

Was Peter Ever in Rome? VI (Church at Home) Fred R. Coulter

Greetings everyone, this is Fred Coulter. Welcome to Church at Home. Church at Home is sponsored by the Christian Biblical Church of God, and we are dedicated to restoring original Christianity for today.

It can be done as never before in the history of the world, because many of the documents that were not available to people even a hundred years ago are now available on the Internet, and there is so much that is being exposed as not true.

One of the **biggest hoaxes, lies, untruth ever foisted upon people who believe in God is that the Apostle Peter was the first pope!** Now, the Catholic Church claims that as so; however, we have seen that that could not have been.

They claim that Peter went to Rome in 42_{A.D.} and was martyred in 67_{A.D.} However, there is not one shred of evidence from the Bible that Peter ever went to Rome.

Now, we also know that in Acts 12, the drought that came during the days of Claudius—when Paul and Barnabas brought relief to the brethren in Jerusalem—is an important cross section and marker.

Now, let's understand this: It is marked very clearly in history. Claudius Caesar was made emperor in 41_{A.D.} Now then, **IF** Peter went to Rome in 42_{A.D.} **he would have been arrested and killed immediately!**

You see, in the third and fourth year, if you get the chronology, you can look it up there. In the spring of 44_{A.D.}, the food was sent up to Jerusalem. In 44_{A.D.}, Herod Agrippa-I persecutes the Church, cuts the head off of James, the brother of John, and throws Peter into jail. Peter is rescued by an angel, and this is in 44_{A.D.}

So, he's still in Jerusalem in 44_{A.D.} Think of that now. What we're going to find is that all the supposed historical claims, official claims of the Roman Catholic Church concerning Peter coming to Rome, **we are categorically proving**—through Scripture and history—**that never occurred!** They like to claim that Peter was pope beginning in 32_{A.D.}, and that was two years after the crucifixion. They have their historical dates wrong.

They have where Peter went **completely wrong!** And yet, over a billion people accept Roman Catholicism as authentic Christianity.

Let's understand something very important here. Claudius was made Caesar in 41_{A.D.}, January 25th. He made an edict that outlawed all Jews from Rome. He was emperor until October 54_{A.D.}

So, Peter could not have gone to Rome during that time. After Claudius died and Nero took over from him, then the Jews and Christians came back into Rome.

But we know in Acts 18:2 that Aquila and Priscilla had left Rome because of the decree of Claudius Caesar for Jews to leave.

Now, let's come to Acts 12 and let's just review one little segment here that's important for us to understand. Then we will review some claims that are on Wikipedia that are given to us as official Roman doctrine.

Here in 44_{A.D.}, Peter gets out of prison. He comes back to where the disciples were assembled. Then, after he was let into the house:

Acts 12:17: "Then, motioning to them with his hands to be silent, he related to them how the Lord had brought him out of the prison. And he said, 'Report these things to James and the brethren.'..."

Now, think about that. James—this James—was the half-brother of Jesus.

"...Then he departed and went to another place" (v 17). *It doesn't tell us where he went!* He went to another place. Now, consider this, as a fugitive from the Roman government:

- Would he dare stay within the bounds of the Roman Empire?
- How could he have possibly gone to Rome and was in Rome from 42-67_{A.D.} when we find in 44_{A.D.} he was still in Jerusalem?

Then he went to another place. The only true evidence that we have where he went to is found at the end of 1-Peter, where he says, "The Church in Babylon salute you."

Now, that shows he was in Babylon. But how do the Catholics cover this up? Now, this is from Wikipedia comments:

From Wikipedia (online):

Peter stood as the unquestioned head of the apostles. His position was made evident in Acts. He appointed the replacement of Judas Iscariot.

Not true! They drew lots and appealed to God to make the decision as to who would replace Judas Iscariot. And they put forth Joseph and they put forth Matthias, and Matthias was the one who was chosen by lot. Peter did not do it. Though he may have chaired the meeting to do it, he himself did not do it.

He spoke first to the crowds that had assembled after the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

Not true! All of the apostles were speaking. We covered that account already, didn't we? Yes, it records Peter's sermon. A little later in Acts 2, but all the apostles were involved in it.

And he was the first apostle to perform a miracle in the name of the Lord.

Not true! John was with him. Peter said, 'Look upon us.' He was healed because of Jesus Christ.

Imprisoned by King Herod Agrippa, he was aided in an escape by an angel. He then assumed his apostolate in Jerusalem.

Now how could that be? When he said, 'Report these things to James.' James was the one who was in charge in Jerusalem.

