

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

and for which he so freely shed his precious blood. It pictures to us the world in its sin, in its deep, dark, inveterate, wilful, chosen sin. It tells us of six hundred millions of heathen, in utter ruin, bound hand and foot by Satan, through various systems of idolatry, and false religion. It causes us to see how improbable is their repentance under present influences, even when through an unknown Saviour, repentance might avail. It spreads before us the glorious gospel of the Son of God as the remedy divinely provided for this desperate condition of disease, as a message of hope to the world, as crowded with the truth which can alone move the masses of the heathen to repent and live. It confronts us with Christ's solemn and explicit command to "preach this gospel to every creature." It demands that we shall obey this injunction and make obedience to it the great business of life. Has the Christian church yet risen to the magnitude of this conception? Is it yet baptized with this spirit?

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### WAS PETER IN ROME, AND BISHOP OF THE CHURCH AT ROME?<sup>1</sup>

A HISTORICO-CRITICO INQUIRY BY J. ELLENDORF. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY E. GOODRICH SMITH, M. A., WASHINGTON, D. C.

#### § 1. *Introduction.*

THE Romish bishops maintain that they have been constituted by God for the supreme rule of the church; that Christ the Lord has appointed them his vicegerents on earth, and that they ought to govern the church in his stead.

But as there is no declaration, and nowhere any mention

---

<sup>1</sup> Ist Petrus in Rom und Bischof der Römischen Kirche gewesen. Eine historisch-Kritische Untersuchung von J. Ellendorf.

in the Holy Scriptures of a transmission of such a dignity and power to the Romish bishops, they have therefore attempted to establish it in the following way:—“Christ, beyond all doubt, gave to Peter the primacy above all the apostles, and appointed him to be the supreme head of the church.<sup>1</sup> This power and dignity of his, Peter has transmitted to the Romish bishops as his successors and his heirs in the Romish see.”

Thus the question is now to be regarded as thrown over to the domain of tradition, and proceeds on the supposition that Peter was a bishop, and indeed the first bishop, of Rome. As the pretended primacy was given to Peter the *apostle*, he must first be a *bishop* before he could have *bishops* for his successors, and make them heirs of his primacy.

Let us now hear what is brought forward from tradition to establish this transmission. It is said: “Until A. D. 37, Peter stood at the head of the church that was forming at Jerusalem and in the region around. But in that year he left Jerusalem and went to Antioch, where he founded a church, and for seven years presided over it as a bishop. After this period, and in the *second* year of the reign of Claudius, A. D. 42, he journeyed to Rome, where he vanquished Simon Magus, preached the gospel, founded a church, and placed himself at the head of it as its bishop. As such he continued till A. D. 50, when Claudius banished the Jews from Rome. Peter was then obliged to flee, and he betook himself to Palestine and Jerusalem, where in A. D. 51, he held and presided over the first council on the occasion of the controversy respecting the circumcision of the Gentile Christians. Thence he went to Antioch. During this time the emperor Claudius died, and Peter now returned through Asia Minor, where he founded numerous churches, and across Sicily and Lower Italy to Rome, which he reached under Nero’s reign, and re-occupied his see. From Rome he made many apostolic journeys into the countries of the West: to

---

<sup>1</sup> That this is not so wholly beyond all doubt I have shown in my *Treatise über den Primat der Röm. Bischöfe*, Kapitel I. (on the Primacy of the Romish bishops. Chap I.).

Gaul, and Britain, and even to Spain and Africa, and everywhere founded churches to which he assigned bishops from among his disciples. Finally he was put to death, together with Paul, at Rome, and there buried, under the reign of Nero, A. D. 65 (66, 67, 69). Before his death he appointed Linus his successor as bishop of Rome and as the heir of his primacy, which in this way he transmitted to the Roman bishops."

This is the pith and substance of the tradition on which, as its foundation, rests the Primacy of the Romish bishops; thus has the Romish church, and thus for centuries have the most celebrated Roman Catholic theologians, as Bellarmin, Baronius, Abraham Echellensis, Leo Allatius, Halloixius, Pagi, Natalis Alexander, Valesius, Pamelius, Feuardent, Lupus, Thomassin and hundreds of others maintained it, and in *their way* proved and propounded it as irrefragable truth. This Tradition, on which as pillars the whole fabric of the Roman Catholic church rests, they have strove to sustain and uphold, well knowing that with it their whole structure goes down together. Hence this tradition, in the course of time, has received a *dogmatical* authority, and indeed, is almost *in due form*, elevated into a *dogma*; attacks on it in the Roman Catholic church are, at the outset, declared to be impious, schismatic and heretical, subject to be punished and to be put down by the several ecclesiastical penalties, while those made by Protestants, at the best, have been honored with a notice by *individual* learned Catholics only to refute them; but in general have been passed over, especially by Rome, with a contemptuous silence.

### § 2. *Sources of this tradition.*

If we inquire for the sources of this tradition, the Holy Scriptures afford us nothing but the *bare* facts that Peter officiated as an apostle in the church of Jerusalem and perhaps presided over it; that there, in A. D. 45, he was put in prison by Herod; but, miraculously delivered, he left the city to betake himself to another place; that he was present at

the council of Jerusalem, in A. D. 51 (53), and soon after (Gal. ii.) he was at Antioch; and that finally, according to 1 Pet. 5: 13, he wrote from Babylon to the churches of Asia Minor, *which were founded by him*. We see that here there is not the slightest reference to be found to Peter's being at Rome. All that brings him in contact with Rome belongs to the *purely historical*, not to the *biblical* tradition.

The sources of the historical tradition are two-fold, *apocryphal* and *true*. The former may well be the oldest, as will be evident in the course of this investigation; they are from the second, third, and fourth centuries, and may be regarded as the special supports of this tradition; for their main purpose is to place Peter very early at Rome, make him bishop of the church there, and have him die there. This is carried out even to the minutest details. Here belong the *Pasiones Petri et Pauli*, falsely ascribed to Linus, and to Dionysius the Areopagite; the *Acta Marcelli*, a biography of Peter; the Life of St. John by Prochorus, one of the seven deacons; the Recognitiones and Homilies of St. Clement, a pretended successor of Peter, and his Letter to James, in which he announces to him Peter's death; the Apostolical Constitutions, made as pretended by Clemens; the *Liber Pontificalis*, falsely attributed to pope Damasus, etc. In these writings the Tradition originated, was developed and spun out, into the minutest particulars. Their authority, as historical testimonies, is good for nothing.

It is evidently from these turbid fountains, as we shall hereafter show, that Papias, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian and Origen have drawn, to prove Peter's abode in Rome; and to them, too, may be joined Dionysius of Corinth. Irenæus is the first who names Peter with Paul as founders of the church of Rome; that by them both Linus was consecrated first bishop of Rome; and first in the third century, Stephen I. and Cyprian name Peter as the first *bishop* of Rome. But these accounts are very short and are, for the most part, only notices *incidentally* thrown in.

The first *detailed* statement of this tradition is given us by Eusebius, who was bishop of Cæsarea, about A. D. 350.

He says that when Simon Magus went from Palestine to Rome, and there had led astray many persons, Peter, aroused by the Holy Spirit, hastened after him. He arrived at Rome in the *second* year of the reign of Claudius, A. D. 42; there he vanquished Simon, preached the gospel, founded a church, presided over it as bishop for twenty-five years, and suffered death under Nero, in A. D. 67. From Eusebius, Jerome took it *verbatim*, from whom it has flowed on, as a continued stream, through the church. Justin likewise relates the story of Simon Magus at Rome, *but without any mention of Peter*.

Of Peter's abode at Rome, the following fathers are perfectly silent: Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Hermas, and Hegesippus.

### § 3. *The Question proposed.*

In this state of the authorities, it is nothing but a foolish arrogance to declare the examination respecting the truth of the tradition as to Peter superfluous, indiscreet, altogether insulting to the *Romish*, and injurious to the *whole* church, which has so long established that tradition as a true, correct, and genuine historical one. Yet more: the dignity and importance of the subject, the freedom of historical investigation, which must examine everything that lies within its sphere, demands that this investigation be undertaken anew and carried out to the attainment of as sure a result as possible. If the tradition is true, and, as a genuine historical one, is sustained by the most credible witnesses, the Romish church need not shrink from the examination. If it is false, supported by no historical documents, then a regard for truth demands that the falsehood be exposed, and this tradition, with all that has been deduced from it, falls to the ground.

This investigation we will here undertake; we will subject the tradition relative to Peter to a historico-critical examination. To lay hold of the matter, as it were, at the root, we will concentrate it in this inquiry:

“**WAS PETER EVER IN ROME?**”

If we are obliged to answer this question in the negative, we need not further discuss all the other points of the tradition; Peter's Romish bishopric, the succession of the popes as the heirs of this bishopric and primacy, all vanish of themselves into nothing. If we are obliged to answer it in the affirmative, then we shall pass over to the other points above mentioned.

#### § 4. *Course of the Investigation.*

We now propose, as the basis of the examination, the tradition of Peter's arrival at Rome in A. D. 42, and his twenty-five years' bishopric there; and we inquire: "Was Peter at Rome in A. D. 42, 44, 45, and 46; was he there in A. D. 51, in 52, in 58, 60, 61, 62, 63 or 65? *Could* he have been there? And if we are obliged to deny this, then we conclude that he never was there. For this purpose we shall most carefully examine the "Acts of the Apostles," then pass on to those Epistles of Paul which he wrote at that time when (as claimed) Peter must have been in Rome, as the Epistle to the Romans, or which were written from Rome, as the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, to the Hebrews, to Titus, Timothy, and Philemon, and we will examine whether these Epistles contain any traces of an abode of Peter at Rome. To these authorities we shall then add the Epistles of Peter, and especially the first one, and subject them to a similar examination.

This concludes the *First Part* of this work, which embraces the **BIBLICAL** sources. In the *Second Part* we shall examine the **TRADITIONS** of the fathers, whether they are authentic, probable, or true, and from what sources they have been derived. We shall here conclude with Origen and Cyprian, because it may be assumed as certain, that the fathers from A. D. 250 on, have only transcribed what their predecessors had transmitted to them.

## PART I.—THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

§ 5. *Opening of the subject.*

We now seek the key for an answer to the inquiry. Here naturally first comes up the question for examination: Whether Peter journeyed to Rome in A. D. 42. In looking round for a fixed point of support, we find it in Gal. 1: 17 etc., where Paul states that after his conversion he did not immediately go up to Jerusalem, to the apostles, but at first he “went into Arabia and returned to Damascus,” and “then after *three* years,” he “went to Jerusalem” to see Peter, and “abode with him fifteen days.” Of this journey also Luke speaks in Acts 9: 23—30. To this event succeed several others, up to the imprisonment of Peter, which, coinciding with the death of Herod in the fourth year of the reign of Claudius, can be accurately determined.

First of all, therefore, we have to inquire when Paul was converted. This fixed, then his journey to see Peter at Jerusalem took place three years *after*; and as it is historically certain Peter was in Jerusalem A. D. 45, then the question at once comes up, whether it be true that Peter, from that first visit of Paul up to the *second* year of Claudius, was seven years bishop in Antioch, and could in that year have travelled to Rome.

§ 6. *The time of Stephen's death and Paul's conversion.*

Paul's conversion followed *after* Stephen's death. We will therefore first examine when this took place. According to Baronius, Bellarmin, Natalis, etc., it occurred shortly after the Pentecost; at the furthest it is placed eight months afterwards.

But this is not to be taken for granted. The Acts of the Apostles is the only authority from which we can here arrive at a decision. Let us see. Stephen's death is narrated in Acts vii. But how many events transpired before, which cannot be crowded into the space of eight months?



1. There are, first, the many miracles which the apostles wrought at Jerusalem (Acts 2: 43). They thus gradually so filled the neighboring regions with their fame, that "there came a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks and them which were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed every one" (Acts 5: 16).

2. Luke makes several pauses or interruptions in the narration, which allow us to infer a long separation of the occurrences :

In chapter ii. he relates the descent of the Holy Spirit and the founding of the church. From verse 42 he now describes its life : "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul ; and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common ; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."

In the 3d chapter Luke goes on further to sketch the growth of the church and the miracles of the apostles : "Once" (Gr. *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ*), it is stated, "Peter and John went into the temple," and now follows the healing of the lame man.

