

## Peter not in Rome - Concluding Comments

While I am not completely sure what town was referred to by Peter in 1 Peter 5:13, I would like to make the following brief comments:

- 1) If the Babylon in I Peter 5:13 does not refer to Rome, then there is absolutely no contemporaneous evidence that Peter ever was in Rome, and thus the idea of him being the first bishop of Rome would be absurd.
- 2) Even if Peter ever was in Rome, the fact is that Paul was in Rome before Peter, and thus has a greater claim to have been the first bishop of Rome.
- 3) The Book of Acts demonstrates that Paul was the first to speak to the Jewish leaders in Rome about the kingdom of God--thus it makes no sense that Peter could have been "Bishop of Rome" for the 18 years prior to this.
- 4) The fact is that neither Peter nor Paul founded the church in Rome (this is documented in the article [What Does Rome Actually Teach About Early Church History?](#)) thus there probably was an earlier leader other than them.
- 5) There were no bishops in Rome prior to the second century according to many Catholic sources.
- 6) Even if Peter did go to Rome, he was never there long enough to fix his residence there.
- 7) Even if Peter did fix his residence there (and there is no clear contemporaneous evidence that he did, even writing one letter would not prove it), that of itself does not mean that some church leader in Rome automatically would have the authority over all the Christian churches.
- 8) If Peter was the first among equals, then after his death one equal to his apostolic rank would be the logical leader.
- 9) The Apostle John was alive for decades after Peter died. It makes no sense that he, an apostle, would have a lower rank than a leader in Rome, who was probably just an elder/presbyter.
- 10) If Rome was the place that had what many Roman Catholics call *the cathedra* of authority of the true Church, the Apostle John who warned about false teachers, etc. could have made the understanding of where the true Church was by indicating that it was Rome. Yet, instead, according to Roman Catholic sources, his last writing appears to warn against Rome.

So Peter may have been to Rome, may have died in Rome, or perhaps neither. But either way, he along with the Apostle John were leaders of the early church. And while we have early sources (from within a decade or so of John's death) indicating who John's successor was, we have no contemporaneous evidence suggesting that any one other than John was Peter's *de facto* successor.

And no true successor of Peter would behave in the grandiose ways that many [Roman Catholic](#) pontiffs have.

Paul noted that there were three leaders in Jerusalem during one of his visits there: James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars (Galatians 2:9).

He undoubtedly listed James first because James was the leader who actually lived in Jerusalem (the others were visiting). But notice that Paul then listed Cephas, who is Peter, and then John. This may suggest that Paul considered that Peter, at that time, had higher authority, sometimes called primacy. It also shows that Peter apparently conferred with John, hence Peter helped train him as a potential successor.

Yet, possibly around 64-67 A.D., Peter was killed, hence he no longer held physical primacy over the remaining apostles.

Now John greatly outlived Peter and is believed to have lived as late as 95-100 A.D. John was an apostle, the early leaders of Rome were only presbyters. The Bible clearly teaches that apostles were first (I Corinthians 12:28). Notice that even Roman Catholic scholars understand: