

dria designates the Pope as 'the successor of S. Peter and Paul' (Paschal Canon n. 10). St. Cyprian, an earlier writer, tells (ep. 51, ad Antonianum) how 'Cornelius was made bishop' in Rome 'when the place of Fabian—that is, when the place of Peter and the rank of the sacerdotal chair—was vacant.' In another letter (ep. 55, ad Cornelium) he refers to Rome as 'the Chair of Peter' and 'the principal Church, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise.' Firmilian of Cappadocia, when unjustly attacking St. Stephen, was witness (ep. 75) that that Pope 'proclaims that he occupies by succession the Chair of Peter.' There was, in fact, no counter-theory at the time. But why multiply proofs of a fact which Protestant scholarship no longer seriously questions—namely, the belief prevalent in the third century that St. Peter resided and was martyred in Rome, and was Bishop of that See? In our next issue we shall follow the evidence of St. Peter's Roman episcopate through the first century and into apostolic days.

V.

With the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the periods with which we have been so briefly dealing, the fact that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome was something that was taken for granted. There was no second opinion about it. There is not the shadow of a trace of a different belief. The Orientals agreed with the Westerns that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, that he was martyred there, and that his sacred remains were preserved in the Eternal City. And this belief (as Martin and other authorities show by reference to their liturgies) continues in the East to the present day, not alone among the Catholic Orientals, but among the Nestorians, the separate Greeks, and others who long centuries ago broke away from the centre of Christian unity.

We have dealt with the episcopate of St. Peter as a separate and independent fact. But to the Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers of the period covered in this paper it was no such thing. It was, of course, important as an event of history. But it was more than a merely human historical fact. It was bound up and identified in their minds, and in the minds of the early Christians generally, with a principle that is most vital to the Church—namely, the fulfilment of Christ's promises to St. Peter and the primacy, which is the fount of its unity, the source of its jurisdiction, the guarantee of the truth of its teaching. 'It is in this light,' says Livius (p. 191), 'that the early Fathers treasure up and record the connection of St. Peter with Rome. And hence, whatever mention they make of him in this relation—whether of his journey to Rome, his preaching and founding the Church there, his being Bishop of that See, or his martyrdom in that city—is made with a view to illustrate the same one fundamental doctrinal fact, viz ,

The Primacy

of St. Peter and his successors in the Roman See. Consequently, whatever arguments or testimony the writings of the early Fathers supply in proof that St. Peter went to Rome at all, go also to prove his episcopate and martyrdom in Rome. It is in this concrete, collective sense antiquity understood these several facts, which must stand or fall together.'

In all these circumstances, the Roman episcopate of St. Peter, if not solidly grounded in fact, would have been sure to have been hotly challenged and strenuously denied in the early Church, especially by the African and Eastern bishops and clergy. But, as we have seen, these accept it as a sheer matter of course. There is not, in all Christian antiquity, a trace of doubt or denial of it. Writing of the fourth and fifth centuries, the Rev. Dr. Nevin, formerly President of the Marshall College (Prot.), Pennsylvania (quoted in Kenrick's 'Primacy,' p. 155) says that in those times all controversies, appeals, complaints received their final settlement only through Rome, and that the Popes were the final judges 'in virtue of the prerogative of their See.' 'We hear of no objection to it,' he continues, 'no protest against it, as a new and daring presumption, or as a departure from the early order of Christianity. The whole nature of the case implies, as strongly as any historical conditions and relations well could, that this precisely, and no other order, had been handed down from a time beyond which no memory of man to the contrary has reached.'

