

VIII.

There are various catalogues of the Popes. They are divided into two classes—the Oriental or Greek, and the Occidental or Latin (Schaff, 'History of the Christian Church'—'Ante-Nicene Christianity,' Div. I., p. 163, Edinburgh, 1884). To the oriental belong the lists of St. Hegesippus and St. Irenaeus, which date from the second century, and that of Eusebius and his successors. The occidental or Latin lists comprise the catalogues of Optatus and St. Augustine (African); the Liberian catalogue (Roman, down to Pope Liberius, A.D. 354), with several recensions; the Felician catalogue (to A.D. 530), Conon's (to A.D. 440); the 'Liber Pontificalis,' martyrologies, calendars, and undated inscriptions in the Catacombs. In the work quoted from above (p. 166) Dr. Schaff, the noted American Protestant historian, admits that 'the list of Roman bishops has by far the pre-eminence in age, completeness, integrity of succession, consistency of doctrine and policy, above every similar catalogue, not excepting those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople; and this must carry great weight with those who ground their views chiefly on external testimonies, without being able to rise to the free Protestant conception of Christianity and its history of development on earth.' On the same and the next following page (pp. 166-167) Schaff, comparing the works of Eusebius, Jaffe, Potthast, Lipsius, and others, gives a 'list of the Roman Bishops,' or 'Popes,' to the days of Constantine, and the first name upon it is 'Petrus-Apostolus'—'Peter the Apostle.'

And now for a few summary remarks on the

Catalogues of the Early Popes

that were drawn up in the second century by St. Hegesippus and St. Irenaeus. St. Hegesippus was a converted eastern Jew. He came from Syria to Rome in the middle of the second century (under Pope Anicetus, who reigned from about A.D. 154 to 166) for the purpose of inquiring particularly into the lists of bishops in that city from the days of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, who were martyred there in A.D. 67. St. Hegesippus found a catalogue going back to Apostolic days. Eusebius, 'the Father of Church History'—also an eastern (who lived about A.D. 264-349)—wrote with Hegesippus' list of Popes under his eye. Now, in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' (iii., 4) Eusebius says that Linus obtained the bishopric of the Church of the Romans 'first after Peter.' In another place he speaks of Clement as 'holding the third place of those who acted as bishops after both Paul and Peter.' It is generally agreed that the 'Chronicle' of Eusebius (which was written in Greek) contained the list of Popes which he copied into his 'History.' The 'Chronicle' is not extant in the Greek. A few extracts from this are, however, preserved in the work of Syncellus, a ninth century Greek writer, and there are translations of it in Latin (by St. Jerome), in Armenian, and in Syriac. A passage from the Greek records that St. Peter, 'besides the Church in Antioch, also first presided over that in Rome until his death.' The same passage in the Armenian is translated as follows: 'The Apostle Peter, when he had first founded the Church of Antioch, sets out for the city of Rome, and there preaches the Gospel, and stays there as prelate of the Church for twenty years' (ap. Rivington, p. 20). St. Jerome's Latin translation of the 'Chronicle' confirms the fact of St. Peter's Roman episcopate. He says of St. Peter: 'He is sent to Rome, where, preaching the Gospel for twenty-five years, he perseveres as bishop of the same city.' The Syriac version (ap. Rivington, p. 21) quotes from the 'Chronicle' thus: 'Peter, after he had established the Church at Antioch,

Presided Over the Church

at Rome for twenty years.' So far as the Roman episcopate of St. Peter is concerned, these versions of the 'Chronicle' of Eusebius have a value independent of their chronology, the confusion in which is evidently the work of copyists. Chronology had not then been reduced to a science, and a thousand facts in sacred and profane history are accepted without hesitation although their dates may be uncertain or confused. The great historian and archaeologist, Cardinal Mai, published a list which was drawn up professedly 'from the labors of Eusebius,' and the catalogue opens with the statement that 'Peter first acted as bishop of Rome.' The great Anglican historian, Bishop Lightfoot, has proved that the catalogue of Roman Pontiffs given by St. Epiphanius in the fourth century is none other than the lost list which Hegesippus had drawn up in the middle of the second. And St. Euphаний's testimony, as given by this great Anglican prelate, runs as follows: 'He (St. Epiphanius) then commences a list of the Roman episcopate, in which he places "first Peter and Paul, Apostles and bishops, then Linus, then Cletus, then Clemens, who was a contemporary of Peter and Paul"' ('Clement of Rome,' vol. i, p. 329).

