holy and blessed archbishop of great and elderly Rome, one with the thrice blessed and all praiseworthy Apostle Peter who is the rock and the foundation of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the right faith." The fourth ecumenical council writing to Pope Leo the Great, "You have come to us. You have been for us the interpreter of the voice of the blessed Peter. You have extended over all of us the benevolence of faith. We were close." And so he continues on in these different councils.

Now one of the things that I think that's important is this ??. In the year 521, 2,500 bishops from the Eastern part of the church, not one stood out. "Submit to this formula. It is the first condition of salvation to keep the rule of right faith and in no degree to deviate from the tradition of the fathers for the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be

passed over which says, 'Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church.' These spoken words are proved by their effects because in the apostolic See religion is always kept undefiled. Therefore desiring not to fall from his faith and fall in what has been constituted by the fathers in all things," he keeps on going on, "wherefore in all things following the apostolic See as we have said, we also preach all that has been decreed by it and therefore hope to be in one communion with you, which the apostolic See enjoins and which the true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion promising that in the future those who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is to say those who do not consent to the apostolic See of Peter, that they're not gonna be part of the church." The East and the West were together. 2,500 bishops from the East signed this agreement.

Okay, we see five different times the emperor declaring in the fifth to the eighth century saying this, "Since the primacy of the apostolic See was confirmed by the merits of St. Peter, prince of the episcopal crown by the dignity of the city of Rome and also by the authority of the holy synods, let nobody have the presumption to attempt anything elicit outside the authority of the See of Rome for the peace of the church shall finally be preserved everywhere when the universe subjects itself to the supreme ruler. The old city of Rome has the honor of being the mother of laws that nobody may doubt that the height of the sovereign pontificate lies with her. For this reason, we ourselves have also believed it necessary to honor this cradle of law, the source of priesthood by a special ordinance of the sacred will. We decree," this is another one, "we decree from the following decisions of the councils that the most holy pope of the old Rome is first of all [unintelligible] and the holy archbishop of [unintelligible] a new Rome occupies a See that is lesser than the pope of the old Rome." Five different times the emperors are saying that Peter holds this place in the church.

Rob Zins. I would like to remind the audience that the thesis of the second course of this debate is the church has historically understood this to be true, not the church from the fifth century forward or the church from the twelfth century forward but the church, the church as it was begun on the day of Pentecost.

We read the following interesting citation from the Catholic Encyclopedia. Now my opponent has stood up here and argued for 30 minutes that the primacy and infallibility, which is a logical conclusion of primacy, of the pope has been vouchsafed to us in and throughout church history by various councils, citations, etc. We read this citation, however, from their own Roman Catholic Encyclopedia. "One need not expect to find in the early centuries a formal and explicit recognition throughout the Christian church either of the primacy or of the infallibility of the pope in the terms in which these doctrines are defined by the Vatican Council." No wonder it took them so long to search throughout to find it. His own encyclopedia says it can't be done.

We present as further evidence the testimony of some of the early church fathers. According to Philip Schaff in his massive three-volume work, "History of the Christian Church," we quote the following. "From the time of St. Paul's Epistle (58 AD), when he bestowed high praise on the earlier Roman converts, to the episcopate of Victor (189 AD)

at the close of the second century, and the unfavorable account by Hippolytus of Pope Zephyrinus and Pope Callistus, we have no express and direct information about the internal state of the Roman church." This represents a gap of 130 years where we have no express and direct information about the internal state of the Roman church.

Now Romanists try to find support for Roman authority in a letter that has been mentioned, the letter of Clement sent from Rome to Corinth around 97 AD, however this letter of Clement does not have a word about the dominance of an alleged pope at Rome. It states, "Ye therefore that laid the foundation of the sedition, submit unto the presbyters and receive chastisement unto repentance, bending the knees of your heart." Not a word about bending to the pope at Rome, rather submit to the presbyters. Notice Clement puts the church of Rome in the same vulnerable position that he felt the Corinthians were in by saying, "We are in the same lists and the same contest awaits us," speaking of their temptations and trials.

Some appeal is made to Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, around 110 and his so-called flattering language written to Rome in a letter, however, this same flattery is common to all the epistles of Ignatius and I quote, "Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, unto her which hath been blessed in greatness through the plenitude of God the Father which has been foreordained before the ages to be forever unto abiding and unchangeable glory united and elect in true passion by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God, even unto the church which is in," you would expect Rome, wouldn't you after that language? No, this letter is written to "Ephesus, worthy of all felicitation, abundant greeting in Christ and in blameless joy." Now to Rome, Ignatius writes, "having the presidency of love," not as Roman Catholic scholars want to say, presiding over the brotherhood. Also to Rome, Ignatius writes, "presidency in the country of the region of the Romans," not as it is alleged, presidency over the entire realm of Christendom. The actual words of Ignatius are "having the presidency of love," that is being first in love, "and having presidency in the country of the region of the Romans," not having presidency in the entire realm of Christendom.

In his closing remarks to the church at Rome, Ignatius, remember writing in AD 110, gives us his understanding of exactly who would bishop the church at Antioch in his absence. He is on his way to Rome and he says this in his letter, "Remember in your prayers the church which is in Syria which has God for its Shepherd in my stead, Jesus Christ alone shall be its bishop, he and your love."

We move forward in the church history to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, 200-258 AD, and we find this amazing concession given to us by the Catholic Encyclopedia with respect to Cyprian's loyalty to Rome and I quote, "Cyprian undoubtedly entertained exaggerated views as to the independence of individual bishops, which eventually led him to serious conflict with Rome." I'll say. Cyprian had serious conflict with Rome and we'll talk more about that later.

Here are a few comments from ??, an apologist of the third and fourth century. Origen was the first father to write a complete commentary on the Bible. He's from Alexandria,

Egypt and explained Matthew 16:18 as follows. "If you suppose that on this Peter alone the whole church is built by God, what would you say about John, the son of thunder, or about any other of the apostles?" John Chrysostom, patriarch of Constantinople explains, "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church which means upon the faith of his confession. Upon this rock, ?? He did not say upon Peter, ??, nor upon a man but upon his faith. By them he has built his church." Jerome writing in AD 40, official Bible translator, interpreter of the church of Rome, writes this commentary on Matthew, "Thou art Peter, petros, and upon this rock, ??, I will build my church, to Simon who believed in the rock, petra, that is Christ, the name of Peter, petros, was given. The rock is Christ who granted to his apostles that they too should be called rocks." Augustine, bishop of Africa, the greatest of the Latin fathers says therefore he said, "Thou art Peter, upon this rock which thou hast confessed, that is upon myself who am the Son of the living God, I will build my church. I will build my church. I will build you upon me, not me on you." The church is not built on men but on Christ. Those who wish to be built upon men said, "I am of Paul. I am of Apollos. And I am of Cephas who is Peter." But others who did not wish to be built upon Peter but upon the rock said, "I am of Christ." That's Augustine. Others who did not wish to be built upon Peter but upon the rock said, "I am of Christ."

