



A SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION OF THE POPE'S PRIMACY

**Apostolos
Makrakis**

A Scriptural Refutation of the Pope's Primacy

AND MISCELLANEOUS STUDIES AND SPEECHES

Apostolos Makrakis

Eastern Light Publishing

SHERIDAN, WY

A Scriptural Refutation of the Pope's Primacy/Apostolos Makrakis

Copyright © 1952 by Constantine G. Vaselakos

Copyright © 2019 by Jonathan Photius on cover artwork, interior design layout, edits and grammatical corrections. All rights reserved.

Jonathan Photius/Eastern Light Publishing
30 N. Gould Street, Suite 2302
Sheridan, WY/82801
www.easternlightpublishing.com

ISBN 978-1-949940-12-1

Contents

Editor's Preface	1
A Logical and Scriptural Refutation of the Pope's Primacy.....	5
A LOGICAL REFUTATION OF PAPAL PRIMACY	8
A SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION OF PAPAL PRIMACY	12
THE THEORY OF FAITH.....	17
SCRIPTURAL REFUTATIONS OF PAPAL PRIMACY	20
THE CENSORIAL CHARACTER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.....	31
THE FALLEN POPES OF THE CHURCH.....	36
HERETICAL POPES.....	39
THE SENTIMENT OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH, AND THE FIGHTS PUT UP IN BEHALF OF IT	42
THE NATURE OF THE PRIMACY OF BLESSED ST. PETER	43
DISCORDANCE WITH THE BISHOP OF ROME, AND GENERAL CONCORD OTHERWISE AT THE FIRST ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.....	51
THE CHALLENGE OF ROMANISM, AND OUR DUTY.....	52
THE FIRST OF THE NINE QUESTIONS AND THE ANSWER TO IT.....	55
THE SECOND QUESTION	57
THE THIRD QUESTION	57
THE FOURTH QUESTION.....	59
THE FIFTH QUESTION.....	64

THE SIXTH QUESTION.....	66
THE SEVENTH QUESTION.....	67
THE EIGHTH QUESTION.....	67
THE NINTH QUESTION.....	68
THE GUILTY SILENCE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC "ORIENT"	69
THE UNIA. THE CLAIMS OF THE POPE, AND OF THOSE IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH WHO ARE TRAFFICKERS IN THINGS SACRED	70
WHERE IS INFALLIBILITY IN THE CHURCH, AND WHICH COUNCILS POSSESS VALIDITY, AND WHICH DO NOT?	72
THE DEPARTURE OF THE ROMAN CHURCH FROM ORTHODOXY	76
The Papal Mania Explained and the Voice of Medical Science Applied To Our Patriarchates (Athens, 1962)	91
Ecclesiastical Senility	113

P R E F A C E

Editor's Preface

"Thou shalt reprove thy neighbor critically, and then shalt thou become guilty of no sin because of him." (**Lev. 19:17**).

The present refusal of the Pope's claim to Papal Primacy was written by the Teacher of Christianity, Apostolos Makrakis, in a series of many articles published long ago in his newspaper entitled "*The Logos*" and translated therefrom, the main ones being selected and assembled here for the use of English-speaking readers. Makrakis composed this refutation, or logical disproof, of the Papal claim to primacy and supremacy in the Church as a whole for the express purpose of refuting a series of provoking articles in another Greek-language newspaper called the "*Orient*" and published by or under the auspices of the Pope in Syros, and therefore one that was serving the object of spreading Roman Catholicism in that part of the world.

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness IN HIGH PLACES." (**Eph. 6: 12**).

