

This file was created October 2021 as a translation for my personal use and without any thought of sharing publicly at the time. I only ask that you keep that in mind when using it.

The French work is available at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k75914s>.

— Neil Godfrey - November 2023

- Turmel, Joseph (1859-1943) Auteur du texte. *Histoire Du Dogme De La Papauté. I, Des Origines À La Fin Du IVe Siècle*. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1908.

History of Dogma of Papacy . . . Chapter 1

The Origins of the Roman Church

The Acts of the Apostles tells us that on his arrival in Corinth, during his second mission, St. Paul met the Jew Aquila and his wife Priscilla, who had come from Rome, from where they had been expelled, along with all their compatriots, by an edict of the emperor Claudius¹. What was the reason for this expulsion, the Acts do not say. But Suetonius makes up for their silence in a famous text, in which he tells us that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome because they were constantly causing trouble under the impulse of a certain Chrestus.² To imagine that there was then in Rome a Jewish agitator by the name of Chrestus is a hypothesis which, although it has had some supporters, is no less implausible. It is generally agreed that the Chrestus of whom Suetonius speaks is the Saviour Jesus Christ, that the troubles to which Claudius remediated by an edict of expulsion, were born around the Christian question, and that, consequently, the evangelization of Rome had then begun; in other words that there existed in the imperial city a Christian community around the year 50.

1. Acts XVIII, 2.

2. Suetonius, Claudius, xxv: <> Judaeos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit."

Let us add that there was probably none before this date. The story of St. Paul attests that the agitation of the spirits took place at the very moment when the Christian idea entered a synagogue. If the evangelization of Rome had begun long before the year 50, the disturbances of which Suetonius speaks would have occurred earlier, and the return of Aquila and Priscilla to Corinth would have preceded the apostle's second mission by a long time. We are therefore authorized to conclude that Christianity was introduced into Rome around the year 50. The texts of Acts and Suetonius tell us that its first field of action was the Jewish colony which, since the victories of Pompey, had formed a considerable group in the Trans-Tiberine area.¹

1. Schuerer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, III 28.

By whom was he introduced? According to a tradition which goes back to Eusebius and probably even to Julius Africanus² the Jewish colony of Rome was evangelized by St. Peter in the year 42 or even earlier. On the other hand, St. Dionysius of Corinth and St. Irenaeus³ seem to attribute the evangelization of Rome to the collaboration of St. Peter and St. Paul. What are we to think of these assertions? We will soon see that the Christian community of Rome does not owe its origin to St. Paul. Moreover, let us leave for the moment the texts of Denys and Irenaeus, and let us deal with the tradition inaugurated or popularized by Eusebius. It is not easily reconciled with the data of the Acts and the epistle to the Galatians, which show us the apostle Peter in Caesarea, Jerusalem, Antioch and never in Rome. It is true that this objection has been answered by saying that the Acts do not give us a detailed account of the life of St. Peter, and that the prince of the apostles could have gone to Rome in 42, returned to Jerusalem around the year 50, gone back to the imperial city following the incident at Antioch, and, after an absence of a few years, taken the road to Rome again, this time to win the palm of martyrdom. At the same time, another objection, drawn from the salutations which end the epistle to the Romans, has been resolved. To the question why St. Paul, who, before closing his letter to the faithful of Rome, greets about twenty of them by name, does not greet St. Peter, it was answered that the head of the apostolic college was not then in Rome. It has been added that he was still absent in 61, when St. Paul came to Rome, and that the reason why St. Peter is never mentioned in the epistles written by St. Paul during his captivity is that he had then left the imperial city. But there remains another, much more serious difficulty, arising from the very existence of the epistle to the Romans and the project which is formulated there. St. Paul, who had never yet been to Rome, sends to the faithful of that city a dissertation on salvation by faith, and at the same time he announces to them that he hopes to see them soon and to do some good among them by preaching the gospel¹. This course of theology, this mission plan, is understandable if the Christians of Rome have not yet received any outstanding teacher. In the traditional hypothesis they no longer understand each other. If St. Peter

