

NEW BRUNSWICK REVIEW.

No. I.

MAY, 1854.

By the Editors

ART. I.—DR. SCHAFF'S WORKS ON CHURCH HISTORY.

1. *The Principle of Protestantism as relates to the present state of the Church.* By Philip Schaf, Ph. D. Translated from the German ; with an Introduction by John W. Nevin, D.D., Chambersburg. Publication office of the German Reformed Church, 1845, pp. 215.
2. *What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development.* By Philip Schaf. Translated from the German. Philadelphia : J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1846, pp. 128.
3. *History of the Apostolic Church, with a General Introduction to Church History.* By Philip Schaff, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa. Translated by Edward D. Yeomans, New York. Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau st., 1853, pp. 684.

WE cordially welcome whatever tends to stimulate inquiry into the early history of Christianity. It was enjoined of God upon his ancient church, "thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God hath led thee in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, and to know what was in thine heart, that he might do thee good at thy latter end." The recollection and repetition of the great events of their national and church history (which were in fact identical), was through all time to form a large part of domestic instruction and conversation. The reason for this was universal, and the duty must therefore be uni-

versal. Is the history of the Christian church at all inferior to that of the Jewish in interest and importance? Is it not every way superior to it; since its field is wider, its truth clearer, its life more free and energetic, its complications more extensive, its events more important, because possessing an interest universal and perpetual as humanity. The history of the church, since the coming of Christ, is the history of the world. From the very close of the apostolic age, the truth and life of Christianity has been the most powerful and influential element in human affairs. It alone gives unity and significance to all history. And to trace the fermentation of this divine leaven as it penetrates the general mass and gradually comes to view in every form of human thought and life, this is the study of church history in its largest sense. If, then, the past vicissitudes and experiences of the church of God, even while its theatre was the narrow strip of Palestine, were to be matter of constant recollection and inculcation, and were divinely declared to be indispensable to preservation from idolatry and the maintenance of pure doctrine, vital piety, and an ever fresh and effectual sense of the providence of God, incomparably more valuable are they to these ends, now that *its field is the world*. And why should not the Christian, as well as the Hebrew father, teacher, and pastor, derive from church history inexhaustible materials and vital influences in the work of forming the young and the general mind? Yet there is no department of human knowledge so little resorted to, either in the family, school, college, or pulpit, for purposes of Christian culture. Everything in heaven, earth, sea, or atmosphere is analysed, classified, and made tributary to the human soul, in the way of expanding and training its immortal faculties; the stream of worldly history is traced through all its windings; but how seldom is the wakeful intellect and earnest eye of youth directed towards that wonderful series of events, where truth is ever in conflict with error, freedom with tyranny, right with wrong; where all the beneficent energies of the gospel are ever at work, tending gradually, but surely, towards "the time of the restitution of all things;" and where, even "to principalities and powers in heavenly places, is made known through the CHURCH the manifold wisdom of God?"

This general indifference is the result, in part, it must be allowed, of the form in which the history of the church has thus far been written. History, in its highest and best form, is the last product of the human mind in all the departments of its activity. Thucydides did not appear till Greek civilization had reached and passed its culminating point, and Livy and Tacitus enter on their work with lamentations on the departed liberty and greatness of their country. Thus it has been not only in polity, but in literature and art, and it cannot be otherwise with the Christian church, which, in some sense, embraces all these departments. The three first centuries, after the completion of the scriptures, left not a single work which deserves the name of a history. The truly great men of those times had all their energies tasked in the work of spreading and defending Christianity. Those were the times for preachers and apologists, not for historians. The outward peace and prosperity of the church under Constantine gave birth to the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius; but though learned and industrious, he was credulous to an extreme, and wrote in the manifest interest of that hierarchy to which imperial patronage and state connexion had then brought a great accession of power and dignity. The fourth century abounded in Christian preachers and writers of the highest endowments. But the controversies of the time, with occasional persecutions, fully occupied them, so that of all their works, "voluminous and vast" as they are, little or nothing remains in the proper form of history. In the following age, Jerome and Rufinus in the Western church, and Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, in the Eastern, left contributions of more or less value to Christian history. But (to say nothing of the fabulous character which the general credulity has imprinted on all the histories of those times) their works are so pervaded and ruled by the monastic and hierarchical spirit, as to be wholly unsuited to popular use. The great body of Christians neither will nor can take any interest in *histories* which are written for the purpose of magnifying particular orders, and ignore the very existence of by far the most important element in the Christian church, the People. Wherever the Bible is in the hands of the people (and there only exists capacity or interest to read anything), such histories are seen to

be so manifest a falsification of original Christianity, that the popular mind will pass them by with indifference or contempt.

"All the great historical geniuses of Rome,"* says Tacitus, "disappeared at the establishment of monarchy." And as the Papacy is the most absolute of all monarchies, the nine centuries of its ascendancy left not one historian who has attained to anything like general fame. History, during those ages of oppression, was as impossible as photography is in the night time. She never lifts her finger to trace events, nor raises her voice to interpret them, but "in those happy times when men can think what they will, and speak what they think." †

The Reformation was followed by great writers and great works in this as in every other department of mental activity. But they were too controversial to be of general interest or use. The first necessity of the Protestant writers was, of course, to show the historical baselessness of the Papacy. While the Romanists, on the other hand, even those who possessed the highest qualifications, were compelled, in order to make out something like a claim to antiquity, to weave even the latest traditions into their history of the first centuries, and that, too, even while they admitted their utter destitution of historical basis. A multitude of church historians have appeared in still later times, but few have had the patience to explore original sources, and their works have, therefore, had that *lifeless* character which always sticks to compilations; almost all have kept history continually on the rack, to extort from her a confession to some *jus divinum* theory of church government; and scarcely any have possessed the indispensable talent of flowing and animated narration. Some of these works have great value for the scholar, but none of them much interest for the people. In fact, the Christian people, the *πλῆθος*, "the flock of God," "the multitude of them that believe," who occupy the foreground in the inspired church history of the first half century, the Acts of the Apostles, and maintain their prominence through the period of the

* Postquam . . . omnem potestatem ad unum conferri pacis interfuit, magna illa ingenia cessare.—*Hist.* I. 1.

† Rara temporum felicitate, ubi sentire quæ velis et quæ sentias dicere licet.—*Tac., ib.*

truly primitive church, as it was by their labors that the gospel was preached everywhere, and by their blood that the earth was saturated with "the seed of the church," completely vanish from history about the fifth century, and never re-appear till the sixteenth. The hierarchy began the work of encroachment on their rights and liberties, and as soon as Christianity became general enough to be an organ of political power, monarchs lent their whole strength to complete and consolidate this usurpation, so that the two united formed the most perfect and absolute despotism by far that the world has ever beheld. This colossal power threw its shadow over the world for nearly a thousand years. During that period, the people had no voice or representation, either in church or state. Of course, therefore, they make no figure in history. Bishops, patriarchs, popes, and princes, with their mutual struggles and intrigues to get and retain power and riches, together with controversies about rites and dogmas (most of them not even mentioned in the New Testament), make up the whole church history of the middle ages, as if Christ had appeared on earth to found a school of theology, or a rich and lordly hierarchy, and not to make a free and happy world.

Two changes are necessary before ecclesiastical history can become matter of general interest or popular culture and instruction. The whole mass must be subjected to the winnowing process of a just and searching historical criticism. Such a visitation as every department of secular history has undergone within the last half century would vastly diminish the bulk of (so called) ecclesiastical history, and in the same proportion improve its quality. All history has, it is true, been subjected to exaggeration and distortion. But nowhere have ambition and cupidity had so direct and powerful an *interest* in falsification as in the history of the Christian church. Here, therefore, fables stand in the most fearful disproportion to facts. The abominable doctrine of the *Disciplina Arcani* (which is simply a device for the invention of traditions to be assigned to any desirable period of the ancient church) has been the mother of an innumerable brood of impostures.

Again, it must be a history of *the church*, in the original

and scriptural idea of the term. The officers of the church, under whatever name, are not the church any more than the polemarchs and heralds were the Athenian assembly (*ἐκκλησία*) whence its name was derived. The church is the community of "holy and faithful persons in Christ Jesus," for whose "perfecting," "edifying," and "consolation," the ministry itself, with all its rich gifts and great spiritual powers, was ordained, and to whom it was said, "all things are for your sakes—all things are yours!" Ecclesiastical history has for the most part been treated as if the question of the ministry, and the form of church government, were the principal question of Christianity. In the scriptures it holds a very subordinate place. The Congregation of the Lord is the great subject of the Old Testament; the Christian People of the New. A church history, written in the spirit of the Bible, would be occupied principally with their culture, worship, labors for the spread of the gospel, and sufferings to attest its truth, their freedom and autonomy in the primitive constitution of the church, the steps by which their liberties and rights were wrested from them, their struggles (not unfrequently even to blood) to retain them, the disappearance of truth and life from the church just in proportion as its popular character was lost, and the partial (and only partial) recovery of both in the churches which separated from the Papacy in the sixteenth century. Are there no materials for such a history? Let any one turn over the remains of the first three (and even four) centuries, and he will find them incomparably richer in materials of this sort than any other. Such a history, drawn from original sources, and written with spirit and eloquence, would be read by all Christendom. The most popular book of our age probably has been a portion of church history written somewhat in this spirit and from this point of view. Merle d'Aubign 's *History of the Reformation* has been read by hundreds of thousands. More copies of it have been printed probably than of all other church histories put together, with the sole exception of the original church history,—the Bible. Its excellent author was not less amazed at its success, than Luther at the wide and agitating spread of the Christian ideas to which he had given utterance in his theses. Each, in his own way, addressed the

Christian people, and thus, without knowing it, struck a chord which vibrated through the vast diapason of humanity.

The works before us are a new contribution to church history, from a writer who, with fine natural endowments, has devoted his life to the researches and labors of a church historian. Dr. Schaff came from Germany to this western continent in the year 1845, on the invitation of the German Reformed Synod, to the chair of Ecclesiastical History in their Theological Seminary at Mercersburg. Since that time his prolific pen has produced the works mentioned at the head of this article, besides conducting, for several years past, a monthly journal, under the title of "Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund." He writes in a flowing and graceful style, conceives strongly and paints vividly, and shows ability of a high order in the disposition of his materials. His works are composed in the German language, but his translators, both Dr. Nevin and Mr. Yeomans, have done all that learning and skill could do in reproducing them faithfully, and at the same time freely and attractively, in English. His last production, "The History of the Apostolic Church," was first published in German, in 1851, and in the English translation of Mr. Yeomans in October of the last year. It is formally announced as the first portion of a general history of the Christian church, which the author proposes to bring down to the present age, and to complete in nine volumes. The work, in its original form was greeted with the most flattering commendations. Its circulation, however, as was to be expected, was extremely limited till its appearance in an English translation, when it at once attracted extensive notice, and every attempt has been made to secure for it a general circulation.

It is impossible, of course, to over-rate the importance of thoroughly examining and justly estimating, from the start, a work which presents itself to the world under so captivating and imposing a title as that of a general history of the Christian church. By far the most effective method of inculcating opinions of any kind is through the medium of history. The very narration of events enables a skilful writer constantly to inculcate his own views, and that in the most insinuating form; while the conclusions deduced,

and the theories based upon them, insensibly grow up into a complete system of theoretical Christianity. If general "history is philosophy teaching by examples," church history is theology teaching by examples.

We observe differences, neither few nor unimportant, between the original German work and the English translation. As the latter was written and printed under the personal supervision of Dr. Schaff, he is, of course, responsible for these changes. He informs us, it is true, that he has "made some additions, especially in the fourth chapter of the general introduction, and in the last chapter of the fifth book, on the heresies of the Apostolic Age." * But there are other, and much more important "additions," of which he has not thought it necessary to give us the slightest intimation. That portentous "Note on the Claims of the Papacy" † is an "addition" entire to the English work; and no one who regards the question of the Papal primacy as involving the whole idea, not only of church government, but of Christianity itself as a divine institution, can allow that this is an affair of small importance. The note on p. 62, referring to Brownson and Newman, and that on p. 65, have been "added" to the English work. The criticism on Matt. xvi. 18, has been much expanded in the English translation. ‡ The note on p. 654 of the English translation is not contained in the German. There are other differences which we do not deem it important to notice. But, in the instances we have mentioned, Dr. Schaff *has materially expanded and aculeated the ideas of the original work, and invariably in the direction of Romanism.* Yet the English translation is holding its flight far and wide over the land, on wings provided beforehand for the German; and the plumage of these wings verily moves our wonder not a little, plucked as it is from "birds" which are generally reckoned by no means "of a feather."

Dr. Schaff's theory of historical Christianity is thoroughly Papal in all its essential features and tendencies. Let not

* Pref., p. 4.

† Pp. 374-7.

‡ Compare Eng. Tr., pp. 351 and 352, with Germ., p. 289; and Eng., p. 353, with Germ., p. 290.

the charitable reader accuse us of harshness. We shall presently give him proof of what we say, we doubt not, to his entire content.

We can by no means admit the validity of the plea that, as English readers, we cannot fully understand a writer so thoroughly German in his education and habits of thought as Dr. Schaff. Is that his fault or ours? The laws of thought and expression are universal. The prophecy of "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," is constructed on the same general principles with the sentence just now uttered in the freest conversation. The hymn of the angels at Bethlehem follows the same logical order with the first utterance of childhood. We can understand Moses, Confucius, or Aristotle, and why not Dr. Schaff—why not the Germans of our own day, who are, in fact, cousin-germans to ourselves? We find no difficulty in understanding Germans of a century or even three centuries back. No writers ever expressed thought with greater perspicuity and directness than Luther and Melancthon. Seckendorff, Sleidan, Mosheim, and Schröckh, are as intelligible to English minds as Robertson or Prescott. This plea, which is put in for Dr. Schaff, leads inevitably to one of three suppositions. Either he is not capable of teaching us, or we are not capable of learning from him, or, once more, *he is attempting to convey ideas by suggestion which he does not think proper fully to disclose.* We should be sorry to imply a suspicion of the latter; but Homer long ago was of opinion that "a fog was more favorable to the thief than night."* An obscure and equivocal style, whatever excuses may be made for it elsewhere, is absolutely incapable of apology in a work of such magnitude and importance as that which has been undertaken by Dr. Schaff, where divine truth and unquestionable facts form the only proper material, and "words of truth and soberness" are pre-eminently required in expressing them.

Does Dr. Schaff give evidence of possessing the high and various qualifications which are necessary to form the character of the general historian of the Christian church?

One of the first of these is largeness of mind and entire

* Iliad iii. 10, 11.

impartiality. The stream of church history, in its flow through eighteen centuries, has incorporated with itself many and widely different literatures and nationalities. Nothing is more essential to its historian, therefore, than that elevation of mind which rises far above all narrow and sectional prejudices, and enables him to survey the whole with a truly philosophic (or better, a truly Christian) impartiality. Christianity is a religion for the world, and its historian must be a man of world-wide amplitude, and liberality of views. Dr. Schaff sadly lacks this qualification. The writer who can speak with contempt of "the poor, stale reproductions of the worn out theology of New England,"* and can see in John Milton nothing better than "a pious but tedious singer,"† "whom we cannot reckon among our poets of the first rank," while he discourses largely of "the rich religious poetry of the Middle Ages,"‡ "the vast

* *What is Church History?* p. 19.