The teacher is not criticizing any man personally. He does criticize, however, evil and cunning ideas, and it is upon such that he waged war all through his life. In his book entitled "*Concerning the Establishment of a Christian University*," which has been translated into English and published in this country, on page 35 (of the English edition) he writes as follows:

"We have but one implacable enemy with whom there can be no conciliation - the Devil, and the Devil's thoughts and

deeds. We neither hate nor assail any man. On the contrary, we have an affectionate regard for all men and especially for those of our own nationality, and because of this affectionate regard we strive in their behalf against the Devil, who is tyrannizing and trying to injure them. Though in reality and truth we are at enmity and war with only the Devil, we appear to be at enmity and war with men - because the Devil has instilled his thoughts and wishes into the minds and hearts of men. Thus, men have thoughtlessly identified themselves with the Devil, or, rather to say, have injudiciously made the Devil's thoughts and wishes their own, and consider them attributes of their own nature and essence. In consequence they take our war against the Devil to be a war against themselves, and, presuming that they are being wronged by us, they become indignant and angry with us, and harbor deadly enmity and hatred. To put it otherwise. The war against the Devil consists in driving the Devil's thoughts and wishes out of the minds and hearts of men and introducing Christ's. This cannot be accomplished otherwise than by blaming the Devil's ideas and praising Christ's, and by censuring and admonishing those who entertain sentiments and wishes of the Devil to exchange them for those of Christ. Such persons, however, deeming what is really another's to be their own, think that they are being attacked and insulted and outraged by our discourse when it accuses them of holding wrong sentiments and of pursuing wrong practices. Presuming that they are being wronged by us in regard to their honor, reputation, and interest, they gratuitously assail and hate one who has in mind nothing but their salvation and benefit.

"Hating the Devil as much as we love Christ, we will fight the enemy, theoretically and practically, in word and deed, with truth and righteousness, until he vanishes. We bear no man enmity or hatred, but we indeed cherish an affection for every man, particularly those akin in faith, and we do them a favor whenever we can. We can be of help to any man that is in need of truth and righteousness, which are attended by everything good and desirable. We think it evil and disgraceful for one to bear one's fellow man hatred and enmity and to ponder how one could injure him. We think it fine and honorable for one to love every man and to ponder how one could benefit him as much as possible. But it is the most difficult thing in the world to do a man a favor not

in regard to his body but in regard to his soul by freeing the latter from the wicked Devil's thoughts, wishes, and habits and subjecting it to the Lord's gentle yoke; because in such benefaction the benefactor seems to the beneficiary to be the contrary of what he is - that is, he seems to be an enemy and a villain, when in fact he is a friend and a well-wisher. Such a benefactor needs must be crucified by the beneficiary, who thinks that he is ridding himself of an insupportable evil by killing the man that repugns and attacks his wicked thoughts and wishes in order to make him better than before. Why did the Athenians condemn Socrates to drink the fatal hemlock? Because he accused them of being ignorant and foolish and censured them for presuming themselves to be aware of things they were ignorant of, and because he urged them to care for virtue rather than money. And why did the Pharisees crucify our Lord? Because, while they presumed themselves to be righteous, Christ accused them of being even worse than the publicans whom they despised, as is attested by the parable of the Publican and the Pharisee, which justifies the humble publican and condemns the priggish Pharisee. Here is the career of the greatest philanthropy and of the highest virtue. In fact, one must be exceedingly philanthropical to be willing to suffer ill in order to do good to one's fellow man. One must have reached the highest degree of virtue to love virtue because it is virtue and not because it makes one appear better to other men and affords honors and benefits. The exercise of apparent virtues brings honors and benefits to those exercising them, so that it is impossible to tell whether the one exercising them does so for the sake of virtue rather than for the sake of his own interest. But the exercise of that virtue which in the eyes of others appears to be a vice and causes the one exercising it persecutions and tribulations and heaps upon him insult and dishonor the exercise of such virtue, I say, proves the one exercising it to be a lover of virtue only and such a lover of it that for its sake he sacrifices himself. Since, therefore, we too have wished to engage in a work of very great philanthropy and of very high virtue by showing that the National University is a perversity and that its professors are perverters, and that from this den the Devil has done and is doing the nation the greatest injuries; since, in addition, we accuse those handling the state affairs of being ignorant and foolish politicians; and since we have censured and are censuring in order to

benefit and save, we must needs suffer the consequences of our work until we either vanquish the enemy or fall fighting in behalf of truth and righteousness.”

Christ said that whoever is of Christ listens to His voice. It is for the sake of such persons that the Teacher published this reproof with a view to fortifying the faith of the Orthodox, on the one hand, and to enlightening those receptive of enlightenment respecting the Pope's error and delusion and acquainting them with the truth. *"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."* (John 8:32).