introduced Christianity to Rome in 42, if he spent eight years among the faithful of that city, if he returned to them in 54, if he is still to return, the Church of Rome is the flock of the best of shepherds, it has no need of a foreign missionary. And St. Paul, who did not like to plough in the field of others, would have thought he was committing an enormous mistake by going to "announce the Gospel" to Christians who had been evangelized for several years by the prince of the apostles. These considerations condemn above all the legend put into circulation by Eusebius and Julius Africanus, but they would retain some of their force if one were to limit oneself to postponing by a few years the journey of Saint Peter to Rome. It must be admitted that the head of the apostolic college had never yet come to the capital of the world when St. Paul wrote the letter to the Romans, that is, in 58. It must be admitted that the evangelization of the Jewish colony of Rome, which began around the year 50, was carried out by anonymous workers, unknown Jews converted in the East and suddenly transported by the necessities of life to the banks of the Tiber. This is more or less the state of things that Ambrosiastre imagined when he wrote at the beginning of his commentary on the epistle to the Romans that at the time of the apostles there were Jews in Rome, and that those of them who accepted the Christian faith communicated it to the Romans.¹

2. Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen litteratur*, i, 704.

3. We shall see their texts below, p. 11.

1. Rom, i, 13-15; xr, 20. It has also been suggested that the first evangelization of Rome was either the work of the Roman Jews who attended Pentecost, or that it was the work of the centurion Cornelius, or the work of the proconsul Sergius Paulus. These fanciful hypotheses have been rejected by Catholic writers themselves. See Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, vol. 56; Semeria, *Dogme, hiérarchie et culte*, p. 42.

1. In Rom, prologue, P. L.y xvii, 45: "Constat itaque temporibus apostolorum Judaeos, proplerea quod sub regno romano agerent, Romæ habitasse; ex quibue hi qui crediderant, tradiderunt Romanis ut Christum profitentee, legem servarent."

The edict of Claudius had the fate of all the similar measures that the Roman police periodically took against the disturbers of the public order. It was only imperfectly executed and soon expired. The Jews soon returned to Rome. As for the proselytes who were called "God-fearing", they were probably not expelled. In any case, a few years later, the Christian community in Rome was reconstituted. In 58 1 it received a long essay from Corinth which began with the words: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ,

an apostle by vocation, chosen to proclaim the gospel of God... to all the friends of God, called to be saints, who are in Rome. Peace and grace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ!" Paul, who was then staying in Greece, wanted to go to the capital of the empire to perfect the instruction of the Christians of that city as well as to win new souls to Jesus Christ; and his letter to the Romans was intended to prepare the way for him. Three years later, his project was realized in a very unexpected way. In March of '61, Paul arrived in Rome, but he arrived there under the guard of a centurion: he was a prisoner. However, his captivity was quite mild. For two years, he was able to devote himself to the work of the apostolate without too many obstacles, under the complacent eye of the Roman guard. What became of him at the end of this time? Was he condemned by the imperial court? Was he absolved? Did he go to Spain as he had planned? And, if he went to Spain, when did he return to Rome? All obscure questions to which we cannot answer anything of certainty. Let us therefore leave these problems. Besides, our attention is drawn to another side.

1. More exactly at the end of 58 or the beginning of 59: such is the common opinion. Harnack (Chronology, i, 239) proposes the date 53-54.

11

Around 170, the bishop of Corinth, Denys, in a letter written to the Christians of Rome, compared the churches of Rome and Corinth to two trees planted by Peter and Paul. Then, after explaining that Peter and Paul had both evangelized the Corinthians, he added: "In the same way, after having taught together in Italy, they suffered martyrdom at the same time." 1 About ten years after Denys, Irenaeus presented the Roman Church as "founded by the most glorious apostles Peter and Paul." 2 He even used this foundation as a point of reference, saying that Matthew had written his gospel "at the time when Peter and Paul were evangelizing Rome and founding the church of that city"; that Mark, on the other hand, had written his after their death. At the beginning of the 3rd century, the Roman priest Caius showed what he called "the trophies" of the two apostles Peter and Paul. He said, "I can show the trophies of the apostles; go to the Vatican or to the road to Ostia and you will find the trophies of those who founded this church." 3 And Eusebius, who reports this text, assures us that, by the word trophy, Caius was referring to the tombs of the two glorious apostles located, one at the foot of the Vatican hill, the other on the road to Ostia. Around the same time as Caius, Tertullian, reviewing the apostolic churches, pointed out as the first of them the church of Rome, of which he made this pompous praise: "Happy church, to which the apostles transmitted, with their blood, the fullness of doctrine; in which Peter underwent a torture similar to that of the Lord; in which Paul received the crown of the same martyrdom as John the Baptist; in which the apostle John was condemned to boiling oil and came out

