

TOPIC --MARY

Part I--Introduction. The Importance of the study of Mary.

I. The Growth of the importance of Mary.

- A. In RC life. Marian year 1954. Marian Congresses as in Canada.
Consecration of nations to Mary. Story in Eternity child home from RC school.
"Next to my real M_other, I love you most M_other." Who is real? Mary.
People are made to bel we have not only Heavenly Father but Heavenly M_other also.
- B. In RC theology. Miegge 1 6-17. He says devotion to Mary as great in 20C as in 12-13th C which were centuries of Mariolatry.

II. The Reasons for the growth.

- A. Desire to reach masses. Best way is to present someone who can sympathize.
"There is the subdued and nostalgic adoration of the drowsy child that is forever in us, desirous of caresses and protection." Mary fulfills this in us.
Best way to reach is to present Mary who is so human.
- B. Desire for peace. We want peace. Ask X. Who has most influence on X? Mother.
So promoting Mary as mediatrix of man.
- C. Desire to make RC rel singular. Orthodox can agree with lots of Rⁿ but Mary draws the line. They appear to have something more than we; thus come into RC ch.

III. The Doctrinal Development.

Miegge p 21-22.

ions

IV. The Doctrinal Problem and ramifications Eternity Oct 55.

- A. The Heart of the Doctrine. Mother of God. Theotokos.
1st used in 431 during controversy against Nestorian heresy at Council of Ephesus. Nestorians against deity of X and scoffed that if X were God then Mary was mother of God. Thus phrase was sort of forced on orthodoxy.
But note it concerned controversy about X first and attention on Mary only later.

B. The ~~ramifications~~ ^{Ramifications} of the Doctrine.

1. Has led to doctrine of perpetual virginity.
2. Has led to doctrine of Immaculate Conception.

C. The Arguments for title M_other of God.

1. Jesus is truly man; so Mary truly mother.
2. Jesus is truly God; so Mary truly mother of God.

Objection by Prot: Mary only mother of human nature not of God.

Answer by RC (Sibbons). We don't say Mother of my body (and of course human parents don't create the soul tho they propagate). X is indivisible person and Mary mother of the Person Jesus X. p.167. Argument has grounds.

D. Arguments against title.

1. Historic. History has proved that when becomes habit to think of Mary as Mother of God this leads to Mariolatry. Leads (as it has) to further ideas: she ought to be without sin (immac conceptn); if so then body incorruptible and fitting she assumed to heaven (1950 dogma). If assumed, then Queen of heaven and worthy of every honor X is. Leads to anti-biblical doctrines.
Doesn't necessarily make title mother of God wrong but shows shouldn't become widely used.
2. Linguistic. Never used in Bible. Douay and Confraternity vss at Lk 1:43 tr Mother of my Lord. Not equivalent. If Mother of God then Mary would be related to eternal deity. If Lord then only to humanity--the person who came into being at the Incarnation.

Mary's relation not to eternal deity but to Theanthropic person.

3. Logic. Built on syllogism. Jesus is God, Mary mother of Jesus; therefore Mary mother of God.
Take step farther. God is trinity, Mary is Mother of God, therefore Mary is mother of trinity. Logic is inescapable, but concl wrong.
So with 1st syllogism.

Part II--Mary in the Gospels.

I. Events related to the Birth of Jesus.

Hope of women to be mother of Messiah. In Mary realized and thus impt.

One says Mary turning point of history of women.

A. The Genealogies.

Mt, Lk. Diff but not purpose to discuss whose they are. Idea that 1 Joe and 1 Mary not proposed till 1490.

1. Idea of subordination.

Seen in Mary's legal position in the genealogies.

a. Clear that Matt's is Joe's. Matt's intention was to show that Jesus as heir of Abr and David fulfilled promises made to them. Pedigree quite artificial but Matt has to stress that Joe was husband of Mary to show that as Joe recognized his wife's son xx in a legal sense his own Jesus was legally the heir of David.

b. Seen in Luke. He doesn't mention Mary. He avoids saying Jesus is natural son of Joe, but He also avoids resting Jesus' claims on Mary.

If Lk is genealogy of Mary nevertheless Jesus linked to grandfather Heli thru Mary but without mentioning her name. RC generally hold Mary's geneal. Jews said that genealogy of mother no genealogy at all.

