

THE VICAR OF CHRIST.¹⁾

I.

Was Peter the "Prince" of the Apostles?

1. Prince, from *princeps*, means first. Peter was the first whom Christ called to be an apostle; Peter was the first to confess Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God; Peter was the first to receive the keys of the kingdom; Peter was the first

88) "Was ist Theologie?" in *L. u. W.* 14, 4 ff. Also in his annotations to Baier's Compend, and elsewhere.

89) Pieper, "Wie studiert man Theologie?" and "Walther als Theologe," in *L. u. W.* 34, 97 ff. Graebner, "What is Theology?" *THEOL. QUART.* I, 1 ff.

1) I. Was Peter the "Prince"? 1. Yes—in honor. 2. No—not in power.—II. 1. Was Peter ever in Rome? 2. Was Peter Bishop of Rome? 3. Was Peter Bishop of Rome for 25 years? 4. Where was Peter?—III. 1. Emperors knew no "Vicar of Christ." 2. Liturgies know no "Vicar of Christ." 3. Early Church Fathers knew no "Vicar of Christ." 4. Canons of Synods know no "Vicar of Christ." 5. Other acts of Synods know no "Vicar of Christ." 6. We will elsewhere try to find the "Vicar of Christ."—IV. 1. A doubtful Pope no Pope. 2. A heretical Pope no Pope. 3. An unlawful Pope no Pope. 4. A simoniacal Pope no Pope. 5. A lack-of-"intention" Pope no Pope.

with the key of the Gospel to open the door of the kingdom to the Jews on Pentecost; Peter was the first to open the door of the kingdom to the Gentiles when Cornelius was converted; Peter was first in rank of honor.

2. "Prince" also means ruler. Was Peter the "ruler and governor and sovereign and monarch and absolute master" of the other Apostles and the Church? This is stoutly held, clutched with a death-grip by the Romanists. (See Archbishop John Ireland in *North American Review*, April, 1907; Jan. 1908.)

Christ said, "All ye are brethren," Matt. 23, 8. The Pope calls himself the Lord and Ruler. Christ said, "Be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ," Matt. 23, 8. "Rabbi" and "Master" here mean teacher. The Pope claims to be the Rabbi, the Master, the only infallible teacher of religion for the whole world, the Living Voice of God. "Christ is the Head of the Church," Eph. 5, 23. The Pope claims to be the head of the Church.

Christ says, "Call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven," Matt. 23, 9. The Pope claims to be the "Holy Father." The very title "Pope" comes from "papa," father. In early days "Papa" was the title of all priests, as it is in the Greek Church to this very day, but about the year 600 the Bishop of Rome claimed the title "Papa" for himself alone.

Christ is the only foundation of the Church that is laid, or lying, *keimenos*, 1 Cor. 3, 11; Eph. 2, 20; 1 Pet. 2, 4—8. The Antichrist is a foundation lying in opposition, *antikeimenos*, 2 Thess. 2, 4.

The Pope says the Church is built on Peter; that therefore Peter is the Prince of the Apostles; that the Pope is the successor of Peter; that therefore the Pope is the Vicar of Christ; that therefore the Pope can do as he pleases; that therefore, etc., etc., ad infinitum et ad nauseam.

Christ is the mystery of godliness; the Pope is the mystery of iniquity.

Pope Pius IX in his Invitation "To all Protestants and Non-Catholics" declares: "No one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ Himself . . . built His Church in this world on Peter."

"All who are in the Church, Apostles included, are built on Peter: all who are in the Church are fed, are strengthened, by Peter. Peter rules and governs; he is the sovereign. . . . The Pope is Monarch of the Church. . . . The Pope is the Vicar of Christ." (Archbishop John Ireland, *North American Review*, Jan., 1908, pp. 11. 13.)

"What are we dealing with when we deal with the papal primacy?" asks Cardinal Bellarmine, and he answers, "We are dealing with the principal matter of Christianity." And the Jesuit Perrone says, "We are treating about the principal point of the matter on which the existence and safety of the Church herself altogether depends." De Maistre says, "The sovereign pontiff is the necessary, the only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity. . . . The supremacy of the Pope is the capital dogma without which Christianity cannot subsist." (Puller, pp. 95. 96.)