unharméd ! 1 " The same doctor said elsewhere that "Peter and Paul left the Gospel to the Romans after sealing it with their blood 2. " He also said that the first persecution was carried out by Nero and that Peter and Paul were martyred at that time.³ Half a century later, St. Cyprian called Rome "the chair of Peter" and presented Cornelius as occupying "the place of Peter."⁴

1. Eusebius, Hist. eccl, n, 25, 8.
2. Hær, ni, 3, 2.
3. Eusebius, ii, 25, 7.

1. De præscriptione, 36.
2. Adv. Mark, iv, 5.
3. Scorpius, 15.
4. Bp., lix, 14; lv, 8.

12

From the fourth century onwards, texts abound which speak of the coming and death of Saint Peter in Rome; it is useless to collect them. Let us limit ourselves to mentioning the belief relative to the twenty-five years of Saint Peter. It presents itself to us in two different forms. Sometimes the twenty-five years begin with the ascension of the Savior and include the entire apostolic career of the prince of the apostles. Sometimes they are added to the twelve years spent by the whole apostolic college in Palestine; they then have as their point of departure, no longer the ascension of our Lord, but the dispersion of the apostles, and they apply to the episcopate of Saint Peter in Rome.

13

The first of these two interpretations is recorded in the Liberian Catalogue of 354, which, after advising us that it is going to give a list of the bishops of Rome with the duration of their respective pontificates and the synchronicity of the emperors, begins thus: "Peter, xxv years, i months, viii days. He was (bishop) under Tiberius Caesar, Caius, Tiberius Claudius and Nero, from the consulship of Vinicus and Longinus (year 30) until the consulship of Nero and Vetus (year 55) 1." It is generally admitted that the Liberian chronographer used a papal list written in 235² by an author believed to be Hippolytus³. It follows from this that the theory which contains the apostolic career of Saint Peter in a cycle of twenty-five years goes back to the first third of the third century. We find it again, with some nuances, in Lactantius who puts the twenty-five years of apostolate before the journey to Rome and seems to restrict the stay in the imperial city to a few

months. "For twenty-five years, until the beginning of Nero's reign, the apostles travelled through the provinces and cities to lay the foundations of the Church. Under the reign of Nero Peter came to Rome." 1 As for the second interpretation, it appears for the first time in the Latin translation of the Chronicle of Euphrates by Saint Jerome, where we read: "In the second year of Claudius (A.D. 42) Peter, after having founded the church of Antioch, was sent to Rome where he preached the Gospel and remained for twenty-five years the bishop of that city. Until recently, St. Jerome was accused of having reworked the text he claimed to translate and of having substituted his own thought for that of the bishop of Caesarea. Today the accusation has given way to confidence. It is believed that Jerome was a faithful translator; it is thought that Eusebius most probably attributed a duration of twenty-five years to the Roman episcopate of St. Peter. And, since Eusebius borrowed the elements of his chronology from Julius Africanus, one is authorized to conclude that the belief in the twenty-five years of St. Peter's episcopate in Rome rests on the calculations of Julius Africanus.2

1. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i, 3.

2. Duchesne, p. vii.

3. Harnack, *die Chronologie*, i, 150; Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i, p. viii-ix.

However, the recently discovered fragment of the Greek text of the Chronicle does not contain a catalog. The editor Bauer (*die Chronik des Hippolytos*, Leipzig, 1905, p. 156), concludes that the feeling commonly received so far must be abandoned.

t. *De mortibus persecutorum*, 2.