From the word used, "once" (English Tr., "now"), we might conclude that the event stood in no *very near* connection with the foregoing. This is yet more evident from the fact that, at the time of the healing of the lame man, *Caiaphas* was no longer high-priest, but *Annas*, before whom the Apostles were brought (Acts 3: 6). If now too we suppose that *Annas* succeeded *Caiaphas* *immediately* in his office of high-priest (a supposition which, indeed, is not necessary), then it is clear that the healing of the lame man did not take place directly after the Pentecost, but in the next year.

Luke now, with a *new* interruption, goes on to sketch the life or internal condition of the church. Especially he here sets forth that they who believed sold their property, and even "*their houses and lands,*" and paid over the money to the apostles. From Acts 4: 36, we see that foreigners also, fellow-members, as for example Joseph the Levite from Cyprus, sold their *more distant possessions in their own country*, and paid over the money. Nothing is more certain than that a measure so vigorously carried out *on a large scale*, in a church of *many thousands*,<sup>1</sup> could not be executed in a *few months*; that it required *years*; for, to sell houses and lands, especially in distant countries, in *such numbers*, and to collect *the money*, cannot be done in a few months.

In chapter v. Luke gives the history of Ananias and Sapphira in immediate connection with the foregoing. Afterward follows a new interruption, in which the growth of the church (verse 14), the further numerous miracles of the apostles, their wide-spread fame, the streaming in of the inhabitants of the regions round about to Jerusalem, are mentioned. Then follows (verse 17 and on) the imprisonment of the apostles by the Sadducees, and their wondrous deliverance from prison.

From chapter vi. it is evident that the church was grown so large that the apostles could no more attend upon its domestic economy. Simply for the care of the *widows*, the seven deacons were now chosen. By nothing more than by this circumstance, is the magnitude of the church evidenced, whose growth to such an extent was certainly not the work of a few months, particularly among the stiffnecked Jews at Jerusalem.

Among the seven deacons was *Stephen*. Luke describes his death in chapter vii. The idea that *he was put to death immediately after his consecration to office*, is in the highest degree arbitrary and has everything against it. Let us see:

Luke, after his account of the choice of deacons, makes a *new* break (Acts 5: 7): "And the word of God increased, and

<sup>1</sup> Acts 4: 4. After the healing of the lame man there were added at once as members 5000 men.

the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith."

This, surely, did not take place in a few weeks. Luke, with a *new* interruption, now passes over to Stephen. "Stephen," he states, "did great wonders and miracles among the people;" and thus excited the hatred of the Jews. This too was not, certainly, the work of a few *days* or *weeks*; indeed, a series of public addresses may have preceded it.

After this narration of *events*, no one can object to our assuming, that from the Pentecost to Stephen's death, *some years at least* must have elapsed, and that Stephen was not put to death before A. D. 35 or 36, though we may not agree with the opinion of the Alexandrian Chronicle, according to which he died in the *first* year of the reign of Claudius, and so in A. D. 41.

Stephen's death appears to have been the beginning of the great persecutions of the Christians by the Jews. Luke mentions this Acts 8: 1, and yet more clearly verse 3. Now we know from Tacitus (*Annals* ii. 85), Suetonius (in Tib. 36), and Josephus (xviii. c. 4, 5), that the emperor Tiberius was the declared enemy of the Jews, while on the contrary, as Tertullian says, he showed a friendly feeling towards the Christians, on account of his high veneration for Christ.<sup>1</sup> It cannot, therefore, properly be supposed, that he allowed the Jews not only in *Jerusalem* and *Palestine*, but also in *Syria*, at *Damascus*, so to rage as Luke describes. Hence we justly conclude that the persecution of the Christians, in which Paul was so furious, did not take place under the reign of Tiberius, and so not before A. D. 37; for it was in this year that Tiberius died. As, according to Luke's account (Acts 8: 1), Saul began his persecution of the Christians *directly* after Stephen's death, we also conclude that Stephen's death, at the earliest period, may have taken place at the close of A. D. 37. How long, now, was it to Paul's

<sup>1</sup> Apol. c. 5. Tertullian says: Tiberium comminatum fuisse periculum accusatoribus Christianorum, ad annuntiata sibi ex Syria et Palestina.

conversion? It is generally assumed that Paul's conversion was immediately after Stephen's death. But it might not have been so. Let us see:

Luke says (Acts 8: 3): "Saul made great havoc of the church, entering into every house and haling men and women, committed them to prison." This kind of persecution, against so large a company, in so great a city as Jerusalem was, demands a period of some length.

Luke now relates how, *during this fury of Saul*, the Christians, fleeing before him from Jerusalem, were scattered abroad to Samaria; how Philip founded a church in Samaria; how Peter and John, by the direction of the apostles, went there, imparted the Holy Spirit to the baptized, and then returned to Jerusalem; how Philip, having come to Gaza, there converted the eunuch of queen Candace of Ethiopia, and afterward *going about*, preached the gospel, and finally came to Cæsarea. That all this took place *during the persecution by Saul*, is evident from Acts 9: 1, where Luke, returning to Saul, says: "And Saul *yet* (Gr. *ἔτι*) breathing out threatenings and slaughter, went to the high-priest and desired of him letters to Damascus," etc.

Therefore after he had first satiated his rage against the Christians in Jerusalem, i. e. *after a considerable time*, in which the events mentioned in chapter viii. had occurred, Saul began his journey to Damascus. On his way, he was converted to the Lord. This event could not, therefore, well have taken place before A. D. 39.

Some other striking points here deserve consideration:

1. When Saul was present at the murder of Stephen, he was a young man. While a youth, as he states, he was a scholar of Gamaliel. Now since Gamaliel, as is evident from Acts vi., was a decided opposer to all persecutions of the disciples and their followers, it is plain that Saul, when he began to rage against the Christians, had not been, for some time past, a pupil of Gamaliel.

2. He could not have been so very young at that time. To say nothing of the fact that Ananias, in Acts 9: 13, calls him a *man*, it is not probable that the high-priest would have

entrusted such weighty and extended authority to the hands of a *mere youth*. The word used in Luke (Gr. *νεανίας*) must therefore designate a *young man*.

3. Luke relates that Paul, *after his first journey* to Jerusalem, which he undertook *three* years after his conversion, Gal. i., went to Tarsus (Acts 9: 30). Thence Barnabas brought him to Antioch, where he remained a year (Acts 11: 25, 26). During this abode there, he went with Barnabas to Jerusalem, to carry thither the alms of the church of Antioch, verse 30. This journey took place at the time of the imprisonment of Peter by Herod (as we shall hereafter see), *during which*, Paul and Barnabas were in Jerusalem (Acts 12: 25); and since this imprisonment was in A. D. 45 (as we shall by and by show), the journey was in this year, A. D. 45. Should we now assume, with Baronius and Natalis Alexander, that Paul was already converted in A. D. 34, and so for the first time went to Jerusalem in A. D. 38, and thence travelled to Tarsus, we must also assume, that from A. D. 37 or 38 up to A. D. 44, when Barnabas brought him to Antioch, i. e. six or seven years, Paul had sat down inactive in Tarsus; a supposition which no reasonable person will make. But if Paul's conversion be placed in A. D. 39, then his first journey to Jerusalem was in A. D. 42, the same year in which he went to Tarsus, whence Barnabas brought him to Antioch in A. D. 44, and thence they went to Jerusalem in A. D. 45, and were there during Peter's imprisonment. Thus everything harmonizes admirably. Therefore Paul's conversion was not before A. D. 39.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It else matters not whether Paul's conversion be placed in A. D. 34 or 39. For if by the first supposition the *possibility* is gained that Peter might have travelled to Antioch in A. D. 38, yet from this possibility the *reality* of such a journey by no means follows; and as, according to those well-known views which rest on the statements of Eusebius, Peter must have gone to Jerusalem in the second year of Claudius, i. e. in A. D. 42, so the seven years of his pretended bishopric at Antioch can in no wise be deduced therefrom. Besides, that pretended journey to Antioch is so clearly a fiction that it throughout contradicts the Holy Scriptures, as we shall hereafter see.

## § 7.

We have now obtained a basis for the investigation. In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul says that *three* years after his conversion he, for the first time, went up to Jerusalem to show himself to the apostles, and especially to Peter. This journey Luke also relates Acts 9: 26—30. It took place accordingly in A. D. 42. *Therefore in the above named year, Peter had not yet gone away from Jerusalem*; the care of the church fixed him continuously to this central point of the Christian church. We now proceed further :

Directly after Paul's departure from Jerusalem (Acts 9: 26—30), Luke goes on, vs. 31, 32: "then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied. And it came to pass, as Peter passed throughout all quarters, he came down also to the saints which dwelt at Lydda." Peter's journey, therefore, embraced the three countries of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, i. e. the whole of Palestine up to the Jordan. So we find the apostle at Lydda, verse 32, where he healed Æneas; then at Joppa, 36—42, where he raised Tabitha from the dead. Here "*he tarried many days,*" and in consequence of a vision he went to Cæsarea, to Cornelius, whom he received, with a number of others, into the Christian fellowship; afterwards he returned to Jerusalem (Acts 11: 1). If we take into view the considerable extent of the provinces over which Peter travelled, and his frequent long abode in particular cities, as for example at Joppa, we must suppose that this journey required *at least a whole year*, and that therefore Peter could not have returned to Jerusalem (Acts 11: 1), before the end of A. D. 43. Here, too, we find him in A. D. 45. For in the 12th chapter Luke relates the killing of James, and Peter's imprisonment by king Herod, Herod's departure for Cæsarea *directly* after Peter's deliverance, and his sudden death there, which, as is well known, occurred in the fourth year of Claudius, and so in A. D. 45.

Therefore in A. D. 45, Peter had not yet come to Antioch, — to say nothing of his coming to Rome; he had not even crossed the boundaries of Palestine. The opinion, then, that Peter went to Rome in the *second* year of Claudius, i. e. in A. D. 42, is proved to be wholly false. It is likewise false if we place Paul's conversion in A. D. 34, and allow that Peter was *seven* years bishop at Antioch; for, even then, he could not have gone to Rome before A. D. 44.

### § 8. *Was Peter Bishop of Antioch?*

We have proved that Peter did not come out of Palestine up to A. D. 45. How could he, now, have been bishop of Antioch since A. D. 37, and of Rome since A. D. 42? Peter's bishopric at Antioch belongs, at all events, to the numerous idle fables which ambition or credulity have invented. Let us examine it more closely:

1. We have seen that, during the persecution by Saul, the gospel was first preached beyond Jerusalem by the disciples scattered abroad, and especially by Philip; and indeed, according to Acts 8: 1, first of all in Judea and Samaria. According to Acts 9: 31, we likewise find churches in Galilee, and Peter, too, had already gone there. We have seen, also, that this journey lasted at least a year. According to the view of Bellarmin, Baronius, and Natalis Alexander (who place Peter's departure to Antioch in A. D. 38, and certainly after the completion of this circuit), those numerous churches were already founded in A. D. 37, i. e. within *three* years.

Now the progress could not well have been so rapid, especially among the Jews. Besides, this too is to be considered: Peter, after that circuit, returned again to Jerusalem (Acts 11: 2). How do these writers know that *he took a journey*, after, to Antioch? It is a mere arbitrary assumption of their own.

2. The preaching of the gospel to the Jews held the first place; not till afterwards, it came to the heathen. First on this circuit, which followed Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (and hence, according to the view of these authors, first in A. D. 38), was it revealed to Peter that the gospel must like-

wise be preached to the Gentiles. The Jewish Christians took it ill of Peter that he had baptized Cornelius (Acts 11: 2, 3). Can we now suppose that Peter already, in A. D. 38, had left Palestine, i. e. the Jews, and turned to the Gentiles — he who (κατ' ἐξοχήν) preëminently was the apostle of the **circumcision**? We believe that such a supposition is destitute of any foundation.

3. The church of Antioch was formed of *Gentile Christians*, as we are expressly told in Acts 11: 19, 20. It did not, therefore, belong to the circle of Peter's calling. Besides, *it was not founded at all by Peter*: in Acts 11: 19, etc., it is related: "Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but Jews only. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." There is no mention at all of Peter. It is *expressly* said, "men of Cyprus and Cyrene," and therefore not Peter, had first preached the gospel at Antioch.

To this church (the founding of which took place, according to the reckoning of Baronius, etc. in A. D. 34 or 35, because it happened *soon* after Stephen's death, placed by them in A. D. 34), the church of Jerusalem, Luke states Acts 11: 22, etc. sent, not *Peter*, but *Barnabas*. He (Barnabas), then, was the proper founder and organizer of the church at Antioch, and if any one is to be named a *first* bishop, it is he, and not *Peter*.