It is to be borne in mind that a reproof differs widely from an insult. A reproof pertains to those who have incurred guilt of some kind, and its object is to prove the fact of their guiltiness. An insult, on the other hand, accuses innocent persons of what they are not guilty of with a view to disparaging them in the eyes of others or of heaping abuse upon them to no purpose. It is therefore the reader's duty to draw a distinction between reproof and insult for his own benefit and as a matter of justice to others.

In addition to *A Scriptural Refutation of the Pope's Primacy*, we have included three interesting Studies and Speeches by Apostolos Makrakis on subjects of great importance to every Orthodox Christian.

THE EDITORS

A Logical and Scriptural Refutation of the Pope's Primacy

Many persons have many times written books and articles against Roman Catholicism, otherwise known as Papism, and have confuted its false doctrine, which it has attempted in the course of its serpentine and crooked meandering to represent as God's truth with a view to misleading those who are capable of being misled and who stop their ears to the truth which right reason and the Holy Scriptures of God teach. After so many confutations and refutations of the false doctrine of Roman Catholicism which so many illustrious and eminent teachers of the Church have been at pains to elaborate, it would be quite superfluous for us to undertake here in these pages to refute the false doctrine of Roman Catholicism, which we have refuted again and again in the columns of *The Logos* (a weekly newspaper and religious journal edited by A. Makrakis), and also in the work entitled "*Memoir on the Nature of the Church of Christ*" (of which an English translation is now available), were it not for the encyclic recently issued by Pope Leo XIII, as the infallible head of the Church in general, as the representative and vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, and as the successor of St. Peter the Apostle.

The contents of this encyclic are well known. Therein the Pope invites schismatics to recognize him as the visible head of the Church, and, in case they fail to do so, he threatens them with everlasting hell. A criticism of this encyclic was made by the metropolitan of Nicomedia, the Most Rev. Bryenios, who, by recourse to Scripture and history, exhibited the rottenness of

the base of Roman Catholicism, and stripped it of its cloak of infallibility, of its pretended representative and vicar of Jesus Christ, and of its pretended successor to St. Peter the Apostle of its chief and highest and supreme prelate and sovereign. pontiff, who has the Luciferian self-conceit and presumption to proclaim that he is the visible head of the Church, on the alleged ground that he was appointed such by Christ, and that whosoever fails to recognize his self-conceited arrogance is judged to deserve hell everlasting. Against this criticism of Roman Catholicism, and against the censure of the Papal encyclic, from the pen of the metropolitan of Nicomedia, a certain deacon by the name of Isaiah Papadopoulos has undertaken to put forth a counter criticism, wherein, however, he displays uncommon skill in sophistry and casuistry, by means of which he endeavors to show that Roman Catholicism and indeed its very base, to wit, Papal primacy, is possessed of divine validity, a validity attested not only by the Holy Scriptures but also by right reason, and that whosoever refuses to submit to the Pope refuses to submit to right reason and to Holy Scripture. The haughty tenor of the counter critique, by which this deacon truckling to the Pope airs his views in articles which he publishes in "*The Orient*," a newspaper of Hermopolis, Syria, and organ of the Pope, and the sophistical argument with which he undertakes to show that the Pope is the chief bishop, having received the rights of primacy from God in accordance with a recommendation by the divine Savior, have compelled us to expose the error of the deacon, not, of course, with a view to convincing him - for Papists are mostly obstinate in regard to this question, being imbued with Luciferian self-conceit but with a view to preventing some persons from being misled who have been shocked and have written to us to write something about the truth of the matter. Since the writer of the articles in question examines the subject, as he says, by means of the Holy Bible and on the basis of right reason, we too, in exposing the falsity of his arguments, shall adopt this dual point of view - that is to say, we too shall argue both logically and Scripturally. Accordingly, we proceed with our first argument.

