

# Chapter 2

## Peter

13 Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, He was asking His disciples, "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" 14 And they said, "Some say John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; but still others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets." 15 He said to them, "But who do you say that I am?" 16 Simon Peter answered, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." 17 And Jesus said to him, "Blessed are you, Simon Barjona, because flesh and blood did not reveal *this* to you, but My Father who is in heaven. 18 I also say to you that you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church; and the gates of Hades will not overpower it.<sup>1</sup>

As pointed out in chapter 1, there are three key New Testament texts used by the Roman Catholic Church in support of its doctrine of the papacy: Matthew 16:13-20, John 20:21-23, and John 21:15-19. Chapters 2 through 11 present a thorough study of the topics raised by the first of these three texts, while chapters 12-14 deal with the second two texts.

### General Observations

Regarding the Roman Catholic view of Matthew 16:13-20, a few *prima facie* observations are in order.

*First:* As pointed out in chapter 1, although Peter's confession is recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels, the content of Jesus' three-part response is presented only in Matthew; Mark and Luke omitted it.<sup>2</sup> This makes it

---

1 Matt. 16:13-18.

2 Some liberal scholars doubt the authenticity of verses 17-19 because they are missing in Mark and Luke. Others accept these statements by

difficult to believe that it was ever intended to be the foundation of so important, so central, a doctrine as the permanent supremacy of Peter and his successors over the church.<sup>3</sup>

*Second:* If a doctrine of the permanent supremacy of Peter is to be found in this text, it seems strange that Peter himself never even mentions "the church" (Greek, ἐκκλησία), much less his supreme position over it, in either of his own two letters, 1 Peter or 2 Peter.

*Third:* If designating Peter as the head of the church is the intent of Jesus in this passage, it is difficult to explain how the disciples twice subsequently got into an argument over who would be the greatest in the kingdom of God, the second time on the very night before Christ's death.<sup>4</sup>

*Fourth:* Again, if designating Peter as the head of the church is the intent of Jesus here, how is it that Jesus, not long after Peter's confession, very clearly defined Peter's future role simply as one of the twelve with no supremacy over the others? Peter's eschatological destiny in the Messianic kingdom, according to Jesus, was to sit on one of twelve equal thrones together with the other eleven disciples judging the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>5</sup>

---

Jesus as authentic but argue that they belong to another time and setting in Jesus' ministry. A number of theories are proposed by these various scholars. In general, issues of biblical criticism are not discussed in this book. I assume the authenticity of these statements and that they were actually stated by Jesus at the time and place of Peter's confession as recorded in Matthew. For a defense of this position, see D. A. Carson, *Matthew*, in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, 12 vols., gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), VIII:366-67. I also accept the authenticity and proper placement of the events in John 20:21-23 and 21:15-19.

3 This point was argued by Theodore Beza (1519-1605), a French Protestant theologian, scholar, and student of John Calvin, cited by Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 2 vols., 5th ed. (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Co., 1886), II:81.

4 Matt. 18:1; Luke 22:24.

5 Matt. 19:28. One may note that in four lists of the twelve disciples (Matt. 10:2-4; Mark 3:16-19; Luke 6:13-16; Acts 1:13), Peter is always mentioned first. However, this hardly implies the supremacy the Catholic Church would like to confer upon Peter. As William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973), p. 452, observes, throughout the gospels Peter is mentioned the most often. He had a personality that would make him stand out in the group and several times was spokesman for that group. Thus, according to Hendriksen, "He is

*Fifth:* Rather than giving Peter the role of the first pope in Rome over the entire church, which quickly became a predominantly Gentile institution, God made him an apostle to the Jews.<sup>6</sup> This mission is quite consistent with Peter's eventual eschatological destiny relative to Israel described in the preceding paragraph.

*Sixth:* Even if Jesus did intend to give Peter a position of supremacy in the church, it certainly does not follow from anything in Matthew 16:18-19 that this supremacy would be transferred to a series of "successors" of Peter, nor that the Pope of Rome is a successor of Peter.<sup>7</sup> In fact, there is no solid historical evidence that Peter was ever Bishop of Rome. More on the historical argument is given at the end of chapter 9.