At the seventh ecumenical council, 787 AD, ?? patriarch of Constantinople explained the Petrine text that follows. "The church has been founded upon the rock, namely upon Christ our Lord." In the second session of the same council, we find that Pope Adrian wrote that the Apostle Peter was thought worthy to confess that faith upon which the church of Christ is founded. Of all the exegetical commentaries on Matthew 16:18 written during the first thousand years of Christianity, not one mentions the papacy. The fathers would not even know how to spell the word. Not one mentions the primacy of the bishop of Rome, such an idea and interpretation did not exist even as a heresy. It did not exist even as a heresy.

I wish now to cite in addition to the above quotation, some of the sordid history of the Roman papacy which destroys the whole concept of Roman papalness. This is what Rome does not like to tell you.

The case of Pope Vigilius. Very interesting. Pope Vigilius, 500-555. He was pope from 537 on forward. Prior to ascending to the papacy, Vigilius was extremely sympathetic to monophysitism, the popular Eastern African idea that Christ had only one nature. Despite giving indication to the contrary in his relationship with the Eastern Church, Vigilius upheld the Council of Chalcedon against monophysitism upon becoming the bishop of Rome. Summoned to Constantinople, Vigilius changed his mind and supported the monophysite position, but after receiving intense pressure from the West, Vigilius again changed his mind and retracted for his position for monophysitism and wrote ?? which means against monophysitism in its essence. Then upon the convening of the second council of Constantinople which affirmed Justinian who sought peace with monophysites, Vigilius changed his mind for the third time. So we have an alleged pope at Rome changing his mind three times on the issue of the nature of Jesus Christ. A sad footnote on the history of Vigilius is he died on his way back to Rome. Hardly the vicar of Christ on earth. One wonders if he had made it back to Rome, would he have changed

his mind yet for a fourth time. This is found in the New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, page 1018 and following.

There's also the case of Pope Honorius I, he's pope from 625 to 638. This pope of Rome was formerly anathematized by the third council of Constantinople in 681. What was his crime? He is found guilty of sanctioning monothelism, the idea that Christ had two natures but only one will. So much for Roman supremacy when they anathematize their own popes after they have died.

There is also the revealing tale of the Avignon popes. In 1378-1409, the intriguing tale unfolds as follows. Pope Urban VI succeeded Gregory XI under the duress of a rabid Roman crowd on the steps of the Vatican and the shout was, "We will have a Roman pope or at least an Italian." On September 20, 1378, the French cardinals elected a new pope claiming that Pope Urban should at once resign. Pope Urban was denounced as an apostate. The great Avignon schism began. Robert of Geneva, Clement VII, was proclaimed pope and the papacy was moved to France. For the next 22 years there were two popes, one in Rome and the other in Avignon. It was not until the Council of Pisa in 1409 that both the Roman pope and the Avignon pope were forced to abdicate, but all this accomplished was a new line, the so-called Pisan line of the papacy. Not until the Council of Constance in 1414 was the papacy finally united under the Martin V. Three popes had to abdicate for this to happen.

As a footnote, we would add that one of three claimants to the papacy during this sordid history of the Roman pope was John XXIII. He fled from the Council of Constance for fear of his life and was eventually captured and put under house arrest. I'd also want to put a footnote to this, that it was this same John XXIII who offered safe conduct both to and from the council to one, Johann Hus, the Bohemian Reformer. Hus was jailed and burned at the stake on July 7 of the same year. His fire yet lives today in us.

Now there were some comments made early on by Mr. Butler in his opening presentation which I'd like to address. There is appeal in historical data from the time period of the third and fourth century on forward made by the Eastern church to the bishop at Rome for their support but John Meyendorff notes this in his work, "Byzantine Theology." "The Reform Papacy of the eleventh century used a longstanding Western tradition of exegesis when it applied systematically and legalistically the passages on the role of Peter to the bishop of Rome. This tradition was not shared by the East yet it was not totally ignored by the Byzantines, some of whom used it occasionally, especially in documents addressed to Rome intended to win the pope's sympathy, but it was never given an ultimate theological significance." In other words, when you wanted more political support, you appealed to Rome. You don't appeal to Rome because you think Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth or that it has the power passed down from the so-called keys of Peter, you appeal to it on the basis of political expediency.

Also I'd like to address the issue of Pope Victor. Mr. Butler said that Irenaeus had something to say, the great bishop of Lyons writing to Victor did certainly have something to say. He rebuked the rash actions of the Roman bishop and called him to

remembrance of what had been done by his predecessors. We read, "For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp to forego the observance inasmuch as these things had been always [so] observed by John the disciple of our Lord." The whole issue centers around when to worship during the Easter period. The Eastern church had their own date and Rome wanted to change it so Victor excommunicated them and Irenaeus came along and said, "You can't do this." Just the fact that Irenaeus would come along and say you can't do this, just the fact that the edict of Victor was totally ignored in this scenario leads us to suspect that neither Irenaeus nor those in the East held to papal supremacy at the time. I'd also like to remind the audience that Mr. Butler quoted from St. Clement in his letter to Rome early on in paragraph 62. I'd like to quote that for you, "Therefore it is the right for us to give heed to so great and so many examples." The word "us" is used over and over again in the letter speaking of the presbyters at Rome to the presbyters and the people at Corinth, not the bishop of Rome. The word "us" is used. Thank you.

Mr. Sungenis. Timer ready? In Mr. White's opening statement, he said that the proofs brought forth for the papacy, he can prove are sheer myth. I would like to say the same thing about his presentation to deny the papacy, it is sheer myth.

