

# Boston College Debate #1 – Was Peter The First Pope? White/Zins Vs. Sungenis/Butler

sermonaudio.com

By Robert M. Zins

**Bible Text:** 2 Thessalonians 2:3-12  
**Preached on:** Tuesday, 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)

Moderator. Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you all to Boston College for a debate on the question of does the Bible teach that Jesus Christ appointed Peter as his vicar of Christ on earth?

Speaker. I'd like to welcome you tonight. I want to thank Robert Zins and James White for coming here. I believe that what we're going to be doing tonight will be looking at the biblical evidence on the papacy, and we believe that the Catholic position on the papacy is true and that's what we're going to be trying to prove tonight, that Peter has a role in the church today. We believe that revelation ceases, the deposit ceases at the time of Christ so it's not as if we pulled this doctrine out 1,700-1,800 years later and created a doctrine. We believe that it originates with Jesus Christ and his words to Peter.

In Genesis 17:5, Abram's name is changed to Abraham. In Genesis 32:28, Jacob's name is changed to Israel. Whenever God changes the name of someone, many times their purpose, function, their mission will change. Both Catholics and Protestants agree with this one principle: God is the rock of the Old Testament. Now the Hebrew word for "rock" in the Old Testament is "sur." This can be seen in Psalms 18:1-2, Psalm 18:31-32, Isaiah 30:29, many different Scriptures show this principle that God is the rock of the Old Testament, both Protestants and Catholics would agree on that principle. But in Isaiah 51:1-2, it says, "Look to the rock, look to Abraham." So to the Jewish mind, Abraham is made the rock here. It doesn't take anything away from Christ or God being the rock. The Jewish rabbinical commentaries, at least the ones that I've gone through and I've gone through, I've never seen on that does not talk about Abraham being made the rock here, would say this, "When God looked on Abraham who was to appear, he said, 'Behold, I have found a rock on which I can build and base the world.' Therefore he called Abraham a rock." The important thing about this is these are the midrash like the ?? and they're back in the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC, before Christ. There's also midrashes back in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, but we also have Jewish rabbinic commentaries which will be commenting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> century after Jesus Christ. So the Jews looked at this Scripture, Isaiah 51:1-2, as being before Christ and also after Christ.

David Stern, a messianic Jew from Fuller Theological Seminary, says this, "When the Holy One wanted to create the world, He passed over the generations of Enoch and the

flood but when he saw Abraham was to arise, he said, 'Behold, I found a rock on which I can build and establish the world.' Therefore he called Abraham a rock as it is said in Isaiah 51:1-2." Now the majority of Protestant scholars, Protestant commentaries, and I've gone through about 50 of them, are saying the same thing about this Scripture. This is InterVarsity press, the New Bible Commentary, "Abraham is spoken of as the rock from which you were hewn." In 1 Corinthians 3:11, Jesus Christ is the foundation. In Ephesians 2:19-20, Jesus Christ is the cornerstone but he's going to build the church on the apostles and the prophets. It doesn't take away from Christ being the foundation and in Revelation 21:14, it says that they're going to build the foundation on the 12 apostles. The people during Christ's time did not see it taking away from Christ being the foundation. In 1 Corinthians 10:3-4, we're told that Jesus Christ is the rock.

The famous Scripture that we're about ready to look at is Matthew 16:13-19. Now there's two different ways to look at this Scripture as far as what languages they were written in. The first part that I will be dealing with, and I believe it to be the correct way, is the Aramaic way, but here is Oscar Cullmann and he says, "The great antiquity and the Palestinian origin of the section, Matthew 16:17, may today be considered beyond question. This is shown by the quite Semitic linguistic characters of the section. The parallelisms of the two statements, 'You are rock and upon this rock I will build,' shows that the second 'rock' refers to nothing different than the first. This is more clearly expressed in the Aramaic where the kepha occurs both times, than it is in the Greek. Thus here in the name and the thing are exactly identical."

Whenever you look at the patristic evidence of what Matthew has written in the first century, all of the different writers, Papias in 130, say that Matthew is written in the Aramaic. Here's what he says, of Matthew he has to say, "Matthew compiled the sayings in the Aramaic language and everyone translated them as well as he could." Irenaeus in 180, Origen in 244 say the same thing. Eusebius in 325. Epiphanius in 373. Jerome in 390. Every one of the different church fathers believed that Matthew was written in the Aramaic. Now even the Ebionites which was a first century sect that only believed in one Gospel and that was their book of Matthew, they agree that Matthew was written in the Hebrew and the Aramaic tongue. In every other language, except for the Greek which we're going to be looking at, for example in the Syriac language, the Hebrew language, the Armenian language, the Arabic language, the Ethiopic language and the Persian language, they have one word for each time they're talking about "rock."

So for example, from a Catholic standpoint here's how we would see it, "Thou art kepha," rock, "and upon this kepha," rock, "I will build my church and the gates of hell," hades, "will not prevail against it." In all those other languages, it's the same word both times. We see the correct translation coming down from kepha would be, "Thou art petra," p-e-t-r-a, "and upon this petra," p-e-t-r-a, "I will build my church and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it." If you were to look at your Greek interlinear, what you would see is that the second "petra" remains the same but the first "petra" changes and what it says is, "Thou art petros," p-e-t-r-o-s, "and upon this petra I will build my church and the gates of hades will not prevail against it." What are Protestant scholars saying? Why is the "a" ending changing to the "os" ending? Petra is a feminine noun. Peter's name is masculine

and in order for that to synchronize, they have to change the "a" ending to the "os" ending, okay. As a non-Catholic and being very anti-Catholic at one time, one of the things that I used to use against Catholics was, "Well, Thou art Peter was a little pebble and upon this rock, Jesus, I will build my church." But if Jesus wanted to use that word, he would have said, "Thou art lithos," l-i-t-h-o-s, but he doesn't use that word.

Now one of the things that Bob is going to be touching on, he is going to be touching on the Greek aspect of this, but one of the things that as I was studying and I was looking at Protestant commentaries looking at this passage, I began to see that I couldn't take the position that I'd been holding for about 15 years and as a pastor, okay? Protestant commentaries, Orthodox commentaries, all of these I had looked over, I had 75 of them, and the majority of those commentaries, 99.9% of those commentaries were saying that Peter was the rock here. John Meyendorff says, "The words of Jesus," he's an Orthodox scholar, "on the road to Caesarea-Philippi, 'On this rock I will build my church,' are bound to the confession of Peter. The church exists in history because man believes in Christ, the Son of God. Without this faith there could be no church. Peter was the first to confess this faith and has become the head of the theologians." To use an expression of the office on June 29, he has received the messianic title of 'The Rock,' a title which in biblical language belongs to the Messiah himself.

Gerhard Kittel's Theological Dictionary says, "But what does Jesus mean when he says, 'On this rock I will build my church'? The idea of the Reformers that he is referring to the faith of Peter is quite inconceivable in view of the probably different setting of the story for there is no difference here to the faith of Peter, rather the parallelism of 'thou art rock' and 'on this rock I will build' shows that the second 'rock' can only be the same as the first. It is thus evident that Jesus is referring to Peter to whom he has given the name 'rock.' He appoints Peter the impulsive enthusiastic but not persevering man in the circle to be the foundation of his ekklesia, the church. To this extent, Roman Catholic exegesis is right and all Protestant attempts to evade this interpretation are to be rejected."

I remember going into the evangelical bookstore in San Diego and I said, "Please, give me your best commentary on Matthew 16:18." This is the Interpreter's Bible, "The most natural interpretation of Matthew 16:18 is that of the Roman Catholic tradition. The rock is Peter. The word play and the whole structure of the passage demands that this verse is every bit as much Jesus' declaration about Peter as verse 16 was Peter's declaration about Jesus."

William Hendrickson, the great Reformed scholar, says this, "The meaning is this, you are Peter, that is rock, and upon this rock, that is on you, Peter, I will build my church. Our Lord speaking Aramaic probably said, And I say to you, you are kepha and on this kepha I will build my church. Jesus then is promising to Peter that he is going to build his church on him." I accept this view.

Gerhard Maier, as a pastor, you would be studying his very conservative "The End of the Historical Method" says, "With all due respect to the Reformers, we must admit that the promise of Matthew 16:18 is directed to Peter and not to a Peter-like faith."

The Lutheran-Catholic dialogue says, "On that level precisely because the Aramaic identity of kepha kepha, there can be no doubt that the rock on which the church was to be built was Peter."

D. A. Carson from Trinity Evangelical says, "Although it is true that petros and petra can mean stone and rock respectively in earlier Greek, the distinction is largely confined to poetry." Moreover, the underlying Aramaic is in this case unquestionable and the most probable, kepha was used in both clauses, you are kepha and on this kepha, since the word was used both for a name and for a rock. The Peshitta written in the Syriac language cognate with Aramaic makes no distinction between the words in the two clauses. The Greek makes the distinction between petros and petra simply because it is trying to preserve the pun and in Greek the feminine petra could not very well serve a masculine person.

I could go on and on. Herman Ridderbos, Knox Chamblin down at Reformed Seminary, Blomberg at Denver Seminary, David Hill out of Sheffield, David Guthrie out of London Bible College, Albert Barnes Presbyterian conservative, Anglicans R. T. Franz. Every person that is James Sheldon out of Oral Roberts University from the Pentecostal side, the Abingdon Press, the Methodist publishing arm has David Boren from the Church of Christ writing the commentary on Matthew 16 in the New Bible Commentary, and they admit that Peter is the rock.

Now Bob will be filling us in on the Greek aspect of the rock. I have showed the Aramaic aspect and because we only have a Greek original, we have to deal with the Aramaic text and Bob will be filling in on that.

