

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Scripture* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_scripture-01.php

in A.D. 67. Although a period of twenty-five years is usually associated with his stay in Rome, cf. Hughes, p. 65, we must not imagine it as an uninterrupted residence there. We know, for instance, that Peter was at the Council held in Jerusalem in A.D. 49 cf. Acts xv. He was also at Antioch where he came into conflict with St. Paul, Gal. ii, 11 ff. and his first Epistle implies that he undertook long missionary journeys, I Peter i, 1. It is reasonable to suppose that Peter, like Paul, would move from place to place spreading the Gospel and founding churches, which would mean long periods of absence from Rome itself. In such circumstances the lack of mention of Peter being in Rome need cause no surprise since it may well have been that when Romans was written in 58 that he was not in fact resident there, but busy elsewhere preaching the Gospel.

2. By 58, when Romans was written, the Roman Church had long been established and had acquired a world-wide reputation. It had not been established by Paul and consequently he tells us in Romans xv, 20 ff. he does not think it right to intrude upon *another's foundation*. This may be an indirect reference to Peter's work because the flourishing state of the Roman Church would argue to a great personality as its founder. Who is that great personality? Tradition has been insistent that it was the Prince of the Apostles. But a mere solitary brief visit of Peter would not account for the position assigned to him by tradition. When Peter and Paul are mentioned together in connection with the Roman Church in the earliest notices, the name of Peter invariably stands first.

The answer to this second part of our question is well given by a non-Catholic writer: "It has often been asked, why St. Paul, if he meant that another had preached at Rome and been the founder of the Roman Church, did not mention his name? The answer is a very simple one: he was not writing for the information of students and critics of the twentieth century, but for the Roman Christians, who knew the facts. There had then been a founder of this great Church of world-wide fame with whom Paul was well acquainted and into whose special sphere of successful preaching he did not think it right to intrude. Who was he? All tradition answers with one voice the name of St. Peter." G. Edmundson, *The Church in Rome in the First Century*, pp. 28-9. Consult further, P. Boylan, *Epistle to the Romans* and Jules Lebreton and Jacques Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, I, pp. 233 ff.

R. FOSTER.

How can the prophecy in Isaias ii, 4 ("swords into ploughshares") be said to be fulfilled? No such peace seems to have come with the Messianic age and it is surely unwarranted to make it conditional.

The theme of peace in the Messianic age is a familiar one in Isaias, cf. i, 26; iv, 4-6; ix, 5-7; xi, 6 f.; xxv, 1 f.; xxvi, 1-6; xxix, 17 f.; xxxii, 16 f.; xxxiii, 15 f.; xxxv, 8 f. Of these passages perhaps the best known is xi, 6 "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb." This poetic language is clearly not meant to be taken literally. We are not moreover to understand these prophecies as being fulfilled in Israel according to the flesh but in the spiritual Israel, namely the Church. What sort of peace does it foretell? If a material peace then it cannot be said to have been fulfilled in the history of the Church. It is true there have been long periods of external peace but the peace foretold is a special characteristic of the Messianic kingdom. Now external and material peace is not the special characteristic of the Church. It is rather in time of conflict that virtue is most evident.

We must then understand it as an interior and spiritual peace—that peace which accompanies a clear conscience in the sight of God and which stands out in startling clarity in time of persecution. It is the peace which Christ promised His followers "Peace I leave with you: my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, do I give unto you." And to show that such peace is interior Christ goes on to stress its special value in time of conflict "Let not your heart be troubled nor let it be afraid," John xiv, 27. Such warfare is directly envisaged by Christ as a result of introducing Christianity into a pagan world. "I came not to bring peace but the sword."

Throughout the history of the Church on earth there has been and will be this startling contrast between interior peace and external conflict. From time to time of course nations that observe God's law enjoy also the fruits of material peace, but there is no necessary connection between the two. Nevertheless the warfare will come to an end with the passing of this world and in the life to come is the perfect fulfilment of the glowing vision of Isaias the prophet.

R. C. FULLER.