

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1944

The Historicity and Significance of Peter's Stay in Rome

Clarence Boye

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_boyec@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Boye, Clarence, "The Historicity and Significance of Peter's Stay in Rome" (1944). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 92. <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/92>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE HISTORICITY AND SIGNIFICANCE
OF PETER'S STAY IN ROME

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Clarence Carl Boye

May 1944

Approved by:

W. Arnold
Thos. Laitoch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
THE HISTORICITY OF PETER'S STAY IN ROME	4
BIBLICAL EVIDENCE	7
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF ROME	18
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF SYRIA	26
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF CORINTH	28
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF ASIA MINOR	31
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF SOUTHERN GAUL	36
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA	39
TESTIMONIES FROM CHURCH OF NORTHERN AFRICA	42
TESTIMONIES OF CHURCH HISTORIANS	44
LATER TESTIMONIES SUBSTANTIATING EARLIER WITNESSES	46
CONCLUSIONS	50
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PETER'S STAY IN ROME	53
REFUTATION OF FIRST PAPAL CLAIM: PETER HAVING GONE TO ROME FOUNDED THE BISHOPRIC THERE AND SERVED AS THE ROMAN <u>EPISCOPOS</u> FOR A PERIOD OF TWENTY-FIVE YEARS	54
FOUNDING OF CHURCH AT ROME	57
PETER'S ALLEGED TWENTY-FIVE YEAR EPISCOPATE	60
REFUTATION OF SECOND PAPAL CLAIM: PETER WAS APPOINTED BY CHRIST TO BE HIS CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE AND SUCCESSOR AND THE HEAD OF HIS CHURCH	68
STUDY OF MATTHEW 16: 18-19	69
STUDY OF JOHN 21: 15-17	77
NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES OPPOSING THIS CLAIM	81
REFUTATION OF THIRD PAPAL CLAIM: HIS SUCCESSORS SUCCEEDED TO HIS PREROGATIVES AND TO ALL THE AUTHORITY IMPLIED THEREIN	93
SIGNIFICANCE OF PETER'S PRESENCE IN ROME	103
CONCLUSIONS	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY	106

INTRODUCTION

As leaders of the Ancient Church, St. Peter and St. Paul undoubtedly stand forth in impressive grandeur. To us, most of the Christian apostolic leaders are but names; but these two are living men to this day. The life of Paul is the easier to write, and innumerable attempts have been made to do so. However, such is not the case with Peter, for when we investigate all sources, we are amazed to discover that so little definite information has survived regarding this man who is given the first place among the Twelve Apostles --- regarding him who took a leading part in the foundation of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, and who was the first to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Farrar vividly expresses this lack of definite information thus:

For the details of many years in the life of St. Peter we have nothing on which to rely except slight and vague allusions, floating rumors, and false impression created by deliberate fictions of heretical romance.¹

It is true, however, that concerning this Christian leader's early life we have sufficient information to enable us to formulate a satisfactory biography. Scripture tells us that he was a native of Bethsaida (although later residing at Capernaum), the son of a certain John, who,

1. F. W. Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, (Dutton Edition), Vol. I, p. 821.

together with his sons, Andrew and Peter, was a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee in partnership with Zebedee and his sons. It also relates to us how in common with the earliest followers of Christ, Peter received three separate calls from his Master, namely: 1) to become His disciple (John 1, 40 ff; cf. 2, 2); 2) to become His constant companion (Matt. 4, 19; Mark 1, 17; Luke 5, 10); 3) to be His apostle (Matt. 10, 2; Mark 3, 14. 16; Luke 6, 13. 14). In fact, from the accounts rendered us in Holy Writ, we see that his life manifests three well-marked stages. The first of these is the period of training, as exhibited in the gospel narrative. This terminates with his shameful three-fold denial, after which he entered into the second period, that of leadership in the Church, as portrayed in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. The third and final period of his life comprises those years in which he rendered humble service in the Kingdom of Christ, which is described to us in the Epistles of the New Testament. When the foundation of the Church had been laid, Peter takes a subordinate place, and in humble labors to spread the boundaries of the Kingdom disappears from the pages of history, as James henceforth takes the leading place in the Church at Jerusalem. (Cf. Acts 12, 17; 15, 13; 21, 18; Gal. 2, 9. 12).

It is also true that concerning Peter's traits sufficient detail is related to us throughout the pages of the New Testament to enable us to obtain a very comprehensive characterization of this "Man of God". In fact, some go

so far as to say that

No character in Scripture history, we may even say in all literature, is drawn for us more clearly or strongly than Peter's. 2

His natural impulsiveness is readily seen from Matt. 14, 28; 17, 4; John 21, 7; that he was tender-hearted and affectionate is attested by Matt. 26, 75; John 13, 9; 21, 15-17. Undoubtedly the most striking features of Peter are the strange contradictions within him as revealed to us in the New Testament. At times he was presumptuous, Matt. 16, 22; John 13, 8; 18, 10; at other times timid and cowardly, Matt. 14, 30; 26, 69-72. He was self-sacrificing, Mark 1, 18, yet inclined to be self-seeking, Matt. 19, 27. Again, he was gifted with spiritual insight, John 6, 68, and yet, slow to apprehend the deeper truths, Matt. 15, 15. 16. Furthermore, Peter made two great confessions of his faith, Matt. 16, 16; John 6, 69, but also the most cowardly denial, Mark 14, 67-71.

However, the aim and purpose of this paper is not to present a biography or character sketch of this disciple of Christ, but to devote our attention to the latter years of his life, and more particularly to the question: "Did Peter visit Rome during the evening hours of his earthly pilgrimage?" We shall examine all the evidence at our disposal, meagre and controversial though it may be, and from this draw our deductions. Since, however, this question of Peter's visit to Rome is the very "corner-stone" upon which the "greatest Christian body on Earth" stands or falls, we shall enter upon a brief, but yet comprehensive, study of the significance of this alleged visit. Thus, this thesis

2. J. Davis, Dictionary of the Bible, p. 596.

3. Foakes-Jackson, Peter, Prince of Apostles, p. IX.

will comprise:

- I) A careful investigation into the possibility and probability of a visit to the Roman capital by Peter; and
- II) If such a visit can be admitted, a polemic discussion of the alleged significance which the Roman Catholic Church attaches to this point.

I.

THE HISTORICITY OF PETER'S STAY IN ROME

Since the infallible Word of God remains silent in regard to the definite scene of Peter's last years and death, and since history affords no incontestable evidence, this question has been the object of endless dispute. Some scholars, including a host of Protestants, have favored the view that Peter did conclude his work for the Lord in the Roman capital; others, in spite of the lack of conclusive evidence, have given a dogmatic negative response to this contention. Among these are the Frenchman Justus Scaliger (1540 - 1609) who stated: "'As for the coming of Peter to Rome....no man with a grain of common sense will believe a single syllable.'"⁴ Richard Adelbert Lipsius (1830 - 1892), a great German critic, asserts: "'The Roman Peter Legend proves itself to be from beginning to end a fiction, and thus our critical judgment is confirmed. The feet of Peter never trod the streets of Rome.'"⁵ The Irish Methodist clergyman, Adam Clarke (1762 - 1832) emphatically avers: "'I am of the opinion that St. Peter did not write from Rome---that he was neither Bishop of Rome nor martyred at

4. Quoted in Faber, Facts and Assertions, p.58, requoted in The Popular and Critical Bible Cyclopaedia, 3,p.1320.

5. Quoted in Presbyterian Quarterly, April, 1876, requoted in The Popular and Critical Bible Cyclopaedia, 3,p.1320.

Rome---in a word, that he was never at Rome.'"⁶ Davidson in his denial of Peter's activity in Rome, makes the statement: "The connection of Peter with Rome...rests on an insecure basis. Distinguished critics reject it, nor without reason.'"⁷ Still another who is in agreement with this view is Kennard, who positively affirms: "I boldly and advisedly assert there is no evidence to show that Peter was ever at Rome".⁸

But let us now investigate the evidence, Biblical and literary, and determine whether or not these men are justified so outspokenly to deny the possibility and probability of Peter's visit to Rome, and on the other hand, what evidence lends support to the opinion that the "Prince of Apostles" actually did live the latter years of his life in that city.

In determining the historicity of Peter's stay in Rome, we shall first enter upon a study of a much disputed passage in his First Epistle, the authenticity of which admittedly is in dispute. Yet, the author of this thesis, without entering upon a detailed apologetical examination of the question, assumes that it is a work of the Apostle Peter. His assumption is based to a great extent upon the following considerations. It is

one of the writings of the New Testament, which are the most anciently and the most unanimously cited as authentic. Papias, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen, all furnish indisputable evidence in its favor.⁹

6. Ibid., requoted in the Popular and Critical Bible Cyclopaedia, 3, p. 1321.

7. Quoted in Davidson, Introduction to the New Testament, 1, 1420, requoted in the Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopaedia, 3, 1321.

8. Quoted in Kennard, Contr. with McLachlan, p. 49, requoted in Bible Encyclopaedia, 3, 1321.

9. F. W. Farrar. op. cit., p. 122.

Ἐυλογον δ' ἐνταῦθα γενομένους, ἀνακεφάλαι-
 ώσασθαι τῆς δηλωθείσης τῆς καινῆς δι-
 θῆκης γραφῆς. Καὶ δὴ Σακκέον ἐν
 πρῶτοις, τὴν ἀγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων
 ζεφυρακτὸν, ὅς ἐστι τῶν Πλάτων
 τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφῆς. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτην,
 τῆς Παύλου καταλεκτέον ἐπιβόλῃς, εἰς
 ἕξῃς τὴν φελομένην Ἰωάννου
 προσέλας, καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν Πέτρου
 κυρωτέον ἐπιβόλῃν. 10

Κέκληται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίας
 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προσέλας ἐπιβόλῃς,
 καὶ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως. 11

Ὁ μὲν σοὶ Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ
 δηλωθείσῃ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους αὐτοῦ
 γραφῇ φελομένη εἰς δεῦρο κέκληται
 τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἀπὸ τῆς
 Πέτρου προσέλας ἐπιβόλῃς. 12

Μένεται δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰωάννου
 πρῶτης ἐπιβόλῃς, μαρτυρία εἰς
 αὐτῆς πλεῖστα ἐπιβόλων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ
 τῆς Πέτρου προσέλας. 13

Πέτρος δὲ ἐφ' ᾧ ὀικοδομεῖται ὁ Χριστοῦ
 Ἐκκλησία ἥς πύλαι ἕδου οὐ κατα-
 γχύουσι, μίαν ἐπιβόλῃν ὁμολογημένην
 καταλέλοιπεν. Ἐξω δὲ καὶ
 δευτέραν ἀμφιβαλλέται γὰρ. 14

10. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, 25.

11. *Ibid.*, III, 39.

12. *Ibid.*, IV, 14.

13. *Ibid.*, V, 8.

14. *Ibid.*, VI, 25.

Besides this, there are many allusions to it in the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians. Little importance, therefore, can be attached to its absence from the Muratorian Canon.¹⁵ Even if the external evidence in favor of the Epistle had been less convincing, the arguments on which its authenticity has been questioned by a few modern theologians have been so amply refuted as to establish its authorship with complete certainty.¹⁶

The verse in dispute, the thirteenth of the fifth chapter, has been strongly urged by both sides as strong evidence of their respective contentions. The words to be considered read: Ἀπταίξετε ἑμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι βυβακλεξῆ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου. Countless pages have been written concerning the meaning of the term Βαβυλῶν. Many vigorously uphold the literal interpretation of the word, thus referring it to the ancient capital of Babylonia. Others, just as strenuously, press their assumption that this is a symbolic term for Rome. Still others, few in number however, see in Βαβυλῶν a reference to the Egyptian town of Babylon in the Nile Delta, or a figurative expression for Jerusalem. Since these latter two views are not predominant today, and since it would carry us too far beyond the scope of this paper to show why neither can be held, we will restrict ourselves to presenting the arguments for the "Babylon" and "Rome" hypotheses, and then on the basis of these, will arrive at our conclusion.

One of the most formidable and most frequently presented arguments that Babylon is to be taken literally is that

It is improbable that, in the midst of matter of fact communications and salutations, in a remarkably plain epistle, the

15. F. W. Farrar, op. cit., p. 225.

16. Ibid., p. 123.

symbolical language of prophecy (viz., Babylon for Rome) should be used." 17

This same view is more tersely expressed in the words:

There are very serious objections to this interpretation. One is, that it is totally out of keeping with Peter's manner of writing. Preeminently he is direct and matter of fact in his style. The metaphorical language he employs is mostly drawn from the Old Testament, or, if from himself, it is so common of us as to be well understood by all readers. It is altogether improbable that this man, plain of speech almost to bluntness, should interject in the midst of his personal explanations and final salutations such a mystical epithet with no hint of what he means by it, or why he employs such a mode of speech. 18

In answer to this argument, however, it can be stated that the assumption that Βαβυλῶν is to be understood as a symbolical term for Rome is not the only instance of figurative speech employed by Peter in this Epistle, for in 2, 4 - 10 we have a section which accords with this figurative term. But more convincing is the fact that in the very same verse in which the term Βαβυλῶν appears there is additional figurative language. In reality, upon closer examination, we observe that the whole sentence in which this appellation occurs must be understood in a symbolical sense. The salutation is given, not by the Church in Babylon, but by the ἑοικελευμένη, a feminine adjective, to which the literal reader would of necessity supply the word ἑοικεμένη. In fact, some expositors have adopted this interpretation and actually suppose that Peter sends the salutation in the name of his wife, elect together with himself. But this interpretation is too unreasonable and too violently opposed to the common sense of Christ-

17. Critical Commentary, Vol. 8, XLVIII.

18. International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Vol. IV, p. 2352.

ians to need a refutation, although in passing it may be said that

a Jew would hardly have sent a greeting from his wife---a poor Galilean woman---to all these churches, or have described her as simply ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι. 19

On the other hand, the Codex Sinaiticus after Βαβυ-
λῶνι adds ἐκκλησίᾳ and the Vulgate has "ecclesia quae est in Babylone", which identical addition is also found in the Peshite and in the Armenian. Hence, this expression βυβεκλεκτή must be accepted as a mystical designation of the Christian community which resides in that city specified by the Apostle as Βαβυλῶνι. This view is in accordance with the unvarying testimony of early Christian writers.

Continuing, one must say that these writers from all quarters raise their voices in affirmation that Βαβυλῶνι here is a recognized appellation of Rome. This Βαβυλῶνι was the ancient central world power, the headquarters of idolatrous worship and the abode of anti-Christian and persecuting powers. Such was Babylon in the times of the prophets, and such was Rome, and Rome alone, in Peter's own day. Thus, there was good reason why such a name should be given to it. All the persecutions then impending---in fact, already beginning, came from the city which succeeded Babylon as the type and center of anti-Christian forces. In addition, the figurative description of Μάρκος in this same verse as ὁ υἱὸς μου tells in favor of the metaphorical interpretation of Βαβυλῶνι in the in-

mediately preceding words.

Further, if Ba Budaiv is to be taken literally as the designation of the ancient city, then we could be assuming that a Christian congregation existed in that city during the last years of Peter's life.

But we have historical evidence, accepted by all critics as genuine, which proves conclusively that a community of Christians, more especially of Hebrew Christians, to whom St. Peter is to have confined his personal ministrations, did not and could not exist in that city or the adjoining district at the time in question. 20

This we can learn from the account given us by Josephus in the final chapter of the 18th book of his Jewish Antiquities. He here states that at about 40 A.D., toward the end of Caligula's reign, the entire Jewish population in Babylon was exterminated, and thus there can be no doubt, as the author expressly states, the Jews abandoned the whole province; and even though at a later date we find them in adjoining districts, there is no indication of their presence within the precincts of Babylon. Clarke, in his commentary supports this view when he states:

Though there were probably Jews in considerable numbers in Babylon in the days of the Apostles, absolutely nothing is said of a Christian congregation among them. 21

Thus, in short, it is utterly incredible that a Christian Church, consisting chiefly, if not wholly, of Hebrew converts, should have been established in Babylon within less than a quarter of a century from that catastrophe,—the extermination of the Jewish people in Babylon. 22

To continue, to hold that Ba Budaiv is to be taken

20. HOLY BIBLE with Commentary, Vol. 4, p. 161.

21. Clarke's Commentary, Vol. VI, p. 506.

22. HOLY BIBLE with Commentary, Vol. 4, p. 161.

literally as a designation of Babylon, brings about further difficulty in explaining the presence of Silvanus and Marcus (5, 12. 13). To defend the literal interpretation that Babylon is here meant, one would have to place Peter, Silvanus, Mark, (and Peter's wife---- βΟΥΕΚΛΕΚΤΗ) in Babylon. But to do this is to claim entirely too much.

Thus, this is really not a question that concerns Peter alone. Hence, we ask: "Was there ever a time during the days of the Apostles when these three men, Peter, Silvanus, and Mark were together in the Far East, in what once was Babylon or in that territory?" and again "Shall we abandon all the reliable data we possess and all that the ancient tradition reports, and operate with an absolute blank as far as records and tradition go, with nothing to go on save this phrase in this Epistle, and set up the hypothesis that Peter wrote this letter from Babylon with Silvanus and Mark at his side?" In this connection we must bear in mind that "there is no tradition in the first five centuries of any activity of Peter in Babylonia." ²³ Besides, St. Mark would certainly not have been needed as an interpreter (ἑρμηνεύων) in a Hebrew Christian Church in Babylon. ²⁴ At Rome he may have been and probably

23. Schaff-Herzog Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. VIII, p.484.

24. That Mark did serve as an interpreter of Peter is testified to by Eusebius who states that "Papias set forth a tradition περὶ Μάρκου τοῦ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον χειροτόμος ἐκτίθεσθαι διὰ τῶντων. Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ πλεονεχίας ἔχει. Μάρκος ἑρμηνεύων Πέτρον (III.39). It is true however that some conservative scholars take the term ἑρμηνεύων in the sense of "literary interpreter".

was almost indispensable, due to the Apostle's ignorance of the Latin language. It has been thought, however, that Mark and Silas could not possibly have been in Rome, and in attendance on St. Peter, till after the death of St. Paul. But there is no reason for supposing that St. Peter outlived St. Paul by any considerable length of time; in fact Eusébius' testimony on this question is:

Καὶ γὰρ ἄνω (Πέτρος καὶ Πᾶυλος)
καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον
φυσεύσαντες ἡμᾶς, ὁμοίως δὲ
καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόως
ἐδιδάξαντες, ἐναρτύλησαν κατὰ
τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν. 25

Nor can it be reasonably supposed that Mark and Silas were adherents to St. Paul in such a sense that they could not at any time have written and carried a letter for St. Peter, and joined him in sending a greeting to the Asiatic churches.

The argument has often been advanced that the order of the provinces to which the Epistle is addressed is not a suitable one if the Epistle was written from Rome, but rather suggests that it was written in the East. However, we assert that the manner of enumeration of the provinces does not substantiate any hypothesis as to the writer's abode. Upon examination we observe that he starts with the province in the far north, Pontus, goes to the adjoining Galatia, next to the adjoining Cappadocia on the east, then to the adjoining Asia on the west, and then back to

the far north, Bithynia, thus following sort of a circle.

We therefore concur with Lenski in his conclusion that

if the order of importance had been intended, Peter would have named the province of Asia first, which also was nearest to Rome. Referring to the order in which Peter names the provinces as an argument for locating Peter in Babylon near the Euphrates, is not very convincing. 26

In short, the order of the provinces to which the Epistle is addressed is not so arranged that the five provinces can be brought into line on any hypothesis as to the writer's whereabouts.