† *Prin. of Prot.*, p. 143. Is it an improbable conjecture that Dr. S. finds this "pious singer" (whose piety was indeed the brightest ornament of his matchless genius) particularly "tedious" when he sings of the contents of a certain "Limbo, large and broad" on the confines of our world—

"Up hither like aerial vapors fly
 Both all things vain and all who in vain things
 Build their fond hopes. * * *
 Embryos and idiots, eremits and friers
 White, black, and grey, with all their trumpery.
 Here pilgrims roam that strayed so far to seek
 In Golgotha him dead, who lives in heaven.
 And they who, to be sure of Paradise,
 Dying put on the weeds of Dominic,
 Or in Franciscan think to pass disguised.
 And now Saint Peter at Heaven's wicket seems
 To wait them with his keys; and now at foot
 Of Heaven's ascent they lift their feet, when lo
 A violent cross wind from either coast
 Blows them transverse ten thousand leagues awry,
 Into the devious air: then might ye see
 Cows, hoods and habits, with their wearers, tost
 And fluttered into rags; then reliques, beads,
 Indulgences, dispenses, pardons, bulls,
 The sport of winds; all these upwhirled aloft
 Fly o'er the backside of the world far off
 Into a Limbo large and broad, since called
 The Paradise of Fools."—*Par. Lost*, iii. 445, &c.

‡ *What is Church History?* p. 75.

poetical powers and resources," "colossal figures," "measureless influence," "gigantic life," &c., of Goethe, Schiller, and (though much more sparingly mentioned) Byron,* gives but slender evidence of his capacity to appreciate the productions of Christian genius in different countries and ages. Instances of this incredible narrowness of mind are by no means rare in the works of Dr. S. ; but these, we think, will render the task of further citation unnecessary.

His extravagant laudations of German literature and theology (and that almost exclusively of its recent productions of this class) betray a mind essentially sectional, and therefore incapable of the wide, liberal, and comprehensive views which ought to characterize the church historian. These are coupled always with expressions of extreme contempt for nearly all that has come from other sources. "There is reason," he says, "to apprehend that very few of our theologians in this country have anything like a thorough acquaintance with the history of the church."† "The late *convert* to Popery, Mr. Newman, openly acknowledges, too, "the great ignorance that prevails in England in relation to the church history in particular of the middle ages." Dr. Schaff is pleased to admit, it is true, "the merits acquired in former times, by the Dutch and English in particular, in the way of biblical study, critical, exegetical, and antiquarian."‡ "But what is all this," he asks, "beside the gigantic creations of the German theology?"§ He affirms that the German "inquiries reach to *the inmost ground of all things* ;" (an unfathomable profundity of *bathos*, beyond all doubt.) "The proper home of Protestant theology is Germany."|| "She is the land," &c. "As Rome was twice the centre of the world's life * * so Germany would appear to be called also to act the second time a world-historical part in * * a vast revolution in theology and the church ; a revolution whose power may be expected, in the end, to *rule the life of the world*, (!) as before, for centuries to come."¶

"All its heresies," says Dr. S., "cannot destroy my

* Prin. of Prot., p. 144.

† Prin. of Prot., p. 161.

‡ Ibid.

§ What is Ch. Hist.† p. 1, Pref.

¶ Id. *ibid.*

¶¶ What is Ch. Hist.† p. 11.

respect for it. * * For only an archangel can become a devil."*

We have not the slightest disposition to disparage the recent labors of German scholars in Christian literature and history. He who goes among their vast accumulations and chaotic theories with a talisman powerful enough to distinguish, in all cases, truth from error, and furnished, above all, with a sure criterion whereby to know "an archangel" from "a devil," may do very well. And yet has this "land of gigantic creations," this "proper home of Protestant theology," produced within the last two centuries one such profound thinker as Butler or Edwards, one such master of Christian homiletics as Hall, Davies, or Mason, one such manifestation of Christianity in life and action as Chalmers? In any view of the case, such unmeasured eulogy ill befits the calm and sober temperament of the historian—least of all, the incipient historian of the church universal.

The immoderate self-complacency of Dr. Schaff is an indication of the same sort. His "essay," he informs us, "is designed only for readers who have some theological culture, and an inquiring spirit. * * I should not think it necessary to make the remark, were it not for the experience I have had. * * We live, indeed, in a glorious land of liberty and equality. But still this can by no means justify the presumption with which it is often pretended in this country, in off-hand newspaper articles, to pronounce judgment on scientific works, which the self-constituted critics show themselves, by their enormous superficiality and poverty of mind, utterly disqualified for understanding." † "I ask for readers at home, in some measure, in the subject. * * This, methinks, is a demand which does no wrong to our republican Constitution." ‡ Speaking of "a review of Mr. Newman," § he says: "Too many of our critics, in their immense Protestant (!) self-complacency, are utterly disqualified for every task of this kind. "Empty self-conceit," "smattering of knowledge," "contractedness,"

* Prin. of Prot., p. 161.

† What is Ch. Hist. ? p. 6, and passim.

‡ Id., p. 7.

§ Id., p. 48, note.

"unhistorical," "unscientific," "intolerant," "tyrannical," and the like charges and epithets, are dealt out by our author against such as may have the misfortune to differ from his theories, or the "presumption" to arraign them "at the bar of the common understanding,"* with a liberality which we have nowhere else met with, except in the kindred writings of the "Mercersburg school." They bring to our minds irresistibly certain scraps of ancient wisdom to this effect: "Ego sapientia cum prudentia habito. Superbus est, nihil sciens," &c. True greatness is generally modest, and prefers to show its power rather by what it does than by what it promises. *Ex fumo dare lucem*, and the opposite, apply almost invariably to the works of "inventive men." And if the illustrious historian of Rome shrank from the "seven hundred years" of her colossal life as a "*res immensi operis*," one might naturally enough expect that the delineation of eighteen centuries of the world's moral life would force from the Christian historian the exclamation, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

The indulgence of a sort of poetico-romantic sentimentalism not unfrequently disfigures Dr. Schaff's work, and looks like a "purple patch" sewed on the grave ground of church history. As an example: "To his (John's) superintendence of the church of Asia Minor" (a fact which it is much easier to take for granted than to prove from history), "may, no doubt, refer the strange remark of Polycrates in Eusebius (v. 24), that John wore the *petalon*, the diadem of the Jewish high-priest." Mark, now, the luxuriant growth of a legend! The *πίταλοι περιφορεῖς* of Polycrates in Eusebius becomes in Jerome, of the next century, † "*auream laminam in fronte portans*." But Dr. S. shows that a legend loses nothing by passing through his hands. For, on his page, the apostle stands forth wearing "the petalon, the diadem of the Jewish high-priest!" Dr. S. pronounces, it is true, the *prima materies* of the tradition "a strange remark," yet cannot resist the temptation to weave a theory about it. "Perhaps," he adds, "he (John) was regarded as the Christian high-priest, because, in the *Apocalypse*, he entered

* What is Ch. Hist. ? p. 7.

† Cat. Script. Ecc. *Polycrates*.

farther than any other into the mysteries of the heavenly Sanctuary." The theory is even more "strange" than the "remark," which never appears in Christian history till the fourth century, as a quotation from the end of the second; and, therefore, might have been omitted from a "History of the Apostolic Church," without in the least diminishing the value of its contents.

Our author gives "two characteristic anecdotes" of John "in the closing year of his life," which, he says, "bear the full impress of truth." This is a good deal to say of events first recorded about two hundred years after their affirmed occurrence.* The stories are well known. "In a town not far from Ephesus, he met with a youth whose beauty and ardor" (strange motives, certainly, for the zeal and charity of a Christian missionary) "at once so engaged his interest, that he handed him over to the bishop as an object of very special care." The youth relapsed during the absence of the apostle, and became leader of a band of robbers. At a second visit, John having, with great grief, learned his apostasy, pursued him to his retreat in the mountains. "When the aged apostle came up, the youth clasped his knees, prayed with strong lamentation for pardon, and *with his tears of repentance, baptized himself a second time.* The apostle assured him that he had obtained forgiveness for him from the Saviour, fell upon his knees, and kissed his hand."†

There are grave historical difficulties in the way of receiving this tradition; and its disagreement in some internal points with the character and inspired teachings of the apostle, is, we think, sufficient at least to awaken distrust. But Dr. Schaff commends it to our unquestioning belief as "a beautiful legend," which "bears the full impress of truth."

Alluding to the great age attained by this apostle, he says, "this *aged youth* passed along in heavenly peace through the tribulations of the primitive church," &c.‡

He alludes also to "the rumor" (founded on "a misunderstanding of the enigmatical language of Jesus—John xxi.

* First related by Eusebius, in an extract from Clemens Alex. H. E. iii. 23.

† Hist. of Ap. Ch., p. 405.

‡ Hist. of Ap. Ch., p. 406.

22") "that John was not really dead, but only asleep, moving the mound over his grave with his breathing, awaiting the final advent of the Lord*—A "rumor" which we never hear of till the fifth century, when it is mentioned (only to be contradicted) by Augustine.

"According to another legend (in Photius and *Pseudo-Hippolytus*!) John died indeed, but was immediately raised again from the grave, translated like Enoch and Elias (*died* indeed, yet was *translated!*) and with these saints of the Old Testament will appear as the herald of the visible return of Christ, and the antagonist of Antichrist."†

Dr. S. has favored us with yet other "legends" of the Apostle John. It is marvellous that he forgot to mention the creed that is said by the papal historians‡ to have been furnished by this same apostle to Gregory Thaumaturgus, at the special request of the Virgin. This too, it is true, came to light only long after the death of Gregory and his personal friends. But that circumstance does not hinder it (according to Dr. Schaff's method of estimating credibility) from "bearing the full impress of truth."

An enlightened pagan historian may read Dr. S. a useful lesson on the value of such materials of history, when he pronounces them "poëticiis magis decora fabulis quam inconruptis rerum gestarum monumentis." "Rumors" and "legends," however "beautiful," which can only be traced to an origin some hundred years later than the time to which they refer (and, moreover, flatly contradict each other), are very unfit material for a "History of the Apostolic Church."

The three following specimens we put down as *non-descript*, leaving the reader to assign them, as he may think fit, to a diseased sentimentalism, a false philosophy, or an incredible levity in speaking of divine things.

"The love of the former (Peter) was more active and

* The story looks very much like a pseudo-Christian re-fashionment of the old pagan legend of Typhœus. So monstrous a perversion of all Christian ideas of death and the grave, especially in connexion with the holy and venerable name of "the disciple whom Jesus loved," deserved no other notice (if any) than a decided reprobation.

† Ap. Ch., p. 406. n.

‡ Tillemont and others; though Tillemont announces it "peu probable."

masculine, that of the latter (John) more *receptive and virgin-like*.*

"John * * reposing on the bosom of the God-man, *became himself, as it were, a second Jesus(!)* so far as is possible for a mortal."†

The next we should not feel at liberty to transcribe, did we not regard it as a necessary exposition of the genius and style of Dr. Schaff. It is by no means alone in its class. "The descent of the eternal Logos through the Holy Ghost into the womb of the Virgin, *in whom the religious susceptibility of the whole human family reached its maturity*, is the beginning * * * * of this sacred biography of the second Adam."‡

This historico-scientific sentimentalism actually rules Dr. Schaff's whole system in his theory of the "typical import of the apostolic church." This theory runs through his entire work, and he loses no opportunity of renewing the impression of it on the reader's mind. He advances it, indeed, "not as pertaining to church history, but as touching the philosophy" (we should rather say *romance*) "of it." It is as follows: "The Lord chose three favorite disciples, who are to be regarded as types, at the same time, of as many stages of development for the church. Peter, the apostle of the Father, the New Testament Moses, or the representative of the principle of authority and law, answers in his personality and form of doctrine to the first stadium of church history, the period of Catholicism flowing over in the end to Popery itself. Paul, the apostle of the Son, the New Testament Elias, the representative of the principle of movement, and of the free, justifying power of faith, is the type of Protestantism. Both stages * * * must, at last, become united. * * * So united, they will form the ideal Church, whose type is exhibited to us in the disciple who lay on Jesus' bosom, the apostle of the Holy Ghost, the apostle of love, &c. To this refers the mystical sense of Christ's word, John 21, 22, where he speaks enigmatically of John's tarrying till his second coming? §

Whence is this romantic typology derived? Dr. S.

* Ap. Ch., p. 410.

† Id., p. 644.

‡ Id., p. 435, n.

§ Prin. of Prot., p. 175.

traces "the idea" to "the prophetic monk, Joachim, of Flore, in the twelfth century. * * * Very recently, however, it has been clothed with new poetically scientific interest, by the greatest living philosopher (Schelling)." We must remind Dr. Schaff that "prophetic monks" and pantheistic philosophers are dangerous contributors, whether of material or form, to the history of the Christian church; and that this "ingenious and beautiful speculation" (and what have such *speculations* to do with history?) degrades the whole life and progress of the church into a human sphere, and directly contradicts one of the most glorious and precious revelations of the gospel. A hope and destination, immeasurably more exalted, is placed before all who believe in Christ, for God "hath predestinated them to be conformed" (not to the type of Peter, Paul, or John, but) "*to the image of his Son.*"

All true church history must, of course, be based on a just criticism of the Holy Scriptures, from whence the very idea of Christianity is to be derived, and by which all that assumes the name of Christianity is to be tried, through all periods and forms of the church. Specimens of Dr. Schaff's exegesis will occur in the course of our remarks on certain aspects of his theory.

And as a true history of Christian antiquity can be drawn only from the original productions of the early Christian writers, an actual and profound knowledge of these productions must be allowed to be indispensable to the church historian. From the manner in which Dr. Schaff appeals to these writers in support of his positions, we shall leave the reader to infer the extent to which his researches have been carried in that direction.

Dr. Schaff's idea of the materials of which church history is to be formed, may be gathered from his chapter on the "Sources of Church History."* These he divides "into *immediate* and *mediate.*"

"A. The IMMEDIATE or DIRECT SOURCES," he continues,

* Ap. Ch., p. 26, et seq. [In the classification we follow Dr. Schaff's capitals and italics.]

"being the pure, original utterances of the history itself, are the most important. They may be divided into

a. Written. Here belong

1. *Official reports and documents.* Of special importance among these are the *acts of councils*. Then, the *official letters of bishops*, particularly the *bulls of the popes*. These decrees and bulls refer to all departments of church history, but especially to doctrine and government. * * * In doctrine history we have, first of all, the *confessions of faith*. In the department of Christian life we have the various *monastic rules*; in that of worship, the *liturgies*," &c.