"And in those days," Luke directly proceeds to say, "came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch." And among them was Agabus (verses 27, 28). Would Luke, who mentions the arrival of these *prophets*, have omitted to mention the arrival of Peter happening, as pretended, precisely at this time, the man who founded the church of Antioch, and had set up in it his first Episcopal chair? We trust that no one will admit so absurd an opinion.



Now Luke further relates, immediately after, in verse 28, that Agabus at *that time* foretold a famine, which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar." Hereupon, i. e. on account of the famine which followed, the Christians at Antioch sent alms to those of Jerusalem by the hands of Barnabas and Paul (ver. 29, 30). Baronius places this famine in the second year of Claudius, and so in A. D. 42, relying, as his authority, on Dion Cassius, Lib. ix. in *Claudio*. But since, now, the sojourn of Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem (as is evident from Acts 11: 30 and 12: 1, 25) was precisely at the time when Peter was shut up in prison by Herod,<sup>1</sup> Baronius himself must admit that Peter was at Jerusalem in A. D. 42, and therefore had not yet acted as bishop of Antioch.

We now advance further: After Luke had mentioned the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, Acts 11: 25, he goes on immediately, 13: 1: "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch, certain prophets, and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." Directly after, verse 3, the journey of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles is mentioned.

Whether, with Baronius and Natalis Alexander, we place this event in A. D. 43, or at a later period, it is sufficiently evident that Peter was not in Antioch, else Luke must have named him among those teachers and prophets who, by the impulse of the Holy Spirit, sent away Paul and Barnabas; and the more so too, since he, as bishop, must have held the first place among them.

We see, therefore, that even in case Paul's conversion is placed in A. D. 34, yet no time can be gained for Peter's being bishop at Antioch, to say nothing of a six or seven

---

Luke, in Acts 11: 30, mentions Paul and Barnabas's arrival at Jerusalem, and in Acts 12: 1—19, relates Peter's imprisonment and deliverance, and then verse 25th, the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch.

years' office, and that this is a pure fiction. For, according to *this reckoning*, Paul's visit to Peter occurred in A. D. 37; Peter's circuit in Palestine, in A. D. 38; and, in the same year, the founding of the church of Antioch (Acts 11: 19), to which not Peter but Barnabas was sent, A. D. 39, who at first sojourned a while in Antioch *without Paul* for a companion (Acts 11: 22—24); then brought Saul from Tarsus, ver. 25, 26, A. D. 40; remained a year with him in Antioch, A. D. 41; and, according to the view of those authors, in A. D. 42 travelled with Paul to Jerusalem, verse 30, where they were present during Peter's imprisonment (Acts 12: 1 and 25). But if (as, by our reckoning above, we must do) we place Paul's conversion in A. D. 37 or 38, then that idea of Peter's bishopric is nothing but folly. For then Paul's first visit to Peter would take place in A. D. 41, and Peter's circuit in Palestine in A. D. 42, in which year those authors place his departure to Rome.<sup>1</sup>

As a specimen of the arbitrariness and superficial way in which the Ultramontanists, and even the *most celebrated* of them go to work when they are aiming to attain their object, we will examine more closely the method of proof adopted by Baronius and Natalis Alexander:

Baronius, to establish an apparent ground for Peter's bishopric at Antioch, maintains that, on the above-mentioned circuit, he came to *Antioch*, and there founded a church and placed himself as bishop at its head; although Luke, as we have shown above, limits that circuit *expressly* to Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, and ascribes the founding of the church at Antioch to the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, scattered abroad *precisely at this time*, and to Barnabas and Paul.

---

<sup>1</sup> That the story of a bishopric of Peter at Antioch assuredly from A. D. 38 to 44 is absolutely untenable because it cannot be harmonized with the Acts of the Apostles, the very learned Jesuit Halloixius admits in the life of Ignatius, Vol. I. c. 2. "Si S. Petrus," he says, "ante haec tempora fuisset Antiochae, ibique ecclesiam fundasset, sedemque suam statuisset, S. Lucas capite XI. actorum facta proxime Petri mentione debuisset non tantum de viris illis Cypriis et Cyrenaeis loqui" (i. e. those who first preached the Gospel at Antioch), "sed multo magis de Petro, si quidem tamdiu ibi fuisset, ut jam tum haberetur Antiochensis episcopus. Itaque nondum eo venerat.

Natalis Alexander makes out as badly, and even worse : First, by a truly ridiculous course of argument he attempts to prove that Paul's conversion took place in A. D. 34, and his visit to Peter in A. D. 37 ;<sup>1</sup> then he maintains, *without adducing the slightest proof or reason*, that Peter left Jerusalem *immediately* after this visit and went to Antioch, though Luke states precisely the contrary (Acts 9: 31 etc., x., 11: 19, etc.). He indeed *attempts* a proof, but it cannot be so called. "Saint Leo," he says,<sup>2</sup> "writes in his letter to Anatolius, that the name of Christians first arose in the Church of Antioch through the preaching of Peter. But this could not be true, unless Peter came there in the same year in which Paul reached there, when indeed 'the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch.'" Such nonsense is from the pen of the learned Natalis !

"The second journey of St. Paul to Jerusalem," he goes on, "which he made with Barnabas, during the famine prophesied by Agabus, at which time Peter also was put in prison, took place in the *eleventh* year after the crucifixion of Christ, i. e. in the *second* year of Claudius. Hence it is clear that between Paul's first and second journeys to Jerusalem,<sup>3</sup> there are seven years, five full years and the first and seventh incomplete. These seven years Peter must have spent at Antioch."

It is remarkable that Natalis should not once have known what he might have learned from any Chronological Outlines, the fact that this second year of Claudius, who came to the empire in A. D. 41, after Caligula's death, is A. D. 42; and that, further, in this second year he has placed Peter's imprisonment, which belongs to the *fourth* year of Claudius. So there were nine years for Peter's bishopric at Antioch.

But Natalis does still worse, page 176, col. 2. : "St. Peter," he says, "founded the church of Antioch in the last year of Tiberius, A. D. 37, in the *fourth* after the death of

<sup>1</sup> Dissert. XIII. T. III. edit. Ferrariae, fol. p. 172, col. 2, at the close.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, the last lines and beginning of p. 173.

<sup>3</sup> After the second visit Peter may have directly left Jerusalem and gone to Rome, to wit, in A. D. 42.

Christ, as Eusebius and the Alexandrine Chronicle testify; but he appears to have established there only a church of the *Jews*, and not of the Gentiles. For the gospel was first preached to the Gentiles in that city *some time after*, by the disciples who shared in the persecution in which Stephen, the first martyr, was stoned (Acts xi.). But the report of this (namely, that many of the Gentiles had received the faith) came to the ears of the church of Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas to Antioch, and a great multitude were converted to the Lord. Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek for Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch, and both remained a whole year with the church there. After this year had passed, they bore alms to Jerusalem at the time of the famine prophesied by Agabus. At this time, Herod cast St. Peter into prison."

We see what trash these otherwise worthy men wander after, when they give themselves up to their party prejudices. Therefore already, in A. D. 37, Peter must have founded a church at Antioch, one indeed of Jewish Christians, and this before those scattered abroad by the persecution of Paul (Acts xi.) had come to Antioch! Such fables must be hung upon the Acts of the Apostles, merely to satisfy the whims of the Ultramontanists.

And now what contradictions these are! This same Natalis who, on page 176 of his work, rates Calvin so dictatorially because he placed Paul's conversion in A. D. 36, and who, almost with violence, refers it back to A. D. 34, here places the persecution in which Stephen was put to death (and which was before the conversion of Paul) a year before the second journey of Paul to Jerusalem, during the famine predicted by Agabus and Peter's imprisonment, i. e. in the time of Claudius, i. e. *after* A. D. 41, or exactly in 44!

#### § 5. *Origin of the story of Peter's bishopric at Antioch—Old Witnesses*

At a very early date, ambition had already crept into the Christian church. At the time when the dignity of metro-

politan, primate, and patriarch were *formed*, everything was sought out which might lend them authority and impart to them honor. To this period especially belongs the tracing back of the origin of a church or office to a particular apostle. And here, in general, their endeavors were directed to the two most celebrated and well known, Peter and Paul. And as since the third century, in which the above-mentioned degrees of rank of the episcopate were formed, the Romish church, which was the *first* on account of the pre-eminence of the city, make Peter their founder and first bishop; so the two other churches which, as next in rank, vied with the Romish, viz. those of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, likewise sought to prove Peter their founder, in which they might hope to succeed as, according to Galatians ii., he was once actually in Antioch. But it was not till in the fourth century that a pretension which made Peter founder and first bishop of Antioch in the face of Acts 11: 19, etc., could actually succeed; for, up to that time the feeling for historic criticism was so great that it could not be conquered.

Let us now look at the testimony on which the Ultramontanists sustain themselves; and here Natalis Alexander, evidently one of the most sound and learned, shall serve as the source of authority. Natalis, p. 177, quotes these passages:

1. S. Ignatii, ep. 12, ad Antiochaenos: *Mementote Evodii beatissimi patris vestri, qui primus post apostolos gubernacula ecclesiæ vestræ sortitus est* — “Remember your most blessed father Euodius, to *whom* first after the apostles, was allotted the government of your church.” This letter is an interpolated one. Natalis admits it. Besides, there is in this passage nothing of Peter: it says nothing else than that *Euodius* was the *first* bishop of Antioch.

2. Eusebius, L. iii. 16. Porro Evodius *primus* fuit Antiochiæ Episcopus, secundus Ignatius, qui illis temporibus multum hominum sermonibus celebratus fuit — “Moreover Euodius was the *first* bishop of Antioch, Ignatius the second, who was greatly celebrated at that time in the discourses of men.” Here is nothing of Peter; indeed in naming *Euo-*

dius the *first* bishop of Antioch, he decidedly denies that Peter was the first bishop there.

3. Hieron. in Catalogo : Ignatius Antiochiæ ecclesiæ *tertius* post Petrum apostolum episcopus — “ Ignatius, the *third* bishop of the church of Antioch after the apostle Peter.” Here then, for the *first* time, Peter makes his appearance as bishop of Antioch. Jerome wrote after A. D. 400.

4. Chrysostomus, homil. de Laudibus S. Ignatii : Ignatius S. Petro in episcopatus dignitate successit. Nam ut, si quis e fundamentis magnum lapidem eruat, alterum ei parem in ejus loco conatur constituere ; alioqui totum edificium labascet et corruet ; ita, cum Petrus Antiochia esset discessurus, alterum Petro parem preceptorem gratia Spiritus substituit, ne inchoata jam ædificatio successoris contemptu debilior fieret — “ Ignatius succeeded St. Peter in the dignity of the episcopate. For, as if any one tear away a mighty stone from the foundations, he endeavors to place another equal to it in its place ; otherwise the whole fabric may slide and fall to ruin ; so, when the apostle Peter left Antioch, the Spirit graciously substituted another teacher equal to Peter, lest the begun building should be weakened from contempt of the successor.” Chrysostom writes this as a presbyter of Antioch. With him it is not Euodius but Ignatius who is the first successor of Peter. With so little firmness does the succession stand.

---

<sup>1</sup> To what inconsistencies bald Ultramontaniam conducts even otherwise able men, a single example may show.

We have seen, that some make not Euodius but Ignatius the first bishop of Antioch. To harmonize the two accounts, Natalis, p. 177, col. 2, says : “ From this indeed it is understood that St. Ignatius was ordained bishop of Antioch by St. Peter, that he might discharge the Episcopal office in that city *for a time*, but not up to *his death*. That I may assert this, I infer from a conjecture which I draw from Book VII. of the Apostolical Constitutions, though I know they are not altogether unquestionable. They are decidedly spurious, and belong to the fifth century. We read there, c. 46, Euodius was created bishop of Antioch by St. Peter and Ignatius, so by St. Paul. *not indeed one after another, but at the same time*. Which, indeed, I conjecture, was then done when the dissension was excited among the believers who were of the circumcision and those who had come to the faith from the Gentiles. Then the remedy was applied, that as long as this state of things existed both should have a see at Antioch, and *one* of them should preside over those of the circumcision, but the *other* over those who should come

5. Theodoret, in dialogo : *Immutabilis ; De illo enim Ignatio omnino audisti, qui per magni Petri dextram pontificatum, suscepit* — “ You have heard concerning that Ignatius who received the pontificate by the hand of the great Peter.”