Where does this language come from and I think this is the key thing. Where is Jesus drawing from when he's talking about Matthew 16:18? The backdrop that Jesus is speaking was at Caesarea-Philippi and it's a mass of rock 500 feet long, 200 feet tall, and there were pagan temples being built. That's how we get the word Caesarea-Philippi. Philip the tetrarch had dedicated a temple to Caesar Augustus but where does this language that Jesus talking about it in here, where is he drawing from? And here's what they're saying, this is in the Anchor Bible and most Protestant scholars are way ahead of Catholic scholars on this issue, but this is what they're saying. Isaiah 22:15 undoubtedly lies behind this. Keys are the symbol of authority and ?? rightly sees this. The same authority is that this vested in the vizier, the master of the house, the chamberlain of the royal household in ancient Israel. Eliakim is described as having the same authority in Isaiah and Jotham as regent is also described as over the household.

F. F. Bruce. And what about the keys of the kingdom? The keys of the royal and noble establishment were entrusted to the chief steward or majordomo. He carried them on his shoulder in earlier times and there they served as a badge of authority entrusted to him. About 700 BC, an oracle from God announced that this authority in the royal palace in Jerusalem was to be conferred on a man named Eliakim, Isaiah 22:22.

InterVarsity Press says that. Oscar Cullmann says that. The majority of Protestant scholars are saying that but let me give you the backdrop what is about ready to happen. David's kingdom is set up somewhere between the year 1010 and 990, according to Eerdmans. When we see this passage being in Isaiah, according to Eerdmans, it's somewhere 740 to 680. Solomon's temple is being set up in the year 931. Ahishar is the first person in 1 Kings 4:6 that will talk about this chief steward role. An analogy so you can see this would be we have the Queen of England. Under the Queen of England we have the Prime Minister and under Prime Minister Mulroney we have a lot of different ministers, the minister of transportation, the minister of commerce, and all these different ministers are answering to the Prime Minister, but ultimately the Prime Minister has to answer to the Queen.

So what is taking place in Isaiah 22:15 is this, Shebna is the head of the master's palace. We don't know why but God's gotten pretty mad at him and he says this in verse 19, "I will depose you of your office." So it's the office that Shebna has and what the person that's going to take that place, he says, "In that day, I will summon my servant Eliakim, son of Hilkiah," and with that office will go a sash of authority and we know that that authority, where will it be coming down through? It will be coming down through the house of Judah and it will be recognized because Eliakim has the key to the house of David. Then it goes on to say whatever he opens shall be shut, whatever he shuts shall be opened. In Jewish rabbinical language, what that means is this: whatever Eliakim in this earth declares to be moral and doctrinal teachings, Jewish rabbinical laws, Jewish interpretation on different things are going to be declared, bound, sealed in heaven. Whatever he says is shut out here on earth are not going to be declared, are not going to be sealed, are not going to be bound in the heavens.

Then in verse 23, it says that this authority, this office is going to be transferred down to offsprings and offshoots, but then something drastic is going to happen. Remember the destruction of Jerusalem happens in 586 and 587. God had formed a covenant with his people in 2 Samuel 7:14-16, Psalm 132, and the Jewish people, the temple's been destroyed, there's no longer anyone holding this office and the keys, and they're wondering, "What happened, God? What have we done wrong?" So what Protestant scholars are saying is this: King Hezekiah was the king during the time of Isaiah and that's a foreshadowing of Jesus being the King in the New Testament. The role that Shebna and Eliakim are playing in the Old Testament is the role that Peter will play in the New Testament. That's what the majority of scholars are saying in the Protestant realms. Blomberg will affirm that from Denver Seminary, Reformed Baptists, many different Protestant theologians are showing that.

But if you can't see it that way, let's go another way about it. In Revelation 1:17-18 it says, "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end. I hold the keys to hades." So Jesus holds the keys. In Revelation 3:7 it says, "To the church of Philadelphia, to the one that is holy, to the one that is true, that holds the key to the house of David, whatever he opens shall be shut, whatever he shuts shall be opened." So Jesus, whatever he declares to be moral and doctrinal teachings and also Jewish rabbinical laws and all those different type of laws, it's a very general thing, are going to be sealed, bound in the

heavens forever and ever. But what does Jesus do with the keys before he leaves this earth? Jesus always holds the keys because he's outside of time, but what he does, he delegates the keys to Peter. It says going back to Matthew 16:19, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom." It's in the dative singular, *soi* is the Greek word, *s-o-i*, "and whatever you," singular, Peter, "bind on this earth shall be bound in heaven, whatever you," singular again, "shall be loosed in heaven." So whatever Peter declares to be moral and doctrinal teachings on this earth are going to be bound, sealed, ratified in the heavens. Whatever he declares not to be bound, as far as moral and doctrinal teachings, it's not going to be bound, sealed, ratified in the heavens.

So Peter has this role. Now when we go to Matthew 18:15-18, we see there's a disciplinary in the church. If somebody's done something wrong, one person goes to that person and says, "You've done something wrong. Repent." The next step is to bring two and three brothers. If that doesn't work, the next authority it says you are to bring it to the church, and if they're not, if they don't listen to the church, they are to be treated as a pagan and a tax collector. But then it goes on and he's talking to all the apostles here and he says, "Whatever you," plural, *h-u-m-i-n*, "bind on this earth shall be bound in heaven, ratified, sealed in heaven, whatever you declare not to be moral and doctrinal teaching down here on earth are not going to be bound, are not going to be sealed, are not going to be ratified in the heavens." But what's the difference between the other apostles and Peter? What does Peter have that the other apostles don't have? He has the keys.

The important thing to notice here is this: just as in David's kingdom had been set up for 400 years, those keys had been coming down for 400 years through a dynastic succession. Peter gets the keys and for us to say that those keys will not follow with the next person after Peter's role, what Catholics would say that that goes along with apostolic succession, that those keys would continue on for 2,000 years and that Christ had preserved his church from that.

This is the International Critical Commentary, "He who holds the key would have power within it, power to admit, power to exclude. In Revelation 3, this power is held by Christ himself. 'He that has the key of David that opens and none can shut and that shutteth and no one can open.' The words are modeled in Isaiah 22:22, expresses supreme authority. To hold the keys is to have absolute right which can be contested by none." To bind and to loose in Jewish legal terminology are equivalent to forbid and allow, to declare it forbidden and declare allowed.

Now the next Scripture that Catholics use is this. Jesus Christ in John 10 is the shepherd but what he does in John 21:15-17, he says, "Feed my lambs. Feed my sheep. Feed my sheep." The one thing to notice here is there's three different words, okay, for "feed." The first one is *bosko* and what that means is that Peter is to give spiritual nourishment to all the lambs, to the people of God, okay? The next word in that sequence is *poimaino* and what that means is that Peter is to be the ruler or the governor or the leader over all the other shepherds. I mean, we can see this. 40% of the time in the New Testament when this is brought up, this *poimaino* means this. You can see it in Matthew 2:6; Revelation

12:5; Revelation 19:15; Revelation 2:27. In fact, Revelation 2:27 says this, "He will rule them with an iron scepter, he will dash them to pieces like pottery."

So the point being is that Peter has this role over all the other shepherds and we would see this as a distinction between the laity and the clergy, but then the third time he comes back again and he says, "Feed my sheep," and the word is *bosko* and Peter is to give spiritual nourishment to the shepherds themselves, the bishops. Oscar Cullmann says this, "We still must consider the wording of the commission as it is formulated in John 21:16, 'Feed my sheep.' It has rightly been pointed out that the Damascus document discovered in 1910 which in connection with the recent manuscript discoveries in Palestine take on particular importance, speak of the leader of the fellowship, the shepherd of the flock, his duty is to proclaim the word, explain the Scriptures and exercise community discipline."

The next Scripture and Bob will be covering that more in detail in John 21, but the next Scripture the Catholics use is this. We see in Matthew 19:28 it says, "Those that have followed Jesus will be sitting on 12 thrones judging the 12 tribes of Israel." In Luke 22:28-32 what it says is that they're arguing who's going to be the greatest in the kingdom of God and then he's speaking just to the 12 apostles and here's what he says, "You're going to be able to eat and sup with me and you're gonna sit on the 12 thrones judging the 12 tribes of Israel." The apostles have this role, they're going to be doing something for the kingdom, but then he turns to Simon and he says this, "Simon, Simon, Satan has desired to have you," that's in the plural, "he's desired to have all you apostles, that he might sift you," in the plural again. But then his wording changes, "but I have prayed for you, Simon," singular, "that your faith," singular, "may not fail, and when you have turned aside when the cock crows three times, you admit that you've done wrong," singular again, "confirm your brethren," that's in the singular. So we have two plurals, four singulars.

Now many people would say that Peter had this role and then when he dies, it leaves us, but let's take the first council at the council of Acts in Acts 15. Here's what we see taking place. There is much discussion going on, there's much arguing, they're going through theological discussions, and Peter gets up and he says that the Gentiles should be let in, and he has this vision from Cornelius back in Acts 10. Then what it says, "and the multitude became silent," *sigao*, and then it goes on in verse 13 and it says Paul and Barnabas start telling about why the Gentiles should be let in and confirming what Peter had done. But right after that it says the word *sigao* again. There's another silence and we're going to show tonight that that *sigao*, the second silence refers to Paul and Barnabas [unintelligible] that the church would let in and this would continue throughout the church for 2,000 years.