What I would like to read for our opponents is a quote from St. Athanasius who said this regarding people who quote one thing from one father but ignore another thing from that same father. Athanasius says this who was confronted with the very same thing that we're dealing with today. Athanasius says, "Yes, he wrote it," referring to a father who wrote something, "and we admit that his letter runs thus. But just as he wrote this, he also wrote very many other letters, and they ought to consult those also; in order that the faith of the man may be made clear from them all, and not from this alone." That is what I think is the major fault of the presentation given to us tonight. Yes, there are many controversies throughout Christendom about the papacy, there are many controversies about the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the role of the Holy Spirit, every doctrine that has come down the pike, there's a controversy about it but the controversy does not prove or deny that this thing, this papacy or the Trinity or the deity of Christ was a reality. As a matter of fact, the mere fact that it is a controversy shows us that the doctrine was in existence and there were people who opposed the doctrine. If there was no papacy, then we wouldn't have to worry about the issue. That is what we're presented with here. Mr. Zins said that, yes, there is much evidence in the fifth century and beyond regarding the papacy. That, again, just proves my point that, yes, it is there. There is controversy but it is there.

Now the doubt is brought into your mind by the fact that in the first four centuries it may not be as clear. Well, let me tell you something, the doctrine of the Trinity was not as clear either. There were people excommunicated on every side of the doctrine of the Trinity for almost four centuries. The deity of Christ, the same thing occurred. They didn't understand it. It was developing. They came to a realization later on in four or five centuries just who Jesus was. As a matter of fact, they didn't really know who he was, they told you what you couldn't say but they didn't really know who he was. They didn't know how to understand it. How do you join deity and humanity in one being? Who can understand that? The role of the Holy Spirit, another thing. They didn't understand that for centuries. Who was the Holy Spirit? So it's no big deal, folks, that we didn't

understand the papacy as well as they think we should understand it, yet the fact is, however, we will prove that it is there and it is quite there. There is no question.

Now we were presented with the fact that Clement, the Pope Clement in the first century, is not really acting as a pope. We quote from Harnack, the Protestant liberal theologian. Now he has no ax to grind. He doesn't believe Jesus is God, he doesn't believe in Christendom per se because he's a liberal Protestant theologian. He's the one who doesn't have this ax to grind that tells us that Clement is the one who's showing us the primacy of Peter, the power of the pope in the first century. It's not a Catholic who's saying that.

Many of the quotes that my colleague brought forth were not given to you by Mr. White or Mr. Zins because, do you know something? They simply don't have them. One of the publications that they use is Eerdmans' Church Fathers. Eerdmans' Church Fathers is a Protestant publication that does not have many of the things that we brought forth today. Many of them are taken out of that publication. That's why they're not there.

I would like to present this challenge to Mr. White and Mr. Zins regarding the interpretation of Matthew 16:18 in reference to the fathers. If it is such as they are saying, that Peter is not the rock and Christ is supposed to be the rock of that passage, give me, let's say, three fathers before the year 400 who said that Christ was the rock. If you can't find three, give me two. If you can't find two, I'll accept one. Give me one father that said Christ was the rock before the year 400. I open that challenge to you.

Mr. White quoted from the scholar Lanois. Lanois had a calculation of who the fathers were saying Peter was: 16, he referred to Peter as the rock, 17 referred to Peter's faith, 6 referred to the apostolic college itself, and 4 said that Christ was the rock. Now the problem with this is Lanois is a ???. He doesn't like the primacy of Peter, number 1. Number 2, Lanois is introducing various medieval and renaissance writers into his calculations all the way up until the twelfth century to try to stack the deck against us. And the most important point is in the early fathers there was no difference in their mind between the faith of Peter and Peter himself. That is a Protestant invention. So if we want to tally them all up, 76% of these fathers believed that Peter was the rock of Matthew 16 because they did not distinguish between faith and rock.

Let me quote just some other fathers. St. Theodore the Studite, 759-826 says, "Peter's faith is undoubtedly the unshakeable rock on which the church rests, but this faith is inseparable from Peter's person. He is indeed the rock." St. John Damascene says, "The faith of Peter is without doubt the immovable rock upon which the church rests, but this faith is not separable from the person of Peter. It is certainly he who is the rock."

Mr. White quoted from the Maldontus via the book James Salmon and it says that, or he quotes Mr. Salmon as saying that Hilary, Gregory of Nissa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria do not affirm that Peter is the rock, that Peter had the primacy. Let me quote you from Hilary, Gregory of Nissa, Cyril of Alexandria and Chrysostom. Hilary says this, "Blessed Simon, who after his confession of the mystery was said to be the foundation stone of the church and received the keys of the kingdom." Hilary, De Trinitate 6, verse

20, AD 360. Gregory of Nissa says this, the very person Mr. White says no reference exists in Gregory of Nissa. He says, "The memory of Peter who is the head of the apostles, he is the firm and most solid rock on which the Savior built his church." Cyril of Alexandria, again the same person Mr. White said had nothing to say about this, says, "He was pleased to call him Peter by an apt similitude as the one on whom he was about to found a church."

Chrysostom, the great Eastern father, who Mr. White said had nothing to say about the primacy of Peter says this, "He brought him back to his former honor," referring to Peter, "and entrusted him with the headship of the universal church." He says again, "God allowed him to fall because he meant to make him ruler of the whole world." The Eastern bishop is saying this. Again, "God has had great account of this city of Antioch," where Chrysostom was the ruler, "and he has shown indeed especially in that he ordered Peter, the ruler of the whole world, to whom he entrusted the keys of heaven, to whom he committed the office of bringing all in to pass a long time here so that our city stood to him in the place of the whole world." Again Chrysostom, I'm concentrating on him because he's a very important church father. He says this, quote, "He saith unto him, 'Peter, feed my sheep,' and why having passed by the others," the other apostles, that is, "does he speak with Peter on these matters? He was the chosen one of the apostles, the mouth of the disciples, the leader of the band. On this account also, Paul went up a time to inquire him rather than the others. Jesus puts into his hands the chief authority among the brethren." Chrysostom said that. Chrysostom also said, "For he who then did not dare to question Jesus but committed the office to another was even entrusted with the chief authority over the brethren." Chrysostom again says this, "For observe they were 120," talking about the 120 in the Upper Room in Acts 1, "and he asks for one out of the whole body with good right as having been put in charge of them, for to him Christ had said, 'And when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.'" Do you see what he's doing? He's interpreting the strengthen thy brethren command given to Peter as the one who has been put in charge of the apostles. Again Chrysostom says, "But though we received him as teacher," talking about the time that Peter was in Antioch, "we did not retain him to the end but we gave him up to royal Rome." They wanted Peter to go to Rome, Chrysostom says, although he did a good job when he was in Antioch.