6. Felix III., in Ep. ad zenon. imperat. : *Ignatium dextera Petri esse ordinatum Antiochenæ sedis episcopum* — “ Ignatius was ordained bishop of the see of Antioch by the hand of Peter.”

7. Conc. Rom. sub Damaro : *Tertia vero sedes apud Antiochiam apostoli Petri habetur honorabilis, eo quod illam primitus quam Romam venit, habitavit, et illic primum nomen Christianum novellæ gentis exortum est* — “ The third see, at Antioch, is regarded as honored through the apostle Peter, because before he came to Rome he occupied it, and there first the name Christian, of a new nation, had its origin.”

8. S. Leo, Serm. I. in nat. apost. : *Jam Antiochenam, b. Petre, ecclesiam, ubi primum Christiani nominis dignitas exorta est, fundaveras* — “ Thou hast now, O blessed Peter, founded the church of Antioch, where first arose the dignity of the Christian name.”

9. Greg. I., Epist., L. vi. 37 : *S. Petrus firmavit sedem, in qua septem annis quamvis discessurus sedit* — “ St. Peter established the see in which he sat for seven years, though he was to leave it.”

We see what is the weight of these testimonies — just nothing at all ; they are from the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. Peter’s bishopric at Antioch is shown to be, in all respects, a fable.

---

into the church from the Gentiles. But that wall of division being at length removed and both parties united into one assembly, there was no longer need of two, but of one bishop only. Then Euodius remained in that sacred office, to whom Ignatius willingly yielded as Clemens did to Linus in the church at Rome. To such nonsense, yea, to the invention of a schism in the church of the apostles, these men have recourse in order to confirm their fables.

§ 10. *Time of the Council at Jerusalem.*

We proceed with our investigations respecting Peter's abode. We have seen above, that Peter, up to about A. D. 45, when Herod put him in prison at Jerusalem, had not left Palestine. We will now see where he was from this time onward.

Luke indeed relates, that Peter in the same night when he was freed from prison by an angel, left Jerusalem (Acts 12: 17) — "And he departed and went into another place;" but in this it is not said that he went to Rome. If this had been the case, Luke would certainly have mentioned it; indeed he would have said he went to another *country*; another *place* indicates only a journey to another *city* in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. We may then properly suppose that Peter, having from fear of Herod left Jerusalem, betook himself to another city of *Palestine*, which lay in that portion not under Herod's sway. And since Herod, as Luke relates (Acts 12: 20—23), immediately after died at Cæsarea, so nothing prevents us from supposing that Peter returned again to Jerusalem, the centre of his activity hitherto. This is probable, also, even in case that Peter had intended to leave Palestine and go to Rome. Such a journey, too, he could not enter on before A. D. 46, nor complete it before A. D. 47. But Peter certainly had not, at that time, undertaken this journey. In the first place Luke says nothing of this journey; and, though he is occupied from A. D. 45, after chapter xii., mainly with Paul, and is silent as to Peter, yet from this silence a journey to Rome cannot indeed be deduced, as in chapter xv. he introduces Peter as a member of the church of Jerusalem. Let us now look further:

Although it cannot be ascertained when Claudius forbade to the Jews admission to Rome (Suet. Claud., Acts 18: 2), yet it may be supposed that it took place in the first year of his reign. And even if we assume, with Baronius and Natalis, that this prohibition was in the *ninth* year of Claudius, yet it would only allow a two-years' abode of Peter at Rome,



namely, from A. D. 47 to A. D. 49. But this cannot be assumed.

From Galatians 2: 7, and many other passages of Scripture, it is evident that the preaching of the gospel among the Jews was especially entrusted to Peter, as that of preaching it to the Gentiles was to Paul. Both of Peter's Epistles are directed to churches which he had formed of *Jews* in Asia Minor. In accordance with this his special calling, Peter was particularly pointed to the East; for here dwelt the Jews: first, in Palestine; then, in Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Media, Parthia, Egypt, and Asia Minor, as is evident from Acts 2: 10, 11. Now Peter had just turned to the Jews in Palestine; we have seen above that, up to A. D. 45, he had not yet passed out over the boundaries of Palestine. How can we then suppose, that wholly leaving aside and neglecting the other numberless Jews of the East, he had turned himself immediately to the West, *to Rome, the seat of the Gentiles*, where there were hardly any Jews (for it was first after the destruction of Jerusalem that they spread themselves in *large numbers* in the West)? It would, at all events, be strange if, merely to support the Ultramontanist fable of Peter's twenty-five years' bishopric in Rome, to say nothing of the Holy Scriptures and the oldest fathers, any one should assume that Peter had, at the very outset, become untrue to his calling to labor in the East, among Jews, where the harvest was so great, and turned to the Gentiles, whose apostle Paul preëminently was. If any one (for which there is absolutely no reason) will make Peter actually take his departure from Jerusalem and Palestine in A. D. 45 or 46, why should he exactly then journey to Rome, of which journey the oldest and most certain sources of authority mention nothing, and not to the *East*, where we find the Babylon from which Peter's first Epistle is dated; or to Asia Minor, where were many churches to whom Peter addressed his Epistle? Why must he, as we might say, per force travel off to Rome?

But we can pass in silence over this journey which, at least for the time named, has never risen above the rank of

a groundless hypothesis. As we find Peter still in Jerusalem in A. D. 45 (Acts xii.), so he makes his appearance again here in chapter xv., and at the council which the apostles here held in reference to the circumcision of the Gentile Christians. At this council we find, once more, all the apostles together; afterward, never again: a proof that Jerusalem *hitherto* had been the central point to which they always returned (as did also Paul) from their excursions into neighboring regions, and which they now appear to have definitively left in order to scatter themselves abroad in the whole world. We hence conclude that Peter also, up to this time, had not left the churches of Palestine. Why should we suppose a journey to Rome, of which no authority makes any mention? How could he, then, be again in Jerusalem at the time of the council?

But Bellarmin, Baronius, Natalis Alexander, etc., know of an expedient. They say that precisely then Claudius had banished the Jews from *Rome*, and *on this account* Peter returned back to Palestine. But where does this stand written? What authority has transmitted it to us? It is nothing but an empty, airy opinion of these men. And now granting that this edict of the emperor was issued precisely before that time of the council of Jerusalem, what then justifies us in concluding that it caused Peter to flee from Rome, i. e. from fear of men, to leave his church and be untrue to his calling? Who can say that the edict affected *him*, as he was not a *Jew* but a *Christian*, and as such presented to the former a remarkable contrast? And though he had now left Rome, why must he, precisely then, return directly back to Palestine? Had he then convened that council, as Natalis would have it, or was it called by *the common agreement* of the apostles, in which Peter likewise took a part? or, finally, as it had its occasion in the controversy between the Gentile and Jewish Christians at Antioch (Acts 15: 1, 2), had they advised Peter thence and enabled him to leave Italy and hasten to Jerusalem to the council? <sup>1</sup> Of all these

<sup>1</sup> This could not be, as there would not be time for Peter to receive the message and to make the journey from Rome, after the arrival of Paul and Barna-

hypotheses, not one is supported by authoritative testimony. Luke simply says (Acts 15: 1, 2): "And certain men which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question."

We see that this mission followed soon after the beginning of the dissension. It was sent to the apostles at Jerusalem; the expression used indicates that they were, the *greater part* of them, in Jerusalem. Indeed it authorizes us to conclude, that up to this time Jerusalem was, among all, the supposed and well-known place of abode of the apostles. The council was held. Peter was present at it (ver. 7). Of his return from the West, nothing is mentioned; what hinders us from supposing that up to this time he never had gone thither? Indeed, the circumstance that Peter and James are introduced as the only speakers, and are represented as the principal persons of the council, allows us to conclude that they had hitherto, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, especially presided over the church of Jerusalem, at that time the centre of all, and therefore they had remained at Jerusalem. Of James it is certain, and of Peter it may be taken for granted.

Now the main question is: When was this council? For this, Paul's Epistle to the Galatians gives us the key. Paul states there (Gal. 1: 18), that three years after his conversion he went up to Jerusalem, for the *first* time, to meet the apostles; which journey Luke relates (Acts 9: 26, etc.). Gal. 2: 1, Paul says: "Then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, and took Titus with me." That this was the journey which Luke relates in Acts, chap. xv., is evident enough from Gal. 2: 3, 4, etc., and will be denied by no one.

The time of the council, therefore, is accurately de-

---

bas at Jerusalem, which gave rise to the Council, as is evident from Luke's account, and which was immediately held.—TR.

fined after the time of the conversion of Paul. If, with Natalis Alexander, Baronius, etc., we place this in A. D. 34, then the council falls in A. D. 48 or 51, according as those fourteen years in Gal. 2: 1, are reckoned from *Paul's conversion* or from his *first journey*; if we place this (Paul's conversion), as we have done, in A. D. 38 or 39, then the council (according to the different reckoning of that fourteen years) falls either in A. D. 52 (53) or 55 (56). The latter figures are plainly too late. Therefore we assume without doubt, that those fourteen years are to be counted from Paul's conversion, and not from his first visit to Jerusalem. As a reason for this, it may be justly claimed, that reckoning those fourteen years from the first visit onward, there would not remain sufficient material, from Paul's life, to fill up such a succession of years. For Paul did *not* stay long in Tarsus, and afterward he abode *one* year at Antioch (Acts 11: 26). In A. D. 45, he returned with Barnabas and Mark from Jerusalem (Acts 12: 35), and, not long after, they seem to have entered on their travels to Cyprus and Asia Minor. We must therefore, in order to fill up these fourteen years, *either* suppose that Paul spent five or six years idly at Tarsus (and this is contrary to the fact that Barnabas brought him thence soon after his arrival at Antioch, which, according to Acts 11: 19, 22, etc., occurred not long after Paul's conversion), *or*, reckon for his first mission to Asia more than five years, which is evidently too much. For this journey embraced merely Cyprus, Pamphylia, and the southern part of Lycaonia (Acts xiii. and xiv.), a tract of country which, in all, is not over a thousand German square miles, — about three thousand English square miles. There lay on the route from Perga (where Paul and Barnabas landed), through Antioch of Pisidia to Lystra, Iconium and Derbe (Acts 13: 13, 14, 51. 14: 1, 6, 7, 19), only a few cities; and they returned back again to Perga, *through the same places* (Acts 14: 20), and afterwards sailed from Attalia, which was in that vicinity, again to Antioch and Syria. If we take into consideration that on their journey to Derbe they stayed only a few days in the principal places, namely at Antioch in Pisidia one

week, at Iconium not more than some months; and that they removed not far from the main roads, we can hardly allow more than two years for this journey.

Considering all this, it is evident that we must reckon those fourteen years from Paul's conversion, and not from his visit to Jerusalem. If Paul's conversion occurred, as we have proved above, in A. D. 38 or 39, then the Council of Jerusalem is to be placed in A. D. 52 or 53. In this year, therefore, Peter had not gone to Rome. All that is maintained of this journey to Rome, is not above a mere story or fiction, at the bottom of which there lies nothing solid.

### § 11. *Peter at Antioch.*

After the Council at Jerusalem (A. D. 53), Paul and Barnabas went back to Antioch (Acts 15: 35, 36) — "Paul also and Barnabas continued in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also. And some days after, Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren, in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do." During this abode of Paul at Antioch, Peter also came there, as is shown Gal. 2: 11. This journey occurred *after* the council, as is clear from the subsequent context of the second chapter.<sup>1</sup> As

---

<sup>1</sup> This appears to me made out, and I will here briefly give the proof. Paul says (Gal. 2: 1, etc.), that he made this his journey to Jerusalem to the Council with Titus; he had brought him with him from Asia Minor after he had converted him from heathenism. Therefore Paul went to Jerusalem *after* his first return from Asia Minor. Verse 3rd, etc., he states that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised, but that he had to withstand false heathen who came in to spy out their liberty in Christ. In verse 2nd he had stated, that he came to Jerusalem in order to communicate the Gospel privately to them *who were of reputation* which he had preached to the Gentiles. With these men of reputation, among whom he names James, Peter, and John, he came to an understanding, and was acknowledged by them as an Apostle to the Gentiles. Verses 10 and 11. "Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do. But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." We see this coming of Peter to Antioch took place first *after* the Council. I cannot, therefore, agree with our excellent Hug, who places it *before* this Council, indeed, immediately after Peter's imprisonment. At that time, when Paul had not approved himself an Apostle of the Gentiles, he would scarcely have ventured on so bold a resistance against Peter.

now Peter went not directly to Antioch with Paul, but followed him there later, so it appears that his *abode* there was protracted till A. D. 54.