2. Idea of exaltation.

Seen in mention of 4 women by Matt. Tamar, 1:3; Rahab and Ruth, 1:5; Bathsheba, 6. In the history of the royal family God accepted strangers and sinners.

B. The Annunciation.

Lk 1:28--highly favored. Charitoo. Only Eph 1:6 elsewhere. From analogy of vbs ending in oo, the form in Lk 1:28 must mean endowed with grace.

But no greater grace on her than on every believer today. Certainly doesn't make her the dispenser of grace.

RC from Gibbons, 175, links with fact that Mary free from sin herself.

Says she had more grace than apostles who followed. Uses 1 Cor 15:41 and makes Mary as glory of sun.

C. The visit to Elizabeth.

Gibbons 176. Mother of my Lord has been the basis for theotokos in later years. Reverence is given to X and thru Mary of necessity.

RC say that they are only Ch which fulfills Mary's prediction that generations will call her blessed. RC's earn the approval of heaven by fulfilling this prophecy of the HS. True that maybe Protestants could praise Mary a little more as they praise Rachel or Rebecca or Ruth or Esther.

Read Gibbons defense of Mary on 181-2. This is abuse and reason why Protestants don't revere her more, I suppose. Maybe this is one case where we have to let the abuse of a truth govern our use of it.

II. Mary's Public Encounters with Jesus.

A. Age 12.

Main point is that Jesus made it clear to Mary that when it concerned Father's business there was to be no interference from her. Yet time had not come when He would be mainly occupied with Father's business so we read that He was subject to parents after that time.

B. Jn 2. Cana of Galilee.

Joe prob dead. Tradition says in X's 18th yr. when Joe lll. "What to me and thee woman." Woman address of respect clearly but Ti emoi kai soi whenever used "marks some divergence between the thots and ways of the persons so brot together" BFW. X's remark that hr not yet come shows that He considered Mary's request untimely.

Miegge "If one would draw a general principle from this incident it would be that Jesus does not welcome His mother's interference in His messianic work, and it does not hold much to indicate an enhanced value in Mary's intercession even if Jesus in the last analysis does accede to her wish." 26.

C. Mk 3:31-35; Mt 12:46-50; Lk 8:19-21.

Mary present v 31. Principle illustrated is that supernatural relations transcend natural ones. Story prob preserved by early ch to show that His own family did not receive Him, but this of course excludes Mary who did understand. Prob she was there merely as member of the family which now if Joe dead would be run by the brothers. Maybe she really tempered the situation and hatred of brothers and X's remarks directed twd brothers more than toward her.

D. On Cross. Jn 19:26-7.

Same address woman so not dishonorable.

1. Shows Mary's outstanding composure when most Orientals and Jews would be wailing (cf Acts 9).
2. Shows X doesn't throw overboard completely natl relationships and responsibilities.

EII. Other encounters.

A. RC's say "It is not improbable that Jesus visited His Blessed Mother repeatedly during the 40 days after His resurrection" Maas Cahh Ency. Nothing in records.

B. Acts 1:14 only other recorded appearance.

1. Not a source of information on this occasion.
2. Not a fount of authority.
3. Not at all a leader of the group.
4. Not worshipped or even venerated.

Part III--Eternal Virginity of Mary (Miegge)

I. The Doctrine Stated. Mary only gave birth to Jesus and none other.

Expressly stated that she was a virgin till birth of X, Lk 1:26-7 and RC says always thereafter too.

"The Canon of the Mass, which is very probably of Apostolic antiquity, speaks of her as the 'glorious ever Virgin,' and in this sentiment all Catholic tradition concurs." Gibbons, 168.

II. The History of the Doctrine.

A. Apostolic Age. Little mention of Mary, 1st half of 2nd century. Fathers and Apologists never mention her.

B. Effect of gnostic teaching. Gnostics were docetic and denied reality of body of X (dokei, seems only He had a body). Reaction was to emphasize reality of body and points of emphasis were Mary and Pilate. Born and crucified with real body.

