

Ten Proofs Peter Was Not the “Pope” at Rome

Every Catholic is taught and believes that the apostle Peter was the first Roman bishop—the first “Pope”—and that he resided at Rome. If this were true, God’s Word would state it. But, in fact, the Bible directly confirms the opposite. History seems to attest, however, and it is quite possible, that Peter was crucified in Rome. This said, here are a series of ten proofs, with scriptural support, demonstrating that Peter never resided at Rome:

(1) Rome is in Italy. This means that Gentile Italians live there. The apostle *Paul* was ordained to be the apostle to the Gentiles, *not Peter*. Paul wrote this to the Gentile Romans: “That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ *to the Gentiles*, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up *of the Gentiles* might be acceptable...” (15:16). He also described himself to the Galatians as having the gospel of the “uncircumcision”—the Gentiles—committed to him (2:7).

(2) The Emperor Claudius had banished all Jews from Rome in A.D. 50. Acts 8:1 describes the “great persecution against the Church” and that “they were all scattered abroad” as a result.

(3) Peter wrote his first general epistle from the city of “Babylon” (5:13). Many have assumed that this is Rome, when it is actually the Babylon of Mesopotamia. It is interesting to note that historians generally confuse—switch—scriptural references to Babylon by applying those that *do* apply to Rome as though they apply to Babylon, and vice-versa—in other words, those that *do not* apply to Rome are assigned Roman designation.

(4) Paul told the Romans, “Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man’s foundation” (15:20). Paul’s assertion would make no sense had Peter been resident at Rome, having established this congregation.

(5) Then, in light of the previous point, why would Paul offer the following salutation to the Roman congregation, also if Peter had been there for years?: “For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end that you may be established” (1:11). Think how insulting this expression would have been to “Pope Peter,” had he been in Rome.

(6) Paul concludes the Roman letter in chapter 16 with separate greetings to 30 different people in Rome—Mary, Andronicus, Junia—(these last two were probably apostles; Rom. 16:7)—Amplias, Urbane, Stachys, Apelles and 23 others—with *no reference* to the one who was supposedly the Pope, guiding the congregation and the entire New Testament Church from that city. No reasonable person could believe that Paul would so *insult* his own spiritual *superior*!

(7) Galatians 1:18-19 and 2:7 demonstrate that Peter was based *at Jerusalem*, from where he periodically traveled to places like Bithynia, Northern Galatia and Babylon, and other places where Israelites (also see #9) had migrated, from A.D. 38 to A.D. 49—the dates of these events described in Galatians.

(8) Luke 22:24 states, “And there was a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest.” Here is why this passage is important. This debate took place *after* Christ, in Matthew 16:17-19, had supposedly designated Peter as the one who would become the first Pope. While not directly involving Rome, this provides

direct proof that Christ never conferred, at least from the other apostles' perspective, the office of "Pope" to Peter.

(9) This point proves the other side of point 1. Already referenced, notice how Paul, who first describes himself, concludes his statement in **Galatians 2:7**, with this about Peter: "But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision [Gentiles] was committed unto me [Paul], as the gospel of the *circumcision* [Jews and the other tribes of Israel, referenced in #7] *was unto Peter...*"

(10) In **II Timothy 4:11**, Paul, commonly understood to be writing this epistle from Rome, states, "Only Luke is with me." Further, in **verse 10**, he describes how one named Demas had "forsaken" him and gone back to the "world," with Crescens and Titus having also transferred to other places of duty. None of this makes sense if the "Pope"—Peter—had been present.

Robert L. Bufkin