
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

WAS PETER IN ROME, AND BISHOP OF THE CHURCH AT ROME?

[Concluded from Vol. XV. p. 624.]

PART II. — THE TRADITION.

§ 22. *Opening of the subject.*

THE holy Scriptures thus not only furnish no proof that Peter was at Rome, founded the church there, and presided over it as bishop; but they beyond doubt prove the contrary.

If now, in spite of this, an attempt be made to save that position, the proof must be taken from tradition. And this has been done without further ceremony.

Had any of the Fathers, or of the authors of the first century, *unquestionably* testified to those pretended facts referring to Peter, weight might have been attached thereto, and it must be respected; but it is not so. The older witnesses, who are wholly unquestioned, proceed from the third century, and deserve not unconditioned belief. Let us see.

§ 23. *The Apocryphas.*

Already in the first century of the church, by pious fraud or the craft of errorists, a multitude of fables and inventions respecting the person of the Saviour, his blessed mother, the apostles, etc., were put into circulation and interpolated into the gaps which the holy Scriptures had left in their representations. Here belong also those writings which have come down to us under the names of Linus, Clemens, Prochorus, Marcellus, Dionysius the Areopagite; of which those of Linus and Dionysius contain a history of the sufferings and death of Peter and Paul; those of Clemens, namely his letter to James, and his Recognitions, similar

accounts; but those of Prochorus, a history of the life and acts of John the apostle.[1] They are plain, open, and bold fictions, filled up with pious conversations, reflections, and fabulous, strange stories. Here, for instance, belongs the statement that John the apostle was a furnace-heater, and a water-carrier to a bath-woman at Rome. Among them are likewise to be found heretical opinions, for example, that the apostles persuaded many women to leave their husbands against the will of the same.

From these and similar corrupt sources, in the tenth century, a certain Metaphrastes composed a description of Peter's travels, in which are marked out all the places where he touched, the churches he founded, and his memorials and monuments, which he everywhere left behind him.

From these writings interpolated, or unworthy of credit, are taken all those data and special accounts, respecting Peter's life, and particularly of his abode in Rome.

These authorities are naturally precisely the most important legends, and they first spread abroad and established those stories, as they brought them out among the common people.

The first centuries of the church were extremely fruitful in such figments; the life of Peter afforded them the greatest room, as the holy Scriptures say so little of him from A. D. 45 and onward. As it was known from the holy Scriptures that *Paul* founded the church at Rome; as this when established at the capital of the world was the first and most distinguished; as the relations of rank in the churches began to be formed in the second and third centuries; so it was natural that they should make out the Romish church to have been founded by those two of the apostles who were regarded as the greatest.[2] Hence they placed Peter at Rome and made him bishop there.

It may be said that such a figment would not have been possible unless at least Peter's presence at Rome was a matter of fact, as its basis. This does not follow. James was

[1] They have been published by Galland.

[2] This began in the second half of the second century.

never in Spain, and yet that story was framed. Peter never was twenty-five years in Rome, and not so long as bishop there; and yet Eusebius mentions it, about A. D. 340, as an old report. Peter never was bishop of Antioch, to say nothing of his being so for seven years; and yet it stands as an old assertion in the Alexandrine Chronicle, and Eusebius reports it as an undoubted fact. The apostle Peter never was at Hierapolis, and yet Papias places him there together with his pretended daughters. John never was at Rome; the pseudo-Prochorus mentions it; and from him Tertullian, from whom other Fathers do the same.

Such stories easily originate. Paul died in Rome; his grave was there. When, a hundred years after, it came into the thought of some one to say that Peter too was put to death there, how soon an epitaph was found for him. Who of the members of the Romish church did not willingly hear such a report? Who wished to oppose it? And if any one did, what did it avail? The populace believed it; critical investigations were not at that time undertaken respecting such subjects; they were not expressed in journals and public papers. Like all stories, this also suddenly started, found fruitful soil, and at the end was spun out into a complete legend.

But we can best conceive all this, if, bringing before us the contents of those apocryphas, we here critically examine the traditional reports of the Fathers respecting Peter's abode at Rome.

§ 24. *Clemens of Rome and Ignatius.*

In his Epistles to the Corinthians, Clemens speaks of Peter and Paul. Of the latter (Edit. Oxon. p. 80), that he died after Peter's death; he had done most for the Gospel; was an apostle of the world, penetrating even to the bounds of the West; and was put to death for the faith, under Nero, at Rome. Of Peter, he mentions nothing of all these things, but this: "propter æmulationem non unum aut alterum sed plures labores sustulit, atque ita martyrium passus in debi-

tum gloriæ locum migravit" ("from emulation he undertook not one or another labor, but many labors; and so, suffering martyrdom, passed into the place of glory that awaited him") — an account which is contradictory to all the other stories of Peter's death. For, according to these, he was put to death by Nero on account of the *faith*, and in his death there was no *æmulatio*, i. e. no *envy*, no *rivalship*, the accusation against him in the church of Rome, as even Clemens supposes, since he holds forth this example to the Corinthians in order to warn them against rivalry, discord, and contention, and to bring them back to peace. When we remember also, that, according to Tertullian's account, Clemens was consecrated by Peter as a bishop of Rome, the strange way in which Clemens here mentions Peter is very remarkable, and renders the account suspicious. When Clemens says distinctly of Paul, that he came to Rome and suffered martyrdom under Nero, the same reason he had likewise in the case of Peter, if he really had been at Rome and was his friend and teacher.

Equally remarkable is the silence of Ignatius. As he nowhere hints that *he* was the successor of Peter, the first bishop of Antioch; so in his Epistle to the Romans, he mentions also not a word of Peter as the founder of that church, or as the first bishop at Rome.

This passage is indeed quoted from his Epistle to the Romans: "Not as Peter and Paul do I command you; they were the apostles of Jesus Christ, I am one of the least;" and from this the conclusion is drawn that Ignatius supposes the fact of Peter's abode at Rome. But this is most unwarranted. Ignatius, in using these words, asks the Romans to lay nothing in the way of his execution. "Yet," he proceeds, "this I do not *command* you, as Peter and Paul, but I only *entreat* you." Ignatius wishes here simply to say: I come to you not with the authority of an apostle; and so he names the two apostles whose activity and authority were most known, especially by their Epistles.

But higher than all this stands the question: Are the Epistles of Ignatius genuine? Is that, particularly, to the Ro-

mans genuine? And if it be genuine, is not that "*Petrus*" smuggled in, like so many other things of which criticism must clear these Epistles before they have their former shape? They can hardly serve as testimony in so important a matter; least of all can that passage, which in every aspect has nothing of evidence in itself, even if it be genuine.

§ 25. *Justin.*

Justin's silence is still more remarkable. If any one may object, in respect to Clemens and Ignatius, that there was *no occasion* to speak of Peter's abode at Rome; as to Justin, this reason utterly fails; for he had the most urgent cause. Justin relates in his Apology (also in Eusebius ii. 15), that Simon Magus journeyed to Rome, that he remained there, wrought wonders, and was honored by the Romans (who regarded him as a god) with a statue, which he himself had seen.[1] As now, according to the opinion of the opponents, the journey of Peter to Rome is placed *in connection with the abode of Simon*, and indeed so that Simon was vanquished by Peter; as, according to Eusebius's detailed account, this contest against Simon was precisely the object of his journey to Rome;[2] so, in case he knew that Peter had been at Rome, with the mention of Simon, Justin ought necessarily to mention Peter and that history. His silence contains the strongest proof that Peter's abode in Rome was wholly unknown to him, and that, at the time of Justin, the story of Simon Magus was only half-way developed.

§ 26. *Papias.*

The father of the story of Peter's abode at Rome is Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, whose works (except a few fragments which Eusebius only has preserved) are lost. Among these fragments is also the passage that testifies to Peter's abode at Rome.

---

[1] He regarded the image consecrated to the Sabine god *Semo Sangus* as one the Romans had set up to *Simo Sanctus*, i. e. Magus.

[2] Eusebius, II. 16.

Before we quote this passage, we will premise some things as to Papias himself, by which his credibility is illustrated.

