

Apostolic Authority – Do we really need a Pope?

Many will dispute the concept of apostolic succession. The idea of a structured earthly church, which was established by Jesus, is foreign to some sections of the Christian community. While nobody will deny that there is a Pope, the authority of the papacy is constantly under attack. From misunderstandings about infallibility, to arguments that Peter was not the first bishop of Rome, issues about the papacy have traveled down through time and history to our time and our Pope, Benedict XVI.

Contrary to common assumptions Scripture is firm in its evidence for a papacy. No matter the issue or argument, the underlying question of papal authority is clearly established in Scripture, and is easily traced historically.

Question 1. Where in the bible is there proof of a papacy?

The best place to start is with Matthew 16:18. Here Jesus confirms Peter as the first pope, after Peter's astounding, Holy Spirit inspired, profession of faith that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Matthew 16:18: "And so I say to you, you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of the netherworld shall not prevail against it."

Catholics contend that the "rock" is Peter himself. Jesus changes Simon's name to Peter, which means "rock". Our Lord says this rock will be God's way of preserving the Church from corruption until the end of time (See appendix 1 for a more comprehensive account of petrine scripture). This is not the first time in the bible that our Lord changed a person's name. The man of faith Abram became Abraham, the "father of a host of nations". Every time a name is changed it is a sign of great significance.

Question 2. The "rock" of scripture is always Jesus. On top of that, in Greek, the word Peter is *Petros* and means 'small stone' while the word for "rock" is *petra* and means 'massive rock'. So, Jesus was saying that he would build his church on the massive rock of faith (as shown by Peter in his profession), not on the small stone of Peter the man.

While this may sound convincing, we must always remember that Jesus and his disciples spoke Aramaic and in this language there is no distinction when it comes to the word "rock". Kepha is the word that Jesus would have used and he would have used it to name Peter and speak of building His church on the same kepha. The Greek anomaly only shows up because *petra* is a feminine noun and *petros* is a masculine noun. Making it necessary to use *Petros* when writing the account no matter what Jesus spoke.

This interpretation of “rock” can be traced back to the earliest of Church Fathers writings (Tertullian d.c. 230). Of course Jesus did not stop with naming Peter as the foundation of the church in the very next verse Peter is given an awesome gift.

Matthew 16:19: “I will give you the keys to the kingdom of heaven. Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

Question 3. Even if an authority was given to the first apostles it was given to them alone. It does not extend to what has become the Roman Catholic Church of today.

This statement can take many forms, but comes down to a questioning of the succession of the authority that is so clearly given here in Matthew 16:19. Since we have a clear historical line of succession there are no teeth to this argument. The question can only lie in what authority was given to Peter.

In the Hebrew mind the image of “keys” carried with it administrative authority and ecclesiastical discipline. The “keys” brought with them a clear power that was given to Peter and Peter alone. The Hebrew scholar of the day would find it hard not to make the quick reference to Isaiah 22:20-22.

Isaiah 22:20-22: On that day I will summon my servant Eliakim, son of Hilkiah; I will clothe him with your robe, and gird him with your sash, and give over to him your authority. He shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah.

I will place the key of the House of David on his shoulder; when he opens, no one shall shut, when he shuts, no one shall open.

The “opening” and “shutting” are clear allusions to jurisdictional power. This was a power that no one but the king could override. The most literal example of this, in the time of Jesus, was the office of the prime minister and his power to deny or allow entry into the palace and access to the king. This office had long been established, going back to the “vizier” of Egypt. The very seat held by Joseph (of Genesis). A seat used to bring salvation to the world (from the famine) and to Gods people (Israel). One can conclude, from Old Testament usage and the culture of the hearers, that the phrase “keys of the kingdom of Heaven” must have great significance for Peter and the papacy.

Binding and loosing, translated at the time, would be; “to forbid” and “to permit” respectively. Jesus was giving to Peter the ability to formulate Christian doctrine for the universal church and to require allegiance to it. As we see in Matthew 18:17-18 and again in John 20:23 this responsibility came to Peter first and then to the rest of the Apostles. Here they were given the duties to hear confessions, impose penance, grant indulgences and absolution. With this power

came the responsibility to condemn heresies that were opposed to true doctrine. Matthew 18 refers particularly to discipline and excommunication in local jurisdictions.