This was in 44_{A.D.}, so they are completely contradicting themselves and have their facts all mixed up. Because how in 44_{A.D.}, being released from that imprisonment, he was in Jerusalem, and **yet the claim is** that Peter went to Rome in 42_{A.D.}

Now you need to go to the segment that we have: Which Peter Went to Rome. **You will find that it was Simon Magus, not Peter the apostle!**

It says here, 'he went to another place.' So, if he went to another place, pray tell, how could he assume his apostolate in Jerusalem?

- this is why it's important that you **prove all things**
- this is why it's important that you **believe your Bible first**

All the traditions of men are null and void before God!

From Wikipedia:

He then assumed his apostolate in Jerusalem, and his missionary efforts included travels to such cities of the pagan world as Antioch, Corinth, and eventually Rome.

Antioch was Paul's headquarters. Paul first went to Corinth. There is no account in the Scriptures that Peter ever went to Corinth. Then they say:

He made reference to the eternal city in his first epistle by noting that he writes from Babylon.

- How could that be Rome?

If that were true:

- What are they really admitting?

The Catholics are really admitting that **what they're doing came from Babylon!** Well, Peter was in Babylon, which is an area of Mesopotamia called Iraq today, because there were more Jews there in Babylon than any place else in the world.

Peter was one of the apostles to the circumcision. If he's the apostle to the circumcision, pray tell, when did the Italians ever embrace circumcision as a nation or as a people? **Never!** If they became Christians, they did not have to be circumcised, as we find by the edicts of James and the apostles from Acts 15.

So then, we're going to see a little later, Peter never went to Rome, and Paul never made one single reference to him in Rome. **So, this is a blatant lie**, which is on the Internet, on Wikipedia, and people accept it as true.

I'm going to read another statement here from this Wikipedia report that's important for us to understand, which is this:

It is certain that Peter died in Rome and that his martyrdom came during the reign of Emperor Nero, probably in 64_{A.D.}

Now, let's ask:

- Do they have any proof here? *It says*, "It's certain."
- Certain based upon what? *They have no evidence of it at all!*

Think of this for a minute:

When they got the bones from underneath the throne of St. Peter's Basilica, they could not prove that they were from Peter. Even one bone was identified from *a woman*. On top of that, the Vatican sits right on top of an ancient pagan burial ground, and the pagans would never have allowed a Jew or a Christian to be buried there.

Now then, from the earliest days of the Church, Peter was recognized as the Prince of the Apostles and the first supreme pontiff.

Not so!

His see, or that is where he had his pontificate, Rome, has thus enjoyed the position of primacy over the entire Catholic Church.

Now then, let's see something very important concerning how Peter would have conducted his ministry wherever he went, because this report quotes John 21, which we've already covered, 'Feed My sheep, shepherd My lambs, feed My sheep.' They say that's where Jesus made him the pope. **Not so!**

Let's see what Jesus said would be required of someone who would be chief of all. And then we will see that Peter followed that.

Matt. 20—we have a very interesting account here where the mother of James and John came to Jesus and said, 'Lord, I have a request for you.' And Jesus said, 'Well, say on, what is it?'

Matthew 20:21: "...She said to Him, 'Grant that these my two sons may sit one at Your right hand and one at *Your left hand* in Your Kingdom.'"

Verse 22: "But Jesus answered *and* said, 'You do not know what you are asking....'"

Then Jesus asked James and John if they were able to 'partake of the baptism' that He Himself was to partake of, referring to His crucifixion. They said, 'We are.' And He said, 'Yes, you will.'

Now this created a furor among the other ten disciples. So let's read it:

Verse 24: "And after hearing *this*, the ten were indignant against the two brothers. But Jesus called them to *Him and* said, 'You know that the rulers of the nations exercise lordship over them, and the great ones exercise authority over them'" (vs 24-25).

Now let's examine this in the Greek. To exercise lordship is 'kata kurio' downward. This is the lordship of those like the emperors—downward. That's exactly what the Roman Catholic Church has as their hierarchy. *The great ones!*

Who are the great ones? Well, Simon Magus, *the Peter that went to Rome*, was called 'a great one.' So, 'the great ones' *are the religious leaders!* It says that *they exercise authority*—'kata kurio'—*downward over them!* Notice what Jesus said here:

Verse 26: "However, **it shall not be this way among you**.... [twelve apostles] ...but whoever would become great among you, **let him be your servant**, and whoever would be first among you, **let him be your slave**" (vs 26-27).

Now think about that for a minute. That's not how the popes consider what they do today. No, they are 'vicars of Christ,' *the replacement of Christ.*

Can any man anywhere in the world replace Christ? *Of course not!* The very titles that he [the pope] holds—Pontiff Maximus—is straight from paganism. We will see that in the genealogies of the popes, *they are missing the first pope!* And I'll tell you who that is in just a bit.

Verse 28: "Just as the Son of man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many.'

Did Peter learn that lesson? *The answer is, yes, he learned that lesson!*

1-Peter 5—let's see how Peter viewed himself.

