

Peter and Paul—"They both came into our city of Corinth and instructed us, scattering the seed of evangelical doctrine; they also went together to Italy, and after they had in like manner instructed you, suffered martyrdom at the same time."* This statement is at variance with the narrative of the sacred historian. It is abundantly evident that Peter was not at Corinth when Paul was there, and that Paul never went from Corinth to Italy. Whether they both met at Rome and suffered there, is just possible. It is certain, however, that Paul's first visit to the imperial city took place when he was taken there as a prisoner in the year 61. His second visit, previous to his martyrdom, may be assigned to the year 67 or 68. If, according to Dionysius, Peter accompanied him, he could not have been resident at Rome more than a few months. His twenty-five years' episcopate there must be classed among the fables.

Tertullian states that Peter baptized (*immersed*—"tinxit")—in the Tiber, and that he was crucified at Rome.† Admitting the truth of these statements it would not follow that he was bishop of that city.

Caius and Irenæus style Peter and Paul the "founders" of the Church of Rome.‡ That Paul was not its founder is evident because a Church had existed there long before his visit. Consequently, these statements fall to the ground. And this further is noticeable, that the ancient fathers, in tracing the succession of the Roman bishops, do not place Peter among them, though they speak of him (incorrectly) as one of the founders of the Church. They uniformly declare that *Linus* was the first bishop, and the enumeration proceeds accordingly.§

The conclusion is, that whereas it is possible that Peter visited Rome, as Origen states, towards the end of his life, or

*Euseb. Hist. ii. 25. †De Baptismo, c. 4 : De Præscript, c. 36. ‡Euseb. Hist. ii. 25. §Euseb. ut. sup. iii. 2.