He lived in the third generation after the apostles (Eusebius iii. 39), and he gives himself out to have been a hearer of their disciples. Jerome makes him the teacher of Irenæus, according to which he flourished in the middle of the second century (Jerome, Ep. 29). That John the teacher of Papias was not the apostle, but the presbyter, Jerome testifies (*Catalog. in Papia*), and Baronius proves it carefully (*ad d.* 118).

Papias, in respect to his capacity and credibility as a writer, stands in very poor repute. Eusebius, to whom we are indebted for all our information about him, says of him: "*Papias mediocri admodum ingenio, præditus, ut ex scriptis ejus conjicere licet*" (Papias was gifted with very moderate talents, as may be conjectured from his writings); he "has communicated many things from oral tradition, which in part were new and in part border on the fabulous. Here belongs his doctrine of the millennial kingdom, an error to which by means of Papias's age, he was also led.[1] Among the evident, we may say intentional, figments, belongs his story of the daughters of the *apostle* Philip, who remained perpetual virgins and lie buried at Hierapolis: he had known that they waked up a dead person." (Eusebius iii. 30, 31—39. v. 24.)

Papias has evidently confounded the *deacon and Evangelist Philip* with the apostle, of whom Luke (who, with Paul, abode in his house) really says, Acts 21: 9, "he had four daughters who were virgins and who had the gift of prophecy."

Here the fiction is too evident. It is the more remarkable if we reflect that these virgins, whom Paul knew as female prophets A. D. 57, when they were already in advancing years, must have been living in A. D. 130 to 140, some seventy or eighty years later.

[1] Eusebius, III. 39. If Eusebius (III. 36) calls Papias a very eloquent man, versed in the Scriptures, this phrase is not in the oldest manuscripts, and Valesius long since proved it to be interpolated.

And yet Polycrates of Ephesus, and Clemens of Alexandria, relate these fables after Papias (Polycrat. apud Euseb. v. 25. Clemens Alex. Stromat.); so little did they then trouble themselves about criticism.

We now come to the passage by Papias. This runs thus: "Tantus autem veritatis fulgor emicuit in mentibus eorum qui Petrum audierunt, *ut parum habentes semel audisse*, sed Marcum Petri sectatorem, cujus hodie extat evangelium enixe rogarent, ut doctrinæ illius scriptum monumentum apud se reliquerat. Nec prius destiterunt, quam hominem expugnassent, auctores scribendi illius quod secundum Marcum dicitur evangelii exstitissent. Quod quum Petrus *revelationem S. Spiritus cognovisset*, librum illum *auctoritate sua comprobasse*, dicitur, ut deinceps in ecclesia legeretur. Refertur id a Clemento in vi. libro institutionum cui testis etiam accedit Papias, Hierapolis episcopus. Porro Marci mentionem fieri aiunt a Petro in priore epostola quam Romæ scriptam contendunt, idque ipsum Petrum innuere qui figurate Romam Babylonem appellat his verbis."

We see that here is *hardly any passage from Papias*, but only a simple appeal to him; the passage itself belongs to Eusebius. We do not, by this, wish to deny that Eusebius drew the story from Papias; but it has little force of proof. It sounds too fabulous. Peter must have been *many years* bishop of Rome, and yet the Romans prayed Mark to point out his discourses, that they might not forget them *once* heard. Mark, *without Peter's* knowledge, had compiled his Gospel, which fact must have been first discovered to Peter by means of a divine revelation.

This sounds fabulous enough. Equally senseless and wholly fictitious is the following notice of Mark, which Eusebius repeats from Papias.

"Ajebat etiam, inquit Papias, presbyter ille Johannes, Marcum Petri interpretem, quæcunque memoriæ mandaverat, diligenter prescripsisse, non tamen ordine pertexuisse, quæ a domino aut dicta aut gesta fuerant. Neque enim ipse dominum audiverat, neque sectatus fuerat unquam, sed cum Petro postea versatus est, qui pro audientium utilitate,

non vero ut sermonum Domini historiam contexeret evangelium prædicabat." (l. c.)

This is the judgment of one who does not know. Mark's Gospel was written like those of the other evangelists; one feels that it is from an eye-witness. And why not? Mark was born at Jerusalem; his family were familiar with the apostles; his house was the place of assembly whither Peter betook himself when he came out of prison, Acts xii. (Epiphanius calls him one of the seventy-two. Hæres. Alog.) And this man was not in the company of the followers of the Lord, not an eye-witness of his miracles! The objection that he observes no definite order in his description, is untrue; there is in it the same kind of order as in Matthew, Luke, and John, as any one can convince himself by a cursory glance, even, into his Gospel. And now the folly, too, that Peter had approved and established Mark's Gospel, that it might be read in public in the churches. The book was written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and *thence* derived all its credibility.

That Mark wrote his Gospel at the instance of Peter, at Rome, and indeed for the Romans, as Papias relates, is not very probable. Mark wrote in the *Greek language*, therefore plainly not for the Romans, who spoke Latin; and only the educated among them, and strangers from Greece, understood the Greek. Besides, the Romish church maintains that Mark was bishop of Alexandria; how could he then, at the same time, be Peter's constant companion? Finally, Irenæus maintains, as is well known, that Mark wrote his Gospel after Peter's and Paul's death (μετὰ τὴν ἔξοδον), an opinion which Baronius has endeavored in vain to weaken in favor of Papias (Bar. *ad. a.* 45).

If we take the above-mentioned circumstances closely into view, it will soon be clear enough, that Papias's testimony is absolutely of no weight, and can be laid aside as of no value. It transcribes nothing but an unwarranted story full of internal contradictions.

§ 27. *Clemens of Alexandria.*

Eusebius (vi. 14.) cites a passage from the last book of Clemens of Alexandria, entitled *Recognitiones*, in which *almost in the same words* which Eusebius, as we have seen, attributes to Papias, he repeats that Mark, the companion of Peter, wrote his Gospel at Rome; only Clemens varies from Papias in this, that he writes Mark had imparted to Peter his design, but that the latter had neither approved nor rejected it.

We see that Clemens merely transcribed from Papias, and indeed with not an exactly true memory; and on this account his testimony is of no more force than that of Papias.

That Clemens did transcribe from Papias without critical examination, need not be strange to us: how learned soever he was otherwise, he had a historical credulity which led him into many errors. According to him, Christ preached only *one year;* the apostle Matthew was Zaccheus; Matthew never ate flesh; Paul had a wife, and recommended the Sibylline *Oracles;* Peter is the author of a Revelation, and of many discourses from which he cites passages; Simon heard Peter preach according to Marcion, who lived under Hadrian and Antoninus; Philip married his daughter. He also holds the Gospel according to the Hebrews and Egyptians to be genuine. (Strom. L. I—VII.) We see that he did not examine with historical accuracy; his testimony as to Peter's abode in Rome, will convince no one; it is but an echo of Papias." But we take higher ground, in opposition to his testimony. Though Eusebius ascribes the Recognitiones to Clemens, yet they are unquestionably interpolated. According to the extracts which Photius published (see Natalis Alex. iii. 424. col. 2.), they are so full of the *Gnostic and Arian* heresies, that, if they were genuine, Clemens would cease to be a Christian Father. Hence we have no doubt in regarding the work as one interpolated for Clemens in the third or fourth century, before Eusebius's time, and so wholly reject the force of that testimony.

§ 28. *Hegesippus.*

Still less weight is there in the testimony of the Syrian Hegesippus, who in his book *de excidio Hierosolymæ*, maintains Peter's presence in Rome.[1] This book, written in *Latin*, is drawn from the apocrypha, and falsely ascribed to Hegesippus, who lived in the second century. It proceeded from the fourth century, and Baronius and Labbe, *in Hegesippo*, T. I, admit this. A testimony taken from it is destitute of all force. The passages extracted from the genuine Hegesippus by Eusebius, make no mention of Peter in this respect.

§ 29. *Dionysius of Corinth.*

Of all the testimonies, that of Dionysius is the most important, and without doubt, too, is the most striking. For he was both a well-informed and a sensible man, and he lived near enough to the times of the apostles; for he died about the year A. D. 178.

