

## APPENDIX.

---

(No. 1.)

### WAS PETER BISHOP OF ROME?

The first thought that strikes an inquirer is the absolute silence of Scripture. If it were true, as Romanists affirm, that Peter was constituted head of the whole Church on earth, it was of the utmost importance that all the Churches should know it, and should know it from the very first. But here is the startling fact, that though all the books of the New Testament were written after the Apostle's supposed entrance on his office, and even after his becoming bishop of Rome (according to the theory), there is not the slightest reference to the matter in the inspired volume. This is altogether unaccountable.

The early fathers, as has been already observed, were entirely ignorant of Peter's presidency over the Roman Church. No mention is made of it in any authentic writing previous to the time of Justin Martyr. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who flourished in the early part of the second century, is cited as a witness; but the sum of his testimony is merely this, (if indeed it be his at all, which is quite doubtful), that Peter wrote his first epistle from "Babylon," which, he says, figuratively means "Rome." No reliance can be placed on that fancy.\*

Then we come to Dionysius of Corinth (died about A. D. 178), who, in a letter addressed to the Church of Rome, fragments of which have been preserved by Eusebius, says of

---

\* Euseb. Hist. ii 15.