But would the designation of BaBUDWV for Rome be understood by those to whom it was addressed? Of course, if explanation were needed, it would at once be given by the bearer of the Epistle. Thus, there is little force in the objection that the Asiatic congregations would be left in darkness as to the significance of the term BaBUDWV,

for the letter did not drop from the sky, nor even go through the post. It was carried by Silvanus, who had come from the place where the author was residing. 27

Further,

we know for certain that the inhabitants of Asia Minor became familiarly acquainted with the expression before the close of the first century. 28

This becomes apparent from the fact that

in the Apocalypse which was written almost the same time or not long after, we see that a Western, and even an Asiatic, Christian, when he heard the name 'Babylon' in a religious writing, would be likely at once to think of Rome. 29

26. Lenski, Interpretation of Peter, John, Jude, p. 14.

27. International Critical Commentary, Vol. 41, p. 77.

28. Ibid. F.W.Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, (Burt Edition), p. 681.

29. Ibid. p. 681.

Passages in the Book of Revelation which give the appellation 'Babylon' to Rome are 14, 8; 16, 9; 17, 5. 9. 18; 18, 2; et al. Then too, the Jews of those days must have been acquainted with the use of this figure of speech, for throughout the Talmud we find the same practice of applying symbolic names. Although the Talmud was compiled later, it represents first century and even earlier Jewish thinking. There Rome figures under the description of Nineveh, Edom, and Babylon, and almost every allusion to Christ is veiled under the names of "Absalom", "That Man", "So-and-so" and "The Hung".³⁰ Also, such metaphors in fact seem to have been not uncommon among the first Christians; even Jerusalem, "the great city of where our Lord was crucified", was spoken of "spiritually" as Sodom or Egypt (Rev. 11, 8). St. Paul had called the Holy City "Mount Sinai" (Gal. 4, 25). Such turns of speech are very natural and therefore present little or no difficulty.

The moment a pious Jew set his foot in the Transtiberine Ghetto, and saw with his own eyes the splendor and vices of the Capital, or heard of the influence of the 'Chaldean' astrologers, or of the blasphemous follies of Caligula, he might very well bethink him of Isaiah, and say to himself, 'Surely this is Babylon, not Rome'.³¹

It is therefore a mistake to suppose that the use of Babylon for Rome would be the sudden obtrusion of "allegory" into matter-of-fact, or

that by using it the Apostle would be 'going out of his way to make an enigma for all future readers'...for an early Christian would have seen nothing either allegorical

30. F.W. Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, p. 681.

31. International Critical Commentary, Vol. 41, p. 76.

or enigmatical in the matter, but would at once have understood the meaning.³²

A further consideration to substantiate the view that by "Babylon" in this verse Rome is designated is the fact that already in the first century the Jews assigned to it this cognomen. To verify this statement we turn to the Sibylline Oracles (v. 143), where in speaking of Nero the following is said: ἡς μεγάλης Ἰωάνης Βαβυλῆος μέγας ... φεύσεται ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος³³ and then later (v. 158) this remark:

Καὶ φλέσσει Πόντον Βαβὺν αὐτήν
ἔξ Βαβυλῶνα Ἰταλίας χεῖρα θ' ἡς
ἕνεκα Πόλλοι ὄλοντο Ἑβραίων ἔχου
Πλετοὶ καὶ ναὸς Ἀθηθῆς³⁴

This reference loses some force, because here care is taken by the naming of Rome and Italy to warn the reader that he is not to suppose Babylon on the Euphrates is meant

just as in Rev. 17, 15 by the note that the waters on which the great whore --- i.e., according to 17, 5, Babylon --- sits (17, 1) are nations, and not literal waters,³⁵

while Peter makes no such addition.

What has been called "the most conclusive evidence against Babylon meaning Rome"³⁶ is the silence of the Apostle Paul about Peter being in Rome. In his Epistle to the Roman Church, Paul greets many believers who were in Rome. If Peter had been there, so the argument is advanced,

32. F.W. Farrar, *op. cit.* (Burt Edition), p. 692.

33. Quoted in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Vol. 4, col. 4623.

34. Quoted in *International Critical Commentary*, Vol. 41, p. 76.

35. *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Vol. 4, Col. 4623

36. *Annotated Bible*, Vol. 4, p. 55.

why did he not mention him also? Or again, why is there no word about his meeting Peter in Rome in his Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, to Timothy and Titus, or especially, why in his very last Epistle from Rome does Paul make the significant statement: "Only Luke is with me?"

It is said this silence about Peter in the Pauline Epistles can only be explained by the fact that Peter was not in Rome at all.³⁷

However, this silence we believe can be explained by one of the three following considerations. In some of his Epistles (e.g. Epp. to the Philippians and to the Colossians) Paul had no special reason to mention Peter, or at the time of the writing of others, Peter had not yet arrived in the Roman capital, or still again, during the writing of others, Peter was absent from Rome at that particular time, doing missionary work in Italy outside of Rome. There is besides the possibility that the Captivity Letters were written not in Rome, but in Ephesus. Another weighty argument in the mind of the author is the fact that no source describes the place of Peter's death as other than Rome. Although this is another argument from silence, yet it seems to be quite potent, for as a matter of fact, none of the Church Fathers contradict Clement's view that Peter's last years were spent in Rome. This, however, will be discussed at greater length later in this paper.

Thus, after a consideration of the evidence, the writer of this paper feels safe to deduce that in Βαβυλῶν as found in 1 Pet. 5: 13, we have a figurative or symbolical

³⁷. Ibid., p. 55.

designation for Rome. His conclusion is based primarily upon the fact that it is untenable to give the verse in question a strictly literal interpretation (βουκελευσέν and Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου), even though it admittedly is in the midst of matter-of-fact communications and salutations. It is further based upon the voice of history which makes it rather implausible to hold that a Christian congregation actually existed in Babylon during the latter years of Peter's life and also upon the silent voice of both history and tradition in failing to testify of his presence in Babylon, in fact the failure of both to give any indication whatever of Peter's activity in the distant East. Moreover, the writer believes that the mention of Silvanus and Marcus is a further and most cogent argument against the supposition that Peter was a resident of Babylon and in favor of the view that he wrote his First Epistle from Rome. Further evidence of importance, the writer believes, is that the appellation Βαβυλῶν for Rome was to be found already in the Sibylline Oracles, and a little later in the Revelation of St. John.

It is readily admitted that except for the prophecy of John 21, 18 ff. and his Epistles, the New Testament gives no information regarding the closing years of Peter, thus, our deductions cannot be verified with any specific testimony, yet from this argument of Βαβυλῶν alone

it seems probable on the whole that Peter did visit Rome although absolute certainty is unattainable.³⁸

Of course, what brought Peter to this city and other quest-

38. Schaff-Herzog Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 8, p. 482.

ions of this nature, we are unable to answer. The question of the significance of his stay in the Roman capital will be discussed at length in the second part of this thesis.

We shall now investigate the writings of the Church Fathers and determine to what extent their testimonies invalidate or substantiate the view that Peter was active in Rome during the latter years of his life.

For our purpose, it will be most convenient to arrange the evidence of the ecclesiastical fathers under the several churches, the first of which is the Church of Rome.³⁹

In his epistle to the Corinthians (written about A.D. 95-97), Clement rebukes the addresses for the existence of a faction, by which some of the elder ministers had been thrust aside. In the earlier chapters, he spoke of the evils which sprang from "jealousy and envy" and had taken from Scripture examples in chronological order, ending with David. He then continues:

Ἄλλ' εἶνα τῶν ἀρχαίων
ὑποδεχθέντων πταγώμεθα, ἔλωμεν
ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑχχλεσα γενομένους
ἀθλητάς· λάβωμεν τῆς γενεᾶς
ἡμῶν καὶ γενναῖα ὑποδείγματα·
ἀλλὰ τῆλον καὶ φθόρον ὡς
μεγέλειος καὶ δεκαλότατος βεῦδος
ἔδωχθησαν καὶ ἕως θανάτου
ἠθάσαν· λάβωμεν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν
ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποβόλους·

39. The outline which is being followed is taken from Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. III, pp. 773 - 777.

Πέτρον, ὃς διὰ ζῆλον ἔδεκεν
οὐχ ἓνα οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ
πλείονας ὑπήνεγκε πόνους, καὶ
οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς
τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δοξῆς·
διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ἔβην Πᾶυλος
ὑπομονῆς βλάβειον ἔδεκεν . . .
τούτους τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὁμοίως
πολλεψυβασμένους βυνηθλοῖσθαι
πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν
ὄξυες πολλὰς δίκιας καὶ
βαβίνας διὰ ζῆλος παθόντες
ὑπόδεγμα κἀδεξτον ἐφέροντο
ἐν ἡμῖν . . .

This passage has been consistently urged as evidence of Peter's visit to Rome, but just as consistently have those who deny a Roman sojourn of Peter refused to grant such claims. Thus, let us study these statements to determine whether or not they lend support to the positive view of Peter's activity in Rome. Cheyne says:

The word μαρτυρήσας will be most fittingly interpreted not 'having suffered martyrdom' but rather 'having borne (oral) testimony' (or, at most 'having suffered tortures'. In the case of Peter, however, the first of these two renderings does not fit well; for οὕτω μαρτυρήσας seems intended to convey 'after that he had borne testimony' by the 'labours' (πόνους) just mentioned. These, however, extend over his whole life as an apostle. That precisely his death was occasioned by some such 'labour' and thus was a martyrdom is not expressly said and therefore might be disputed. Still, since Peter is here cited as an instance of how the greatest 'pillars' contended even unto death, we refrain from doing so.

"In like manner it will be well to concede that 'among us' (ἐν ἡμῖν) does

not mean 'among us Christians' ---- which would be tolerably vague --- but 'among us Romans'. The reference is to the victims of the Neronian persecution who were made use of for the purpose of presentation of mythological pieces. Still when it is said of the Neronian martyrs in Rome that they were gathered together with Peter and Paul, we are by no means to draw it as a necessary inference that Peter and Paul lived in Rome. To 'was gathered' (συνελοίεθη) what we ought rather to supply will be 'to the due place of glory' (εἰς τὸν ὑφελθόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης) or 'to the holy place' (εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον). Thus the common meeting place referred to is not Rome but heaven, and accordingly the present passage says nothing as to the place of death.⁴¹

The strength of this passage, Cheyne states, is often resisted

on the ground that no other place than Rome is ever mentioned as the scene of Peter's martyrdom, and that it would be too extraordinary if Clement, while knowing the fact of Peter's death should be ignorant of the place of it.⁴²

He asserts, however, that neither of these objections is conclusive, for which assertion he presents the following supposition

If, let us suppose, Peter had perished while travelling in a distant land, at some obscure place, not as the result of ordinary process of law, but perhaps in some popular tumult, and if also such companions as he may have had perished along with him, then information of his death could reach his fellow-Christians only by report; and if, even at a later date, no Christian Church arose at the place where it occurred, no local tradition as to his end had any chance of surviving.⁴³

Again he states:

There is no difficulty in the supposition that Peter met his death in an unknown and obscure place, perhaps without legal process, perhaps on a journey, perhaps

41. Ibid., Vol. 4, Col. 4599.

42. Ibid., Vol. 4, Col. 4601.

43. Ibid., Vol. 4, Col. 4601.

without any companion, so that no tradition regarding it survived which could have asserted itself against the steadily advancing belief that he had died in Rome.44

Such are the arguments as presented in refutation of the claim that these words of this Epistle of Clement speak for Peter's stay in Rome. Let us, however, by closer examination, seek to determine whether they render a visit to the Roman capital improbable, even if not impossible, or whether this passage can be adduced to substantiate the positive view. That Clement here asserts that Peter suffered death by martyrdom is conceded by all critics. However, the author of this thesis believes that Cheyne is guilty of some false exegetical interpretation when he insists that 'was gathered' (βυνηθολοιβθη) is to be attached to εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον εἰς δεξιάς, referring it to the meeting place in yonder world --- to heaven -- - instead of to Rome, the scene of the Neronian persecution. Then further, the author feels that Cheyne's suppositions regarding the site and manner of Peter's death are too weak to merit support. His conjecture that the manner and place of the Apostle's death is unknown both to history and tradition seems hardly plausible.

Now, on the other hand, let us once again look at these same words of Clement and see if they afford evidence in support of Peter's ministry in Rome. It is true that in his letter, no specific mention is made of Peter and Paul having founded the Church at Rome or having been martyred there; yet the most reasonable explanation of the fact that the examples of the other Apostles are passed over and these two alone are mentioned is that the examples of

44. Ibid., Vol. 4, Col. 4625.

heroism of these two Apostles were best known to the Church in whose name he writes. Hence, would not a logical deduction be that these two leaders of the Church actually manifested such heroism and actually suffered martyrdom in Rome? Further, as the entire passage proves, Clement undoubtedly is speaking of the Neronian persecution and thus refers the martyrdom of Peter and Paul to that epoch, the date of which harmonizes very well with the time of the latter years of both their lives.

But what seems to be the most convincing argument of all is that Clement has carefully chosen his language to emphasize the likeness between the two Apostles. The importance of this is that St. Paul's martyrdom at Rome is universally allowed. Hence, since he is speaking of the suffering and martyrdom of the two, we feel justified in assuming that Clement in this Epistle to the Corinthians gives evidence for Peter's martyrdom, not as Cheyne maintains "outside of Rome and away from the western world altogether,"⁴⁵ but in the Roman capital.

The next bit of evidence coming from Rome itself is that given by a certain Caius, a person of whom we know nothing certain except that which Eusebius tells us a century later, namely, that

he was a very learned man, a member of the Church under Bishop Zephyrinus (ca. 199-217), and that he wrote at Rome a polemic in the form of a dialogue against Proclus, a leader of the Montanist faction.⁴⁶

Among the several passages cited from this dialogue by Eusebius only one concerns us at this time, namely that

45. *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, Col. 4607.

46. J. Shetwell and L. Loomis, The See of Peter, p.82

passage in which Caius is apparently maintaining the supreme authority of orthodox Roman doctrine over Montanist teaching on the ground that the Roman Church was the direct creation of the Apostles and the site of their martyrdoms, and possibly the repository of their bones. This extract reads:

Ἐχὼ δὲ τὰ κροτάλια τῶν
ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖδει· Ἐὶν γὰρ
θεληῖς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν
βασιλικόν, ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν
Ῥωμῆαν, εὐρήσεις τὰ κροτάλια
τῶν ταύτων ἰδρυομένων
τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. 47

These words are an explicit statement that both Peter and Paul worked for some time at Rome and also that both died a martyr's death at Rome. But the question still remains ---- are we to understand by τὰ κροτάλια the places of execution or of burial? Eusebius evidently accepts the latter of these interpretations as can be seen by his words:

Παῦλος δὲ οὖν ἐπ' αὐτῆς
Ῥώμης τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποστρωθῆναι
καὶ Πέτρος ὡσαύτως ἀνακοδοπεθῆναι
κατ' αὐτὸν ἰστοροῦνται. Καὶ
Πλάτωνος γε τὴν ἰστορίαν ἢ
Πέτρον καὶ Παύλον εἰς δεῦρο
κρατῆρας ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτόθεν
κατακειμένων πλοβητίων. 48

47. Eusebius, op. cit., II, 25.

48. Ibid., II, 25.

Again he states:

Γάριος... φησὶν ἄλλα δὲ τὰυτὰ περὶ τῶν
Σότων ἔνα τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων
τὰ λέγει ἡ Κληνίμια Κεταζέθελτι. 49

His view, however, is opposed by modern investigators, who believe that the place of execution is meant, and this mainly for lexical reasons. It is said

even the literal meaning of the word ('sign of victory') admits this meaning only; for a martyr gained his victory only at the place of his death, not at the place of his burial. To understand the meaning 'sign of victory', we have only to make the further supposition that those who honored the martyrs were able to show, at the place of death, some object or other that marked it out for those who visited the spot, and with which was associated some reminiscence, whether real or supposed, of what happened at the martyr's death.⁵⁰

However, for our purpose, it is immaterial which of these two opinions is correct, as the testimony retains its value in either case. Caius hereby testifies of Peter's presence in Rome, the historicity of which this thesis seeks to ascertain.

The third witness of the Roman Church is Hippolytus. Between 220 and 230 A.D. he published a "Refutation of All Heresies", known also as the Philosophumena, in ten books, of which Books I and V * X are still extant. Having described at great length the philosophic system of Simon Magus (concerning whom more detail will be given later), he added (VI, 20) that Simon Peter had met and withstood each other on several occasions at Rome, and that Simon had finally left the city and died elsewhere. It appears, however, that Hippolytus used the Apocryphal Acts, and we cannot be sure therefore that his statement is independent

49. Ibid., II, 25.

50. Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, col. 4594.

evidence. Yet the end of Simon as described by him differs from his end according to the extant Acts, and thus

it is possible that his account of Simon's death represents a bit of actual Roman tradition as to the heresiarch's end.⁵¹

A reference, vague and incidental though it may be, is to be found in a fragment of the Muratorian Canon, (composed somewhere between 170 and 190 A.D.). The excerpt taken from, 1, 37 reads:

"Lucas optime theofile comprindit quia sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur sicuti et semote passionem Petri evidentur declarat, sed et profectionem Paul ab urbe ad Spaniam profiscentis."⁵²

Concerning this passage we shall note several considerations; first, that

here the martyrdom of Peter is regarded as a known fact and can easily be conceived of by the author (...) as having happened in Rome.⁵³

and second, however, since this excerpt is found in close connection with St. Paul's journey to Spain, as is also the case in the Acts of Peter,

it is probable that the writer (...) has these Acts in mind, and we are not entitled to infer more than that he does not question the truthfulness of Acts in these matters.⁵⁴

Our final reference to the literary production of the Roman Church is to the notice in the Depositio Martyrum, one of the tracts which form the general name of the Liberian Catalogue, i. e., the list of Roman bishops brought down to Liberius, A.D. 352 ff., which in turn forms part of the Chronicle of 354. In this Catalogue Peter is first

51. J. Shotwell and T. Loomis, op. cit., p. 129.

52. Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 750.

53. Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, Col. 4603.

54. J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3, p. 769.

spoken of unreservedly as first bishop of Rome in the words: "post ascensum eius (Jesus) beatissimus Petrus episcopatum suscepit."⁵⁵ Whereas the prime importance of this passage --- the alleged twenty-five year episcopate of Peter in Rome --- will be discussed at length in the second half of this thesis, yet at this time it should be noted that these words naturally assume Peter's presence in the Roman capital. Elsewhere in this work, there is mention of the translation of the Apostles' bodies (Peter and Paul) in 258, which confirms the evidence of Caius.

We now proceed to an investigation of the evidence of the Fathers of the Church of Syria, the first of which is given us by Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch. His letters were written

while he was on his way under guard to death at Rome, to be ground like "God's wheat... by the teeth of wild beasts" in order to become "the pure bread of Christ." At various stopping places on his journey he wrote letters to the churches he was leaving behind in Asia, exhorting them to steadfastness in the face of perils without, and to unity and loyalty to their bishops in view of dissensions within.⁵⁶

He also sent ahead a letter of greeting to the Romans, in which he endeavors by every means to restrain the Roman Christians from striving for his pardon and in which he begs them not to deprive him of the crown of martyrdom by their intercession with the authorities. His exact words are: οὐχ ὡς πέλρος καὶ πύλος διατάσσεται.⁵⁷ The significance of this brief statement cannot be definitely determined; for we do not know whether he has in mind oral commandments delivered in person or whether he is thinking

55. Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, Col. 4596.