Then what happens is this, James gets up and he says, "Simeon has declared." The word there is *exegosito*, the same word that came from John 1:18 when it says the Father has declared the Son. Then Simeon gets up and gives a couple Scriptures and then he says, "I give my voice, I give my opinion." The word there is *aigokrino*. So what he's doing, he's and then he set down four different conditions known as the Noahide laws out of Genesis and one of those conditions is that you couldn't have anything to do with blood, and then

we see in verse 29 it said, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us," the church, "that we would live with these four different conditions that we're putting on the Gentile believers coming in so that they wouldn't scandalize the Jews." The farther that you'd go out from a Jewish community, these four different conditions did not pertain to it. James is the bishop of Jerusalem but when he writes the letter in verse 22 he says, "I write this letter in the name of all the apostles and all the elders." He's not trying to usurp Peter's position. In fact, Paul in 1 Corinthians 8 and 1 Corinthians 10 says that as soon as, he said it's alright to eat meat as long as it's not sacrificed to idols. Ten years later between the year 58, the council was in 48, Paul's going against completely something different than what James had set up. It's a pastoral decision that's coming down and it can be replaced at any time and with Paul it was replaced in 10 years. The only thing that's authoritative that comes down through the council is the dogmatic decree that you Christians and Catholics to today, that Gentiles can be let into the church.

There's a Scripture, this doesn't pertain to Peter but it pertains, it's in Jude 1:11 and what it says is this, "Woe unto them for they have gone in the way of Cain and ran greedily up to Baalim for reward and perished in the gainsaying of Korah." What is that referring to? It's referring to Numbers 16:1-3. It was about the congregation of the people, they were trying to usurp the position of the hierarchy and what did God do in the Old Testament when they tried to do that? He smote them in Numbers 16:32. Why would he be warning the people of God in the New Testament about a hierarchy, if you're coming against the hierarchy you're coming against God?

The point that I'm trying to say is this, there are many other Scriptures and my time is about ready to end, but Bob's gonna cover a lot of those different things. What we've done today is this, we're trying to show that Jesus Christ is not a liar; that when he says the gates of hell will not prevail against the church that's founded on Peter because he's made the rock, that he has the keys, and I can be sure that his faith will never fail because it's Jesus that's gonna guarantee the church. In Matthew 23:1-3 it says the Pharisees and the Sadducees sit in Moses' seat therefore you must obey them. Where is Moses' seat in the Old Testament? It's not there. The word there is cathedra. You must obey them, the person that's sitting in that seat. But then it goes on to say but if we have a pope that's not living up according to that lifestyle, we don't have to live like that pope but we're to obey the person that sits in Moses' seat and there's only one person that can sit in that seat and this is a first century finding, it's archaeological finding in Deleos that we have Moses' seat and it can only fit one person. So when we're saying that the pope speaks ex cathedra on moral and doctrinal decisions, it's because he's been given the divine right by Christ to be able to do that and that I must obey them because Christ is morally binding them, not to a written tradition but to an oral tradition that the Jews knew to be true.

Rob Zins. It's my pleasure to be here this evening with my esteemed colleague and my worthy opponents and the issue before us this evening is one of great importance to each of you in the audience and each of you who will view this video in the future for we have presented before us an issue of deep and great importance, whether or not the pope in the Roman Catholic religion in Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth so designated by our Lord Jesus Christ.



Now on September 20, 1351, Clement VI issues these questions to the ?? of the Armenians in a letter of examination of their beliefs concerning the Roman pontiff. In these questions, we find an apt description of what the Roman Catholic religion means when it speaks of Peter being the vicar of Christ on earth. Let us suppose these questions were asked of you in the audience. What would be your response? What do you really believe about the Roman pontiff? Indeed, what does the Catholic religion teach about the Roman pontiff? Can you disagree with this teaching and still be considered a Roman Catholic? Indeed can you in light of Roman Catholic dogma on this issue, disagree, that is not be obedient to the alleged vicar of Christ on earth and still be considered a Christian?

Here then are the questions. We ask whether you believe that no man outside the faith of this church and outside of the obedience of the pope of Rome can finally be saved? We ask whether you have believed, believe or are prepared to believe that blessed Peter received complete power of jurisdiction over all faithful Christians from our Lord Jesus Christ and that every power of jurisdiction was completely subject to the authority and power which blessed Peter received from our Lord Jesus Christ himself, over whomsoever are believers in Christ in all parts of the world, and that no apostle or any other one whosoever received that very complete power over all Christians except Peter alone? We ask whether you have believed and have held or are prepared to believe and to hold that all the Roman pontiffs who succeeded blessed Peter will succeed in the same plenitude in the jurisdiction of power over the complete and universal body of the militant church which blessed Peter himself received from our Lord Jesus Christ?

Now in these citations which I have read to you, we find these words over and over again: complete power of jurisdiction; every power of jurisdiction; completely subject to the authority and power given to Peter. Over and over again complete, universal power and authority, power and authority. The teaching of the Roman Catholic religion is that our Lord Jesus Christ gave unto Peter every jurisdiction of power as fitting the head of the church of Christ. In the Council of Florence held under the authority of Pope Eugenius meeting in 1438, we have this striking appraisal of the role of Peter, "We likewise define that the holy apostolic See and the Roman pontiff hold the primacy throughout the entire world and that the Roman pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, the chief of the apostles and the true vicar of Christ, and that he is head of the entire church and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, rule and govern the universal church just as is contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils and in the sacred canon," etc. etc. There can be no missing the point here. The Roman Catholic religion teaches that the pope at Rome has the authority, power, dominion and jurisdiction allegedly given to Peter in the first century.

Not much has changed today. The modern Catholic religion has confirmed this dogma in the writings of Vatican II and in the New Catechism of the Roman Catholic religion. The Catholic Catechism quoting from *Lumen gentium*, dogmatic constitution of the church in paragraph 22 has this to say, "The Lord made Simon alone, whom he named Peter, the

rock of his church. He gave him the keys of his church and instituted him shepherd of the whole flock. The office binding and loosening which was given to Peter was also assigned to the college of apostles united to its head. This pastoral office of Peter and the other apostles belongs to the church's very foundation and is continued by the bishops under the primacy of the pope. For the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as vicar of Christ, namely, and as pastor of the entire church, has full, supreme and universal power over the whole church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered." I do not want anyone in this audience to go away with a misunderstanding of what the Roman Catholic religion thinks of their pope.

In summary, Peter is said to be the teacher of all Christians, the head of the whole church, the root of the unity of the church. We read these words from Pius IX, "Therefore the Catholic Church alone is conspicuous and perfect in the unity of the whole world and of all nations, particularly in that unity whose beginning, root and unfailing origin are that supreme authority and higher principality of blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles and his successors in the Roman chair."

The Roman Catholic religion is so bold in their dogma as to say that to be subject to Peter and his successors is necessary for salvation. If you disagree with this dogma that I have just read, you run the risk of being outside the orbit of salvation itself and do not qualify for the hallways of heaven.

Listen to the words of these two Romish popes and Vatican I. "Furthermore, we declare, say, define, and proclaim to every human creature that they by necessity for salvation are entirely subject to the Roman pontiff, Boniface VIII, and whoever rises to reproach him cannot be an inhabitant of the heavenly regions." Boniface I, 418. "If anyone then says that it is not from the institution of Christ the Lord himself or by divine right that the blessed Peter has perpetual successors in the primacy over the universal church or that the Roman pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in the same primacy, let him be anathema, let him be accursed." Vatican I, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. And finally, "This is the doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate and keep his faith and salvation."

There you have it by Rome's own testimony. I stand here condemned, I am anathematized, I have no hope of the halls of heaven unless I repent of my position, unless I consider the language of these councils to be accurate in their fullness report of the primacy of the papacy, I stand condemned before you.

Now the question in light of these claims for Peter being the vicar of Christ on earth, we naturally must ask the question is there any biblical support and foundation? We are concerned in the first portion of this debate to determine if the Bible supports Rome in its claim that Peter was given absolute authority over the church. Does the Bible indeed support the contentions of the Catholic religion when it comes to Peter? We wish to be as noble-minded as the Bereans to examine the Scriptures as to whether these things are so. Will a fair reading of the Scriptures yield to the Romish claim of Petrine primacy as defined by the aforementioned popes and councils?

We ask where is the biblical proof from the Bible offered up by Romanists for their conclusions that Peter received complete power of jurisdiction over all believers in all parts of the world, and no other except Peter alone received this very complete power that all Roman pontiffs will succeed the same plenitude of jurisdiction of power, that all future Roman pontiffs who are vicars of Christ have received immediately from Christ this power in the highest degree over the complete and universal church, that Peter had full, supreme, universal, whole church power over all other apostles and was chief apostle, true vicar of Christ and head of the entire church? We ask for the biblical data.

Let us review, then, the portrayal of Peter given to us in the word of God. Simon, brother of Andrew, son of Jonah, is presented to us in Scripture as one of the first disciples called by the Lord to follow him early on in his relationship with Jesus. Simon was given the name Peter, Petros in Greek, Cephas in Aramaic. Peter, Petros, and Kefa all mean stone or rock. And he brought him to Jesus, Jesus looked at him and said, "You are Simon, the son of Yohanas, you shall be called Cephas, which translated means Peter." Paul refers to Peter as Cephas in 1 Corinthians 1:2, in fact, Paul refers to Peter as Cephas in circumstances that convey just the opposite meaning of the modern papal designations. While we find that some at Corinth were holding men in high esteem and Paul reports this to the Corinthians, "Now I mean this, that each one of you is saying I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas and I am of Christ." Their guilt and their sin was holding a man in high esteem rather than holding Christ in highest esteem. Again in 1 Corinthians 9:5 Paul brings up Cephas as an illustration of apostles having the right to bring along believing wives. "Do we not have a right to take along a believing wife, even as the rest of the apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?" In Galatians 2:9, the pillars of the church, James, Cephas and John, triumvirate, three not one, give to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship in acceptance of their call 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." And we note early on that Paul had to oppose Peter to his face for Peter's hypocrisy, "but when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned, but when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all and I noted that the rest of the Jews had joined him, Cephas, in his hypocrisy."

