

Was Peter the first pope? (Part 3 of 3)

© 2013
The King James Bible Church
HARLEY HITCHCOCK
PO Box 310 Mt Ommaney
Australia 4074
e: hitchcock1611@gmail.com

This follows "Was Peter the first pope?" (Pts [1](#) & [2](#))

15. Peter ignores tradition

Peter takes the opposite view of tradition that Rome has, saying "...ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation **received by tradition from your fathers**;" (1 Pet 1:18)

16. Peter was only an apostle

If Christ had instituted Peter as the first pope, why is there no record of Peter letting everyone know this. Surely this would have been in line with his character? Why doesn't Peter sign off his two epistles with "His Supreme Pontiff, Vicar of Christ on earth, Ruler of all Kings"? No, he simply calls himself "...an apostle of Jesus Christ..." (1 Pet 1:1).

17. Peter says Paul knows more than him

Finally after the confrontation he had with Paul 14 years earlier (Gal 2:11), Peter admits his lack of knowledge. We read "As also in all his (Paul's) epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are **some things hard to be understood**, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, ... (2 Pet 3:16)

Surely then, it stretches the imagination that Peter is the perfect human vessel for all knowledge and wisdom as the first pope?

18. Peter only writes two books

Why would Peter, the first pope, write less books than Paul who wrote fourteen? If anyone should be the first pope, it should be Paul? But Rome wouldn't have that, because, as we have seen, Paul **completely supercedes** the gospel of Peter's kingdom of heaven with **his** kingdom of God gospel.

19. Peter is called satan

For more information contact:
AUSTRALIAN BIBLE MINISTRIES PO Box 5058 MT Gravatt East 4122 Qld, Australia
www.australianbibleministries.com

It defies belief, that Christ having chosen Peter as the first pope, would **four verses later** then call him **Satan!** The scriptures say "*But he turned, and **said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.***" (Matt 16:23)

Why would Christ, knowing who Peter really was, call him Supreme Pontiff in one breath and then Satan in the next? If Peter was the first pope, then surely he would be thirsting after the things of God, but no, Christ says Peter was **savouring the things of men!**

20. Peter said not to confess sins to him

In Acts 8:22, Peter tells of Simon of Samaria that he should pray to God, not himself, where we read "*Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, **and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.***" (Acts 8:22)

21. Peter, popes and priests are not the mediator between God and man And it certainly isn't Mary! *For there is one God, and **one mediator** between God and men, **the man Christ Jesus;*** (1 Tim 2:5).

Indeed, "... he (Jesus) is **the mediator of the new testament, ... the promise of eternal inheritance.** (Heb 9:15) "... when **he had by himself** (Jesus) **purged our sins, ...**"; (Heb 1:3)

All priests, popes and any special spiritual hierarchy, are totally unnecessary and unscriptural to the completed work of Christ and the cross. We read "... we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ **once for all.** And **every priest ... can never** take away sins: But **this man** (Jesus), after he had offered **one sacrifice for sins for ever, ...For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.**" (Heb 10:10-12, 14)

However, Rome, through its many man-made sacramental laws and rituals, uses fear upon its members, to fence them in. Nowhere in the New Testament can we find the use of such abominable practices.

22. Christ condemns the Nicolaitans

With the appointing of a special class of priests, popes and archbishops to rule over the laity, Rome dominates well over a billion people. Peter disagrees and informs - "**Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.**" (1 Pet 5:3)

Christ also **hates** the Nicolaitans ('conquering the laity') "... the deeds of the **Nicolaitans, which I also hate.** (Rev 2:6)

23. Peter is 'a PEBBLE' not 'the rock'

It is on the following verse that Rome claims that Peter was instituted as Supreme Pontiff by Christ. "*That **thou art Peter, and upon this rock I***

will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” (Matt 16:16-19).

However, the sincere student of the Bible should note the following facts: **Firstly**, from the evidence provided, surely Peter wouldn't be the one chosen by Christ to repel the gates of hell?

From the time Christ said these words, the common knowledge was, and indeed is now, that Peter's past and future record of his **faulty doctrine, sinfulness** and **disobedience**, would indicate that Christ would **not** choose Peter, to head up his church. If Peter was chosen as pope, one can imagine that Satan would be very happy!