In the Old Testament God established His Covenant with the nation of Israel. He provided for a living, continuing authority in the Mosaic priesthood. This authority did not end when the Scripture was written; rather, it continued as the safeguard and authentic interpreter of Sacred Scripture.

When Christ established His Church, He followed the same pattern (makes sensetrue God from true God.....). He set up a living, continuing authority to teach, govern, and sanctify in his name. This living authority is called “Apostolic” because it began with the Apostles, but like the old Covenant this new Covenant was meant to be passed down. The authority is to be used to interpret the Revelation of Jesus. It is by that authority that the early church: formed doctrine, taught the faith and established the canon of scripture. It is by that same authority that today’s church: defines doctrine, defends the faith and teaches on the moral issues of our time.

There can be no dispute that the “keys” given to Peter were the Authority of Jesus here on Earth. We call the Pope the Vicar of Christ, this is because Jesus has given to Peter (and thus to his successors) the “Keys” of his own authority. This authority is shown plainly in Revelation 3:7, as Christ describes Himself.

Revelation 3:7: “...the holy one, the true one, who has the key of David, who opens and no one shall shut, who shuts and no one opens.”

The question of authority being given is not hard to prove. After showing the clear scripture, the question must be asked back, how could Jesus *not* have intended for this authority be passed on? If the early church needed an authoritative leader, we, separated by so much time and so many efforts to corrupt true teaching, need it even more.

Question 4 I can agree with you on the authority of Holy Scripture, and that it was given to the Church to be interpreted and used as a source of moral law, but the idea that any one man, or one church, on this earth is the arbiter of that truth in an infallible way is absurd.

This statement is tricky; at first one might think that there was common ground. The problem is that the average non-Catholic uses words differently. “Holy Scripture” excludes the seven books of the Old Testament removed by the first “Reformers”. The “church” is not an organized visible church established by Jesus, but a nebulous group of believers that follow the teachings of Jesus as found in their bible. “Interpretation” of this bible is personal. While denying the primacy of Peter and his successors, they lift up primacy of the individual. This has led to a fracturing of the protestant movement along every conceivable doctrinal line (See appendix 2). The fragmentation of protestant denominations is one of the greatest evidences of a need for a pope and a teaching magisterium.

Of course this then leads to one of the most misunderstood doctrines of our Catholic faith; Infallibility.

The ecumenical First Vatican Council, in 1870, defined once and for all the dogma of papal infallibility as follows:

We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, is, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, irreformable.¹

The issue was fleshed out and further defined by Vatican II:

Although the individual bishops do not enjoy the prerogative of infallibility, they can nevertheless proclaim Christ's doctrine infallibly. This is so, even when they are dispersed around the world, provided that while maintaining the bond of unity among themselves and with Peter's successor, and while teaching authentically on a matter of faith or morals, they concur in a single viewpoint as the one which must be held conclusively. This authority is even more clearly verified when, gathered together in an ecumenical council, they are teachers and judges of faith and morals for the universal Church. Their definitions must then be adhered to with the submission of faith.

Infallibility belongs in a special way to the Pope as the head of the bishops (Mt 16:17-19; Jn 21:15-17) and is something he

enjoys in virtue of his office, as the supreme shepherd and teacher of all the faithful, who confirms his brethren in their faith, he proclaims by a definitive act some doctrine of faith or morals. Therefore his definitions, of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are justly held irreformable, for they are pronounced with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, an assistance promised to him in blessed Peter.²

1. In *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees* (Rockford, Illinois: TAN Books, 1977), 256. (Documents on Councils of Trent and Vatican I, plus Decree on the Immaculate Conception and the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pope Pius IX) See also CCC, pars. 891, 2035; Hardon, CC 224-233; Harden PCD, 194-195. For conciliar infallibility, see CCC, pars. 891-892, 2035.
2. *Lumen Gentium*, 25. Keating, Karl; *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*, 1998 Ignatius Press, San Francisco. p 216

Question 5 Well you just proved it yourself, papal infallibility is nothing more than another made up doctrine to increase the power and influence of the leaders of the Church. That is one of the biggest problems with the Catholic Church; they seem to just make sweeping edicts about the faith even up until 1870 if we use your example. If infallibility was always true then why didn't the church define it until 1870?