Here Dr. Schaff points the student of history as to "pure, original utterances of history itself," to a mass of the boldest forgeries which the world has ever witnessed. Of "councils" which never sat, and "acts" which were never enacted save in the brain of some impostor, who hoped to curry papal favor by that sort of manufacture, there are so many in what has been called church history, that a word of caution on that point would have been by no means superfluous. But Dr. S. cannot possibly be ignorant that nearly five centuries of "the official letters" and "decrees of the popes" are a *sheer and absolute forgery*, long ago given up and laughed at by the papal court itself; though, "with a whore's forehead that would not be ashamed," she continued to assert their genuineness long after learned men within her own communion blushed at the transparent imposture. Let us suppose, now, that the reader of history should take Dr. Schaff's advice, and begin his researches into church history with these "decretals of the popes." He opens the first volume. The first "official letter" which meets his eye is one from Clemens (according to some the *second*, to others the *third* "bishop" or "pope" of Rome,—truth never so perplexes its asserters) to James, the brother of the Lord, in which he gives that apostle an account of the recent martyrdom of Peter, and of his previous transmission to him, the said Clemens, of all the powers and privileges of the apostolic see: when, *by universal consent, the death of James preceded that of Peter!* The impostor wears his disguise so carelessly as to make his scriptural quotations in the language of the Vulgate translation, which was not made till more than four hundred years after the

"letters" and "decrees" purport to have been written.* This clumsy and palpable counterfeit was executed in the ninth century; it was suspected at the very cock-crowing that preceded the dawn of the sixteenth, and was exposed, beyond all possibility of denial or doubt, by the earliest light of the Reformation. "The pressure of Protestant criticism" has driven it to the wall, and demonstrated its absurdity so effectually that no respectable Romanist could now be found who would claim the least authenticity for it. But Dr. S., in classifying the sources of church history, places these "official letters, decrees, and bulls of the popes," in "A. a. 1," and pronounces them "pure, original utterances of history!" Should Dr. S. ever find leisure to give an account of the sources of secular history, we may expect him to put the Golden Ass of Apuleius, the Adventures of Baron Munchausen, and the History of Dietrich Knickerbocker, in "A. a. 1," as pure, original utterances of history."

And what sort of revelations the "bulls of the Popes" would afford in the "department of doctrine and govern-

* Blondell (Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes) mentions the above and a multitude of other anachronisms and contradictions, in these "letters of the popes." The above work of Blondell so completely demolished all claim of the collection to authenticity, that no Romanist can hold up his head at the mention of it. "To say anything on this subject after Blondell," says Cave, "would be to make an *Iliad* after Homer." Cave pronounces the collection "*stupenda plane impostura* * * * et ita quidem esse, uno fere ore jam agnoscunt cordatiores Pontificii"—("a stupendous imposture manifestly, and that it is so in fact, all the more sensible papists now, with nearly one consent, acknowledge.") *Script. Ecc. Hist. Seculum ix.*, p. 445. The eminent Romanist, Baluze (cited by Cave), calls the compiler *impudentissimus ille nebulo* (that shameless vagabond). Constantius (Romanist) Prolegom. ad *Epist. Pont.*, admits in full that they are forgeries. So does Fleury, *Hist. Ecc. Diss.*, Pref. to the 16th vol. (cited by Mosheim, vol. ii., pp. 126, 7). Even Bellarmine has not a stomach strong enough for them. He says, *Epistolæ SS. quæ nunc extant non carent scrupulo. Nam constat S. Jacobum, ad quem scribuntur duæ epistolæ, obiisse multo ante S. Petrum: et tamen in iis significatur mors S. Petri.*—Bell. de *Script. Ecc.* Yet here we have Dr. Schaff, a German, and a professed protestant, pronouncing "the official letters of bishops, particularly the bulls of popes," "decrees and bulls," *sine* "scrupulo," without the slightest caution or discrimination, "immediate sources," "pure utterances, &c. The reader will doubtless mark the adroit wording of the enumeration. But it will by no means enable Dr. Schaff to evade the responsibility of the avowal.

ment," the reader may conclude from a glance at the bulls "In Coena Domini" and "Unigenitus;" or, in fact, from almost any "bull" which has ever been "fulminated" from the papal throne.

But "letters, decrees, and bulls of the Popes" are not the only "pure, original utterances of history." To this class also belong, "2. Inscriptions; particularly upon tombs." The high veneration which Dr. S. has for "relics,"* causes him, doubtless, to attach this great importance to "tombs" as "immediate or direct sources" of church history.

To the same class belong, "6. Unwritten (sources); particularly church edifices, religious paintings, the Gothic domes of the middle ages, * * are of the greatest moment for the historian."

At a modest distance after "decrees and bulls of the popes," "tombs," "religious paintings and Gothic domes," come "the accounts and representations of historians," among which are admitted "the Acts of the Apostles," which Dr. S. allows, however, to be "almost the same as immediate sources;" *i. e.* the narrative of the accurate and truthful Luke, "a man of God," moreover, whose "scripture is all given by inspiration of God," is "*almost* the same" (not quite) to the student of history, as the pseudo-Isidorus, the admitted *forger* of "the false decretals," "the acts of councils," "the letters of bishops," "the bulls of popes," "monastic rules," "inscriptions upon tombs," "religious paintings," "Gothic domes," &c., &c. The inspired narrative is, in fact, *only five degrees lower* in value and "importance" than these remarkably veracious "documents," "A. a. 1: Bulls and decrees of the popes and *monastic rules*. * * 2: Inscriptions upon tombs. * * b: Religious paintings, Gothic domes, &c. (The above are all "immediate or direct sources—pure utterances of history.") Then

* "In the Roman Catholic Church * * remembrancers of the world unseen meet us on all sides, in crosses, churches, images of saints, *relics*, and *expressive* symbols of every kind." Dr. S. cites this as a reason why "she exercises a much greater power than Protestantism over the consciences and spirits of those who stand in her communions." (Prin. of Prot., p. 140.) Why does not Dr. Schaff "stand in her communion," and avail himself to the full of the spiritual benefits to be derived from such "remembrancers of the world unseen," as "*crosses*," "*images*" of saints," "*relics*," &c., &c.?

follow, "Mediate or indirect sources: B. a. * * Acts of the Apostles, by Luke," &c. Such is Dr. Schaff's scale of historical credulity! Such is his conception of "immediate sources—pure utterances of history!"

"Among the mediate sources," continues Dr. S., "though in a very subordinate rank" (*i. e.* one degree lower than "the Acts of the Apostles, by Luke," the transition being only from "a" to "b"), "we may place oral *traditions, legends, and popular sayings*, which are often characteristic of the spirit of their age: the saying, for example, current through the middle ages, that the church, since her union with the state under Constantine, had lost her virginity."*

What sort of a *stream* will flow out of such "sources" the reader may conjecture. It is to hold on its course, it seems, through eighteen centuries. If it is so filthy in its first gushing forth, it is hard indeed to tell "to what complexion it will come at last."

It is hardly worth while after this to find fault with Dr. Schaff's "division of church history." His "FIRST AGE" is "the primitive, or the Græco-Latin universal church, from its foundation on the day of Pentecost, to Gregory the Great (A. D. 30—590); thus embracing the first six centuries."

What possible reason can there be for comprising "the first six centuries" within one "age?" What resemblance or congruity between the first century and the sixth? What even between the second and the fifth? No two continuous centuries, in fact, are so utterly unlike as the third and fourth (unless we except the fifteenth and sixteenth). In the third, the church was still bleeding and fainting under persecution and the world's contempt. Before the middle of the fourth she had become the opulent and powerful ally of the State, her bishops independent of, and superior to, secular judges and magistrates. Dr. Schaff thus defines an "age:" "A new age will commence where the church, with a grand and momentous revolution, not only passes into an entirely new outward state, but also takes, in her inward development, a wholly different direction."† Now,

* Some truth in that "oral tradition," at least.

† Ap. Ch., p. 36.

if the Christian church did not, "with a grand and momentous revolution, pass into an entirely new outward state" in the fourth century, it would be difficult to find such a "revolution" in history. From being arraigned as a criminal before kings and governors, she was acknowledged, honored, and enriched as the ally of the autocrat of the civilized world. From being denounced and doomed as "a mover of sedition," "an enemy of the human race," an abetter of impiety and atheism, she is now extolled as the source of all that is pure and excellent in humanity. Till the third century had considerably advanced, she had not, like her Master, where to lay her head. She owned not a house on earth in which to assemble her disciples. "In an upper room," "on the sea shore," "by the river side," in the sepulchres, "in dens and caves of the earth," they gathered stealthily and tremblingly to pray, and praise, and "feed their souls with the inspired utterances." By the middle of the fourth she had magnificent churches of her own, a ritual considerably matured, bishops with large revenues and extensive sway, and with pride, luxury, and tyranny to match. As her "foundation" was laid by her divine Lord, she was "not of this world." Who could affirm this of that which bore her name in the sixth century? Was not here "a grand and momentous revolution"—"an entirely new outward state?" And whoever looks, by way of comparison, into the epistles of Paul and Peter, and the letters of "Gregory the Great," will, we think, discern, "in her inward development, a *wholly different direction.*" This division is a bold violation of historical truth and unity, for no other purpose, we apprehend, than *to get the rise of the Papacy into the same "age" with "the primitive or universal church,"* to embark "Gregory the Great" in the same bottom with the apostles, that they may sail down the stream of history, and meet the admiring gaze of mankind together. But it will not do. The papal craft must cut loose from such "goodly fellowship," hoist its own colors, and meet its own destinies.

We only notice Dr. Schaff's "division" further, to observe that his "ninth" (or last) "period" partakes of a sort of *prophetic-historic* character. It is as follows:

"Ninth Period.—*Subjective and negative* protestantism (rational-

ism and sectarianism), and *positive preparation* for a new age in both churches (from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present time)."

Such are the two and only constituent elements, according to Dr. Schaff, of Protestantism "from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present time,"—"rationalism and sectarianism!" No wonder that Dr. S. considers it "in an interimistic" (*i. e. perishing*) "state." The present stage of its *aufhebung* (to follow out this Hegelian formula) will *negate* or *abolish* all that has gone before; and the next will present it in a new form! The tendency of this "ninth period" is, "a *positive preparation* for a new age in both churches" (the Protestant and Roman). What this "new age," this "magnificent UNION,"* as it stands revealed to the eye of our historic seer, is to be, will appear in the sequel.

The reader will now be hardly surprised at the assertion that Dr. Schaff's "History of the Apostolic Church" is neither more nor less than a historical plea for the papacy. Thither his "sources" and "divisions," his theories, criticisms, "legends," and *vaticinations* plainly tend. But the proof is still more lamentably and overwhelmingly certain. Through the misty drapery of Dr. Schaff's philosophy, every essential feature of the papal system stands forth with a prominence so sharply defined, as to leave doubt impossible, and charity in despair.

The first of these which we shall mention is "the primacy of Peter," which Dr. Schaff pronounces "a subject of vast importance," and justly observes that "*the claims of the papacy*† are well known to centre here." Dr. Schaff fully asserts "the primacy of Peter," and devotes about thirty pages‡ of his work to the proof of it, and the exposition of its relations to the Christian church and its history.

"The character of Peter" is his first topic and source of proof.

"This apostle was distinguished from the other eleven by an ar-

* Prin. of Prot., p. 178.

† The italics are his own; p. 374. n. ‡ Ap. Ch., p. 348-377.

dent, impulsive, choleric, sanguine temperament * * * and an eminent talent for representing and governing the church. He was always ready to speak out his mind and heart, to resolve and to act. But these natural endowments brought with them a peculiarly strong temptation to vanity, self-conceit, and ambition. His excitable, impulsive disposition might very easily lead him * * * in the hour of danger, to yield, with equal readiness, to entirely opposite impressions. * * * He was born to be a church leader, and his powers, after proper purification by the spirit of Christ, admirably fitted him for the work * * * of founding and organizing the church.*

That a man of "impulsive, *choleric*, sanguine temperament," "*always ready to speak out his mind and heart*," is thence concluded to possess "eminent talent for *representing and governing*," to be admirably fitted for *founding and organizing*"—in short "born to be a *church leader*," may certainly pass for a specimen of historical delineation which gives singular promise of Dr. S.'s future achievements in that line.

But his "eminent talent" was not his only qualification. "His strength lay" partly, also, "in an imposing mien, which at once commanded respect and obedience."†

Where Dr. S. learned this fact he does not inform us. From some "legend," or "rumor," perhaps; or more probably, from the "Icones Pontificum" prefixed to the "letters, decrees, &c., of the popes," where "Simon Petrus" figures with a *very* "imposing mien," as the "Primus Romanus Pontifex." "Religious pictures" being among the "sources of church history," and the decretals themselves "immediate sources, pure utterances," &c., it would be quite "unhistorical" to doubt that Peter had "an imposing mien, which at once *commanded* respect and obedience."‡

* P. 350. † Ibid.

‡ The peculiarly humble and gracious tone of his epistles might indeed seem at variance with the "imposing mien," "at once commanding obedience," &c., which is here ascribed to him. "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims,"—"the elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder,—be clothed with humility,—all of you be subject one to another,—*not lording it over God's heritage*," &c., &c. Nor was his "mien" very "imposing," nor his tone at all "commanding" in the "apostolic council. (Acts xv.) If Dr. S. had made more account of the writings and actions of Peter, as they are preserved in Scripture, especially after his "conversion"

But "eminent talent" and an "imposing mien" would not, of themselves, demonstrate the "primacy of Peter." A critical basis must be sought; and Dr. Schaff proceeds to construct it as follows, in his section entitled, "Position of Peter in Church History."*

"The place and significance of this apostle in the history of the church," says Dr. S., "was determined by his natural qualifications, so far as they were under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. * * The Lord knew at once what was in him, and named him at the outset (John i. 42; Matth. x. 2) *Cephas* in the Aramaic language, or, as translated into Greek, *Peter*, signifying rock. A year afterwards the Saviour confirmed and explained to him this title of honor, and connected with it that remarkable promise, which has been such an apple of discord in the Christian church. Simon was the first to recognise and acknowledge * * the great central mystery, the fundamental article of Christianity, the Messiahship of his Master. In a critical, sifting hour, * * Simon declared, in the name of all his colleagues, * * "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." (Matth. xvi. 16; cf. Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20.) On the ground of this first Christian creed, this joyful confession of saving faith, revealed to him not by flesh and blood, but by the Father in heaven, the Lord pronounced him blessed, and added, '*Thou art Peter* (rock, man of rock); *and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* And I will give unto thee the keys,' &c., &c. We have here an uncommonly significant play upon words, which we cannot feel the full force of without referring to the Greek, or what is still better, the Hebrew original. Without doubt, our Lord used in both clauses, the Aramaic word כִּיפּוּא. * * In the Greek, *ὁ εἰ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν πέτραν*; as also in the Latin, *tu es Petrus et super hanc petram*,—the play on words is somewhat obscured by the necessary change of gender. In the German and English it is wholly lost, since *fels* and *rock* are never used as proper names. But in the French, *tu es Pierre et sur cette pierre je bâtirai mon Eglise*—it is brought out as clearly as in the Semitic dialects."

and the "baptism of the spirit," and drawn, *cum scrupulo*, as Bellarmine recommends, from his own "immediate sources," he would, we think, have formed a very different estimate of his character." But he will probably account this the judgment of an "unscientific divine," who, he says, "has no right to meddle," &c., &c. (What is Ch. Hist. ? p. 7.)