C. African Fathers.

1. Clement Alex hesitatingly proposed idea of perpetual virginity. He always attempted to unite gnostic or philosophic ideas with Xnty.
2. Origen followed and further tried to avoid difficulty of brothers of Lord by saying they were by an earlier marriage of Joseph.
3. Tertullian stressed virgin birth more and not perpetual virginity. p. 39-40.

D. 4th Century.

Here arose idea of perpetual virginity. Came not from theology or piety but along with rise of asceticism. Mary became greatest example of asceticism. Theology born of idea of chivalry. Jerome held.

Pseudo-Matt taught perpetual virginity. read pp47-8.

In 5th c this and other pseudo documents circulated freely and weren't considered so unorthodox as earlier. And most of RC teaching concn Mary comes from these.

III. The Biblical Appeal. Gibbons, 169.

A. Matt 1:25. Till. He says till does not imply other children. "When a thing is said not to have occurred until another event had happened, it does not necessarily follow that it did occur after that event took place."

Proof: Gen 8:7--raven never returned. 1 Kg 15:35--"id not see him at all.

Psa 109. X does not cease to sit at right hand of God after enemies are subdued. True but also true till implied event did occur, Mt 13:33. Heos used as Gen 8.

B. Title firstborn. Does not imply other children.

Title given to Jewish child whether there were other children or not.

C. Mention of brothers of X. Mt 12:46; 13:55-6.

RC says James and Joseph sons of Mary wife of Cleopas, Jn 19:25.

She was sister of Virgin so really cousins of Jesus. To call cousins brothers OK bec Gen 13:8.

However, 1 major flaw. Brothers of Jesus did not believe in Him, Jn 7:5.

James son of Cleopas and Mary was disciple and followed X.

Also why would Virgin Mary have sister named Mary, in same family don't do that.

See Miegge p 42 fnnt on Jn 19:25.

Part IV--Immaculate Conception of Mary

- I. Statement of the doctrine. Soul of Mary, unlike rest of children of Adam, was never subject to sin, even in 1st moment of its infusion into the body. Mary was redeemed "but in a more sublime manner," Gibbons, 171.
"Mary is as much indebted to the precious blood of Jesus for having been preserved as we are for having been cleansed from original sin."

II. Foundation of the Doctrine.

Ligget Th.M. 54.

A. IN Scripture.

1. Gen 3:14-15. RC interpret she shall crush ~~xxx~~ thy head and thou shalt bruise her heel. Vulgate has feminine but neither Heb nor LXX--both masc. Rhle-Preuss admit this but argue that bec enmity put bet Satan and woman that Mary is involved with X in this conflict.
And then conclude that she couldn't triumph unless free from original sin.
2. Lk 1:28,42. Mary had highest form of grace and thus immaculate.
3. Other Script. Some use allegorically, Prov 8:22; Song Sol 2:2; 1 Cor 15:47. Fable Preuss say "The dogma of the Imm Con is not expressly enunciated in Sacred Script." VI,42. Quite an admission.

B. In Tradition.

Remember that equal with Script. PP "but the lack of Scrip evidence can be abundantly supplied from the writings of the Fathers." VI,43.

1. ~~From~~ To 1100 A.D. No definite idea of Immac Conc.
2 ideas prevailed, Mary's transcendent purity and contrast bet Mary and Eve as compared with X and Adam (and as X sinless so Mary too).
PP-dogma may be logically deduced from Patristic conception of Mary as 2nd Eve. Augustine's words not clear. He made Mary an exception but not clear statement of Imm Conc. PP take it so, tho admit Aug never formally drew this conclusion.
2. 12th C onward. At this time a feast of Imm Con held in S. France honoring miraculous birth of Mary and her exemption from sin. Bernard of Clairvaux opposed, tho near teaching.
Thomas Aquinas "Mary immune both from original sin and from actual sin."
But Thomas further said that Mary was conceived in sin tho not born with it. Mary was sanctified in the womb after conception and before birth.
Otherwise X not Savior of all.

III. The Dogma.

Steps leading up to proclamation on Dec 8, 1854. by Pius IX.

Approval to feast given in 1471-84.

Approval to invoking Mary under title of Imm Conc 1484-92

Council of Trent, 1545-63 did not want Mary included in discussion concn original sin.
Pope Paul V 1605-21 forbade anything contrary to teaching of Imm Con to be said in public.

Pope Gregory XV, 1621-23 same for anything said in private.