This question is one of the most common attacks on the Catholic Church. The claim that things are "added" or "made up" shows a lack of understanding when it come to the unfolding of doctrine over time. The misconception, be it intentional or from ignorance, comes from the disconnect that most non-Catholics have with Christian historical precedent and a general lack of theological instruction.

The doctrine of infallibility has developed over time, but by no means sprang out of nowhere in 1870. This doctrine is implicit in several Scriptural texts. Let us look first at Luke 22:31-32.

Luke 22:31-32: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has demanded to sift all of you like wheat, but I have prayed that your own faith may not fail; and once you have turned back, you must strengthen your brothers."

This scripture occurs just before Jesus is taken from the Apostles and prior to Peter being told that he will deny Jesus three times. Jesus states that Satan has demanded to sift all the apostles like wheat, and in response, Jesus has prayed, *not for everybody*, for Peter. In turn, after he has turned back from his denial, Peter is to strengthen his brothers. What a fabulous thing it is to be a part of Jesus' prayer for Peter. If there is no papacy, or there is no successor to Peter, then there is nobody to strengthen the brotherhood of Christianity as Jesus set forth. We see the "turning back" required of Peter in John 21:15-17.

John 21:15-17: When they had finished breakfast, Jesus said to Simon Peter, "Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these?" He said to him, "Yes, Lord, you know that I love you." He said to him, "Feed my lambs." He then said to him a second time, "Simon, son of John, do you love me?" He said to him, "Yes, Lord, you know that I love you." He said to him, "Tend my sheep." He said to him the third time, "Simon, son of John, do you love me?" Peter was distressed that he had said to him a third time, "Do you love me?" and he said to him, "Lord, you know everything; you know that I love you." (Jesus) said to him, "Feed my sheep."

Infallibility is, put simply, a supernatural gift by which, through the power of the Holy Spirit, the recipient is shielded from all error in matters of faith and moral teachings. It is very clear in Luke with the words "that your own faith may not fail". It is implied in the command to confirm his brethren. It is supposed in the very failure of Satan's attempts to destroy the Church. It is ratified in Jesus' three-fold affirmation of Peter to: Feed, Tend and Feed His sheep.

The Greek word for “tend” in Jn 21:16 is the same word applied to Jesus in Revelation 7:17 translated; shepherd.

Revelation 7:17: “For the Lamb who is in the center of the throne will shepherd them and lead them to springs of life-giving water”

This same word is used in Mt 2:6 and Rev 2:27, 12:5, and 19:15. It is also used of bishops in Acts 20:28 and 1Peter 5:2 (seemingly St. Peter’s reminiscence of the Lord’s charge to him). There can be little doubt that the Holy Spirit inspired the writers of these scriptures with the purpose of showing the spiritual authority given to Peter, all his successors, and all those united in leadership with him.

As Christians began to grasp the implications of the teaching authority of the whole Church and of the primacy of the Pope the doctrine of infallibility began to make itself more evident. As early as the year 433 Pope Sixtus III declared that to assent to the Bishop of Rome’s decision is to assent to Peter, who lives in his successors and whose faith does not fail.³ Even earlier about the year 256 Cyprian of Carthage wrote, “Would heretics dare to come to the very seat of Peter whence apostolic faith is derived and whither no errors can come?”⁴ Augustine of Hippo summed up the ancient attitude when he remarked, “Rome has spoken; the case is closed.”⁵

An infallible pronouncement is made only after a doctrine is called into question. Most of the great number of doctrines found in the catechism have never been formally defined by an *ex cathedra* papal statement. Instead, these doctrines were formulated and pronounced infallibly, with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by other sources; such as ecumenical councils or the unanimous teaching of the Fathers. In fact, over the last 2000 years only two *ex cathedra* statements have been recorded (Pius IX – Immaculate conception, 1854 and Pius XII – Assumption, 1950). While every encyclical letter on matters of faith and morals is not held as infallible, when the Supreme Pontiff restates a long-held teaching of the Church a good case can be made for the infallibility of the restatement. A few examples of this would be: the Church’s teaching on the evil of artificial contraception in *Humanae Vitae*, and its stance on male priesthood in *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*.