Now we were talking about Ignatius. Mr. Zins brought up Ignatius. The problem with his presentation is he didn't read you the whole quote. Let me read it all for you. He says this, "But my desire is that those things also may be firm, which in gaining others to discipleship you command. Remember in your prayers the church in Syria," remember he made reference to that, "which now has God for its shepherd in place of me." And he stopped there as if God is now the shepherd. Doesn't that give you that impression? Yes, well, let's read the rest of it. "Jesus Christ alone and your love will bishop it," now this last verb is the verbal form of the noun episkopos, bishop or overseers is how it's translated in the New Testament, and he points out that the Roman church alone among those addressed in Ignatius' extant letters, is expected to have this oversight or care for the distant church of Antioch. That's what Ignatius said. Don Chapman says the same thing when he uses this word "presiding," that it refers in a jurisdictional sense, an

authoritative sense. That's a Protestant interpretation of that very passage that Mr. Zins diluted and said had nothing to do with jurisdiction.

Ignatius that was talked about, Ignatius is important because he is in 107 and he says this, "To her that presides in the district of the region of the Romans and having the presidency of love," now there's a very specific word used here, the Greek word ?? and whenever else Ignatius uses this word, he's referring to an authoritative jurisdictional position, and this is what he understands of the church of Rome.

Irenaeus, 185-190 says this, "But as it would be very long task to enumerate in such a volume as this the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who in whatever manner whether by an evil self-pleasing by vainglory or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings." He was aware of controversies, of people who were usurping Rome's authority and said this, "By indicating that tradition derived from the apostles of the very great, the very ancient and the universally known church founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, as also the faith preached to men which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops for it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this, the Roman church, on account of its preeminent authority." Irenaeus. We were told that Irenaeus didn't believe in this, that he objected to something that the pope said. Hey, everybody objects to something that the pope says, that's nothing new. Irenaeus isn't perfect. People object today to what the pope says but he knew that where the authority rested.

As far as Peter being the rock, Tertullian says this, "Was anything withheld from the knowledge of Peter who was called the rock on which the church would be built?" Origen, "Look at Peter, the great foundation of the church, that most solid of rocks upon whom Christ built the church." Hippolytus which Mr. Zins mentioned says, "Peter, the rock of the church." He says Hippolytus had nothing to say about that. St. Cyprian says, "On him he builds his church and to him he gives the command to feed the sheep, and although he assigns a light power to all apostles, yet he founded it on a single chair, Peter." Bishop Eusebius says, "The very head of the apostles, Peter, Peter, that voice of the apostles after having first founded the church at Antioch, went away at Rome preaching the Gospel and he also after the church presided over that of Rome until his death." St. Hilary I already read. St. Cyril of Jerusalem...

[Time's up.] Thank you.

Mr. White. Aren't you glad this is being taped? I hope you all have the opportunity of going back and listening because I am amazed at the inaccurate citations, the citations that aren't there, and the misrepresentations that I've heard so far this evening.

Mr. Sungenis just said that I said it was a sheer myth there is evidence of the Roman Catholic position. If you'll go back and listen to what I said, I said it is a sheer myth that there is such a thing as unanimous consent of the fathers. And then he used that over and

over again to beat me over the head. Straw men work that way. If you took that out of his presentation, he didn't have a whole lot left.

He quoted from Irenaeus just now but he didn't bother to tell you the bottom of the very same page is an alternate quotation that destroys his point.

He quoted from Tertullian but he didn't tell you that Tertullian mocked the bishop of Rome and called him pontifex maximus, which was an insult to Christians at that time. He only gave you a part of what Tertullian said about things like that.

It's interesting to me, he then quoted from Athanasius and Athanasius' statement about you need to read all of what someone says. It's interesting to me we haven't heard anything from Athanasius this evening about the papacy because obviously he didn't believe in these things.

I told you that we needed to be very very very very careful about the Peter Syndrome and you were just given 15 minutes' example of what the Peter Syndrome is. The Peter Syndrome is finding any statement about Peter by any father and just assuming that that's relevant to the topic. You just heard statement after statement after statement, in fact, he again misrepresented me. He said that I said, quoting from Maldonotus, and this amazes me because Mr. Sungenis has the tapes where I've given this quotation, Mr. Butler has the tapes where I gave this very information in a debate against Jerry M. six years ago, so they've got the quotation, they've got the book. If they'd read the book, Maldonotus is talking about their interpretation of Matthew 16, not what they said elsewhere about Peter. And so again, I might suggest that if they stayed in the room and listened to our presentation, they might know what we're talking about and be able to respond to our actual statements.

Now Mr. Sungenis then said, "Well, you know, the Trinity and the deity of Christ wasn't understood for a long time either." Folks, I want you to think about what you're being told there. The Trinity and the deity of Christ has no stronger basis in Scripture and no greater clarity than what the tortured exegesis of Matthew 16, Isaiah 22 we've heard this evening. The central aspect of who God is is nowhere clear than trying to say that John 21 or Luke 22 teaches the papacy? My friends, this is dangerous dangerous things.

We were told that Pope Clement wrote the letter to the Corinthians. Where does Pope Clement ever say that? Scholars recognize that Clement never identifies himself. Secondly, it's written in the plural, and many people feel that Clement was actually the secretary for the elders in the church. So much for Pope Clement.

It's interesting, we were told that this edition of the Eerdmans set which is now published by Hendrickson, it takes things out. Please look into that. You see, there are a lot of later Latin additions that scholars have discovered. Remember, it's Rome that for a long time based its papal claims on forged decretals for years and years and years. Think about who has more of a reason to insert things, the later Latins or the original Greek.

In fact, Mr. Butler stood up here and said I forgot to tell you something that's on page 15 of this book. Well, there's page 15 of this book and, folks, I challenge you to go look at it. What he says is there, ain't. This is not about the primacy of Rome here. It's not on page 15. You can look at it yourself if you'd like. I have the same book you do. It's not there. Look at page 15. In fact, what Mr. Butler forgot to tell you is on page 16, there is an excursus on the extent of the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome over the ?? churches. It quotes from Hefele who says, quote, "It is evident that the council has not in view here the primacy of the bishop of Rome over the whole church but simply his power as a patriarch." Read it yourself, folks. I have no reason to mislead you on it. Read it yourself.