*Seventh:* If Peter was to have a successor as head of the church, then upon Peter's death this successor, though himself not one of the twelve apostles, would have authority over a surviving apostle, namely, John.<sup>8</sup> This is a singularly difficult state of affairs to imagine.

Once the dogmatic inferences drawn from Matthew 16:13-20 by the Roman Catholic Church are seen as at least questionable, it is possible to examine the meaning of Christ's three-part response strictly according to the grammatical-historical method of interpretation.<sup>9</sup>

---

indeed the leader of the group." Carson, *Matthew*, p. 237, suggests that Matthew's use of the word "first" (πρωτος) implies *primus inter pares* ("first among equals"). This is not the Roman Catholic doctrine of Peter. Moreover, there is no indication in that this "first among equals" status, if an accurate description of Peter in the gospels, continues in the eschatological role described in Matt. 19:28. Indeed, it does not even seem to have continued during the period of the Book of Acts. In Acts 15 James, not even one of the twelve, makes the final decision, and in Gal. 2:9, this same James is mentioned first in the list: "James and Cephas [Peter] and John." Gal. 2:6-9.

6

7 Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, 4 vols. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1958; original publication date, 1849), I:173, makes the following point: "Nothing can be further from any legitimate interpretation of this promise [in Matt. 16:18], than the idea of a perpetual primacy in the successors of Peter; the very notion of *succession* is precluded by the form of the comparison, which concerns the person, and *him only*, so far as it involves a *direct* promise" (emphasis original).

8 Carson, *Matthew*, p. 368.

9 According to Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.; original publication date, 1890), p. 203, "The grammatico-historical sense of a writer is such an

In this regard, the first point to make is that the whole of this response is entirely Hebraistic.<sup>10</sup> There is no hint of Greek background or Gentile orientation.

- Peter's great confession to which Jesus is responding is, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God."<sup>11</sup> The central truth about the ministry of Jesus and the most important truth about him in Peter's estimation here is that Jesus is the Messiah of Israel.
- "Blessed are you," the first part of Jesus' response, is Jewish in spirit and form.
- The Greek word for "son" (υἱός) is not used in Matthew 16:17 in Jesus' address to Peter. The Greek text of Matthew has Σιμων Βαριωνα, translated "Simon Barjona" in the NASB. Σιμων, or Simon, is the name used for Peter in this phrase. βαρ is the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic בַּר (*bar*, "son"), corresponding to the Hebrew בֶּן (*ben*), and Ιωνα is the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic/Hebrew name יוֹנָה, "Jonah." Thus the expression "Simon, son of Jonah," shows not only that Jesus and Peter were speaking Aramaic,<sup>12</sup> but perhaps even more

---

interpretation of his language as is required by the laws of grammar and the facts of history." Terry describes the grammatical-historical method of interpretation in more detail as follows: it has as its "fundamental principle...to gather from the Scriptures themselves the precise meaning which the writers intended to convey. It applies to the sacred books the same principles, the same grammatical process and exercise of common sense and reason, which we apply to other books. The grammatico-historical exegete...will investigate the language and import of each book...He will master the language of the writer, the particular dialect that he used, and his particular style and manner of expression. He will inquire into the circumstances under which he wrote, the manner and customs of his age, and the purpose or object which he had in view" (p. 173).

10 Points two through five in this list are taken from Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II:81.

11 Χριστός, "Christ," is the Greek word meaning *anointed one, Messiah* (AG, p. 895). It is a translation of the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ, (*Mashiach*) *anointed [one]*, from מָשַׁח, *to smear, to anoint* (BDB, pp. 602-03).

12 "Indeed, a Jewish Messiah responding, in the hour of His Messianic acknowledgment, in Greek to His Jewish confessor, seems utterly incongruous" (Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II:81). On the other hand, the possibility that Jesus and the disciples sometimes spoke Hebrew cannot be entirely dismissed: "That

importantly displays the Jewish custom of citing the father as almost part of the name of a male child.<sup>13</sup>

- The expression "flesh and blood" is a common Jewish expression to distinguish man from God.<sup>14</sup>
- The phrase, "my Father who is in the heavens" (ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), is language familiar to Jewish ears (אַבִּינוּ שְׁבַשְׁמַיִם).