Pope Alex VII, 1655-67 said conception of Mary was legitimate object of devotion.
Decree of dogma says that Imm Conc means that Mary "in the first instant of her conception by a unique grace and privilege of the omnipotent God and in consideration of the merits of XJ the Savior of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original sin..."

Part V--The Assumption

I. The Apocryphal Accounts concerning the death of Mary. Miegge pp86-90.

II. The Related Doctrines to the doctrine of Assumption.

A. Divine Maternity.

Mother of God given at Council of Eph 431. Link to assumptn is idea that since her body bore His, hers would naturally be kept from corruption.

So reasoned Andrew of Crete, 660-740 and Jn of Damascus, d 749, who taught not assumptn but incorruption. They said this was fitting the dignity of Mother of God.

B. Immaculate Conception. Idea helped assumptn. Reasoning was: Mary's condition as without sin points way to idea that her body would not see corruption which points way to idea that her body belonged in heaven. Incorruption was 1st idea then assumptn. When dogma proclaimed by Pius XII he said "These 2 privileges (immac conceptn and assumption) are most closely bound to one another."

C. Infallibility. Proclaimed in 1870 not without a lot of discussion. There was internal party friction over this. But after proclaimed it gave confirmation to immac conceptn 1874 and that in turn almost made assumptn a foregone conclusion.

III. Scriptural evidence adduced.

RC's divided over this. Aquinas said no Script evidence. Others cite "implicit" evidence.

A. Gen 3:15. Prophecy of man's victory over sin. Since X inseparable from Mary Mary is included in this promise too and thus she will also have victory over death.

B. Luke 1:28,42. Full of grace and blessed among women and thus she could not be subject to death.

C. Rev 12. Mary is woman and she taken up into heaven. In Rev acc to some RC interp the taking up is not taking up of man child but flight of woman into desert and her preservation for a season. Never suggested before 5th c and even then and now held with reservations. Note that woman's sojourn in desert is limited as to time.

IV. Evidence from "Appropriateness" of doctrine.

A. Related to Person of X.

1. X's glory would not have been complete if He had left body of His Mother to see corruption.
2. His filial devotion would not have allowed that.
3. His past favors to her (perpetual virginity) make us bel He would also do this.

B. Related to Mary.

1. Her blood relationship with X demands this.
2. Her personal relationships with X demand.
3. Her immunity from sin demands.
4. None of her relics have been found so must have been assumed.
5. Others were granted this privilege or will be, Mt 27:51-53; 1 Cor 15:51ff so surely Mary would be.

K.

C. Related to men.

Assumptn of Mary promotes esteem of her and faith in her and faith in our own future resurrection.

Concl. These reasons may be fine and may be edifying, but do they est her res. as a fact. Either it is a fact she arose or it is not. If it is not a fact then all arguments of appropriateness have no importance.

What about the silence of Scrip concern her death. RC's essay it indicates that she was assumed and did not die.

Actually it may just as well indicate that she merely passed from prominence in ch and died a natural death in a lowly manner.

Her passing out of picture in record of Acts argues for this.

Actually when the Bull proclaiming the dogma in 1950 was read it only contained Script references in passing and without using as support, it only referred to tradition as early as 7th c and did not base dogma on either Script or tradition.

Real foundation of dogma acc to the Bull is the theological suitability of the doctrine.

Part VI--Mary, Mediator and Redemptress.

I. Mediator.

A. Background. Historical.

1. Parallel bet Eve and Mary. Instituted by Irenaeus and Justin Martyr
2. Idea of special value in intercession of martyrs which began at end of 2nd c. Entered the ch unnoticed from idea of unity of ch militant and ch triumphant.
3. Mary is associated with martyrs in first place.
4. Then prayers to Mary and saints.

B. Theological background.

1. Idea of mediator necessary to be human and divine stated by Irenaeus.
2. Then Bernard said X all divine and Mary all human in this idea of mediator.
3. Middle Ages idea developed into picture of X as executioner with axe raised, and lo, the sweet Mary lays her gentle hand on the blade so that it should not come down on the head of the guilty one.
4. Then Mary made practically omnipotent in her service for sinners.