The evidence of St. Hegesippus is corroborated by that of St. Irenaeus. The testimony of this renowned Father of the Church is of exceptional value. It is, in fact, by itself alone sufficient to peremptorily decide the fact in dispute. St. Irenaeus was by birth and education an Eastern. He was the disciple of and had enjoyed familiar intercourse with St. Polycarp, who had close relations with St. John the Evangelist and others who had seen the Lord. St. John, who wrote his Gospel after St. Peter's martyrdom, was well acquainted with its circumstances (St. John, xxi., 18-19), which must also have been well known to St. Polycarp, and, through him, to St. Irenaeus. St. Irenaeus knew all the Churches of Asia, and was bishop of one of the Gallic (French) Sees. He came to Rome later than St. Hegesippus, farther on towards the close of the second century, and, whilst there, obtained materials for drawing up a list of the bishops of that See. Dr. Doellinger has, however, proved that St. Irenaeus made an independent catalogue, and that he did not see or draw upon that of St. Hegesippus. The Protestant writer Lipsius says (ap. Schanz, 'Christian Apology,' iii., p. 477): 'The source from which he drew was the official Roman tradition, such as it had established itself at the time of Eleutherius (174-189). Above all, he

Found a Catalogue

of the Roman bishops reaching as far back as Linus, who had been instituted by Peter and Paul. This was probably the same list previously found by Hegesippus when he came to Rome, under Pope Anicetus (154-166 or 155-167), which he completed, down to Eleutherius, second successor of Anicetus (Euseb. iv., 11-12). It may, therefore, be considered certain that as early as the year 160 the Roman Church traced her origin back to the two Apostles.' In other words, belief in the Roman episcopate of St. Peter and in the apostolic succession of the bishops of that See, was in full and admitted possession in Rome at a time when a great number of persons were living whose fathers could, in the full vigor of manhood, have seen SS. Peter and Paul and heard their preaching there.

Singularly discreditable attempts have been made by controversialists such as Puller and Salmon to misrepresent the nature and purport of the evidence contained in the lists of St. Hegesippus and St. Irenaeus. In this, as in other matters concerning the Papacy, Salmon is, especially in his early and ill-tempered book, 'The Infallibility of the Church,' a singularly untrustworthy witness. The work referred to has a considerable vogue, and is, we understand, used as a text-book or a book of reference in a Protestant Theological College in Dunedin. But it is marked throughout with shameful garbling, misquotation, and misrepresentation of points of Catholic doctrine. We make this statement with the fullest sense of our responsibility, and are prepared, should occasion require it, to sustain it by abundant proof. St. Irenaeus gives two enumerations of the Bishops of Rome. In one he enumerates all the Bishops (the Apostles included) who occupied the See of Rome till his time. In the other he gives those who succeeded to the Apostles there. St. Hegesippus and St. Irenaeus are two independent and accordant witnesses. Bishop Lightfoot admits that 'all authorities' are agreed as to the authenticity of St. Irenaeus's catalogue of the Bishops of Rome. And that catalogue

Includes St. Peter.

He, moreover, admits that there could be no 'accidental tripping' in this great saint's double list, because the enumeration which, in express terms, makes St. Peter Bishop of Rome, appears in the very next chapter to that in which St. Peter's episcopate is asserted by necessary implication, when he gives the list of the successors of the Apostles in the Eternal City.

It is a point of great importance here that the testimony of St. Irenaeus and of St. Hegesippus was polemical. Its immediate purpose was to refute heresy. The object of both was to prove the orthodoxy of local Churches by the standard of the faith of Rome. And in proof of the genuineness of the faith in the Eternal City, they pointed defiantly to the unbroken succession of the Roman Pontiffs from St. Peter, who was the rock-foundation of the Church of Christ. 'By this same order and this same succession,' said St. Irenaeus ('Contra Haereses,' iii., 3) 'both that tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is the fullest proof that it is the one and the same life-giving faith which has been preserved in the Church and handed down in truth from the Apostles even till now.' This was the challenge they flung out; this the test by which innovations in doctrine were to be tried. The challenge was never taken up. The episcopate of St. Peter was never denied. The succession of the Roman Bishops from him was never questioned. In this matter Tertullian is a witness of the first order of importance, for his testimony is from both inside and outside the Church. While