In such a thoroughly Jewish passage, it is difficult to insert reference to a centralized, monolithic, Gentile organization headquartered in Rome.

Now that the background and context of Christ's response to Peter's confession have been established to be Jewish, the statements can be examined in detail.

## The Role Played by Peter

### What Was Peter's Name?

In Matthew 16:18, the word translated "Peter" is the masculine noun *πετρος* (*petros*), while "rock" is the feminine noun *πετρα* (*petra*). The use of these two words in this verse has generated much discussion and argument over the centuries. However, before examining this issue, a question must be answered: What was the actual name of this disciple?

His true Hebrew name is שְׁמַעוֹן, a common name among the

---

Jesus and His disciples spoke Aram. does not justify us in assuming too easily that they used this familiar speech alone in the sphere of divine worship. It may be presupposed that they must have had some acquaintance with Heb. as the ancient ecclesiastical language of their people" (Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "ἐκκλησία," *TDNT*, III:524). Note that Luke 4:16 implies that Jesus definitely spoke Hebrew on occasion. Nevertheless, it is my working hypothesis in this book that in Matthew 16, Jesus and the disciples were indeed speaking in Aramaic.

13 This custom is illustrated hundreds of times throughout the Old Testament. E.g., Num. 1:5-15; 7:12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60, 66, 72, 78; 13:4-15; 16:1; 1 Sam. 1:1; 2 Sam. 6:3; 16:5; Ezra 7:1; Neh. 1:1; Esther 2:5; Isa. 1:1; Jer. 1:1; Jonah 1:1; Zeph. 1:1; Hag. 1:1; Zech 1:1.

14 E.g., Sirach 14:18; 17:31.

Jews. Its Greek transliteration employed in the New Testament is Συμεων, or *Symeon*.<sup>15</sup> However, this name is used only at Acts 15:14 and in some manuscripts of 2 Peter 1:1.<sup>16</sup> By contrast, the name Σιμων, *Simon*, is a common Greek name, etymologically unrelated to שִׁמְעוֹן (*Symeon*):

The Gospels, however, use Simon, a Gk. proper name attested already in Aristoph. Nu., 351. The disciple later came to be known as Simon, since there is a similarity in sound between the Gk. and the Heb. names, and Simon could easily replace the non-Gk. Symeon. It is possible, indeed, that from the very first Peter bore the Gk. as well as the Heb. name, esp. if, like Philip, he came from Bethsaida, which was under Gk. influence.<sup>17</sup>

In John 1:42 another "name" found:

He brought him to Jesus. Jesus looked at him and said, "You are Simon the son of John; you shall be called Cephas" (which is translated Peter).<sup>18</sup>

Κηφας (*Cephas*) is a Greek transliteration of the Aramaic

---

15 *Symeon* (usually spelled *Simeon* in the English translations) is the transliteration of Συμεων into English letters. The transliteration of שִׁמְעוֹן directly into English letters would be somewhat different.

16 Peter's second letter in some MSS begins, Συμεων Πητρος (*Symeon Peter*), while other MSS have Σιμων Πητρος (*Simon Peter*). His first letter opens simply with Πητρος (*Peter*).

17 Oskar Cullmann, "Πητρος, Κηφας," *TDNT*, VI:100.

18 John 1:40 might give the impression that Peter was already called "Peter" or "Cephas" before he met Jesus for the first time in v. 42: "One of the two who heard John speak and followed Him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother." However, "Cephas" is probably used proleptically in v. 40 since John wrote long after it became a common name for Simon. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), p. 159, makes this statement on verse 40: "When the Gospel was written the great Apostle [Simon Peter] was well known and this way of writing is both intelligible and natural."

word אֲפֵי, <sup>19</sup> meaning "rock" or "stone."<sup>20</sup> It is not attested as a proper name in Aramaic.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, Jesus is probably giving Symeon a nickname at this point in anticipation of his noble confession in Matthew 16.<sup>22</sup>