He now writes to the Romans (Eusebius ii. 25) that they have, united in themselves, the seed of the apostles, sown by Peter and Paul. "For both apostles came into our city and instructed us, scattering the seed of evangelical doctrine; they at the same time went to Italy, and after they had in like manner instructed you, died at the same time the martyr's death."

This testimony of such a venerable man is so weighty, that it deserves a closer examination. It comprises three parts: First, that Peter was in Corinth; *then*, that there he *met with* Paul; and *thirdly*, that both together went from Corinth to Italy and were put to death.

If *any one* of these points is found to be untrue, then they

[1] Hegesippus has reported from the Pseudo Acts of Linus, Marcellus and Dionysius, the Areopagite, the story that, as Peter was leaving Rome, Christ met him at the gate, and to the question of Peter where he was going, answered: "To Rome to be crucified again." Et Peter conversus *in urbem* redit, Captusque a persecutoribus cruci adjudicatur (and Peter turning about went back into the city, was taken by his persecutors and condemned to the cross).

all fall; they have only one authority. We will therefore see whether Peter met with Paul at Corinth, and they together went to Italy. From the Acts of the Apostles, it is seen that Paul was several times at Corinth; but it is there clearly expressed that he *never* went thence into the *West* to Italy; but only that he travelled back to the *East*. Thus, Acts 18: 18, he went from Corinth, through Cenchrea, by ship, to Asia; 20: 1 etc. he came from Macedonia to Greece, but after three months he travelled again, through Macedonia, to the East, and then again to Jerusalem, whence he came as a prisoner to Rome. In this period, therefore, from A. D. 56 and 57, Peter could not have so met with Paul at Corinth, because Paul *never* did travel thence to Italy.

Paul made his *first* journey to Italy, not through Corinth, but as a prisoner, by ship, along by Crete and Malta, where they were driven by a storm, and to Sicily. (Acts, chaps. xxvii. and xxviii.) On this journey, also, Paul certainly had not Peter for a companion.

It only remains, therefore, to suppose this journey of Paul from Corinth to Italy occurred A. D. 65 or 66, and that he made it with Peter whom he met at Corinth. But possible as such a journey is, in itself considered, there is much that stands opposed to it.

1. Had Peter been in Corinth, he would, like Paul, have preached the gospel here; how is it, then, that Clemens of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, one hundred years before Dionysius, and, on this supposition, hardly ten years after Peter was in Corinth, says nothing at all about it? This silence, in case Peter was at Corinth, is not to be explained. *Clemens must have spoken of it.* For he points the Corinthians to all the holy authorities, that they should leave off their dissensions; to the holy Scriptures, to the example of the saints, to Paul's exhortations, to Paul's Epistles to them. Would he have passed over Peter, had he with Paul founded the church of Corinth and preached the gospel in it? Ought he to forget him, *his own* pretended *teacher* and *friend*, from whom he must have received the episcopal dignity at Rome?

2. It appears as if Paul had not travelled at all from Corinth to Italy. He writes to Titus, that he intended to remain the winter in Nicopolis (in Acarnania) and wait for him. It is very probable that he had shipped from there (Nicopolis) to Italy.

3. Dionysius is the *only one* who speaks of this abode of Peter in Corinth, and of his journey to Italy from Corinth with Paul; no one of the Fathers, no one of the apocryphas, mentions anything of it.

But that Dionysius has reported this erroneous story, ought not to excite surprise. In his time, the oldest churches everywhere were striving to deduce their origin from the most famous of the apostles. Had the Romans drawn Peter to Rome and associated him with Paul, Corinth did not wish to be left behind; it does the same thing. But the story found the easier reception, as we see, from First Corinthians; there really had been *followers of Peter* at Corinth, who had likewise formed a party there. Hence it was easily concluded that Peter himself had preached the gospel at Corinth. The journey with Paul was thus readily added to it of itself.

According to what has been said, it may now be easily decided, that the testimony of Dionysius deserves little credit. *But were it credible and certain, it would hence follow, that Peter did not come to Rome before* A. D. 66, *and as he was soon after put to death there, he had not been there above one year.* With this, therefore, all those stories about the founding of the church of Rome by Peter, of his bishopric there, tumbles to ruin of themselves.

§ 30. *Caius.*

Caius was a presbyter of Rome under pope Zephyrinus, about A. D. 200. He wrote his διαλέξεις against the Montanist Prochis, in which he says, according to the fragment from his writings transmitted to us by Eusebius: "I can *show you the monuments* (Trophäen) *of the apostles;* for when you go out to the Vatican, or on the road to Ostia, you

will find the same monuments of those who have founded this church." (Eusebius ii. 25.)

If we suppose this testimony to be authentic, it proves nothing at all. The monuments (or trophies) may signify graves; but who says that these "monuments of the apostles" were the graves of *Peter* and *Paul?* Those men are called Apostles, in the holy Scriptures and by the Fathers, not only who were the Apostles specially, but likewise their pupils and followers. Thus Luke, Acts 14: 13, names Barnabas an apostle; so Paul often calls Titus, Timothy, Silas, etc., his fellow apostles; so Clemens of Rome is called by Clemens of Alexandria, who was a contemporary of Caius, *an apostle.* (Stromata iv. 17.) Among the apostles, also, to whose graves Caius points, we may properly understand those of Paul and many of his companions who, with him, founded the church at Rome, and who died there with him, or after him, in the faith. The addition that they were the graves of those who founded the church of Rome, necessarily points to this interpretation; while it is a matter of fact, according to the holy Scriptures, that the church of Rome was *founded* by *Paul* and his disciples, but in no wise by Peter and his followers. Even if we receive Dionysius's testimony as true, Peter was at the utmost only a year in Rome, at a time when the Roman church needed no more *founding* by him.

But if we look at the testimony of Caius a little closer, it is evidently untenable from internal grounds. Whether those monuments signify *signs of victory* or *graves;* yet it is improbable that at the Vatican, near the tomb of *the Scipios*, that is, in the way to Ostia on the *public road*, there were the tombs of the Apostles, and decorated with inscriptions, at a time when *the persecutions raged, when the populace often destroyed Christian churches* as soon as they discovered them, and left nothing uninjured which was holy to them; at a time when the emperor and his officers commanded every one to blot out the Christian name.

§ 31. *Tertullian.*

We see that Tertullian read the apocryphas and believed in them; his accounts of the apostles are drawn from them. Probably the apocryphas of "Linus," "Marcellus," and of the "Areopagite," which are too affecting and too pleasing not to have found great applause with the Fathers, made their appearance at that time.

Tertullian mentions that Peter baptized in the Tiber (de baptismo, c. 4.); and there, he says, Peter was crucified. (Scorpiæ, c. ult. De prescriptione, c. 36.) This story, no doubt, was formed on John 21: 18 as its basis.

No Father of the church, before him, had related these things; Tertullian is the first. But Tertullian deserves little faith in this matter; we see that he drew from poor authorities, and from apocryphal stories and tales. We place little weight on it, when he maintains that Peter had consecrated Clemens as his successor, though all other authorities specify Linus. This difference merely shows how uncertain, how wavering, and contradictory already, at that time, were the traditions of the primitive period of the church of Rome.

But what renders Tertullian's veracity, as to this account of Peter, wholly suspicious, is, that he relates also that John the apostle had likewise been at Rome; that Nero cast him into a caldron of boiling oil; and, when he remained unharmed, banished him to an island (de prescriptione, c. 36). Jerome says of this report: "Tertullian reports that John was cast, by Nero, into a caldron of boiling oil and came out purer and stronger than he was before" (in Jovin. L. i).

That is something entirely new: none of the Fathers had before mentioned it; hardly any transcribed it after him; and Jerome gives it only as a *statement* of Tertullian, which he doubtless had drawn solely from the book of the pseudo-Prochorus of the life of John.

That John was at Rome, that he there suffered martyrdom, is plainly a fiction. If it were not, then would Papias, Polycarp, Irenæus, especially Clement of Alexandria, who brings

forward so many particulars from the life of the apostle, have surely not been silent as to this; and particularly Polycrates of Ephesus (A. D. 196), in his contest with the Romish bishop Victor respecting the paschal feast, could not have passed over this event of John's life, if it was a fact.