C. Elements in the doctrine.

1. There is nothing Mary cannot do for the sinner in persuading X.
2. Her intercession is naturally efficacious after death.
3. Unlimited trust is to be put in Mary. To find Mary is to find grace. Read Miegge 148.
4. Her intercession is necessary for our salvation. All graces God dispenses pass thru Mary.
5. Her influence exceeds that of angels, patriarchs, prophets. Gibbons 187-89. cf story in Miegge 94. Read both.

II. Co-Redemptress.

A. History.

Extends as far back as 12 th C. Moving very rapidly toward it today. However, RC theologians divided on ques and esp on how much Mary involved in redemptn. Present status: Agree that Mary has some part in sal. She is not idle. What part is ques. (1) As mother of Redeemer she had passive part. (2) All agree s he collaborates with X in distribution of graces He acquired by Himself on Calvary. (3) Don't agree on whether or not Mary also acquired some merits and graces in herself.

B. Scriptural citations.

1. Gen 3:15 again.
 2. Luke 1:26-39 again.
 3. Jn 19:25-27. Roschini says Mary at foot of cross "impelled by the duty of offering her Son for the sal of the world to the extent that it depended on her just as she had brot Him to the light for its sal, to unite her sacrifice to that of her Son." She stood "like a priest offering his sacrifice to God for all humanity." When Jesus said Behold thy mother He was declaring "the spiritual motherhood of the Blessed Virgin and therefore her immediate cooperation in the objective redemptn." "She shows herself to be the immediate cooperator in the work of redemption, that is, as true and proper co-redemptress."
- If these things are being said today, how long will it be before this is declared as a dogma?

11-11-11

TOPIC --DOCTRINE OF INFALLIBILITY (Pickering, 52)

Part I--

K. History of the Doctrine

1. Papacy during 1st 13⁹ centuries.

A. From Apostolic era to Leo Great.

1. NT says nothing about papal system.
2. Authority of bishops began to rise in 2nd century.
1st in Rome who tried to act as a Pope was Victor I, 193-202. Tried to settle for whole church question of celebrating Easter. Upbraided by other bishops so evident he not recognized as having authority over whole ch.
3. Callistus bishop of Rome 217-222. Papal supremacy began to flourish under him.
4. Cyprian held that Peter was a bishop of Rome and held to the supremacy of Roman see. Strong supporter of bishops but not of a Pope.
5. Siricius bishop of Rome from 384-398 1st to use word papa in title.
6. Leo Great 440-461 said "St. Peter has spoken thru Leo."
7. Gregory VII said every Pope if lawfully elected is holy and infallible.
8. In 13th C more and more claims made.

B. From 14th C to 1870.

1. Boniface VIII said ch had 1 head and vicar of X was Peter and his successors.
2. Rival popes. Around 1400 when Popes went to France in exile. When returned to Rome, French cardinals elected rival Pope. In Rome Urban VI, in France, Clement VII. Schism not ended till 1417 with election of Martin V.
3. Characteristic of middle ages was increasing outspokenness for infallibility.
4. Jansen and followers against infallibility. Papal bull broke their power and prepared way for proclamation of infallibility.
5. Infallibility proclaimed July 1870 by Pius IX.

II. Factors in rise of Papacy~~xx~~ Supremacy.

1. Geographical, political, economic supremacy of city of Rome.
People naturally looked to Rome and ch did too for settling of controversies.
2. Rise of Mohammedanism in East crippled eastern ch and strengthened western.
3. Ability of bishop of Rome to grant favors made him sought after and recognized as Pope.
4. Sending out of official representatives to foreign govts.
5. Founding of religious bodies in ch whose existence depended on Pope, not bishops.
6. The Index Expurgatorius which condemned all books that might have been enlightening.
7. Jesuits who have always been strong papalists. They are bound by a special vow to the Pope. Decree of 1870 was crowning achievement of Jesuits.

Part II--The Doctrine of Infallibility

1. What is not involved in Infallibility

What RC's do not mean by infallibility.

- A. Does not mean priests of RC are infallible. He is almost everything else.
Can dispense God's grace, can consecrate Host, provide regeneration thru baptism, administer grace to dying, but not infallible.
- B. Vatican council not infallible. Morany council.
- C. Occupant of chair of Peter infallible when speaking as supreme teaching of ch.
 1. Not infallible in secular matters.
 2. Pope not sinless. Infallibility does not require holiness of life.
 3. As a private teacher Pope may make mistakes, but not when speaking ex cathedra.