2. Harnack, *die Chronologie*, J, 71, 114, 124, 132, 704.

14

We have just seen the most ancient texts which clearly affirm the coming of Saint Peter to Rome. It remains for us now to point out three attestations of a special character. At the end of the first epistle of Saint Peter, we read: "The church of the elect which is in Babylon greets you, as does Mark my son." 1 Taken literally, this formula has no historical significance. But, from the beginning of the fourth century, we see Eusebius explaining that Babylon is here a mask under which Rome is hidden, and that the prince of the apostles wrote his first epistle in the capital of the empire 2. Thus interpreted, the salvation of the Babylonian church became a vital guarantee of St. Peter's coming to Rome; so when, in the sixteenth century, the Protestants set out to ruin the traditional belief, the apologists put the attestation of St. Peter himself in the forefront against them. Later, when the writings of St. Clement and St. Ignatius were published, they

provided theologians with two new testimonies almost as important as that of the Prima Petri. In the course of a dissertation on the crimes of which jealousy was the motive, Clement expresses himself thus: "Let us look at the good apostles. Peter, a victim of iniquitous jealousy, endured not one or two, but many trials, and after suffering martyrdom, entered the place of glory that was his due. Paul, a victim of jealousy, won the palm of patience... and, having suffered martyrdom in the presence of the magistrates, he went from this world to the homeland of the saints. With these men of holy life were associated a great multitude of chosen ones, to whom jealousy inflicted many torments and who were an excellent example among us. Ignatius, on his part, after having begged the Romans not to take any steps to save him from the torture, said to them: "I do not command you as Peter and Paul did. They were apostles, but I am only a disciple. It was pointed out that these words, in the mouth of a Roman, necessarily referred to martyrs immolated in Rome, victims of Nero's ferocity. The formula "was associated" was also emphasized, and it was concluded that by presenting the Roman martyrs of 64 as "associated" with Peter and Paul, Clement placed the martyrdom of these two apostles in Rome. As for the text of Saint Ignatius, the following reasoning was made on his account: St. Ignatius could not have evoked the memory of St. Peter and St. Paul in his letter to the Romans if these two apostles had not had a special relationship with Rome; and this relationship would not have existed if St. Peter and St. Paul had not had their tombs in Rome; if these tombs had not been under the eyes of the Romans; if, in other words, the church of Rome had not been the church of the holy apostles Peter and Paul. All Catholic apologists agreed that the texts of St. Clement and St. Ignatius are veiled attestations of the death of St. Peter - and also of St. Paul - in Rome.

1. I Petri, v, 13.
2. Hist eccl, ii, 15.

1. Ad Cor, v.
2. Ad Rom. iv, 3.

17

The Protestants, especially from the fifteenth century onwards, set out to demolish the Catholic tradition. Their tactics, which were clearly indicated in advance, consisted in dividing the testimonies into two groups, attributing to legend the manifest attestations which begin with Dionysius of Corinth, and attributing to an error of interpretation the veiled attestations of the apostolic period. Here is a summary of their objections in the most recent form they have given them 1.

1. The following exposition is borrowed from the dissertations published by Erbes in 1899 in your collection of Texts and Untersuchungen, t. xix, and in 1901 in the Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte y t. xxn. The title of the first is: die Todestage der Apostel Petrus und Paulus; the second is entitled: Petrus nicht in Rom gestorben. The objections presented by the school of Tubingue disappeared the day when it was acquired that the novel of the pseudo-Clemens writings is much later than Saint Jusiin.