Tertullian's account of John's abode at Rome, is therefore a fiction. This the Romish church also has seen, which never received it, as it would otherwise have not failed to do; because thereby a new weight would have been added to their authority.

As, now, Tertullian *places together* the account of Peter's and John's presence at Rome; and since the latter is found to be untrue, we may also set aside as false the former, *which absolutely has no better foundation.*

§ 32. *Irenæus* (*about* A. D. 200).

Irenæus says, plainly enough, that Peter and Paul founded the church of Rome, and that they made Linus the first bishop of the same.

How great soever may be the authority of Irenæus as a teacher in the church, in matters of this kind he is to be used with caution. He is often inconsiderate, and credulous. When he maintains (lii. 39) that Christ died at a more advanced age, between forty and fifty years old; when he says that all the Elders testify to this, and that the apostle John delivered it to them, the historic credibility of the man is greatly lowered.

If we look at his testimony as to Peter, the opinion that Peter with Paul *founded and built up* the church of Rome, is so erroneous, that it wholly contradicts the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles; according to which, as we have proved above, this took place only through Paul and his disciples. Why should we not suppose that Irenæus drew these erroneous reports from Papias, from whom he took the fable of the thousand years' kingdom?

Not less inadmissible is it, that the apostles made Linus the first bishop of the Romish church; as it is proved, from

numerous passages of Scripture, that the apostles set at the head of the churches founded by them not a *single* bishop, but several *elders*, as bishops, i. e. overseers, as we have fully proved in our book respecting the primacy of the Romish bishops, in the last chapter.[1]

It is therefore evident how little Irenæus's testimony amounts to.

§ 33. *Origen* (*about* A. D. 252).

The further the time advances, so much the more the Romish story of Peter is enlarged, and so much the more the apocryphal points of it stick out. Has Tertullian reported that Peter was crucified at Rome, so Eusebius already relates (L. iii. c. 1.), from Origen, that Peter at *the end* of his life (*ἐπὶ τέλει*) came to Rome and was crucified *with his head downwards*. We see the *passio Petri* of the pseudo-Linus had already gained an important publicity.

Besides, it appears from this passage how much Eusebius contradicts himself, who, in his Chronicon and in his Church History maintains that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius; but here, according to Origen's statement, this journey is put off to the end of the Apostle's life; while Lactantius, who lived not long after Origen, places Peter's arrival at Rome in the beginning of the reign of Nero, and thus increases the discordance of the opinions.

§ 34.

After Origen, the story of Peter, upheld by the apocryphas and spun out into a complete legend, even in the minutest details, continually acquired more and more life, definiteness, and extent. It now soon became predominant in the whole church, and it is not to be doubted that the Romans, since they saw how important to them this story was, provided also for a tomb of Peter.

---

[1] See Notes, etc., at the end. — Tr.

For, as we have said, the story was now soon of importance; the Romans grounded on it their primacy. The Romish church, according to the economy of the empire, was the *first* in rank; next to it followed that of Alexandria; then that of Antioch. Now, indeed, must the higher principality (*potior principalitas*) of the founding come in. So they made out a *cathedra Petri* (see of Peter), the prince of the apostles. Irenæus names Peter and Paul as the *founders* of the Romish church: he does not say that they were *bishops* at Rome; they, as he supposes, had made Linus the *first* bishop of Rome.

How different it is in the middle of the third century. Then Paul is already shoved aside; then Peter is already made the *first* Romish bishop; then Stephanus seeks to sustain, against Cyprian, a primacy from the succession of Peter (*ex successione Petri*); then he already maintains that the Romish see is "Peter's see, the principal chair whence sacerdotal unity takes its rise" (sedes Petri, cathedra principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta sit).

And that merely was empty stuff, a patch from the story of Peter fastened on the pure robe of evangelical tradition. Now the legend rooted itself firmer continually; it became the sustainer of the primacy; in the fifth century, and not before, the popes, as an emanation of their *successio Petri*, gave it authority in the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Later, when the primacy was immovably founded, they boldly drew the reverse conclusion: Because the Romish church had the primacy, therefore Peter must have been at Rome.

We conclude, therefore, with Origen, who reaches into the first half of the third century, our series of the witnesses; because all that follow are nothing but a repetition of the preceding given and expressed anew on his authority. When Baronius, in order to put the best face on his cause, says that the *whole* of Christian Antiquity believed in Peter's abode at Rome, and names fifty Fathers, up to within the sixth century, this gives to his cause a *fair show;* he might spare four-tenths of those names. His proof is exactly like that which Natalis Alexander uses in order to prove the genuineness of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite.

§ 35. *Rise of the legend of Peter.*

We have already remarked above, that the church, too, has had her time of fables; then the apocryphas shot forth like toad-stools; then writings were interpolated to the Saviour, to the Virgin, and to the Apostles; then the *Acta* and *Passiones*, the *Recognitiones*, *Constitutiones*, *Canones* of the same were invented. The period of these fictions belongs to the second and third centuries, and it coincides with that in which the witnesses above quoted lived. Their testimony is therefore, and so continues, very suspicious; the silence of the older witnesses, as Clemens of Rome, Justin, etc., has much more weight. The silence of the Acts of the Apostles, Paul's and Peter's Epistles, completely destroys the whole force of those witnesses.

It is interesting, now, to examine how this story of Peter's abode at Rome was formed. We will here briefly put it together.

These stories are formed where, in the history, there are large gaps; there they thrust in themselves, often being connected to most insignificant points, and frequently without the slightest supports. They are produced so much the easier, the more interest is brought into play. Thus originated the story of Peter.

The Acts of the Apostles only touches some prominent points of his life; the Epistles of Paul, his own Epistles, the writings of the oldest Fathers, are almost without any notice respecting him. This unoccupied soil the story took possession of. How it grew by cultivation, the *Passiones* of Linus and of the Areopagite, the *Acta Marcelli*, and the writings of Prochorus, bear witness.

Now, too, interest was not wanting. Many churches sought to derive their origin from the most famous apostles: these were Peter, John, James, and Paul. But Jerusalem only could lay claim to James: he was ever there; so there remained only three others. How they vied with each other for them! Then Antioch and Corinth laid claim to Peter

and Paul; Rome, to both of these and also to John. Probably the pseudo-Prochorus wrote his books solely to transplant John to Rome.

With the oldest Fathers, Peter was not at all regarded as the primate of the apostles, the head of the church. According to the "Galatians," Peter, James, and John were the pillar-apostles, the pillars of the church. At that time, certainly, no supremacy had yet entered into the church. In proportion as these distinctions were formed, ascending from the bishops, metropolitans, up to the primate and patriarch, also *the idea was developed that there was, too, a precedence among the apostles;* and, finally, they made Peter their head and leader. At the same time were likewise formed the patriarchal sees; and the three first cities of the empire, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, laid claim to them. Now they all three strove to secure Peter as their founder. Paul, who is the well-established founder, from among the apostles, of the churches at Rome and Antioch, was no longer found sufficient; they sought to lay claim to Peter. And as, now, Rome had gained the *first position* in the church, so Peter must be secured, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, for Rome; he must be placed there, at whatever cost. With this story they filled the gaps in Peter's history.

A connecting point, too, was found: Peter's First Epistle is dated from Babylon. This Babylon, now, must be Rome; John had called it so, too, in the Apocalypse. They believed they now had firm bottom. The story grew, spread itself out into details; then, Peter soon became bishop of Rome; that an occasion might not be wanting, he came there, under Claudius, A. D. 42, in order *to vanquish Simon Magus*, and all sorts of rarities besides.

§ 36. *An objection.*

It is said that there must yet, necessarily, have been a fact lying at the bottom, for the manifold and diverse stories respecting Peter's journey to Rome, his abode, bishopric, suffering and death there; and that it must be *that Peter, at*

least, was in Rome. Without this fact, these stories could by no means have been formed or established.

But it is not so: thousands of stories have been formed and established without any historical foundation. Prochorus gives us an account, and in full details, of John's life and acts at Rome: that he was there thrown into a caldron of boiling oil and remained uninjured. Tertullian believed it all, and transcribed it; and, if we are not mistaken, it has been transferred to the breviary. And yet it is a fable: John never was in Rome.