* § 90, p. 350 foll.

"In the interpretation of this passage" (continues Dr. S.) "two errors are to be avoided. On the one hand, the promise must not be sundered from the confession, and attached to the mere person of Peter as such."

"Equally unreasonable is it, on the other hand, to disjoin, as many Protestant theologians do, the 'petra' from the preceding 'petros,' and refer it solely to the confession in v. 16. For this plainly destroys the beautiful, vivacious play upon words, and the significance of the *πέτρα*, which evidently refers to the nearest antecedent,* 'Petros.' Besides, the church of Christ is built, not upon abstract doctrines, but upon living persons, as the bearers of the truth."

"Rather must we, with all the fathers, and the best modern protestant interpreters, refer the words, 'Thou art a rock,'† &c., by all means to Peter, indeed; but only to him as he appears in the immediate context; that is, to the renewed Peter, to whom God had revealed the mystery of the incarnation; to Peter, the fearless confessor of the Saviour's divinity; in a word, to *Peter in Christ*. Thus the sense is, 'I appoint thee, as the living witness of this fundamental truth, which thou hast just confessed, to be the chief instrument in founding my indestructible church, and endow thee with all the powers of its government under me, the builder and supreme ruler of the same.‡ In these words, therefore, our Lord describes the official character of this apostle, and foretells to him his *future place in the history of the church*.§ Peter here appears as the foundation and Christ himself as the master-builder of that wonderful spiritual edifice, which no hostile power can destroy."

Dr. Schaff then adopts in full the papal interpretation of this passage. For no papist ever thought of "sundering the promise from the confession, and attaching it to the mere person of Peter as such," or of "referring the words," "thou art a rock," to any other than the "renewed Peter," &c.; in a word, to "*Peter in Christ*." The idea of "refer-

* A feminine demonstrative pronoun "evidently referring to" a masculine "antecedent" is certainly a grammatical novelty.

† What shall we say of a writer of Dr. Schaff's pretensions, who *mistranslates the passage on which he founds his proof, and then reasons from it in that mistranslated form throughout his argument?* *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος* does not mean, "thou art a rock," but "thou art Peter." Such a shallow and short-sighted instance of disingenuousness could have no other effect than to bring suspicion on his whole argument.

‡ The words here put in italics are not contained in the German.

§ The italics in this sentence are Dr. Schaff's.

ring them to the *unrenewed Peter*, to *Peter out of Christ*," would not so well suit the purposes of Romanism. Nor would Bellarmine, or any other Romanist, ask more than to "refer the words, *Thou art a rock, and on this rock will I build my church*," &c., to Peter (whether in or out of Christ matters not much), and then, having allowed Dr. Schaff to make the passage over, and adapt its very language to the papal purpose, in a way that they had never dared to do themselves, to accept this as "the sense" of it:—"I appoint thee, &c., * * and *endow thee with ALL the powers of its (my church's) government under me*; * * our Lord here describing," as Dr. Schaff assures us, "the *official character* of the apostle, and foretelling to him his *future position in the history of the church*." So that "Peter here appears as *the foundation* of that wonderful edifice."

"A wonderful edifice" it would be verily! "The church of God," the community of the holy and redeemed of all countries and ages, "Mount Zion, the city of our God" (with all its glorious contents, Heb. xii.), "the fulness of him that filleth all in all"—founded upon Peter! A cone of world-wide dimensions and world-embracing contents poised on its apex, and that, alas! a crumbling one, would not be a more wonderful edifice than that which our exegetical historian has here contrived to erect.

And that too on a single passage, a *solitary phrase* of Scripture. The other evangelists do not contain this part of the address to Peter (cf. Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20). It is found only in Matth. xvi. 18. This is truly marvellous in the case of the Gospel of Mark. For "the Gospel of Mark," says Dr. S., "was written in Rome, and designed, as may be seen from its frequent latinisms, &c., in the first instance, for Roman readers.* * * * In fact, tradition traces it back, at least, indirectly (a "*tradition, tracing back, at least, indirectly!*") to Peter himself, whose confidential companion Mark was." But we have not done yet: "Important critics of various schools" even "incline to the view that the second Gospel is the oldest, and forms the basis of the first and third." Whither is this "tradition tracing backward indirectly" leading us? It is at length apparent.

* Ap. Ch., p. 593.

"Thus would the first evangelist stand connected with the first apostle, and Peter, more than any other disciple of the Lord, would be * * the founder of the church, in reference also to her permanent documents."*

We now turn to this "basis" of the other gospels, and look for the "foundation of the church," on Dr. S.'s theory. It is not there. "Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ. And he charged them that they should tell no man concerning him." Such is the whole narrative as far as Peter is concerned, as it stands in Mark viii. 29, 30. And this gospel, too, was "written in Rome," "designed for Roman readers," by "a confidential companion of Peter," and "traced back by tradition, at least indirectly, to Peter himself." Yet of the only passage in the New Testament which affords the least shadow of a support to the "primacy of Peter," it contains not a word. Inexplicable omission! Was it from modesty? But "the prince of the apostles," "endowed by Christ with all the powers of the government of his church under him," could not, consistently with the peace and order of the church, have failed to insert, or cause to be inserted in that "gospel which formed the basis of the first and third," those few words of his Master which constituted the sole authentication of his "official character" and "future position in the history of the church." Since the gospel was to bear the name of Mark, modesty itself could make no objection to this indispensable insertion. If it had been a later gospel, the insertion of the passage in an earlier one or more, might in some degree have accounted for its omission. But this being "the oldest gospel" and "the basis" of the rest, and "written, too, in Rome," and "designed for Roman readers," and Peter being to fulfil his "official character" as "supreme ruler of the church," in his own person and that of his successors at Rome and from Rome, it is passing strange that the "Romans" should not find one word in their especial "gospel," to awe that refractory people, and to induce them to a cheerful co-operation with their primate, "the prince of the apostles," through whom "Rome" was a second time to be "the centre of the world's life, while the sword of the capitol, *trans-*

* Ap. Ch., p. 594.

planted with broken point to the dome of St. Peter, ruled western Christendom,"* &c. &c. Not one such word does it contain. Nor does any other discourse of our Lord, nor any other book of the New Testament, contain the slightest allusion to Peter, as "*the foundation*," or "*primate*" of the church, nor does Peter anywhere claim such primacy, nor is it anywhere conceded to him by the other apostles, nor does he put forth one act in the remotest way implying such a primacy; and if any such word or act had occurred, it would simply have falsified the declaration of our Lord ("one is your master even Christ, and *all ye are brethren*," and many others to the same effect), and the words of Paul, who says that the church is "*built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone*," and "*other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ*."

And when we turn to this *solitary phrase* in the gospel of Matthew, what do we find? *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, &c.* The *person* and the *rock* are designated by different words. Dr. S., indeed, with a presumption which outdoes even the Romanists, translates them (as we have seen) by the same word, "*Thou art a rock, and on this rock*," &c. He is obliged to admit, it is true, that, "*in the classics, πέτρος signifies properly a stone, and πέτρα the whole rock*." † "*But*," he adds, "*this distinction is not always observed*." It is very seldom deviated from. And in the New Testament, *πέτρα*, as signifying a *foundation*, is the *invariable* usage. ‡

* What is Ch. Hist. † p. 11.

† P. 351, note.

‡ In the classics, *πέτρος* occurs in such phrases as *throwing a stone* (Hom. Il. passim), or *striking one stone against another to elicit fire* (as *ἐν πέτρῳι πέτρον ἐκρίβων*.—Soph. Phil., 296), while in the same tragedy, *πετρα* (v. 16, and often elsewhere) is used to denote the *rock* in the cavity of which the exile found shelter. In a very few instances *πέτρος* is used to denote a large mass of rock. In the New Testament, *πέτρα* is used fourteen times to denote a *rock*; *πέτρος* never. The former, in five passages, denotes the *foundation* of a building, or the support of such foundation (viz. Matt. vii. 24, 25; xvi. 18; Luke vi. 48, twice in the same verse); the latter is never so used. *Πέτρος*, in fact, never occurs in the New Testament, but as the name of the person, Peter. *Πέτρα* is thrice figuratively applied to Christ, to say nothing of the passage in question, Matt. xvi. 18 (viz. Rom. ix. 33; 1 Cor. x. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 7). In no instance is it so applied to Peter, or any other mere man. (Cf. Dr. Robin-

Dr. Schaff, however, to justify his translation, cites two authorities: 1st, "the Hebrew original,"* and 2d, "the French" translation.

"Without doubt," he says, "our Lord used, in both clauses, the Aramaic word כִּיפָּא." Now, "the Hebrew original" of the gospel of Matthew being a document in Dr. Schaff's sole and undivided possession, the greater part of the learned world not even believing that such a document ever existed, we have no means of meeting the proof which, "without doubt," he adduces from that imaginary document. The only authority which "unscientific divines" possess on this subject is the Greek text of Matthew, which, "being given by inspiration of God," is quite sufficient and conclusive to their minds. But even allowing that "the Gospel of Matthew" (as Dr. S. affirms † with as much confidence as if the fact had never been questioned) "was written originally in Aramaic, and afterwards, most probably by himself, in Greek," and even allowing that "our Lord" spoke the Aramaic, "and used in both clauses the Aramaic כִּיפָּא" (*there being but one word in the Aramaic language to denote πέτρος and πέτρα, and therefore the fact to which Dr. S. seeks to attach so much importance not having the slightest weight in the case*), so much the more significant is the fact, that when Matthew came to translate or re-write his gospel in Greek, for the perpetual instruction of the Church, he (or rather the Holy Spirit who guided him) used Πέτρος to denote the person, and πέτρα the rock, thus guarding against the possibility of a misunderstanding or perversion which would make a *man* the foundation of the "Church of God." The distinction then becomes only the more important and significant by the admission of Dr. Schaff's supposition, or, to speak more justly, his sheer *invention*.

For Dr. Schaff's remaining authority, "the French," as that translation has seldom before had the honor of being

son's clear distinction of the signification and use of the words.—Lex. of the N. T.) A *usus loquendi* so nearly absolute in the classics, and entirely without exception in the New Testament (which, of course, is the determining authority in the case), could not be overlooked by any one who was not pre-determined to make out a theory.

* P. 351, note.

† P. 593.

cited as an authority in critical matters, we may as well leave it the undisturbed enjoyment of it in the present case, and Dr. S. the full benefit of its testimony. Only, we will say, that as far as we can judge, the "beautiful, vivacious play upon words" entirely vanishes in "the French," since the word used in both clauses is the same: "Tu es *Pierre*, et sur cette *pierre*." Here the *jeu de mot* on which Dr. Schaff builds the colossal structure of the papacy entirely vanishes. It is simply a repetition of the same word, first as a proper, then as a common noun. As if we were to say in English (for in English, too, *stone* is used both as a proper and common noun, so that if we chose to disregard the change of words in the original, we might construct this "beautiful, vivacious play upon words" just as well in English thus), "Thou art Stone, and on this stone will I build my church."

A *stone* would be as good a foundation for a church as a "beautiful, vivacious play upon words," for a theory of church government.

But Dr. Schaff's idea of critical authorities is certainly as much his own as his estimate of historical "sources." Should he ever classify the former, we may expect to find in "A. a. 1. The Hebrew original of the gospel of Matthew. b. The French translation."

Dr. Schaff further supports his theory of "the Primacy of Peter" thus: "The Lord gave him (Peter) charge of his sheep and lambs." * "Jesus said unto him, feed (*βόσκει*) my lambs, feed (*ποιμαίνει*) my sheep." (John xxi. 15, 16.) The latter of these words, which alone carries with it the least idea of sway or rule, is (by a coincidence which is certainly remarkable) addressed by Paul to "the elders of the church" of Ephesus, † and by Peter himself to "the elders which were among the elect strangers scattered abroad throughout Pontus," &c. ‡

* Ap. Ch., p. 349.

† Acts xx. 28. "Take heed to yourselves—to feed (*ποιμαίνει*) the church of God."

‡ 1 Pet. v. 2. "Feed (*ποιμανετε*) the flock of God." The same word is sometimes used of a servant, as Luke xvii. 7. ,

There is one more critical prop by which Dr. S. attempts to shore up "the Primacy of Peter." It is Luke xxii. 31, 32. We give the whole passage as it is cited and expounded by Dr. S. :—

"It is worthy of remark, that in this passage, according to the original, the faith of the other apostles seems to be made dependent on that of Peter. 'And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have *you* (ὑμᾶς, which includes all the disciples), that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for *thee* (περὶ σοῦ, referring to Peter), that thy faith fail not; and when *thou* art converted, strengthen *thy brethren*.'"

Peter, then, was not merely the "Primate" and "Prince of the apostles," but "the other apostles," nay, "all the disciples" were "included" in him. He was the *genus apostolicum*, or rather, *Christianum*, impersonated,—the whole apostolic college; in fact, the whole multitude of "*disciples*" in a generic way. Why should the Divine Intercessor "pray" for them "all," or for "all who should believe on him through their word" (John xvii.), since all were "included" in Peter? When Peter afterwards denied his Lord, all "the other apostles" denied him in his person? When "Peter followed him afar off," we see the whole apostolic college bringing up the rear of the multitude. What irreverence in "that other disciple" to "outrun Peter, and come first to the sepulchre. How remarkable that he is put after the rest, indeed that the rest are mentioned at all, in those memorable words, "Go, tell my disciples *and Peter!*" But what shall we think of Paul, who "withstood him to the face" (and thus withstood himself and "the other apostles," and "all the disciples") "at Antioch?" What condescension that Peter should "exhort the elders of Pontus," &c., merely as "an elder and a witness," not *the* witness, "of the sufferings of Christ!" And all this, too, affirmed, not of Peter, but of "Simon, Simon!" If such things can be predicated of Simon ("the carnal Simon," as Dr. S. distinguishes him under that name), what shall we say, how shall we adequately conceive, of "Peter?" Verily, a marvellous personality, such an one as

history nowhere else takes note of, was this "personality of Peter!"*

There is an observation of Peter himself,† to which Dr. S. would "do well to take heed."

But of Dr. Schaff as an exegete we have had enough. Let us view him once more in his proper character, as a historian.

Entirely satisfied with his scriptural basis of "the primacy of Peter" (i. e. "a beautiful, vivacious play upon words," and a *change in the number of a pronoun*), Dr. S. thus proceeds to unfold the historical realization of it.