A sterling truth, if for *Christianity* he had written *Catholicism*. This is the sole foundation of the whole papacy, which is thus an inverted pyramid. If this citadel be taken, the whole cause is lost. The Indian world rested on an elephant; the elephant on a turtle; the turtle on—nothing: the Pope rests on the supremacy of Peter; the supremacy of Peter rests on—nothing.

One text to support papal pretensions is, "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep," John 21, 15. 17. But that word to Peter does not make him the absolute master of the Apostles and the supreme and divinely appointed teacher of the whole Church for all time. Paul charges all the elders of Ephesus to "Feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood," Acts 20, 28. Peter himself bids his fellow-elders, "Feed the flock of God which is among you," 1 Pet. 5, 2.

When Peter asked, "Lord, what shall John do?" Jesus

said, "What is that to thee?" John 21, 20—22. Clearly Peter had no jurisdiction over John.

Why did Christ address these words to Peter? Surely, not to make Peter and the Popes "head and chief of the Church; and that all the faithful, even Bishops, Patriarchs, and Apostles, are subject to him, and ought to be fed and ruled by him," as Cornelius à Lapide claims, for which he cannot bring any witnesses earlier than St. Bernard in the twelfth century. No, St. Cyril of Alexandria, the president of the greatest theological school of his day, gives a much simpler and better reason: Peter had grievously denied the Lord three times; three times the Lord asks Peter, "Lovest thou me?" and then He "absolves the disgrace of his sin" and reinstates him as an apostle. (Oxenham, p. 39.)

Cardinal Merry del Val, Secretary of State of Pope Pius X, himself does not think this text proves much for the supremacy of Peter, and says it is used only in addition to the other texts. (*Validity of Papal Claims.*)

Another Scripture brought by the Pope to prove his supremacy is, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren," Luke 22, 31. 32. Far from making Peter the supreme ruler, these words actually put Peter below the level of the others, as a worse offender than the rest. Christ said these words to Peter "sharply reprovng him," writes Chrysostom. The first attempt to base Peter's supremacy on these words was made by Pope Pelagius II in his *First Letter*, in 586, to the Bishops of Istria, who, in their reply, denied his teaching. Pope Agatho revived it in 680, and it appears in the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. Of the twenty patristic citations made by Bellarmine in its favor, all are quoted as from Popes, and eighteen of the twenty are from the False Decretals. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 83; Salmon, *Inf. Church*, p. 344.)

Christ's command to "strengthen" his brethren is nothing peculiar to Peter. The same word, *sterizein*, is used of Paul establishing the church at Rome, confirming the churches of

Syria and Cilicia; of Judas and Silas, confirming the brethren at Antioch; of Timothy, confirming the Thessalonian church. Rom. 1, 11; Acts 14, 22; 15, 32. 41; 18, 23. The papal explanation of "strengthen" is not found till it was invented by Bellarmine, about 1621. This prayer for Peter is so clearly personal that some Romanists do not at all rely on this passage.

Another text on which the Pope vainly tries to base his supremacy is Matt. 16, 19, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." But this same power to bind and loose is given to all the Apostles, as well as to Peter, John 20, 23; yes, it is given to all Christians, Matt. 18, 15—20.

"The authority and infallibility of the Pope depend ultimately and solely on the text, 'Thou art Peter,' Matt. 16, 18. All Roman apologists begin with this text and end with it, and when once this foundation is mined, the Church raised upon it is shown to be the weakest of ecclesiastical structures." These words of the Rev. Arthur Galton come with special force because he himself had been led to Rome by the papal explanation of this text, while a broader knowledge later forced him out of the Roman Church, when he saw how false was the papal explanation of this famous text.

The Jesuit commentator Maldonatus admits that "There are among the ancient authors those who interpret the 'rock' to mean the 'faith' or the 'confession of the faith,' by which thou hast acknowledged Me to be the Son of God, as St. Hilary, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril of Alexandria. St. Augustine, going even further, interprets the 'rock' to mean Christ Himself, since Christ is the Rock." (Oxenham, p. 26.)

Rome's rock is—quicksand. "Their rock is not as our Rock," Deut. 32, 31. "Neither is there any rock like our God," 1 Sam. 2, 2. The very fact that the Fathers differ in their understanding of the "rock" is of itself sufficient that it is a vain boast that the Church is built on Peter, and that therefore the Pope is the "absolute master" of the Church.

