

**PETER THE APOSTLE NEVER
AT ROME, SHEWN TO
BE AN HISTORICAL FACT:
WITH A DISSERTATION**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649411955

Peter the Apostle Never at Rome, Shewn to be an Historical Fact: With a Dissertation by J. H. Brown

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

J. H. BROWN

**PETER THE APOSTLE NEVER
AT ROME, SHEWN TO
BE AN HISTORICAL FACT:
WITH A DISSERTATION**

PETER THE APOSTLE NEVER AT ROME,

SHEWN TO BE A HISTORICAL FACT:

WITH

A DISSERTATION

OF THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY OF THE SYMBOL
(OR CREED) OF THE CHURCH.

BY

J. H. BROWN, M.A.,

RECTOR OF MIDDLETON-IN-TEESDALE



Oxford & London:

J. H. AND JAS. PARKER.

1861.

100. b. 82.



Printed by Messrs. Parker, Cornmarket, Oxford.

SYNOPSIS.

OPENING of the Argument.—Eusebius' (wrote A.D. 315) account of St. Peter's coming to Rome.—Justin wrote A.D. 140.—Irenæus wrote A.D. 178.—What Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 194) says on the subject.—Papias wrote A.D. 116.—Eusebius states the time when St. Peter came to Rome.—Eusebius and Irenæus differ as to the time when St. Mark's Gospel was written.—A brief view of Eusebius' statement.—Jerome wrote A.D. 392.—Sophronius wrote A.D. 390.—Theodore wrote A.D. 394.—Valesius shews Justin to be deceived about Simon Magus' coming to Rome.—The Acts of the Apostles examined, as to the support they give to the evidence of Eusebius.—The First Epistle of St. Peter examined in reference to this question.—The Epistles of St. Paul examined in reference to this question.—Pearson and Lardner's statement, that St. Peter went to Rome, examined.—Pearson says St. Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome.—Quotes Clement of Rome as his authority.—What Clement asserts in the passage quoted.—Pearson's manner of dealing with Clement's evidence.—How Clement speaks of the two Apostles, SS. Paul and Peter.—The necessary inference to be drawn from his language.—Lardner supposes that St. Peter suffered at Rome.—How the Second Epistle to Timothy influences the determination of this question.—Lardner's statements shewn to be incorrect.—He finds evidence in Clement's Epistle that Peter suffered in Rome.—The passage on which he relies.—Lardner's misinterpretation of the passage corrected.—The other writers whom he quotes all rely upon Eusebius.—Lardner discredits his own witnesses,—and relies on the statement of Lactantius alone, (who wrote A.D. 306).—Pearson's idea that Peter and Paul were the first Bishops of Rome.—Eusebius and Irenæus do not support this idea.—They do not speak of the Apostles as Bishops.—Pearson's mistake about Hyginus being ninth Bishop.—An error in the text of Irenæus.—Pearson adopts that error.—Pearson claims Epiphanius, (wrote A.D. 368,) as proving the two Apostles to have

been first Bishops of Rome.—What Epiphanius means.—How Valens understands Epiphanius.—Pearson's argument, drawn from Irenæus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, shewn to be groundless.—Pearson mistranslates a passage of Hegesippus, (wrote A.D. 173).—The object for which he refers to this author.—Pearson quotes Dionysius of Corinth, (wrote A.D. 170).—The value of his authority.—Result of the examination of Pearson's authorities.—Bishop Bull's estimate of the value of the evidence of Eusebius and of Clement.—The importance and force of Bp. Bull's judgment.—All great authorities are against St. Peter's being in Rome in the reign of Claudius.—Barrow quoted.—Summing up of the historical argument.—Eusebius' account of the personal character of St. Peter.—It accounts for his pre-eminence amongst the Apostles.—St. Peter's position yielded to him by his brethren, rather than given him by our Lord.—St. Chrysostom's testimony on this point.—Reason for the position which the Epistle to the Romans occupies amongst the Epistles.—St. Paul commanded by our Lord to bear witness of Him in Rome.—How Rome became the chief city of the Catholic Church.—A short and concluding summary of the argument.