We see how stories are often formed of mere air: Peter must have met with Simon at Rome and fought with him. The apocryphas relate it in details; Justin says, also, that the Romans erected a statue to Simon; he had, himself, seen it. He read the inscription: *Semoni Sango deo fidio*, i. e. it was dedicated to the Sabine god Semo Sancus or Sangus, and he made out of it, *Simoni Sancto;* and the story was fabricated *seventy* years after the event.[1] As Justin was a credible author, so he was believed without any doubt; the story had gained for itself a firm footing.[2] Soon they went further than Justin: they now made Peter come to Rome on purpose to fight with Simon. The origin of this story, as it happens, can be shown: Suetonius relates, in the twelfth chapter of Nero, that a certain Icarus had attempted to fly, publicly, but that he was dashed down the *Suggestus* of Nero and broken to pieces. This, now, must have been Simon (Baron. ad. a. 44 n. 34.): the statue puts it beyond doubt. But how was it possible that the Romans had erected a statue to Simon, who came to his death so miserably, and not to Peter his conqueror? of this they are silent. *Credat Judæus Apella.* Valesius felt just so.

The Apostle Philip, with his four daughters, must have been buried at Hierapolis in Phrygia: Papias, the bishop of

[1] This pillar with the inscription was found under Gregory XIII., on an island in the Tiber.

[2] Rigaltius, in his Notes to Tertullian's Apology (after the Notes to Cyprian), Petavius in *haeres*, Menandr. N. 5, and especially Valesius in his Notes to Eusebius, II. B, have together with Pagi discovered this blunder and the consequences drawn from it.

that city, relates it; he had known the daughters; Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, related this after Papias; and it is universally believed. And yet Papias either invented it, or allowed himself to be somehow imposed on. He had confounded the *deacon* and *evangelist* Philip, of whom Paul speaks, with the *Apostle* Philip, and placed the latter, who lived at *Cæsarea*, at Hierapolis.

Since in general, in spite of historical probability, so much that is untrue has been fastened into the story of Peter — as Peter's journey to Rome in the second year of Claudius; his contest with Simon Magus; his journey back to Jerusalem; his bishopric in Antioch and in Rome; his travels to Britain; his execution together with Paul, etc. — there is nothing against regarding the *whole* story as of no higher value than its parts.

§ 37. *The contradictions of the opposers.*

Nothing more proves the falsehood of the story of Peter, than the numberless discrepancies with which it is propounded. Eusebius makes Peter come to Rome in the second year of Claudius; then he relates, according to Origen, that he *came to his death* there. According to Lactantius, this arrival occurred in the time of Nero; and indeed in his first year, according to the *Liber pontificalis*, which is falsely ascribed to pope Danaus. According to Eutychius of Alexandria (in originib.), Peter's death was in A. D. 54; according to Onuphrius, he reached Rome A. D. 69; the pseudo-Servius Dexter places his arrival in A. D. 66. The Chronicon of Alexandria assures us that he did not go from Palestine before the Council at Jerusalem. There are, besides, the variations of the apocryphas. And now for the other peculiarities which are drawn from this.

Thus, according to Metaphrastes, Peter went into Spain as vicegerent of Christ. From Antioch he brings thither an image of the blessed Virgin, which is now worshipped as the Virgin of Atocher, i. e. Antioch, at Madrid. There he left Epenetus behind as bishop at Sexifirmum in Bætica,

and travelled, in company with Marcellus, Eugenius, etc., to Africa and Egypt. Then the Maronite Abraham Echellensis knew accurately the places he touched at in Sicily and Italy, and the bishops he appointed there. Then Leo Allatius and Baronius are clearly informed that Peter, as a commander with a great retinue, marched through the whole earth to exercise everywhere his office of pope. And while, according to Dionysius, Peter came with Paul to Rome, through Corinth, these writers know, that *they met each other there from wholly different regions of the world.*

But enough of these contradictions, which form such a confused snarl that hundreds of the greatest of the Ultramontanists, up to this day, have not been able to disentangle it. When those pretended learned and famous men, Baronius, Allatius, Abraham Echellensis, and Natalis, without any exercise of criticism and selection, transcribe writings like those of a Metaphrastes, Flavius Dexter; when they have recourse to the most stale hypotheses in order to bring light into this darkness, it would be an insult to the civilization of the present century to wish longer to busy ourselves with them.

§ 38. *Conclusion.*

We will now, very briefly, sum up the results of our investigation.

1. That Peter was bishop at Antioch, seven years, is a fable.

2. It is a fable, that he came to Rome in the second year of Claudius, i. e. in A. D. 42, and was bishop there twenty-five years.

3. Peter was not in Rome in A. D. 42; nor in A. D. 44, 45, and 46; he was not there in A. D. 53 and 54; he was not there in A. D. 58; he was not there from A. D. 61 to 63; he was not there in A. D. 65 and 66; therefore he *probably* never was there.

4. The church at Rome was not founded by Peter; its foundation belongs solely to Paul and his followers; Peter had no part in it.

5. The holy Scriptures contain not only no testimonies of Peter's abode at Rome, but they clearly show the contrary.

6. Testimonies for Peter's abode in Rome are to be found only in *tradition.* Yet the two oldest and most important of the Fathers, Clemens of Rome and Justin, are silent, not only as to that abode, but they contain statements which contradict it.

7. The testimonies which seem to contain that abode stand in the worst contradiction to each other, and bear the stamp of incredibility on their front: their authorities are the apocryphas.

8. Precisely the most important and the most credible of these testimonies, that of Dionysius of Corinth, places Peter's arrival at Rome not before A. D. 66; and, if he is to be believed, proves that Peter was not there above *one* year; therefore, neither *had he founded* the church of Rome, nor *was its bishop.*

These, now, are the results of our investigation, which we lay before a public capable of judging, for a considerate and serious examination. Though the proofs which we have brought together for our view, from the most important and surest authorities — from the holy Scriptures — are strong enough to smite to the ground the arguments of the opponents, which are drawn solely from the apocryphas and the most untrustworthy accounts of the Fathers; yet we will not run into the faults of those opponents, and set down our view as that which is the only true one. We may grant that Peter *might* have been at Rome; it is possible that he was there about A. D. 65 or 66. When Paul wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy, from his second imprisonment, he was not yet there; but in the interval *which occurs after the composition of this Epistle*, shortly before Paul's execution, he *might* have come there: this view at least clashes with no statement of the holy Scriptures. But he did not come, together with Paul, as Dionysius reports; he was not bishop of Rome; he had not founded this church; he then merely died in Rome, as Eusebius indeed reports after Origen. But this, now, only remains forever nothing but an hypothesis; it cannot be proved; it is only *possible.*

Hence we conclude, that in spite of the *possible* correctness of this hypothesis, the opposite also is the probable; yea, is indeed the more probable, and that we cannot find fault with a Protestant, when, relying on the proofs which the holy Scriptures and the oldest Fathers, Clemens of Rome and Justin present, he holds the abode of Peter at Rome and all connected with it, for a tale drawn from the apocryphas. Thus much is certain: that no one of the arguments which can be opposed to him has so much weight that he is morally bound to acknowledge the story as truth. *Peter's abode at Rome* CAN NEVER BE PROVED; neither, therefore, can *the primacy of the Romish church, based on it, be so.*

The question whether Peter was at Rome, is the question respecting the life or death of the primacy. Granting, too, that Peter himself even held a primacy on account of his personal character, of what avail is that to the Romish bishops? For now arises the questions: Was Peter at Rome? was he the first bishop? — are the Romish bishops yet his successors? If this cannot be proved, decisively and beyond a doubt, then his primacy cannot be proved.