In the Popish church, which, however, is falsely and proudly called the Catholic church, it is held to be a fundamental and salutary dogma that the Pope of Rome is a representative of Jesus Christ and a successor of St. Peter the Apostle, and that he is

consequently the chief and highest of all bishops and one to whom all Christians owe blind obedience and submissiveness. This fact was proudly expressed in writing during the thirteenth century by Pope Boniface to King Philip of France. His letter to the king said *verbatim*:

"We state and proclaim that the belief that every human creature is subject to the Pope of Rome is necessary for future bliss."

In the creed of Pope Pius IV is read the following confession:

"I confess the Holy Catholic Roman and Apostolic Church to be the mother and mistress of all the other churches, and I promise true submissiveness to the bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and representative of Jesus Christ."

This is also the dogma sanctioned by the Council of Roman Catholics held at Trent, in which the primacy of the Pope was invested with "divine" validity. One consequence of this dogma concerning the primacy of the Pope was the notorious dogma concerning the infallibility of the Pope, and its corollary of inerrability and sinlessness - for, as we shall show in what follows, he that is infallible does not err or sin. After the Papists proclaimed the Pope to be the visible head of the Church, as prince of the bishops and pontiff, or chief manager, of the Church, it was but natural for them to deduce from this false principle their conclusion that the chief manager, or "sovereign pontiff," of the Church is also infallible - for otherwise, erring or being liable to err in what he said and declared, he could not be relied upon to lead and guide the Church to her destiny. But since the Pope is infallible, why shouldn't he also be inerrable and sinless, seeing that the latter characteristic is a direct consequence of the former? Being infallible, then, and inerrable, the Pope has no need of law, for he communes directly with the Holy Spirit; he has no need of counsellors and advisers, for he knows everything; he has no need of the Holy Scriptures, for as one who is infallible and equal to God and equal to Christ he himself is able to make laws and lay them down to the Church. Thus, it is naturally to be understood that his words and consequently his deeds too are the law by which Roman Catholics and the whole Roman

Catholic Church are governed. In this manner the Pope has managed to usurp the right of Christ to legislative authority, and has begun to dogmatize dogmas contrary to the Holy Scriptures and subversive of the real dogmas of the Church of Christ.

A LOGICAL REFUTATION OF PAPAL PRIMACY

The idea of Papal primacy was a product of the Dark Ages, during which the Popes, by means of the forged Isidorian decretals which they had invented during the eighth or ninth century, schemed to gain a material profit for themselves by means of the system of concentrating the prelacy in a single dictator, the Pope of Rome, whom thereafter, Cardinals succeeded in crowning as king. It has been shown in *The Logos* (Number 383, of May 9, 1881) that this device of Papal primacy is opposed to the logical principle that the unity of the Church can be achieved only by means of some Catholic or general authority that is analogous to the nature of the Church as a whole - an all-wise, almighty holy, and all-good authority able to guide and direct the Church to her best and finest end. Such an authority in the Church cannot be a mere man, whether St. Peter, a Pope, a Patriarch, or any other finite mortal, but only God become a man - that is to say, in a word, a God-man guiding the Church 1) by means of infallible and inerrable words and instructions and laws, and 2) by means of a life that is holy, blameless, and sinless; such a person is our Lord Jesus Christ, who is a perfect God and a perfect man. Being a God-man, Christ is the head of the Church, and is the head whence all members of the Church receive the notion of their destiny, and the notion of the means whereby they can achieve their destiny. But since Christ is both a God and a man likewise deified, He is everywhere present in heaven and on earth, both in the Church of the perfected in heaven and in Church of the militant on earth; in fact, He is constantly and continuously in the Church, as He told His disciples and all His Church that He will be with her always, till the consummation of the age. For He received authority not only in heaven but also on earth:

"All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am

with you always, till the consummation of the age. Amen"
(Matt. 28: 18-20).

But since Christ as the principle of unity of the Church and as her head is both in heaven and on earth, and since He has authority to be the head not only of the Church in heaven of the perfected but also of the Church on earth of the militant, how could Peter the Apostle have been the visible head of the Church, and through him the Popes of Rome? Can a body have two heads? That would be a monstrosity, and such a Church would be really a monstrosity, as is the so-called Catholic Church of the Pope, which is in fact a Popish institution which deifies a man who is a liar and a sinner, namely, the Pope.