Ignatius 2 mentions, in his Letter to the Romans, Saint Peter and Saint Paul, because the memory of these two apostles haunts his imagination; and this memory haunts him because Saint Peter and Saint Paul met at Antioch, and he considers himself, bishop of Antioch, in a way as the successor of the two illustrious apostles. It is therefore on the side of Antioch and not on the side of Rome that we must seek the explanation of his text, which can be paraphrased as follows: "Compared to my predecessors Peter and Paul, I am nothing; therefore I cannot speak to you with authority as these two apostles would have done." So much for Ignatius. As for Clement, he reminds the Corinthians of the great example of patience given by the Roman martyrs of 64; he also says that these martyrs were associated or reunited with Peter and Paul; but the place of the reunion, the appointment he has in mind, is the abode of glory, Heaven. His text is usually paraphrased as follows: the martyrs of 64 suffered in the same place as Peter and Paul; they suffered "at home"; therefore Peter and Paul also suffered "at home". This is a mistake. Clement, who has just mentioned the heavenly reward won by Peter and Paul, adds that the Roman martyrs of 64 went to the same place of glory as the apostles: "this assertion does not authorize any induction with regard to the place where Peter and Paul died. One could at most make on the text of Clement a reasoning similar to that which one made on that of Ignacê and seek in the very evocation of Saint Peter and Saint Paul the proof that these two apostles died in Rome. And this reasoning would have some value if, to show the Corinthians the fatal effects of jealousy, Clement had limited himself to quoting the two apostles Peter and Paul, then the Roman martyrs of 64. But this is not how he proceeds. He begins by mentioning, as having been victims of jealousy, Abel, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Mary sister of Moses, David. These examples are not supplied to him by Rome; one does not therefore have the right to affirm that it is Rome which supplied him with the names of the apostles Peter and Paul. Let us add that Clement, who knows that Saint Paul went to the farthest reaches of the West and that he gave testimony before the magistrates, has nothing precise to tell us about Peter and speaks of the "multiple trials" of the prince of the apostles as if he knew them only from the account in Acts.

2. Erbes, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, xxii, 16-25.

It is said that, in the *Prima Petri* Babylon indicates Rome. This may be so. But this hypothesis entails consequences that its supporters have not seen. Catholic tradition, which venerates the tomb of Peter in the Vatican, must logically rank this apostle among the victims of Nero's persecution and place his death in 64; for it was on this date that Nero gave, in his Vatican gardens, the horrible spectacle mentioned by Tacitus. On the other hand, it was only after Nero's persecution that Babylon was used to designate, in Christian literature, the city of Rome - this took place, for Jewish literature, after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. It follows from these premises that, if the apostle Peter died in the gardens of the Vatican, he could not have given Rome the name of Babylon, and that, if he gave it this name, he was not buried in the Vatican. And one is put on notice, either to sacrifice the authenticity of the *Prima Petri* to the Catholic tradition concerning the tomb of Saint Peter, or to sacrifice the tomb to the epistle. It is claimed that, in any case, the Babylon spoken of in the *Prima Petri* refers to Rome and cannot refer to the real Babylon, which, according to Strabo and Pliny, was deserted in the first century. Once again it is possible that the formula of the epistle is a metaphor; but the opposite can be true and one does not have the right to raise the metaphor to the level of a certainty. The statements of Strabo and Pliny are exaggerations of the kind used by medieval writers when they said that Rome, at the time of the Avignon popes, had become a desert. In the first century of the Christian era, Babylon had fallen far from its former splendor, but it was still inhabited; we even know from Josephus that an important Jewish colony had been established there, and that it was still there several years after the death of Strabo.⁴ And this colony was undoubtedly sorely tried under the reign of Caligula; but it reformed itself in good time, since it is to it that we owe the Babylonian Talmud. That Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, went to Babylon to evangelize his brethren, while Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, went to Greece, is only probable. If the *Prima Petri* is authentic, it could therefore have been written on the banks of the Euphrates. Nothing, moreover, prevents it from having the same origin if, as it is generally believed today, this letter bears the name of Peter unduly. In any case, the salvation of the "Babylonian church" raises too many unresolved and perhaps forever unsolvable problems to offer any support to the tradition of the death of Saint Peter in Rome.