Check out all the citations yourselves because you're gonna need to. For example, the quotation from the Council of Sardica, which is on page 417 of the same edition, the end of Mr. Butler's quotation was not in that citation at all. In fact, Sardica is a very interesting council. You might want to look into it and Rome's misuse of it later on and the North African bishops' rejection of Rome's misuse of it.

We were told that the bishop has the line item veto regarding Canon 3 of Constantinople. Isn't it interesting that Canon 3 of Constantinople ends up in Canon 28 of Chalcedon? If he had a line item veto, why did you keep bringing it back up? Didn't everybody believe that Peter was the vicar of Christ on earth? So how does it end up in Canon 28 of Chalcedon?

And then we were told and it's interesting, Mr. Butler's been citing from Meyendorff many times but you notice he didn't cite from Meyendorff about Canon 28. Do you know why? Because I cited from Meyendorff in my opening presentation and he confirms that Canon 28 was in the Byzantine collections and in numerous other places. He does mention that there are people in the West who did not accept Canon 28, well, of course. Of course the Roman bishop didn't like it. Well, that's terrible. I mean, doesn't that mean he has some primacy? No. He's the bishop of the one See in the West and he doesn't like Constantinople getting the second position. This is political, folks, nothing more than that at all.

Mr. Butler gave you just a very small portion of J. B. Lightfoot's citation about the letter of Clement and he misled you badly. He does say this is the beginning of the rise of papal primacy but this is the whole section that Mr. Butler left out because he went on to say, "There is all the difference in the world between the attitude of Rome towards other churches at the close of the first century when the Romans is a community remonstrate on terms of equality with the Corinthians," that's a little bit different than what we've been told, "on their irregularities, strong only in the righteousness of their cause and the feeling as they had a right to feel that these councils of peace were the dictation of the Holy Spirit and its attitude at the close of the second century, when Victor the bishop excommunicates the churches of Asia Minor for clinging to a usage in regard to the celebration of Easter which had been handed down to them from the Apostles and thus foments instead of healing dissensions. Even this second stage has carried the power of Rome only a very small step in advance towards the assumption of a Hildebrand or an Innocent or a Boniface or even of a Leo, but it is nevertheless a decided step. The

substitution of the bishop of Rome," and notice Mr. Butler kept telling us we've got to do away with this myth of the distinction between the church of Rome and the bishop of Rome, listen to what Lightfoot says, "The substitution of the bishop of Rome for the church of Rome is an all important point. The later Roman theory supposes that the church of Rome derives all its authority from the bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter. History inverts this relation and shows that as a matter of fact, the power of the bishop of Rome was built upon the power of the church of Rome." I can understand why the full citation would not be read in your hearing and I'm not saying you have to cite every single thing someone says but if you're going to cite a scholar who says X, Y or Z, if he then goes on in the next paragraph to totally destroy your point, don't cite him. I think that's just simply honest to people who may not have the opportunity of going out and getting books like this and checking out the accuracy of the statements that are being made.

We are told, for example, that Irenaeus, by Mr. Butler, gives a list of all those popes after Peter. If you actually look at Irenaeus' list, the first bishop, he doesn't talk about popes of course, the first bishop of Rome he does not say was Peter, he says that Peter and Paul ordained the first bishop of Rome. Again, just a little matter of historical accuracy.

Then interestingly enough, he cited from Firmilian and if you were listening closely, maybe he just didn't hear me when I cited it, I don't know, but I cited the exact same passage. Now how could we cite the exact same passage for two completely opposite positions? Because of what's called, as I said, the Peter Syndrome. You see, when Mr. Butler sees what Firmilian said, Firmilian talked about the church being founded on Peter and so he reads it, but if you read the section as I quoted it to you, Firmilian is citing it mocking Stephen, the Bishop of Rome. Now please, folks, this is what I'm talking about. We must take these fathers in their context. We can't just simply take a little snippet out of here and a snippet out of there, let's look at what they said in totality.

This is an important issue. I just want you to think about one thing in regards to the historical section of this debate. We've heard all sorts of things about Peter in exalted language, haven't we, but have you heard anything that even begins to demonstrate that the early church believed what Vatican I stated, that Peter was made the vicar of Christ on earth with absolute jurisdictional authority over all the world? Were you given any information like that? If you do not receive, remember Vatican I said it was the unanimous consent of the fathers. We've had to hear Mr. Sungenis go so far as to say, "Well, but you see, you've gotta realize they believe that Peter's faith and Peter are the same thing so we can change all the numbers here, and so you've got more, now you've ¾'s of the fathers who believed this." Well, let's get away with that even if I think it's ridiculous, let's say it's true, you're still not up to Vatican I, are you? Vatican I said unanimous. It's not the case and yet Rome uses the anathema upon us for standing on the truth of history. Think about that. God bless.

Moderator. We now have the second rebuttal from the Roman Catholic point of view by Scott Butler.

Scott Butler. One of the things that I wanted to point out Mr. Sungenis had talked about Dr. Harnack, a liberal theologian, but here's what he says. He really doesn't have a bias either way because as far as a Protestant or a Catholic position but he says this about the second century. "Now it is a priori probability that the transformation of Christianity into an organized Catholic Church which was simply the adaptation of the Gospel to the then existing empire, came about under the guidance of the metropolitan church, the church of Rome, and that Roman and Catholic had therefore a special relationship from the beginning. It can however be proved that it was the Roman church which up to about the year 190 was closely connected with that of the Asia Minor, that all the elements of which Catholicism is based first assumed a definite form. From these considerations, we can scarcely doubt that the fundamental apostolic institution of the laws of Catholicism were framed in that city and in other respects imposed its authority on the whole earth, that it was the center from which they spread because the world had become accustomed to receive law and justice from Rome. Again after the exposition of the arguments, all these causes combine to convert the Christian communities into a real confederation under the primacy of the Roman church."

Mr. White had said that there is no papal jurisdiction in the East. This is the bishop of Rome intervening. Peter the successor of St. Athanasius of the Alexandrian See in the year 370 was thrust out of the Arian party. Pope Damasus armed with letters which claimed the power of restoring him, restores him to his See. Why does he have the power to do that?