The false device of the Papal primacy, which the Popes invented for their own material advantage, is not only false in principle, but the fact that it is counterfeit and mistaken can be proved from the consequences of the idea. Let us assume that the Pope is the visible head of the Church who is guiding her to her destiny, and that all her members ought to obey and respect the law of her head under penalty of everlasting expulsion and punishment in case they dare to do the contrary. But since all of them ought to listen to the infallible head of the Pope, they ought likewise to act also in accordance with the law which his will lays down, since the latter is enlightened by his infallible head. For the will of the infallible Pope cannot possibly wish anything that is contrary to what it conceives to be true; nor, consequently, can it do anything that is contrary to what it conceives to be correct and right, or anything that is contrary to whatever good he desires. For if we grant that the will of the infallible Pope wishes anything that is contrary to what he conceives to be true - that it wants what is false or wicked - or that it does anything that is contrary to what he conceives to be true, or contrary to whatever good he desires, it then becomes obvious at once that the Pope, as a sinner choosing evil of his own accord, is not worthy to be enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and much more unworthy to be the guide and head of the Church, but, on the other hand, is worthy of and deserves everlasting condemnation and punishment. Will not all those who listen to the head of the Pope and think that it is infallible and enlightened by the Holy Spirit, mistake the villainous acts of the Pope for good acts, for acts recommended by God? And in such a case will not the majority of the

people in their ignorance mistake the life of the "Holy Father" for the very acme of morality? And will they not become imitators of his villainies with the conscience that they are imitating the conduct of the head of the Church? And can it be said that such was not the life of the infallible bishop of Rome, a life in all respects like the life of men bearing ambitious titles, as, for example, sons of God and even Gods-titles appropriated by the Caesars of ancient Rome? Can it be said that the ignorant peoples of the West did not mistake the immoral life of the Popes of the Middle Ages for a mirror of moral perfection? It is only the sane, the prudent, that laugh when they hear about an infallible and inerrable Pope, a visible head of the Church, a universal dictator of divine and human affairs having power to bind and to loose all things in accordance with his own will; the ignorant and prejudiced peoples of the West, who are destitute of reason and of judgment, think that this falsehood is truth - that is to say, they find no difficulty in believing that the Pope is the infallible head of the Church, the oracle of God, and that whatever the Pope does is all right, that it bears the sanction and seal of God! What an unpardonable blasphemy against the God of truth! It was in this manner that the Pope in times of ignorance succeeded in making himself a Pope-King in the West and in becoming a tyrant over the ignorant and stupid peoples of the West. He wanted, indeed, to become also in the East a dictator and tyrant by divine right, but he was prevented from doing so because he met with strong resistance in right reason and the Gospel, the only sacred heirlooms of the Orthodox Church of Christ.

The consequences of Papal primacy and of Papal infallibility are the ignorance of the West during the Middle Ages, when the Pope prohibited education and the study of the Gospel by Christians of the West. It was during those times that the corruption of the Popes and of the Papal clergy reached its zenith, with the granting of indulgences for the remission of sins, simony, traffic in things divine and the commercialization of God, religious wars and massacres in the West, and finally the establishment of the Inquisition in Spain to deal with those opposed to the Pope, and the flames of the fire in which were burned alive tens of thousands of Christians who had the courage to abjure hideous Romanism. The history of the Middle Ages bristles with Papal crimes and Roman Catholic atrocities worthy of the nature of

the infallible and inerrable Popes of Rome. Well, do not such consequences evidence the fact that the Papal primacy of the ambition and self-interest of the Popes is a Satanic device which Satan implanted in the mind of the ambitious and self-interested Popes with a view to leading astray the peoples of the West, whom he found to be more liable to become victims of falsehood and delusion than receptive of God's truth?