56. J. Shotwell and T. Loomis, op. cit., pp.71.72.

57. Ignatius. C.IV, quoted in J.Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 769.

merely of the hortatory epistles sent by these same apostles to the churches. We therefore refrain from concurring in the opinion that

the meaning of this remark must be that the two apostles laboured personally in Rome, and with apostolic authority preached the Gospel there.⁵⁸

But we definitely reject the opinion that these words of Ignatius can be used to support the view that Peter never visited Rome, as some scholars do, even though it is remarkable that although he is actually on his way to martyrdom at Rome, he makes no allusion to Peter and Paul having suffered martyrdom in the city before him.

Continuing, we turn our attention to the Clementine Literature, of which the Grundschrift had its origin probably in Syria before the close of the second century. There are three documents comprising this work, namely, the Homilies, the Recognitions, and the Eptome. In this Clementine Literature we find a few allusions to Peter's visit to Rome in connection with the Simon Magus story and also in regard to the Roman bishopric, although we must admit that it cannot be definitely ascertained that they are not due to later editing. Further, of the Clementines it has been said:

They are pure fiction, but are interesting as showing how the Christian writers sought to make their principles attractive to the public, much in the fashion of a modern religious novel.⁶⁰

Hence, because of their nature and because of the uncertainty as to the time at which the references to Peter

58. Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 749.

59. E.g. Dallmann. See W. Dallmann, Peter, p. 217.

60. Foalses-Jackson, op. cit., pp. 181. 182.

were embodied in the text, this Clementine Literature cannot be strongly urged as evidence for Peter's presence in Rome.

The third testimony given us by the Syria-speaking church is that of the Doctrine of Addai, which "in its present shape is a work of the latter half of the fourth century."⁶¹ In this work there is mention made of "the Epistles of Paul, which Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome."⁶² Hence, also this less renowned document, though of later date, supports the view that Peter was present in Rome.

We next turn to the Church of Corinth, whose sole representative in this question is Dionysius. This bishop of the Corinthian church wrote letters to various churches in Greece, Asia Minor and Crete, which were later assembled in a collection read by Eusebius in the early fourth century.⁶³ He also wrote a letter to the Roman community in the time of the bishopric of Soter there (ca. 166-174) in which he thanks the Romans for the pecuniary help given to the members of the Corinthian Church. Eusebius in his Historia Ecclesiastica, has quoted four short passages from this letter to the Romans, one of which is noteworthy for our consideration at this time. This quotation is the earliest statement which we have to the effect that Peter and Paul actually "founded" (or "planted") the Roman Church. (The significance of this "founding" or "planting" will be discussed in the second half of this thesis). Dionysius'

61. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.

62. Ibid., Vol. III, p. 770.

63. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 75.

remark is:

Ὡς ἵπτος ἡλιόθεν ἐκὼν καὶ
ἡμεῖς δὲ τῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ νοσηρίας
τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου
φυσίαν γεννηθέντων ῥωμαίων
καὶ κορινθίων συνέχευόμεθα.
καὶ γὰρ ἄνω καὶ εἰς τὴν
ἡμετέραν κοίτην φευόμεθα,
ἡμεῖς ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν
ὁμοίως δεδιόμαστε, ἐμαρτυρήσαντες
κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν. 64

The reference to the common work of the two Apostles in Corinth is probably a mere reference from 1 Corinthians; but there is nothing in the New Testament which can account for the assertion of their common activity in Italy. He, therefore, here refers to a tradition,

which may have come to him through the medium of the Petrine Acts, but which, however, he accepted. It matters little whether ὁμοίως is to be taken loosely to mean 'together' or more strictly '(going to) the same place', i. e. in Italy. Dionysius can only have Rome in his mind. 65

The last words of this quotation form the earliest text to imply that Peter and Paul met their deaths on the same day, although the Greek wording is perhaps too vague to be much insisted upon; yet, somewhat later the Roman church is found to be celebrating their martyrdoms or depositions together. 66 Whether it is held that the Apostles died on the same day of the month but in different years (so Augustine

64. Eusebius, op. cit., II, 25.

65. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.

in his Sermones: "On the Anniversary of the Apostles Peter and Paul"⁶⁷), or whether they met their deaths on the very same day, or that the Roman church fixed originally upon the single date because of a simultaneous translation of the two bodies during the first centuries, is a question which need not be answered in this thesis. Suffice it to say, that this testimony of Dionysius is one of the earliest and clearest statements of the Church Fathers which have come down to us regarding Peter's activity in the Roman capital. Yet, objections have been raised to the significance of this evidence on the grounds that the forepart of this quotation is an untrue assertion. It is argued:

Dionysius of Corinth says Peter and Paul planted the church at Corinth. From the Acts we know Paul did the planting. In the same sentence he says that Peter and Paul went to Italy. The Acts tell us that Paul went to Italy alone, without any Peter. And so we can put no trust in the further statement that Peter and Paul were martyred in Italy at the same time.⁶⁸

However in refutation, we say, the apparent discrepancy between the Acts and this statement of Dionysius is solved by a correct understanding of the significance of the word "plant" (which subject is to be entered upon later). Further, according to 1 Corinthians 9, 5 Peter travelled around, and we may assume that he visited Corinth, because there was a Cephas party there. In addition, even though admittedly true is the fact that the Scriptural account has Paul going to Rome alone, does Dionysius here contradict that fact? He merely says that they "taught together in Italy

66. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 75.

67. Taken from Feriale Ecclesiae Romae, I, 71, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., pp. 107.108.

68. W. Dallmann, op. cit., p. 219.

and suffered martyrdom at the same time." He makes no assertion that Peter and Paul journeyed together and arrived at Rome together. Thus we hold that this statement of Dionysius written in the latter half of the second century is one of paramount importance in substantiation of the view that Peter was present in Rome. NB

From the Church in Asia Minor we have the witness of Papias, who, like Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, belong to the group we call the "Apostolic Fathers", men who in their youth had come into contact with one or more of the original Apostles. It is he who gives us our oldest extant account of the composition of the Gospel of Mark, although unfortunately Eusebius does not give us Papias' own words, preferring in this instance to quote the version of a later man, Clement of Alexandria, and using Papias' name merely to confirm Clement's story. For our purpose, however, we note only the fact that the story itself is traced back to Papias, together with the view that it gives of Peter's activity at Rome. The lengthy quotation from Eusebius follows:

Το βούζο δ' ἐπέλαμψεν τῆς ζωῆς
ἀκροαζῶν τῶν Πέτρου διακόνου Ἐυσεβίου
φέρου, ὡς καὶ εἰς ἅπασιν ἐκινῶς
ἔχειν ἀρκέσθαι ἀκοῆ καὶ δεσφῆ ἀχλαφῆ
τοῦ θεοῦ καλύψματος δεδαδικαδίας
παλακλῆσε δε παντοίας Μάλκον οὐ
τὸ εὐαγγελιὸν φέρεται ἀκόλουθον ὄντα
Πέτρου δεπαλῆσε, ὡς ἂν καὶ δε
χλαφῆς ὑπομνήσε τῆς δε λόγου παλα-
δοθείσης αὐτοῖς κασαδεῖσαι δεδαδικαδίας,

μὴ πρότερον εἴ ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατ-
εργάσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ζωὴν αἰζίου
γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγμένου κατὰ Μάρκον
εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. Ἰόντα δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα
ὄψεσθαι τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ
τοῦ πνεύματος, ἠγάθησε τῆ ζωῶν ἀνδρῶν
πλοθυμιά, κωλύει τὴν γραφὴν εἰς
ἔντευξεν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, (Κλημῆς ἐν ἔκτῃ
τῶν ὑποσημειῶν παρθεύεται τὴν
ἑβραϊκῶν, συνεπεμαρτυρεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ
Ἰεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνομάσει Παπίας)
τοῦ δὲ Μάρκον μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν
τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἢ καὶ συνετάει φεβῶν
ἐπ' αὐτῆς ῥωμῆς, ἔχοντα εἰς τούτῃ αὐτοῦ
τὴν πάλιν εἰσοπτικῆτον Βαβυλῶνα προβλεπόντα
διὰ ζούτων ἠδὲ πᾶσαι ἡμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνα
συνεκλεκτῆ, καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου. 69

In regard to this we say that

it is a reasonable inference from the language of Eusebius that Papias interpreted 'Babylon' in 1 Peter 5, 13 of Rome and is therefore a witness for the Roman visit.⁷⁰

Admittedly true is the fact that this is a rather weak and none-too-convincing testimony, yet

when taken along with Ignatius' allusion to Peter, cited above, it seems to show that at the opening of the second century, Peter was connected with the community at Rome in the minds of prominent Christians of Asia Minor.⁷¹

We direct our attention next to the Gnostic Acts of

69. Eusebius, op. cit., II, 15.

70. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.

71. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 74.

Peter which undoubtedly had their origin in Syria. This includes three separate documents, chief of which is the Actus Petri cum Simone. The story as related in these Acts is in brief:

- a. Paul in obedience to a vision departs from Rome on his journey to Spain.
 - b. Simon Magus arrives in Rome and gains adherents. The brethren are distressed that Paul has left them, and that they have no leader to help them against Simon. Just at this time, however, the twelve years after the Ascension being past, Christ appears to Peter in a vision and bids him to go to Rome.
 - c. Peter arrives in Rome. After preaching to the brethren, at their request he goes from the synagogue to the house of Marcellus (formerly a disciple of St. Paul), where Simon is. At this point there ensues the episode of the speaking dog which takes Peter's message to Simon. Marcellus, who had been so much under Simon's influence that he had erected in his honour a statue with the inscription Simoni iuveni deo, repents. In course of time, it is arranged that there should be a public encounter between Peter and Simon in the Forum. Peter's power of truly raising the dead proves him to be superior to Simon. Simon undertakes to fly to heaven. This he attempts to do before a great crowd in the Via Sacra. Under the influence, however, of Peter's prayers he falls and breaks his thigh. He is stoned by the crowd, leaves Rome, and shortly afterwards dies at Terracina.
 - d. The prefect Agrippa (note that the minister of Augustus is transferred to Nero's reign) has four concubines who are persuaded by Peter to refuse Agrippa any intercourse. Xanthippe similarly withdraws from her husband Albinus, a friend of the emperor. Albinus, therefore, and Agrippa make common cause against Peter.
 - e. At the request of Xanthippe and the brethren, Peter consents to leave Rome. As he is passing through the gate of the city, he sees Christ entering. The well-known conversation between the Lord and the Apostle takes place and he returns to the city knowing that the Lord would suffer in him. St. Peter is brought before Agrippa who condemns him to be crucified.
-

When he is brought near the cross, he addresses it in mystic language --- Ὁ ὄντων
ἄρχων, μυστήριον ἀποκρυφῶν κ.τ.λ. He asks that he may be fixed to it head downward, and in mystical language he explains the significance of that position. πρὸς ὧν ὁ
κύριος ἐν μυστηρίῳ λέγει ἑγὼ μὴ ποιεῖτε ἐν
ἑστέῃ κεφαλῇ ἐὰν ἀποκρυφῶν ἀποκρυφῶν ὧν ἐν
ἑστέῃ κεφαλῇ ἐὰν ὧν ἐν κεφαλῇ κεφαλῇ ἐὰν ὀπίσθω
ἧς ἐν ἀποκρυφῶν ὧν ἐν ἀποκρυφῶν ἐν ἀποκρυφῶν.

At the burial, Marcellus acts the part of Joseph of Arimathaea. Peter, however, appears to him in a vision and reminds him of the Lord's saying, 'Let the dead be buried by their dead.' So Marcellus awaits Paul's return to Rome. The romance ends with a notice of Nero first determining to persecute the converts of Peter and afterwards being restrained by a vision... of one who chastised him and warned him to 'refrain his hands from the servants of Christ'.⁷²

We grant that this entire story is purely legendary and is rejected by all authorities unanimously as historically incorrect and impossible. In fact

the central idea of an encounter between Peter and Simon was, of course, absolutely fictitious. The Simon Magus of the Acts was never in Rome, so far as we are aware. The Simon of Gitta, whom Justin Martyr had in mind, may or may not have been the same as the founder of the Simonian sect. The latter, however, certainly belonged to the close of the first century rather than to the middle and probably did not see Rome until twenty-five years, at least, after the apostle's death.⁷³

Thus, since the entire story rests upon no historical foundation whatever, we, of course, cannot urge it as a strong testimony for Peter's presence in Rome; yet we do assert that the mere fact that the legend centers about Peter's activity in Rome does give evidence of the fact that the claim of Peter's presence in Rome was widely circulated and commonly accepted during the second half of the second century, when these Acts first made their appearance. Further, if, as many believe, this a work of Leucius Charinus,

72. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 773.

73. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 134.

who lived in Asia Minor, it is clear that he did not place the scene of Peter's conflict with Simon Magus at Rome from motives of ecclesiastical patriotism, but on the other hand it is natural to suppose that he built up the romance on a current tradition of Peter's visit to Rome.

Together with these Gnostic Acts, it is necessary to mention the so-called Catholic Acts of Peter, which, in the main, present the same story as the foregoing. There are a few noteworthy differences however, because of which, we deem it advisable to present a brief summary or resume of the legend as therein related:

- a. Paul arrives in Rome. The two apostles meet with joy. Paul stills a dispute between Gentile and Jewish Christians. The preaching of the apostles converts multitudes, and in particular 'Livia the wife of Nero and Agrippina the wife of Agrippa,' (note the confusion) leave their husbands, while not a few soldiers withdraw from military service.
- b. Simon Magus now begins to traduce Peter, and performs magical tricks. He is summoned before Nero, and claims to be the Son of God. The two great Apostles and Simon hold a disputation and a trial of strength in miracles before Nero. At length Simon requests that a wooden tower may be erected, from which he undertakes to throw himself, that his angels may bear him to heaven. When the day arrives, Simon begins to fly, to the great distress of Paul. Peter, however, adjures the angels of Satan to help him no longer. Simon falls in the Via Sacra and dies.
- c. Nero thereupon commands that the apostles should be thrown into prison. At Agrippa's suggestion Paul is beheaded in the Via Ostiensis. Peter, when he is brought to the cross, asks that, being unworthy to hang as his Lord hung, he may be crucified head downwards. He then relates to the people the "Quo Vadis" story, and, after having prayed to the Good Shepherd, he gives up the spirit.⁷⁴

74. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 774.

By comparing these two accounts we notice a striking similarity, and yet at least one noteworthy difference, and that is in regard to the place and manner of death of both Simon and Peter. Since the two legends disagree on such an important particular account as this, we believe it is plausible to assume that the legends grew up independently of one another. Hence, in this way, both the Gnostic and the Catholic Acts of Peter would verify the assumption that the tradition of Peter's presence in Rome was quite prevalent throughout the churches, and commonly accepted by its members at the time of their writing.

Among the writers of the Church of Southern Gaul who merit our attention for this consideration, the most prominent is Irenaeus, an Asiatic who had migrated to Lyons on the Rhone in Gaul and who had become the bishop of the church there. As a pupil of Polycarp in Asia, he was acquainted with the tradition of 'The School of St. John'. He had visited Rome, probably on more than one occasion, and it would appear, he resided there for sometime. During this residence he presumably lectured on the heresies of his age, employing as one of his most effective arguments:

The Gnostic teachers professed to have received a tradition from the apostles of the Lord, whereas the bishops of the Apostolic Churches who had been ordained by the followers of Christ and had received from them the true teaching, knew nothing of this secret tradition.⁷⁵

Thus it was in opposition to these Gnostics, who asserted that they had passed in deeper knowledge beyond the slow-witted, uncomprehending disciples of Jesus, as well as

⁷⁵. Foakes-Jackson, op. cit., p. 154.

against the Montanists, who claimed to be the direct recipients of fresh revelations, that Irenaeus turned for reassurance to the churches who could be trusted to teach and interpret the Scriptures as the Apostles had done. Preeminent among such churches was the Church of Rome with its twofold Apostolic tradition.

The words of Irenaeus which are of import for us in our attempt to determine the historicity of Peter's presence in Rome as found in his Contra Haereses are in translation:

Matthew among the Hebrews issued a gospel written in their tongue, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and founding the church there. (τοῦ Πέτρος καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελισθέντων καὶ θεμελιούσων τῆς ἐκκλησίας). And after their departure (ἐξόδου) Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, he too handed on to us in writing what Peter preached.⁷⁶

... the blessed Apostles then founded and reared up the Church...⁷⁷

Later he speaks of the

very great, very ancient, and universally known church founded and constituted at Rome by the two very glorious Apostles Peter and Paul (Maxima et antiquissima et omnibus cognita a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundata et constituta ecclesia).⁷⁸

In regard to the quotation speaking of the "departure" of the two Apostles, Hastings states:

Irenaeus, it will be noticed, speaks of the joint work of the Apostles at Rome as belonging to a period so well known that it supplies a means of dating another event. Further, it

76. Irenaeus, III, 1.1, quoted in J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.

77. Irenaeus, III, 1.3, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 78.

78. Irenaeus, III, 3. 1, quoted in Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, Col. 4892.

is natural to take the word ἔβησεν as referring to the Apostles' deaths; for (independently of other notices) this interpretation is favored by: 1. the use of the word. Cf. Luke 9, 31; 2 Peter 1, 15; and the frequent use of exitus in Tertullian; and 2. the context --- to say that Mark recorded the substance of Peter's preaching after his death defines not only the date but the reason of the composition of the Gospel.⁷⁹

Further, besides this testimony of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria makes the statement, verified by Papias that

Mark wrote his Gospel to satisfy the importunities of the brethren and without the apostle's knowledge, before the death of Peter, and submitted it when complete to the Apostle's judgment.⁸⁰

Origen says that Mark wrote as Peter dictated to him (ἔβησεν δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκου ὡς Πέτρος ἠνείκετο λέγει).⁸¹

These four accounts, while they differ in details and may be independent, agree in bringing Mark into close personal relation with Peter. Not one of them says in so many words that his Gospel was written in Rome, but the language of Irenaeus seems clearly to imply this, and it was probably the belief of the other three also.

At any rate from these corresponding statements of these four writers, and from the additional excerpts quoted above from Irenaeus' work, we are safe to assert that

the tradition that the church had been grounded by St. Peter and Paul was well established by A. D. 178. From henceforth there is no doubt whatever that, not only at Rome, but throughout the Christian Church, Peter's visit to the city was an accepted fact, as was his martyrdom, together with that of Paul.⁸²

79. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.