About the same time, Pope Damasus writing to the ?? bishops commended them for the care in observing the ordinances their forefathers and referring all doubtful matters to the head so as to avoid all departure from the regulations of the apostolic See. In the same letter, the pope claimed to hold the chief helm of the church. In another letter to the Oriental bishops, he claimed that the opinion of the Roman bishops ought to be sought before that of all others. In the year 386, Pope ?? writing to the bishop of ?? in Spain claims the inheritance of Peter's government and lays down a rule which must be observed by all priests who do not wish to be rent from the solid apostolic rock on which Christ constructed his universal church. He also calls this rock the head of the body.

Pope Innocent in the year 410 writing to the bishop of ?? sends a book of rules to be communicated to his fellow bishops. It's on and on. To the bishop of ?? condemning those who think that the custom of any other church than that of Rome should be followed. In the same letter, he asserts that no precedence prevails against what has been handed down to the Roman church through Peter. To the bishop of Carthage he writes asserting that the whole authority of the episcopate is derived from the apostolic See and he claims that according to the fathers no local action should be counted as completed until the entire sentence is confirmed by the authority of the See. Hosius, one that had been at the Council of Nicea, he was the bishop of Cordoba writes that you must submit to the holy pontiff. That's the bishop of Rome.

This whole thing about all these different popes that have committed this great heresy, we're not going to be able to have time to cover that but all those different popes in the

Luthern/Catholic dialog on Liberius Vigilius and Honorius, they say that they do not affect infallibility in any way. So this is the largest Protestant group saying it has nothing to do with infallibility, these three different cases. I would love to go into those because I could prove that there is nothing that infringes on infallibility at all.

One other thing that's kind of funny about St. Augustine, at the Council of Milivas, this is in Africa, and the Council of Carthage, they write to the bishop of Rome to resolve a situation. Then what happens is Augustine with five other bishops writes to the bishop of Rome to resolve the situation on Celestius and Pelagius. Why would somebody from another Western See, from the African See, be writing asking for the bishop of Rome to take control of the whole situation?

Robert Zins talks about the seventh ecumenical council. It's almost unbelievable the seventh ecumenical council says this, "The See of Peter shines as holding the primacy of the whole world and stands as head of all the churches of God and blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, who first sat on the apostolic throne left the primacy of the apostleship and of his pastoral care to his successors who shall always sit on the most sacred chair to whom he by divine command left the power of authority given to himself by God our Lord and Savior. And the holy synod answered, the whole most sacred synod so believes and so convinces, so teaches." And another time it says, "We follow, we receive, we accept."

At the sixth ecumenical council, Pope Agatho which is an Eastern pope, the Eastern and Western fathers were saying, "Agotho has spoken on this issue. It is resolved."

At the Council of Lyon in 1274, the East and the West had split. At the Council of Lyon, they affirmed the Roman primacy when they tried to get back together. At the Council of Florence in 1435-1439, the one thing that is affirmed by the Eastern and the Western church is that the Roman primacy is true.

Now the East backs out of that situation later on but at both of those councils it affirms the principle. In every council that's coming down, we see this language about the Roman pontiff.

The amazing thing in the Council of Chalcedon in 451, we have the empress ?? saying this, "By the authority of blessed Peter the apostle, we utterly revoke it by the general decision." The patriarch of Constantinople, he says, "He instantly obeyed," he says, "all the pope's injunctions. The Canon was not a work of blame is to be laid on the clergy of the Constantinople but even as the whole force and confirmation of the acts was reserved to your holiness." The point being he tries to make it out...

This Theodore the Lector is in 550, 100 years after the council is an Eastern historian. John S., he's an Eastern historian. This Dionysus writes in the Greek canons and different things, he affirms there's only 27 canons. These are people from the East. Mr. White says they're all from the West.

I have 40 pages of stuff just saying on Peter is the rock here. Bob had quoted one on Tertullian. "What kind of man are you subverting and changing what was the intent the apostles [unintelligible]. You cannot deny that you may know that in the city of Rome the chair was first conferred on Peter which is the prince of all the apostles." The point being is Tertullian as a Catholic believed in the primacy and as a Montanist after he leaves 20 years later believes that he's the rock too.

St. Gregory of Nissa says, "That unbroken and most firm rock upon which the Lord built his church." St. Gregory of ??, "Seeth the ?? of the disciples of Christ all of whom were great and deserving of the choice. One is called the rock and is entrusted with the foundations of the church." This is the year about 350. St. Basil, 371, says, "One also of these mountains was Peter upon which rock the Lord promised he'd build his church." ?? said, "It was right indeed that he, Paul, should be anxious to see Peter for he was the first among the apostles and was entrusted by the Savior with the care of the churches." St. Epiphanius, "And the blessed Peter who for a while denied the Lord, Peter was the chiefest of the apostles, he who became unto us the truly affirmed rock upon which is based the Lord's faith, upon which rock the church is in every way built."

St. Ambrose. I mean St. Athanasius and St. Ambrose presided over the majority of these different councils and Mr. White would say that they didn't, they had to accept what the councils said at each one of these different councils. They were the presiding person, the head guy and each one of those councils said that Peter had this role in the church. St. Ambrose says this, "Therefore where Peter is, there is the church." St. Jerome says, "This is Peter to whom he said thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church. Where therefore Peter is, there is the church. And in accordance with [unintelligible] it is justly said to him, I will build my church upon thee."

I have 91 quotes from St. Chrysostom. Bob was only able to fill, give you like 14 or 15. I've got 91 quotes from a Greek father, the largest Greek father writing on the primacy of Peter. Now this all be in a book and everybody will be able to analyze it, but the point being is he's the largest Greek father. He's affirming this principle. He's the largest father that we have the most writings from and Mr. White would put it as if there's no writings affirming this principle and I have not yet heard before the year 400, Matthew 16:18, give me one father that says Jesus is the rock. We asked them for three, then we asked them for two, now we've asked them for one. Give us one, that's what we're asking for.

Moderator. We'll have the statement closing the debate from the Roman Catholic point of view from Bob Sungenis.

Bob Sungenis. In my closing statements, I just want to recap a couple of things that were said by our opponents that I want to clarify and then give a summary statement.