"The Acts of the Apostles, *accordingly*, testify to this; the first twelve chapters forming a continuous commentary on the prophecy of Christ, Matt. xvi. 18."

In "the Acts of the Apostles," the inspired narrative of the institution of the apostolic church, and the historic picture of its normal and primitive form, must we look, if anywhere, for solid "testimony" to "the primacy of Peter." And how does the case stand?

An apostle was appointed to succeed Judas (c. 1). Did Peter appoint him? Did he even nominate him? Did he ratify the choice or ordain him when appointed? Nothing of the kind. "Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples (the number of the names together were about an hundred

* If the reader would see how ordinary language would bear such handling as Dr. Schaff here gives to the inspired text of Scripture, let him apply this method of exegesis to a passage in Homer (Od. xi. 456-7), where a similar *change of number* occurs in two successive lines, addressed to the same individual:

'Αλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε ἱπεί, καὶ ἀρκεύεις κατὰλεξον,
'Εἶπου ἔτι ζώοντος ἀκούετε παιδὸς ἡμοῖο.

Must we suppose that Ulysses passes instantly from an *individual* to a *generic* character, while the ghost of Agamemnon thus inquires after his son, addressing him, in the course of the inquiry, first in the *singular* and then in the *plural* number! The pronoun of the first person twice undergoes a similar change of number *within the same line*, in vs. 308 and 315 of the Med. of Euripides. Dr. S. speaks deplorably (Prin. of Prot., p. 152) of the "fearful grammatical recklessness and truly wheel-breaking exegesis" which erewhile prevailed. But a more excruciating specimen of this same wheel-breaking exegesis (out of his own works) it would be difficult to find.

† 2 Pet. iii. 16.

and twenty), and said, *Brethren!* this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, &c. * * Wherefore of these men who have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, * * * must one be ordained to be a *witness with us* of his resurrection. And *they* (not *he*) appointed two, * * * and *they* prayed, * * * and *they* gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered among the eleven apostles."

The increasing complications of the church made it necessary to appoint deacons (c. 6). Did Peter again, in this new step towards "organization," appoint, nominate, ratify, or ordain? No. *The twelve* called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, * * * *brethren*, look ye out among you seven men, * * * whom *we* may appoint over this business. * * And the saying pleased *the whole multitude*: and *they chose* Stephen, &c., * * whom they set before the apostles, and when *they* had prayed, they laid their hands on them."

Missionaries were to be appointed. Where was Peter, "the superintendent of the church," "endowed with all the powers of its government under Christ," "the organ of the whole Christian body in word and deed,"* when this important measure of church extension was planned? His name is not mentioned in the whole transaction. "Then tidings of these things" (the unexpected success of the gospel in heathen countries, under the "preaching of the Lord Jesus," by those which were "scattered abroad" by persecution, Acts xi. 19, &c.), "came unto the ears of *the church*, which was at Jerusalem, and *they sent forth* Barnabas," &c. And again (Acts xiii. 1, &c.), "There were in the church at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; * * as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work wherunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, *they sent them away*. So they, being *sent forth by the Holy Ghost*, &c. And after a wide missionary tour in Syria, Cyprus, and Asia Minor, they came back "to Antioch" (c. xiv. 26, &c.), * * and when they were

* So Dr. S. calls him, Ap. Ch., p. 353.

come, and had *gathered the church together*, they rehearsed what God had done with them."

An "apostolic council" was held at Jerusalem. (Would that all later councils had been equally *apostolic*!) The collisions of Jewish and Gentile converts rendered the step necessary. This was a matter of world-wide concern, involving a question of no less magnitude than this—whether Christianity was to be only a new form of Judaism, or a religion for the whole human race. It is the first general council. On this august occasion, "the primacy of Peter" may be expected to inaugurate itself by some public and solemn act, so as fully to manifest his "*official character*," and occupy "*his future place in the history of the church*." This is the more important, as the present is his *last appearance* on the stage of church history, as far as these annals are concerned. His name does not occur in the Acts of the Apostles after this chapter. Now or never, therefore, must his "primacy" be asserted. Let us turn to the record. (Acts xv.) Did Peter convene the council? No. The church at Antioch being agitated by the different opinions of Jewish and Gentile converts, "the brethren * * determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the *apostles* and *elders* about this question"—(the necessity of circumcision "after the manner of Moses"). * * And when they were come up to Jerusalem, * * the *apostles* and *elders* came together for to consider of this matter. Thus "the apostolic council" of Jerusalem has now opened its first (and last) session, without brief, bull, or rescript, or so much as the mention of "the primate." Did Peter preside in it? Dr. Schaff says, "Peter" was "probably the president of the council." * But as he has not thought it necessary to give us the historical ground on which he bases this *probability*, we are left simply to follow the record, which would seem to make it very *improbable*. Peter, it appears, did not speak first; for, "*when there had been much disputing*, Peter rose, and said, Brethren, ye know," &c. (We recommend the reader to peruse his entire speech, which does not occupy quite five verses.) "Barnabas and Paul" followed; James concluded.

* Ap. Ch., p. 253.

So that Peter spoke neither *first* nor *last*. James, in fact, speaks and acts much more like the primate on this occasion; for he makes the last speech, which is introduced as follows: "After they had *held their peace*" (*i. e.* Peter, Barnabas, and Paul), "James answered and said, Brethren! *hearken unto me*. Simeon" (the use of this, his natural and "*carnal*" name, would have savored of disrespect if he had been alluding to the "primate" and "president of the council") "hath declared," &c. * * "Wherefore, *my sentence is* (Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω)." Could anything have bespoken the primate more emphatically than this word? It properly expresses the *arbiter*, the *umpire*, the *judge*.* "Wherefore, *my sentence is*, * * *that we write unto them*," &c. If Peter had summed up and concluded the discussions at "the council of Jerusalem" by saying, ἀκούσατε μου: Ἐγὼ κρίνω, &c., it would have been drawn into "confirmation strong" of his presidency and primacy; especially if it could have been clenched, as in the case of James, by the authority of Chrysostom, who pronounces James "the greater and more honorable."† But alas! Peter neither summoned "the council of Jerusalem," nor opened it (either in person or by legate): he neither propounded the subject, nor made the first speech, nor the last one. And when the "act" of that justly famous "council" was passed (they only passed one), it was in this form: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, *with the whole church*, to send chosen men * * to Antioch, * * namely, Judas * * and Silas, *chief men among the brethren*." And finally, the promulgation of the canon was after the same sort. "*They wrote letters by them after this manner*: "The *apostles*, and *elders*, and *brethren* send greeting unto the brethren of the Gentiles in Antioch, &c. * * It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you. * * For it seemed good *to the Holy Ghost and to us* to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye

* Κρίνω is used to denote the decision of a contest by supreme authority (Soph. Philoc, 1367); the authoritative termination of disputes (Od. xii. 440); the giving of legal judgments (Il. xvi. 387).

† Μειζώνα και τιμιώτερον, and that, too, while speaking of James and Peter together.—Comm. in Gal. i., Op., tom. x., p. 659, Ed. Bened.

abstain, &c., * * from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well." (No *anathema* appended, "si quis impie contradicet," &c.)

Thus ended "the council of Jerusalem;"—a model, certainly, of simplicity, humility, and moderation, to all successors of the apostles, and to all Christian councils in later times. We have not the smallest objection that the "act" of this "council" be placed in "A. a. 1" of the "Sources of church history." But it certainly affords very little "testimony" to the "primacy of Peter," or to any other primacy (or prelacy either) in the Church of Christ.

Churches were founded and organized in almost all the principal cities of the world before the apostolic age came to a close. In nothing have later "primates" been more studious to assert and manifest their superintendence than this.* But "the primacy of Peter" never appears, either directly or by representative, in the organization of any of the apostolic churches. Paul planted, founded, and organized a vast number of churches,† but Peter, as far as the Acts of the Apostles testify, not one.

And among all the labors of the apostles, evangelists, and missionaries, by whom "the line of the Gospel was carried out into all the earth, and its words unto the ends of the world," we cannot discern the slightest trace of the primacy of Peter. "Philip went down to Samaria, and preached Christ unto them."‡ "Barnabas and Saul departed to Seleucia, and from thence to Cyprus and Asia Minor, and the latter in time to Macedonia and Greece. They that were scattered abroad at the persecution about Stephen *went everywhere* preaching the word." Was their activity in the least controlled? Was not the energy and zeal of private Christians, and even of women, free to put itself forth in every form for extending the kingdom of Christ? Were not the labors of these honorably mentioned by the apostles—never

* "Nemo ecclesiam œdificet priusquam Pontificis iudicio locus et atrium designentur, &c., &c.—Pontificale Romanum, P. ii., p. 281.

† So Chrysostom: "After he (Paul) had *organized* (*διορθωσάμενος*) and conducted to Christ Pamphylia, Lycaonia, and all who inhabit that region of the world," &c.—Comm. in Gal. i., Op., tom. x., p. 659.

‡ Acts viii.

with the least censure for having transcended their sphere? Was not Paul supreme in his?

And after the organization of these churches, letters were addressed to them by Paul, James, John, and Jude, as well as Peter, unfolding the whole Christian system, not only of doctrine and life, but of polity too, as far as "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost" that any should be revealed. *None of these epistles contain a word which can be construed into a testimony, or even an allusion to Peter as the foundation or primate of the church.* James, John, and Jude do not mention him. Paul, four times, in the most incidental and undistinguishing manner, in his first epistle to the Corinthians. And further, only in his letter to the remote, rural, and comparatively obscure "churches of Galatia" (Gal. i. and ii.), where he says that he "went up to Jerusalem to see Peter," and that his interviews with "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars" (none of them "primate," however), resulted in a distinct understanding and admission of their several and independent spheres, to Paul being "committed the gospel of the uncircumcision, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter." And with this understanding, "they gave," he says, "unto me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship" (very different, to be sure, from the *imposition* of the right hand of primatical ordination!) "that *we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.*" It would be hard, we think, for even Dr. Schaff's exegetical alembic to extract any hint towards a primacy from the passages in which Peter is alluded to in the epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians. And *in these instances only is Peter mentioned in all the apostolic epistles.*

Paul addressed an epistle to the church at Rome. On Dr. Schaff's theory of the "*official character*" of Peter, as "endowed with all the powers of the government of the church," and "his future position in church history," how could his name be omitted from this important document, addressed to the church of the imperial city, from which Peter and his successors were to "rule Christendom?" But it nowhere occurs. The church must have been some time before founded and organized; for Paul says their "faith was already spoken of throughout the whole world." But no allusion is made to Peter as their founder. Paul expresses

a "longing to see them, that he might impart to them some spiritual gift." But why this impatience if the primate had already been there, or was soon to be? He speaks minutely of several offices in the Christian church,—“prophecy,” “ministry,” “exhorting,” “ruling,”*—but not a word of “primacy.” He is very stringent in the injunction that “every soul be subject unto the higher powers,” † but says nothing of setting them a good example, by being himself “subject to the primacy of Peter;” on the contrary, he speaks of his own operations in a style of complete independence, and addresses his precepts to the Roman Christians in a tone of authority, ‡ which seem very remarkable when addressed to the very “*Cathedra Petri*,” whether the primate was already there, or was shortly to enter upon that *See*. Still more remarkable is it that Paul should conclude this long epistle with a multitude of salutations to men and women, specially remembering even “the households” of some of the brethren, without the slightest allusion to the “primate” of the general church, “the organ of the whole Christian body,” and the founder, either exclusively or with himself, of that particular church.

If Paul “was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles,” § in what possible sense could Peter be “primate?”

“That which cometh on me daily, the *care of all the churches*.” || “So ordain I in *all the churches*.” ¶ This is much like the tone of a “primate,” a “general superintendent,” of the church. If it had proceeded from Peter, it would have been regarded as a clear assertion of sway and primacy. But it is the language of Paul, and cannot possibly be reconciled with the position or the consciousness of a *subaltern*.

Peter was “intrusted with *the gospel of the circumcision*.” Christ “wrought effectually in him to *the apostleship of the circumcision* ;”** he “gave (with James and John) the right

* Rom. xii. 6-8.

† xiii. 1.

‡ e. q. C. xv. 15-20.

§ *Μηδὲν ὑπερβίβειν* in nothing after, or inferior to (2 Cor. xi. 5).

|| 2 Cor. xi. 28.

¶ 1 Cor. vii. 17: *ὁὐτως διατάσσει*. This word is full of *organizing, superintending, governing* force. No such word is used by Peter in all the New Testament.

** Gal. ii. 7, 8.

hands of fellowship (partnership*) to Paul that they should *go to the circumcision.*" How, then, could he be primate of the whole church? He was not "intrusted" with such a charge. Christ did not "work effectually in him" to such a labor. He did not so understand his own commission and sphere.

Dr. S., in fact, admits that "this primacy never interfered with the independence of the other apostles in their own spheres of labor." † And by this admission he shows how utterly regardless he is of even the appearance of consistency with himself. A "primacy" without authority, a "supreme rule" without sway, a "general" and "*practical* superintendence of the church," ‡ which yet "never interferes with the independence of others in their own spheres of labor!" Such is "the primacy of Peter!" Such is the bewildering levity with which Dr. Schaff permits himself to use language when speaking of questions which involve, not the form only of the Christian church, but the very truth and life of Christianity, and the dearest and most sacred rights of men. He goes on again to re-assert this doctrine, and to build on it the most stupendous theories, as if quite unconscious that he had demolished the very substance of it by the above admission. He tells us that the "actual superiority of this apostle appears clear as the sun in the gospels, and the first part of the Acts;" § that this "superiority is so clearly assigned him by his natural capacities, as well as by the prophecy of Christ, and so fully confirmed by the facts of the apostolic history, that nothing but blind party spirit can explain, without, however, by any means justifying, the denial of it." ||

It is true, in some of these passages, he affirms this especially of the period "down to the apostolic council at Jerusalem." ¶ But we must hold him to his general theory, which is, that "the sense" of Christ's words to Peter (Matt. xvi.) is thus: "*I endow thee with all the powers of its (my church's) 'government under me ;'*" and that "in these words our Lord describes the *official character* of this apostle, and foretells to him his *future place in the history of the*

* Gal. ii. 9: *κοινωνίας*. Its general meaning is that of *partnership*.

† Ap. Ch., p. 354.

‡ P. 397.

§ P. 374.

|| P. 354.

¶ P. 353.

church ;" * and that "Peter here appears as *the foundation of that wonderful spiritual edifice.*" †

This is Dr. Schaff's theory. Of course, no papist would desire it stated in stronger terms, or *could* so state it, if left at liberty to do so for himself. How it will bear a comparison with the facts of the apostolic history, the reader has already seen. Dr. Schaff himself admits that it will not bear this comparison, by the very admission that "this primacy *never* interfered with the independence of the other apostles." A "primacy," which "never interfered with the independence" of its subordinates, is a contradiction in terms.