Aside from these well-known references in the epistles of Paul, Peter is best known for the following. He's among the inner group, Peter, John and James in Luke 8:51, the raising to life of the daughter of the synagogue official. In Luke 9:28, it is Peter, John and James at the transfiguration. In Matthew 26:37, they are together again at the garden of Gethsemane. Peter is the impetuous one in the Scriptures, walking on water in Matthew 14:28 but drawing the sword in defense of our Lord in John 18:10. He affirms Jesus in Matthew 16:16, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." But later on in the same chapter, Matthew reports that Peter rebukes Jesus, "May God forbid it, Lord, that you should do this." He denies our Lord Jesus Christ. In Luke 22:60 we read these words from Peter, "Man, I do not know what you are talking about," in reference to the accusation that he was with our Lord on the night of his betrayal. We find Peter going

fishing, going back to his old profession having thought the entire scenario of the Savior was finished. In John 21:3 we read, "I go fishing," and then we find him being restored at the end of John 21, "Tend my sheep." We find him writing two letters to the Jewish diaspora, 1 & 2 Peter.

But in all of the New Testament data, there is not a shred of evidence for Peter being a pope. There is not a shred of evidence for the office of pope anywhere in all of Scripture. What we do find are fallible human beings. Peter was a sinner saved by the grace of God and called to be one of the original men to confess Christ and proclaim him in the world. God worked marvelously through Peter, Paul and the other men whom he chose to spread this Gospel. Peter was special but Peter was no pope, in fact, we now need to turn our attention to the fallibility of Peter.

After receiving the keys to the kingdom of heaven, Peter attempts to stop Jesus from his appointed mission in Jerusalem, Matthew 16:22-23.

After receiving the keys of the kingdom of heaven, Peter joins in an argument about who would be first in the kingdom, Luke 22:24, "And there arose also a dispute among them as to which one of them was regarded to be greatest." Why the dispute? Why the argumentation if it was settled by our Lord that Peter would be, in fact, the greatest?

After the day of outpouring of the Spirit of God at Pentecost, Peter is confronted by Paul at Antioch with the accusation of immorality, that is deceit and undermining the Gospel, that is the faith issue. Listen to these words, "But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the gospel," Peter being among them, not straightforward about the gospel, "and the Jews joined him in hypocrisy."

Peter shares authority with James and the other apostles at the Council of Jerusalem. Acts 15 has already been mentioned in the opening statement of my opponent. Let me say briefly here that we find in Acts 15:4 that it's the apostles and elders meeting together. We find in verse 6 of Acts 15 it's apostles and elders, and in verse 22, it's the apostles and elders all in harmony, not one shred of evidence that Peter was the governor of the council, the vice-regent holding the key of David at the council. Not one shred of evidence whatsoever, in fact, James stands up and has the final word and closes the session.

Peter admits to equal if not greater status in the writings of Paul in his second epistle, "just as also our beloved brother Paul according to the wisdom given him wrote to you as also in all his letters, speaking in them things in which some things are hard to understand." Peter's own testimony to the credibility of Paul and his writings in some things perhaps that Peter didn't even understand as well as Paul.

Peter is never said to be the all-powerful leader in the church by anyone at any time. In fact, Paul's words indicate the opposite where he says in 2 Corinthians 11:5, "For I consider myself not in the least inferior to the most eminent of apostles."

Peter finally refers to himself as a fellow elder in 1 Peter 5:1, "Therefore, I exhort the elders among you, as your fellow elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a partaker also of the glory that is to be revealed, shepherd the flock." Peter writing to fellow elders telling them to shepherd the flock. Shepherd the flock.

Peter is never called pope or father in all of Scripture.

Now let's take a look at the book of Acts. The book of Acts is the unfolding of God's redemptive program. It is a chronicle, as it were, of the historical outworking of salvation beginning from the day of Pentecost and moving forward. We find the first sermon given by Peter in the book of Acts. We find the first Gentile converts in the book of Acts. We find first missionary journey in the book of Acts. And it's in the book of Acts where those who believe on Christ are first called Christians. Shouldn't we search and find a shred of evidence where we might find Peter being called pope first in the book of Acts or at least given primacy in the book of Acts? Hardly.

Peter is obedient to Scripture in Acts 1 when he says, "Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled." He does not take authority on his own as vicar of Christ on earth, but rather he subordinates his exhortation in Acts 1 to the Scriptures. Scripture had to be fulfilled. Peter is conspicuous in Acts 2 but not alone. Peter is prominent in Acts 3 but not alone or above his peers. Peter is a defender of the faith in Acts 4 in Acts 5, but not alone. He is always with another apostle. He acts in concert with fellow believers. There is no trace of popery here. Peter goes down to Samaria in Acts 8 but he is not alone, and incidentally, he is sent down. He does not carry a peculiar jurisdiction or authority over John with whom he goes. The text reads, "Now when the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent them Peter and John." Peter was sent by the other apostles. Peter preaches the Gospel and heals in Acts 9 but there is no hint of popery here. In Acts 10, Peter is amazed at the work of God at the household of Cornelius. In recounting the experience, Peter proclaims that the Holy Spirit was given to the Gentiles and fell upon them just as he fell upon us at the beginning. No distinction given by way of the Spirit of God being given unto believers differently from what was given to Peter and all early believers.

In fact, if we take into account the book of Acts, we believe that Paul would be a better candidate for being pope at Rome. Paul was especially set aside by the Holy Spirit for his ministry, Acts 13:2. Paul did not consult with flesh and blood concerning the contents of his Gospel, Galatians 1:12, 17. Paul says in his own testimony that he had the pressure of the entire church on him continually. That's something a pope might say, "I have the pressure of the entire church on me continually," 2 Corinthians 11:28. Paul was especially entrusted with the Gospel to the Gentiles. Peter was entrusted with the Gospel to the Jews, Galatians 2:7. Whereas the 15<sup>th</sup> chapter of the book of Acts ends the accounting of the ministry of Peter, there's no more mention of his missionary work nor advice to the church in the book of Acts or the epistles of Paul, Paul is mentioned throughout the remaining chapter of Acts, all the way through Acts 28, and writes six times as much to the body of Christ as Peter. If you're looking for a pope, ladies and

gentleman, give it to Paul. No one has more prominence. No one has more authority. No one has more divine initiative in his ministry than the great Apostle Paul.

Furthermore, Paul at least claimed authority whereas Peter never did. Listen to the words of Paul, "If anyone thinks he is a prophet or spiritual, let him recognize that the things which I write to you are the Lord's commandment." That's papal language. "And we for this reason, we also constantly thank God that when you received from us the word of God's message, you accepted it not as the word of men but for what it really is, the word of God which also performs its work in you who believe," 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

Who is to shepherd the flock of God according to the word of God? What does first century ecclesiology look like from the New Testament? Well, the New Testament plainly paints the picture of a multitude of missions in the local church. The local body is to be governed by elders, presbyters, bishops, episcopos, in the assembly. They are to be aided by deacons, diakonos, servants. This we find in Acts 20:17 and 28 on Paul's final departure for Jerusalem, he calls together the elders at Ephesus and warns them. He doesn't call the pope and warn him, he calls the elders, plural, together to warn them.

What are the qualifications for an elder or a bishop according to the New Testament? They are clearly set forth in Scripture and have nothing to do with Romish popery. Read it yourself, 1 Timothy 3:1 and following, and Titus 1.

What is the Gospel of Peter? What Gospel did God give to Peter? Peter preached the Gospel of repentance and faith for forgiveness of sins. We find these words in Acts 2:38, "Repent and let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Again in Acts 15:11, "But we believe that we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus in the same way also as they are." This message is contrary to the modern message of Rome and serves notice that scriptural Petrine prominence has nothing to do with Romish religion, let alone the false primacy of the Romish pope.

I'd like to turn now in the final few minutes that I have to a focus on an initial denial of the Roman Catholic interpretation of four passages summing to prove Romish popery. Matthew 16, "And I also say to you that you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hades shall not overpower it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," Matthew 16:18-19. We deny that Matthew 16:18 establishes that Peter was the very foundation of the church with all the aforementioned power and authority lauded on the pope at Rome. It cannot be proven that the original Matthew was written in Aramaic. This eliminates the Catholic charade of Aramaic originals lending the so-called true translation of "Thou art Cephas and upon Cephas I will build my church." Ladies and Gentleman, there is no proof whatsoever that Matthew was written in Aramaic originally. We have not one scrap of manuscript evidence that it was, in fact, Aramaic. There is scholarly opinion and that's it. What we do have, however, is manuscript evidence of the Greek text that has a differentiation in the words.

Secondly, the use of the demonstrative pronoun "upon this rock I will build my church," diverts attention away from Peter. Christ did not say "upon you I will build my church." The change from second person to the demonstrative opens up the proclamation of Christ to either Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ," or to Christ himself. "And I also say to you that you are Peter and upon this rock," "this" being the demonstrative, not upon you, Peter, but upon this rock, diverting attention away from Peter to either his confession or to Christ himself.

Thirdly, even granting Peter as the rock upon which Christ will build his church does not lead to popery. Petrine prominence has already been noted. It is an unwarranted leap from Peter being an apostle of initial prominence to the pope at Rome. Christ is everywhere called the foundation of the church. Also, the passage does not say "upon this rock and thy successors I will build my church." Neither does it say that the universality of the body of Christ will be in Rome.