Several able Protestant writers and divines—among them such illustrious names as Grotius and Leibnitz—have fully admitted the absolute need and the actual existence of this primacy of the Roman Pontiff. At present, however, our business is with those who acknowledge, with the whole voice of antiquity, that St. Peter was Bishop of the Roman See. The learned Swiss Protestant writer, Baratier (quoted in 'Chambers' Encyclopaedia,' ed. 1901, Art. 'R.C. Church') says:

'All the ancients,

and the great majority of the moderns, have undertaken to derive the succession of the Bishops of Rome from the Apostle Peter. So great in this matter has been

the agreement of all that, in truth, it ought to be deemed a miracle that certain persons born in our day have presumed to deny a fact so manifest.' Palmer, an Anglican authority, says in the second volume of his 'Treatise on the Church': 'The Roman Church was particularly honored as having been presided over by St. Peter, and was, therefore, by many of the Fathers called the See of St. Peter.' Dr. Lardner, the noted Nonconformist divine (quoted by Palmer) says: 'There were in the second and third centuries disputes between the Bishop of Rome and other bishops and Churches about the time of keeping Easter and about the baptism of heretics. Yet none denied the Bishop of Rome to have what they called the Chair of Peter.' A book which has acquired a great vogue among adherents of the Church of England is 'The Catholic religion, a Manual of Instruction for Members of the Anglican Church,' by Rev. Vernon Staley. The author, basing his statement on St. Irenaeus, says (pp. 43-44, 5th ed., 1896): 'Rome received the Apostolic succession from St. Peter and St. Paul, and both of these Apostles were martyred and buried there.' Bishop Pearson, an able and learned Anglican ('Minor Theol. Works,' Oxford ed., 1844, vol. 1., p. 348) writes as follows: 'For although in this age a dissertation treating of this Apostolic succession (whether, namely, the first Bishop of Rome had some one of the Apostles as author and predecessor) may be called a question, yet in the primitive Church it was never looked upon as a question, but as a real and indubitable truth.' And then he goes on to prove (by reference to Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Caius, and other early Fathers and writers) that St. Peter and St. Paul founded the Church in Rome, that they were Bishops of Rome, and that the Bishops of Rome (the Popes) derived their succession from St. Peter alone. A recent Protestant writer, the Rev. Mr. Hall, goes farther still. In his 'Leadership, not Lordship' (p. 40), he writes as follows: 'The primacy is of our Lord's appointment. It resides in Rome, because Rome was chosen for St. Peter's fixed and final See. The evidence of this is overwhelming. The only passage that I know of, which can be quoted against it, is the clause in the abortive canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, that the Fathers gave the primacy to Rome because it was the Imperial city; but this sentence, even if the canon were authoritative—which it is not—does not explain the primacy, but only why Rome was chosen for its seat. I feel this is most important for anything like fair and respectful controversy with Rome.' Let it be borne in mind that all this is not merely the personal testimony of Protestant historians and divines. It is founded on the unanimous belief of the primitive Church in the very ages in which, according to the generally received Anglican teaching, the faith was pure and the Roman Pontiffs generally conspicuous for the sanctity of their lives.

(To be concluded.)

Diocesan News

DIOCESE OF WELLINGTON

(From our own correspondent.)

August 1.

Solemn Requiem Mass was celebrated at Newtown on Thursday for the repose of the soul of the late Pope. Rev. Father McNamara was celebrant, Ven. Archdeacon Devoy deacon, and Rev. Father O'Shea subdeacon. The church was suitably draped. The solemn Gregorian music was rendered by the local and visiting clergy. Father Kimbell was organist and played the Dead March at the end of the Mass.

A meeting of the ladies' branch of the Sacred Heart Society in the Te Aro parish was held at St. Patrick's Hall on Thursday afternoon to arrange for a series of entertainments to be held in aid of the schools of the parish. The Rev. Father O'Shea presided, and Rev. Father Kimbell was also present. It was decided to hold the first soiree in the Druids' Hall on August 19, the entire management of it to be left to the ladies. An amusement and musical committee was formed to make the necessary arrangements for that part of the entertainment.

The weekly meeting of the Marist Brothers' Old Boys' Association was held in St. Patrick's Hall on Monday evening last. Rev. Father Kimbell occupied the chair. The subject for the evening's debate was 'Is the modern day drama a factor for good or evil?' Mr. M. J. Crombie argued for it as a benefit and Mr. J. McGowan against. A most interesting discussion followed. Upon being put to the meeting the votes tied.

ANGLO CYCLE CO.,

6, PRINCES STREET, DUNEDIN. Great Removal Sale.
Write at once for Catalogue. SALE CLOSES AUG. 9th.