But the question whether Peter was at Rome, is a purely historical one. As it is not affirmed by the *divine authority of the Scriptures*, nor by *an infallible decision* of general councils — which, moreover, cannot decide infallibly on facts aside from the Bible; so it belongs exclusively to *historical* investigation, and is exactly parallel to the question whether, for example, Alexander was ever in India or Italy. History will never be withheld or restricted by the hierarchy nor the pretended Romish infallibility in her investigations, nor allow the answer to be prescribed, as to the story of Peter, by dictatorial authority and before all examination; but not caring for the *dogmas* of the *Romish court*, will take her course, perfect her researches, and maintain the freedom which is due to science. Though Rome by her own hand, or her councils ruled by her, and to which there were wanting knowledge and skill to set in order investigations,[1] by violence force the story of Peter

[1] That, alas, these have often been wanting to them, the management of the false decretals abundantly proves. Had there been, too, in the Catholic church,

into the rank of an historic event; though she has filled the Index with writings which maintain the contrary; these means are no longer of avail at the present day. Science will not, cannot, be prevented from examining that story, and she has freedom enough, likewise, to express this result through the lips of a *Catholic*. That such a point has been reached, is an immeasurable gain. The Catholic church will be delivered from the *Romish vicegerency of Christ*, and the absolute sovereignty deduced therefrom, whenever history, in her, attains to free power. To this power must Rome, some time, yield.

§ 39. *Additional Notes, by the Translator.*

There are several points which perhaps did not occur to the author of the Treatise, or to which at least he has not alluded, that might still further strengthen his argument, in its different parts; some of them we will briefly state.

1. On the supposition that Peter was bishop of Antioch, as claimed by the Roman Catholic writers, at the time they state, the question may be asked: Why should Barnabas go after Paul, to Tarsus? Paul was a recent convert, at least in comparison with Peter; and it was a most strange course to take, to go after him, when the chief of the apostles, as they say, had already taken charge of this church. Luke does not say it was at Peter's suggestion, as he must have done, if Peter had been there and found it necessary to summon in such aid. Besides, Paul expressly states, in Gal. 1: 18, that his first visit to Peter was at Jerusalem, and this, we see in Acts xi. and xii., was at the time of Peter's imprisonment by Herod. On this visit he was accompanied by Barnabas. Our author places it in A. D. 45.

2. In respect to the time of the Council at Jerusalem, and the gratuitous assertion that Peter came to it from Rome, made by Romish writers, it may further be said, the suppo-

---

the disposition for scientific criticism, and a general state of learning, that patchwork could never have attained to a canonical value and an authority of the primitive church.

sition is contrary to fact; because Peter's argument respecting the preaching of the gospel to Gentiles (Acts 15: 7, etc.), does not mention Rome, as he would probably have done, had he just come from that capital of the world. Could he have stated that, as they knew, he had organized a church there of Gentiles — for the names of the persons in the church of Rome (see Rom. xxvi.) were of such, and, from Acts xviii., the Jews there were ignorant of the gospel when Paul arrived there long after — could Peter have quoted this case, striking and decisive as it must have been, he would have done so. Instead of which he evidently points the council to his visit to Cornelius and his former vindication on that occasion. He says, Acts 15: 7, "ye know that a *good while ago*" (*ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων* — a stronger expression than our version) "God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." The Roman Catholic writers, too, pretend that Peter had just been driven out of Rome by the decree of Claudius, and thus had returned to Jerusalem in time to be at the council. But from Acts 18: 2 we learn that Paul, when (after a tour through the churches in Asia Minor) he had been at Athens, came to Corinth, and found there Aquilla and Priscilla, who had *lately* been driven out of Rome by Claudius's decree. This was some time *after* the council at Jerusalem, and the whole account indicates that the event was quite recent, a fact wholly at variance with the supposition that Peter had been subject to this decree *before* the time of the council.

3. In addition to what our author states as to the evidence, from the Epistle to the Romans, that Peter was not and had not been in Rome when it was written, as there is no salutation to him or his particular friends — we might recur to the character of the argument and the nature of the instruction which it contains; which afforded occasion, and indeed furnished some peculiar reasons, why a reference should be made to Peter and his teaching, if personally known to those to whom it was addressed. Again, in the same Epistle we have, in chap. 15: 20, Paul's declaration to

them that he did not wish to preach where Christ had been named, lest he "should build on another man's foundation." Would he then have written as he did, to these very persons to whom he was making this statement, had they enjoyed the preaching of the great Apostle Peter? Could he have been guilty of so gross an inconsistency as to write a formal Epistle, and so preach to them? This applies equally to Paul's subsequent residence and preaching in person at Rome, in case Peter was or had been the bishop there, as claimed.

4. Had Peter gone to Rome (as assumed) from Antioch, his natural course would have been through Greece; and he would doubtless have been noticed, as having been at Corinth, in those Epistles as well as in the Acts, where that city is mentioned (Acts xviii.). But though his disciples are mentioned, he evidently had not himself been there. When Paul came to Corinth, the whole account indicates it was *new* ground. His Epistles were written but a few years after, and the divisions were caused by some zealot Jews who had followed in his track and who rested their claims on their acknowledgment of Peter; but Peter was not there, or Paul must have saluted him; and had he been there at any time, he would doubtless have alluded to it. There is no evidence that Peter ever followed in the track of Paul preaching the gospel, and thus as it were seeking to build on any other man's foundation. Luke mentions the fact of Apollos's being at Corinth (Acts 19: 1) *after* Paul; and no doubt would have done the same respecting Peter, had the fact been so.

5. The supposition that Peter was at Rome when Paul was there, and wrote thence his First Epistle, and so that the Babylon there mentioned is a figurative appellation for Rome, is shown by our author to be at variance with the internal evidence of the Epistle and common sense. Besides, the fact that there is no salutation from Paul, called here a "beloved brother," and so they could not be estranged from each other, shows decidedly that they were not there together. — The same thing is likewise proved by the man-

ner in which Paul, in his Second Tim. 4: 11, speaks of Mark, a friend of Peter. After he had said, "*only Luke is with me*," he goes on: "Take Mark and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry." Had Mark been at Rome previously with Peter, as claimed, and Peter now there, would his coming have been requested now, without also the reason being assigned that he could be of comfort likewise to Peter, his other dear friend? Would not Paul feel, that at least he might wish to learn something about his early master and bishop, by whose direction at Rome, it is claimed, he wrote his Gospel? But there is not the slightest allusion to his coming to Rome for Peter's sake. No allusion to Peter, at all, in the whole Epistle.

As to the Babylon mentioned First Peter 10: 13, the argument that this is not a symbolic term, as in the Apocalypse, is further strengthened by the consideration that the Apocalypse is evidently a sequel to Daniel, who, as do Isaiah and the other prophets, predicts the fate of Babylon; so that in carrying out the historic times into the future, the apostle very naturally used the same name symbolically. Such is the view of Auberlen, in his able work on Daniel and the Apocalypse. If the Apocalypse was written towards the end of the life of John, as maintained, there is no reason to suppose that Peter ever saw the book, or knew of such a use of the word for Rome, but every reason to the contrary.

There is some diversity among the modern commentators and authors who have treated of the chronology of the primitive church, embraced in the Acts of the Apostles and the periods covered by the Epistles of the New Testament, as to the particular dates; though the best authorities concur, so far that Ellendorf's argument is not affected by these differences, in its main points.

One of the ablest writers, probably, is Wieseler (Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters: Göttingen, 1848). He gives a tabular list of thirty authorities on the various dates mentioned, which is valuable for consultation. He himself places Stephen's death in A. D. 39 or 40; Paul's conversion in A. D. 40; the famine mentioned, in January, 41, etc.; Paul's

first journey to Jerusalem (Acts ix.), in A. D. 43; Peter's flight from Jerusalem, A. D. 44; Agrippa's death, Aug. 6 (14), A. D. 44; Paul's second journey to Jerusalem, A. D. 45; Paul's return to Antioch, A. D. 48 or 49; Paul's third journey to Jerusalem, to the council, A. D. 50 or 51; Paul's fourth journey to Jerusalem, at the Pentecost, A. D. 54; Paul at Jerusalem a prisoner, A. D. 58; Paul reaches Rome in A. D. 61, and is put to death there early in A. D. 64. This author holds to but one imprisonment of Paul at Rome.

Wieseler has an able excursus, in which he examines the question of Peter's abode and martyrdom at Rome; and, while admitting that Peter may have suffered martyrdom there — grounding his opinion on the traditions of Caius, Dionysius, etc., which Ellendorf has so thoroughly sifted — yet he says that Peter *could* not have come to Rome before A. D. 54, 61, or 63; and that, if he was there at all and died there, it must have been in the after part of the summer of A. D. 63, and he could not have been there a whole year. He also argues that the First Epistle of Peter must have been written at a late date, from Babylon *on the Euphrates*, shortly before Paul was put to death.