Luke 22:31-32 was mentioned, "when once you have turned again, strengthen your brothers." There is no room for popery here or power or papal potency. Jesus exhorts Peter to strengthen his brothers after he himself has been restored from his own serious weaknesses. The word "strengthen" here is used in Revelation 3:2 as part of the Lord's admonition to strengthen the things that remain. There is nothing magical about this exhortation. Paul wishes to strengthen the church at Rome with his visit, Romans 1:11, the same word.

John 21:15-17 that was read earlier, there's nothing in John 21 that remotely suggests popery. This passage centers around the reinstatement of Peter to the ministry after he decided to go fishing. We notice the threefold questioning of our Lord by way of recapitulation. This is a new charcoal fire and unlike the one where Peter denied the Lord, this fire will be a source of warmth and sustenance. The entire episode centers around the re-enlistment of Peter for the work of service. Ironically, Peter unlike modern Romish popery, is told to keep his mind out of what God may be doing with others for Jesus said, "If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you?" Thank you.

Bob Sungenis. I'm Bob Sungenis and I thank you for all being here tonight. Mr. Zins, I would like to thank you for a very accurate historical presentation of what the Catholics believe about the pope. It's very accurate, however, your biblical information is totally inaccurate and I will address each of the points that you have brought forth to us.

In Galatians 2, as Mr. Zins pointed out, he says that Peter was upbraided by Paul for what Peter had done in perverting the Gospel supposedly. Let me just give you some background on this issue. Paul's major concern in Acts 15:1 is that the Jews are commanding that the Gentiles be circumcised before they come into the church. That is his concern. That is also his concern in Galatians 2. We read that he didn't want to circumcise Titus to give the Jews any space to say that, "Yes, we were falling back into the circumcision that we were denying." That is the issue. Is that what Peter is doing in Galatians 2? No, not at all. Paul accuses Peter of disfellowshipping with the Gentiles, a

very minor infraction. Peter is not doing what Paul had accused him of. He is not perverting the Gospel. He is not circumcising anyone. Paul is overreacting to Peter. It is actually the very Paul who had decided to circumcise Timothy because he had an understanding of the Jews, he wanted to placate them. He circumcises Timothy so that it would be much smoother to approach the Jews. Then he changes his mind in Galatians 2 and says that, "I didn't circumcise Titus because I didn't want to give any place to the Jews." Well, which is it, Paul? One or the other. He does this both because Timothy is a Greek and Titus is a Greek. That's the criteria that Paul uses.

Yes, Paul was overreacting. What is Paul's address addressed to? The Galatians, the Judaizers. These were the ones who were trying to circumcise Christians and say that they had to be circumcised, had to obey this law to become Christians. When we read the rest of the Galatian epistle, that is his concern. As a matter of fact he says, "I wish they would circumcise their whole body and leave me alone." His concern is not with Peter. Augustine says, yes, Peter did have a moment of imprudence but it wasn't the destruction of the Gospel that we're told that it is.

In Matthew 16, Mr. Zins says that Jesus rebuked Peter for Peter's alleged stopping of Jesus from going to the cross, as if this was some great crime. Let me back up a little bit and give you the context of Matthew 16 so you can understand what's going on here. Peter is given a revelation from God. Jesus recognizes it and he says, "You did not give, have this information given to you by flesh and blood that I am the Son of God, it was given to you directly by the Father." You see, the whole context that Jesus is basing the giving of the keys to Peter is on the revelation that Peter received from God, not so much on his faith. Yes, faith is a prerequisite for anyone who comes to the kingdom but what is special about Peter that is not given to the other apostles is this revelation from God directly.

Now we know that Peter was not given a revelation that Jesus had to go to the cross and die because in the next verse it says that's the first time that Jesus told the apostles that he had to die. So naturally Peter is surprised at this. The Father had not given this information to Peter. He had given the information that, yes, he was the Son of God but not that Jesus had to go to the cross. So there's no conflict here. There's no issue here. Jesus is now teaching Peter, "Yes, I must die," and not even until Jesus died and rose again do the apostles really understand the death and resurrection of Christ.

Not a shred of evidence, we are told, for Peter being the pope. Peter was a sinner. I didn't know that sin was a disclaimer or a disqualifier for being a pope. I didn't read that anywhere in the Bible.

He brought the fact out that the apostles are talking about who is the greatest. This is pettiness among the apostles. This is their problem, they're all vying for leadership, vying to see who's the better among them. That's exactly what Jesus is condemning. Don't talk about who is the greatest. What Jesus wants them to be is servants. That's exactly what Jesus said he was. He was going to be a servant, does that diminish his authority at all because he wants to be a servant? No. This is exactly what he doesn't want Peter to be, to



claim to be the greatest. It's not a competition here, it's a position of servanthood for the rest of the church. That's what Jesus is concerned about.

In Acts 15, we are told that all the apostles and elders are present. Well, I hope so. It's a council. That's why they're there. But who's the one who stands up first and declares this dogma that the Gentiles do not have to be circumcised in order to be let into the church? It's Peter. And do you know what else Peter says? He says, "God told me this." A revelation again, the same thing as in Matthew 16. God told him that in Acts 10, the sheet came down with all the animals in it, and as a matter of fact, he backs it up and he says, "And why do you test God trying to give Gentiles this burden to carry?" He's speaking in God's place at the council and everybody's hushed up listening to him.

Paul and Barnabas come over and give examples of all the miracles that were performed, "Yes, Peter is right." James stands up and says, "Yes, Peter is right. Simeon has declared this and now I'm gonna add my little opinion here," and then the whole group gets together and says yes, but Peter made the doctrinal proclamation that still stands today: Gentiles do not have to be circumcised to be let into the church.

He says in 2 Peter 3:16, Peter didn't understand what Paul was writing, where does it say that in 2 Peter 3:16? It says the unstable wrestle with Paul's writings, that they don't understand it. It doesn't say that Peter didn't understand it.

In 1 Peter 5:1, we're told that Peter is just a fellow elder, that he addresses these people just as a fellow elder and that doesn't really give him any prominence among these people. Well, I don't know about you but when I talk to a group of people, I don't say, "Hey, you know, I'm the big cheese here. I'm the boss. You have to listen to me." No, what you do is you come down to their level and you say, "I'm a fellow elder with you." Just like the President would say, "I'm a fellow American citizen with you," but it doesn't diminish his authority as the President of the United States.

Exactly what is happening here is Peter is doing exactly what Jesus told him to do in John 21 if you remember what my colleague had said about John 21. Jesus uses the special Greek word *poimainei*. Almost half of the time that it is used in the New Testament, it refers to ruling. There are lambs and sheep that he is supposed to rule over in John 21. They must represent the whole church. There is nobody else in view here. In other words, Peter is to *poimanei*, to rule, to govern over this whole church, and he is also to *boska*, to feed them. That's exactly what he's doing in 1 Peter 5:1, he is governing, he is ruling and he is feeding, what Jesus told him to do.

He says in the book of Acts he's always with another apostle. Well, I hope so. I hope that the apostles wanted to travel around with Peter and trying to imply that this means that Peter is somehow degraded or that, you know, because he has these companions along with him. Please, people, don't get that impression at all. If you look at what's happening in the book of Acts, every chapter that talks about Peter, he holds the prominence. He's the one who speaks. John, who is the inner circle of the apostles, is there and John doesn't say a word. Most of the time John doesn't perform, he may perform miracles but there's

not recorded miracles of John nor James. Peter is the one who raises people from the dead. His shadow is curing people. As a matter of fact, when it refers to the apostolic man it says Peter and the apostles, it doesn't even name the other apostles sometimes.

He says that Paul did not consult flesh and blood in Galatians 1 and 2. Yeah, here's Paul knocked off his horse, he's got all this new stuff he's got to learn, God gives him this special revelation but what does he do afterwards? He goes to see Peter for two weeks to consult with Peter. The Greek word used there is ?? which means to get information from, to learn from. Now if Peter has no prominence, why is Paul going to him? He's consulting with flesh and blood now because Peter is somebody.

Yes, Paul says, "I had the pressure of the church on my shoulders." I hope so because he is the messenger to the Gentile churches. He is the one who's doing it as Peter was to the Jews. I hope he has the pressure. He has to take that pressure, that's God's mandate for him.

Paul is mentioned more than Peter was the claim. So what? This doesn't, I mean, Paul has a mission to do from God. Peter had his mission to do from God. Frequency is not a criterion for leadership, it's not a criterion for papal primacy and he says that because Paul says, "The things I write to you are the Lord's commandment," as if Peter doesn't believe the same thing. As a matter of fact, that's exactly what Peter says in his epistles, "The things I write to you I want you to believe too." Because it's Scripture, they both believe Scripture is God's word. I would say that too if I were Paul or Peter.

He says that in Acts 17 Paul calls the elders not the pope, it's because he's dealing with elders at the church. The pope isn't there, he's in Jerusalem. Why call the pope up there? He doesn't need the pope in Acts 17. They're not having a council there. They had their council in Acts 15.

Let me give you some more information about the understanding of Matthew 16 and John 21, Luke 22 and others. As I said before, there is a revelation that is given to Peter. It's not based so much on his faith. Now the problem that Protestants have is they don't understand that someone can be called rock and another person can be called rock, someone could be called a stone and another person could be called a stone. In Ephesians 2:20, the apostles and the prophets are the foundation and Jesus is called the foundation, believers are called stones and rocks, Jesus is called a stone and a rock. The metaphors are interchangeable. Jesus is called the shepherd and bishop, the exact same two words that are given to the pastors of the church, shepherd and bishop.