Mr. White said that the issue about Moldontonus where we talked about Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory of Nissa and Cyril of Alexandria, that I said that what actually he said that he was trying to make some issue that they don't refer to Peter as the rock. That is exactly what I said, that they do refer to Peter as the rock. Hilary said that Peter is the

foundation stone. How much closer to a rock do you want to get? Gregory of Nissa, he said Peter was the most solid rock. Cyril, upon whom Jesus founded a church. And I hope I don't have to read the quotes again from Chrysostom who, again, said Peter was the rock.

As my colleague reiterated, our challenge was if Peter isn't the rock, give us something that says Jesus was the rock prior to 400 AD. We have given you many fathers that said Peter was the rock prior to 400 AD. The challenge remains.

I just want to clear up one thing about Galatians 2 back in the biblical part. Where does the Scripture say that disfellowshipping yourself with Gentiles is destroying the Gospel? Circumcision of Gentiles is destroying the Gospel. Show me where the Scripture says the opposite. But nevertheless, whatever their interpretation of Galatians 2 is, whatever the controversy is about Peter and Paul, this has nothing to do with either the primacy of Peter nor infallibility. The church does not define primacy nor infallibility based on a personal confrontation between Peter and Paul. Those things are going to come up. Paul had his own confrontations with Barnabas and the heated debate was so heated that they split their ways and took, one took one person, one took the other to their missionary journeys. Controversies are all over the place but this doesn't dilute the primacy nor the infallibility.

Mr. White harps on this word "unanimous" in Vatican I. The Latin word used here does not mean that every single church father has to agree with this issue. It is not referring to every single father, it's referring to the prevailing view of the centuries of the church. That is what Vatican I is talking about. But of course, not every father is going to agree. Who could expect that? Why would Vatican I make such a statement knowing that the history does not show that? Actually the fathers that disagreed eventually some of them found their way out of the church. The numbers were being refined but that doesn't mean every single father.

Now let me pose this to you: if the church was not what we say it is, if there is no papal primacy, let's take a doctrine, the deity of Christ for example, there was such a controversy about this doctrine. One party wanted to say Jesus was just like God, he wasn't really God. The other party wanted to say, no, he really was God. They used two Greek words to distinguish these. The ones who said he was like God said he was ??, one little letter in the Greek, the iota, distinguished it from the other term that was used when it said Jesus was God, ???. Now what if the church decided that they didn't want ??, Jesus was God, and decided that he was only like God? Would we have the same faith that we have today? The answer is no. We would not have salvation today if the church chose the wrong answer to the question because Jesus is God, he is not like God. That's what the Jehovah's Witnesses believe or the Mormons may believe. They don't have salvation.

Or take another doctrine, the Trinity that we talked about before. What if they said, no, there were three modes of God, there weren't actually three persons, would we have the same faith that we have today? No. Again, what if the church decided that the epistle of Barnabas should have been put into the Canon, or the epistle of Clement should be put

into the Canon, and Hebrews and Revelation and maybe James and Matthew should be taken out. Would we have the same faith that we have today? No, we would not because we would be in error and we cannot be in error and have the same faith, the same salvation that Jesus gave us.

That is why it's so necessary to understand that there can be no error. These gentlemen believe those doctrines. Why do they believe them? Because the church passed them down to them. They are living off the borrowed capital of the Catholic Church.

You know, it's funny in debates like this, the Catholics are always put on the defensive. We have to prove the papacy. We have to prove this and the other thing. I'd like to turn the tables around right now. What do we have in Protestantism to replace what they think we have made such an error in? Do you know what we have? We have 25,000 different denominations in the world today in Protestantism. Why? Because there is no leadership, because everybody looks at the Scripture, looks at the fathers and they think something different. The Jehovah's Witnesses even quote the church fathers to deny that Jesus was God. Anybody can take anything they want. If there is no authority, you're gonna have mass confusion and that is exactly what we have today. Look at America, look at the world, look at how they're falling apart, churches left and right falling down. So let me turn the tables. Do they have a better? Yes, there's a lot of ambiguities in history, there's a lot of things we can't cover tonight, but do they have a better answer for you? No, they don't.

You know, Jesus was frustrated with the people that he was trying to convince that he was the Son of God, the Jews. He was very frustrated and even Jesus himself couldn't convince the Jews that he was the Son of God and at one time he said, well, you know, there's this passage back in the Psalms that when God said to the people of that time, the rulers of that time, it says he called them gods, trying to convince the Jews now that this is, that he is the Son of God, okay? So he says that God called these people, these rulers back in the Old Testament gods. Now what big a deal is it for me when I say I'm from the Father and I call myself the Son of God? If God called them gods, why is it so hard for you to believe me being from the Father that I'm the Son of God? An interesting argument. Now I would like to pose this. Peter is called rock, he's called kephas in John 1:42, he's called petros in Matthew 16. Paul calls him Cephas all throughout the epistles which means rock. Now if it's so hard to understand that Peter is the rock from those quotations, are we in the same dilemma that Jesus was with the Jews? That is exactly the case. Jesus says, "God called them gods and I say I'm the Son of God." Jesus called Peter the rock, so why is it so hard for us to believe that Peter is the rock? That's what's so frustrating for us. It's there in plain daylight for us. His name was changed to rock and these people keep denying it. What else does kephas mean besides rock? Give me one other alternative. There is none.

He is the rock, folks. He is the rock and you cannot listen to all the quotes my colleague has brought forth to you today from century after century after century, the councils saying, "Yes, we affirm the primacy of Peter. He is the rock." How much more information do we need? Yes, there is controversy, one bishop against another bishop,

that is to be expected. There's always controversy. We live in a sinful world and it's not gonna be perfect but, folks, it is there. It is there. Examine the evidence. Get the tapes, look at it yourself again.

More time?

I just implore you in the one minute that I have left. The arguments may sound very convincing but please listen, this is the voice of a church of 2,000 years of history, 2,000 years. These gentlemen can trace their history back for 400 years. Martin Luther, the guy who started it all, he took away from the Bible and he added to the Bible. He took away James and Hebrews because they were not suitable for him, they didn't preach the doctrine that he wanted. Is that the legacy that you want to live with, taking away from the Scripture to prove your faith? No. Stick with the church that has never changed a dogma in its whole 2,000 year history. Yes, practices, practices have changed. We don't eat, we can eat meat on Friday now but dogmas do not change. I challenge you, those who have laughed, give me one dogma that has changed and I will convert back to Protestantism. I'll end it right there. Thank you.

Moderator. Please hold your applause until the very end and please hold your laughter forever. Final closing statement by Robert Zins.