Tertullian is the first to say the "rock" is Peter; but he contends that it is a purely personal matter and was fulfilled by the part Peter took in the formation of the Church by admitting the first Jews on Pentecost and the first Gentile in the person of Cornelius.

If the "rock" applies to Peter personally, the Church tottered to its base when Peter denied Christ. If the "rock" applies to Peter personally and makes him the infallible guide of the Church, he led the Church astray when he rejected the doctrine of the atonement when Christ proposed to him the doctrine of the crucified Messiah.

If the "rock" in Matt. 16, 18 refers to Peter and is to be applied to the Pope as Peter's successor, then the "Satan" in v. 23, which surely refers to Peter, must also be applied to the Pope as Peter's successor, and this verse applies with destructive and stinging accuracy to a large number of the 260 Popes personally and to the spirit, methods, and policy of the Roman Court throughout its history.

A modern infallibilist tries to evade the force by alleging that the Peter of the second clause was a different person from the Simon Bar-jona, or Peter, of the first clause. (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 11.)

Mark 8, 27—34 and Luke 9, 18—23 record Peter's confession of Christ's deity, but they have never a word about the Church being built on Peter. Peter himself did not so understand it, or he would have directed his friend Mark to record it, as well as the words, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" Mark 8, 33.

The Church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, not on Peter alone, Eph. 1, 19—21. The Church has twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles, Rev. 21, 14.

The Apostles did not know that Peter was their "Ruler," for "there was a strife among them, which of them should be accounted greatest," Luke 22, 24. Christ Himself did not know that Peter was the "Ruler" of the Apostles, for He did not end the unseemly quarrel by pointing to Peter. On the

contrary, He told them heathen exercise lordship and dominion, "but ye shall not be so," Luke 22, 25—27.

When Salome asked that one of her sons might sit on the right hand of Christ and the other on the left, Christ did not refuse by saying Peter was the "Vizir of the right hand," and that no "Vizir of the left hand" would be appointed, but Christ refused on the ground that no one of them should rule over the others.

Christ puts all the disciples on the same level when He promises them the twelve thrones, Matt. 19, 27. 28. Again, when He calls Himself the Vine and them the branches, John 15, 5.

After His resurrection Christ spoke to His disciples for forty days about His kingdom, but nowhere did He appoint Peter the "Ruler" in this kingdom. On the contrary, *all* of them were to be His witnesses, John 15, 27. *All* of them were promised the Holy Ghost, John 14, 16. *All* of them did receive the Holy Ghost, Acts 2, 4. *All* of them were to preach the Gospel and baptize all nations, Matt. 28, 16—20.

Had Peter been the "Ruler" of the Apostles, he would have appointed some one in place of Judas the traitor; but he wasn't and he didn't. *The whole assembly* appointed two candidates, and *the whole assembly* cast their ballots and elected Matthias, Acts 1, 23. Had Peter been the "Ruler" of the Apostles, he would have appointed the deacons. But *the Twelve* called the multitude together, and *the whole congregation* elected the seven deacons, Acts 6.

Had Peter been the "Ruler" of the Apostles, he would have sent his Legate to Samaria, as the Pope does, but the others "sent" Peter to Samaria. Acts 8, 14.

Had Peter been the "Ruler" of the Apostles, they would not have found fault with him in the matter of Cornelius; but they did. After Peter made his explanation, they were satisfied with his action and thanked God, Acts 11, 18.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," would not Herod have killed him in place of James?

Had Peter been the "Ruler" of the Apostles, he would have given his decision when the question of the circumcision of all Christians threatened to disrupt the infant Church; but he didn't. "The Apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter," Acts 15, 6.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," he would have presided at this Council at Jerusalem; but he didn't: James presided. Why James? Because James was the Bishop of Jerusalem, as Eusebius tells us. (Bk. 2, ch. 28.) On papal theories Peter would have presided.