After disproving the argument from the Roman Catholic writers, for the primacy based on Christ's address to Peter, he says: "But though the correctness of the ideas respecting the constitution of the church which is its basis, should be admitted, it is a mere fiction that Peter was bishop in Rome and the *first* bishop. Even Eusebius, who had already reported many fabulous things respecting the Romish abode of Peter, knows nothing of the episcopal office of Peter at Rome. Compare Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte, I., p. 103, note 6. And might there have existed at that time generally bishops, in the sense of the Romish system, yet at least Peter, who came to Rome so late, both on account of the previous existence of the Romish church, as well as the longer blessed activity of the apostle Paul in the place and spot, must have already found an organized church, not have been the first bishop of it" (p. 592).

Similar are the opinions of others, among whom may be mentioned Fr. Baur, Lange, Delitzsch, Mayerhoff, etc.

Dr. E. T. Mayerhoff, in his "Historisch-critische Einleitung in die Petrinischen Schriften," after an elaborate examination of the question, covering some twenty octavo pages, in which he takes up the various traditional authorities cited in defence of the opinion of Peter's abode and bishopric in Rome, comes to the following conclusion, on p. 94: "The *historical contradictions, which are absolutely beyond solution*, render wholly suspicious that story of an abode and martyr's death in Rome; and if we regard, still more, the *mode of its rise*, the *late period* of its formation, the silence of the earliest accounts respecting the place of Peter's death, the *lively interest of the Romish church* for the presence of the Apostle there, and in general the *uncertainty of the tradition*, the *credulity*, and the *want of critical skill* in the Fathers, who heap up one error on another — we find it easy to be explained how so certainly unhistorical a story of an abode of Peter at Rome might be formed and be so generally spread abroad.

Windischmann indeed, in his Vindiciæ Petrinæ, attempts to sustain the Roman Catholic view; but the manner in which he controverts the arguments of Mayerhoff and others, speaks little for his coolness or soundness of reasoning, as he seeks to establish the traditionary authorities in their most enlarged form.

Ellendorf's work on the Primacy has an extended criticism of the passage (Matt. 16: 18), on which the Roman Catholic writers build their argument for Peter's supremacy among the apostles; and in a note, p. 10, he states, in relation to the explanation of the term "rock," as applied to Peter's confession: "Most of the Fathers are of this opinion, viz. forty-six, among the oldest and most famous; eight hold all the apostles and their successors for the foundation on which the church is built; sixteen, the Saviour alone; only seventeen decide for Peter. The learned and famous Launor, teacher of the Sorbonne, has brought together all the passages. (Opp. T. V. P. II. Ep. vii. p. 99, etc.) Compare Pinel, über den

Primat des Rom. Papstes, Deutsche von Breidenstein. Stuttgart bei Cotta, 1829."

After a most elaborate examination of the question historically, Ellendorf sums up his conclusion respecting the claim of the church of Rome to the primacy in these words, p. 243: "OF A ROMISH PRIMACY, OR OF A CENTRAL GOVERNMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF ROME, THERE WAS YET, IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES, NO MENTION; THE ROMISH BISHOPS YET EXERCISED NOT A SINGLE ONE OF THOSE PREROGATIVES (RECHTE) WHICH TO-DAY FORM THE PRIMACY. BUT GRADUALLY THOSE FALSE HISTORICAL VIEWS, NAMELY OF THE BISHOPRIC OF PETER, OF HIS SEE AT ROME, OF THE SUCCESSION (SUCCESSIO) OF THE ROMISH BISHOPS IN PETER'S BISHOPRIC, CAME INTO CIRCULATION, UPON WHICH THE PRIMACY FINALLY ERECTED ITSELF."

He then goes on, in the same masterly manner as before, to discuss the question: "What was the constitution of the church in the period indicated?" and more particularly: "What constitution had the church in the Apostolic age, i. e. in the first century after its foundation" (p. 244)? This is very thoroughly done by a particular critical examination, in reference, first, to Timothy and Titus, of all the passages in the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles throwing light on the subject, by which he reaches his conclusion (p. 249): "We see accordingly that the Christian church, first, was governed by the apostles and their helpers in the apostolic office. Every apostle entered directly upon the administration of all the churches founded by him, either personally or by epistles or by missions of fellow-laborers who were furnished by him with all plenipotentiary powers."

His next question is: "What church constitution did the apostles ordain?" Here he says (p. 250, 251), "The Catholic church says: These presbyters *were* not *priests*, but *bishops of the present day.* These are, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the successors of the apostles, appointed by them to be heads and rulers of the individual churches, and for this end entrusted with a special higher power, which was imparted to them by a peculiar consecration. Under them stand, as *subordinates*

of a lower order of rank, the *priests* properly, who were consecrated by the bishops, while the former could only be consecrated by archbishops. The latter have the exclusive right to administer the sacraments of confirmation and consecration. In every church there can and must be only *one* bishop; while the number of priests may be large. The bishops form the first order of rank, *appointed by God* in the church, while the *priests* make up the *second.*

"The inquiry now is, whether there were such bishops in the apostolical church as a specially appointed institution given by Christ?

"After we have carefully examined and compared all the writings of the New Testament, and have likewise consulted the oldest traditions after the time of the apostles, we see ourselves forced decisively to reply in the negative to this question, and to hold firmly by the view, that originally there were no bishops in the present sense; that from the beginning onward, bishop and priest formed *one and the same* rank and grade, *one and the same* dignity; that at first the priests were appointed by the apostles to be pastors of the church; and that they, as well according to the name as in fact, were bishops; that the present episcopate is not of *divine* but *historical* origin.

"*This our view*, which is a vital question agitated between the Catholic and Protestant church, *we will prove, by incontestable reasons, as the only true and correct one.*

"If the present episcopate is of divine origin, it must of necessity, according to its essence, show itself in the apostolical century, namely, in the time of the apostles themselves. Accordingly, the bishops of that period must be:

"a. Accurately distinguished from the priests, and be placed above them.

"b. They must have possessed and exercised a peculiar higher power above the priests: (α) special care for the preservation of doctrine and discipline; (β) the distribution of the sacrament of confirmation and the consecration of the priests.

"c. In every church there must have been only *one* bishop, and he must show himself, in every case.

"Yet of all these things there is not a single trace, but precisely the contrary, as we shall show."

This is done by a clear examination of the passages of Scripture bearing on the subject; and then Ellendorf goes on, in p. 254, to add:

"It is not to be conceived how, in spite of these expressions of the holy Scriptures, so clear and unquestionable, there could have arisen, in the Catholic church, the opinion that *bishops* and *elders* were different, and that the former constituted a rank, appointed by Christ, above the latter. But the grounds by which the advocates of the episcopate defend this as a divine institution, correspond completely to the utter baselessness of this view. Let us hear, once for all, Walter, who, at the present day, is the most powerful and skilful defender of the Catholic church constitution and hierarchy.

"Walter says that the bishops, by virtue of a divine and apostolic appointment, form the head of the ecclesiastical administration in every church; that to them *priests* and *deacons* are given as helpers; and that, accordingly, the hierarchy, in its essential grades, consists of bishops, priests, and deacons. In a book, in which Walter treats of the privilege of the church, of all acknowledged Christian confessions, and indeed with the avowed purpose of exhibiting the superior excellence and the divine authority of the constitution of the Catholic over every other — in this book Walter adduces, as his only proof of the legitimacy of this ecclesiastical constitution from divine right, the decree of the council of Trent (Sess. xxiii. c. 6. 7). With the unambiguous and most decisive expressions of the holy Scriptures, he deals by the most pitiable and superficial reasoning:

"The usage of language of the holy Scriptures, for the most ancient time, appears to be contrary to the distinction between bishops and elders; for in part the apostles frequently call themselves only πρεσβύτεροι (1 Pet. 5: 1. 2 John 1: 1); and in part the terms ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι are

often used promiscuously together (Acts 20: 17, 28. Tit. 1: 5, 7). But although the names, in the beginning, were not so accurately distinguished, *yet the Epistles of the apostles prove* that the things were distinguished, and that particular overseers, among the rest, were distinguished as the central point of the unity. So, for example, Titus himself had to appoint elders (Tit. 1: 5), and Timothy to receive accusations against the elders (1 Tim. 5: 19)." Thus Walter's proof.