As after this time Luke no further mentions Peter's abode, either in Palestine or in Jerusalem, although in Acts 21: 17, 18, there was a pressing occasion for it in case Peter had stayed there; so we conclude that he travelled from Antioch to the East, to preach the gospel to the Jews of the dispersion. That, moreover, he did not then go to Rome, we will now prove.

### § 12. *Peter, after his journey from Antioch.*

If we assume, what we have proved, that Peter in A. D. 53 or 54 had not come out of Palestine and Syria, then the opinion that he went to Rome immediately after, at once falls away to nothing. Pagi and Stolberg (*Religionsgeschichte—History of Religions*, vol. vi.), influenced by the reasons which the Holy Scriptures present, and which we have explained above, regard Peter's departure from Syria and Palestine as following first *after* the Council, and agreeable to Lactantius, make him come to Rome in the beginning of the reign of Nero, and therefore in A. D. 55, and accordingly assume that he journeyed there *directly* from Antioch.

But this cannot be absolutely assumed. Peter could not pass by the Jews of the dispersion. And, though we will not here adduce his Epistle written from Babylon, in proof of his abode in Chaldea and Mesopotamia, yet its address "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," proves that Peter preached the gospel in these extended countries, and founded and set in order churches there. That for this, labor was required, not a few months merely, but a succession of years, we may conclude from the fact that Paul, on his second tour, which embraced only certain strips of South-western and Middle Asia Minor, and some points of Greece, yet spent five years. Pagi and Stolberg assume that Peter founded

the churches in such extensive tracts of country while passing along; a supposition which is irrational. It must hence follow, that Peter had not come to Rome in the beginning of the reign of Nero, that is in A. D. 54 and 55. *We will now prove that he had not yet come there up to A. D. 63.*

§ 13. *Proof from Paul's Epistle to the Romans.*

The Epistle to the Romans, according to the agreement of all the learned, was written A. D. 58. As a proof that when Paul wrote this Epistle, Peter was not bishop of Rome, and was not staying there, we first produce the fact that Paul not only gives no salutation to Peter, which must have necessarily been the case, had Peter already been bishop of that city and ruler of the whole church ever since A. D. 42 or 54; but also that only those men are mentioned who were not from Peter's school. Mark, Peter's favorite and constant companion, is not once named. In fact, we must assume either that Paul had no knowledge of Peter's abode in Rome and his bishopric there, or that the omission of a salutation to him supposes a gross want of respect, which was unworthy of Paul.

But, say Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Rothensen, and others, the omission of the salutation to Peter, Mark, etc., proves nothing: Paul might have known that Peter, exactly then, was absent from Rome on an apostolical mission. For, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, he does not salute Timothy, nor in the Epistle to the Hebrews, James, though the former was undoubtedly at Ephesus, and the latter in Jerusalem.

Both these resorts are good for nothing. For whence do we know that Paul was aware of Peter's absence? How can any one have recourse to an hypothesis for which there is not the semblance of a reason to be discovered? As to what relates to the second resort, namely, the salutations to Timothy and James, omitted in the two Epistles named, the case is wholly different. For, in the first place, in his Epistle to the Hebrews Paul salutes *no one* as he does

in the Epistle to the Romans, but "them that have the rule over you and all the saints," in general; the Epistle to the Ephesians absolutely bears no salutation. The Epistle to the Hebrews was not written to the church of Jerusalem where James was, but to *all the Jewish Christians in general*, and consequently a salutation to James as an *individual*, would have been very strange. But that Paul, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, did not salute Timothy, lies simply in the fact that Timothy was not at Ephesus, *but was with Paul at Rome*. This is proved thus: the Epistle to the Ephesians was written by Paul in his imprisonment at Rome (which lasted from A. D. 61 to 63), as is evident from 3: 1. 4: 1. 6: 20; and Natalis Alexander, p. 45, also admits it. *At the same time*, Paul wrote *from Rome* his Epistle to the Philippians (Phil. 4: 22) and the Colossians (Col. 4: 10, etc., compare with Acts 27: 2), as is likewise said in both of them clearly enough; and this Natalis admits, in the place cited. But now *both* of these Epistles begin: *Paul and Timothy*, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ at Philippi (and Colosse). Therefore Timothy was, at that time, at Rome with Paul when he wrote this Epistle to the Ephesians. Timothy also, in A. D. 65 or 66, when Paul wrote his second epistle to him from Rome, *was not in Ephesus*, as is expressly said, 4: 12.

What now shall we say of those men who make such objections, namely Natalis Alexander, who, to judge from what he writes p. 45, well knew that Timothy was not at Ephesus when Paul wrote thither. Here also it is plain that these men, when they are aiming to reach their party objects, reject on one side what they have written on the other.

And now, once more. Paul praises the Romans very much on account of their faith, which is spoken of throughout the whole world; he commends the laborers in the Romish vineyard of the Lord; and would he have forgotten to mention him from whom they had received the treasure of their faith, namely Peter? Would he have named the laborers, but be silent as to him who was their head?



§ 14. *Proof from the Acts of the Apostles.*

In A. D. 58, therefore, Peter was not yet in Rome. Let us now see whether he was there in the following years, up to A. D. 63. It is well known that Paul, when he had appealed to Cæsar, was carried to Rome. This happened, according to the universal opinion, in A. D. 60; and from A. D. 61 to 63 he remained in the capital of the world, two whole years. Luke describes his journey there Acts 27: 28, and in 28: 30 he relates that abode. Now there are in his narration several points of importance, from which it is evident that Peter was not, at this time, in Rome.

1. Though Luke reports at length Paul's arrival at Rome, and mentions his abode there, yet he says not a word of Peter. He relates (Acts 27: 15) how the Roman church went out to meet him at Appii Forum and the Three Taverns; not a word of Peter.

2. Luke further mentions (Acts 28: 17, etc.), that Paul, three days after his arrival at Rome, caused the chief of the Jews to be called to him. When they came to him, it is evident that they were still unacquainted with Christianity, because that it had not yet been especially preached to them. For they said, verse 22: "But we desire to hear of thee *what thou thinkest*; for as concerning *this sect*, we know that it is everywhere spoken against." 23. "And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him to his lodging, to whom he expounded and testified of the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening. 24. *And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not.*"

We see, that the gospel *had not yet been particularly preached* to the Jews at Rome. The church at Rome had hitherto not attempted their conversion; we shall see, further on, that it was yet very small in A. D. 58.

If Peter was at this time (and indeed, as is maintained, had been for many years) at Rome, *how could he to whom was specially committed the gospel to the Jews, have given*

*himself so little trouble about them, or have spoken with so little power, that they were first converted at the word of Paul?*

3. Luke's silence here is actually fatal. If Peter was then at Rome; if he had already been there twenty years, and indeed as bishop of this church; if he held the rank of the head of the whole church, how is it possible that Luke could have been silent respecting it? There is a silence, indeed, from which no negative proof can be adduced: thus, for example, when one Gospel passes over this or that event in the life of Christ. But what one omits, another has; they need not all narrate the same thing; a single one is enough. Besides, the most important, the main fact, is in all. But when Luke is silent as to Peter's presence at Rome, and when he *can* and, according to circumstances, he *must* speak of it, we justly conclude that he did not find Peter at Rome. The force of this negative proof appears yet stronger in the following considerations; for Paul, too, is silent.

§ 15. *Proof from the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians, to Philemon, and the Hebrews.*

All these Epistles were written by Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, in A. D. 61 to 63. Of the four first, it is proved, because it stands therein in plain words; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is probable: chap. 13: 24, "The brethren from Italy salute you." If these Epistles prove anything, they prove irresistibly that Peter, at the time when Paul wrote them, was not in Rome, and had not been. Let us see:

1. If we go carefully through the first four Epistles, we find the clearest and most varied expressions and notices respecting the state of the church at Rome, of Paul's relations, and of persons and things. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (6: 21, etc.), Paul sends *Tychicus* to them, that he may make known to them all things respecting his situation and circumstances. In the Epistle to the Philippians (1: 12, etc.) he mentions the progress of the gospel at Rome, how it penetrated to the camp of the Pretorian guards, and even to the

imperial court (4: 24). He says (1: 14): "And many of the brethren in the Lord, *waxing confident through my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear*; that "some indeed preach Christ of envy and strife, and some of good will;" that these preach, inspired by love, knowing he was set for the defence of the gospel; but the others of strife, and not sincerely, to add affliction to his bonds.

We see that Paul had in his eye the Jewish Christian zealots, like those of Antioch whom he met so boldly and so successfully, as is evident from Acts xv. and Galatians ii. This party opposed him in Rome; they could not endure that he should receive the Gentiles without circumcision; they pretended he would abolish the law, and on this account they acted against him.

If we here suppose that Peter was at that time, and indeed for a long time had been, bishop of Rome and governed, as the head, not only this but also the whole church, how could the brethren *first* be made more courageous by *Paul's bonds* to preach boldly the gospel? How could it *first by Paul*, have penetrated to the Pretorian camp and the court of the emperor? And further, could Peter have developed so little power, energy, and authority during his long rule, that *under his very eyes*, the envy and hypocrisy of the *Jewish Christians*, his immediate disciples, should rise against Paul, and could they have carried out, openly and unpunished, the foul purpose *to add affliction to his bonds*? Shall we suppose that he had anew, at Rome, as formerly at Antioch, suffered himself out of weakness to be carried away by the zealots, and had forgotten the decrees at Jerusalem which were given by the Holy Spirit? We cannot allow ourselves to imagine such things of Peter; and had he really been in Rome, with his power, his fiery zeal, he would have carried the gospel to the Pretorian camp and the court of the emperor, and not only protected his beloved fellow-laborer Paul against every conflict and aspersion by the Christians, but would have severely punished them by his power as bishop of the place.

In the *second* chapter, from ver. 17 and on, Paul makes

known to them his purpose to send *Timothy*, whom he greatly praises (ver. 19—24), to them, in order that he might give them information respecting him; he mentions that he had also sent to them *Epaphroditus*, of whose activity and loving care for him, and his dangerous illness, he gives a full account (25—30). Similar information respecting his friends *Silas* and *Clemens*, and of himself, he gives in the fourth chapter. We see (ver. 10), that Paul in his prison was supported by the church at *Philippi*; that they sent to him a maintenance directly through *Epaphroditus* (18), and *that before it reached him he had suffered want* (11, etc.), which was doubtless occasioned by those zealots. How is this, now? And yet Peter had already lived many years in Rome as bishop, and though there were rich people in his church, had not once cared for the necessities of his beloved fellow-apostle, had not once impelled the Romans to do their utmost to lighten the condition of the prisoner! We cannot believe this of such a man as Peter was.

Also in the Epistle to the Colossians, there are not wanting similar notices. They stand in the fourth chapter, 7th verse. Here, too, Paul gives them information, by *Tychichus*, of his situation, his welfare, etc. If, now, we cast back a glance on what we have cited, the conviction forces itself upon us, that Peter was not, at that time, in Rome. Of *his own* merits in spreading the gospel, Paul speaks; of *Peter, who yet founded that church, carried it forward, and must at that time have long governed it*, he is wholly silent. Of *himself*, and *his friends*, he often gives full information; of *Peter, the head of the church and of Peter's disciples, not one word*. Is it possible that Paul, during two years' abode at Rome, where he *must* have met Peter innumerable times, and where he *could not but* take notice of him, in so many Epistles makes mention in not a word, not a syllable, of him, if Peter really was there? We must suppose that Peter and his friends were wholly indifferent to Paul, yea, that he looked on him with envious eyes; and hence Paul passed over them and their labors in silence.

## § 16.

But this stands out yet more strongly in the following: In most of these Epistles, Paul gives information of *his* disciples and fellow-laborers; he names a multitude of them; he conveys to those to whom he is writing, salutations from them. We have already seen this above. Let us look at it further.

Philippians 4: 21, "Salute every saint in Christ Jesus. The brethren which are with me greet you." Colossians 4: 10—14, "Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him), and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me. Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always laboring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God. For I bear him record that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. Luke the beloved physician, and Demas greet you." Philemon, ver. 23, 24, "There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus; Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-laborers." Hebrews 13: 24, "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you."