Notes: Gibbons argues for infallibility in practical layman way from ch, not from individual. Says no one says 1st c ch fallible, and its successors not either. As the Pope is the ch, the ch is infallible, but Gibbons argues from ch corporate, 68ff.

II. What is involved in Infallibility

Pope is when speaking ex cathedra. What does this mean?

A. Meaning of ex cathedra.

1. When Pope is carrying out his office as Supreme Teacher of all Ans.
2. When defining a doctrine of faith and morals
3. In view of his supreme apostolic authority
4. When speaking to the universal ch
5. When making mandatory the doctrine he is defining.

B. Meaning of infallibility

1. Preserved from all error and all possibility of error
2. Means conclusion only is infallible. Could be built on fallible premises but infallible concl or decree is independent of fallible arguments on which it may be based.
3. Includes realms of faith and morals but not necessarily doctrines which only need explaining on basis of former revelation, of Assumption which was proclaimed ex cathedra without any attempt to justify it from Script.

C. Organs of infallibility.

1. Bishops in communion with Pope
2. Ecumenical councils called and controlled by Pope
3. Pope himself alone.

But all depend on Pope. Can be no infallible organ which is independent of or in opposition to the Pope.

III. The RC logic behind infallibility.

- A. X when He est His rel on earth must have left some means by which any seeking person could ascertain it.
- B. This means must be certain and never fail.
- C. This means must be universal so that it is adaptable over all the earth.
- D. This means is the RC ch. true ch.
- E. The true ch is the RC by tests of sanctity, catholicity, apostolicity, perpetuity.

IV. The Logical Case against infallibility.

- A. It is incompatible with Romanist theory of development of doctrine. X gave germs and ordained that ch should go on developing under guidance of HS. If that is so, then why, e.g., didn't ch recognize doctrine of infallibility before 1870. Not revealed yet, RC ans. But if germs there why could not an infallible ch recognize it. The preceding generations must have been fallible. True there is a developmt of doctrine but e.g. as premil developed we say that Calvin was wrong. As RC doctrine of infallibility developed we have to say that wrong before it was announced.
- B. Fallible logic must support infallibility. Not the fallible premises bec RC say God gives special protection to ch and we admit fallible men used in inspiration. But related to Protestant principle of private judgment. An individual must decide for himself which is the infallible ch. Having decided by using principle of private judgment then he can accept the infallible teachings of that ch. But suppose his logic is fallible in deciding and he make s wrong decision? RC answer is "Once we come to bd in and rely upon authority we can afford to overlook the means by which we were brot to accept it."

Part III--The Claim of the Primacy of Peter and the Roman See

I. X Appointed Peter the 1st Pope.

A. Script Argument. Almost all writers use same. No difficulty getting agreement on texts. In this claim Script is all important. Can't prove this one with tradition.

1. Mt 16:17-19. Rock is Peter and keys give Peter and successors judicial and legislative authority over church. To thee keys given, not to her, i.e. church.

Thou art Petros and upon Petra. RC's point out that Aramaic word for rock is same in both bases. But inspired text is in Greek not Aramaic. Rock is foundation and Peter understood it to be X, 1 Peter 2:4,6-8, cf 1 Cor 3:11, Eph 2:20.

However, the vs does give a primacy to Peter, yet P had same, 2 Cor 12:11.

Keys of kingdom--just as it is a mistake to make Petros and petra same, so to make church and kingdom of heaven. Keys of kingdom, not church nor heaven. Passage does not give Peter power over souls of men. Same power given to all disciples, Mt 18:15-18.

2. Lk 22:32. Some RC admit this is a very personal word to a disciple in trouble and don't use this for primacy. Note Greek pl--desired to have you pl. Prayed for you sins. When converted Peter to strengthen his brethren. This is duty of all ministers, for same word used Acts 14:22; 15:32,41; 18:23; Rom 1:11; 2 Cor 11:28.