3. Cited in Leslie Rumble and Charles M. Carty, *Radio Replies* (Rockford, Ill.: TAN Books, 1979), 3:95.

4. Cyprian, *Epistulae* 59(55), 14.

5. Augustine, *Sermones* 131, 10.

Question 6 If Peter has the authority, that you claim, then why is it that he did not preside over the Council of Jerusalem? It was run by Jesus' brother James who had already become the leader of the Church.

This question is a common mischaracterization of the Council of Jerusalem. Let us cast away for the time being the misguided pronouncement that Jesus had brothers or sisters, a backhanded way of calling into question Mary's eternal virginity. Marian doctrines could possibly be the focus of another argument down the road.

Acts 15 gives the account of the first Church council – the Council of Jerusalem. The council was called at the request of St. Paul to discuss whether Gentiles had to follow the Law of Moses. The claim set forth says that St. James the Less (not the apostle James) was at this time the leader among the Apostles. To come to this conclusion one would have to skip over the first twelve chapters of Acts. Every chapter leading up to 15 clearly shows St. Peter in a leadership position. James the Less simply gives the concluding remarks at the council and also recommends some marriage and dietary regulations for the Gentiles. Any honest analysis will show that St. Peter presided over this council. Peter spoke first and decided the matter unhesitatingly (Acts 15:7-11), declaring Gentiles not bound to the Law. He proceeded to rebuke those who held the opposite view (Acts 15:10). After he spoke the assembly fell silent (Acts 15:12). There had been much discussion, but Peter's statement ended all debate. History shows us that St. James was the Bishop of Jerusalem. Acts 21:15-25 describes that he was concerned for Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, who felt their ancient customs threatened by the great number of Gentile converts. This explains his remarks and his prominence at the council.

We need to remember that this council was not the first time Paul went to Jerusalem. In the beginning of his ministry, three years after his conversion, he came to confer with Peter for 15 days. Paul notes that he saw no other apostles, but did see James the Less. It makes sense that he would visit the Bishop of the town he was in.

History tells us much more about the early Church's position on the papacy. Around the year 80, the Church at Corinth deposed its lawful leaders. The fourth bishop of Rome, Pope Clement I, was called to settle the matter. This occurred, even though St. John the Apostle, who was still alive, was much closer to Corinth.⁶ The Corinthians appealed to the Bishop of Rome because he had the "Keys" of authority. The writings of St. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons from the year 180-200, student of St. Polycarp (disciple of St. John the Apostle), also show clearly that the earliest Christians viewed the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, as the head of the immediate post-Apostolic Church. In his writings he stresses that Christians must be united to the Church of Rome in order to maintain the Apostolic Tradition.⁷

6. First Letter to the Corinthians, 57, 1; Jurgens, #27

7. Irenaeus, Against Heresies

Question 7 How can you claim infallibility for a bad Pope, anti-Pope, and weren't there even 3 Popes at one time? Which one was infallible? It makes more sense that none of them were.

This question is always the last gasp of the desperate. Since the authority has been proved and infallibility shown as true doctrine, the attack on individual Popes is all that is left. We see much the same in politics. If you can't attack the position, attack the person. The problem is people, who do not understand the concept of the papacy or infallibility, confuse infallibility with impeccability. The former has been fully explained, the latter means an inability to sin. No man is without sin, not even a Pope. The Church has never claimed impeccability as a papal doctrine. It is generally agreed by historians that four or five Popes were guilty of serious moral lapses. This has no bearing on the doctrine of infallibility or the authority of the papacy. Even though the man was in error none of these examples ever put forth, as doctrine, false teachings. It is true that, at times, there have been disputes over who was the properly elected Pope. The Great Western Schism 1378-1417 is the example cited in the question. During this time three separate elections gave us three Popes⁸. Yet, even amid this turmoil, no Pope or Council has ever officially contradicted an earlier officially taught position on faith or morals. There have been contradictions in private opinions and on disciplinary rulings, but as we stand now, 265 Popes after St. Peter, we have one man on the face of this Earth that claims the mantle of "the Rock", Pope Benedict XVI and of those 265 men nearly all lived the most holy of lives.