One amazing thing that I found in Matthew 16 is this very word that was brought up, this, when Jesus says "upon this rock I will build my church." It's the Greek *taute te petra*. This is a very interesting phrase in Greek because it can be translated this, it could be, "this very rock or this same rock or even this rock." If you want to prove this to yourself, go to Protestant translations of this Greek phrase in the Bible and you will see it. In the King James version, for example, it's translated as "the same" in 1 Corinthians 7:20 or "this same" in 2 Corinthians 9:4. The same thing can be found in New American

Standard Bible, the Revised Standard Bible, the NIV, the NEV, the all Protestant versions of the Bible. In other words, how could we translate this phrase? It could be this, "upon this very rock I will build my church," or "upon this same rock I will build my church." The Greek word *taute* there has a very demonstrative force. Yes, Mr. Zins, it does. It's pointing out exactly that the rock that it had just talked about two words ago. That's the natural reading of this text and verified more by the Greek.

What's even more amazing is what Jesus didn't say. He didn't say "upon the rock or upon a rock" to make it more ambiguous, he said, "upon this rock or this very rock." And he didn't say, "You are Peter but upon this rock I will build my church," he said, "You are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church." He's connecting the two phrases together showing that they're one and the same.

There was an argument brought up in the production Mr. White did from Peaceway Productions claiming that the word "you" is in the second person in this passage and because the word "rock" is in the third person, therefore second person and third person do not match up therefore Peter cannot be the rock. Let me tell you this, we don't need anything past eighth grade grammar to understand that rock is a noun and it doesn't have person. Pronouns have person, I, you, he, she, it, have person. So it's a fallacious argument to say that second and third person don't match up together.

Another aspect of this passage is very important. Jesus says, "Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." In Hebrews 6:13 it says that God cannot lie. That means that God cannot bind anything in heaven that is a lie on earth because God cannot lie. God cannot confirm, validate or accept anything that is an error in heaven because he is God, that is his nature not to lie. Therefore whatever Peter binds on earth must be without error or God could not bind it in heaven.

How will this happen? Because God will intrude into the mind of the pope and prevent him from error. That's the only way it can happen. The precedent for that was already set in Matthew 16 when Peter was given a revelation from God that Jesus was the Son of God. It wasn't from Peter's own heart, it was given to him by God. That's what the pope has today.

In John 21 when Jesus says, "Do you love me, Peter? Feed my sheep," and the whole scenario there, does Jesus say to Peter as some Protestants tell us, "Well, Peter, you don't really agape me, you only phileo me so I'm not really gonna accept your answer." That's the kind of claim that is made because Peter is using a different word for love. No. Jesus accepts Peter's answer every time. He says, "Yes, Jesus, I love you," and he says, "Okay, do this. This is your job. This is your position. Feed my sheep. Shepherd my sheep. Feed my lambs." And he does that very thing. The other apostles are all there. No one of them is approached. James and John, the inner circle are there, they are not approached. They are not given this job and position, Peter is. He passed the initial test. Jesus gives people tests before he gives them a position. He had failed, yes, but now he is going to be reasserted and Jesus wants to know where his heart is. "Yes, Jesus, I love you."

The comment was made that when in Luke 22 Jesus says, "When you are turned around, strengthen your brothers," that this word *sterison* in the Greek is used of Paul to confirm the brethren. Well, of course, all that does is define the word. Yes, it does mean to confirm but what is the context of this passage? It is used in reference to Peter's relationship with the apostles, not the laity. He is to confirm the apostles, the highest authority that there is on earth. And in order to confirm them, Peter must be a higher authority.

In 1 Peter 5:1, which I already covered a little, it says that Peter tells the people to feed their flocks, to shepherd their flocks. That's because he is fulfilling the mission that Jesus gave to him from John 21, "Feed the sheep. Rule the sheep." It was pointed out that that word *poimaino* means to rule. As a matter of fact, other words are used in that context: *presbuteros*, *episkope*, all words that are used for leadership in the church. Peter is using those.

In Isaiah 22 that was brought up by my colleague, it's amazing when you go back, if you remember the argument there, Eliakim in Isaiah 22 is the Prime Minister under King Hezekiah and many Protestants are claiming that, yes, this is where Matthew 16 gets its language from. Yes, it appears in Revelation 3:7 as well where Jesus says, "I have the key of David too." But there's a sharing of authority. Just like the father can have authority, the son can have authority. It doesn't diminish the son's authority because the father has authority nor the father the son. Likewise it doesn't diminish Jesus' authority if he gives to Peter authority.

But what is important about this is the dynastic succession of this office and in the Hebrew it's called *el habayit*, the master of the palace. In our setting it could be something like the Chief of Staff of the White House. That's what Peter is. The house is the church. He's the Chief of Staff. He rules that house. That's exactly what Israel had. Ahishar under King Solomon, Arza 1 Kings 16:9 under King Elah, under King Ahab there was Obadiah 1 Kings 18:3. It's the same Hebrew phrase that is used, *el habayit*, the master of the palace, and that was passed down in succession all throughout Israel's history. Now there's only one King left, Jesus, but there is a Prime Minister still and there's a succession of Prime Ministers going on.

Now we are told that there is no succession. Can you imagine when the framers of the US Constitution got together and they elected George Washington as their President all the while musing that after his death there would be no more Presidents? Can you imagine that happening? No, that's an absurd proposition. Now are they any smarter than Jesus? Doesn't Jesus know the future? Yes. Why would he set up an office in Matthew 16 and all these other places giving Peter this position and not follow it through with a succession? It doesn't make sense.

In my next approach, my next time, I will go through succession even in more detail in the Scripture. I just want you to be when you listen to the rest of this debate, please understand that because Scriptures are thrown out and said this way or that way, please as

the Bible says in Proverbs 18:17, when you hear one story, wait until you hear the other side because you need both to make your decision.

Mr White. ...of listening to all that is said this evening and remember what my colleague, Mr. Zins, said. Roman Catholicism is not telling us that the papacy is a probability. Roman Catholicism is not telling us just something that we might want to believe. Roman Catholicism is telling us this is something we must believe and it's absolute truth. It is not an issue where you can have arguments that, "Well, maybe I can come up with an argument here and maybe I can come up with a possible understanding of this passage and a possible understanding of that passage and string them all together and that's enough." No, when you tell people that they have to believe in what you're teaching under pain of the anathema, it cannot be that that doctrine is the end of a long chain of syllogisms and at every single point along that line you can successfully challenge that line of thinking. If that's all we are presented with this evening is, "Well, maybe we can understand it this way or maybe we can understand it that way," that is an insufficient basis for the Roman Catholic doctrine of the papacy.

Now I want to refer to one thing that Mr. Sungenis said just a few moments ago while it's still fresh in your mind, and that is in regards to Galatians 2. He said that what Peter had done was a very minor infraction and to quote him, "Paul is overreacting to Peter." I would like to ask who Mr. Sungenis is to judge what the Scripture says at this point. It is the Scripture that says at Galatians 2:4, "But it was because the false brethren who had sneaked in to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus in order to bring us into bondage, but we did not yield in subjection to them for even an hour so that the truth of the Gospel might remain with you." Paul's talking about the truth of the Gospel. He's talking about false brethren in relationship with the truth of the Gospel and it's in that context that we have verse 14 that Mr. Sungenis says is Paul's overreaction, "But when I saw that they were not straightforward about," what? Just a minor thing about table fellowship? No, verse 14, "But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all." My friends, I think one of the major problems in the church today is that we think that being not straightforward about the truth of the Gospel is a minor infraction.

Now in regards to Matthew 16, you're going to be hearing a lot about this tonight. You're going to be hearing a lot about Luke 22, John 21, Matthew 16 because, folks, that's all Rome has. That's all there is so that's what we have to deal with.

Now as we look at Matthew 16, we have heard it said, "Well, it must have been written in Aramaic." I would like to challenge our Roman Catholic friends to come up here and show us the Aramaic Matthew. Show us how they can have certainty of what it said in the Aramaic Matthew. Dr. Kurt Aland, the greatest living expert in the text of the New Testament summarizes my position that was also held by Alexander Bruce, and ?? and Nigel Turner and Robert Gundry and many others, quote, "There is no longer any doubt that Greek was the language in which all the parts of the New Testament were originally written."

Now are there people who believe it was written in Aramaic? Yes, but can you base an entire dogma upon which you will use the anathema upon a mythical Aramaic original that you don't know what it said? "Oh, but we know what it said." No, you don't. For example, I would like to suggest for you reading the very recent work of Chris Karagounis, available in English translation with the title "Peter and the Rock," Karagounis provides compelling documentation against the theory that we have here in Matthew 16 a repetition of the Aramaic term "kepha" demonstrating the evidence would more likely favor the use of the Aramaic term "minra" for the phrase "upon this rock I will build my church."

Now let's say you disagree with Karagounis. That's fine. The simple fact of the matter is there is a perfectly logical and scholarly alternative, the Roman Catholic position but there can't be alternatives to absolute dogmas, folks. If you base yourself upon this concept of the Aramaic original, I simply would challenge my friends here to show us the Aramaic original, prove to us that it did indeed say that. The simple fact of the matter is Rome claims to have canonized Scripture and the Gospel they canonized wasn't in Aramaic.