Now note the translation of אֲפֵי given by John: σὺ κληθήσῃ <sup>23</sup> Κηφᾶς (ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται <sup>24</sup> Πέτρος): "you will be called Cephas (which is translated Petros)." So Symeon's

---

19 The Hebrew letter כ (Kaph) is normally transliterated into English as "k" or "kh" and is so pronounced. א (Aleph) does not have a corresponding letter in the English or Greek alphabets and is transliterated into modern English as ' (an apostrophe with its tail curling downward to the left; the Hebrew letter א [Ayin] also has no corresponding letter in English and is transliterated as an apostrophe with its tail curling upward to the right). Therefore, the best English transliteration of the Aramaic word אֲפֵי is *kēphā'*. The New Testament writers transliterate אֲפֵי into Greek by replacing the א with a typical Greek ending ς, resulting in κηφας. This in turn transliterates into English as *kephas*. However, English versions of the Bible normally use "c" instead of "k," giving *cephas*, which is normally pronounced "see-phas." However, if "c" is used, it should be pronounced as in "cat," as it also should be in the case of the basketball team, Boston Celtics!

20 The Hebrew equivalent is אֶבֶן, *rock*, which is used only in the plural and only at Job 30:6 and Jer. 4:29.

21 Cullmann, "Πετρος, Κηφας", *TDNT*, VI:100-101. Cullmann also states, "The fact of translation [by John in 1:42] supports the contention that Cephas was not a proper name, since one does not translate proper names." Well known archaeologist, biblical scholar, and philologist, William F. Albright, in his commentary with C. S. Mann, *Matthew*, in *The Anchor Bible*, gen. eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1970), p. 195, makes a similar statement: "There is no evidence of Peter or Kephas as a name before Christian times." In view of Cullmann's entry in *TDNT* and Albright and Mann's comment, it is curious that Carson, *Matthew*, pp. 119 and 367, quite dogmatically states, "While uncertainties remain, what is quite certain is that *kēpā'* ('rock,' 'stone'), the Aramaic equivalent of 'Peter,' was already an accepted name in Jesus' day." Carson cites only one source, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Aramaic *Kepha'* and Peter's Name in the New Testament," in *Text and Interpretation*, eds. Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: University Press, 1979), a source to which I do not have access. However, the issue, though interesting, has no direct bearing on the interpretation of Matt. 16:13-20.

nickname given to him by Jesus is *Cephas* in Aramaic and, by translation, *Petros* in Greek, which is written in English as *Peter*.

### Πετρος and Πειτρα (*Petros* and *Petra*)

In Matthew 16:18 Jesus makes the following statement to Peter: σὺ εἶ Πέτρος,<sup>25</sup> καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ<sup>26</sup> οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ("you are *Petros* and upon this *petra* I will build my church"). Neither *πετρος* nor *πειτρα* are proper names; they are simply Greek nouns, with *πετρος* given by John as a Greek translation of the Aramaic noun, *cephas*,<sup>27</sup> which Jesus gave Symeon as a nickname in John 1:42. What then is the relationship between the words *πετρος* and *πειτρα*? Are they synonyms?

According to Oskar Cullmann in his entry on *πειτρα*,

The fem. *πειτρα* is predominantly used in secular Gk. for a large and solid "rock." It may denote equally well the individual cliff or a stony and rocky mountain chain....The masc. *πετρος* is used more for isolated rocks or small stones, including flints and pebbles for slings. Since there is such a great difference in content, the emphasis should be noted, though in practice one cannot differentiate too strictly between *πειτρα* and *πετρος*; they are often

---

22 A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1932), V:28. Cullmann also calls Cephas a nickname. However, even though there is a sense in which Cephas is a nickname, it was taken no doubt quite seriously by Jesus. Morris, *The Gospel According to John* p. 160, makes the following observation: "This [re-naming] must be understood in the light of the significance attaching to the 'name' in antiquity...It stood for the whole man. It summed up his whole personality. The giving of a new name when done by men is an assertion of the authority of the giver (e.g. II Kings 23:34; 24:17). When done by God it speaks of a new character in which the man henceforth appears (e.g. Gen. 32:28). There is something of both ideas here."