1. Antiquität, Judaïc, xv, 2; xvm, 12.

In short, the journey of St. Peter to Rome has no witnesses until the middle of the second century. From 170 it is attested by Dionysius of Corinth and Irenaeus. But these two teachers, who tell us that Saint Peter came to the capital of the world, also tell us that he founded the Church of Rome together with Saint Paul. This assertion, denied by history, is singularly suggestive. It presents Peter and Paul as two inseparable brothers. How did we come to this? Partly as a reaction against the Gnosticism that opposed St. Paul to St. Peter; partly as a result of the habit that had long existed of associating the two apostles who overshadowed all the others and summed up the apostolic college, the apostle of the circumcision and the apostle of the nations. Under the influence of these two diverse causes, the Christian conscience united the destinies of St. Peter and St. Paul, and this union had a capital consequence. St. Paul, who had come to Rome, led St. Peter, who had never been there, to Rome. The legend of St. Peter's journey to Rome is due, above all, to a phenomenon of attraction. This, at least, is its main source, but it has secondary sources. One of them is the famous text of the Prima Petri where "the church of Babylon" greets the Christians of Pontus; the other, a blunder of Saint Justin who, encountering in Rome a statue with the inscription *Semo Sancus Deus Fidius*, and ignoring that *Semo Sancus* was a Sabine divinity, read *Simon sanctus* and concluded that Simon the magician had come to Rome, where he had succeeded in making himself adored.¹ When the Apocalypse referred to Rome as Babylon, the text of the Prima Petri was applied to the church of Rome; and when, from St. Justin onwards, it was admitted that Simon the magician had come to Rome, the law of association of ideas dictated that St. Peter, who had condemned the impostor in Samaria, had followed him to the capital of the empire to fight him. St. Peter, who had already been drawn to Rome by St. Paul, was drawn there again by the "church of Babylon", and also by Simon the magician, who himself was brought there by St. Justin 2.

1. In 1574 a statue was discovered in Rome in the Tiber with this inscription: *Semoni sancus Deo Fidius Sex. Pompeius S. P. E. Col. Musianus Quinquennialis Decur. Bidentalis donum dédit*. It is commonly believed that it was this statue that caused the misunderstanding of Saint Justin. Baronius (ad annum xlv, 55-58), Tillemont, (Memoirs, ii, 521) Maran (Preface on St. Justin, P. G., vi, 142), Schmid (Petrus in Pom., 1892, p. 106) have tried to prove the validity of Justin's assertion. Lanciani (Pagan and Christian Rome, 1893, p. 105), Besnier, (Vile Tiberinus, 1902, pp. 274-279), the *Analecta Bollandiana*, xii (1893) 452, Grisar (History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages, 1906, i, 189) believe that Justin was mystified.

2. Erbes, *Zeitsch. Kircheng.*, xxii, 221.

The memory of the torture and burial of St. Paul remained alive in the memory of the faithful of Rome. It was known that the apostle of the nations had had his head cut off by the sword on the road to Ostia and that his remains were in a tomb situated on the Appian Way, at the place called *ad Catacumbas*. As there was no data on St. Peter, he was placed among the unfortunate victims of the persecution of 64 and, consequently, his martyrdom was placed in the Vatican, in the gardens of Nero. This is what the text of Caius shows. The "trophy" that this priest shows on the road to Ostia is the place where St. Paul was executed and not his tomb which - as we know - was on the Appian Way. Similarly, the "trophy" he shows to the Roman is the place where St. Peter won the victory, that is, the supposed place of his martyrdom; it is not his tomb. Caius does not mention the tomb of St. Paul, although he knew it. Did he know the tomb of St. Peter? We cannot say. If he knew it, he must have identified it with the tomb of St. Paul. You who are looking for Peter and Paul, know that these saints once lived here": this is what Damasus says in an inscription that he had engraved, around 380, in the "basilica of the apostles", that is to say, in the church built on the tomb of the Appian Way *ad Catacumbas* 1. This important inscription is enlightened by the following information of one of the catalogs of the Liberian collection: "Third day before the calendars of July: Peter in the catacombs and Paul on the way of Ostia, Tuscus and Bassus being consuls 1. The calendar that provides this notice goes back to the year 354. It tells us that, under the consulship of Tuscus and Bassus, that is to say in 258, a feast was instituted on June 29 to celebrate the apostle Saint Peter, whose tomb was then *ad Catacumbas*, and the apostle Saint Paul whose tomb had just been transferred to the road to Ostia. Thus, until 258, the tomb on the Via Appian, which contained the remains of St. Paul, was supposed to contain the remains of St. Peter 2. In 258, the bones of St. Paul were transported to the Via Ostia, to the place where the apostle's head had been cut off; moreover, Pope Sixtus, then bishop of Rome, instituted a feast in honor of Peter and Paul on June 29, no doubt to strengthen the faithful with the memory of the two great apostles, to give them the courage they needed on the eve of Valerian's persecution, of which, a few weeks later, he himself was going to be a victim. As for the legendary bones of Saint Peter, after 258 they continued to be venerated in the tomb on the Appian Way. They were still venerated there in 354, since the Liberian calendar mentions them at the place called *ad Catacumbas*. They were transferred to the Vatican a few years later, when the ancient basilica of St. Peter, begun by Constantine, was completed: this took place under Constantius I.