80. Eusebius, op. cit., II, 15, quoted in International Critical Commentary, Vol. 41, p. 62.

81. Eusebius, op. cit., VI, 24, quoted in International Critical Commentary, Vol. 41, p. 82.

82. Foakes-Jackson, op. cit., p. 155.

Our attention is next directed to the testimony presented by two renowned churchmen of Alexandria, namely Clement of Alexandria and Origen. The former (ca. 190), a teacher in the catechetical school in Alexandria, in his commentary on the Scriptures, known as the Hypotyposes, of which only a few fragments, preserved in other men's writings, have come down to us, states in regard to the composition of Mark's Gospel:

ΤΟΥ ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΣΥΝΟΜΙΛΙΑ ΕΝ ῬΩΜῃ
ΚΗΡΥΞΑΝΤΟΣ Τὸν Λόγον, ΚΑΙ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ
Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον Ἐξελεπόντος, τοὺς Παλόντας
Πολλοὺς ὄντας Πάλαι καλέσας τὸν Μάρκον,
ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόλλῶθεν καὶ
μενημεμένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ
ἐλεημένα ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,
μεταδόναι τοῖς θεουμένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅτι ἐπι-
γινόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προσεπέσεικῶς ἡγε-
κώδους ἡγετο πλοτρεῖσθαι. 83

In another passage where Eusebius transcribes the same matter from the Hypotyposes, though somewhat differently, (Eusebius II, 15 ff.), Rome is presupposed, through the connection with II, 15 5f. ("Peter was conducted to Rome"), to be the place where Mark was requested by the Christians to write his Gospel. Thus, these two excerpts from Clement of Alexandria again seem to substantiate the view that Peter was present in Rome, although it must be said that the testimony here rendered is none too weighty, in view of the fact that

83. Eusebius, op. cit., VI, 14.

He (Clement) never (?) says where he heard any specific story and without such definite corroboration it is impossible to be sure how far he is in any given instance repeating from floating hearsay or legend and how far from direct, reliable tradition. Eusebius tells us that one of the episodes he quotes from Clement (which has previously been noted) was confirmed by Papias. But Clement alone leaves one usually a little uncertain.⁸⁴

In connection with Clement of Alexandria it may be mentioned that the earliest testimony to the Roman sojourn of Peter is perhaps found in the following statement in the Pauli Praedicatio:

et post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulus post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutua conglitationem et altercationem in rerum agendarum dispositionem /the reference is to Gal. 2; Acts 15/ postremo in urbe quasi tunc primum invicem sibi esse cognitae, et quaedam alia huiusmodi absurde ac turpiter conficta (and that after such long time, Peter and Paul, after the collation of the Gospel in Jerusalem and the mutual consideration and discussion and arrangement of things to be done, had at last in the city, in a certain way, then for the first time become known to one another; and certain other things of this sort, absurdly and basely feigned).⁸⁵

Concerning this reference Cheyne remarks:

"In spite of the title Pauli Praedicatio this quotation is often regarded as coming from the book known by the title of Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, in the belief that the title sometimes ran like this Preaching of Peter and Paul. Were this correct we should have here the oldest testimony to the Roman sojourn of Peter, it being presupposed that the book was used not only by Clement of Alexandria but also as early as in the Apology of Aristides. But the question of the derivation of the quotation from it is so uncertain that we need not pursue the matter further.⁸⁶

In answer to this we merely say that this may be stronger

84. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 79.
(Parenthetical additions are my own).

85. Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, Cols. 4593. 4594.

86. Ibid.

evidence of Peter's presence in Rome than Cheyne believes, for other scholars and commentators disagree and say:

the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου is probably identical with a work called the Preaching of Paul; or Of Paul and Peter.⁸⁷

Origen (ca. 250) the most powerful intellect in all that group of Church Fathers who were living when the second century passed into the third, is the first who tells us that Peter seems to have been active in those provinces to which he addressed his First Epistle, and that he suffered crucifixion with head downward. Eusebius' account of his words are:

Πέτρος δὲ ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατικῇ καὶ
Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ Καππαδοκίᾳ ἔῃ καὶ Ἀβυῶν
κεκρυφέναι τοῖς ἐν Σαββατοῦ τοῦ
σαίου ἔοικεν ὅς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν
Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεγκοπιέσθην κατὰ
κεφαλῆς, οὕτως ἀντὶς ἀβύσσῳ παθεῖν.⁸⁸

We, however, refrain from stating that these words clearly intimate the peculiarity traditionally ascribed to Peter's crucifixion; for we believe that there may be some grounds for disputation that the words κατὰ κεφαλῆς mean "with the head downwards". Some say that these words do not indicate such a mode of death. This is a view expressed in McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia:

No instance, we believe, can be adduced which would justify such a translation. The combination κατὰ κεφαλῆς occurs both in classical and Biblical Greek, but in every

87. McClintock and Strong, Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Vol. 8, p. 14.

88. Eusebius, op. cit., III, 1.

case it means "upon the head". According to analogy, therefore, Origen's words should mean that the Apostle was impaled, or fastened to the cross, i. e., by the head. When Eusebius has to mention the crucifying of martyrs with the head downwards, he says distinctly ὅτι δὲ ἀνὰ πᾶσιν καὶ κατὰ πλοβητῶν θέντες (VIII, 8). It is probably to a misunderstanding of Origen's words that this story is to be traced and it is curious to see how it grows as it advances. First we have Origen's vague and doubtful statement above quoted; then we have Eusebius' more precise statement: Πετρός κατὰ κεφαλῆς βλάστησεν. (Dem. EV. III, III, c); and at length, in the hands of Jerome, it expands into: "affixus cruci martyrio coronatus et capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis, asserens se indignum qui sic crucifigeretur ut Dominus suus". (Catal. Script. Eccles. 1) 89

In passing we may mention Peter of Alexandria (c. 300), a successor of Clement and Origen in the school of Alexandria, who makes this assertion in his Epistola Canonica (the date of which is apparently 306 A.D.) 90 Concerning the two Apostles Peter and Paul:

Thus Peter, the first of the apostles (the first appearance in our ecclesiastical writers of this title, which was soon to become a commonplace 91) after being frequently arrested and imprisoned and treated with dishonor, was finally crucified at Rome. 92

Tertullian (c. 200), the most thorough-going theologian of the Latin West before Augustine and the earliest witness from North Africa, gives one of the most important testimonies regarding Peter's presence in Rome. The passages in his writings which are to be noted are:

-
89. McClintock and Strong, op. cit., Vol. 8, p. 14.
 90. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.
 91. Parenthetical statement a footnote from J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 94.
 92. Epistola Canonica, Canon IX, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 94.

Adversus Marcionem. 4: 5: Romani... quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt.93

Scorpisce (or Antidote against Scorpion): XV: Orientem fidem Romae primus Nero circumtulit. Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci adstringitur.94

De Baptismo: Ch. IV: Therefore it does not matter whether one is washed in a sea or in a pool, in a river or in a fountain, in a lake or in a tank, nor is there any difference between those whom John baptized in the Jordan and those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber.95

De Praescriptione Haereticorum: 32, 36: ... For in this form (i.e. episcopal lists) the apostolic churches present their registers, such as the church of Smyrna, which shows that Polycarp was appointed thereto by John, and the church of Rome, which states that Clement was ordained by Peter...96 and ... If thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome where authority is ever within reach. How fortunate is this church for which the Apostles have poured out their whole teaching with their blood, where Peter has emulated the Passion of the Lord, where Paul was crowned with the death of John (scil. the Baptist).97

From these scattered references it is plain that Tertullian accepted as unquestioned the belief that Peter had both preached and suffered death by crucifixion in Rome; in fact, he is the first to speak of the manner of Peter's death, and the first to explicitly state that it took place in Nero's reign. It is true that the foregoing allusions are brief and cursory, but notwithstanding, slightly more definite than those found in the older writers. They still deal apparently with the fact which every reader was expected to know and no one doubted (Peter's presence in Rome), and which, therefore, was unnecessary to re-enforce

93. Quoted in Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, Col. 4594.

94. Quoted in J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 770.

95. Quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 87.

96. Ibid., p. 86.

97. Quoted in Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, pp. 749-750.

by proofs.

From Northern Africa comes also the voice of the first Christian poet which testifies to the presence of Peter in Rome. Commodian, writing about A.D. 280, speaks in the Carmen Apologeticum, 820 f. of Peter and Paul suffering martyrdom in Rome under Nero,⁹⁸ and thus joins Tertullian in stating the time of this event.

In continuation, we investigate the evidence of two historians, Lactantius (c. 310) and the renowned Eusebius (c. 325). The former, a native probably of Africa, upon several occasions refers to Peter at Rome, although his references contain nothing new. In his The Death of the Persecutors he puts them together so as to form a clearer and more connected story than previously recorded, giving what is apparently a summary of the tradition in the shape that was then current. We note two excerpts from his writings, the first from the above-mentioned work:

For at his (Christ's) departure he had endowed them (the disciples) with power and strength, by which the doctrine of the new gospel might be founded and made firm. But he also unfolded to them all things which were about to happen, which Peter and Paul preached at Rome....⁹⁹

The second, taken from his longest and most important work, The Divine Institutes, a manual of Christian theology, reads:

The disciples.....scattered throughout the whole earth to preach the Gospel, as their Lord and Master had commanded them, and for twenty-five years, until the beginning of the reign of Nero, they were laying the foundations of churches through every province and in every city. And during Nero's reign, Peter came to Rome, and after performing certain miracles by the power of God commit-

98. J. Hastings, op. cit., p. 770.

99. Lactantius, Divinae Institutiones, IV, 21, quoted in J. Shetwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 95.

ted unto him, converted many to the true religion and built up a faithful and steadfast temple to God. When Nero heard of these things and observed that not only in Rome but everywhere and daily a great multitude was abandoning the worship of idols, going over to the new religion and condemning the old, for as much as he was an execrable and pernicious tyrant, he set about to raze the heavenly temple and destroy the true faith; and he was the first of all the persecutors of God's servants. He crucified Peter and slew Paul.¹⁰⁰ (Petrum cruci affixit et Paulum interfecit.)

Eusebius of Caesarea, although he wrote his Historia Ecclesiastica as late as 330, had access in the episcopal library of Caesarea to a mass of loose documents of varying age and character which he studied to excellent purpose. He was a diligent compiler and thus collected all the information accessible in his age to aid him in relating the story of the Church. This he incorporated in part or in its entirety in his History, and though often imperfect in arrangement and uncritical or partisan in viewpoint, yet we have preserved for us in this momentous production a quantity of priceless information which otherwise would undoubtedly have perished. The references which he makes to Peter's presence and death in Rome have been quoted or alluded to previously in this thesis in connection with the various earlier Church Fathers and hence will not be repeated here. In resume, we merely mention the fact that he relates practically all he knows about Peter, which was, we may assume, all that a very learned eastern bishop could ascertain. Further, this testimony is the more valuable because Eusebius has no bias in favor of the Roman Church, and though, admittedly, he is not very well informed as to

100. Lactantius, De Mortibus Persecutorum, 2, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 95.

its history, yet Peter in his mind is inseparably connected with Rome, the scene of his later labors and death; nor does any early Christian writer assign any other place for them. The tradition was, therefore, firmly settled and implicitly believed early in the fourth century, and no later testimony is needed to confirm it.

In contrast to this positive testimony of Peter's presence in Rome, we admit, however, that the silence of several writers of the second century is noteworthy. The first of these is the author of the Shepherd of Hermas. Although this was written in Rome about 140 A.D., still it makes no mention of Peter, nor yet, it must be added, of Paul. Even though we are fully aware of our inability to explain this omission to the complete satisfaction of all, yet we assert that a book consisting of a series of visions, one which is of so apocalyptic a character, is not to be supposed to concern itself with personal details from a past time. The silence of the second writer is all the more eloquent, namely, that of Justin Martyr, who wrote in Rome about 152 A.D. Although he lived and suffered in Rome, and has much to say regarding the sojourn there of Simon Magus, yet he mentions nothing of his being refuted by Peter. In fact, as shown previously, it can be said that it was not until the third century that we hear of this famous contest.

As stated before, at the time of Eusebius, or even before, it was commonly accepted by all that Peter had been active in Rome. Hence further evidence to substantiate this is, strictly speaking, superfluous. Nevertheless, we at this point wish to append various additional testimonies for the

purpose of verifying our statement that the tradition of Peter was actually accepted as historical.

In addition to the other authors already discussed in this thesis, we mention that of Porphyry (c. 230). His is the only known surviving comment of a pagan on the story of Peter and has been preserved by the fact of its incorporation in an apologetic Christian work of the early fifth century by a certain Macarius Magnus. Porphyry himself spent much time at Rome about the middle of the third century and came into relations with the Christians there. It is clear that he investigated their writings and traditions with usual care; and then he states:

...This fine fellow (Paul) was overpowered in Rome and beheaded, he who had said that we should judge angels, even as Peter, who had received the right to feed the lambs, was fastened to the cross and crucified.¹⁰¹

Another record of considerable interest, testifying directly to the presence of Peter's and Paul's bodies in the crypt ("ad catacumbas") at Rome and therefore indirectly to the presence of Peter in that city, is the inscription erected by Pope Damasus (Bishop from 368-384) in the chamber presumably once sanctified by their holy relics:

This place, you should know, was once an abode of saints; Their names, you may learn, were Peter and likewise Paul. The East sent hither these disciples, as gladly we confess. For Christ's sake and the merit of his blood they followed him among the stars and sought the realms of heaven and the kingdoms of the righteous. Rome was deemed worthy to retain them as her citizens. May Damasus offer them these verses, new stars, in their Praise.¹⁰²

101. Macarius Magnus, Unigenitus, IV, 4, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 93.

102. Damasus, Inscription in the Platonica, II, 2-3, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 111.

In the second book of his treatise on the Donatist Schism, which he dedicated to the Christians emperors, Optatus, bishop of Mileve (c. 370), a town in the Roman province of Numidia, makes a very definite assertion regarding Peter and his connection with Rome. In fact, his assertion is more sweeping than any found upon the subject previous to him. He states:

You cannot deny that you know that the episcopal seat (cathedra) was first established in the city of Rome by Peter and that in it sat Peter, the head of all the apostles, wherefore he is called Cophas...Therefore, Peter was the first to sit in that one seat. 103

This claim, however, was excessive even for that credulous age, and thus it is not surprising that we have not found it repeated. Of concern to us though is the manner in which the author naturally assumes Peter's presence in Rome as the alleged basis for his further claims.

With Jerome (c. 350-400), who, like Origen and Tertullian is one of the outstanding personalities in early church history, the accepted tradition assumed its final shape. In his De Viris Illustribus, the first patrology or collection of lives of the Christian Fathers, we have his attempt to furnish concise information regarding everyone who had ever taken part in the construction and elucidation of the Christian Scriptures, including himself. He opens with the life of Peter as the author of the epistles bearing his name and the source of the Gospel of Mark. The material for writing this life, as well as the allusion to Simon Magus, was taken from Eusebius' Historia Ecclesiastica. A few items, such as the episcopal title, the twenty-five

103. Optatus, De Schismate Donatistarum, II, 2-3, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loonis, op. cit., p. 111.

year residence at Rome and the burial spot, he himself added. His words are:

He wrote two epistles which are called catholic, the second of which in the opinion of many is not his, since in style it differs from the first. In addition there is ascribed to him the Gospel according to Mark, who was his pupil and interpreter.....

He was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the Via Triumphalis, and is celebrated by the veneration of the whole world.¹⁰⁴

Then in Book V treating of the life of Paul, Jerome writes:

...So in the fourteenth year of Nero on the same day on which Peter was executed, he (Paul) was beheaded at Rome for the sake of Christ and was buried in the Via Ostiensis, in the thirty-seventh year after the Lord's passion.¹⁰⁵

In concluding this section, we briefly refer to a quotation of the Christian Poet Prudentius, which pictures the Roman Church of the year 400. The following words show us that by this time the tradition is not only definitely fixed and located, but

is now finding expression in terms of solemnity and beauty to shed undying lustre over the inheritors of Peter's office and Peter's merits.¹⁰⁶

His words are:

More than their wont men gather and rejoice.
Say friend, why? All over Rome they hasten
and exult in triumph. To us is returned the
day of the victorious feast of the apostles,
Marked with the blood of noble Peter and
Paul. The same day, tho' separated by the
space of one full year, saw them both crown-
ed with the lofty wreath of death. The marsh

104. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, I, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, *op. cit.*, pp. 115.116.

105. *Ibid.* V, quoted in J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

106. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

on the Tiber, laved by the bordering river,
 Holds earth consecrated by two trophies.
 And saw both the cross and the sword; twice
 a bloody stream rolled down and flowed over
 the same grass. The sentence fell first upon
 Peter, doomed by the laws of Nero to hang
 suspended from the tall beam. But he feared
 to emulate the majesty of the supreme death
 and aspire to the glory of the great Master
 and asked that they lift his feet above his
 prostrate head, that with his eyes he might
 face the base of his cross.

The Tiber, hallowed on either bank divides their
 bones, flowing between the consecrated sepul-
 chres. The right shore holds Peter, entombed in
 a golden shrine, musical with olive trees, mur-
 murous with running brooks.

Let us turn where the road leads over Hadrian's
 bridge. Then let us cross again to the river's
 left bank. The vigilant priest first performs
 his sacred office beyond the Tiber, then re-
 turns speedily hither to repeat his vows. 107

Having at length presented the testimonies in behalf of
 Peter's visit to Rome, we now wish to present a brief re-
 sume of the evidence set forth and then draw our conclusions.
 For our summary we quote the words of Hastings:

We have the evidence of official lists and
 documents of the Roman church, which prove the
 strength of the tradition in later times, and
 which, at least in some cases, must rest on
 earlier documents. The notice of the transference
 of the apostle's body to a new resting
 place in 258 and the words of Caius, show that
 the tradition was definite and unquestioned at
 Rome in the first half of the third century.
 The fact that Caius in the passage referred to
 is arguing with an Asiatic opponent, the evi-
 dence of the Gnostic/and Catholic/ Acts of Peter,
 the passages quoted from Origen, Clement of
 Alexandria, and Terullian, show that at the
 same period the tradition was accepted in the
 Churches of Asia, of Alexandria, and of Carthage.
 The passage of Irenaeus carries the evidence
 backward well within the second century, and is
 of special importance as coming from one who
 had visited Rome, whose list of Roman bishops
 suggests that he had access to official docu-
 ments, and who, through Polycarp, was in con-

107. Prudentius, Perisstephanon, Hymn XII, quoted in
 J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., p. 118.

tact with the personal knowledge of St. John and his companions. The testimony of Clement of Rome seems clear when his words are examined, while at the same time it is not definite and circumstantial enough to have created a legendary history. This concurrence of apparently independent testimony becomes much more impressible when it is remembered that the New Testament supplies nothing which could give rise to a legend that St. Peter visited Rome. On the contrary, the narrative of Acts and the notices in St. Paul's later Epistles seem to make such a visit improbable. Moreover, the one clear statement as to the place in 1 Peter literally interpreted becomes a conclusive argument that the apostle's work in his later years lay in a region far from Rome. It is only when the words of 1 Peter 5, 13 receive the less obvious, but in reality more natural, interpretation that they are seen to be a strong confirmation of the evidence of early writers.¹⁰⁸

Add to this, the testimonies given us by Hippolytus, the Muratorian Fragment, the Liberian Catalogue, Ignatius, the Doctrine of Addai, Dionysius, Papias and Commodian, and we believe that Hastings is correct in saying:

The main pieces of evidence are independent and consistent. When combined they form a solid body of proof which is practically irresistible.¹⁰⁹

We admit, however, that this question of Peter's presence in Rome, even though it is built upon a most solidly fixed tradition, is still a question which cannot be given an answer so definite that it cannot be disputed. Hence we cannot and do not concur in the assertions of the Roman Catholics who maintain:

It is an indisputably established historical fact that St. Peter laboured in Rome during the last portion of his life, and there ended his earthly course by martyrdom...St. Peter's residence and death are established beyond contention as historical facts by a series of

108. J. Hastings, op. cit., Vol. III, 777.

109. Ibid.

distant testimonies extending from the end of the first to the end of the second centuries, and issuing from several lands;¹¹¹

and again:

Peter's going to Rome is a historical fact so intimately connected with some great Catholic truths that it would be believed even if time and accident had destroyed ALL the original evidence therefor¹¹¹.

From this it can be readily seen that the Catholics accept the presence of Peter at Rome not necessarily on historical facts, but upon faith, although they assert at the same time that faith is really not called upon, since the evidence satisfactorily established the event as an historical fact.

Nor on the other hand, do we agree with Cheyne who boldly asserts: "Our decision must decidedly be that Peter was never in Rome at all".¹¹² Therefore, our decision is this: Although it cannot be established as a definite historical fact, we feel confident to make the assertion that Peter did visit Rome during the latter years of his life, the making of which assertion is prompted by the convincing nature of the documentary evidence hitherto presented.

110. Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 748.

111. J. Shotwell and L. Loomis, op. cit., XXIV.

112. Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, Col. 4590.

II.