From all these friends and acquaintances he conveys salutations; *from Peter and his disciples*, none; from them, not a word. How is this? Were not the two apostles and their disciples on terms of mutual friendship? Were they estranged? Had they no intercourse together? Were they excluded from each other? Was there enmity and jealousy between them? Or were the churches of Colosse, Philippi, Ephesus, and in Palestine so much strangers to Peter and his friends, so indifferent, that they had no testimonies of Christian friendship and sympathy, i. e. salutations for them? Or did Paul suppose in those churches such an indifference

and want of sympathy in respect to Peter and his friends, that he believed nothing ought to be said by way of information or salutations from them? Indeed, we must have lost all common sense and regard for truth if we maintain, under these circumstances, that Peter and his disciples were with Paul at Rome in A. D. 61—63, when he wrote these Epistles.

And when now Paul says (Col. 4: 10, 11), that at Rome Aristarchus, Mark, and Justus were his only fellow-laborers of the circumcision,<sup>1</sup> is it not thus clearly enough said that he had neither Peter nor his Jewish disciples for fellow-laborers in the world's capital? Or must we call in to our aid the assertion that Paul speaks here only of *his own disciples*, but makes no mention of Peter and his disciples because he had no occasion for it? We leave any one who will, to satisfy himself with such an excuse.

But Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Rothensen, etc., object: From the silence of Paul, in these Epistles, nothing follows against Peter's abode at Rome; he was not wont always to be at Rome; "he was not, like Prometheus, on the Caucasus, so tied down to his see;" and sat in it not idly, "as an Emeritus," but he went from Rome into all the surrounding countries; he penetrated even to Britain to preach the gospel. Why not then suppose that when Paul wrote, in A. D. 58, to the church at Rome, and abode there from A. D. 61 to 63, he (Peter) was on these apostolic travels? Why may we not assume this to explain those temporary absences that are proved by the silence of Paul?

Answer: We may not, because of these travels not *a single one of the credible authorities* mentions a syllable; and they are but empty hypotheses which are foisted into the history, as foolish as they are presumptuous. Then, again, because in the authorities named, there is not a trace of Peter's relations at Rome, or of his activity there; as we shall fully adduce hereafter. We may therefore justly conclude that Peter was not in Rome in A. D. 61—63.

---

<sup>1</sup> Namely, at Rome; otherwise it is untrue, for in other regions Paul had helpers enough of the circumcision.

§ 17. *Peter was not in Rome also in A. D. 65 and 66.*

After Paul was released in A. D. 63, he left Rome. Whether, as he proposed in his Epistle to the Romans, he went to Spain, is not to be ascertained; but it is not very probable. For, assuming that Paul had really travelled to Spain, nothing is more certain than that he would have stayed several years in this great and populous country (Spain with Portugal was larger than Asia Minor), which, especially in the south, was covered with large cities. But as now Paul's death, according to Pagi, took place in A. D. 65 — but according to the supposition which makes Peter to have come to Rome in the second year of Claudius, i. e. in A. D. 42, to have been bishop there for twenty-five years, and suffered martyrdom there with Paul — falls in A. D. 67; as, further, we find the apostle of the Gentiles, after his deliverance, again in Macedonia, Greece, Asia (2 Tim. 4: 20), and Crete;<sup>1</sup> as he spent a whole winter in Nicopolis where he called Titus to come to him (Tit. 3: 12); as, finally, Paul was certainly not imprisoned and put to death *immediately* on his arrival in Rome; and much more, assuredly for a time preached the gospel openly; which is evident enough from 1 Tim. 1: 3, 14; so there is no room for an *apostolical* journey to Spain. We take it for granted therefore, that Paul after his departure from Rome turned himself immediately to Greece and Asia.

If now we consider the great extent of the tracts of country in which Paul labored after his departure from Rome; if we think how much time a simple journey from Rome to

---

<sup>1</sup> Titus 1: 5. That Paul in all former years had not been at Crete *in person*, is evident from Luke's accurate description of Paul's journeys, in which he does not mention any excursion to Crete. From Titus, in the place above cited, it is evident that *he was there together with Titus*. If any one should refer to Acts 27: 7, 8, and especially verse 21, it is evident (and from verses 8—14, also), that the ship in which Paul sailed was only forced by bad weather to run into Crete, but that she sailed directly again, and Paul who was a prisoner in the ship certainly did not receive permission to preach the Gospel. Besides, Titus was not at that time in Paul's company; according to Acts 27: 2, he had only *Aristarchus* with him; therefore he could not then *have left Titus behind* in Crete.

Crete and back through Greece, Macedonia, and Asia Minor already required; if we reckon, in addition, the considerable stays he made at Crete, Ephesus, Nicopolis, and Philippi, where he had repeatedly promised to come again (Phil. 1: 26-2: 24); it is evident that with all these things several years might have been consumed, and that we do not err when we place Paul's second arrival in Rome in A. D. 65 or 66. Hence it follows that Paul's death must be placed in A. D. 66 or 67, but in no wise earlier than A. D. 65.

Paul was very active during this abode in Rome; we shall speak of this in the next paragraph. Of his Epistles, the two to Timothy belong to this time. When he quitted Asia for the last time and went to Macedonia, he had left him behind at Ephesus,<sup>1</sup> and Titus he left at Crete; he now calls both of them to him at Rome; but that Timothy was no longer in Ephesus, is evident from 2 Tim. 4: 12. Let us now look at these Epistles, in order to adduce our proposed proof.

The *first* Epistle to Timothy, of which nothing is more certain than that it was written at Rome, but which accord-

<sup>1</sup> Paul says (1 Tim. 1: 1-3), that he had besought Timothy, on his departure (from Asia) to Macedonia, to remain at Ephesus. Paul's first journey to Macedonia is related, Acts 16: 19, etc.; it probably occurred in A. D. 55. Shortly before, Paul had taken the young Timothy to himself (Acts 16: 1, etc.), in order to have him for his companion on his journey (verse 3). Hence it is evident, that he did not leave him behind to be the chief overseer at Ephesus, aside from the fact that the young man just now received was not ripe for such a high calling, which he first learned in company with Paul. The journey is described in verse 11, etc.

Acts 18: 18, Paul left Greece in order to travel in the East. Verse 19th, he is in Ephesus. But at this time he did not go to Macedonia, but to Syria; consequently he did not leave Timothy at this time in Ephesus. When Paul came back from the East (18: 25) he touched anew at Ephesus (19: 1), and remained there three years (19: 8, 10. 20: 31). From here he went indeed to Macedonia (19: 21), yet he did not leave Timothy behind in Ephesus, but sent him together with Erastus forward to Macedonia (verse 22), while he himself remained a while in Asia. Chap. 20: 1, he himself followed. We find Timothy on the return journey from Macedonia to Troas in company with Paul (verse 4). From now forward, before A. D. 62 or 64, Paul came no more to Ephesus and Macedonia, but he travelled from Miletus (21: 17, etc.) through Cos and Rhodes to Tyre (21: 1, etc.), and from there to Jerusalem. Whence he finally reached Rome as a prisoner. Consequently he left Timothy behind at Ephesus first after A. D. 63.



ing to 1 Tim. 3: 14 Paul composed when he was free, contains nothing relating to our subject; but the second especially does. This Paul wrote when he was a prisoner (2 Tim. 1: 8), and very probably not long before his execution (4: 6, etc.), which he foresaw. On this account he begs Timothy "to come to him *soon*" (ver. 9). Ver. 10: "For Demas has forsaken me from love of this world, and is gone to Thessalonica." See also ver. 11, 12: "Only Luke is with me. Take Mark and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry. And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus." Ver. 20: "Erastus abode at Corinth; but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick." There is assuredly the strongest proof, in these passages, that Peter was not at Rome when Paul wrote them. For if he had been there, together with Paul, if both at this time were expecting to suffer death on account of the faith, how is it possible that Paul does not mention his colleague? He names all who were united to him by the gospel; of Peter and his disciples, not one word. *He says expressly that only Luke was with him*; this would not be true if Peter also and his disciples were at Rome. It cannot be said that these were not of Paul's friends of whom he is here speaking. This objection is good for nothing; Paul speaks of those who were at Rome as *evangelists*, and among these, Peter would also have belonged; we know, too, that Paul very much hated this division into parties and schools among the apostles, as appears in the first Epistle to the Corinthians.

He salutes Titus from several persons he names, *especially* Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, Claudia; *from Peter there is no salutation*; of him who ought to be named before all, as the head of all of them, nothing. In case Peter had taken the place of a pope at Rome, what could be more agreeable to Timothy, more consoling, than a salutation from such a man? Had Peter been at Rome, could Paul really have forgotten to add this? Certainly not, if it were only to show, that between himself, the head of the Gentile Christians and Peter the head of the Jewish Christians, there reigned a harmony and peace which had not been always undisturbed.

Peter, it is well known, must have named Linus his *first* successor; Linus was a disciple of Peter. *Natalis* proves this according to his very strained method. Paul now mentions Linus; from him he greets Timothy; of Peter, he is wholly silent! Is it possible that any man can suppose Peter was, at this time, at Rome? In case he were, would not this silence, which holds Peter, Mark and all others of Peter's disciples, not worthy of mention, be a most striking proof that a division, enmity, yea an open breach, existed between Paul and his disciples and Peter and his disciples?

But here the old objection also is urged, that Peter at this time must be supposed again to be on an apostolical excursion. And this supposition is so ingenious and naïve, that we shall not venture to say anything against it.<sup>1</sup>

#### § 18. *Peter's Epistles.*

We have thus far seen, that the whole Acts of the Apostles, the collective Epistles of Paul, of which *one* was written *to* the church at Rome, and five *from* Rome, contain not a vestige of evidence that Peter came to Rome, and there for twenty-five years was bishop and governed as pope; we have found many facts accredited by those sacred writings, from which the contrary of all these opinions is evidently enough deduced. We now turn to St. Peter himself; perhaps proofs are to be found with him of his Romish bishopric.

The Romish Court and their adherents Baronius, Bellarmine, Natalis Alexander, and hundreds of others, cannot think of St. Peter at all, but as a pope, i. e. as having charge of the *whole church*, everywhere *regulating, prescribing, commanding*, and that as a leader of an army with a great train he must make his appearance in the externals of a pope of the present day. And yet nothing of all these things has been shown. Peter, on this supposition, must have been

<sup>1</sup> Especially, as according to tradition which is so great an authority with those writers, it must have been at the very time that Peter was about to suffer martyrdom with Paul at Rome. — Tr.

twenty-five years bishop and pope of Rome, and have carried the gospel to Sicily, Italy, Spain, Britain, Gaul, yea to Africa. And yet we have only *two* pastoral letters from him to the churches of Asia Minor founded by him. How is this? Could he wholly forget the Western churches; not have thought of them at all? Could he not once have prepared for them the comfort and encouragement of a single letter, with which Paul so often made glad all the churches and provinces to which he had preached the gospel? And even to the church of Rome, which it is said he left in A. D. 51, from which he was separated for so many years, namely until A. D. 65 or 66; could he have so wholly withdrawn himself from them that he should not once have visited them with a single letter of comfort and exhortation? If Peter really was bishop and pope of Rome, this conduct appears to us absolutely unworthy of him. Of this, his position and government as bishop at Rome, we now perceive nothing at all.

The two single Epistles which Peter sent out, are not two encyclical epistles to all Christendom, but, as we have already said, simple pastoral letters to the churches of Jewish Christians founded by him in Asia Minor. In both of them there is not a word to be met which proclaims the visible head of the whole church; in both, no trace is to be found of an abode in Rome. But now it is said that the *Babylon* of which he speaks 1: 5, 13 was Rome, which at that time had often been called by this name in the church, particularly in the Apocalypse; and some fathers of the church are quoted also, who by that Babylon in Peter understand Rome (Jerome, in Catal. in Marco); indeed, Natalis Alexander, together with Baronius, knows likewise the reason why Peter changes the name; he says, to wit p. 168, col. ii: "Because indeed Peter had escaped from the prison at Jerusalem, as he would not that his place of abode should be known to all; and wished likewise to consult the safety of the Christians at Rome, in order that, if this letter perhaps came into the hands of the heathen,<sup>1</sup> they might not know that there were

<sup>1</sup> He sent the Epistle not by a post, but by Silvanus.

many Christians at Rome,<sup>1</sup> and be excited to persecute them, especially since Claudius was very favorable to Agrippa the persecutor of Peter.”<sup>2</sup> Any further remark as to this statement is superfluous.