23 2nd singular future passive indicative of *καλεω*, to call, to name.

24 3rd singular present passive indicative of *ερμηνευω*, to interpret; passive, to be translated.

25 A masculine noun.

26 A feminine noun.

27 AG, p. 660: "Πετρος as a name can scarcely be pre-Christian...From the beginning it was probably thought of as the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic כֶּפָּאס = κηφας."



used interchangeably.<sup>28</sup>

Similarly in his entry on πέτρος, this same author writes,

The difference in meaning between the two Gk. words is not fixed, though in common Gk. usage ο πέτρος tends to denote the isolated rock and η πέτρα the cliff.<sup>29</sup>

A. T. Robertson describes the distinction as follows:

In the ancient Greek, *petra* was used for the ledge of rock like Stone Mountain while *petros* was a detached fragment of the ledge, though itself large.<sup>30</sup>

However, he adds that the distinction only "may" exist in Matthew 16:18.

Arndt and Gingrich<sup>31</sup> define πέτρα (*petra*) as *rock*, the word used for the "rock" out of which a tomb is hewn<sup>32</sup> and on which a house is built.<sup>33</sup> It is also used in the Septuagint (LXX)<sup>34</sup> for the rock that Moses struck to obtain water.<sup>35</sup> They define πέτρος (*petros*) as *stone* and note that it is used in this sense by Homer.

Nigel Turner, however, makes the point that whatever distinction between πέτρος and πέτρα might have existed in secular, pre-Koine Greek, the use of πέτρος "was out of general use" in NT times, and that Symeon's nickname πέτρος was just "a masculinizing of πέτρα."<sup>36</sup>

---

28 Cullmann, "Πέτρα," *TDNT*, VI:95.

29 Cullmann, "Πέτρος, Κηφας," *TDNT*, VI:101.

30 Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, V:28.

31 AG, p. 660.

32 Matt. 27:60; Mark 15:46.

33 Matt. 7:24-25; Luke 6:48.

34 The Septuagint, abbreviated LXX, was the Greek translation of the Old Testament completed by the end of the second century B.C. and familiar to Greek-speaking Jews, certainly to the writers of the New Testament.

35 Exod. 17:6; Num. 20:8, 10-11.

36 Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 22; vol. III of *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament* by James Hope Moulton. The -os ending is masculine, while the -a ending is feminine. Other eminent scholars have also made this suggestion. For example, Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*, I:173, and F. F. Bruce, *The Hard Sayings of Jesus* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1983), p. 143.

As already argued, Jesus was speaking Aramaic on the occasion recorded in Matthew 16:18, and would therefore have used the same word כִּפְּי, *Cephas* (*Kepha*), both times: "You are *kepha*, and upon this *kepha* I will build my church." Therefore, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that there is no material difference between *πέτρος* and *πετρα* as used in this verse: the meaning of *πετρα* obtains for both. Turner's observation gives a good rationale for the different spelling by Matthew when using the noun for Symeon's nickname: he had to "masculinize" it.<sup>37</sup> On this view, John's statement, Κηφᾶς (ὃ ἔρμηνεύεται Πέτρος), "Cyphas (which is translated Petros)," is saying that the best Greek translation of כִּפְּי (*Cephas*) is *πετρα* (*petra*), but he spelled it *πέτρος* (*petros*) to turn the feminine noun *πετρα* into a masculine noun morphologically (in its form).

### Who or What Is the *πετρα* on Which the Church is Built?

There have been at least four answers to this question:

- The *petra* upon which Christ will build his church is *Christ himself*.<sup>38</sup>

---

37 Carson, *Matthew*, p. 368, also sees no substantive distinction. As evidence he points out that "the Peshitta (written in Syriac, a language cognate with Aramaic) makes no distinction between the words in the two clauses."