But Dr. Schaff asserts for it also the whole weight of historical authority—the unanimous consent of the early church. "We must," he says, "*with all the fathers,* * * refer the words, 'thou art a rock,' &c., by all means, to Peter." ‡

In support of this astounding assertion, Dr. Schaff has given us only a single scrap from Origen, and that cited from Eusebius, and put into a foot note : § "Peter, *on whom the church of Christ is built,*" &c.

But this is not enough to allow Origen to say on a subject in relation to which he had views of his own, which he has often expressed with characteristic fervor and boldness, and which imprinted themselves on the literature of the church for many centuries after him. Here is his exposition in full of the passage on which Dr. S. founds his theory :||

"As to the reply of Simon Peter, in these words, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' if we say the same thing that Peter said, flesh and blood not revealing it to us, but the light shining in our heart from the Father in heaven, we too become even what Peter was, being pronounced blessed in like manner with him, ¶ inasmuch as the causes of beatification pertain alike to him and to us, since flesh and blood hath not revealed to us that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, but the Father in heaven, from heaven itself, that we might dwell in heaven, hath revealed to us the revelation which leadeth up to heaven those who, stripping away every veil from

* Ap. Ch., p. 353. The italics in this latter sentence are Dr. Schaff's.

† Ibid. ‡ Ap. Ch., p. 352. § P. 360.

|| Matt. xvi. 16, &c.

¶ Καὶ αὐτοὶ γινόμεθα ὅσπερ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος, ὁμοίως αὐτῷ μακαριζόμενοι.

their heart, receive the spirit of wisdom and revelation of God. And if we say as Peter said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' flesh and blood not revealing it to us, but the light shining in our heart from the Father in heaven, we become Peter,* and to us may it be said, † by the word, 'thou art Peter,' and what follows. ‡ For every disciple of Christ is a rock. §. And upon every such rock is built || the whole doctrine of the church, and the polity (government) conformed to it. ¶ For in every one of those who are perfect, even in those who have the assemblage ** of those doctrines, and works, and dispositions †† which fully constitute blessedness, is the church built up by God.

"But if you think that the whole church is built of God upon that one Peter alone, what can you say concerning John, the son of thunder, or each of the apostles? Moreover, shall we dare to say that against Peter peculiarly †† the gates of hell shall not prevail, but that they shall prevail against the other apostles and perfect men? Was not that just before spoken addressed to all and every one of them, 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against her,' and that too, 'upon this rock will I build my church?' Were the keys of the kingdom of heaven given to Peter only, and shall no one else of the blessed receive them? But if that is common to the rest, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' how not all that was said before and after, as addressed to Peter? Here, it is true, these things are spoken as if addressed to Peter, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind,' &c., but in the gospel of John (xx. 22) the Saviour, giving the Holy Spirit to his disciples, by that insufflation §§ (breathing on them), saith, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' and the rest. ||| Many will, therefore, say to the Saviour, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,'—but shall not all who make this profession (flesh and blood by no means revealing it to them, but the Father in heaven, drawing off the veil which rested on their hearts, that thereafter they may, with open face, beholding in a glass the glory of the Lord, speaking by the Spirit of God), say of him, 'Jesus is the Lord,' and to him, 'Thou art the Christ,' &c.? And if any one shall so speak to him, 'flesh and blood not having revealed the same to him, but the Father in heaven,' *he shall obtain the things spoken, as the letter of the gospel speaks to that*

* Γινόμεθα Πέτρος, Petrus efficietur.

† Λέγοιτο.

‡ Τὰ ἐξῆς.

§ Πέτρα γὰρ πᾶς ὁ Χριστοῦ μαθητής.

|| Ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν τοιαύτην πέτραν ἀικοδομεῖται.

¶ Ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν πολιτεία.

** Τὸ ἄθροισμα.

†† Νοημάτων.

‡‡ Ἰδίως.

§§ Διὰ τοῦ ἐμφυσηματος.

||| Τὰ ἐξῆς.

Peter, and as the spirit of the gospel teaches to every man who becomes such as Peter was. For all the followers of Christ derive their name * from the rock, even the followers of Christ the spiritual rock which follows those who are saved, that from it they may drink the spiritual drink. These are named from the rock, even Christ. * * Surnamed from Christ, they are called Christians; from the Rock, Peters." †

So Origen on "the primacy of Peter,"—a primacy which, whatever it be, pertains to every believing and confessing soul. So many "Peters," "rocks," and "foundations" of the church would by no means suit the theory of Rome and her advocates.

Ὅτι ἀγαθὸν πολυχειραλίη

is as fixed a maxim in her polity as it was in that of Ulysses. Dr. Schaff's appeal to Origen draws forth from the earliest commentator of the Christian church a noble assertion of Christian individuality, which is full of the truth and freedom of Protestantism, and contradictory to every fundamental doctrine of popery. In Origen's system, faith is the result of a special illumination from the Father. It is an immediate act of the soul on Christ. The confession which completes and proclaims it is addressed directly to Christ. No church intermediation in the matter. Every Christian is a rock on the Rock of Ages.

Hippolytus, of the same (third) century, relates the life and martyrdom of Peter with all the accessory traditions of the second century, but his memoir does not contain a word which implies that he supposed Peter to be, in any respect, distinguished from, or superior to, the other apostles. †

And in the recently-discovered book entitled "Refutation of all Heresies," now generally ascribed to the same author, Peter is twice mentioned, but, in both instances, without the least distinction from the other apostles. §

* Παρώνυμοι, nomen trahunt.

† *χριστὸς παρώνυμοι, ἐχρημάτισαν χριστιανοί, πέτρας δὲ Πέτρος.*—Origenis Op., tom. iii., p. 523, &c.

‡ De duod. Apostolis, Op., tom. ii. App. p. 30. Ed. Fabric. Hamburg, 1716.

§ Origenis Philosophumena (such was the title under which the work was first published) vi. 20, and vii. 32, pp. 176 and 255. Oxford, 1851.

In his book "de Antichristo," however, he lays down the falsifying and assuming the offices of Christ as a sure mark of Antichrist.* He is clearly of opinion, too, that Antichrist would be revealed at Rome. †

Gregory (of Neo-Cæsarea, third century, shamefully nicknamed Thaumaturgus) alludes to the passage, but merely inserts the question of our Lord and the answer of Peter as a general declaration of the divinity and Messiahship of Christ. He does not even mention the name of Peter. ‡

Hilary (of Poitiers, fourth century) thus expounds the passage: "Peter speaks what human voice had not yet uttered, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' * * The Father, by saying, '*This is my Son,*' made a revelation to Peter which enabled him to say, '*Thou art the Son of God.*' On this rock of confession, therefore, is the erection of the church.' * * This faith is the foundation of the church; through this faith the gates of hell are weak against her. This faith holds the keys of the kingdom of heaven. What this faith looses or binds on earth, the same is bound and loosed in heaven." §

Eusebius (of Cæsarea) expresses his views of the foundation of the Christian church, and at the same time indirectly gives an exegesis of this passage, in his Comm. on Is. xxviii. 16, as follows: "Therefore, thus saith the Lord, Behold, I lay in Zion,' &c. (where he cites the whole passage), 'I will lay my precious and honorable stone || at the corner, and I will make the same lofty, and glorious, and conspicuous to all other men (*i. e.* Gentiles), so that he that believeth in him may not fail of his hope.' This stone, then, he promises that he would lay at the foundation of Zion, which he did in fact when he fulfilled this saying, 'Upon this rock will I build my church.' For Mount

* De Antichristo, Op., tom. ii, § 6.

† Ib. § 25, and following.

‡ Serm. in S. Theoph. et de Christi Bapt, Op., p. 37. Paris, 1622.

§ Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est. * * Hæc fides ecclesiæ fundamentum est; per hanc fidem infirmes adversus eam sunt portæ inferorum. Hæc fides regni cælestis habet claves. Hæc fides quæ in terris solverit aut ligaverit, et ligata in cælis sunt et soluta.—S. Hilarii de Trinitate, lib. vi., Op., p. 903-4. Paris, 1693.

|| Δίθρον τὸν πρυθινητὸν καὶ ἰμπεριον.

Zion we generally take to signify the preaching of the gospel, and the church founded thereupon."*

And on p. 17 : " He that believeth shall not make haste.' He that believeth will be of patient mind, waiting for the promise of the word. And this may be the stone" (cf. v. 16), " the very rock itself, concerning which the Saviour said, ' Upon this rock will I build my church.' "

Eusebius often alludes to this passage, and always interprets it in the same spiritualizing way, *not even mentioning Peter in connexion with it.*

Nor among all the fragments of the writers of the first three centuries which he has preserved in his ecclesiastical history, do we meet with the idea that Peter was the foundation of the Christian church (except in the clause from Origen, which Origen himself has fully vindicated above from any such misinterpretation), or that it is under any other " primacy " than that of the " King of Saints."

Augustine, in his " Retractions," says : " When I was a presbyter, I said, in a certain place, concerning the apostle Peter, that on him, as on a rock, the church was founded. But I know that since, I have very often explained what was said by the Lord, ' Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,' &c., to signify upon him whom Peter confessed when he said, ' Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God ;' and so from the rock denominated Peter, he was a figure of the church which is built upon this rock. * * For it was not said to him, ' Thou art a rock,' but ' Thou art Peter.' The rock, however, was Christ, whom when Simon confessed as the whole church confesses him, he was called Peter. Of these two opinions, let the reader choose the more probable." †

In his exposition of Ps. lxxxvi. 2, " His foundation is in the holy mountains," he discusses at large the foundation of the church, viz., *the apostles and prophets resting on Christ,*

* Σιών γὰρ ὄρος τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν κήρυγμα, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο θεμελιωμένην ἐκκλησίαν πολλὰς ἐξελήφμεν.—Eusebii Cæs. Comm. in Hesaiam, cap. xxviii. 16. Collectio Nova Patrum et Scriptorum Græcorum, tom. ii, p. 467.

† Non enim dictum est illi, Tu es petra, sed *Tu es Petrus.* Petra autem erat Christus, quem confessus Simon sicut eum tota ecclesia confitetur, dictus est Petrus.—August. Retract., lib. i., c. 21, Op., tom. i., p. 32. Venetiis, 1729.

who is the *fundamentum fundamentorum* (citing Eph. ii. 10), without so much as mentioning Peter. *

In a sermon on the resurrection of Christ, he cites the confession of Peter, and the blessing, &c., which followed, "Blessed art thou," &c., "in heaven." And then adds: "The faith merited to be so addressed, not the man. For the man himself—what was he, but what the Psalmist says, '*Every man is a liar.*' †

He expounds the same passage with great fulness in another of his sermons, concluding thus: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, on this rock which thou hast recognised when thou saidst, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' will I build my church; that is, upon myself, the Son of the living God, will I build my church. I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee.*" ‡

Gregory of Nyssa thus expounds the passage: "Jesus Christ our Lord and our God is called the rock of faith: the rock in a general way, on account of the immutability of his Godhead; the rock of faith, inasmuch as he is the foundation. As the Lord himself said to the chief of the apostles, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church, on the confession, that is to say, of Christ, because Peter had said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" §

"If Peter was a rock," says Basil ("the Great"), "not as Christ is he a rock, but as Peter a rock. For Christ truly is the immovable rock: Peter is so on account of the rock. || For Jesus bestows his own dignities, yet sustains no loss, but has what he bestows. He is Light. Ye are the light of the

* Op., tom. iv., p. 919.

† Fides hoc meruit audire, non homo. Nam ipse homo, quid erat, nisi quod ait Psalmus, *Omnis homo mendax.*—Serm. 232. In Dieb. Pasc., Op., tom. v., p. 981-2.

‡ Super hanc petram quam * * confessus es * * ædificabo ecclesiam meam; id est, super me ipsum, Filium Dei Vivi, ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Super me ædificabo te, non me super te.—Serm. 76, Op., tom. v., p. 415.

§ Super hanc petram. * * super confessionem videlicet Christi, quia dixerat, 'Tu es Christus,' &c.—Greg. Nyssa, ex Vet. Testam. Delect. Testim. &c., Op., p. 252. Only extant in the Latin of Sifanus.

|| *Χριστός γὰρ ὄντως πέτρα ἀσάλευτος Πέτρος δὲ διὰ τὴν πέτραν.*—Hom. de Pœnit., Op., tom. ii. p. 863. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1839.

world. He is a Priest. He maketh them priests. * * He is a Rock. He maketh a rock, and bestoweth his own on his servants."

In another passage he is very clear as to the foundation of the church: "We are God's husbandry. We are God's building. If we depart from the life-giving root, the faith in Christ, we are cast forth, withered and burnt. * * If we abide not on *the foundation of the apostles*,* being utterly baseless, we fall to ruin, and our fall is great."

"Peter," says Ambrose on this passage, "waited not for the opinion of the people, but proclaimed his own, saying, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!' Great is the grace of Christ, who has bestowed almost all his own names on his disciples. 'I,' he says, 'am the light of the world;' 'ye are the light of the world.' 'I am the living bread;' and 'we are all one bread.' 'I am the true vine;' 'I have planted thee a noble vine.' Christ is the Rock; for 'they all drink from that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ.' The favor of that title also he did not deny to his disciple, so that he, too, is Peter, because from the rock he derives strength of constancy, firmness of faith.

"Strive, therefore, that thou, too, be a rock.† Seek not the rock, therefore, without thyself, but within thyself. Thine act is a rock. Thy mind is a rock. Thy faith is a rock. Faith is the foundation of the church.‡ If thou be a rock, thou shalt be in the church, because the church is upon a rock. If thou be in the church, the gates of hell shall not prevail against thee."

The close resemblance of Ambrose's exposition to that of Origen, will of course be observed. It is yet more clear in the following passage, "Believe, therefore, even as Peter believed, that thou too mayest be counted worthy to hear those words, blessed art thou, for flesh and blood hath not,"

* 'Εάν μὴ ἐπιμένωμεν τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων.—Com. in Es, cap. i., Op., tom. i., p. 554.

† Enitere ergo ut et tu petra sis.

‡ Petra tua fides est. Fundamentum ecclesię fides est.

&c. For he who hath overcome the flesh is a (or the) foundation of the church.*

Cyril (of Jerusalem) simply cites the confession and the blessing ("blessed art thou," &c.), and adds, "whoever therefore acknowledges our Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God, is partaker of that blessedness. But he who denieth the Son of God is wretched and miserable."†

He speaks of "Christ the true head," "himself the head of his body the church,"‡ "the mentally perceived rock,"§ the "corner stone;" but never of Peter under any such title, or in any other character, than as an honored and faithful servant of Christ.

