

~Was Peter ever in Rome?~

Like other Protestants, Fundamentalists say Christ never appointed Peter as the earthly head for the simple reason that the Church has no earthly head and was never meant to have one. That is what the Bible says. That is why we Christians believe **it**, and not the traditions of men.

1 Cor 11:3

But I would have you know, that the **head of every man is Christ**; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.

No mention of a pope here at all. In fact, there is no mention of a pope in all the Bible. No wonder the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) wants extra-biblical teachings. They could never justify a pope without them!.

Matt 23:9-12

9 And *do not call anyone on earth 'father,'* for you have one Father, and he is in heaven.

10 Nor are you to be called 'teacher,' for you have one Teacher, the Christ.

11 The greatest among you will be your servant.

12 For whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted.

In this injunction, Jesus tells us that the greatest among us will be the servant of all. Humility is the characteristic that Jesus wants us to display. The whole idea of a '**pope**', '**father**', '**head**', '**leader**' is against the structure of the church. We are to serve each other with the gifts God has given us and not to be called by titles that exalt us: **father, teacher, rabbi, reverend, leader** are titles that we are to shun! They cause separation--ie: "clergy" vs "laity", when no such divisions should be in the church of Jesus Christ..

Christ is the Church's **only head and foundation**, in every possible sense of those terms. That is what the Bible says. Again, to make another foundation, the RCC needs to elevate tradition (**their** tradition, that is) to the same level as Scripture.

The papacy arose out of fifth or sixth-century politics, both secular and ecclesiastical; it has no connection with the New Testament. It was not established by Christ. The papacy is a ruse and an aberration! In any case, it is an institution designed to give the Catholic Church an authority it does not have Biblically!

The case is stated perhaps most succinctly, by **Lorraine Boettner** in his best-known book, **Roman Catholicism (117)**: *"The remarkable thing, however, about Peter's alleged bishopric in Rome is that the New Testament has not one word to say about it. The word Rome occurs only nine times in the Bible and never is Peter mentioned in connection with it. There is no allusion to Rome in either of his (Peter's) epistles. Paul's journey to the city is recorded in great detail (Acts 27 and 28). There is in fact no New Testament evidence, nor any historical proof of any kind, that Peter ever was in Rome. All rests on legend."*

Rom 1:11

"For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established"
If Peter was the pope of Rome, then why would Paul want to impart some spiritual gift? Would not Peter have already done so, as the 'head' of the church??

Rom 15:20

"Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation" Paul went to churches that he founded and would not have gone to a church that Peter had founded.

When Paul greets those in the church at Rome, in chapter 16, he lists many people, but never mentions Peter at all! Strange, is it not, that the "pope" of the church was neglected in Paul's letter???

The Bible **never** says Peter was in Rome even though it tells us of all the other places he was. If such an **important** office as the pope were to be established by the Lord or His Apostles, SURELY there would be, at least, one tiny indication of such.

Peter was an Apostle *to the Jews* and one would expect him to minister to them. It tell us where Peter journeyed. Let me quote the Bible:

Gal 2:7

But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the **un-circumcision (Gentiles)** was committed unto me, as the gospel of the **circumcision (Jews)** was unto Peter;

Gal 2:8

"For he that wrought effectually in **Peter** to the apostleship of the **circumcision (Jews)**, the same was mighty in me toward the **Gentiles**."

1 Pet 1:1 Peter tells his readers that he is: "an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers (Jews) scattered throughout *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia*"--**NOT A WORD ABOUT ROME!**

The popes are not to be married and, yet, Peter (whom the RCC claim was the first pope) was married!

1 Cor 9:5 "Don't we have the right to take *a believing wife* along with us, as do the other apostles and the Lord's brothers and **Peter** (Cephas)?"

Why does the RCC forbid the pope and priests to have wives? Such a ban on marriage is unnatural and certainly against Paul's injunction in:

1 Tim 4:1-3:

- 1 "The Spirit clearly says that in later times some will abandon the faith and follow deceiving spirits and things taught by demons.
- 2 Such teachings come through hypocritical liars, whose consciences have been seared as with a hot iron.
- 3 **They forbid people to marry** and order them to abstain from certain foods, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and who know the truth."

Peter was dominant in the NT, but that doesn't make him leader of the church. In the Jerusalem council in Acts 15, it was **James** who dominated the council. In some instances, *Peter needed leading and correction*: Paul had to scold Peter and rebuke him in front of the church for his hypocrisy (**Gal. 2:11**)

and then WRITES IT FOR ALL TO SEE, showing us that Peter was a fallible, gullible, hypocritical man who had to be corrected, now and then--much like the rest of us.

And THIS is the man considered by Roman Catholics as God on earth? One thing we can be sure of is the impossibility of Peter being a pope!

You may get Peter in Rome, as the pope, by the machinations of the RCC, but you will never get it by the Bible! Never!