Having on the basis of our investigation of the testimonies and other evidence of Peter's presence in Rome concluded that as far as can be historically determined, Peter was present in the Roman capital during the latter years of his life, let us now proceed to the second part of our thesis, namely

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PETER'S STAY IN ROME

It is a fact well established that upon the historicity of Peter's presence in Rome the Roman Catholic Church stands or falls. If it could not be reasonably ascertained on the basis of the historical evidence at our disposal that he ever set foot in the city, then the entire super-structure of the Roman church would crumble; for the entire papistic system has as its foundation this supposition that Peter did labor in Rome. Now that we have shown that as far as one is able to judge, it is permissible to assert the apostle's presence in the Roman capital, are we thereby asserting that we are subscribing to the Roman Catholic claims which are based upon the historicity of this claim? By no means! For even though we admit that Peter was in Rome, yet we steadfastly maintain that we have not yielded one "jot or tittle" to the further claims of the papacy. We insist that the historicity of Peter's stay in Rome is but a starting point for the entire Papal structure and in or-

der to be able to maintain their assertions it would be necessary for the Papacy and its adherents to prove three claims. Not until they have indisputably proved the historicity and the merit of these claims will we admit that our admission of Peter's presence in Rome asserts our agreement with the remaining Catholic claims; and not until that time will we attach any momentous significance (as do the Romanists) to his visit to the Roman capital. Thus, since these claims will always remain but claims and will never become established as facts, we thereby assert that we will never concur in the significance which the Romanists attach hereto; for their claims are not abetted or supported by any historical evidence, but more than that, they are the result of faulty and forced exegesis, and stand in direct opposition to clear Scriptural teachings. These three claims into which we now wish to make inquiry, the investigation of which will comprise the second part of our thesis, are:

1. Peter having gone to Rome founded the bishopric there and served as the Roman Ἐπίσκοπος for a period of twenty-five years.
2. Peter was appointed by Christ to be His chief representative and successor and the head of His Church.
3. His successors succeeded to his prerogatives and to all the authority implied therein.

As previously admitted, the presence of Peter in Rome can be admitted on the basis of all possible evidence; in fact, the evidence seems too weighty against a plausible attempt to deny it. Yet, the mere fact that Peter did live in Rome during the latter years of his life does in no way imply that he founded the Roman Church. The Roman Catholics, in substantiation of their claim, point to several state-

ments of the Church Fathers, particularly to several from Irenaeus. Since this patristic was born in the first half of the second century and probably within fifty or sixty years after the death of St. Peter, and was at one time in Rome on a mission or embassy from the martyrs of Lyons, his testimony is worthy of careful consideration. His statement in the old Latin translation (the Greek original of this section has been lost) reads in part: "a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundata et constituta ecclesia."¹ A similar assertion is in translation: "Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and laying the foundation of the Church."² From these statements Romanists seek to prove their claim in the following manner:

If Peter and Paul are named as the founders, it is correct in so far as the latter by his Apostolic labors and his martyrdom became in some degree a second founder of the Church; but that St. Paul was not the original founder is evident from his letter to the Romans (1, 18; 15, 20-25). Therefore St. Peter alone can be the real founder of this Church, which is also attested by the whole character of the epistle to the Romans.³

In answer to this we say that the sentence introduced by "Therefore" is a "non sequitur". Simply because St. Paul cannot be considered the original founder of the Roman church, it certainly does not follow that St. Peter must be given that acclaim. Peter and Paul are here mentioned together ----what is said of one is said of the other. Hence if we ascribe to one the honor of founding the Roman

-
1. Irenaeus, iii, 1, 2. Quoted in H. Brueck, History of the Catholic Church, p. 44.
 2. Irenaeus, iii, 1, 1. Quoted in R. Litterdale, The Petrine Claims, p. 176.
 3. H. Bueck, op. cit., p. 45.

Church, the construction of Irenaeus' statement necessitates our ascribing the other the same honor. However, Paul's own remark in his Epistle to the Romans militates against the assertion that Paul laid the foundation of the Church in Rome; in fact, several of his assertions render it absolutely impossible that the apostle Paul "founded" this Church in the sense in which the Romanists maintain. In the first Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans he states:

Making request, if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God to come unto you. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established;..
..Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was let hitherto,) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles...So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also.⁴

Thus we see that at the time of the writing of this Epistle Paul had not been in Rome, for although he many times desired to visit them, he was prevented from doing so. Yet, he writes to the Church at Rome, which proves that the Church was already founded at this time and consequently Paul cannot be considered the "founder". Therefore, since Peter and Paul are mentioned as having been co-founders, and since Paul cannot be regarded as founder in the original sense, we assert that it is reasonable to conclude that in like manner Peter also cannot be considered to be the "founder" of the Church. Hence, our interpretation of the words "fundata et constituta" is that these two apostles labored in the Church at Rome, preaching the Gospel to the Roman

4. Romans 10, 11. 13. 15.

Christians, and in this manner more firmly grounded the believers in Christian doctrine and in such manner more firmly established the Church which had been previously founded.

Immediately the question arises then, when was this Church founded if at the time of the writing of Paul's Epistle to the Romans Christians were already to be found there?⁵ In the account of the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost, we read in the enumeration of the sojourners in Jerusalem in this festival occasion that there were "strangers of Rome" (Acts 2, 10).

Certainly it is reasonable to assume that of these Roman strangers or pilgrim sojourners at Jerusalem who heard Peter's sermon, some were among the converts, and brought the Gospel to the Metropolis. Thus, in this sense Peter "founded" the Church at Rome, though having never yet visited it.⁶

In regard to the "founding" of the Church it can be said:

The Roman Church owed its origin to no Apostle, nor even any prominent Christian laborer, but that among the numerous visitors to that metropolis of the civilized world, there would be not a few who, having felt the power of the Gospel, were unable to keep it to themselves, and made it their business, when there, to spread the knowledge of it among their friends and acquaintances. That a large number of Jews and Jewish proselytes resided at this time at Rome, is known to all who are familiar with the classical and Jewish writers of that time and the immediate subsequent periods; and that those to them who were at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, and formed probably part of the three thousand converts on that day, would on their return to Rome carry the glad tidings with them, there is no doubt.⁷

5. This is learned from Romans 1, 7. 8.

6. A. R. Fausset, Bible Cyclopaedia, p. 611.

7. Jameson, Fausset, Brown: Critical Commentary, Vol. 6, p. XIV.

Hence we conclude that the date of the introduction of Christianity at Rome must have been very early ---yes, before the time of Peter's visit to the city.

A further statement of Irenaeus which is urged in substantiation of the Romanist view of Peter's founding the Church is:

The blessed Apostles, then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the Episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement was assigned the bishopric.⁸

In regard to this we say:

The historical value of this testimony of Irenaeus is much weakened by a passage in an earlier part of his great work, where he asserts that all the elders who knew St. John testify that our Lord's ministry lasted from his thirtieth year till He was between forty and fifty (II.XXii.5); that is, for more than ten years; whereas we have certain fixed chronological data in the Gospels to disprove this view: for the Baptist's ministry began in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar (A.D.28; or, if that reign be counted from the association of Tiberius with Augustus in the Empire, A.D. 26) and preceded that of Christ. But Pontus Pilate was appointed Procurator of Judaea in A.D. 25, and recalled in A.D. 34, and as his government covered the whole period of our Lord's public ministry, the furthest possible range is seven clear years, which would make our Lord still under forty at His death, which is fixed by other data to A.D. 30. And the received view of the Roman Church is that A.D. 29 is the true date, following the statements of Tertullian, St. Clement of Alexandria, Julius Africanus, and Lactantius, thereby rejecting the testimony of Irenaeus on a point where he must certainly have had more evidence to guide him than in his chronology of the popes; for although he obtained the latter in mature life, and almost certainly at Rome it-

8. Irenaeus, III, 3.1. Quoted in Litterdale, op. cit., p. 176.

self, yet it is clear that the documents there, a very little later, did not agree with this statement.⁹

The words of Dionysius as recorded in the Historia Ecclesiastica of Eusebius are also mentioned by the Romanists.

The words previously quoted in another connection are:

ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς κοινότητος ναυθεγείετε.
τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενεθῆεν
Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκείβετο 10

Concerning this testimony we merely assert that we are not ready to subscribe to the claim that φυτεία Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου ascribes to the two apostles the distinction of being the true "founders" of the Church in the sense of personally and directly founding the congregation. Further, the same argument as set forth against the conclusiveness of Irenaeus's statement is here cogent also, namely, that Paul and Peter are mentioned as co-planters. We have seen that Paul cannot have been the founder of the Roman Church through his personal labors, since it already existed before his first trip to that metropolis, and hence it is hardly permissible to assume that the word "plant" (or in the other testimony the word "found") would have one connotation for Paul and another for Peter. Also from this quotation we see that Dionysius declares that

The joint relation of St. Peter and St. Paul to Rome was exactly the same as that which they both bore to Corinth, which Church they had united in planting and organizing. But we learn from Acts, and from the Epistle to the Corinthians, that St. Paul was the original evangelizer and chief ecclesiastical authority in the Corinthian Church, though St. Peter's influence there is expressly re-

9. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 176.
 10. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 25.

cognized also (1 Cor. 1, 12; 3, 22), while not so much as the vaguest tradition points to either Apostle as ever having been locally Bishop there.¹¹

Hence, in very brief resume we state in regard to this Roman claim that Peter founded the Roman Church that

tradition makes him...to have founded the Roman Church, but if well¹² sifted, the tradition is found to be chaff.

Further evidence¹³ that Peter cannot be regarded as the founder of the Roman Church is

There is no allusion at all to St. Peter in the Catacombs of Rome earlier than the third century, and none to his Roman bishopric till the fourth century; and none of any date ascribing the foundation of the Roman Church to him.¹⁴

Having shown that the Papistic assertion of Peter having founded the Roman Church is untenable, let us now proceed and investigate their claim of Peter's twenty-five year episcopate in that city. This assertion makes its first appearance in the words of St. Jerome:

Simon Petrus post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiae et praedicationem disperionis eorum, qui de circumcisione crediderunt in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et Bithynia secundo Claudii anno ad expugnandum Simonem Magnum Roman pergit ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit usque ad ultimum annum Neronis.¹⁵

This is the first statement that Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, and is given by a man who was born more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of

11. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 180.

12. Hovey, American Commentary, Vol. 6, p. 6.

13. This evidence is of but a secondary nature, since it is an argument from silence.

14. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 189.

15. Jerome, De Viris Illustribus, 1, quoted in H. Buseck, op. cit., p. 45.

St. Peter. He gives no authority for his assertion whatever, although

no doubt this was the popular view at Rome in the time of Pope Damasus, and St. Jerome most probably got it from the archivists there.¹⁶

But we are not interested in how widespread and accepted the claim was two and a half centuries after the death of the Apostle, but we do desire to determine from what year Jerome's authority dates. Until that is determined (which is impossible since he gives no earlier authority), we refrain from laying much, if any, weight upon such a late testimony as this. Further,

it is a remarkable fact that in the fifth chapter of this very book, devoted to an account of St. Paul, St. Jerome is entirely silent as to St. Paul's having had any share whatever in the foundation or the ecclesiastical government of the Church at Rome, contenting himself with mentioning the Apostle's imprisonments and martyrdom there. This shows that already there was a tendency at Rome to thrust St. Paul into the background, and so far to contradict, if not to falsify, the testimony of all the narrative, the earlier records, including the New Testament itself. And so serious an omission in one part of the narrative justifies the belief that there has been as serious an accretion in the other part....¹⁷

This brings us to the "date question". As noted above, Jerome places the coming of Peter to Rome in the second year of Claudius' reign---in 42 A.D., whereas the Armenian translation of the Chronicon places it two years previous. We, however, maintain that to hold either of these dates as the beginning of a twenty-five year episcopate is not permissible if not altogether impossible. We base our assertion upon the

16. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 187.

17. Ibid., p. 188.

following considerations: In the year 44 A.D. James, the son of Zebedee, was put to death, at which time Peter was also imprisoned in Jerusalem. Thus two years after Peter supposedly began his episcopate in Rome, we find him imprisoned in Jerusalem, from which place, however, he was miraculously released by an angel of the Lord. Next, at the Apostolic Council held in Jerusalem in 49, we find Peter present. It is possible, but very improbable, that Peter was in Rome in 42, at Jerusalem in 44, back to Rome after his release from prison, and then in Jerusalem again in 49. Further, history tells us that in the year 49 the Roman emperor Claudius ousted and banished all Jews from Rome. Hence, Peter, being a Jew, if in Rome would most likely have been banished along with his fellow Jews, or had he not been there, there is little likelihood that he would go to Rome under such circumstances. This banishment for the Jews we believe lasted until the death of Claudius in the year 54. Thus, until this date it is very improbable that Peter could have or would have lived in the Roman capital. In addition, after the Apostolic Council in 49 we are told that Peter travelled about. (1 Cor. 9, 5). This Epistle Paul wrote in the year 55, so in all likelihood Peter was not settled in Rome at that time as yet; nor again is it plausible to believe that he was present in the Roman capital the following year, 56, for when Paul writes his Epistle to the Romans, although mentioning a number of saints in the Lord, he neither mentions nor refers to Peter, which we would have expected him to do, had Peter been in the city. While relating the events pertaining to Paul's arrival in Rome (in 59) Luke again makes no mention of

Peter. In accordance with the explanation presented in the first part of this thesis, here again we assume that Peter had arrived in Rome prior to this, but was absent from the city doing mission work in Italy just at that time. In brief, then, the author of this thesis, fully aware that the establishing of a date for the arrival of Peter in Rome is controversial, personally holds that it transpired between the time of the writing of Paul's Epistle to the Romans in 56 and his arrival in Rome in 59, and that he (Peter) lived there until the year 64 when he suffered martyrdom under Nero.

Regardless, however, whether these dates are accepted, the fact still remains that it is not plausible to uphold the Roman claim that Peter arrived in Rome in the year 42 and at that time began his alleged twenty-five year episcopate. Because of the above considerations, this early date does not harmonize with the chronology which is derived from the references we have in the New Testament and from history. Hence, we conclude that "the twenty-five year bishopric is chronologically impossible"¹⁸ and thus another claim, another "prop" of the Roman Catholic superstructure, must give way.

In fact, there are some very weighty arguments which render it impossible that Peter was every Bishop of Rome at all, much less for twenty-five years. Referring again to Irenaeus' testimony we note seven deductions which prompt our conclusion. They are:

1. Irenaeus refers to St. Peter in connexion

18. Jamison, Fausset, Brown, op. cit., Vol. 6, XLIV.

- with the Church of Rome; but all he says is that St. Peter and St. Paul were joint founders of that Church, which is a very different thing from saying that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome.
2. We may fairly argue that Irenaeus' silence about Peter's Roman episcopate implies that he did not believe that the apostle had ever held that episcopate.
 3. Irenaeus teaches that St. Linus was the first Roman bishop.
 4. Irenaeus assures us that Peter and Paul, during their lifetime, committed the episcopate to Linus. No stress could be laid on this point, if Linus' consecration immediately preceded the martyrdom of the two apostles; but we have no certainty that such was the fact, and it does not seem to have formed any part of the latter Roman tradition on the subject.
 5. In the Liber Pontificalis Linus is said to have commenced his episcopate when Saturninus and Scipio were consuls, that is to say, in the year 56, which was several years before the death of Peter.
 6. Irenaeus in III.iv, 3 states that "Marcion flourished under Anicetus, who occupied the tenth place in the episcopate". Hence here there is no reference to the apostles. Anicetus occupies absolutely the tenth place in the list of bishops. Yet, if the apostles are to be reckoned among the bishops, Anicetus' place is the eleventh, not the tenth.
 7. Thus, in short, it seems clear that Irenaeus, while he regarded Peter and Paul as the apostolic fathers of the Church, did not consider that either of them was to be reckoned among the bishops of the city.¹⁹

But there is a far weightier argument why Peter was not Bishop of Rome and that is that

in Peter's day there were no bishops as we know them. In the New Testament a bishop and presbyter, or elder, mean the same thing.²⁰

The New Testament speaks with the greatest clearness on this question. In Acts 20, 17, Paul is said to have called the elders (πρεβυτεροις) of the church at Ephesus; in

19. F.W. Puller, The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome, pp. 37 ff.

20. W. Dallmann, Peter, p. 222.

his address to them in the 23th verse he says: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." The word "overseers" in the Greek is ἐπιλόκοποις, so that, according to the inspired account, presbyters and bishops are synonymous officers. Hence, at Ephesus the bishops were simply ordinary pastors of the church. In the Epistle to Titus, Paul tells him that he had left him in Crete to ordain elders (πρεβυτέρους) in every city; and speaking of these officials he says: "A bishop must be blameless, as the steward (ἐπιλόκοπος) of God."²¹ showing that in Paul's opinion the term bishop and elder or presbyter described the same officers. Peter addresses the presbyters thus:

The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also a elder (εὐμπρεβυτέρος), and a witness of the sufferings of Christ... Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly.²²

Now the words "taking the oversight" is the translation of the Greek word ἐπιλόκοποις, all of which shows, that in the judgment of Peter, elders are bishops.

The fact that the office of bishop and presbyter was identical in apostolic days is further testified by a host of Church Fathers.

Cum autem ad eam iterum traditionem, quae est ab apostolis, quae per successiones presbyterorum in ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos qui adversantur traditioni; dicent, se non solum presbyteris sed etiam apostolis existentes sapientiores....²³

21. Titus 1, 5. 7.

22. 1 Peter 5, 1. 2.

23. Irenaeus, Adver. Haeres., 1, 3, c.2. Quoted in W. Cathcart, The Papal System, p. 54.

Here Irenaeus represents a succession of presbyters as guarding the apostolical doctrine, as the chief human protectors of the revealed treasures of heaven.

Quapropter iis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet; his qui successionem habent ab apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum episcopatus successione, charisma veritatis certum secundum placetum patrum acceperunt.²⁴

Here the presbyters have their succession from the apostles, and these same presbyters, like those of Ephesus, have the succession of the episcopacy; thus, in the time of Irenaeus the terms bishops and presbyters were given interchangeably to the same clergyman.

Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt se ex ecclesiae consuetudine, ei qui sibi praepositus fuerit, esse subjectos; ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominica veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere.²⁵

In these words Jerome speaks against any divine distinction between bishops and presbyters, and states that the custom of the Church is the sole authority for the superiority of bishops over presbyters.

...Cum apostolus perspicue doceat, eosdem esse presbyteros quos episcopos.²⁶

Presbyter et episcopus aliud aetatis, aliud dignitatis, nomen. Unde et ad Titum et ad Timotheum de ordinatione episcopi et diacone dicitur; de presbyteris omnino reticetur; quia in episcopo et presbyter continetur.²⁷

Audi et aliud testimonium, in quo manifestissime comprobatur, eundem esse episcopum atque presbyterum...²⁸

-
24. Irenaeus, op. cit., Lib. V. cap. 431 Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 54.
 25. Jerome, Comment in Tit., VI, p. 199. Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 55.
 26. Jerome, Ep. ad Evang. 85, Vol. 1. 259. Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 55.
 27. Ibid., Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 56.
 28. Ibid., Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 56.

From these further words of Jerome we can see that it was Jerome's definite opinion that the office of a bishop and presbyter were one.