"But Walter has only forgotten to add this, to wit: that the *elders*, of whom mention is made in both places, were designated by the apostles as *bishops;* that neither Titus nor Timothy were bishops, but helpers of Paul in the apostolic office, i. e. were themselves apostles, according to Acts 14: 13. This position of Titus and Timothy, we have heretofore proved beyond refutation."

Ellendorf then looks at the passages by Walter, and shows that they demonstrate the very contrary of what he wished to prove, or "that *elders* (priests) and *bishops were absolutely one and the same*," and thus reaches his conclusion:

"From these numerous witnesses, capable of no other interpretation, and that cannot be refuted, we draw the conclusion that in the apostolical church there were no bishops as a higher order of rank above priests, appointed by Christ; that, still more, bishops and priests were one and the same, and that, accordingly, in any church (gemeinde) were as many bishops as there were priests, who, united in a college — the *presbytery — in common* (or collectively), administered the highest government of the church."

Had we been able, we should have been glad to present Ellendorf's argument in detail; but it would occupy too large a space. It is well worth reading by any who have access to the original German.

Since Ellendorf's treatise appeared, Bunsen has published his "Hippolytus and his Times." In this book he

---

[1] Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts V. Auflage, §§ 15, 16, 17, 24, not. m.

proves that Hippolytus, who was bishop of Novus Portus or Ostia, the harbor of Rome, wrote about A. D. 220 and suffered martyrdom, as he supposes, about A. D. 236 or 238; and that, at this time, nothing was known of any such primacy or supremacy of Peter or of the Roman church as is claimed. Had there been, Hippolytus could not but have alluded to it. Bunsen, vol. 3d, p. 223, says: "Thus we find the suburban towns incorporated with Rome: Tusculum and Preneste, Tibur and Velitræ, Ostia and Portus, each of them a bishopric. It is clear from the words of Hippolytus that there was no further extension of the Roman church in his time." Again, p. 224: "The Roman church, at the beginning of the third century, had not yet become the Italian (in our sense), still less the Latin church."

Speaking, too, of Eusebius, on whom the tradition impugned rests in so large a degree, Bunsen further says: "Eusebius was entirely a man of the East, and his literary knowledge of the Western church, in the second and third centuries, is most notoriously defective." The recent examination of this historian by Mr. Coleman, will no doubt be remembered, and his authority be duly estimated by the readers of the Bibliotheca Sacra.

A single author more may be mentioned here, as he is not perhaps so well known in this country as he deserves to be, Edward John Shepherd, rector of Luddesdown. In his "History of the Church of Rome to the End of the Episcopate of Damasus, A. D. 384. London, 1851," he closes with an "Inquiry into the Authority for the doctrine of the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome," etc., in which he examines the question of the traditions respecting Peter at Rome. After a careful review of the pretended authorities, and arriving at a similar conclusion with Ellendorf, he comes to Clement, who, it is claimed, was the person "whom St. Peter himself ordained bishop of Rome;" and in relation to him he says: "I now put it to the reader's common sense to say whether, as Clement was the first recipient of this power, which was to remain in his successors forever, it is not one of the most unaccountable facts on record, that, knowing how impor-

tant these facts were, not only to his own church, but to the church at large, he should, in magnifying the apostles Peter and Paul, mention as a matter of glory St. Paul's preaching and martyrdom, in the West, which had no such results, and be silent on the same facts in St. Peter's case, which had such stupendous consequences.

"It seems to me that a person viewing this subject without prejudice, would come to the conclusion that Clement knew nothing of the country in which St. Peter died; or, that if he did, he judged it of no importance to be stated; and, consequently, that he was entirely ignorant of the present Roman theory; and that, in his view, St. Paul was a far more important personage in the Christian church than St. Peter. This, I have but little doubt, was his real opinion. That opinion was undoubtedly held by the ante-Nicene church, as, in their writings, St. Paul is generally styled 'the apostle,' without any reference to his name.

"The only ante-Nicene evidence for the fact of St. Peter's having died at Rome, rests on the same evidence as that Clement was ordained by him; and if he was, and wrote that letter, I think it is clear that he knew nothing of Roman supremacy; nay, that he did not even know that St. Peter had ever been in the West. In an oration, attributed to Gregory of Nanzianzum, Peter is distinctly confined to Judea (Orat. xxxiii. s. 11). Whoever wrote this oration, it is an oriental opinion of Peter's proceedings, very different from the Roman. The writer never could have had the slightest notion that St. Peter had ever been in Europe; and I believe that, in the fourth century, such was the general impression; it is mine, I confess, in the nineteenth."

Adverting further to what Eusebius says, Mr. Shepherd remarks: "The writer (it cannot be Eusebius) tells us that he 'adduces these things [the testimonies of Caius and Dionysius] that the history of Peter's dying at Rome may be the more accredited.' Accredited? — if the Roman theory be true, the supremacy, which was founded upon Peter's having died at Rome, had been a constant fact before the eyes of the church for the previous three hundred years.

The interference of the Roman church had been seen and felt, during these centuries, everywhere, on this very ground and only on this very ground — that St. Peter had died bishop of Rome.

Objectors, then, to believing that Peter had died at Rome, there could have been none. There might have been doubts, A. D. 70; but A. D. 330, after an admitted authority of three centuries, there could have been none, if the Roman story be true. But if unbelievers were so numerous as to attract the notice of the historian, or rather, if this is an insertion into the history of Eusebius, the supremacy founded upon St. Peter having died at Rome, must be a fable."

Mr. Shepherd regards very many of the authorities adduced by the Romish church, in support of their claims, as interpolated. In five letters, addressed to the Rev. S. R. Maitland, he calls in question Cyprian's letters; and, by a series of well-arranged and forcible historical arguments, sustains his position as to their falsehood. Indeed, he more than questions the very existence of Cyprian himself.

In his "History of the Church of Rome," he also adverts to the same subject, and, alluding to these "letters of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who is probably an imaginary personage," he says: "that until the middle of the third century there is not the least trace of any intercourse between the bishops of Rome and Carthage; indeed, we scarcely know anything of either church." "That during the short interval between A. D. 250—258, the two churches are seen in the closest possible intimacy." "The members of both churches are so intimately acquainted, that commentators are puzzled to distinguish Romans from Africans." "The curtain drops; and although Africa is described as in a state of fearful confusion in the fourth century, there is not, during the remaining half of the third, near the whole of the fourth, nor until the fifth, the slightest fragment of any intercourse between the orthodox churches of Rome and Carthage. During four hundred years there is no known voluntary intercourse between these two sees, except during these eight years in the middle of the period." The character of the

letters themselves are examined with no little acumen, and the conclusion reached seems justified by the facts adduced. In another portion of his History, Mr. Shepherd subjects some of the letters of Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, to a similar trial and with a similar result. These two instances afford striking proof how little reliance is to be placed on a variety of the evidence on which the claims of the Romish church rest, and also serve to sustain Ellendorf's views as to their authority in the case of Peter's abode, bishopric, and martyrdom at Rome.

ARTICLE IV.

DEMONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY REV. JOHN J. OWEN, D. D., NEW YORK CITY.

THE difficulties which invest this subject, all will admit; its importance cannot be over estimated. If it be true that the great adversary of our race is surrounded by an innumerable band of wicked spirits, to whose wiles and machinations we are constantly exposed, we ought to acquaint ourselves, as far as possible, with this great agency of evil.

Of the existence of a great and mighty intelligence, the impersonation of evil, and in a special sense its author and promoter, no one can doubt who reads and believes the Bible. Satan, the adversary of the Old Testament, and διάβολος, the accuser and calumniator of the New, from the opening to the closing chapters of revelation, from his triumph over man's integrity in the garden of Eden, to the awful overthrow predicted of him in the close of the sacred canon, is made the prime actor in all that is bad and subversive of God's authority among men. With those who can see no evidence, in the Bible, of the existence of such a malig-