Now anyone familiar with the comments of scholars on this passage is aware of the multitude of different positions taken about it. I would like to point out to you that the central theme of Matthew 16 is the Messiahship of Jesus Christ. Any interpretation that takes the focus off of Jesus as Messiah is missing the point. Jesus' questions to disciples about the opinions of the multitudes and then their own viewpoints are all directed toward his own person, his own identity. When Peter speaks up and confesses that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, he is confessing the faith of all the disciples, not merely himself. He is speaking for them all as he so often does. Jesus' pronouncement of blessing upon Peter is not due to any inherent goodness in Peter, but is due to Peter's being the recipient of a great blessing from the Father.

Now the subject of the passage remains the identity of Christ found in the confession of Peter. When the Lord says, "I tell you that you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hades will not overcome it," the focus does not change. Jesus is not here speaking of the identity of Peter, he is still talking about himself and his church. This is plainly seen by continuing on through verse 20 where we read, quote, "Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ, the Messiah."

Some modern scholars having missed the fact that the focus remains on Christ all the way through are so puzzled by this passage they suggest that it's not in the original, but such conjecture is simply not necessary. The rock of which the Lord speaks is that common confession made by all who are part of the church, Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. This is seen I believe in the fact that while the Lord is addressing Peter directly, and by the way these are the very words that I used in the video presentation Mr. Sungenis just misrepresented, listen closely to what I actually said, in the fact that while the Lord is addressing Peter directly, he changes from direct address to the third person, this rock, when speaking of Peter's confession. He does not say "upon you, Peter, I will build my church," instead you have a clear distinction between Peter, the petros, and the

third person in, what? In address. He's not addressing this petra, he's addressing Peter, second person. I say to you, Peter, but upon this rock, something else, third person of address, I will build my church.

Notice something that has not been brought out by our Roman Catholic friends. This statement is followed by the promise to "at some time in the future, I will give," *doso* in the Greek is future, "I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter so what he binds on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever he looses on earth will be loosed in heaven." I emphasize this as a promise. The verb is future in tense, yet when we see this authority given in Matthew 18:18, it is given not to Peter alone or even primarily but to all the apostles, and that using the exact same language word for word regarding binding and loosing. If someone wishes to say that Peter receives the keys in distinction from the other apostles, and that's what Mr. Butler says in his own copyrighted materials that he was presenting to you as he was giving his presentation, if someone wants to say that, they are also forced to admit that the giving of these keys to Peter and Peter alone is never recorded for us anywhere in Scripture. A strange thing indeed for something supposedly so fundamental to the constitution of the very church itself.

Now it is very true that there are many Protestant interpreters who identify Peter as the rock in Matthew 16. For example, Dr. William Hendrickson follows this course as was cited to you, however, unfortunately again, it is not brought out as I think it would have to be brought out to be honest with these things, that all of these Protestant interpreters that say this are quick to reject any papal pretensions that are placed upon this passage. Dr. Hendrickson, who is cited in part not in full by Mr. Butler, in his commentary on page 645 presented three views that he said must be rejected. One view that is to be appreciated and the one that he takes himself, the second view presented that must be rejected is that, quote, "this passage proves that Peter was the first pope." He then quotes the same passage from Cardinal Gibbons' book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," and says as follows and this is a very exalted statement about Peter being the pope, "The passage does not support any bestowal of well-nigh absolute authority on a mere man or on his successors."

Similarly we find Dean A. identifying Peter as the rock but following this with the following statements, quote, "We may certainly exclaim with Bengel, 'All this may be said with safety for what has this to do with Rome?' Nothing can be further from any legitimate interpretation of his promise than the idea of a perpetual primacy in the successors of Peter. The very notion of succession is precluded by the form of the comparison which concerns the person and him only so far as it involves that direct promise. In its other and general sense, as applying to all those living stones, Peter's own expression for members of Christ's church, of whom the church should be built, it implies as Origen excellently comments on it saying that all this must be understood as said not only to Peter as in the letter of the Gospel, but to every one who is such as Peter here showed himself as the spirit of the Gospel teaches us."

Therefore the Protestants that are cited are all saying the same thing as Frederick ?? writing, they are emphasizing, quote, "the uniqueness, the historical once-for-allness of

Peter's commission as rock." The text does not say on this rock and on his successors I will build my church, solus Petros, Peter alone. To take this text literally is to honor Peter only. Peter was given the first place by Jesus as the one who first confessed Jesus Christ, the divine Son, and so Peter is made the first rock of the church for the church is built upon the foundation of the apostles like Peter and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone.

I want to comment just briefly on the use of Isaiah 22 and the key to the house of David to Peter himself in Matthew 16. Such an attempt and connection is logically necessary for the Roman position for there must be some effort found somewhere in Scripture to establish succession in this passage despite the fact that it simply isn't there. Yet upon what basis do we identify the keys and Mr. Butler went back and forth from key and keys never pointing out there's a difference between the two, the keys, plural, of the kingdom of heaven which are associated plainly with the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the New Testament with the key, singular, of the house of David which is messianic in nature. How do we connect those two we weren't told, and should we not instead accept the interpretation given by the Lord Jesus himself when he cites Isaiah 22:22 of himself in Revelation 3:7 where we read, "Unto the angel of the church of Philadelphia write, He who is holy, who is true, who has the key," key, singular, "of David, who opens and no one will shut and who shuts and no one opens says this." Jesus has, present tense, the key of David. He does not say that he gives this key to anyone else and it's very interesting to note that in the materials that Mr. Butler has written, he says, "Well, yes, Jesus has this key but who did he give it to before he passed off the earth? See Matthew 16:19." Wait a minute, can we put this in order here? This is being written to the church of Philadelphia, folks, there was no church in Philadelphia when Matthew 16 was written and when that was when the promise was made. Jesus says, "I am right now the one who holds this key," and that's long after Matthew 16. There's a real problem with anachronism in the arguments being presented by our friends across the way this evening.

Now John 21, I hope you're all keeping a deep seat in the saddle. John 21. You've heard it read to you, "Feed the sheep. Feed the sheep," so on and so forth, "Shepherd the sheep." Now we are going to be dealing with the church fathers in just a few minutes but I hope you don't mind my using Cyril of Alexandria as my interpretation of this passage because I agree with him. Cyril said, "If anyone asks for what cause, he asked Simon only though the other disciples were present and what he means by 'feed my lambs' and the like, means that St. Peter with the other disciples had already been chosen to the apostleship, but because meanwhile Peter had fallen from the great fear he had thrice denied the Lord, he now heals him that was sick and exacts a threefold confession in place of his triple denial, contrasting the former with the latter and compensating the fault with the correction."

Here we have the gracious Lord restoring the apostle who in his brash impetuosity had promised to follow him even to death and yet had denied him three times. The threefold question of Peter followed by the command to feed or shepherd Christ's sheep is restorative in nature. Nothing in the passage even begins to suggest to us that this means that the other apostles were not likewise commissioned to feed and pastor Christ's flock



on an equal base with Simon Peter. There is no indication that only Peter is told to shepherd God's flock, nor that all others who shepherd the flock do so derivatively from Peter's supremacy which is the Roman position. Indeed if such were the case, Paul seems to have been very ignorant of this doctrine for he instructed the Ephesian elders in Acts 20:28, "Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers. Be shepherds of the church of God which he bought with his own blood." Paul does not say as Peter is the chief shepherd, you act as under-shepherds of the flock of God. No, again, the only way that such an understanding can be found is if we take a much later development and read it back into the text as our Roman Catholic friends are forced to do. This passage in no way sets Peter apart as the prince of the apostles, instead it shows that he was in need of special pastoral care on the part of Jesus Christ.

Then Luke 22 was brought up, "Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat," and the Lord Jesus prays specifically for Simon. Now even after Jesus tells Peter that he's in trouble, he rationally says in verse 33 of the same passage, "Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death." To which the Lord replies that Peter will, in fact, deny him three times. Roman Catholics have cited this passage as pointing out yet once again the preeminence of Peter and some have even gone so far to say that the Lord's prayer for Peter's faith extends to Peter's successors and the bishops of Rome. Yet if there is any Petrine primacy here, it is Petrine primacy in the denial of Christ, not in being the vicar of Christ.

This passage like John 21, shows us that Peter was more in need of pastoral care by the Lord due to his impetuosity, nothing more. The Lord's prayer was fulfilled for even having denied Christ, Peter unlike Judas, went out and wept bitterly, but his faith did not fail completely and he was restored, humble but wiser. To take this as indicating Petrine primacy, however, is to go far beyond anything the text says and, again, if this is the type of basis that a dogma upon which you use the anathema is based, we have a real problem.

Now some have said that Peter is here set apart from the others by the phrase, "and when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers." Mr. Sungenis just told us, yes, *sterison* is used elsewhere, for example, in Acts 14:22 and 15:32 and many other places this term is used, and not only of Peter, by the way, those places where Paul confirms the churches. But he says if you're gonna do that, you have to have higher authority. Where did he get that from? I don't see it in the passage. Where does it say, "Those who confirm someone else must be of higher authority." I would like to find the lexical sources from which Mr. Sungenis derived that meaning of *sterison*. I would like to ask him to provide those things to us in his opportunity of responding to my comments.

Now in the few moments that I have left, Mr. Butler told us that in Matthew 23 we have the chair of Moses and in his printed materials he says that Christ passed the chair of Moses on to Peter. I would like to invite all of you to take your Bibles, to read Matthew 23 and see if you can find anywhere anything about the chair of Moses being passed on to anyone. In fact, I'd like to invite Mr. Butler to show us a single place where *cathedra* in the Greek is ever used of Peter at all. I'd like to see where this comes from. We were told that that is the case.