Robert Zins. Let me start out by saying that any man who can be converted by "The Catholic Controversy" written by St. Francis de Sales certainly can be converted back by logic greater than this and by his own testimony, if we can prove to him that the truths we have portrayed this evening are in fact reality, we would expect Mr. Sungenis to debating on our team the next debate.

Now in my closing 10 minutes, I'd like to say this: the Roman Catholic religion has stated two propositions boldly and unambiguously in Vatican I dogmatic constitution on the church. The first is that according to the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the entire church of God was promised and was conferred immediately and directly upon the blessed apostle Peter by Christ the Lord. Notice, according to the Gospel. We have examined the Gospel to find out if this is accurate. We have scrutinized Matthew 16, Luke 22, John 21, and we have thrown in Isaiah 22 as well. We have found these texts do not lend the least support for the Roman Catholic claims of Petrine supremacy. We have also looked at a number of other passages which show Peter to have been locked out of the modern invention of popery by virtue of his own testimony as being a fellow elder among others. We have also presented a candid portrayal of Peter from the word of God. We found Peter to have been given prominence but not primacy. We found Peter failing in a test of faith and doctrine. We found Peter one and equal among many apostles who were the foundation of the church of God, but never did we find Peter superior. There is no doubt from the testimony of the Scriptures that Peter was no more and no less than the other apostles. In fact, we built a case for the Apostle Paul as being the better candidate for the fiction of the Romish pope rather than Peter. In fact, we would prefer it in light of Rome's consistent denial of justification by faith alone and the mighty Apostle Paul's absolute contradiction of Rome at this point.

The second position of Rome is that the primacy of Peter is to be believed and held by all faithful according, and I quote, Vatican I, "according to the ancient and continual faith of the universal church and to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors so pernicious to the Lord's flock." We have shown, in fact, that the testimony of early church history denies the Roman Catholic religion its most cherished desired possession, that of a clear-cut historical witness to the papalness of the See at Rome. Rather we have shown that the earliest testimony of the church of Christ knew nothing of the Roman papacy. We have marshaled up account after account, some from Catholic sources, which deny the existence of such supremacy and such an office of power and authority.

We have shown that the entire concept of Romish rule among the early church fathers is imported from the nineteenth century and cannot be justified from an unbiased reading of the early church fathers.

We do search in vain for affirmation of Vatican I of the Romish rule from Clement of Rome. We search in vain for the affirmations of Romish rule from Vatican I in Ignatius, in Polycarp, in Tertullian, in Irenaeus, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Athanasius and Chrysostom. Remember, the burden of proof is to show that Vatican I can be repeated in the early church fathers. Vatican I cannot be repeated. Vatican I cannot be substantiated and that's what this debate centers around. The burden of proof is not to prove that one or two of the early church fathers may have thought that Matthew 16 refers to Peter as the rock. Rock doesn't equal papacy. Rock does not equal Rome. The burden of proof, as I will remind you from the councils, is that Rome indeed can be established by the early church fathers on the basis of what Vatican I claims for Rome which is absolute rule and authority.

We search in vain for Romish dominion of the early ecumenical councils. We cannot find the Romish pope at Nicea, 325 AD. We have said the great Arian controversy in this most important of church councils was settled without Rome. May I remind you of Canon 4 of the Council of Nicea, 325 AD, Canon 4, "But in every province, the ratification of what is done should be left to the metropolitan." Not Rome but to the individual metropolitan.

I remind you again of Canon 6, the Council of Nicea, "Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis prevail, that the bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction in all these since the like is customary for the bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the churches retain their privileges." These two Canons have not been denied in the Council of Nicea.

At Constantinople, 381, Rome actually was denied supremacy in Canon 2 and Canon 3. Let me review with you Canon 2, "The bishops are not to go beyond their dioceses to churches lying outside of their bounds, nor bring confusion on the churches, but let the bishop of Alexandria, according to the Canons alone, administer the affairs of Egypt and let the bishops of the East manage the East alone. The privileges of the church in Antioch which are mentioned in the Canons of Nicea being preserved, and let the bishops of the

Asian diocese administer the Asian affairs only, and the Pontic bishops only Pontic matters, and the Thracian bishops only Thracian affairs."

These Canons cannot be denied. We quote Canon 3 of Constantinople again. "The bishop of Constantinople however shall have the prerogative of honor after the bishop of Rome because Constantinople is new Rome." A political and power-based priority that has nothing to do with biblical interpretation with regards to the Roman papacy.

At Ephesus in 431, Rome was not even represented. At Chalcedon in 451, Rome sent only legates. Canon 28 was confirmed by Constantinople on the basis of political importance. We find no hope for Roman supremacy at Carthage in North Africa, not only defied by Cyprian but also in the throes of the anti-pope controversy with Novatian of Rome. There is no hint of the alleged Roman superiority, in fact, the bishop at Rome is hard to distinguish between Novatian and Cornelius during this time, and that was the entire North African position, who really is the bishop of Rome? We can't tell. Even if we could, we're not going to lend ourselves to be obedient to the dictates of the bishop of Rome.

Now my opponent has stood up here and asked a simple question: give us something better than the Roman Catholic religion. What do you have in the place of what we are trying to prove? My friends, I submit to you that we have the word of God which has always been sufficient for the faithful by way of salvation and sanctification. It is his word that he has given unto us by which all things must be examined. This word has proved sufficient throughout the ages. It proved sufficient insofar as Origen was concerned when he quoted his understanding of Matthew 16:18, Mr. Butler, Origen writing in 254 says, "If you suppose that on this Peter alone the whole church is built by God, what would you say about John, the son of thunder, or about any other of the apostles? Isn't it at all possible to say that against Peter in particular the gates of hell shall not prevail but that they shall prevail against the other apostles and against the elect? Let us consider in what sense it is to be said to Peter and to every Peter," believer, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom.' Consider how great a power the rock has and how great a power everyone has who says, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" You wanted one, I give you one.

I give you another, St. Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria writes, "You are blessed who are in the church by faith and who dwell on the foundations of faith... For this is what is written, 'Thou art the Son of the living God,' which Peter confessed by the revelation of the Father...No one, therefore, will ever prevail against your faith, most beloved brethren."

I throw in a third, St. Ambrose, if I had the time. They asked for one, they asked for two, they asked for three. I submit St. Ambrose in my closing remarks. Thank you.