After "much disputing" Peter spoke; after that Barnabas and Paul spoke. "After they had held their peace, James answered" and gave the decision, which was accepted as the decree of "the Apostles, elders, and brethren," Acts 15, 23.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," Paul would have "assayed to join himself to" Peter; but Peter wasn't, and Paul didn't; Paul "assayed to join himself to the disciples," Acts 9, 26.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," Barnabas would have taken Paul to Peter; but Peter wasn't, and Barnabas didn't. Barnabas took Paul "and brought him to the Apostles," Acts 9, 27.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," Paul would have mentioned him first; but he writes, "James, Cephas, and John seemed to be pillars of the Church at Jerusalem," Gal. 2, 9.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," Paul would not have "withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed . . . walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," Gal. 2, 11—14. Cornelius à Lapide admits that Peter was in the wrong.

After this Council Peter disappears from the Acts, and Paul becomes the dominating person.

Had Peter been the "Ruler," Paul could not have written, "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest Apostles," 2 Cor. 11, 5; 12, 11. Not one is over the rest, and Paul is equal to the rest. Again Paul writes, "As I teach everywhere in all the churches," 1 Cor. 4, 17. And again, "So ordain I in all the churches," 1 Cor. 7, 17. And once again, that there

“cometh upon me daily the care of all the churches,” 2 Cor. 11, 28.

Where is the supremacy of Peter?

Had Peter been the “Ruler,” he would have said so in his writings; but he doesn’t. On the contrary, he calls himself simply “an Apostle of Jesus Christ,” 1 Pet. 1, 1. Writing to the “elders of the Church,” Peter calls himself “also an elder,” a “fellow-elder,” no more, 1 Pet. 5, 1. As an elder he expressly admonishes his fellow-elders to be “ensamples to the flock,” and not to be “lords over God’s heritage,” 1 Pet. 5, 1—4.

Had Peter been the “Ruler,” Paul could not have blamed some Corinthians for being followers of Peter, while others followed Paul and still others Apollos. But he does, 1 Cor. 1, 11—13; 3, 3—5. And Peter does not censure Paul; on the contrary, he calls him “our beloved brother Paul,” 2 Pet. 3, 15.

John lived many years after the death of Peter, but nowhere does he write about Peter as the “Ruler” of the Apostles, nor about Peter’s successors as the Heads and Rulers of the whole Church.

In the first chapters of the Acts Peter is the central figure; but he is soon overshadowed by the colossal figure of St. Paul, ch. 13—28. If the two epistles of Peter had been lost, no practical difference in the sum and color of Christian teaching would be noticeable. How, then, can Romanists call him the “Universal Teacher”? Christianity is Pauline and Johannine almost exclusively. Paul’s writings are fourteen times greater than Peter’s in bulk, and unspeakably greater in literary and theological importance. So thoroughly did the early Christians realize that St. Paul is the great Teacher of the Church that whenever they speak of “the Apostle,” they mean St. Paul; for instance, Chrysostom says, “When you say *Apostle*, at once all think of Paul, just as when you say *Baptist* they think of John.” And this is true to-day in the Oriental churches, where “the Apostle” means the book of Paul’s epistles.

Pope Leo I (*Serm.* 4, 2; *Epp.* 10, 1) says, and Cardinal

Manning in a sermon on July 3, 1887, repeats, that whatever share the other Apostles had in authority over the Church was "always in union with, and in dependence upon, Peter, who was their head." (Littledale, *P. C.*, p. 35.) But in 1 Cor. 1, 10—13 Paul sets it down as a mark of schism, this clinging to Peter, what Rome to-day sets down as the one peculiar note and test of Catholic fellowship.

From Gal. 2, 7—14 it is clear that Paul had jurisdiction over the Gentile Church, and that Peter was restricted to the Jewish Christians, and was therefore not head of the whole Church.

Paul has "kept back nothing that was profitable," and has "not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God," Acts 20, 20. 27, yet nowhere in his many writings has he a single word on the privilege or supremacy of Peter, one of the most important of all things according to the Romanists. On the contrary, Paul uses language wholly inconsistent with such authority of Peter: Rom. 1, 1—7; 11, 13; 15, 15—20; 1 Cor. 4, 14—21; 5, 3—5; 7, 17; 11, 1. 2; 16, 1—4; 2 Cor. 2, 9. 10; 11, 5. 28; 12, 11—13; 13, 1—3. 10; Gal. 1, 1; 2, 11. 12; Phil. 4, 9; 2 Thess. 3, 6. 14; 2 Tim. 2, 1. 2; Tit. 1, 5.