Secondly, as we have discussed in a previous tract, Peter was only the first to get 'the keys' because of his answer "Thou art the Christ."

Christ then says "**Look dear Peter, let's make the distinction very clear, you are Peter, but I am the Rock on which I shall build my church. Despite your insightful answer, I'll be heading up the show dear boy ... and you won't! You are Peter and I am the Rock! Understand?**"

Thirdly, never in scripture is Peter referred to as 'a rock'. In fact the opposite is true as Peter means '**pebble**' or '**stone**' but **never** a '**rock**'. Peter, by his own admission calls himself a stone "**Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, ...**" (1 Pet 2:5).

He is saying to the strangers he is writing to (1Pet 1:1), "Look folks, **I'm only a stone** and you're only a stone, and we are just lively stones together in a spiritual house ...".

Fourthly, it is Christ who has the title of **the Rock** and no-one else, as Peter testifies that Christ is the rock saying "*Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a **chief corner stone, elect, precious: ...***" (1 Pet 2:6). Now a cornerstone is the stone that correctly determines the precise vertical, geometrical and mathematical exactness of a building. Peter, with all his wayward nature, could never be this.

Fifthly, the word for 'Peter' is 'Petros' which means 'a **small stone**' or 'a **rolling stone**' or 'a small stone that **can be thrown by hand**'. The word 'rock' is a PETRA which means 'a **great rock**'. So the Lord says to Peter "Thou art Petros (a small stone); and upon this **PETRA, ME, JESUS CHRIST** (a great rock) I will build my church." The Lord wants a clear distinction between himself and Peter, between the Petros and the PETRA. Christ did **not** say "Thou art **Petros** (a small stone, a **rolling** stone, in **one place today** and **some place else tomorrow**, a small stone that can be **thrown by hand**) and on thee I will build my church."

Dear Reader, do you understand the gravity of Christ's speech to Peter? Christ does **not** call Peter the PETRA, a rock that cannot be moved, but the **opposite**.

Peter is a stone that **can** be moved! He can be thrown about! Peter is called a Petros because of his **highly unstable** and **rebellious nature**. Christ knew that before the cross, Peter would deny him three times! Furthermore, in denying the prophecy of the cross, Peter attempts to turn Christ's thoughts from his upcoming crucifixion "...and began to **rebuke him**, saying, *Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee.* (Matt 16:22) (get that - **rebukes the Lord!** Of course only Satan would rebuke the Lord) No, Christ did **not** call him Petros for his steadfastness and strength of character ... just the opposite! Of all the twelve, there was not one as **weak** and **vacillating** as Peter.

No, **Christ is the rock of offence** as mentioned in the Old Testament (Is 8:14), by Paul (Rom 9:13) and Peter himself (1 Pet 2:8).

In addition, Christ is "...the foundation can no man lay that is laid..." (1 Cor 3:11); Christ is the Rock, the PETRA (1 Cor 10:4). Forty times in the Old Testament, the word "rock" is used - **the Rock of Israel was God himself** (Deut 32:4,18,30,31; 2Sam 23:3; Ps 18:2,31; 31:3)

And so, when Peter confesses "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God", he was simply re-affirming that Christ was the Rock, God himself, had **come down from heaven** and manifested in the Son. As has been said, it goes against the entire language of scripture, to have a sinful and fallible child of Adam as the foundation of God's spiritual temple,

It's as if the Lord had said "**Peter, please don't be upset, and I love you greatly, but you are a weak and vacillating stone, easily tossed about by others. You have all the backbone of a jellyfish, and that is why I call you Petros. Indeed, you have truly confessed that I am the PETRA, the Rock from heaven, the Son of the living God, the living Rock, and upon myself, I will build my church. I'm the team captain and you'll only ever be one of the players. I hope we all understand.**"

(This is endorsed by 16th century Roman Catholic documents and indeed by Chrysostom himself.)

In conclusion, "**If you were a Jew in the upcoming tribulation, you'd certainly want more than a flight into a Petros, wouldn't you? You'd want to be fleeing into Christ, the Rock from heaven, the PETRA, and not into Peter, the rolling stone, the Petros.**"

* Note: The above 23 points haven't been written to malign Peter, but only to show Rome's **total inability** to discern God's words.