When John, in a book like the Apocalypse, names Rome by a foreign name, this cannot be objected to; it is quite natural; but in an Epistle, it would be strange, if not ridiculous. And now what necessity is there to suppose that Peter wrote his Epistle, not in Babylon but at Rome? None indeed. As the apostle of the circumcision, Peter was especially pointed to the Jews, as Paul was to the Gentiles. If Paul went through half the world to convert the Gentiles and fulfil his calling, why should not Peter have done this? Why should he not have travelled to the Euphrates and Tigris, where hundreds of thousands of Jews dwelt? why not to Egypt, where their number was not less; countries which bordered on Palestine and Syria? And in both of these regions there was a Babylon. Old Babylon yet stood, though already sunken; it was first destroyed by Gallus; *Seleucia*, on the Tigris, in *Peter's* time, was commonly called Babylon, instead of which city the Seleucidæ had long ago erected it; Stolberg also concedes this. The Egyptian Babylon was an important city, where a legion was encamped. What hinders us from supposing that Peter wrote his Epistle from this Babylon? Why must it be precisely Rome?

Let us now, further, consider the particular circumstances of this Epistle: 1 Pet. 5: 12 it is said, “By Silvanus a faithful brother, as I suppose, I have written briefly.” Therefore Silvanus had the care of delivering the letter to its address. Silvanus here does not appear as an intimate acquaintance of Peter, as his scholar, else he would not have said, “*a faithful brother as I suppose.*” This does not allow us to sup-

---

<sup>1</sup> This they might know by the sight of their own eyes; they needed not Peter's letter for it.

<sup>2</sup> He had been dead for some time, before Peter could come to Rome. But if Peter had such a design, then he ought to have named no name, but have let the salutation be given orally by Silvanus.

pose any intimate personal knowledge. Silvanus was therefore only *accidentally* with Peter, probably on business. Why not? He belonged to the Jews of Asia Minor, in whose conversion Paul had so great a share, from whom he had formed a church. Who, now, is this Silvanus? The two Epistles to the Thessalonians are superscribed: "*Paul and Silvanus and Timothy.*" There is no other Silvanus in the Holy Scriptures. Since, as the superscription above shows, he stood in the closest fellowship with Paul, as he was as intimately united with him as was Timothy, and held the same position to him, so it is certain, as is admitted by the ablest interpreters, that this Silvanus was no other than Silas, Paul's constant companion and fellow-laborer (Acts 15: 22. 16: 19. 17: 4, 14. 18: 5, etc.). As we find him no more afterwards among Paul's attendants, so it appears that he betook himself to the East, and devoted himself to the care of the Jewish Christians there, of whom he was one.

When now neither in the Epistle to the Romans, nor in those to the Ephesians and Philippians, nor especially in those to the Colossians and to Titus, which are all of them dated from Rome, is there any mention of Silas, though Paul names *all* his scholars and companions who were with him at Rome, or who came and went; since a deliberate omission of his name cannot be supposed, because next to Timothy he was the *most distinguished* of Paul's disciples, it follows that Silas was not in Rome; that he therefore could have taken no Epistle of Peter's with him *from* there to the churches of Asia Minor; that accordingly as he actually took it with him, Peter when he wrote it and gave it to Silvanus, could not then be in Rome.

Just so is it with respect to Mark, whom Peter mentions as *his own son and companion*; of his presence in Rome also, there is no mention anywhere. To assume this, is the more foolish, as they who maintain that Peter was at Rome, maintain also that he had sent Mark from *Antioch* to Alexandria, where he became bishop. And there is yet another and additional reason. Peter addresses his Epistle to the strangers scattered abroad in *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia,*

*Asia, and Bithynia.* This succession allows us to conclude, with tolerable certainty, that the province of Pontus was nearer to the writer than Asia Minor. If Peter wrote *from Rome*, it would be natural to send the Epistle first to the Christians in Asia and Bithynia; for these were situated nearest to him, and through these lay the way to the other. Therefore Peter did not write this Epistle from Rome. But if we suppose *Seleucia* on the Tigris was the Babylon from which Peter wrote, the letter sent to these churches of Asia Minor must first come to the church of Pontus; it then went from Seleucia on the great commercial road of Armenia, the only one which there was here, through Cara, Singara, Nisibis, Amida, Arsamosata to Trapezus in Pontus. From Rome it could not come *first* to Pontus.

§ 19. *The founding of the church of Rome without Peter.*

From the Holy Scriptures not the least share, by Peter, in the founding and establishing of the church of Rome can be proved; *all there is due to Paul*. But gradually some began to *associate Peter with Paul*, and to name both as *funders* of the church of Rome and then as its *bishops*.<sup>1</sup> In the course of time Peter was *placed before* Paul, the latter apostle only called a *helper*, and finally wholly *left out*, and at last it is marked out as a *heresy* to suppose that the church of Rome was built more upon Paul than on Peter.

It has already been observed above, that Peter as the apostle of the circumcision, especially and first of all was pointed to the Jews, i. e. to the East; and that his career must preëminently be assigned *here*. The pretence that Peter was directly called by the Lord, to bring the heathen into the faith of the gospel, has no weight. *That this was no special commission to Peter, but to all the apostles and disciples*, is evident from the opinion then prevailing among all Jewish Christians, and clearly admitted by Peter (Acts x.), that the gospel was destined only for the *Jews*, not for the

<sup>1</sup> See the Second Chapter of the First Book of my Treatise on the Primacy of the Bishops of Rome.

*Gentiles.* Paul the apostle was raised up just at this time.

In the whole of the Acts of the Apostles, and in the writings of Scripture, nothing is to be found which intimates Peter's destination to the West, to Rome; but Paul was chosen, by the Lord himself, for the capital of the world. This inward spirit already impelled him early toward Rome; he testifies to this fully: Rom. 1: 10—16, "Not to the Greeks only, but also to the barbarians," to those who are not Greeks, i. e. to the Latins, was he "a debtor." (Compare Rom. 15: 23—25, where he declares his whole circle of operation in the East as closed.) This thought never left him; Rome always lay before his eyes as the goal of his course, as the theatre of his call to the Gentiles. "After I have been at Jerusalem, I must see Rome also" (Acts 19: 21).

Finally, the *voice of the Lord himself* points him to Rome; here must he preach the gospel: "Be of good courage, Paul," it said to him, "as thou hast borne witness for me at Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness of me at Rome also" (Acts 23: 11). Where do we find such testimonies of Peter? There is not a single trace of one.

We now pass over to the Church of Rome. The founding of this church must have taken place after the first dispersion of the disciples; and we certainly shall not fail in correctness, if we place it not before A. D. 48. We take it for granted that, already some years earlier in the great intercourse of the world in which Rome stood, individual Christians came to Rome from Palestine and gained adherents among the Jews; but this was far from founding a community or congregation, a *church*, which could not be so easily effected in Rome, the seat of heathendom, where in general they looked with contempt on everything that came from Palestine. We reject the fable of Peter's arrival at Rome in A. D. 42, or as Natalis Alexander would have it, in A. D. 45 (according to Acts xii.)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> But according to this story which makes Peter *first* preach the Gospel in Rome, this did not take place before A. D. 45. In A. D. 38, he left Rome, say Natalis, Baronius, and others; seven years he was in Antioch; in A. D. 45, he was imprisoned, therefore he did not come to Rome before A. D. 46.

and we hold upon what is historically accredited. In A. D. 58 Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans (Natalis places it in A. D. 47), *before he had come into personal contact with them.* And yet we find *the fullest acquaintance, the most intimate intercourse, the closest connection between the apostle and the church at Rome.* The whole 16th chapter is full of it. Ver. 1—15, “I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea; that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a succorer of many, and of myself also. Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus; (who have for my life laid down their own necks; unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles) likewise greet the church that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved Epenetus, who is the first fruits of Achaia unto Christ. Greet Mary, who bestowed much labor on us. Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me. Greet Amplias, my beloved in the Lord. Salute Urbane, our helper in Christ, and Stachys my beloved. Salute Apelles, approved in Christ. Salute them which are of Aristobulus’ household. Salute Herodion, my kinsman. Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord. Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which labored much in the Lord. Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them. Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which are with them.” These passages furnish many conclusions :

1. From verses 4, 14, 15, it is evident that the church of Rome, at the time when Paul wrote this epistle, did *not yet form a completed church with a public place of assembling*; the Roman Christians came together in the houses of certain members; the most considerable of these *assemblies or conventicles*, perhaps Paul names all, were those in the



houses of *Prisca* and *Aquila*, of *Asyncritus*, *Phlegon*, *Hermas*, *Patrobas*, *Hermes*, of *Philologus*, of *Julia*, of *Nereus*, and of *Olympas*. To reckon its numbers according to this view, the church of Rome could not at that time be very large, and it could not accordingly yet be very old.

2. *Paul had not yet been in Rome, and yet he was very familiar with the circumstances of the church of Rome; he knew almost all its distinguished members.* And indeed he knew most of them *personally*, as is evident from that enumeration which we beg our readers to examine closely. How long must he have already stood in connection with them; how often have interchanged communications with them? It appears that the Romans had directly chosen him as their patron in the Lord; had sought the spiritual, apostolic point of support in him, the apostle of the Gentiles, who had twice penetrated to their neighborhood, even to Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Illyria.

3. And if now we consider more closely these men and women whom he salutes, we find *that they were most of them Paul's intimate acquaintances and also his fellow-laborers and disciples.*

There are, first, *Prisca* and *Aquila*. He became acquainted with them at Corinth (Acts 18:1), as Jews who were driven out of Rome by the edict of Claudius; he won them for the gospel, and henceforward we see them his companions (Acts 18:26. 1 Cor. 16:19. 2 Tim. 4:19).

There is, further, *Epenetus* an *Asiatic* whom he calls *beloved*, a proof of personal, intimate acquaintance. There are *Andronicus* and *Junia* his *relatives*, who have shared with him in his *frequent imprisonments* (2 Cor. 11:23, etc.). There is *Anplias* in similar circumstances to him with *Epenetus*. There is *Urbane*, whom he calls his *fellow-laborer*, like his trusty companions *Silas*, *Titus*, *Timothy*, etc. There is *Stachys* his beloved. There is *Hcrodion*, his fellow countryman.

We cannot otherwise explain these relations than on the supposition that *all these persons were disciples and companions of Paul*, whom, when he could not, at the outset, come

to Rome, he *sent forward from him* to preach the gospel, which he afterwards finished himself. This is the more evident from the salutations of *Timothy, Luke, Jason, Sosipater, Tertius, Caius, and Erastus* added to those of Paul, who also had not yet been in Rome, and could only be so far acquainted with the church at Rome, as they were the friends and acquaintances of those who were Paul's disciples.

It is therefore established, that Paul's disciples, sent by him, founded the church at Rome; and that this founding can be in no way claimed for Peter, of whom, as of his disciples, we find no trace. This becomes perfect certainty when Paul, at the end, calls the gospel which had been preached to the Romans *his* gospel (Rom. 16: 35).

In A. D. 61 Paul himself came to Rome; he remained there two years, and he was able to preach the gospel *undisturbed* (Acts xxviii., close). What his disciples had begun and had conducted to a successful progress, he could now himself gloriously complete.

We will now see how Paul's activity was excited at Rome. *Directly after his arrival in Rome, on the third day, he began, in his own dwelling, to gain the chiefs of the synagogue for the gospel* (Acts xxix.). Luke relates how it was done, not without good success. We have seen it above. For *two whole years, he now preached the gospel to the Gentiles without hindrance* (Acts 29: 31), a proof that up to A. D. 63 Nero had not begun to persecute the Christians.

We have seen above, that at the time when Paul wrote to the Romans in A. D. 57 or 58, the church of Rome was yet *inconsiderable*, at least was yet not large. It was first increased and extended abroad by Paul's efforts and zeal.

He himself says, in the Epistle to the Philippians, that through him the gospel has been made known "in all the palace and in all other places;" that through him many of the brethren have waxed confident, fearlessly to preach the word of God (1: 12); yea, that even in the court itself he has gained followers (4: 22).

We know Paul's fellow-laborers in the gospel, those dear to him. Besides *Barnabas, Silas, Sosthenes, Judas, Sopater,*

*Secundus*, there are also *Timothy* and *Titus*, both mentioned in numberless places in the Acts and the Epistles. *Aquila* and *Prisca*, as we have seen above; *Erastus* (Acts 19: 22), *Caius* (Acts 19: 29. 20: 4. xxvii.), *Aristarchus*, *Tychicus*, *Trophimus* (Acts 21: 29. 20: 4), *Luke*, *Mark* (Acts 13: 5), *Epaphroditus*, and *Epaphras*, *Justus* (Acts 13: 7, 8), *Demas*, *Artemas*. All these men, from *Timothy* on, we find with him as fellow-laborers at Rome. They all are to be found in this position in the Epistles which he wrote from Rome. See Eph. 6: 24. Phil. 1: 1, 12. 2: 19, 23, 25. 3: 3. 4: 18. Coloss. 1: 1, 7. 4: 7, 9—12, 14. Philem. 23, 24.