Much has been made of Acts 15. We were told that we are going to be demonstrated that one use of *sigao*, another use of *sigao* means this, that and the other thing. We haven't heard any of that, but in Acts 15, again I would invite you to take the time to get out your Bible, read it and see if Peter is a pope in Acts 15. Don't start with the assumption that he is, just read the Scriptures and ask yourself the question, "Is the man speaking starting at verse 7 through verse 11 the vicar of Christ on earth? Do the people hearing him see this man is the vicar of Christ on earth, the holy father, the one upon whom the church is built?" Ask yourself if that passage teaches this.

Peter speaks the truth. We are told that he got a revelation. Here he doesn't say that, he says, "You know that in the early days God made a choice among you that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." And he preaches the truth about the Gospel, that the Gentiles are not to be brought under the necessity of circumcision, but then after he speaks is the issue over? Would you derive that from any honest reading of the text? Verse 12 says, "And all the multitude kept silent and they were listening to Barnabas and Saul as they were relating what signs and wonders God had done through them among the Gentiles." "Paul, Paul, wait a minute, the vicar of Christ just spoke. You don't need to relate these signs and wonders. The case is settled. It's all over. We don't need this. Paul, you don't need to do that anymore." No, Paul confirms the truthfulness of what Peter has said. Peter is exactly right but for some reason Paul and Barnabas felt the need to get up and the whole assembly fell silent as they listened to what they were saying, and when they then fell silent, that is Paul and Barnabas, James gets up and I would like to point a few things out. A. I would like to ask my friends to show us anywhere else in Acts 15 where the speaker uses the imperative mode in the Greek, issues a command. James says, "Brethren, listen to me," imperative.

Then we were told that when James gives his decision and when he talks about "my judgment" in verse 19, well, that's my opinion. That's just my voice. You know, it doesn't mean anything more than just simply my voice. Verse 19 says, "Therefore it is my judgment that we do not trouble those who are turning to God among the Gentiles." *Ego krino*, I judge. Is that used of opinions? Yeah, it is. It is also used as the very judgment of God by the same author? Yeah, it is. Read it for yourself and judge and, again, remember these things, folks, if in every single one of these verses I can give you a perfectly logical, consistent and plausible alternate understanding, the Roman position fails. The Roman position is based upon this long line. Peter's the rock. Peter's given the keys. Nobody else is given the keys. This somehow has something to do with Isaiah 22. That has something to do with the bishop of Rome. Therefore there are successors. If you can challenge that line all the way along, think about what it means for Rome to say, "You are anathema if you reject this belief." Thank you very much.

Mr. Sungenis. My concluding remarks will be confined to rebutting what Mr. White has just said. In Galatians 2, he asked who was I to judge that Paul was just overreacting. That's exactly the point. In the context of Galatians 2, there is no divine judgment. God is not saying, "Paul, you're correct. Peter, you are wrong." Nor, "Paul, you are totally correct and, Peter, you are totally wrong." We must remember that this is written from

Paul's disposition. Paul was really concerned about people circumcising Gentiles, but let me reiterate that is not what Peter did. Peter just disfellowshipped himself from eating with Gentiles. That is not a major crime. That is not distorting or destroying the Gospel. Circumcising Gentiles is destroying the Gospel.

He talks about the Aramaic. We don't need the Aramaic. I don't even use the Aramaic in my arguments, I use the Greek. I was very demonstrative in pointing out the demonstrative taute te petra, this very rock. I don't know how much clearer it can be in Matthew 16. What else does Jesus have to say to us to get it through our heads? It is not the rock, it is not a rock, it is this rock I just talked about. Petros means rock. John 1:42, he changed his name from Simon to rock, the Aramaic Cephas. How much more information do we need?

He says that Peter speaks for all the apostles. Yes, on certain occasions but in this occasion in Matthew 16, he doesn't speak for all the apostles, as a matter of fact, their information is wrong. They don't know who he is. They say, "Some say you're this, some say you're that." Nobody speaks up. Peter gets the revelation, as I said before, from God that this is the Son of God.

He says that rock is the third person addressed. My friends, let me tell you again there is no such thing as a third person address for a noun. Rock is a noun. It's petra. Nouns do not have person address. They have declensions in Greek to signify what they represent in the context.

His argument about Chris Karagounis' book, his own professor at Fuller Theological Seminary says any argument of the caliber of Chris Karagounis is just prejudiced against the papacy of the Roman Catholic Church, and this is a Protestant scholar.

He says Matthew 16:19 uses the word doso in the future. Well, of course. Peter will be on sitting on the chair of Peter in the future. He will be restored from his fall and be the pope and he will continue throughout the centuries. It doesn't dilute the message that Jesus gave him. Remember, Jesus gave him the keys. He said, "Whatever you bind shall be bound." Listen to that. That's what he said to him. Don't get confused about future, perfect, and present in the Greek. That doesn't mean anything here. He will have it. If he doesn't have it now, he will have it in the future.

He says that, yes, William Hendrickson talks about Peter as the rock. He admits it. Congratulations, Mr. Hendrickson and you along with many other Protestant scholars, but he says, well, Mr. Hendrickson doesn't talk about succession, he doesn't believe in succession. I know. That's a Protestant problem. It took them 400 years to discover that Peter was the rock, I hope it doesn't take them another 400 years to discover the next truth that there is succession. And we never said that Matthew 16 talked about succession. All I said was Matthew 16 said Peter was the rock. He was given the keys to bind and to loose.

And Mr. White makes a big deal about the singular key and the plural keys, and he says, well, Jesus gave Peter the keys, plural, in Matthew 16 but it's singular in Isaiah 22 and it's singular with Jesus. Let's not get petty about these words. The singular is also used of Jesus. Revelation 1:18, it says, "I have the keys," plural, "of hell and death," and he says in singular, "I have the key of David." Jesus uses both singular and plural about his own authority so what's the big deal about singular and plural? Jesus uses both of them and he gives this to Peter, the keys. Many commentators say it's because he's opening and shutting. There's a significance to the plural keys here because he had the complete authority. It's as if there are two keys and Peter has both of them, not just one, because it may imply that somebody else may have a key. There's a lot of nuances here that we can't cover but I hope that that suffices.

He says that Paul does not, this is what he says, Paul does not say you are to go to Peter as the under-shepherd when Paul is talking to the elders. Another argument from silence. Just because he doesn't mention Peter the pope doesn't mean that Peter is not the pope. He's talking to the people in the specific church about their problem. It doesn't dilute Peter's authority in Jerusalem.

And he asked where did I get this higher authority idea of the word *sterison* in John 21? If you remember, that word was also used of Paul as they claim, when Paul says, "I strengthen the brethren too, I strengthen the churches." I get it right from the context of John 21. I don't have to be, you know, confused about the definition of *sterison*, the context helps us to find what its usage is in this passage. The usage is in the context of the apostles. They, we know, are an authority, are they not? Are they not the highest authority in the church? It says built on apostles and prophets.

Now if Peter is to strengthen them who have authority, how can he do it without greater authority? And he's not talking to James and John. He says, "James, you strengthen the brethren. John, you do it." These are part of the inner circle of apostles. He talks to Peter. Peter is mentioned over and over and over and over again in the New Testament. Jesus is speaking to him constantly. Peter speaks up for everyone. Can't we get it through our heads that there's something significant about this person?

And he says read, open up your Bibles and read Acts 15 and tell me if you think Peter is the pope. Well, from his understanding I don't see how you could understand Peter was the pope. I explained to you before there is a doctrinal issue at stake here in Acts 15:1. Look at verse 1, it says the Jews were coming down and wanted people to be circumcised to be saved. That is a problem. That is a doctrinal problem. Peter, no one else, stands up and says, "No, that will not be the case. They do not have to be circumcised," and uses God as his authority. "God told me and why do you test God?" How much clearer can it be that he's laying down a doctrinal proclamation?

Now he says that Paul and Barnabas get up and the discussion is not over. They get up and they talk about their miracles and all this stuff and the discussion is not over and James has to get up, as if Peter, you know, wasn't complete, he didn't really do his job. Come on, Mr. White. All they're doing is confirming exactly what Peter said and now

giving the stipulations that may be good for the church. That is the 4 Noahide laws that were mentioned, don't eat meat offered to idols just so these Jews won't be hurt. They're supporting Peter. Yeah, the discussion is not over because somebody wants to add something but it doesn't dilute Peter's authority. He already made the doctrinal proclamation no Gentiles are going to be circumcised and that still stands today. That has never been taken away but as we saw from my colleague, the pastoral concerns of James were diluted. They were taken away because they were not dogmatic proclamations.

Why would James stand up and speak? Because he's the bishop of Jerusalem, the council is taking place in Jerusalem. I hope he would have something to say. But you know, that's the only time that James says something in the New Testament. He's only mentioned four times and the other three are just in passing. This is the only time he says something and it's in support of his pope, Peter. He doesn't deny what Peter is saying.

In the Greek it says ego krino. Yes, it can be used in very divine senses. "I give a judgment," very firm judgment. It can also be used in a very weak sense. The word ego krino has a wide semantic range. We can't pin Acts 15 down and say, "Yes, it refers to James's judgment," as if he's making some doctrinal proclamation here. We have no way of verifying that from the use of this word. As a matter of fact, in many translations of the Bible, Goodspeed, Moffet, the New American Bible Society, all translate it as "this is my opinion." Now I'm not saying that they're correct either, we just don't know the semantic force of this word is but I'll give James every right to speak up. He has it but he's not denying what Peter is saying, he's just adding to it to help the church get along with the problems that they had.

Now as I said before, the problem with the exegesis that is presented by Mr. White is it touches on some things but it ignores the very things that we need to understand these passages. I wish I had time to go through more of them but I think you're getting a flavor for how they can distort the Scriptures with what they do.