1. Here are the first two verses of the inscription of Damasus:
Hic habitasse prius sanctos cognoscere debes. Nomina quisque Petri pariter
Paulique requiris.

See Erbes, *die Todestage*, p. 79; Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i, civ.

1. Depositio marljTum, in Duchesne, Liber pontificalis, i, 11: HI Kal. jul. Petri in catacumbas et Pauli Ostense Tusco et Basso cons. (258). Erbes often returns to this text which, in his system, has, indeed, a considerable iniporlaure. See aie Todestage... 37, 81, 83, eie. ; Zeit- chrift für kircheng.. xxii, 38.

2. A curious legend formed around the tomb ad Catacumbas. It is said that men from the East arrived in Rome when the body of Saint Peter was about to be buried in the Vatican and that they took the mortal remains of the apostle to Jerusalem; but that when they arrived on the Appian Way at the place called ad Catacumbas, they were frightened by a thunderclap and left the precious treasure there to be buried on the spot. Erbes believed that this legend was proof that Saint Peter died in Jerusalem. See Zeilsch. Kircheng, xxii (1901), 161-224.

1. Erbes, die Todestage... p. 116.11 draws this conclusion from the following inscription which was still being read in the ninth century: *Justitiæ eedes fidei doraus aula pudoris Hæc est quam cernis pietas quam possidet omnia Quae Patris et Filii virtutibus inclyta gaudet Auctoremque suum genitoris laudibus æquat.*

This filius who collaborated with his father in the construction of the basilica, it is according to him, Constance. Moreover, as we have seen, he believes he can prove by the calendar of 354 that the remains of Saint Peter were still, at this date, on the Appian Way.

25

We can see how the opponents of St. Peter's coming to Rome try to explain what they call the Catholic legend. I must say now that this attempt at explanation is commonly rejected by historians as well as by archaeologists. It is admitted that the ancient basilica of St. Peter was completed by Constantine 1 and that the bones of St. Peter were transported there during the reign of this emperor 2. It is granted that Saint Peter and Saint Paul rested together for some time in the cemetery of the Appian Way, but it is pointed out that this transitory stay was not the primitive stay. One posits in principle that the "trophies" of which Caius speaks are tombs, and thus that the two illustrious apostles rested from the beginning in the respective tombs where they are today. It is added that they were transferred to the cemetery of the Appian Way at the time of the persecution of Yalerian, in order to be preserved against the profanations of the pagans. It is therefore explained that the year 258 marks not the time when the remains of Saint Paul were deposited on the road to Ostia, but the time of their entry, together with the remains of Saint Peter, into the tomb ad Catacumbas 3. In short, the coming of St. Peter to Rome, while retaining some opponents, today gathers many adherents outside the

Catholic world. The critics who are most free from the scruples of orthodoxy readily believe that St. Peter came to Rome and died there¹. Only they tend to put the date of his arrival around 63, and they place his death in August 64².

1. Grisar, *Histoire de Rome et des Papes au moyen âge*, h, 249.
2. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, i, cvii.
3. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, p. cv-cvii; *Analecta bol-landiana*, xix, (1900), 44. Or admits however here that the translation of the primitive tombs to the cemetery of the Appian Way "presents obscurities".

1. Harnack has recently shown himself to be one of the most resolute supporters of this view. See *die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litterature* i. 709. In *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentum* 2, \y 54, he conjectures that St. Peter was martyred after a few months in Rome. He supports this feeling on a word of Porphyry to whose testimony he attaches, I do not see why, a considerable value.

2. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, i, 64. On the legend which places the martyrdom of Saint Peter on the Janiculum, see Grisar, *Histoire de Home et des Papes au moyen âge* i. 242.