Orthodoxy, however, rather than fall into the clutches of Roman Catholicism, preferred to fall into the clutches of another wild beast, commonly referred to in Greek as Turkism, by which is meant the Turkish style of Mohammedanism, because it deemed the latter less dangerous than Roman Catholicism, which was seeking to conquer and enslave the spirit of truth under the spirit of falsehood and of delusion, whereas Turkism sought to conquer and enslave the body. In fact, our Fathers who saved the Christian Orthodox Greeks from intellectual enslavement to the Popes of Rome were really thrice-blessed in having preferred to save their spiritual liberty and ours even at the cost of falling into the hands of the Turks, rather than to save their bodily liberty by submitting to the intellectual and corporal tyrant of Rome and thus betraying the sacred truth in the most shameful manner. Since right reason, both as a result of the premises and as a result of the consequences of Papal primacy rejects this idea as a blasphemous and Satanic invention, and utterly refutes and overthrows this Papal dogma, our Fathers too, being logical and lovers of reason, could never possibly consent to such a blasphemous Papal demand, but, on the contrary, resisted it with all their might, and thus with divine support succeeded in saving Orthodoxy. But we too who are genuine descendants of theirs cannot afford to discontinue the glorious work of our forefathers in waging war upon the Roman Catholic error until it is driven off the face of the earth and all men learn the truth. After this logical refutation of Papal primacy, in the next chapter we shall undertake the refutation of it by means of a few Scriptural arguments, as promised in the foregoing. But we can say beforehand that whatever be the nature of the case, what is logically true cannot but be Scripturally true, too, and vice versa; for right reason and Scripture are products of one and the same spirit, that is to say, of the God of truth.

A SCRIPTURAL REFUTATION OF PAPAL PRIMACY

Inasmuch as bishops in the Church are nothing but employees of the sovereign and grand high priest Christ, who remains forever in the Church and never deserts her in any way or under any circumstances, being Himself her one and only infallible and inerrable head and will and the Law in the Church, the Truth, while the Pope is but one of the bishops, it necessarily follows as a matter of inference that he too is one of the employees of the grand high priest Christ and that he is not, as he now heretically and conceitedly and perversely contends, the sovereign and grand high priest, or pontiff. Let us see and let us judge.

Our Lord Jesus Christ declared Himself an enemy of primacies and of despotic offices, but, on the other hand, a brave defender of God's will. *"Nevertheless, not as I should will, but as thou wilt"* (Matt. 26:39), said He. His whole care and anxiety was how to make His disciples acquainted with the will of God, and make them be the first to do it and thus become helpers and saviors of others by saving them in the name of Christ, whom God sanctified and sent forth into the world as its Savior. Through full and direct knowledge of the divine will and its execution, Christ sought to combine and unite His disciples into a single social body, a free body having as its principle and basis and substantial support the good and benevolent will of God Himself. But God's will is that all men should believe in His Son and Logos, in Jesus Christ, who is the center of union of all the faithful, the immovable and steadfast cornerstone supporting the Church forever as her foundation. God revealed this will of His, namely, that all men should believe in Him whom He sent, and made it known when Christ was being baptized in the river Jordan, and when He was being transfigured in Mount Tabor. *"This is my beloved Son, in whom I have shown my good will"* (Matt. 3: 17; 17; 5). For how would it have been possible for His disciples to believe in Christ first, and for all later persons to do so afterwards, if Christ had not been borne witness to by the Father, who is greater than all and who declared that He is His Son and Logos, in whom He was pleased to show His good will by offering us our salvation? How could it be otherwise, seeing that Christ is the means of salvation to those who believe in Him as a result of the words of His Apostles? Hence it is logical to conclude that God Himself had to bear witness openly and frankly in the midst of the world

to the fact that it is His will that all men should believe in Christ and obey Him as the bearer and plenipotentiary of God's grand Design and Will, as the Son of the living God. Blessed St. Peter in his Second Epistle owns to having heard the voice of God in Mount Tabor bearing witness that Christ is His beloved Son, and he confirms and corroborates the glory and honor which was bestowed upon Christ by God His Father, for, he says, he himself was an eyewitness of it (II Pet. 1: 17-18). But Christ too made it His life work to declare and make known the divine will and to execute it. So, in view of the fact that Christ's only care was to manifest and execute the divine will, which was that all men should believe in Him as the Son of the living God, it is to be inferred as a logical conclusion that it is impossible for there to be any truth in the claim of the Romanists that Christ made St. Peter the head of His Church, since no such will of God's is anywhere mentioned at all in the Holy Bible. Christ carried out the commandment which He had received from God to carry out. He received the commandment to effectuate God's Design and Will, to reveal God's will to men, and to proclaim and preach it as the foremost and uppermost, as a law and rule to govern the behavior of all men, as a catholic and absolute and unalterable principle, as a principle that is by nature infallible and inerrable. Do ye hear, O foolish Romanists, what the work of Christ is? The subjection of all to the will of God, to His Son and Logos, and not to St. Peter or any other mortal, as ye blasphemously contend. God wishes the submission of all men to Christ and not to some other person who is a mere human being. such as Peter, Paul, or the Pope.