In his "Essay on Development" Newman admits very frankly that neither Scripture nor tradition will furnish any adequate proof of Roman doctrines; that the Pope's supremacy is a development; that the Fathers never allege the sentence of a universal pastor and teacher against the gnostic heretics; that the heathen writers are quite ignorant of such a doctrine; that the state of the primitive Church did not well admit such a universal sovereignty.

II.

1. Was Peter ever in Rome?

In the 13th century the Waldenses denied that Peter ever was in Rome. In the 14th century Marsilius of Padua, in his *Defensor Pacis*, writes: "As to St. Peter, I say that it

cannot be proved from Holy Scripture that he was Bishop of Rome; nay, more, that he was ever in Rome at all. Wonderful, indeed, it seems that according to some ecclesiastical legend . . . such things are to be said of Peter, and that Luke and Paul should make no mention of them."

Friedrich Spanheim wrote a learned work in four parts against the Roman claim.

On February 9 and 10, 1872, Gavazzi, an ex-priest of the Roman church, and some Protestant ministers in Rome, in a public debate, held that Peter had never been in Rome. (*Livius*, pp. 4. 5.) The Romanist Ellendorf denied that Peter was bishop of Rome, yea, that he had ever been in Rome. (Schick, p. 55.)

The earliest uninspired Christian writing, the letter of Clemens Romanus, merely mentions the martyrdom of Peter and Paul; but it is only fair to assume that he means at Rome. About 170, Bishop Dionysius of Corinth names Italy as the place of their death. About 200, a dialogue of Caius, the Roman presbyter, says their tombs are at Rome, and from that time this tradition reigned without a rival.

Cardinal Merry del Val, the Secretary of State of Pope Pius X, writes "that Lightfoot, Ellicott, Farrar, Westcott, and Gore, Wieseler, Harnack, Hilgenfeld, Renan, Thiersch, and Ewald all acknowledge Peter's death in Rome as unassailable, and that Lanciani, speaking as an archaeologist, declares that it is 'established beyond the shadow of doubt by purely monumental evidence.'" (*Truth of Papal Claims*, p. 25.) Seven cities compete for the honor of being the birthplace of Homer, but no city contests Rome's claim of being the death-place of Peter; and so we concede the honor to the Eternal City.

2. Was Peter Bishop of Rome?

He was not, for the very simple reason that in Peter's day there were no bishops, as we know the term. In the New Testament a bishop and a presbyter or elder mean the same thing, also in the genuine *Epistle* of Clemens Romanus, also in the earliest Church Manual, the *Didache*, or *Teaching of*

the Twelve Apostles. This is conceded by the Episcopalians Littledale (*Petrine Claims*, p. 60) and Salmon (*Infallibility*, p. 356), and by the Romanist Doellinger, who shrinks from calling Peter Bishop of Rome and says, "The office afterward called episcopal was not yet marked off." (*First Age*, II, 130.)

Jerome writes: "With the ancients presbyters were the same as bishops; but gradually all the responsibility was deferred to a single person. . . . Let Bishops beware that they are superior to presbyters—more owing to custom than to any actual ordinance of the Lord."

Augustine writes to Jerome: "Although, according to titles of honor, which the practice of the Church has now made valid, the episcopate is greater than the presbytery, yet in many things Augustine is less than Jerome." (E. G. Man, p. 123.)

Irenaeus held the Bishop of Rome was but a presbyter, Jesus Himself being the only bishop of souls. Maurus affirmed that all ministers were bishops, and all bishops were of equal rank. Theodoret says, "Christ alone is the Head of all."

Bellarmino says William, the master of Wiclif, was the first to assail the Roman bishopric of Peter.

As late as the year 180 Peter's Roman bishopric was unknown, for Irenaeus (in *Haer.* 3, 3) ascribes the founding of the Roman church to Paul as well as to Peter, and that the two of them gave the office of bishop to Linus, after whom came Anencletus (Cletus, or Anacletus); after him came Clement in the third place from the Apostles. Doellinger says, "This makes the regulation of the Roman church and the appointment of Linus a common act of both apostles." And we say therefore that there is as good reason for calling Paul first Bishop of Rome as there is for calling Peter first Bishop of Rome.

3. Was Peter the Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, from 42 to 67?

Paul taught the Romans by letter and went there to preach in person, and it was his policy not to build on another's foundation, Rom. 15, 20; cf. 2 Cor. 10, 15, 16.