The Answer:

Do we need a Pope? The simple answer is yes. Jesus set St. Peter as the foundation of His Church. He promised to be with this church until the end of time. Jesus gave, to Peter, the "keys of heaven" and with those keys came His earthly authority over His Church. Jesus then blessed Peter and prayed to God the Father that through Peter all Christians might be strengthened. Through this prayer and by the power of the Holy Spirit, Peter, all his successors, and all those united in leadership with him, are free from error in teaching faith and morals. After His resurrection Jesus reaffirmed that he wanted there to be an earthly leader of his Church. He once again named Peter as this leader, the earthly shepherd of His flock. Down through time, recorded in history, Christians have held fast to all these truths. To deny any of this is to deny that which Jesus did for us. To live outside the structure laid down by Jesus is to live outside the plan of God. To live outside the plan of God is to put your eternal soul in jeopardy. Jesus did nothing without a purpose. Do we need a Pope? Jesus thought we did!

8. Keating, Karl; *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*, 1998 Ignatius Press, San Francisco. p 218-219

References

1. All bible references from 'New American Bible'; online
<http://www.nccbuscc.org/nab/bible/>
2. Armstrong, Dave; *A Biblical Defense of Catholicism*, 2003 Sophia Institute Press, Manchester
3. Chacon, Fr. Frank and Burnham, Jim; *Beginning Apologetics I*, 2004 San Juan Catholic Seminars, Farmington
4. Drummey, James; *Catholic Replies*, 1995 C.R. Publications Inc., Norwood
5. Keating, Karl; *Catholicism and Fundamentalism*, 1998 Ignatius Press, San Francisco
6. Kelly, J.N.D; *Early Christian Doctrines*, 2003 Prince Press, Peabody
7. Web Resources:
The Evangelization Station
http://victorclaveau.com/htm_html/Catholic%20Apologetics/Apologetics/papacy_and_infallibility.htm

Appendix 1: Petrine panoply: fifty New Testament proofs for the pre-eminence of St. Peter⁹

1. Peter alone is the *Rock* upon which Jesus builds His Church (Matthew 16:18). Christ appears here not as the foundation, but as the architect who "builds." Moreover, *Rock* embodies a metaphor applied to him by Christ in a sense analogous to the suffering and despised Messiah (1 Peter 2:4-8; cf. Matthew 21:42). Without a solid foundation a house falls. The *Good Shepherd* (John 10:11) gives us other shepherds (*pastors*) as well (Ephesians 4:11).
2. Peter alone is given *the keys of the kingdom of heaven* (Matthew 16:19).
3. Peter is individually given the power to *bind* and *loose* (Matthew 16:19).
4. Peter's name occurs first in all lists of Apostles (Matthew 10:2, Mark 3:16, Luke 6:14 Acts 1:13). Matthew even calls him the *first* (10:2). Judas Iscariot is invariably mentioned last.
5. Peter is almost without exception named first whenever he appears with anyone else. In one (only?) example to the contrary, Galatians 2:9, where he (*Cephas*) is listed after James and before John, he is clearly preeminent in the entire context (for example, 1:18-19, 2:7-8).
6. Peter alone among the Apostles receives a new name, *Rock*, solemnly conferred (John 1:42, Matthew 16:18).
7. Likewise, Peter is regarded by Jesus as the Chief Shepherd after Himself (John 21:15-17), singularly by name, and over the universal Church, even though others have a similar but subordinate role (Acts 20:28, 1 Peter 5:2).
8. Peter alone among the Apostles is mentioned by name as having been prayed for by Jesus Christ in order that his *faith may not fail* (Luke 22:32).
9. Peter alone among the Apostles is exhorted by Jesus to *strengthen your brethren* (Luke 22:32).
10. Peter first confesses Christ's Messiahship and divinity (Matthew 16:16).
11. Peter alone is told that he has received divine knowledge by a special revelation (Matthew 16:17).
12. Peter is regarded by the Jews (Acts 4:1-13) as the leader and spokesman of Christianity.
13. Peter is regarded by the common people in the same way (Acts 2:37-41, 5:15).
14. Jesus Christ uniquely associates Himself and Peter in the miracle of the tribute-money (Matthew 17:24-27).
15. Christ teaches from Peter's boat, and the miraculous catch of fish follows (Luke 5:1-11): perhaps a metaphor for the pope as a *fisher of men* (cf. Matthew 4:19).
16. Peter was the first Apostle to set out for, and enter the empty tomb (Luke 24:12, John 20:6).
17. Peter is specified by an angel as the leader and representative of the Apostles (Mark 16:7).
18. Peter leads the Apostles in fishing (John 21:2-3,11). The "bark" (boat) of Peter has been regarded by Catholics as a figure of the Church, with Peter at the helm.
19. Peter alone casts himself into the sea to come to Jesus (John 21:7).
20. Peter's words are the first recorded and most important in the upper room before Pentecost (Acts 1:15-22).