At his second abode, too, for the most part, they are again with him; and they stand distinguished in the last chapter of the second Epistle to Timothy. Indeed Paul was the first who, as it were, made Rome the central point of the church; from Rome he held the West in connection with the East; his disciples went out and came back as messengers; from Rome Paul cared for the churches in Greece, Macedonia, and Asia Minor. All the men as they stand in the above-mentioned Epistles, as we have named them, were sent out from Rome by Paul to these churches. Here he mentions to Titus, whom he calls to him, that he had sent *Artemas* and *Tychicus* to the regions of the East (Tit. 3: 12), *Timothy* he calls back to him (2 Tim. 4: 12). Then he tells Timothy that *Demas* had gone to Thessalonica, *Crescens* to Galatia, *Titus* to Dalmatia, *Tychicus* to Ephesus, *Erastus* he had left at Corinth, and *Trophimus* was left behind sick at Miletus; he had Luke only still with him; therefore he should take with him *Mark* and come to Rome (2 Tim. 4: 10, etc.); *Clemens* he commends to the Philippians as a fellow laborer of his (Phil. 4: 3).

Finally, it is shown that all the important names which rendered glorious the first period of the church at Rome, *Linus* (2 Tim. 4: 21), *Clemens*, *Claudia*, *Hermas*, *Phlegon*, *Caius*, etc., were Paul's disciples; the two first pretended successors of Peter were *followers of Paul*, not of Peter.

While Paul developed such a wide-spread and deeply-penetrating activity at Rome; while there he concentrated

the action of almost the whole body of the important intellects of the church, or pointed out to them abroad the circle of operation; and while he formed, organized, founded, and governed the church at Rome, and from it lending form and aid, he made his attacks on the East and the West, *nothing is perceived of Peter, not a word is breathed of his abode at Rome, or of his activity there.* The stale conversion of the name of Babylon into Rome (1 Pet. 5: 13), is the only argument by which they venture to prove Peter's abode at Rome, his episcopate and his popedom from the Holy Scriptures. It would not pay for the trouble to waste a word on it.

#### § 20. *Recapitulation.*

A part, indeed the most important part, of our task is accomplished. For as the most important and the principal authorities respecting Peter's life and labors are the holy books of the New Testament; by proving that these not only contain no proof *for*, but many proofs *against* the abode of Peter in Rome and his bishopric there, we have without doubt performed the most important portion of our task. The witnesses which are brought from tradition, from the fathers especially, are only of a secondary rank, and are of value only so far as they do not contradict the Scriptures.

If now we review the course of investigation over which we have passed, we find that the following points are shown: Paul's conversion cannot be placed before A. D. 38. *Three years after it, therefore, A. D. 40 or 41, he visited Peter at Jerusalem, who soon journeyed to see the churches in Palestine, A. D. 42.* Paul now went to Tarsus. In this time the gospel had penetrated to Antioch; thither the apostles sent Barnabas to constitute a church there. He (Barnabas) now brought Paul from Tarsus, and they both remained a year in Antioch, A. D. 44. Afterwards they went to Jerusalem to carry alms, and *during their stay there, Peter was put in prison by Herod, in the fourth year of Claudius, A. D. 45.*

With this the opinion that Peter founded the church of Antioch and was bishop there from A. D. 38 to 44,

is overthrown; and with it the view that Peter came to Rome in the *second* year of Claudius, i. e. in A. D. 42, as Eusebius, and after him all the defenders of Peter's Romish episcopate advance, is shown to be without foundation. Thence, we have shown that it absolutely contradicts Peter's peculiar calling to preach the gospel to the Jews, when, directly after A. D. 45, he is made to travel to the West, where were only a few Jews, and to Rome; that such a supposition is not supported by a single trace of historical testimony, and is nothing but an arbitrary fiction, to sustain which requires still other fictions. For as Peter *was present at the Council at Jerusalem* (Acts xv), which Baronius places in A. D. 48, Natalis in A. D. 51, and others, with whom we agree, in A. D. 53, *and soon after met with Paul at Antioch*, so to explain this, we must have recourse again to a wholly arbitrary supposition sustained by no proof, that Peter left Rome and wandered back to Jerusalem, in consequence of the edict of Claudius which drove the *Jews* out of Rome.

We have further seen, from Paul's Epistle to the Romans, that *Peter at the time when this Epistle was written, in A. D. 57 or 58, was not in Rome*; from Acts xxviii., from the Epistles to the Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, and Philemon we have seen that *Peter also was not to be found in Rome in A. D. 61—63*; and the second Epistle to Timothy instructs us that *Peter likewise was not in the capital of the world in A. D. 65 or 66*. Finally, we have proved from the above-mentioned authorities that *not the slightest share can be shown for Peter in the founding of the church at Rome*, and, much more, that this was exclusively owing to Paul and his disciples.

The mode and manner of conducting this proof has been twofold, *positive* and *negative*. In the former we proved, that Peter was elsewhere at the time in which he is placed at Rome; in the latter, that the silence of the authorities render that residence of Peter at Rome wholly inadmissible. This kind of proof we will here now yet more accurately examine.

§ 21. *The Negative proof.*

The whole force of the negative proof has been wholly denied; let us therefore examine with what justice it is so. The negative proof rests on the principle, that if an important fact is passed over in silence by *the whole body* of contemporaneous authors, in circumstances in which they *could* and *must* mention it, the same cannot be admitted to have actually occurred. If besides now, positive proof is added to this, then the negative is thereby raised up fully into evidence. We will illustrate the subject by an example.

For many centuries it has been taken as a fact and especially has been maintained by Rome, that the apostle James, the brother of John, preached the gospel in Spain, and that his corpse lies buried at Compostela.<sup>1</sup> For centuries Europe made pilgrimages there, thousands of miracles are pretended to have taken place at this grave of St. James, and there was a time when to doubt about this grave and the miracles, would have been punished by the holy inquisition as a heresy, a crime worthy of death. And yet St. James never was in Spain. For this James, the brother of John, was already put to death in A. D. 45 by Herod (Acts 12: 1, 2), and until then he, like the other apostles, had not left Jerusalem.

So too in reference to Peter at Rome. His abode in Rome is not mentioned either in the Acts or in the apostolical Epistles; though in case Peter really was at Rome, there was not only naturally reason for such a mention in the circumstances, but it was *absolutely necessary*. We will illustrate this further: Whatever design we may ascribe to the Acts of the Apostles by Luke, the presence of Peter at Rome, in case it really took place, in case the highest rule of the

<sup>1</sup> The original Toletan Breviary celebrates this event in a hymn:

Magni deinde filii tonitrui,  
Adepti fulgent, præce matris incliti  
Utrique vita culminis insignia;  
Regens Joannes dextera solum Asiam,  
Et laeva frater positus, Hispaniam.

church of Rome was actually borne by Peter,—Luke could not and ought not to leave him unmentioned; and indeed for this reason, because it was a fact of immeasurable importance, more important than all else made known of Peter; more important than his travels to Samaria and Antioch, or than his visitation of the churches in Palestine. For by the journey to Rome, in case it occurred, the constitution of the church was definitively settled for all time. The mention of it was the more necessary, it forced itself upon him so much the more, as, at the time when Luke wrote (namely, not before A. D. 64), Peter must already have been bishop of Rome for twenty-two years.

And how often had Luke a perfectly natural occasion to mention Peter's journey to Rome and his being bishop there! First, Acts viii., where he relates the meeting of the apostle with Simon Magus at Samaria, whom he must afterwards have fought, vanquished, and annihilated at Rome. Then chap. xii., where Peter, escaping from Herod, left Jerusalem. Luke had before mentioned the journeys to Samaria, Joppa, Cæsarea, why should he not there have remarked — as Baronius, Natalis, etc., assert — that Peter took a journey to Rome? Or had not Luke known anything where Peter betook himself? Or did he who wrote twenty years after this event, fear that Peter's residence would be discovered? Then chap. xv., where Luke describes the council at Jerusalem: there he mentions how Paul, Barnabas, and others came from Antioch; how suitable it would have been to notice here, in a few words, that Peter also had just now come from Rome, the capital of the world, in time to preside over the council. As Luke had so minutely described so many journeys of Philip, Peter, Paul, Barnabas, Mark, etc., *would he have left out exactly the most important journey of all?* Finally, chap. xxviii., where Paul with Luke and Aristarchus reached Rome. There he immediately makes the Jews to come to Paul, and he preaches to them; of Peter, not a word. How natural, how fitting it would have been here to mention Peter: how they found him at the head of the church at Rome; how they were lovingly received by him,

and united themselves with him to preach the word of the Lord.

And now for Paul ! The occasions when he could and *must* have mentioned Peter's presence in Rome, his overseership of the church, were numberless, were so natural, so crowded upon him, if Peter was in fact at Rome, acted as bishop of the church there, and was clothed with the office of a vicegerent of Christ on earth, that this total silence of Paul, this complete ignoring of Peter and his disciples, his episcopal office, his preaching the gospel, as we have proved it from the authorities, *necessarily leads to the conclusion, that Paul either was full of envy and jealousy toward Peter, or that an irreconcilable obstinate quarrel existed between the two and their disciples.*

We see how weighty, how crushing, this negative argument is, from the silence of the Holy Scriptures. Baronius, Natalis, and others have felt it, and on this account sought to weaken the force of this argument. Natalis says : "The negative proofs from Luke's silence have hardly any weight ;<sup>1</sup> for otherwise the important mysteries of our faith would totter. For Matthew has nothing about the circumcision ; Mark mentions nothing of the presentation in the temple ; Luke, nothing of the new star which led the Magi to Bethlehem." (Natalis, Tom. III., Dissert. xiii., p. 174, col. 2.) That is all true ; but the circumcision, which is not to be found in Matthew, is in Luke ; he relates also the presentation in the temple, which is wanting in Mark ; and Matthew gives an account of the star of the Magi, of which the rest are silent. Thus we find it abundantly. Many facts of the life of Jesus, which one Evangelist has not, the other narrates. But an important fact of Jesus' life which *no one* of them has, will never elsewhere find credit ; and many writings of the earliest times, pretended to be made by the apostles, have been rejected as apocryphal merely on this account, because they contain matters and things which stand either in direct contradiction to the acknowledged genuine

<sup>1</sup> The prudent man omits all reference to Paul's silence, which is yet more eloquent.



Evangelists and holy writings, or are not mentioned in them. If the appearance of the star, the history of the presentation in the temple, etc., had been related by *none of the Evangelists*, and by *none of the apostles*, they must also have been rejected, at least not made matters of necessary belief.

No testimony of the fathers, made a hundred and more years afterwards, can impart credibility. As now Peter's abode in Rome, and his bishopric there, are passed over in silence in all the Holy Scriptures, though there was the most urgent necessity to mention them, the negative proof taken from this silence, is of unusual, irrefragable force, and stands like any positive one.

The opposers too kick as much as they possibly can, now, against the consequence drawn from that silence; but it is only *when* this consequence is adduced *against* them; while, *where* it affords them an advantage, they welcome any negative proof. Let us look at some examples.

The *Acta Marcelli* accuse a certain pope of open idolatry. "That is a scandalous falsehood and calumny of this most venerable pope," cries out Baronius,<sup>1</sup> for if the accusation had been true, the Donatists, and Augustines also, would not have been silent respecting it; as it would have shown in the capital of the world, before the emperor, so that what happened in the city, would have been known through the whole earth."

Irenæus writes, that the church at Rome was built up *proportionately* by Peter and Paul. That Leo Allatius will not admit, because thus Peter's authority suffers, and he boldly uses the negative argument against Irenæus. "In this matter to sustain themselves merely on the assertions of the fathers, *when other proof fails*, is wasting time and labor; for although the fathers maintain it, it is not so."<sup>2</sup>

We see from these few examples, to which hundreds might be added, how different the views of these men are in reference to the force of negative proof.

<sup>1</sup> Ad. a. 302, n. 98, 99.

<sup>2</sup> Leo Allat. de perpetuo consensu, L. I. c. V. p. 15.