In the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew is recorded the historical fact that when Christ came to Caesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples to tell Him what view men entertained concerning Him, and He did so with the intention of asking them afterwards in connection with this occasion what they themselves thought in this respect. So, speaking to them as equals, He addressed to all of His disciples the question: "*Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?*" To this question each disciple responded as he had been told of the views men entertained concerning Christ, avouching that some persons thought Him to be John the Baptist; others, Elias; and still others, Jeremiah or one of the prophets. But in asking His question Jesus was

intent upon something else, and not trying to learn what man's impression of Him was. The question was aimed at eliciting a confession of the view of His disciples, who ought to have entertained a different view concerning Christ than that which the world entertained concerning Him. The disciples had been associating with the Master and had learned who He was. So, inasmuch as the same confession of faith was to be obtained from all the disciples, and the same view concerning Christ was expected to be avowed by all of them, which was the basis of their apostolic work, He asked each of them the question, and not only one of them. He therefore put the question in the plural, by saying: *"But whom say ye that I am?"* The answer demanded thought. The disciples were many, while the question to all of them was but one. Hence it was perfectly plain that a single answer should be given, which, of course, had to be given by one of them all, without any noise, disorder, and disturbance, as would have happened had they all cried out the same thing together. Peter, as the most vehement of the disciples and the liveliest of them, made bold to answer by saying: *"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."* Here Peter was not replying as though he alone had been asked the question, for the question Christ asked was addressed to all the disciples equally. Hence it is plainly evident that the reply ought to be given by all of them. But instead of them all crying out the reply, he cried out the same view as that entertained by the others. So that Peter did not answer either as the chief of the apostles or as a proxy of the others with authority to represent all of them in his confession. He replied as being livelier than the others and as being more vehement than they were, as was his nature. He replied in a natural manner, as anyone might reply now to a question by way of forestalling many others to whom the question had been put, also. But since Peter's confession agreed with the faith of all the disciples concerning Christ, the others prudently deemed Peter's confession sufficient, and confirmed it with their silence.

We now ask whether, after questioning all of His disciples as to what view they entertained concerning Him, and having received the confession of all that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God, Christ could have replied only to Peter, whether He could have blessed him alone, and whether He could have promised him alone the keys to heaven. If it is true that Christ

expected a reply from all of them, because He addressed His question to all of them; and if Peter anticipated the others by giving a reply as being more lively and more courageous than the others on account of his age, it is necessarily true also that Christ's rejoinder to the apostles' confession was a rejoinder intended for the ears of all, and not for Peter's only. But if the blessing was pronounced upon all of them, and so were also the keys to bind and to loose given to all of them, and, accordingly, it was upon the faith of all that the Church of Christ was to be built, is it not manifest that the Papal claim that Christ made Peter by divine right the director and governor and president of the Church as her visible head a chimaera - a distortion of the facts?

To Peter's confession Christ replied by saying, verbatim:

"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. And I will give unto thee the keys to the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (**Matt. 16: 17-19**).

What was it that God the Father had revealed to Peter? It is manifest that He revealed to him the idea that Christ was His Son. But inasmuch as it has been proved that this revelation was made not to Peter alone but to all the apostles who had been questioned by Christ, it necessarily follows as a matter of course that the blessing was not intended exclusively for Peter, but for all the apostles in whom God had revealed the idea respecting His Son, in which idea they believed and which they confessed. In promising Peter the keys to bind and to loose, Christ was promising them to all His disciples; and He accorded them this right when He fulfilled His promise thereafter as is stated in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew:

"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (**Matt. 18: 18**).