21. Peter takes the lead in calling for a replacement for Judas (Acts 1:22).
22. Peter is the first person to speak (and only one recorded) after Pentecost, so he was the first Christian to "preach the gospel" in the Church era (Acts 2:14-36).
23. Peter works the first miracle of the Church Age, healing a lame man (Acts 3:6-12).
24. Peter utters the first *anathema* (Ananias and Sapphira) emphatically affirmed by God (Acts 5:2-11)!
25. Peter's shadow works miracles (Acts 5:15).
26. Peter is the first person after Christ to raise the dead (Acts 9:40).
27. Cornelius is told by an angel to seek out Peter for instruction in Christianity (Acts 10:1-6).
28. Peter is the first to receive the Gentiles, after a revelation from God (Acts 10:9-48).
29. Peter instructs the other Apostles on the catholicity (universality) of the Church (Acts 11:5-17).
30. Peter is the object of the first divine interposition on behalf of an individual in the Church Age (an angel delivers him from prison - Acts 12:1-17).
31. The whole Church (strongly implied) offers *earnest prayer* for Peter when he is imprisoned (Acts 12:5).
32. Peter presides over and opens the first Council of Christianity, and lays down principles afterwards accepted by it (Acts 15:7-11).
33. Paul distinguishes the Lord's post-Resurrection appearances to Peter from those to other Apostles (1 Corinthians 15:4-8). The two disciples on the road to Emmaus make the same distinction (Luke 24:34), in this instance mentioning only Peter (*Simon*), even though they themselves had just seen the risen Jesus within the previous hour (Luke 24:33).
34. Peter is often spoken of as distinct among Apostles (Mark 1:36, Luke 9:28,32, Acts 2:37, 5:29, 1 Corinthians 9:5).
35. Peter is often spokesman for the other Apostles, especially at climactic moments (Mark 8:29, Matthew 18:21, Luke 9:5, 12:41, John 6:67 ff.).
36. Peter's name is always the first listed of the "inner circle" of the disciples (Peter, James and John - Matthew 17:1, 26:37,40, Mark 5:37, 14:37).
37. Peter is often the central figure relating to Jesus in dramatic gospel scenes such as walking on the water (Matthew 14:28-32, Luke 5:1 ff., Mark 10:28, Matthew 17:24 ff.).
38. Peter is the first to recognize and refute heresy, in Simon Magus (Acts 8:14-24).
39. Peter's name is mentioned more often than all the other disciples put together: 191 times (162 as *Peter* or *Simon Peter*, 23 as *Simon*, and 6 as *Cephas*). John is next in frequency with only 48 appearances, and Peter is present 50% of the time we find John in the Bible! (39) Archbishop Fulton Sheen reckoned that all the other disciples combined were mentioned 130 times. (40) If this is correct, Peter is named a remarkable 60% of the time any disciple is referred to!
40. Peter's proclamation at Pentecost (Acts 2:14-41) contains a fully authoritative interpretation of Scripture, a doctrinal decision and a disciplinary decree concerning members of the *House of Israel* (2:36) - an example of *binding* and *loosing*.
41. Peter was the first "charismatic", having judged authoritatively the first instance of the gift of tongues as genuine (Acts 2:14-21).
42. Peter is the first to preach Christian repentance and baptism (Acts 2:38).