38 Of the various views in the list, this one places the most emphasis on the presumed distinction between *petros* and *petra*, especially their difference in "size": Peter is a (little) stone (*petros*), but upon this (big) rock (*petra*) the church will be built. E.g., Arno C. Gaebelin, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1961; original publication date, 1910), p. 349: "The word *Peter--petros--*means a part of a rock, that is a stone. When the Lord says upon what He is going to build his church, He no longer speaks of *petros*, a stone, but he uses the word *petra*, which means a rock, out of which the *petros*, the stone, is hewn....'This rock' upon which the assembly is built is 'Christ, the Son of the living God' as confessed by Peter." John F. Walvoord, *Jesus Christ Our Lord*, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1969), p. 239, similarly bases his view on a distinction between *petros* and *petra*, although he takes the *petra* to be the totality of the apostles and prophets. He paraphrases Matt. 16:18 as follows: "You are Peter [a little stone or sliver of rock], and on this rock [consisting of many flaked pieces--the totality of apostles and prophets, Eph. 2:20] I will build my church" (insertions original).

- The *petra* upon which Christ will build his church is *Peter's confession*: Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the living God.<sup>39</sup>
- The *petra* upon which Christ will build his church is *the type of faith* Peter exhibited in his confession.<sup>40</sup>
- The *petra* upon which Christ will build his church is *Peter himself*.<sup>41</sup>

The first three views are all based, to varying degrees, on a distinction between *petros* and *petra*. However, as already noted, any distinction between them is difficult to maintain in view of the fact that Jesus almost certainly spoke Aramaic and simply used the same word, *kepha*, twice. Therefore, if for no other reason, the fourth view is to be preferred.

There are, in addition, many scholars who also argue that any other view but the fourth strains the language of Jesus' statement.

There is no reference here to the faith of Peter. Rather, the parallelism of "thou art Rock" and "on this rock I will build" shows that the second rock can only be the same as the first. It is thus evident that Jesus is referring to Peter, to whom he

---

39 E.g., Andrew E. Hill, "Rock," *ISBE*, IV:206: "By this [statement in Matt. 16:18] Jesus was signifying that the foundation of the Church was to be the affirmation of Him as the Christ."

40 E.g., Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, I:132: "What is the rock on which Christ will build his vast temple? Not on Peter alone or mainly or primarily. Peter by his confession was furnished with the illustration for the rock on which His church will rest. It is the same kind of faith that Peter has just confessed." Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II:83, presents a similar view: "Perhaps it [the distinction suggested by the distinct terms *petros* and *petra*] might be expressed in this somewhat clumsy paraphrase: 'Thou art Peter (Petros)--a Stone or Rock--and upon this Petra--the Rock, the Petrine--will I found My Church.' If, therefore, we would not entirely limit the reference to the words of Peter's confession, we would certainly apply them to that which was the Petrine in Peter: the heaven-given faith which manifested itself in his confession."

41 Most who take this view refer it to Peter alone. Alford, *The Greek Testament*, I:173, presents a variation: "He was the first of those *foundation-stones* (Rev. xxi. 14) on which the living temple of God was built" (emphasis original).

has given the name Rock.<sup>42</sup>

The word THIS [ταύτη] makes reference to anything else than the immediately preceding *petros* very unnatural.<sup>43</sup>

D. A. Carson makes an additional point that it would be a strange mixture of metaphors in the same verse if the builder of the church is also its foundation.<sup>44</sup>

It is sometimes argued that if Jesus wanted to state that he would build his church on Peter, he would have said, "You are Peter, and *upon you* I will build my church."<sup>45</sup> However, the Jewish people loved puns, and it is easy to see an intended play on words here.<sup>46</sup>

If the fourth view, then, is accepted, in what sense was the church to be built on Peter? Before this question can be addressed, however, the nature of the "church" to be built must be examined.

---

42 Cullmann, "Πετρος, Κηφος", *TDNT*, VI:108. In his entry on Πετρα, he states similarly, "Πετρος himself is this πετρα, not just his faith or his confession" (VI:99).

43 Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew*, p. 647.

44 Carson, *Matthew*, p. 368.

45 E.g., Gaebelein, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 349.

46 E.g., Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, I:131: "But Jesus has a purpose now in using his nickname 'Peter' which he had himself given him [in John 1:42]. Jesus makes a remarkable play on Peter's name, a pun in fact..." Similarly, Cullmann, "Πετρα," *TDNT*, VI:98, calls it an "obvious pun."