3. John 21:15-18. RC claim Peter rec'd his institution here as Papal head of church. This is actual installment into office. Lambs are laymen and sheep are clergy. Pope is over both and all. But is this a peculiar honor conferred on Peter? No, cf Acts 20:28. Did Peter claim supremacy, No, 1 Pet 5:12.

B. Arg from Tradition.

Irenaeus, 175, and his support of bishops. Chrysostom later, etc etc.

But can easily cite fathers who taught that the Rock was X or faith in X as Origen, Hilary, Augustine, etc.

II. Peter Executed the Office of chief apostle and Pope.

A. Argument.

1. His preeminence among lists of apostles, Mt 10:2-4; Mk 3:16-19; Lk 6:13+16; Acts 1:13. Matt uses proton in his list. We agree he had a unique position and standing among apostles but that's far from clothing him with infallibility as vicar of X.

2. Preeminence in choosing Judas' successor. Don't argue as some Protestants that Peter was out of will of God here and P was rightful 12th. Better simply point out that Peter was evidently only a chairman because certainly the appointment was not by 1 man. Peter didn't even give his papal blessing.

B. Answer.

Just continue in the account in Acts.

1. Note Acts 15:1-5. James handed down the decrees. Some RC's point out that Peter spoke 1st and then pass on.

2. Note Gal, 2:11-14.

3. Note 1 Cor 1:11-12.

III. Peter was 1st bishop of Rome.

A. Evidence of Tradition.

1. Clement of Rome 95 says Peter martyred there.

2. Irenaeus gives P and Peter as founders of Roman church.

3. Dionysius affirms Peter founded.

4. Tertullian, Clem Alex Origen testify to Peter's being in Rome, not founding.

RC's sometimes say (tho RC Ency is doubtful) that Peter there from 42 to 68.

Eusebius says this and Jerome based on Eusebius. Pickering argues this can't be true therefore Peter was never in Rome. Doesn't follow.

B. Evidence of Scripture. Remember informed RC Ecgy only claims Peter died in Rome and says can't know how long etc. Don't argue against straw man of 25 yr residence as Pickering.

1. Peter in Jerus when P went 1st time, Acts 9:26, Gal 2.
 2. Peter departed somewhere Acts 12:17. Some say he went to Rome then but not necessary.
 3. Peter at Jerus council in 51. and in Antioch right after, Gal 2:11ff.
 4. Peter travelled as a missionary with his wife, 1 Cor 9:5.
 5. Was in Babylon in 1 Pet 5:13 about 67.
 6. Peter not mentioned in Romans 58 or 2 Tim 67. or in 1st imprisonment epistles.
- If Peter in Rome would have to be 59-65 or so. Wouldn't have to be mentioned in P's prison epis. If Babylon in 1 Pet means Rome then very strong case. If not, still case.

Note: Admitting Peter was in Rome and had something to do with the Roman church does not admit he was Pope.

C. Meaning of Evidence.

See note above. Certainly neither tradition or Script gives support to idea he was bishop.

1. Tradition--Clement of Rome doesn't say he was bishop.

Other testimony only says he was 1 of founders.

Probably didn't have bishops till middle of 2nd c.

- B. Script. If bishop why didn't P mention in prison epist. Peter must have been there by that time.

IV. The Popes today are the successors of Peter.

A. The Issue. RC dogma today depends not on even whether or not Peter 1st Pope. Depends on whether Peter passed on power. Depends on succession.

B. The Proofs.

1. No Scriptural proof. RC say about Mt 16;18 that if gates of hell would not prevail against ch then ch must have an infallible teacher and that is Pope. But logic (and twisted at that).

2. History bears out fact that apostolic succession not really prominent thot in ch till Cyprian.

History records 3 rival popes and council nullified all their appts and elected Pope Martin V as true Pope. But all the cardinals who created this Pope had no right to vote bec they had been created by an illegitimate Pope.

Cf Geo Salmon, the Infallibility of the Ch. Good and clever attack on Infallibility.

3. RC Logic. "Whatever official prerogatives were conferred on P eter were not to cease at his death, but were t o be handed down to his successors from generation to generation." Gibbons, 108. Illus. Constitutional powers given to Washington have devolved on the present incumbent of the Presidential chair. But that's bec of continuing constitution, and RC can t say Pope today has powers bec of continuing Bible. Do not claim for Pope today powers of inspiration or miracles.