43. Peter (presumably) leads the first recorded mass baptism (Acts 2:41).
44. Peter commanded the first Gentile Christians to be baptized (Acts 10:44-48).
45. Peter was the first traveling missionary, and first exercised what would now be called "visitation of the churches" (Acts 9:32-38,43). Paul preached at Damascus immediately after his conversion (Acts 9:20), but hadn't traveled there for that purpose (God changed his plans!). His missionary journeys begin in Acts 13:2.
46. Paul went to Jerusalem specifically to see Peter for fifteen days in the beginning of his ministry (Galatians 1:18), and was commissioned by Peter, James and John (Galatians 2:9) to preach to the Gentiles.
47. Peter acts, by strong implication, as the chief bishop/shepherd of the Church (1 Peter 5:1), since he exhorts all the other bishops, or *elders*.
48. Peter interprets prophecy (2 Peter 1:16-21).
49. Peter corrects those who misuse Paul's writings (2 Peter 3:15-16).
50. Peter wrote his first epistle from Rome, according to most scholars, as its bishop, and as the universal bishop (or, pope) of the early Church. *Babylon* (1 Peter 5:13) is regarded by many commentators as a code name for Rome.

In conclusion, it strains credulity to hold that God would present St. Peter with such prominence in the Bible, without some meaning and import for later Church government. The papacy is the most plausible interpretation and actual institutional fulfillment of this biblical evidence. For why would God foreordain such a leadership function, only to cease after Peter's death? Clearly, the *office* of the papacy is paramount, not individual popes, and this was to be perpetual (*apostolic succession*), just as are the offices of bishop, deacon, teacher, and evangelist.

9. *The Evangelization Station*;
http://victorclaveau.com/html/Catholic%20Apologetics/Apologetics/papacy_and_infallibility.htm

Appendix 2: Origin of some Protestant Religions¹⁰

Dear Readers: Do you have any idea when your religion was founded and by whom?

- If you are a member of the Jewish faith, your religion was founded by Abraham about 4,000 years ago.
- If you are Hindu, your religion developed in India around 1,500 B.C.
- If you are a Buddhist, your religion split from Hinduism and was founded by Buddha, Prince Siddhartha Gautama of India, about 500 B.C.
- If you are Roman Catholic, Jesus Christ began your religion in the year 33.
- If you are Islamic, Mohammed started your religion in what is now Saudi Arabia around 600 A.D.
- If you are Eastern Orthodox, your sect separated from Roman Catholicism around 1000.
- If you are a Lutheran, your church was founded by Martin Luther, an ex-monk in the Catholic Church, in 1517.
- If you belong to the Church of England (Anglican), your church was founded by King Henry VIII in 1534 because the pope would not grant him a divorce with the right to remarry.
- If you are a Presbyterian, your church was founded when John Knox brought the teachings of John Calvin to Scotland in 1560.
- If you are Unitarian, your religious group developed in Europe in the 1500s.
- If you are a Congregationalist, your church branched off from Puritanism in the early 1600s in England.
- If you are a Baptist, you owe the tenets of your faith to John Smyth, who launched it in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in 1607.
- If you are a Methodist, your church was founded by John and Charles Wesley in England in 1744.
- If you are an Episcopalian, your denomination was brought over from England to the American colonies and became a separate church founded by Samuel Seabury in 1789.
- If you are a Mormon (Latter Day Saints), Joseph Smith started your church in Palmyra, N.Y. The year was 1830.
- If you worship with the Salvation Army (yes, it's a religious group, not just an organization that collects money in kettles on Christmas and serves dinners to the homeless), your sect began with William Booth in London in 1865.
- If you are a Christian Scientist, you look to 1879 as the year your religion was founded by Mary Baker Eddy.
- If you are a Jehovah's Witness, your sect was founded by Charles Taze Russell in Pennsylvania in the 1870s.
- If you are Pentecostal, your church was started in the United States in 1901.
- If you are an agnostic, you profess an uncertainty or skepticism about the existence of God or a higher being.
- If you are an atheist, you do not believe in the existence of God or any other higher power. This country's best-known atheist, Madalyn Murray O'Hair, has not been seen or heard from in more than a year. According to her son, she has disappeared without a trace.

10. Taken from St. Mary's Bulletin Jan 6 2008; *Message from Fr. Wehmann*, St. Mary of Shakopee, Mn