Post episcopum tamen diaconi ordinationem subjicit. Quare? Nisi quia episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatione est. Uterque enim sacerdos est; sed episcopus primus est, ut omnis episcopus presbyter fit. Non omnis presbyter episcopus. His enim episcopus est qui inter presbyteros primus est. 29

Quid est episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos? 30

Inter episcopum et presbyterum interest firme nihil. 31

ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΤΟ ΠΩΛΙΟΝ ΕΚΑΛΟΥΝΤΟ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΙ ΚΑΙ

ΕΛΑΚΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ. 32

From these statements of Ambrose, Augustine and Chrysostom it can be clearly seen that these Church Fathers held that there was no difference between a bishop and a presbyter, for even though the bishop is the highest presbyter, yet the fact still remains that he is a presbyter. Further, that these Fathers taught that the superior position of bishops has no divine authority, but that it rests simply on the usage of the Church of Rome, is clearly seen from the further statement of Augustine:

According to the terms of honor which now the usage of the Church of Rome hath brought about, the episcopacy is superior to the presbytery. 33

-
29. Ambrose, 1 Timothy III, Vol. 1, p. 272. Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 57.
 30. Augustine, Quaest. Novi et Vet. Testamenti, quaest. 101. Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 58.
 31. Chrysostom, 1 Timothy. Rom. II., Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 58.
 32. Chrysostom, Phil. I, Rom. I in same. Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 58.
 33. Augustine. Quoted in W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 58.

We now proceed to investigate the second claim of the Papacy, previously enumerated, namely, that Peter was appointed by Christ to be His chief representative and successor and head of the Church. Concerning this, Romanists state:

Christ himself unmistakeably accords Peter a special precedence and the first place among the Apostles, and designates him for such on various occasions.³⁴

The official teaching of the Papacy on this point as set forth in the Vatican Decrees on the Constitution of the Church is:

If anyone shall say that blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed by Christ the Lord the Prince of all the Apostles, and the visible head of the whole Church militant; or that he received a primacy of honor only, and not directly or immediately one of true and proper distinction from the same our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.³⁵

Let us now investigate the teachings of the New Testament and conclusively prove that they militate against this Roman assertion. Before examining the evidence which speaks against the Papal claim however, it is necessary to examine two passages on the strength of which

the church of Rome claims for its supreme pastor the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church, making him at the same time the rock upon which the Church rests, the centre of Church government, the infallible teacher of all the faithful, and, finally the Vicar of Christ.³⁶

34. Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 745.

35. Quoted in R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

36. G. Bartoli, The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome, p. 30.

The first of these two passages is Matthew 16, 18. 19.

And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Romanists say:

This text, the meaning of which is obvious, has been tortured in the strangest ways by Protestants so as to avoid acknowledging the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors.³⁷

Other Papal adherents say that these words

become at once promise and fulfillment. Has not history taught us, and are we not seeing every day, that it was, and is, and will be this one rock which supports the Church of Christ, and with that Church a living faith in the incarnation of the Son of God?³⁸

Cardinal Gibbons states that in these words "Our Lord gave plenipotentiary powers to Peter to govern the whole church."³⁹ and thus accorded special primacy to Peter. Concerning this text he further states:

All respectable Protestant commentators have now abandoned, and even ridicule, the absurdity of applying the word rock to any one but Peter; as the sentence can bear no other construction, unless our Lord's good grammar and common sense are called in question.⁴⁰

We, however, state that

this is rather tough on Gyprian, and Jerome, and Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria, and Ambrose, and Hilary, and Augustine, all of whomagree in making something other than Peter the rock....⁴¹

37. L. Jouin, Evidences of Religion, p. 329.

38. E. Adam, The Spirit of Catholicism, p. 107.

39. Cardinal Gibbons, Faith of Our Fathers, p. 98.

40. Ibid., p. 99. 100.

41. J. Stearns, Faith of Our Forefathers, p. 113.

The Papal exposition of this "Thou art Peter" assertion

is:

Peter supports the whole Church, and the Pope succeeds him in this position; by the keys which the pontiff receives as Peter's successor, he is the ruler of the whole kingdom or Church of God, with authority to bind or loose whomsoever or whatsoever he will.⁴²

To state it in different words:

The Savior's statement admits of but one explanation, namely, that He wishes to make Peter the head of the whole community of those who believed in Him as the true Messiah; that through this foundation (Peter) the Kingdom of Christ would be unconquerable; that the spiritual guidance of the faithful was placed in the hands of Peter, as the special representative of Christ... It is also clear that the position of Peter among the other Apostles and in the Christian community was the basis for the Kingdom of God on earth, that is, the Church of Christ. Peter was personally installed as Head of the Apostles by Christ Himself.⁴³

In refutation, we first of all assert that whether or not these words can be referred to Peter is a debatable question. The author of this thesis personally believes that they speak of Peter's faith and his confession of that faith, and not of the Apostle himself. This view is substantiated by a number of testimonies of the Church fathers, namely, Origen, Hilary, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom. The testimonies of these men presented in the order in which their names have been enumerated are:

All who make St. Peter's confession of Christ their Rock, become the same as Peter.⁴⁴

42. W. Cathcart, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

43. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XI, p. 746.

44. Origen, in *St. Matt. Comm.* XVI. 18, quoted in R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

Upon this rock of the confession is the building up of the Church... This faith is the foundation of the Church. Through this faith the gates of hell are powerless against it. This faith hath the keys of the heavenly kingdom. 45

Peter, the foremost of the Apostles, who became to us a truly solid rock, laying the foundation of the faith of the Lord, on which (faith) the Church is in all respects built. And that first because he confessed Christ, the Son of the Living God, and heard that "Upon this rock of unshaken faith I will build My Church." 46

... Faith, therefore, is the foundation of the Church, for, not of the flesh of Peter, but of his faith, was it said that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"; but the confession vanquished hell. 47

In Thy saints, who in every age have been well pleasing to Thee, is truly Thy faith; for, Thou hast founded the Church on Thy faith and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. 48

"And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church", that is, upon the faith of his confession
(ἐπὶ τῆς πίστεως τῆς οὐνοδοξίας) 49

However, since any view which is held is subject to controversy, the author's view will not be pressed nor thrust upon the reader, for he is fully conscious of the fact that many Protestant, as well as all Roman Catholic, commentators

45. Hilary, De Trinit. VI. 36, 37. Quoted in R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 74.

46. Epiphanius, Adv. Haer. Lib. II. Tom. I. 8, Quoted in R. Litterdale op. cit., p. 74.

47. Ambrose, De Incarnatione, Cap. IV, n. 30, 32, 33, Quoted in G. Bartoli, op. cit., p. 54.

48. Athanasius, In Ps. CXVIII, p. 1191, Migne, Quoted in G. Bartoli, op. cit., p. 57.

49. Chrysostom, Hom. 54 in Matt. XXVI. Sect. 2, Quoted in R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 77.

hold that the words "this rock" are definitely spoken of Peter.

Let us assume, however, that these words are to be referred to Peter himself. Does that necessitate our acknowledgment of the validity of the Papal claims? That such is not the case we now wish to show. Eadie correctly states:

Whatever the meaning of the figurative language addressed to Peter, it would be certain at most the description of a personal honor to be conferred on Peter---a regard for the priority of his confession. This personal honor conferred on Peter no official superiority over his colleagues. Such supremacy Peter never enjoyed. This passage gives no countenance to the popish dogma of "the chair of St. Peter." It neither speaks of a primacy nor limits it to Rome; least of all does it declare it transmissible.⁵⁰

In addition, even if the rock on which the Lord affirms He would build His Church is Peter, yet these words of Christ

do not make Peter the foundation of the church any more than the expression of Paul does when he says we "are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone", or the language of John in the apocalypse does, when he declares "that the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb."⁵¹

Thus it is true that Peter may be considered a foundation stone, built upon the foundation Rock, but in the same sense and in the same manner as was everyone of the Twelve.

But again granting that the Rock is Peter, let us consider just what the Roman Catholic will have to show in or-

50. J. Eadie, Bible Cyclopaedia, p. 515.

51. W. M. Taylor, Peter the Apostle, p. 33.

der to establish the further claims of the Papacy.

1. He must show that Peter alone was to be the founder of Christianity. Of this there is no evidence, but the obviously figurative expression before us...
2. He must show that Peter not only was the sole founder of Christianity but that he was viceregent of God and sovereign of all Christians. No Scripture testifies this at all, unless the present passage does, and the whole tone of the New Testament is against it. Nor does any of the Fathers who understand the rock to be Peter indicate the notion of his having any such position or power as the modern Pope.
3. He must show that this supposed authority of Peter's was transmissible, of which there is no particle of evidence in the New Testament; and it is strictly inconsistent with the very image of a cornerstone, or foundation rock, to suppose it frequently removed and a new one substituted.
4. He must show that Peter lived and died in Rome, which is probably true but not certain; and that he was, rather than Paul, the head of the Church at Rome, of which there is no evidence at all...
5. He must show that Peter's supposed transmissible authority was actually transmitted to the leading official of the Church at Rome. Of this there is no evidence but comparatively late tradition..⁵²

The Papists proceed to state that the next verse in which the power of the keys is bestowed is further proof of their claims. They maintain that Christ hereby gives to Peter and to Peter alone the supreme authority and jurisdiction over the entire Church in the words:

And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.⁵³

Let us look at these words though and determine the validity of this Papal claim. We may grant, in accordance with

⁵². Hovey, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 356. 357.

⁵³. Matthew 16, 19.

the Papists, that the keys are here given to Peter. We immediately ask, however, is he on this account the sole owner of the Keys? Is Peter hereby to be regarded as the only one who has the authority to use them? In answer to these questions and at the same time in refutation of the Papal claim of Peter's absolute sovereignty on the basis of this passage, we assert an emphatic, No. For such a claim does not harmonize with the rest of Scripture, since this same authority is given to others, in fact, to the whole Church. Such a claim is even opposed to the clear teachings of Matthew himself, for just two chapters later, in 18, 18, the very same words are repeated, and there they are spoken to all the disciples alike; Peter is in no way singled out. If Christ had meant to give this honor and power to Peter alone in 16, 19, and had Peter and the other Apostles recognized the Lord's meaning, does it not appear reasonable that the other disciples and Peter especially would have called to the Lord's attention the fact that just a short time previous He had assigned this primacy to Peter alone? In connection with this repetition of the bestowing of the keys in 18, 18, the Romanists seek to present a logical interpretation in harmony with their claims based upon 16, 19, but in doing so they become guilty of some false and forced exegesis. Their explanation of these words is:

The keys were really intrusted to Peter, but did not the apostles receive the same powers? Did not our Savior say to all the apostles: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven"? Yes; but by these words the apostles were neither made the rock on which the church is built, nor did they receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, nor did

Christ revoke the privilege already granted to Peter alone. Hence, if they are now made partakers of the powers conferred on Peter, they do not receive them in their fulness, nor can they exercise them independently of him. Their jurisdiction as apostles was not, indeed, restricted as that of the bishops, who are their successors in the episcopate, but not in the apostleship; yet they also depended on Peter, who was constituted the head of the Church, and the centre of unity. 54

We remark that it is no wonder that Luther said:

It grieves me to the heart that we must suffer these mad saints to tear asunder and blaspheme the Holy Scriptures with such insolence, license, and shamelessness, and that they make bold to deal with the Scriptures, whereas they are not fit to care for a herd of swine. 55

A weighty argument against the Roman hypothesis that Peter was given power and jurisdiction over the Church by the bestowal of the keys to him by Christ as recorded in Matthew 16, 17 - 20 (which words form one of the most significant and most important things that Jesus ever said) is that it is not emphasized nor as a matter of fact not even mentioned by the other Evangelists. Should this actually be one of the most significant items of Divine Revelation as the Romanists consider it to be, then we are entitled to expect to find reference to it in Mark and Luke.

Of course if it lay outside their plan, and they made no reference to this conversation at Caesarea Philippi, no conclusion either way could be drawn from their silence,...., But St. Mark and St. Luke both do embody St. Peter's confession of Christ in their narratives, yet leave out entirely all reference to the words "Thou art Peter," etc.--- St. Mark 8, 27 - 34, St. Luke 9, 18 - 23. Hence it is clear that in their minds the important part of the conversation was the declaration of our Lord's person and office, not

54. L. Jouin, *op. cit.*, pp. 334. 335.

55. M. Luther, The Papacy at Rome, Holman Edition, Vol. 1, p. 361.

the definition and scope of St. Peter's privilege. Nor is this all. The received tradition of the Roman Church is that St. Mark was the disciple of St. Peter, and wrote his Gospel by St. Peter's direction and under his supervision. But St. Mark omits the words "Thou art Peter". The inevitable inference from this most weighty fact is that St. Peter himself did not consider the words of Christ in St. Matthew 16, 17-20 necessary to be communicated by St. Mark for whom his Gospel was written, and therefore it is clear that he did not attach the meaning to them which Roman controversialists now allege as the true one.⁵⁶

What, then, is the true meaning of these words of Christ?

It is as Luther states:

Let every Christian believe that in these passages Christ does not give to St. Peter or to the other apostles the power to rule, or to soar so high....These words of Christ, are nothing but gracious promises, given to the whole Church (Gemeinde), in order that poor sinful consciences may find comfort when they are "loosed" or absolved by men.⁵⁷

Soon after this utterance of St. Matthew (16, 17-20), and just before the bestowal of the power of binding and loosing on all the apostles (18, 18), the question of precedence in Christ's kingdom is raised, and is answered by our Lord in terms inconsistent with the opinion that the disciples had understood Him to have settled the point, or that He had in fact done so, whether they understood Him or not.

At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.⁵⁸

56. R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

57. M. Luther, *op. cit.*, pp. 377. 378.

58. Matthew 18, 1 - 4.

If, by the words of 16, 18, 19, Christ had meant the significance which the Romanists now attach to the words, Christ's answer to the question: "Who is the greatest?" could easily have been "Why, Peter is the greatest, of course. Didn't you hear me tell him so the other day?" But instead of that, He calls a little child unto Him, and sets him in the midst of them; and from that text preaches a sermon to them on humility.

But this sermon seems to have made but little impression on two of them; for we read, only two chapters further on, that the mother of Zebedee's children, or as Mark relates it, (10, 35), Zebedee's children themselves, came to Him with the request that they might sit, the one on His right hand, and the other on His left, in His kingdom. "And when the ten (of whom Peter was one) heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren;" not because the two were showing disrespect to the primacy of the one, but because they were conspiring against the equality of the twelve.⁵⁹

The second passage of Scripture which has been repeatedly urged to prove that Peter was pastor of the Church universal, or head of the whole Church, are the comments of Jesus to feed His lambs and to feed His sheep. (John 21, 15-17). To disclaim the Papal views that

on the basis of Peter's more faithful love deputed him, and him alone, to take His position as shepherd of His flock,⁶⁰

and that

Peter has jurisdiction not only over the lambs,---the weak and tender portion of the flock,---by which are understood the faithful, but also over the sheep, i.e. the pastors themselves,⁶¹

in other words, to disclaim the view that Christ in these

59. J. Stearns, op. cit., p. 120.

60. W. M. Taylor, op. cit., p. 109.

61. Cardinal Gibbons, op. cit., p. 101.

words constituted Peter the pastor of his whole flock and invested him with all the powers necessary to fulfill that office, we present two lengthy quotations.

When we consider the words which our Lord used, and compare them with a parallel passage in one of St. Peter's own Epistles, we seem to find a confirmation of the view.... that our Lord's words did not, strictly speaking, convey a commission, but were rather an injunction to use the apostolic commission previously bestowed. For, when St. Peter wrote to the presbyters of the churches of Asia Minor, and said, "Tend the flock of God, which is among you", (1 Peter 5, 2), he was not imparting to them the priestly office; he was enjoining them to exercise the office which they had previously received from the Holy Ghost when they were ordained....

It seems clear that these words do not of themselves imply any grant of jurisdiction of St. Peter over the other apostles. Our Lord does not say, "Act as a shepherd to thy brethren and co-apostles," but "Feed My lambs," and "Tend" and "Feed My sheep." The words evidently have reference to the pastoral office which St. Peter was going to fulfill towards the sheep and lambs of Christ's flock after the Lord Himself had ascended into heaven... That pastoral ministry began with apostles, who were the first set of under-shepherds, and to each of them whom was given pastoral authority over the whole flock. If it were clearly revealed in other parts of Scripture that St. Peter was the supreme under-shepherd, having jurisdiction over the other apostles, then it might be permissible to suppose that such supreme jurisdiction was being communicated to St. Peter by our Lord, when He said, "Feed My sheep", and that consequently on that particular occasion the inferior under-shepherds were numbered among the sheep. But there is no trace in other parts of Holy Scripture of such a supremacy, and therefore there is no reason for numbering the apostolic shepherds among the sheep in the passage which we are considering. The wording of that passage, taken by itself, suggests apostolic, not primatial jurisdiction.

It seems probable that our Lord, by the words, "Pascere oves Meas," was not giving a new commission to St. Peter, but was authorizing and enjoining him to use a commission previously

bestowed; and it seems clear that that commission was not a commission to be primate, with a rule over the apostles; but a commission to be an apostle, with a rule over the sheep and lambs belonging to the Church of God. 62

Luther, is not so hesitant in denouncing the Papal claim as the former author, but very outspokenly and in his own individual manner holds the claim up to ridicule and thereby shows the unreasonableness of their view.

"Feeding", in the Roman sense, means to burden Christendom with many human and hurtful laws,....to rob the whole world by means of letters, bulls, seals and wax,....in short, to allow no one to come freely to the truth and to have peace.

But if they say that by "feeding" they do not understand such abuse of authority, but the authority itself, it is simply not true.... It is clear that they hold "feeding" to mean naught else but preying and flaying....

They have a high-sounding, keen and subtle speech---as they imagine---when they say that person and office are not one and the same, and that the office remains, and remains good, though the person be evil. From this they conclude, and it must, indeed, follow, that the word of Christ, "Feed My sheep," means an office of external power, which even an evil man may have, for the office makes no one holy. Very well. This is acceptable to us and we will ask the Romanists a question. Whoever keeps and fulfills the word of Christ, he is truly obedient and pious, and shall be saved, for His words are spirit and life. If, therefore, "feeding" means to sit in the highest place and to have an office---even if the incumbent be a knave---it follows that he feeds who sits in the highest seat and is pope; and whoever does this work of feeding is obedient to Christ; and whoever is obedient in one particular is obedient in all and is a saint. Therefore it must be true that whoever is pope and sits in the chief room is obedient to Christ and is a saint, though he be a knave, or a rogue, or what not. Have thanks, my dear Romanists! Now I know, for the first time, why the pope is addressed

as "your holiness."....

Further, if "feeding" means to sit in the highest place, then "being fed" must mean to be subject, or so that just as "feeding" means external governing, "being fed" must mean to be governed, and, as they say, to live in Roman fellowship.

What do you say to this, my good Romanists? Come now and pipe your lay. Do you not see that "feeding" must mean something else than having authority, and "being fed" something else than being externally subject to the Roman power, and how utterly senseless it is to cite the saying of Christ, "Feed My sheep", in order to strengthen Roman authority and its external unity or fellowship!

Before saying three times to Peter: "Feed My sheep", He asked him thrice if he loved Him, and Peter thrice answered that he loved him. It is evident, therefore, that there is no "feeding" where there is no love. Therefore the papacy either must be love, or it cannot be a feeding of the sheep, and if the word "Feed My sheep" established the papal chair, it follows that all are popes who love Christ and feed the sheep. And this is perfectly true: for aforesaid all bishops were called popes, which title is now restricted to the one at Rome.

But here look you what our Romanists do when they must overcome these words of Christ, and must admit, though with great reluctance, that no one can feed except he love Christ, as the clearly expressed words of Christ declare. Gladly they would give Him the lie, or deny Him; but now that they are hit squarely between the eyes, so that their heads swim, hear what they say. They say that Christ indeed demands love in the office of the pope, but not that high love, which, they say, is meritorious unto eternal life; but the ordinary love is quite sufficient, such as a servant has toward his master...Tell me, my dear Romanists, all of you melted together unto one heap, where is there so much as one letter in the Scriptures concerning this love of which you dream?