"Peter," says Epiphanius, "who, for a time, had denied the Lord, became a firm rock to us when he laid down as a foundation the faith of the Lord on which the church is every way built.|| Because he first confessed Christ, the Son of the living God, and heard the words, 'upon this rock of steadfast faith I will build my church.'"¶

Chrysostom thus expounds Matt. xvi. 18. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church," that is, *on the faith of this confession.*

So briefly and yet so decidedly does Chrysostom despatch the clause. And as to any superiority of Peter over Paul, if we were disposed to make out the opposite theory from Chrysostom, nothing would be easier. Dr. S., when he pronounces Peter "the organ of the whole college of apostles," cites Chrysostom (in a foot-note again—these foot-notes are like javelins thrust into the ground on the line of the reader's march), declaring him "the chosen of the Apostles, and the mouth of the disciples, and the head of the band or

* Crede igitur quemadmodum Petrus credidit; ut et tu audire merearis, &c. (v. 17). Qui enim carnem viceret, Ecclesiæ fundamentum est.—S. Ambrosii Expos. Evan. Luc., lib. vi., Op., tom. iv., p. 143, Venetiis, 1781.

† ὁ τοίνυν γνωρίζων τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χ. τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς μακαριότητος μετέχει, &c.—Cyr. Cat. xi. Op., p. 150. Ed. Bened. 1763.

‡ αὐτός ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ Σωματός τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.—Cat. 13, p. 194.

§ νοσητὴν Πέτραν, p. 199 & 137.

|| τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐφ' ἣν οἰκοδόμητο ἡ Ἐκκλησία κατὰ πάντα τρόπον.

¶ ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ ταύτῃ τῆς ἀσφαλούς πίστεως οἰκοδομήσω τὴν ἐκ.—S. Epiph. Adv. Hæer., lib. ii. Op., tom. ii., p. 500. Coloniae, 1682.

group."* But if Dr. S. had looked a little further into Chrysostom, he would have found him saying incomparably handsomer things of Paul. He not only calls him along with Peter (and *before* him as it happens), by the same and yet higher titles, e. g. "*Paul and Peter, the pillars of the church, the chiefs of the apostles,*"† but he calls Paul distinctly "the prince of the apostles," "the common father and progenitor of the servants of Christ,"‡ "the light of the churches," "the teacher of the world," a "spiritual trumpet," a "celestial lyre." "Though small of person," he says, "Paul compassed the world, and ran around it as if he were winged."§ But what is still more to the point, he calls Paul "the impregnable tower,"|| "*the foundation of the faith!*"¶ How poor and frigid the epithets of Peter which Bellarmine and Dr. Schaff have culled from Chrysostom, in comparison with these! In truth, we cannot entirely acquit the good father of extravagance in some of these and other titles which he has applied to Paul. But we must remember that he was oriental, not only by birth and nurture, but in his bold and ardent genius; and we must observe too, that he qualifies these somewhat unguarded eulogies, by the phrase "not Paul, however, but *the grace of the spirit.*"*** So that we could not do him a greater injustice than to suppose that he ascribed to Paul any other pre-eminence than what he derived from "the energy of Christ, which wrought in him mightily."

Jerome has said some rash things of Peter in his letters. But he thus expounds Matt. xvi. 16, &c., which alone is or can be claimed as the Scriptural basis of his primacy: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock,' &c. As Christ, himself

* Ap. Ch., p. 348, n.

† Πάτρον και Πέτρον τοὺς στύλους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τοὺς κορυφαίους τῶν ἀπόστολων.—Chrysa. *περὶ προσευχῆς*.—§ 81.

‡ ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡγεμίων, *ib.* § 23. ὁ κοινὸς πατήρ και πρόγονος τῶν δούλων τοῦ Χ. *ib.* § 25.—Suicer's Collection.

§ καθάπερ ὑποπτερον περιεβράμει τὴν οἰκουμένην.—De Pœn. Hom., § 11. Op., tom. ii. p. 293.

| τὸν πύργον ἀσάλκτον.—*Ib.*

¶ τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς πίστεως.—Hom. in illud, *Salutate Pris. et Aq.* Op. .iii. 177.

** *Ib.*, p. 173.

the Light, granted to his apostles to be called the light of the world, and bestowed other titles on them, so to Simon also, who believed on the rock Christ, he gave the name of Peter."*

Basil of Seleucia (fifth century), after quoting at length the confession of Peter, continues thus: "Christ having called this confession a Rock, names him who first confessed it Peter; bestowing the name as a token of the confession. For this is truly the rock of godliness, this the basis of salvation, this the bulwark of faith, this the foundation of truth: for 'other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ, to him be glory and power for ever and ever. Amen.'"†

Isidore of Pelusium (fifth century), says, "Christ proposed that inquiry to his disciples, *whom do men say that I am*, for the purpose of teaching all men the firm confession, which Peter, inspired by him, laid down as the basis and foundation upon which the Lord built his own church."‡

The following exposition will have, perhaps, some weight at Mercersberg, coming as it does from a pope—and one of no less fame than Gregory "the Great." He flourished in the sixth century.

"In the style of Scripture, when a rock is mentioned in the singular number, who else than Christ is understood? This is attested by Paul, who says 'the rock was Christ.' But when they are spoken of plurally, they are the members of Christ, that is, holy men who are made strong by his strength. Whom indeed, Peter, the apostle, calls 'stones' (1 Pet. ii.), saying 'ye also as living stones,'" &c. §

"Christ and the church is one person." "Christ with

* Simoni qui credebat in petram Christum, Petri largitus est nomen.—Com. in Matt. xvi. 18. Op., tom. 8. Ed. Erasm.

† ταύτην τὴν ἠμολογίαν Πέτρον καλίσας.—S. Basilii Seleuc. Or. xxiv. at the end. Op., p. 142. Paris, 1622.

‡ τὴν ἀσφαλῆ ἠμολογίαν, . . . ἐφ' ἣ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ὁ Κύριος ὠκοδόμησε.—Isid. Ep., lib. i. 235.

§ In sacro eloquio cum singulari numero petra nominatur, quis alius quam Christus accipitur? Paulo attestante, &c. . . . Cum vero pluraliter appellantur, membra ejus. . . . Quos nimirum Petrus apostolus lapides vocat (1 Pet. ii.). . . . Expos. Moral., Op., tom. ii., p. 822.

his holy church is one substance." "What are all Christians but members of Christ?" Could Gregory then have supposed that Christ was founded on Peter?—that Peter was the head of Christ? He would probably have rejected the idea with as much horror as he did the title of "Universal Bishop,"—which he is well known to have declared, was a mark of Antichrist. The papacy, then, has been considerably "developed" (quite genetically, however), since the time of Gregory "the Great."

Thus we see that even adopting Dr. Schaff's sweepingly comprehensive "Age of the Primitive Church," all the principal "fathers" of that "Age" united in representing Christ as the only rock on which his church is founded, the only primate whose sway she acknowledges.

But even after the Roman church had made fearful strides towards her later apostasy, the most eminent writers within her own communion boldly *protested* against the enormous absurdity and impiety of assigning a human foundation to a divine church.

Berengandus is supposed to have written in the eighth or ninth century. In his commentary on the Apocalypse he holds the following language. "I have been reproved by a certain person for calling Peter the foundation of the church in that place where the Lord said to him, 'Thou art Peter,' &c. If Peter is the foundation of the church even as the other apostles, as the passage before us plainly shows, then upon him was the church built, *even as on the rest*. Nor is 1 Cor. iii. 11, at variance with this. For Christ is the foundation of all his own apostles, in like manner as they are foundations of those who through them believe. *One foundation there is, therefore, that is Christ, by whom all the foundations are held together, upon whom the whole structure of the church is erected.*"*

"The faith of the church of God cannot fail," says Bernard, "*which has been founded on the solid rock Christ.*"

* Unum est igitur fundamentum, id est Christus. . . super quem tota compages Ecclesiæ constructa est.—Bereng. Expos. Apoc. de Via vii (cap. v. 14). In Cod. Op. St. Ambrosii, tom. viii., p. 361.

Whence the Lord (Matt. xvi.) says to Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church,' &c.*

That Bernard was quite sound on this point, is plain also from an incidental but important passage in his "Tractatus Confessionis." "Because the church is founded in faith and in the sacraments, therefore it pertains not to him (the Pope) to give to the ministers of the church new articles of faith, or to remove those already given, or to institute new sacraments, or to remove those already instituted: this belongs to the highest power, which is due to Christ alone, who is the foundation of the church."†

Pascasius Ratbert was one of the most eminent writers of the Roman church in the ninth century. Bellarmine reports him the first author who stated in full the doctrine of the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. Moreri (and other learned Romanists) think that, strong as are his expressions on this subject, he still held to a figurative sense, and was only "un peu trop mystique." Be that as it may; even if he were a believer in transubstantiation, he was not so capacious of absurdities as to allow that Peter was the foundation of the church of Christ. Here is his interpretation.

"I say unto thee that thou art Peter, &c., which name is derived from the rock, that is from me, on whom is built the whole church.‡ For not, as some erroneously think, is Peter the foundation of the whole church,§ because other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. Although upon that foundation Peter is rightly believed to have been first laid, nevertheless, in that rock and

* Non potest deficere fides Ecclesiæ Dei quæ supra firmam petram Christum fundata est.—Bernard (Clairv.) de Chris. Fid., Firmitate. Op., tom.i., p. 7. Ed. Bened. Venet. 1745.

† Quia Ecclesia fundata est in fide et sacramentis, ideo ad Ecclesiæ ministros novos articulos fidei edere, vel editos remove, aut nova sacramenta instituere aut instituta remove non pertinet (papæ from the previous sentence); et hoc est potestatis excellentissima, quæ soli Christo debetur, quod est Ecclesiæ fundamentum.—Op., tom. iii., p. 422.

‡ A petra, id est, a me super quem ædificatur omnis Ecclesia.

§ Non enim, ut quidam male putant, Petrus fundamentum totius Ecclesiæ est, quia, &c.

upon that rock from which he received his name, is that Heavenly Jerusalem built and established, that is upon Christ,* that it may abide firm for ever. * * And it is to be noted, that not here first was that name given him, but long before (John i. 42). And he said not, thou *shalt be called* Peter, because he had already been so called, but he saith expressly, 'thou *art* Peter,' and upon this rock from which thou hast been made Peter, I will build my church.† Not because he was already so firm, but because it should come to pass that he should be made so by Christ, who calleth the things that are not as though they were. And by the Holy Spirit he should be so established that 'neither death nor life,' &c. (Rom. viii. last.) So too, he was not yet blessed in fact, but only in the predestination of God, by whom, not as he then was, but as he was to be, he was beloved by the Lord. * * * Whether thou sayest the gates of hell shall not prevail against this faith, or against the church which in this faith is built and established upon Christ,‡ it is all one, so the foundation is not dissolved, nor such and so great faith invalidated, nor the church amidst innumerable gusts and tempests overwhelmed. But so great faith is not born but by the revelation of God the Father, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, so that *every one who hath this faith is called Peter*, from the solidity of the rock,§ flesh and blood not revealing it, but God, * * so that with the apostle he may say (Phil. iii. 20). And it is to be observed, that every one of the faithful is so far a rock|| as he is an imitator of Christ, and so far light as he is illuminated by the light. And in this way only is the church of Christ founded upon them as they are themselves established by Christ. Whence, not on Peter only,¶ but on all the apos-

* In ea petra . . . et super eam tota construitur et constabatur illa cœlestis Hierusalem, id est, supra Christum, ut firma permaneat in sempiternum.

† Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram a qua Petrus factus es, œdificabo Ecclesiam meam.

‡ Ecc. quæ hac fide supra Christum fundata est et firmatur, unum est.

§ Ut Petrus quisque qui hanc habuerit fidem a firmitate petræ.

|| Tantum petra est unus quisque fidelium quantum imitator est Christi.

¶ Non super uno Petro.

ties and those who come after the apostles *is the church of God founded."

No name is in higher repute at Mercersberg than Anselm (of the early part of the twelfth century). Dr. Nevin affirms that "such a saint as Anselm has not been produced within the Protestant church since the Reformation." The opinion of this "saint" will doubtless be received there with great respect. We give it, therefore, at the more length, especially as, with the exception of the scanty concession to the papal claim at the end, it may be regarded as a tolerably sound Protestant exposition. All its leading ideas are certainly in full harmony with protestantism.

"'Thou art Peter,' on account of the boldness of thy faith and of thy confession; 'Peter, I say, named from me the rock.'†

"And on this rock; that is, on me will I build my church. As if he said: so art thou Peter from me the rock, that to me, nevertheless, be reserved the dignity of the foundation;‡ but thou, to whom, as a lover and confessor of me, I have given a participation of my name, shalt lay polished stones on me the foundation§ * * and the gates of hell, &c. For he who in intimate love of heart shall apprehend the faith of Christ, will easily conquer whatever shall assail him from without.

"'And I will give unto thee the keys,' &c. He who, with so great devotion, has confessed the king of heaven, is deservedly presented with the keys of the kingdom of heaven; that it may be evident to all, that without faith and confession, no man can enter the kingdom of heaven. He calls the judgment itself and power of discerning, the keys of the kingdom of heaven;|| that is, discernment (discrimination) whereby he may discern the worthy or unworthy. . . Observe

* Successores apostolorum, interpreted by unusquisque fidelium before. —Paschas. Ratberti in Matt. Ev. lib. viii. Bib. Patrum., tom. xiv., p. 549.

† Petrus, dico, dictus a me petra.

‡ Ut mihi reservetur fundamenti dignitas.

§ Super me fundamentum . . ordinabis.

|| Claves regni cœlorum ipsam discernendi sententiam et potentiam nominat.

that he saith ('whatever thou shalt bind) upon earth.' For to men has not been given the power of loosing or binding the dead but the living; the power of loosing or binding the dead has been reserved to God alone.* * * It must be observed that this power was not given to Peter only,* but as Peter answered one for all, so in Peter he gave this power to all. Whence, after his passion he said, 'whosoever sins ye remit,' &c. Nor to the apostles only, but to all bishops and presbyters, this power was granted. But so, as if to Peter only he granted it specially, that he might invite us to unity."

We close with Erasmus; "On this rock,' that is, this solid profession of faith, 'I will build my Church,'† on which if it stand firm, hell shall not prevail against it, nor shall men." (He quotes Theophylact, Chrysostom, Augustine, in support of this interpretation), "Men who were willing to be built on men‡ once said, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas (i. e. Peter). And others who were not willing to be built upon Peter, but upon the rock,§ 'I am of Christ.' * * I marvel, therefore, that there are any who twist this passage to the Roman pontiff,|| to whom it doubtless applies primarily, as to the chief of the Christian faith. Not to him only, however, but to all Christians, as Origen elegantly indicates in his first homily. But there are some people to whom nothing is enough, unless it is too much. * * Our interpretation differs only in words from that of Augustine, which we have therefore introduced, because his seems somewhat too confined; to which, however, he chose rather to defect, than to fall upon the other rock, namely, to lay in a man the foundation of the church."¶

In the last two or three interpretations the Romish theory begins to show itself. The doctrine that the church is

* Hæc potestas non solum Petro data est.—D. Anselmi Cantuar. Enarr. in Matt. cap. xvi. Op. (the three vols. of his works are not numbered) p. 89.

† Super istam petram, hoc est, solidam istam fidei professionem extruam ecclesiam meam.