Paul sent a whole chapter of greetings to Roman Christians, but no mention is made of the alleged Bishop Peter. Rom. 16. (About 57 or 58.)

Paul wrote several letters from Rome, and yet Peter is not named.

Paul lived in Rome for two years in his own hired house, but we hear nothing of Peter.

Paul says only Luke was with him, 2 Tim. 4, 10. No mention of Peter; and this was about the year 67.

The only ante-Nicene book that plainly, in express terms, speaks of Peter having been Bishop of Rome is the apocryphal *Clementine Homilies*, rejected as the forgery of heretics by the Roman church since Pope Gelasius condemned it in 496.

Baronius (in *Ann.* 58, § 51) owns the force of the Scripture reasons for believing that Peter was not in Rome during any time on which the New Testament throws light.

“Peter’s residence in Rome was brief. . . . There is no sufficient evidence that he was ever Bishop of Rome, or that Rome had a bishop in apostolic times.” (Prof. Briggs, *North Am. Rev.*, 1907, Febr. 15.)

The statement of Eusebius that Peter went to Rome in 42, under Claudius, is opposed by Acts, which show Peter in Judea and Syria till after the death of Herod Agrippa I, in the *fourth* year of Claudius. Lactantius says Peter arrived in Rome in Nero’s time. The *Paschal Chronicle* declares the apostles did not break up their College at Jerusalem till after the Council there in the *sixth* year of Claudius.

Livius admits that various Catholics, Herbst among them, deny that Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. The difficulties in the way of this claim are too great to overcome. They deny that Peter went to Rome under Claudius, and say he went under Nero, and that he was in Rome a little over a year.

Pagi, following Baluze, both eminent Roman Catholic scholars, suggest that the notion of twenty-five years’ session

of St. Peter at Rome arose from a hasty inference from Lactantius, which has no special reference to Peter.

"The church that is at Babylon saluteth you," writes Peter at the end of his epistle. It is supposed that "Babylon" means Rome. It is supposed Peter came to Rome in 42 — first found in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, some three hundred years after the supposed event. It is supposed Peter was the Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. Farrar holds this was first suggested by the Pope's librarian Baronius, writing about 1558, or 1400 years after the event. The Roman Catholic historian Alzog candidly calls this "an ancient report."

In the *Church Bells* of August 10, 1900, we read: "A well-known Roman priest has written in the *Weekly Register* that the story of St. Peter having fixed his see at Rome, and of having resided there for twenty-five years, must be abandoned." (E. G. Man, pp. 65—72.)

4. *Where was Peter?*

In the year 33 Peter preached on Pentecost in Jerusalem.

In the year 40, three years after his conversion, Paul visited Peter at Jerusalem. Peter heals Eneas and Dorcas, Acts 9 and 10; Gal. 1, 18.

From 40 to 42 Peter was put in prison by King Herod Agrippa, who came from Rome to Jerusalem after Pentecost 41, the first year of Emperor Claudius. After his wonderful escape, Peter went in hiding, "went into another place;" certainly not to Rome, where Claudius would have arrested him and sent him back to Herod.

From 44 to 51, after Herod's death, when safe, Peter oversees the church of Antioch for seven years, according to St. Gregory. (*Epistle* 7, 20; *Chronicle* of Eusebius, relied on by Baronius.)

In the year 50 Peter goes from Antioch to Jerusalem to attend the conference about circumcision, at which James presided and gave judgment, Acts 15.

From 51 to 54 Peter was in various parts of Palestine preaching and strengthening the churches.

From 54 to 57 Peter meets Paul in Jerusalem; they give each other "the right hand of fellowship," Gal. 2. He travels and founds churches in Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, Pontus, according to Jerome, and preaches in the Parthian kingdom, according to Origen.

From 62 to 65 Peter goes down the Euphrates valley to Babylon; from there he writes a letter (First Peter), not earlier than the year 65.

The Jews had been driven out of Rome by the Emperor Claudius. There was a large Jewish population then at Babylon, according to Josephus' *Antiquities* (15, 3; 17, 2; 18, 1). In this letter there is an absence of symbolical language.

From 65 to 67 Peter was probably crucified, according to John 21, 18, 19, and it is probable that he died at Rome, June 29, A. D. 67, when Paul was beheaded.

(To be concluded.)