PETER THE APOSTLE NEVER AT ROME A HISTORICAL FACT.

THE title of the 14th chapter of the 2nd book of Eusebius is "Concerning the Preaching of the Apostle Peter at Rome." The subject of the preceding chapter is "Concerning Simon Magus," *περὶ Σίμωνος τοῦ μάγου*, 'of Simon the magician.'

The whole subject is thus introduced in this 13th chapter:—"The faith in our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ having now been delivered to all men, the enemy of the salvation of men contriving to take possession firstly of (or devising previously to occupy) the imperial city, leads here Simon who has before been spoken of, and combining with the præstigiatory acts of the man, draws over many of those inhabiting Rome to the error. Justin truly shews this, who

Opening of
the Argument.

Eusebius'
(wrote A. D. 315)
account of St.
Peter's coming
to Rome.

Justin wrote
A. D. 140.

was not long after the apostles, plainly declaring it in the work (i. e. his Apology) which we now have. In the 1st of the Apologies to Antoninus, he writing, says thus:—"And after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, the dæmons sent forth certain men, saying that themselves were gods, which men were not only not persecuted by you, but were even esteemed worthy of honours, as Simon a certain Samaritan from the

village called Gittæ, who in the time of Claudius Cæsar, having through the art of dæmons working in him performed magical powers over your imperial city Rome, was esteemed a god, and is honoured among you as a god by an image on the Tiber, between the two bridges, having this Latin inscription, "Simoni deo sancto," which is, "to Simon holy god." And nearly all the Samaritans, and few in other nations, worship, confessing him as the first god."

Irenæus
wrote A.D. 178. "Thus Justin. And Irenæus agrees with him in the 1st book of the work concerning heresies. . . . We have received indeed that Simon was the first leader of all heresy. From whom until this time, those following his heresy acting as in a mask the sober philosophy of Christians^a, which is celebrated among all people on account of purity of life, nevertheless take hold again of that superstition concerning idols, falling back again upon pictures and images of Simon himself, and that of Helena manifested with him, undertaking to worship them with incenses, and sacrifices, and libations."

In the next chapter, the 14th of the 2nd book, the subject of which is, "Of the Preaching of the Apostle Peter at Rome^b," Eusebius proceeds to relate that "the evil power, hater of good, and contriver against the salvation of men, having at that time put forward Simon (father and executor of such evils) as some great one, and adversary of the great divine apostles of our Lord: nevertheless the divine and heavenly grace

^a τὴν σόφωνα καὶ διὰ καθαρότητα βίου παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσι βεβοημένην Χριστιανῶν φιλοσοφίαν ὑποκρινόμενοι.

^b περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ῥώμην κηρύγματος Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.

helping its ministers, through their coming and appearance quickly extinguished the flying flame of the evil, through their pulling down and taking away every high thing exalting itself against the knowledge of God. Therefore neither any attempt of Simon, nor of any other of these then born, stood its ground during these apostolical times. For the light of the truth conquered and prevailed over all things, and the divine Word Himself from God, having lately shined upon men, both Himself flourishing upon earth, and conversing with His own apostles. Immediately Simon the Magician, that is, the deceiver, (*ὁ δηλωθεὶς γόησι,*) having been stricken in the eyes of his mind, as by a divine and wonderful dazzling, who before in Judæa had been convicted by the Apostle Peter upon the evil deeds he had done, having taken the greatest and over-sea passage from the East, departed, fleeing to the West, thinking that here only it was that he could live with freedom in the practice of his art. Having arrived at the city of the Romans, the power seated here greatly assisting him, in a short time so far had his attempt succeeded, that he was honoured as a god by the dedication of an image to him. But these things did not long prosper to him. Immediately (*παραπύδας*) following his footsteps, in the same reign of Claudius, the all-good and beneficent providence of all things leads the strong and great one of the apostles, him on account of virtue (*τὸν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα*) the speaker of all the others, Peter, unto Rome, (as against so great a destroyer of life,) who like a noble commander of God, having fortified himself with the divine arms, carried the rich merchandize of the intellectual light out of the East