I know right well that this little word, "love", scares the pope and his Romanists and makes them weak and weary, nor are they willing that it should be pressed, for it overturns the whole papacy....This is the reason why some of the popes in their Canon laws so neatly pass in silence this word "love", and make so much

ado about "feeding",....This is the reason, too, why the pope and the Romanists cannot bear any questioning and investigating of the foundation of papal power, and every one is accursed of doing a scandalous and heretical thing, who is not satisfied with mere assertions, but seeks for its real basis....⁶³

Hence, in brief, we conclude that

it seems absurd in the extreme to gather papal sovereignty over the churches from such commands. ("Feed My sheep;" "Feed My lambs"). Besides, Peter, not the pope, is mentioned.⁶⁴

Therefore, after a thorough study of the two important passages for the Roman Catholic claims, we concur with Luther in his conclusion:

These two sayings of Christ, spoken to Peter, on which they build the papacy, are stronger against the papacy than all others, and the Romanists can produce nothing that does not make them a laughing stock.⁶⁵

Let us now turn to those passages which definitely oppose the Roman Catholic claim for Petrine and Papal authority.

In the last chapter of Matthew we read:

Chap. 28, 18 ff.: And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.---Here we note that the commission and the promise to abide with all His successors is given to all the Apostles equally and in no way intimates a special blessing to Peter. No distinction is made between the Apostles.

In the Gospel of St. Luke we also shall examine one passage, namely:

63. M. Luther, op. cit., Vol. I., pp. 383-390.

64. F. W. Puller, op. cit., p. 12.

65. M. Luther, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 390.

Chap. 22, 28 ff.: Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.---Note that there is here no mention made of the appointment of St. Peter as vice-regent or chief ruler.

Various verses in St. John's Gospel militate against the primacy which the Romanists ascribe to Peter.

Chap. 11, 16: Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellow disciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him. ---Note: "fellow-disciples". The equality of all is here implied; no one disciple is above the others.

Chap. 12, 20: And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast. The same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus. Philip cometh and telleth Andrew.---Andrew and Philip approach Jesus directly, and not through Peter, which one could expect had he been given the primacy Rome would have us believe.

Chap. 15, 26 ff.: But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, ye shall testify of me: and ye shall also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.---No special gift is given to St. Peter. The Spirit is given to all alike. Further, all are to be witness in the same manner.

Chap. 16, 13: Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. ---All are to be equally guided by the Spirit.

Chap. 20, 22 ff.: And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained. But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord.---The "Power of the Keys" is here bestowed equally on all. Thus, even after the

occasion prompting the words of Matt. 16 (previously discussed) all the disciples are spoken of as equal. There is no distinction whatever made, and above all, no primacy is given to Peter.

Turning to the Acts of the Apostles we learn the same truths, namely, that Peter is nowhere given primacy over the other Apostles, and hence the words of Matthew 16, 18 cannot be interpreted according to the Papal system.

Chap. 1, 24-26: And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen, That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place. And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven disciples.---This account is often urged by the Papists in support of their claims; we, however, agree with Litterdale who says: "The narrative of the eleven and the election of St. Matthias, so far from helping to establish any claim to sovereign authority on St. Peter's behalf, furnishes one weighty item of evidence against it. Nothing is clearer than that if he had succeeded in any special sense to Christ's authority over the Church, as His Vicar, and if, in consequence, the Apostolic College bore any such relation to him....St. Peter would have filled up the vacant place of Judas on his own authority...St. Peter's share in the transaction is strictly confined to suggesting the necessity of designating a successor. The whole College unites in nominating two candidates, and the actual election is decided in quite another way than by the voice of its president."66

Chap. 4, 11: This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.---This is Peter's own testimony as to who is the Rock---not, himself, but Christ.

Chap. 6, 2: Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.---The twelve called the meeting, not St. Peter as primate.

66. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 23.

Chap. 6, 6: Whom they set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.---All laid hands upon them; thus here we infer the equality of all.

Chap. 7, 14: Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John.---Note especially that the Apostles together are regarded as supreme, and not Peter supreme over the Apostles. Further, Peter did not do the sending but is sent by the body of the Apostles, by the Twelve.

Chap. 9, 27: But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apostles.---Barnabas took Saul to the Apostles in general, as a group, and not to St. Peter as the primate.

Chap. 11, 1 ff.: And the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him.---St. Peter is by no means regarded as supreme and infallible as Romanists would have us believe.

Chap. 15, 6: And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter.---There is no appeal whatever to St. Peter in this case, but the matter was considered by the Apostles and elders together.

Chap. 15, 19: Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God.---Surprisingly to the Romanists, Peter, had he the primacy they attribute to him, was not president of the Apostolic Council, a position held by James. This verse therefore shows the fallacy of the Roman Catholic argument that "as long as St. Peter was with the apostles he always takes the lead in everything that is done." 67

Chap. 15, 23: And they wrote letters by them after this manner. The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.---The men who were sent by the Apostles and elders, in fact by the whole church, were given letters (or decrees) from the Apostles, and not an encyclical of St. Peter.

Chap. 15: (The Apostolic Council): In regard

to Peter's connection with the Apostolic Council, McClintock and Strong correctly state: "It is to be remarked that on that occasion he exercised no one power which Romanists hold to be inalienably attached to the chair of Peter. He did not preside at the meeting; he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the suffrages nor pronounced the decision."⁶⁸ Litterdale likewise shows the falsity of the Roman claims regarding Peter's place in this Council by saying: "The fact that Peter argues in the Council of Jerusalem for the relaxation of the ceremonial law in the case of Gentile Christians establishes no more than Peter's right to a voice in the assembly. He does not open the debate, for he does not begin to speak till 'after there had been much disputing' (Acts 15, 7), nor---what is more significant---does he close it."⁶⁹

Chap. 16, 4: And as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem.---Again, these were decrees of the Apostles and not encyclicals of St. Peter, which encyclicals have been so popular with St. Peter's alleged successors.

Chap. 22, 10: And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told of thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.---Paul, the Apostles of the Gentiles, was not sent to St. Peter. This, is a cogent argument, therefore, that St. Peter, the supposed primate, did not have supreme power of mission activity among the apostles. If such power had been given to him, it is difficult to understand why it was not recognized in such a case as this.

Hence, from these many passages taken from the Acts of the Apostles, we see that there is nothing that supports the Papal view that Peter was in any way the "prime" Apostle, that he had supreme authority and jurisdiction over the Twelve; on the contrary, however, we believe that the Romanists encounter difficulty in reaching a plausible explanation

68. McClintock and Strong, Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Vol. 8, p. 8.

69. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 25.

for some of these passages, which, if not directly oppose their view (e.g. the presidency of James at the Apostolic Council), then at least certainly tend to invalidate their claims.

Turning to the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians we observe the following verses which oppose the Roman claims of Peter's primacy among the Apostles:

Chap. 1, 12: Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Appollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.---Contrary to the Roman claim that Peter is always mentioned first in the naming of Apostles, we see that his name appears third.

Chap. 3, 11: For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. ---A foundation is laid, but that foundation is not Peter.

Chap. 3, 22: Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours.---Another instance disproving the Roman assertion that Peter is always named first.

Chap. 12, 28: And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.---Observe that "first" is not St. Peter, not the Bishop of Rome, not a Vicar of Christ, but Apostles.

Chap. 15, 5 ff.: He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve:---after that He was seen of James; then of all the apostles.---St. Peter and St. James are mentioned in the same terms; hence, no primacy of one over the other.

In the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians we note:

Chap. 11, 5: For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.---There is no hint of St. Peter's supremacy in this verse.

Chap. 11, 28: Beside those things that are without, and that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.---This passage is interesting only for the consideration what the Romanists would have made if these words

had only been said by Peter and not by Paul.

Chap. 12, 11: For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing. ---Again, no hint of St. Peter's supremacy to be found there, but more than that, there is no trace of St. Paul's inferiority to St. Peter.

.St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians gives us the following verses to consider in this connection:

Chap. 1, 19: But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.--- All Apostles are here considered equal, and there is definitely no primacy given to Peter.

Chap. 2, 6 ff.: But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me: But contrariwise, when they saw that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; (For he that worketh effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:). ---Again, the equality of the Apostles is the only correct interpretation.

Chap. 2, 9: And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.---"The order of names of the three "pillars" of the Church, as listed here is a difficult verse for the Romans to interpret. Evidently Cardinal Gibbons felt the significance of the arrangement as it stands in the text of his Version, as well as in the King James, and so intentionally reverts the order, placing Peter first and James second. (Stearns calls attention to this, The Faith of Our Forefathers, p. 126.)

Chap. 2, 11: But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.---There is certainly no hint of supremacy and infallibility to be found in this account. Roman Catholics, however, in the words of Cardinal Gibbons, say that this withstanding cannot invalidate the claims of Peter; Gibbons continues: "From this very circumstance, I draw a confirming evidence of Peter's supremacy. St. Paul mentions it as a fact worthy of record that he actually withstood Peter to his

face".⁷⁰ We follow Stearns in answering: "Yet, only a few lines above on the same page, he (Cardinal Gibbons) says, 'It is not a very uncommon thing for ecclesiastics occupying an inferior position in the Church to admonish even the Pope'. --- That is to say, St. Paul mentions it as a fact 'worthy of record', that he actually did what was 'not a very uncommon thing'."⁷¹

One verse from Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians is worthy of note:

Chap. 2, 20: And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.---There is certainly no singling out in this verse of Peter as the rock on which the Church is built.

In St. Peter's own First Epistle we are especially interested to see if he himself makes any mention of his primacy. We note three verses at this time:

Chap. 1, 1: Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. --- Peter here calls himself an Apostle and that is all, if he had considered himself which the Romanists now say that he is, we would expect to hear Peter calling himself the Head of the Church, or the Vicar of Christ. Hence, we conclude that he himself was not aware that he possessed any primacy and supremacy. Luther, on the basis of this verse, very aptly refutes the Roman Catholic claim of Peter's primacy with the words: "St. Peter is a messenger and the other apostles are messengers too. Why should the pope be ashamed to be a messenger if St. Peter himself is not more? But ye (the laymen) have a strong argument, for the Greek απόστολος is in German 'messenger', and thus are they called throughout the Gospel. If, then, they are all messengers of the one Lord Christ, who would be so foolish as to say that so great a Lord, in a matter of such great importance for the whole world, sends but one messenger, and he, in turn, sends other messengers of his own? Then St. Peter would have to be called, not a "Zwoelfbote" (one of the twelve messengers), but an only-messenger, and none of the others

70. Cardinal Gibbons, op. cit., p. 105.

71. J. Stearns, op. cit., p. 126.

would remain "Zwoelfbote", but they would all be St. Peter's "Elfboten" (i.e., his eleven messengers). ...Christ sent all the apostles into the world with His Word and message with full, equal powers, as St. Paul says: 'We are ambassadors for Christ.' And in 1 Corinthians 3 he says: 'What is Peter? What is Paul? Servants through whom ye believed.' This ambassadorship means to feed, to rule, to be bishop, and so forth. But that the pope makes all the messengers of God to be subject to himself, is the same as if one messenger of a prince detained all the other messengers, and then sent them out when it suited his pleasure, while he himself went nowhere. Would that he be pleasing to the prince, if he found it out? Should you say: True, but one messenger may be above another, I would reply: One may indeed be better and more skilfull than another, as St. Paul was when compared with Peter; but since they bring one and the same message, one cannot be above another by reason of his other skills. But, put the other way, St. Peter is not a "Zwoelfbote" at all, but a special messenger and Lord over the Eleven. What can it be that one has above the others, if they all have the same message and commission from the Lord?" 72

Chap. 2, 6: Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded.---This is Peter's own testimony that he is not the "Rock" of Matthew 16, 18, but Christ. Here Peter keeps silent about his being himself a foundation; which he could not, in such a connection, have possibly done, had he been such a foundation as the Romanists now claim.

Chap. 5, 1: The leaders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed. ---Peter says that he also is an elder; certainly this does not support the view that Peter considered himself supreme and the head of the Apostles.

From his Second Epistle we call attention to two verses:

Chap. 1, 1: Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ.--- Again, Peter makes no allusion to his supposed supreme headship.

Chap. 3, 2: That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior.---The Apostle Peter herein considers all Apostles equal.

Finally, we refer to one statement found in the Revelation of St. John:

Chap. 21, 14: And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.---In this verse we see no mention of one special foundation of one Apostle, St. Peter.

In substantiation of their claims, the Romanists set forth the following positive arguments:⁷³

1. Peter was one of the three apostles who were companions and witnesses of Christ on certain special occasion, from which the general body of the apostles were excluded, namely the Transfiguration, the raising of Jairus' daughter, and the agony in the Garden of Gethsemane.

In refutation we say as regards these occasions, St. James and St. John share the distinction with St. Peter, and hence no special primacy is thereby given to Peter.

2. St. Peter's name stands first in the three lists of the apostles given us in the Synoptic Gospels.

Concerning this argument we say that Peter's priority in the lists of Apostles may denote some precedence, for it would be more natural to expect in the first position the name of Andrew, as the first called of the Twelve, and himself to call another to Christ, or else of St. John, because of his special prerogative as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (John 12, 23: et al.). We admit that if jurisdiction of St.

73. The first four of these arguments are given in R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 18; the last four are presented by Cardinal Gibbons, op. cit., pp. 102.103.

Peter over the other Apostles was attributed to him elsewhere, this fact of his being named first would serve as collateral evidence in proof of this claim.

But the entire silence of the Gospels on this head forbids us to read any such clause into the statement, and shows that, instead of the order of names in the lists serving as a key to interpret the remainder of the notices concerning St. Peter in the Gospels, it must itself be interpreted by them, if the extent of St. Peter's privilege be inferred from them the information they supply.⁷⁴

Further, as we have seen from the various New Testament passages quoted above, the Apostles, and Peter himself, were conscious of common equality amongst the Apostles, and thus, at the most Peter was "Primus inter pares". Further, Peter is not always mentioned first in the naming of several Apostles. Cf. Gal. 2, 9.

3. Christ sent Peter to the lake to catch the fish in whose mouth he found the stater to pay Christ's and his own tribute money, Matthew 27, 27, and is thus specially coupled with our Lord.

It is true that at first glance this incident does seem to couple him more individually with Christ, but an inquiry into the circumstances of the case deprives it all of all importance for the matter at issue.

The relation is one which does not arise out of His spontaneous action for the purpose of honouring Peter, but from the accidental coincidence in time, so to speak, of the application to St. Peter for payment and our Lord's visit to his house. (Cf. St. Matthew 17, 24 with St. Mark 1, 21. 29). Further, both Christ and St. Peter were, in this instance, alike subordinate to the Jewish law, which naturally treated them as on exactly the same footing below itself, and recognized no distinction of liability between them; so that no inference whatever can be drawn from the narrative as to their

74. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 19.

relation to each other under the Gospel, and it remains that the sole reason for the commemoration of the event is to record the miracle of the fish.⁷⁵

4. Peter is sent to prepare the upper chamber for the Passover.

The same refutation as offered under 1. is here adduced, for there is no special privilege discernable as far as Peter individually is concerned, inasmuch as he was not sent on this errand alone, but was accompanied by John.

5. Peter is the first apostle who performed a miracle. This, however, is a primacy of date, not of authority.

6. "He is the first to address the Jews in Jerusalem (on the Day of Pentecost), while his apostolic brethren stand respectfully around him".

We merely ask from which Biblical book did Cardinal Gibbons quote the word "respectfully"? Certainly, this is a case of malicious addition to the Sacred Volume, simply to make his claim plausible.

7. Peter is the first to make converts from the Gentile world in the persons of Cornelius and his friends. This again is merely a primacy of date and not of authority.

8. "When it is a question of electing a successor to Judas, Peter alone speaks. He points out to the Apostles and disciples the duty of choosing another to succeed the traitor. The Apostles silently acquiesce in the instructions of their leader."

75. Ibid. pp. 20.21. (Whether the author is correct or not in his last statement is doubtful; yet his other arguments are sufficient to refute the Papal assertion.)

Here again Cardinal Gibbons is not accurate in his account of the Biblical narrative, but intentionally presents the case with a false coloring; for Peter gives no instructions, and therefore they do not acquiesce in any; he simply points out. There is no exercise of any other authority than that of moderator of the assembly, and that is just what his primacy consists in.

In fact, there is no primacy exercised at all by him, unless it be a primacy in formal speech-making.⁷⁶

Hence, after a thorough study of the various texts of the New Testament, we arrive at the conclusion that

One thing is clear, that not in all the New Testament is there any vestige of any authority either claimed or exercised by Peter, or conceded to him, above the rest of the apostles-----a thing conclusive against the Romish claims in behalf of that apostle.⁷⁷

We next take up the third claim of the Roman Church concerning Peter's authority and that is that his successors succeeded to his prerogatives and to all the authority implied thereby. The claim is officially stated thus in the Vatican Decrees on the Constitution of the Church:

If any should say that it is not by the institution of Christ the Lord Himself, or by Divine right, that blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the primacy over the Church Universal, or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy, let him be anathema.⁷⁸

We must at the outset assert that

76. *Ibid.* p. 123.

77. Jamieson, Faussett, Brown, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 89.

78. Quoted in R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

as the entire Papal claim rests avowedly on asserted heirship to St. Peter, and right of succession to all his privileges,..., it follows that the Pope can claim no more than is plainly discoverable as conferred upon and exercised by St. Peter himself.⁷⁹

As we have previously seen, the New Testament confers no special authority or jurisdiction upon Peter, and since

no allegation is made that those privileges (i.e. Peter's alleged privileges) have been specifically re-granted to the Pope since his time,⁷⁹

it is really unnecessary to enter upon the question of Papal supremacy today. Inasmuch as Peter had no authority to transmit, and inasmuch as the Papacy claims to have inherited by succession Peter's authority only, it follows, therefore, that the Papacy is the recipient of no apostolic supremacy as they claim, and hence their claims are baseless and impudent.

However, let us assume that Peter did have all the supremacy entrusted to him which the Romanists claim. Our task is then to show that even if this were the case, still the Papacy has no foundation upon which to base their claim that they are in possession of this Petrine authority and supremacy, which task we now wish to undertake.

In order to prove their claim that the Bishops of Rome are Peter's successors it would be necessary for the papists to prove that Peter

constituted the Bishops of Rome his heirs and successors in the plenitude of his authority, giving them jurisdiction over all the apostles who might survive him, and over all Churches founded by them throughout the world.⁸⁰

This they will have to verify with historical facts. Now it

79. R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 5. (Parenthetical statement my own.)

80. Ibid. p. 191.

would seem plausible that in Rome, the greatest city and most important see of the ancient Church, and also a centre of learning in a lettered age, these records would be so accurately kept as to be models of precise notation and trustworthy evidence. But, the facts are that there is great confusion and obscurity as to the order, names and dates of the earliest popes. The following rival views have come down to us from obscurity:⁸¹

The Apostles, in their lifetime, made Linus Bishop of Rome, to whom Anacletus succeeded, and then Clement.⁸²

Clement is already Bishop of Rome, and presumably ordained by St. Paul, before St. Peter goes thither.⁸³

Clement is ordained as Bishop of Rome by St. Peter soon before his own death.⁸⁴

Linus is first Bishop of Rome, after the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul, Anacletus second, and Clement third.⁸⁵

Linus, first Bishop of Rome, is ordained by St. Paul; Clement, second Bishop, after the death of Linus, ordained by St. Peter.⁸⁶

88. Peter and Paul were jointly first Apostles and bishops of Rome; then Linus, next Cletus, and then Clement, it being uncertain whether Clement was ordained bishop by the Apostles in the lifetime of Linus and Cletus, and kept in reserve without a see, to do occasional duty at Rome during the absence of the Apostles on missionary journeys, or ordained by St. Cletus after their deaths, there being historical statement both ways.⁸⁷

Linus and Cletus, first and second Bishops of Rome, predeceased St. Peter, himself never bishop of Rome, but merely an apostle residing there,

-
81. The following series of eleven quotations are given in R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 192.
 82. S. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* iii, 3.
 83. *Apostolical Constitutions*, 6, 8.
 84. *De Praescript. Haeret.* 32.
 85. *Eutychius Alexandr.*; Eusebius, *op. cit.*, iii.21.
 86. *Apostolical Constitutions*, 7, 46.
 87. St. Epiphanius, *Adv. Haeres.* XXvii.6.

who then ordained Clement in the third place.⁸⁸

Linus was first bishop, Clement second, and Cletus or Anacletus third, according to the current Latin opinion in St. Jerome's day, though St. Jerome himself makes Clement fourth in order.⁸⁹

Cletus and Anacletus (or Anencletus) are two distinct persons, so that the order is, Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Anacletus.⁹⁰

Linus was elected by the people after St. Peter's death, and followed in order by Cletus, Anacletus, and Clement.⁹¹

Peter, Linus, Clement, Cletus, Anacletus.⁹²

Further, as noted in the first part of this thesis, there is said to have been an interval of a whole year between the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul and that St. Peter was the first to die. (*Prima Petrum rapuit sententia legibus Neronis.*)⁹³

Let us now investigate the papish claim on the basis of these details just presented. First, the utter discrepancy of the different accounts of the order of succession shows that no reliance whatever can be placed on the trustworthiness of the early Roman ecclesiastical records, from which Tertullian, Eusebius, Optatus, Jerome, Augustine and the compilers of the Liberian Catalogue obtained their information. If they could not settle initial facts as to whether Peter is to be reckoned in or left out of the numerical account, whether Clement was first, second, third or fourth in succession from

88. Rufinus, Praef. in Recogn. Clem.

89. St. Hieronymus, De Viris Illustribus. 15. St. Augustine. Epist. liii. Ad Generosum. Optatus Milevus, De Schism. Donat. ii. 2.