- Did he view himself as one who was in a high, exalted office, and everybody had to come and bow down and kiss his ring or kiss his feet?

OR

- Did he consider himself an elder who did the work of an apostle?

An apostle merely means one who is sent with authority. How many apostles were there? *Twelve!* So, let's read what he says here in 1-Peter 5, and we will see that he learned the lesson.

1-Peter 5:1: "*The elders who are among you* I exhort, even as a fellow elder, and an *eyewitness* of the sufferings of Christ, and a partaker of the glory that is about to be revealed: Feed the flock of God *that is among you*..." (vs 1-2).

Stop right here and ask: Did Jesus ask Peter three times to feed the sheep, shepherd the lambs, and feed by flock? *Yes!* The Catholics claim that made Peter the chief apostle.

- Is Peter here making these other elders chief apostles by saying, 'Feed the flock of God'?
- Was Paul in Acts 20—when he told the elders from Ephesus to feed the Church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood?
- Did all of those elders become popes?

So, you see how the reasoning breaks down!

- ***There is no proof in the Bible that Peter was ever the first pope!***
- ***There is no proof in the Bible that Peter ever went to Rome!***

Now in writing this from Babylon, Peter writing to the other elders as addressed in the first couple of verses of the first chapter. Notice what he says here:

"...exercising oversight not by compulsion, but willingly; not in fondness of dishonest gain, but *with an eager attitude*" (v 2).

Notice v 3 very, very carefully; the same words that Jesus gave to the apostles:

Verse 3: **“Not as exercising lordship over your possessions; but by being examples to the flock of God.”**

Now then, did Peter learn that lesson? *Yes, he did!* So, *it is not true to say that Peter was the first pope!* Let me bring this to you here again from the Wikipedia:

From the earliest days of the Church, Peter was recognized as the Prince of the Apostles.

Nowhere does it say that in Scripture?

And the first supreme pontiff, his see, Rome, has thus enjoyed the position of primacy over the entire Catholic Church.

Let’s tell you about a pope that is never listed in the lineage of the popes of Rome. This is from:

Miller’s Church History by Andrew Miller

This is talking about Constantine in 325_{A.D.}

Constantine now took his place more openly to the whole world as the head of the church.

An emperor as the head of the church?

And at the same time retained his office of Pontiff Maximus, which is the title that the pope of Rome today embraces.

Where did that come from?

The high priest of the heathen.”

It came from Babylon!

This he never gave up, and he died head of the church and high priest of the heathen.”

Think about that!

- Do you read these things?
- Are you given this history?
- Are you told the truth?

If you go to church on Sunday—which you shouldn’t be doing; you should be observing the Sabbath—***how much truth do you hear?*** *Well, you hear enough to make you feel good!* But do you hear enough to really change your life?

from *Subversion of Christianity* by David Frohlock: (transcriber’s note-unsure of spelling last name)

In 325_{A.D.}, Constantine at the Council of Nicaea set the date Easter when the sun crossed the zodiac of Taurus, a most important time to the pagans. Made to cross, the primary symbol of this merged

Christianity, set Sunday as the legally binding day of worship of the empire, and added all the basic dogmas now given Christian names.

Constantine himself had become the first potter or pope.

This is the origin of the succession of papal authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Any claims by the Roman Catholic Church to apostolic authority, that is through the primitive Christian Church, by succession to the Apostle Peter, are without factual basis.

Absolutely true! Isn’t that astounding? Yet, what do you have? *You have today billions, over a billion people believing that!*

Much of the world also believing it because the Vatican has ambassadors from nearly every country in the world, even including Iran.

Why is that? *Because Rome is the center of pagan religion!* It has adopted all the pagan customs that have come from Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome. *It is not Christian by any stretch of the imagination!*

Now then, let me challenge you to this. Because some people get so emotionally involved, they set out to do things to destroy the messenger and the message.

However, you can never stamp out Truth. We have given you the Truth concerning this from the Scriptures and also from true history. There’s more yet to learn about the Apostle Peter.

So once again, thank you for inviting me into your home. Next time we’ll continue the rest of the story concerning the pope. So, be sure and visit our other website: **cbcg.org** **[or truthofGod.org](http://truthofGod.org)**.

Until next time, this is Fred Coulter saying so long, everyone.

Scriptural References:

- 1) Acts 12:17
- 2) Matthew 20:21-22, 24-28
- 3) 1 Peter 5:1-3

Scriptures referenced, not quoted:

- Acts 18:2; 2; 15
- John 21
- Acts 20

Also referenced: Books

- *Miller's Church History* by Andrew Miller
- *Subversion of Christianity* by David Frohlock
(transcriber's note-unsure of spelling last name)

FRC:bo/po
Transcribed: 12/28/23