‡ Volentes homines ædificari super homines.

§ Alii qui nolebant ædificari super Petrum sed super petram.

|| Detorquent ad Romanum pontificem.

¶ In alterum scopulum, videlicet ut in homine poneret, ecclesiæ fundamentum.—Erasm. Annot. in Matt. cap. xvi. Op., tom. vii., p. 71. Basil. 1541.

founded on Peter, is, we see, in some quarters asserted. These eminent writers show themselves in an attitude of resistance and *protest* against it. (To this extent they were *protestants* before *protestantism*.) They admit its germ, however, on the specious but deceptive plea of Christian unity. So full of danger and of error is the first deviation from the word of God! The angle of divergence begins with a point, but ends with infinity.

In the catechism of the council of Trent* and Bellarmine, the papal theory appears in its full form. We give the words of the latter.

“What it is for the church to be founded upon a rock.”
Matt. 16.†

“Catholics teach that by this metaphor it is signified, that to Peter is committed the government of the whole church,‡ especially in matters of faith. For it is proper to the fundamental rock to rule (regulate) and sustain the whole building.

“If the church is said to be founded on Peter, the meaning is, that the church depends on Peter as its ruler.”§

The statement of Dr. Schaff presents the papal theory in a somewhat more bold, distinct, and complete form.

“The sense|| is: I endow thee with all the powers of its¶ government under me. * * In these words our Lord describes the *official character* of this apostle, and foretells to him his *future place in the history of the church*. Peter * * here appears as the foundation * * of that wonderful spiritual edifice.”**

And elsewhere, he calls Peter, “the chief of the apostles and rock of the church,”†† “the founder of the church,”‡‡ “the prince of the apostles,”§§ “the head of the apostolic college,”||| “the organ of the whole Christian body in word

* Pars i. c. 15.

† Such is the title of Lib. i. cap. ii. of his treatise “de Summo Pontifice,” “quid sit super petram ædificari ecclesiam.”

‡ Catholici docent hac metaphora significari, Petro esse commissum regimen totius Ecclesie.—Ib.

§ Ecc. pendere a Petro ut rectore.—Ib. | i.e. of Matt. xvi. 18.

¶ Ref. to “My indestructible Church,” in the prec. clause.

** Ap. Ch., p. 353. †† P. 676. ‡‡ P. 594 and 361. §§ P. 410.

|| P. 353.

and deed."* "The faith of the other apostles," says Dr. S., "seems to be made *dependent on Peter*."†

With these and the like papal phrases and ideas, our historian takes good care to leaven and familiarize the minds of his readers through the course of his history. The index too, with friendly assiduity, points the inquiring reader to the "Primacy of Peter."

There is one difference. Dr. Schaff has laid his hand on the text itself. With unparalleled audacity he has translated Matt. xiv. 18, "thou art a *rock*, and on this *rock*," &c., as if "Peter" and the "rock" were expressed in the original by the same word. Bellarmine has not ventured to do this, nor any other Romanist within our knowledge.

Dr. Schaff, too, somewhat overtops papal arrogance in the denunciation of his opponents. "The adversaries," says Bellarmine, "deny that Peter is the foundation of the church,"‡ "Luther, Calvin, the Magdeburg Centuriators, the Liber Smalcaldicus, and all the other heretics§ of this age will not allow," &c.

Dr. Schaff declares that "nothing but *blind party spirit* can explain, without, however, by any means justifying the denial of it."||

One of his proofs, however, we have omitted. It is "the lists of the apostles, in all of which," says Dr. S. "Peter is mentioned first."¶ In support of this argument, Dr. S. cites fourteen passages of the gospels, *eleven of which contain no "list of the apostles" at all*. If any man supposes that the circumstance of Peter's being *mentioned first* in the enumerations of the apostles,** or that of his generally speaking or acting first (with the ardent temperament which characterized him††), is any proof of his being "the foundation of the church" or "endowed with all the powers of its govern-

* P. 353. † 349 n. cf. the phrase "*pendere a Petro*" of Bellarmine.

‡ Same chapter as above. *Adversarii negant*, &c.

§ Cap. 12. What orthodox "heretics" could Bellarmine have found among "us protestants" (so Dr. S. classifies himself) in our day!

| Ap. Ch., p. 354.

¶ P. 353 n.

** Matt. x. 2 et seq.; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14. These are all the "lists of the apostles" which occur in the gospels. One more Acts 1.

†† ὁ θεημέτραιος Πέτρος he is styled by Chrysostom. Dr. Schaff pronounces him "sanguine, with a strong infusion of the choleric."

ment," we shall make no attempt to disturb his opinion. But Dr. S. ought to be more careful in the use of the word "all." "His disciples and Peter,"* "the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas,†" "Paul, Apollos, and Cephas,"‡ "James, Cephas, and John,"§ are enumerations which quite demolish any little force there may be in this argument, if indeed it can be dignified with the name of argument.

But Dr. Schaff asserts even Protestant countenance for "the primacy of Peter." We must, he says,|| "with all the fathers and the *best modern Protestant interpreters*, refer the words, 'thou art a rock, by all means,' to Peter." Now when Dr. S. affirms that "all the fathers" adopt his "sense" of Matt. xvi. 17, &c., the misstatement may proceed from ignorance. But when he says that "the best modern Protestant interpreters" thus surrender the whole of Protestantism to the Papacy, and that, too, without citing or being able to cite a solitary instance, we can only ascribe it to an impudent recklessness, which in its eagerness to produce a momentary impression, cares not to maintain even the semblance of truth.

It is then quite apparent—1. That even the "wheel-breaking exegesis" of Dr. Schaff cannot torture a single phrase of the gospels into a testimony to the "Primacy of Peter."

2. That the Acts and Epistles present no instance in which such a "primacy" was asserted by Peter, conceded by the rest, or implied by any word or act.

3. That "all the fathers" are unanimous and clear in their loyalty to Christ, as the only foundation and head of the church.

God has given to no man the name of *father* in his church who would build it on any other foundation, or assign to it any other head than His beloved Son.

4. That the eminent church writers of the middle ages are still on the one foundation, Christ: under the one Head, Christ.

* Mark xvi. 7, the more remarkable as occurring in the gospel for "the Romans."

† 1 Cor. ix. 5.

‡ iii. 22.

§ Gal. ii. 9.

| Ap. Ch., 352.

5. That, down to the very eve of the Reformation, and even after its morning twilight, the Romanists themselves, of the more eminent class, would have nothing to do with Dr. Schaff's "sense" of Matt. xvi. ; steered wide and clear of "the rock of laying on a man the foundation of the church."

What then are we to think, what are we to expect of a Historian of the Universal Church, who begins by falsifying with one stroke of his pen, the testimony of that church for fifteen centuries ?

We can have no room for doubt, then, in what system we are to have a "History of the Christian Church" from Dr. Schaff. He has laid the *base-course* on which the whole structure is to rest,—“the primacy of Peter,”—no other structure than the papacy can stand on that foundation. Of all communities calling themselves Christian, none but the Roman church has ever asserted that doctrine, and she only after she had conceived and avowed the design of establishing a universal despotic monarchy on the ruins of individual thought and freedom and popular rights, over all Christendom.

The Greek, Syrian, Armenian, and other ancient churches, deplorably as they have fallen away from Christ, by ignorance, formality, and superstition, have never assailed the kingly majesty of their Redeemer. They have declined from Christ, but they have not renounced him. They have not claimed his attributes and prerogatives to help them to the erection of a human and worldly tyranny. This the church of Rome has done, and she only. "The Roman church," says Dr. Schaff, "has chosen to found herself on Peter." * She has thus denied, forsaken, and built off from the one foundation other than which can no man lay. The Roman church has acknowledged Peter as her ruler (rector). She thus holds not the head from which the whole body (of the true church), fitly framed together, groweth." She assumes to her "Peter," her pope, herself, all the divine prerogatives of Christ,—infallibility, immutability, universal government, origination of doctrine and rites, communica-

* Ap. Ch., p. 377.

tion of life and grace. This is what renders her position and history entirely peculiar. This is what shows her to be the great "apostasy" of "the last times;" while her "lying wonders," her enforced abstinences and celibacy, her ferocious persecution of the saints of the Most High, complete the fearful identity.

The greatest crime which can be committed under any government is "læsa majestas"—treason. The church of Rome has committed it. She has denied the sovereignty of her Lord, and appropriated his royal attributes to "Peter," in order, from that shadowy source, to derive them, by her fictitious "succession," to herself. She alone, of all the nominal churches of Christ, has done this, and a heavy reckoning she will have for it.

Dr. Schaff has taken his position in this system so boldly and distinctly, that he quite spares us the invidious office of giving him or his theory an odious name.

Adversarii negant (says Bellarmine) Petrum esse fundamentum ecclesiæ.

Catholici docent, &c.*

"Peter," says Dr. Schaff, "here" (Matt. xvi.) "appears to us as the foundation of that wonderful edifice." "Peter, the rock of the church." Nothing but blind party spirit can explain, without, however, by any means justifying the denial of it." Now, is Dr. Schaff an "adversarius" or a "Catholicus?"

Bellarmino again says, that this fundamental article of papal faith *signifies* that Peter is "rector ecclesiæ."

"The sense," says Dr. Schaff, of Matt. xvi. 18, "is, I endow thee with all the powers of its (my church's) government under me."

Dr. Schaff has, then, fully "chosen to found" himself and his "apostolic church" "on Peter." He has fully cast in his lot with the desperate fortunes of the papacy.

He has determined, too, to write a "history of the Christian church" on this system. He has thus laid the foundation of it. We shall have occasion to see hereafter that he carries up the whole building plumb and true to the ground-

* See quotation from Bellarmine above.

plan, and "after the pattern showed him" by the most approved masters of papal church-building.

That such a work should have proceeded from the bosom of the Protestant church, and from a chair of ecclesiastical history in a church especially renowned of old for its learned and powerful champions of reformed Christianity, is a portentous fact. It is, to say the least, not less so, that it has somehow gained the strongest testimonials from several of the most respectable and influential Protestant journals. The papacy has never won a victory but by *stealing a march*. Her tactics have fairly been successful this time. This book is circulating through the Protestant church with an *imprimatur* from authorities which no American Protestant has been in the habit of questioning.* One of them goes so far as to recommend that Dr. Schaff's book (then only published in German) be translated and introduced as a text-book into our theological seminaries. It would be well, as a preparatory measure, in case that were done, to apply to the "General of the order of Jesus" to send us over professors to teach it. Our Protestant professors would (till properly initiated and trained) betray some awkwardness in laying down the primacy of Peter as the foundation of the church of Christ, drawing the waters of history from such sources as bulls of the popes, and weaving together beautiful legends and oral traditions into an osier-work of church history, instead of piling up, as heretofore, the solid granite of historical fact, and the pure marble of Christian doctrine. Our students of divinity, too, for whose "benefit"† Dr. Schaff's work is especially intended, would be sorely puzzled when set to learn "beautiful legends" by heart, to search among "bulls of the Popes" for "doctrine and government"‡ and to take, for the first lesson in Church History, "the Primacy of Peter." A sad change must come over our Theological Schools when this "broad road leading Rome-ward"§ is sub-

* A long and masterly article in the *Christian Intelligencer*, however, shortly after the appearance of the English translation, exposed the fallacious philosophy and Romanizing tendencies of the work.

† *Ap. Ch.*, Pref. p. 5.

‡ *Ap. Ch.*, p. 26.

§ So the *Princeton Review* (Jan. 1854) justly styles the philosophical theory on which Dr. Schaff's History is based. It further asserts that it is

stituted for the "old path" in which the Livingstons, Masons, Millers, Alexanders, and Cannons were wont to guide our youth to the Holy Ministry. Towards these highly respected authorities, we could take no other attitude than one of absolute dissent. This first volume of Dr. Schaff's History is an attempt to *force* the growth of the whole papacy within the Apostolic age. The attempt involves him, of course, in the most stupendous contradictions with history and himself. And as to the substance of his work, "learned" though Dr. S. is "in all the wisdom of the Germans,"—as far as the ancient productions of the church are concerned, the contents of his book are mere skimmings from the very surface of secondary sources. Solid learning can no more characterize an apology for the papacy, than sound law or logic a plea for a forger or counterfeiter.

It is quite time that the churches of our country should awake to the extent and tendencies of this movement in the midst of American Protestantism. After a series of advances and retractions, strongly resembling the tactics of the Tractarian party in England, we have at length a bold avowal of "the primacy of Peter," the fundamental and test doctrine of the papacy, followed by a concession of every vital point of Christianity—Church, Ministry, Worship, Sacraments, and the Right of Private Judgment—to Romanism, and that too, *while the name and the forms of Protestantism are* (as far as possible) *studiously retained.*

The position already taken by the Reformed Dutch Church towards this movement, we contemplate with sincere and thankful joy. Of all the other churches, she sustained the most ancient and intimate relations to the German-Reformed Church. From those peculiar relations she has withdrawn, accompanying the act with a voice of kind but solemn warning to her faltering sister. *Every interest*

"pantheistic," and that "no man can hold and carry out this theory of the church, without becoming a Romanist." All this is quite true, and is unanswerably demonstrated in the same article. And yet to our great wonder and sorrow the Reviewer calls it "a noble history," characterized, among other good things, by "a Christian spirit."

within her communion has prospered with a new life since she took that step. She has only proved the truth of the promise, "them that honor me I will honor." Here is a point on which Christ will bear with no tampering in church or individual. If any article of the Christian faith can be called *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*, it is that of the sovereignty of Christ in his own Church.

By Rev. Dr. M'Clure

ART. II.—PETER THE HERMIT.

1. *The Historie of the Holy Warre.* By Thomas Fuller. Fol., Lond., 1639.
2. *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge nach Morgenländischen und Abendländischen Berichten.* Von Friedrich Wilken, ordentlichen Professor des Geschichte bey der Grossherzoghen Badenschen Universität zu Heidelberg. Leipzig: bey Siegfried Lebrecht Crusius, 1807. Six volumes, 8vo.
3. *Histoire des Croisades.* Par Michaud, de l'Académie Française, et de celle des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Sixième édition. Faite d'après les derniers travaux et les dernières intentions de l'auteur, et précédée d'une vie de Michaud. Par M. Poujoulat. Six volumes. Paris: Furne et C^{ie}, Editeurs, 1841.
4. *Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades.* Traduit de l'Allemand de Heeren, par Charles François Dominique de Villers. Paris: Treuttel, 1802. 8vo.
5. *History of the Crusades for the Recovery and Possession of the Holy Land.* By Charles Mill. Phila., 1844.

THE enthusiastic hermit of Amiens is one of those historical personages sometimes called "representative men," and who are nothing when separated from the scenes wherein they acted. Had he lived an age or two sooner than he did, he would never have risen out of obscurity. But that Divine Providence, which never wants for the proper instrument at the proper time, had fitted him for the juncture, and he served as the firebrand when the pile was ready for combustion.

The fall of the Western Empire left Europe in a broken