90. Roman Breviary

91. Anonymous author of the metrical Five Books Against Marcion, bk. iii.

92. Liberian Catalogue, A. D. 354.

93. Prudentius, Perist. Xii. II, Quoted in R. Litterdale, op. cit., p. 193.

St. Peter, whether Linus and Cletus entered on their office before or after Peter's death, it follows that the value of their evidence for Peter himself having been bishop of Rome, or having appointed anyone to succeed him in his chair and privileges is reduced to mere nothing.

Secondly, this carelessness exhibits another truth and that is that the details of the succession at Rome can have been thus of no greater practical significance to the Christian body at large than those of the order of the bishops at Colosse or Philippi. No momentous powers could have been thought to depend on the regularity of the Roman claim by orderly succession. This uncertainty is all the more remarkable when contrasted with the perfectly accurate knowledge we have of the civil chronology of this very time, with the order and succession of the Roman consuls.

Thirdly, if Linus and Cletus were appointed as Bishops of Rome, and died before Peter, it is clear that he did not divest himself of his "privilege" on their behalf, so that they were in that case popes without enjoying any specific primacy. This we believe is conclusive proof that the privilege is not necessarily attached to the office. The same argument holds good if Linus was appointed Bishop during the lifetime of Peter, but survived him, because even in that case, the Apostle must have separated the see from the privilege in his lifetime, and there is no proof that he provided for their reunion after his death,

Fourthly, if Peter did consecrate any one of the three, Linus, Cletus or Clement, as Bishop of Rome, or as intended to succeed him in any capacity, that very fact militates against his title of having ever been Bishop of Rome, for

the ancient Church knew nothing of coadjutor bishops, nor of a bishop resigning his see to another, nor yet of ordaining anyone with right of succession. In this connection we may mention the word of Pope Innocent I who stated that it was an unheard-of-thing to ordain anyone to occupy the place of another still living, no one having had power given him for that purpose.⁹⁴ Further, the Council of Antioch in 341 decreed in its twenty-third canon:

It is not lawful for a bishop to appoint another as successor to himself, even if he be at the close of life; and if any such act be done, the appointment shall be void.⁹⁵

Thus, we say that it would be hardly possible that such a rule would have been laid down if the Council knew that Peter himself had set such a precedence in Rome itself.

Fifthly, if St. Paul survived Peter by a full year, and if they were joint rulers and bishops of the Roman Church, the whole authority there must have been concentrated in Paul's hands, and he alone could bequeath it, if it were possible to transmit it at all.⁹⁶

This question of transmissibility is argued by Cardinal Gibbons in the words:

Whatever privileges, therefore, were conferred on Peter, which may be considered essential to the government of the Church, are inherited by the Bishops of Rome, as successors of the Prince of the Apostles; just as the constitutional powers given to George Washington have devolved on the present incumbent of the Presidential chair.⁹⁷

94. Sozinus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, viii. 26, quoted in R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

95. Quoted in R. Litterdale, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

96. *Ibid.*, pp. 194-198.

97. Cardinal Gibbons, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

Let us first note the word "therefore". The Cardinal is here assuming that he has proved that certain of the privileges which the Romanists claim for Peter were actually conferred upon him. We, however, have previously seen that such claims are not in harmony with clear statements of Scripture, nor, on the contrary, can they be substantiated by the Scriptural references which they set forth. However, at this time, it is not our purpose to re-state the fallacious deductions made by the Papists on the basis of such passages, but it is to show that even had Peter been endowed with such privileges, then to disprove the claim that it is not possible for the popes as the alleged successors of Peter to have received these privileges in toto. In regard to this argument of Gibbons we present in refutation the words of Stearns:

Here is a gap in the logic, as well as a flaw in the illustration....The flaw is in this, that whereas certain "privileges" were "conferred on Peter", without mention of successors, the "constitutional powers" were "given", not "to George Washington", but, to the "President of the United States," which George Washington was not, at that time. "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America," says the Constitution; not, in "George Washington and his successors"; still less, "in George Washington".⁹⁸

Another illogical argument presented by Gibbons is that one

can easily infer that the arguments in favor of Peter's Primacy have equal weight in demonstrating the supremacy of the popes.⁹⁹

Such an argument is a "non sequitur". For it is contrary to logic and to common sense to hold that one man's primacy demonstrates another man's supremacy.

⁹⁸. J. Stearns, op. cit., p. 143. 144.

⁹⁹. Cardinal Gibbons, op. cit., p. 109.

A further assertion of Romanists supporting this claim is:

Wherefore, since the apostolic body always remains morally the same, though the individual members constituting it are ever changing; and since St. Peter was appointed by Christ the foundation of His Church, the centre of unity, the chief pastor of Christ's whole flock, St. Peter also continues to live on earth in his lawfully appointed successors, the Bishops of Rome,---for these alone have ever been recognized as his successors, and no others have ever dared to claim this prerogative,---and he ever exercises the powers entrusted to him by Christ.100

The underlined statement is merely a Papal claim which must be proved, and we still await proof for that claim that the Bishops of Rome are the "lawfully appointed successors" of Peter, before we can and will subscribe to that statement.

The same author writes later:

The bishops who are at present governing the Church hold their powers by legitimate succession from the apostles. To show this, we have but to trace the succession of the Apostolic See of Rome, with which all Catholic churches must agree, and in which is placed the plenitude of jurisdiction; because Christ gave to Peter and his successors the keys of heaven, the power of binding and loosing on earth, of feeding all His sheep and lambs, and of confirming his brethren in the faith. To this succession the ancient writers of the Church appealed as to the most conclusive and most convincing argument. Now, the continued and uninterrupted succession of the Bishop of Rome is an historical fact beyond dispute.101

For this statement we would like to have Father Jouin or any Roman Catholic adduce the historical evidence which establishes this claim as a "fact beyond dispute".

At this point we wish to quote the words of Taylor at length, which summarize the correct view of this subject as

100. L. Jouin, *op. cit.*, p. 242. (Underlining my own).
101. *Ibid.*, pp. 287. 288.

to whether Peter, even if in possession of the authority the Romanists ascribe to him, could have transmitted it to the popes as his successors:

There is still evidence wanting that Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, and that, even if he ever occupied that position, he could transmit his personal prerogative to any successor.....All the honor conferred on Peter was given to him, not as an apostle, but as a prompt and enthusiastic confessor of the Lord; and the succession to that honor, if there be any succession in the case, must come only to those who are endowed with the characteristic which evoked it from the Savior at the first.

As a matter of order, it may be true enough, that a bishop may ordain a bishop, and a presbyter a presbyter, and the ordination may indicate the fact, that, by the consent of the Church, the individual ordained shall discharge the functions belonging to his office.

But apostles have no successors: it was a condition of their office, that they should be appointed directly and immediately by the Lord. Hence, if this honor was given to Peter in his apostolic capacity, he could not transmit it to others. But if Peter could not, as an apostle, impart this honor to others, neither could he as a bishop; for though a bishop may ordain another bishop, yet he cannot transmit character. Hence, even if it were true, which is far from being universally conceded, that Peter was Bishop of Rome, he could not leave his character as a legacy to those who should come after him in that office; and without his character the honor would be impossible.

It was on Peter the confessor, and himself resting on the Lord Jesus, that the Church was built, and it was to Peter the confessor that the keys were given. Now, it is vain for any man, be he bishop or pontiff, to claim these honors if he is destitute of the character on which the honor was bestowed; while, on the other hand, the humblest believer, who makes a similar sincere and enthusiastic declaration of his faith in Jesus, does in a measure enter into Peter's succession, and share with him his privilege and prestige. He, who in the face of a wavering world, and when men, in answer to the question, "What think ye of Christ?" are giving diverse replies, stands forth and says, "He is the Son of the Living God," does thereby put him-

self into the chair of Peter, and will be privileged to open many doors into the Church for sinners converted through his instrumentality; and that is a higher honor than to be pope of Rome. 102

The fact that the alleged supremacy which Peter supposedly possessed as the alleged Bishop of Rome is violently opposed by the consideration that the popes had no supremacy of jurisdiction in the great councils of the first seven centuries. It is true that

in modern times, the pope calls a council, and presides over it by deputies; no question can be discussed in it without the permission of his representatives; its decisions are worthless till he confirms them; from beginning to end, it is his abject slave. And he claims the widest range of authority over these judicatories. 103

However, during the first seven centuries the Bishop of Rome had no more power in a General Council than other Bishops, a declaration which is capable of being supported by any amount of evidence.

From a very early day the bishop of the chief city of the world-embracing empire of Rome, in virtue of his place of residence, was held in high esteem, his name was placed first in a list of bishops, and his opinion was naturally enough received with great attention. But when you examine his power as he sits in person, or by delegates beside his brethren in councils, he is weak as other men in the episcopal office. 104

If Peter had actually transmitted all the authority and jurisdiction ascribed to him by the modern papacy, it seems strange that it took the bishop of Rome and other Bishops until the seventh century to come to the realization of this momentous truth, if such indeed it were.

In passing we may briefly answer the question as to how

102. W. H. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 88-90.

103. Z. W. Cathcart, op. cit., p. 34.

104. Ibid., p. 35.

this Papal claim developed since there is no Scriptural basis for it and since there was no trace of it for so long a period. The development of this claim can be traced to several different factors, some of which are various historical circumstances which come into consideration, as well as the fact that many ancient bishops by appealing to the Bishop of Rome in their quarrels made him believe to be their natural and divinely appointed judge. The most important factor is, however, the presence of a great number of documentary falsifications and interpolations of passages in the books of the ancient Fathers, or in the Acts and Canons of the Councils. The most noteworthy of these are: Interpolated passages of St. Cyprian's De Unitate Ecclesiae; spurious additions in Pope Hormisdas' profession of faith, or formula; the Collectio Conciliarum; an interpolation in the Prisca, an ancient Latin translation of the Nicene Canons; the pretended Synod of Sinuessa; the Decretum Gelasii; the text of the Canons III., IV., V. of the Council of Sardica; the Canons of the Council of Nicaea; and finally the most important fraud of all, the so-called False Decretals, named after Isidorus Mercator.¹⁰⁵

The question arises now, if Peter was in Rome, but did not occupy the chair of the Roman See, for what purpose did he go to that city. In the last chapter of Matthew, Peter, as well as the other apostles, was given the command "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Thus, Peter's presence in Rome was occasioned by these last words of our Lord and Savior; for to him Rome was as much a

105. G. Bartoli, op. cit., pp. 106 - 114.

part of the "world" as was any metropolis or rural district. It was to tell the Romans of the wonderful workings of God through Christ, to tell the Romans that "the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sins."¹⁰⁶ Yes, it was to preach the Gospel to the Gentile Romans just as he had originally done to his fellow Jews. By such actions we see manifested in this disciple of Christ an exemplary missionary zeal and fervor; for he was "not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ",¹⁰⁷ and therefore he considered it his divine mission "to be about his Father's business",¹⁰⁸ by preaching the glad tidings of Christ to the people in Rome also.

Thus after a thorough and comprehensive inquiry and study of "THE HISTORICITY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PETER'S STAY IN ROME", we are ready to set forth the following conclusions:

1. The term Βαβυλῶν is in 1 Peter 5,13 best interpreted as meaning Rome.
2. The testimonies of the Church Fathers substantiate, as far as is historically possible, the view that Peter labored in Rome during the latter years of his life.
3. The claim that Peter was founder of the Roman Church, as well as the claim of a twenty-five year episcopate, is unwarranted.
4. No primacy is given to Peter by any New Testa-

106. 1 John 1, 7.
 107. Romans 1, 16.
 108. Luke 2, 49.

ment passage.

5. The Papal "Thou art Peter" assertion cannot be held.
6. The alleged primacy and supremacy of Peter, even if capable of proof, was not transmitted to the Popes as his "legitimate successors."
7. The sole significance of Peter's presence in Rome was that he was thereby fulfilling his duty of preaching the Gospel in all the world.

In conclusion, the author of this thesis states that on the basis of his study, he accepts the historicity of Peter's visit to Rome, but that he denies any other significance which may be attached to this visit, save that Peter journeyed to the Roman capital to there also "preach Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."¹⁰⁹

109. 1 Corinthians 2, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- ADAM, KARL, The Spirit of Catholicism, translated by Dom. Justin McCann, revised edition, New York, Macmillan Company, 1937.
- BARTOLI, GIORGIO, The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.
- BRUECK, HEINRICH, History of the Catholic Church, translated by E. Pruente, third revised edition, I, New York, Benziger Brothers, 1904.
- CATHERART, WILLIAM, The Papal System from its Origin to the Present Time, A Historical Sketch of Every Doctrine, Claim and Practice of the Church of Rome, Aurora, Missouri, Monace Publishing Company, 1872.
- GRUSE, C. P., The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of Caesarea, with Notes selected from the Edition of Valesius, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1917.
- DALLMANN, WILLIAM, Peter, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1930.
- EUSEBIUS, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, edited by Fredericus A. Heinrichen, Leipzig, C. G. Kaysor, I, 1827, II, 1828.
- FARRAR, F. W., The Early Days of Christianity, New York, A. L. Burt, n. d.
- FARRAR, F. W., The Early Days of Christianity, New York, E. P. Dutton, 1882.
- GIBBONS, JAMES CARDINAL, The Faith of Our Fathers, Being a Plain Exposition and Vindication of the Church Founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ, Baltimore, John Murphy Company, 1917.
- JOUIN, LOUIS, Evidences of Religion, New York, P. O'Shea, 1877.
- LITTERDALE, RICHARD FREDERICK, The Petrine Claims, London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1839.
- LUTHER, MARTIN, The Papacy at Rome, An Answer to the Celebrated Romanist at Leipzig, Philadelphia, A. J. Holman Company and the Castle Press, 1915.

PULLER, F. W., The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome, third edition, London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1914.

SHOTWELL, JAMES T., and LOUISE H. LOOMIS, The See of Peter, New York, Columbia University Press, 1927.

STEARNS, EDWARD J., The Faith of Our Forefathers, An Examination of Archbishop Gibbon's "Faith of Our Fathers," tenth edition, revised, New York, Thomas Whittaker, op. 1879.

TAYLOR, WILLIAM M., Peter the Apostle, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1904.

ENCYCLOPAEDIAS AND DICTIONARIES

A Dictionary of the Bible, J. Davis, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1924, 597-99, sub "Peter".

A Dictionary of the Bible, J. Hastings, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902, III, 1319-28, sub "Peter, Simon," IV, 306-10, sub "Rome".

A Standard Bible Dictionary, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1909, 657-68, sub "Peter, Simon, the Apostle".

Bible Cyclopaedia, A. Fausset, Hartford, Conn., S. S. Scranton Company, 1917, 590-94, sub "Peter," 611-12, sub "Rome".

Biblical Cyclopaedia, A Dictionary of Eastern Antiquities, Geography, Natural History, Sacred Annals and Biography, Theology and Biblical Literature, Philadelphia, J. P. Lippencott Company, 1901, 513-17, sub "Peter".

Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, J. McClintock and J. Strong, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1894, VIII, 4-27, sub "Peter," IX, 71-75, sub "Roman Catholic Church".

Dictionary of the Bible, J. Hastings, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909, 713-18, sub "Peter".

Encyclopaedia Biblica, A Critical Dictionary of the Literary Political and Religious History, the Archeology, Geography and Natural History of the Bible, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1907, IV, Columns 4145-57, sub "Rome (Church)," 4559-4627, sub "Simon Peter".

The Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, Robert Appleton Company, 1911, XI, 744-55, sub "Peter, Saint, Prince of the Apostles".

The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Chicago, Howard-Severance Company, 1915, IV, 2348-58, sub "Peter, Simon".

The New Chain-Reference Bible, third improved edition, Indianapolis, B. B. Kirkbride Company, 1934.

The New Schaff-Hersog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1910, VIII, 479-88, sub "Peter the Apostle," X, 70-86, sub "Roman Catholics".

The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopaedia and Scriptural Dictionary, Chicago, Howard-Severance Company, 1906, III, 1319-23, sub "Peter".

COMMENTARIES

An American Commentary on the New Testament, A. Hovey, Philadelphia, The American Baptist Publication Society, 1888, I, 355-362, VI, 5-8, 67-74, sub "The First Epistle of Peter".

A Commentary, Critical, Experimental and Practical, of the Old and New Testaments, Philadelphia, J. P. Lippencott and Company, n. d., VI, xliii-xlix, 615-18.

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students, New York, Charles Scribner and Company, 1889, XVII, 296-99, XXV, 3-10, 185-96, sub "The Epistles General of Peter".

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, The Gospel of Matthew, H. Meyer, translated and revised by W. Dickson and F. Crombie, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1877, I, 415-24.

Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible, New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, n. d., V, sub Matthew 16: 16-20, VI, sub "An Exposition with Practical Observations of the First Epistle General of Peter".

Notes on the New Testament, Albert Barnes, London, Blackie and Son, n. d., X, 101-07.

Popular Commentary, P. E. Kretzmann, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1922, New Testament, I, 89-93, II, 516-17, 539-41.

The Annotated Bible, The Holy Scriptures Analyzed and Annotated, R. Gabelein, New York, Publication Office "Our Hope," n. d., IV, 49-56.

The Expositors Greek Testament, London, Hodder Stoughton Limited, n. d., I, 223-25, V, 3-38.

- The Holy Bible with an Explanation and Critical Commentary, (Holy Bible with Commentary), London, John Murray, 1881, IV, 155-72, 215-20.
- The International Critical Commentary, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907, XXVI, 175-80, XLI, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, 1-87, 182-92.
- The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude, R. Lenski, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1938, 1-13, 219-36.
- The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, R. Lenski, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1938, 602-13.
- The Lutheran Commentary, New York, Christian Literature Company, 1897, XI, 93-101, 174-80.
- The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ with a Commentary and Critical Notes, Adam Clarke, New York, Eaton and Mains, 1853, V, 95-96, VI, 481-84, 502-06.
- The Pulpit Commentary, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company, n. d., I, 1-xiv.