

seventh, Sixtus; sixth, Alexander; fifth, Euaristos; fourth, Clement; third, Anencletus; second, Linus; and first, Peter—to whom the unanimous voice of the ancient Church, East and West, gave that place. On the other hand (Bk. III., c. 3), where for controversial purposes and as a proof of the true doctrinal tradition Irenaeus is tracing the succession of the Bishops back to the Apostolic Founders—enumerating those whom the Apostles, to use his own words, “were leaving behind as their successors, delivering up their own place of government to these men” (ibid. n. 1),—the writer sets down Linus as first successor, Hyginus being then, of course, the eighth. Irenaeus is quite correct and consistent with himself.

Bishop Nevill objects that in one of my passages (Bk. iii., c. 4) the old Latin translation has “eighth” (remember the Greek original overhead has ninth). An unhappy objection this! Look at the manner in which the Anglican Bishop Lightfoot of Durham, an eminent patristic critic, demolishes his good brother of Dunedin in regard to this whole matter. Referring to the two passages, or, as he calls them, “two other places” (Haer. i, 27; iii., 4), Lightfoot goes on: “Here, therefore, if the readings be correct, either the apostolic founder or founders must have been included in the enumeration, so that Linus would be the second Bishop, or there must be some accidental tripping in the number. In either case, Irenaeus is probably copying from some earlier writer, such as Justin Martyr or Hegesippus. At all events, we can hardly suppose him (Irenaeus) to have deliberately adopted a different enumeration in the second of these passages, which occurs only a chapter later than his own complete catalogue of the Roman bishops.” To all this he subjoins a note: “In the first passage (i, 27) the text of the old Latin translator has ‘ninth’; and this reading is confirmed by Cyprian (Ep. 74) and by Eusebius (H.E., iv., 11), as well as by Epiphanius (Haer. xli., 1). Here, then, all the authorities are agreed” (Clem. Rom., i., 204). All the authorities, and Irenaeus himself, are against Bishop Nevill! And yet he coolly assures us that “critics usually allow that ‘ninth’ in Book i., ch. 27, is either an interpolation or an error which has crept in.” The phrase, “critics usually allow,” is ambiguous. If he means that competent critics generally do so, the statement is utterly without foundation; but if he means that some critics, understanding thereby himself, his chaplain, and the lovely Littledale, have a habit of doing so, that may be admitted. But they have got an unfortunate habit.

The mention of Littledale's name reminds me that a writer in your issue of Saturday chid me because I used rather strong language in regard to the authorities alleged by Bishop Nevill—especially in regard to Littledale. I regret the necessity. But what could I do? Hear what Littledale's Anglican co-religionists say of him: “His controversial works,” says the Rev. E. W. Gilliam, “are so evidently dictated by ill-feeling and prejudice, and the rules of good breeding are so seriously ignored by him, that a reader of any refinement of mind instinctively draws back from one who seems thus regardless of the first principles of Christian moderation and ordinary charity.” Of Littledale's “Plain Reasons” he spoke thus: “Entirely negative in character” (I am reminded of the character of his Lordship's arguments) “it is, moreover, a coarse, vituperative, brutal book, without piety and without justice—a book whose spirit has nothing in unison with a holy and upright mind.” (Vide Carr's “Reply to Potter,” p. 12.) Another Anglican clergyman—the Rev. Dr. Lee—

Detected and Exposed not less than 201 errors in regard to fact, inaccurate quotations, garbled extracts, quotations from Fathers showing an entirely different meaning from the originals—all in only one of Littledale's “valuable little books.” Dr. Lee might well have added: “Had we a body of clergy with a sound theological education, such a publication must have met, first, with a chilling welcome from those being duped, and then with a howl of execration. I will not directly say more than that, having carefully examined it, in conjunction with others—the first edition with the last—we have found it to be manifestly unfair and altogether untrustworthy. I would that we could regard its compiler as unintentionally misled and mistaken” (loc. cit.) “The book”—“Plain Reasons”—wrote Dr. Mossman, “appears to me to be written in a most reprehensible spirit. Unless exposed and refuted, it is calculated to do grievous harm to the blessed and holy cause of Christian reunion. The book cannot, of course, mislead anyone who is really acquainted with ecclesiastical history and dogmatic theology; but how very few of its readers will know that it is a little more than a rude congeries of fallacies and erroneous statements, taken at second-hand, which have been exposed and refuted again and again.” One might, in view of the sneers of Bright, and even of “the shameful garblings, misquotations, and misrepresentations” of Salmon's “Infallibility,” keep his temper, but no honest man could use other than

strong language if he referred at all to Littledale and his “valuable little books.”

One can now understand a late local, rather peculiar, ecclesiastical phenomenon. When King and Kaiser, President and Ambassador, were expressing their regrets over the death of Leo, Bishop Nevill was gathering his wretched bundle of controversial nettles from the prickly hedges of Bright and Littledale in order to throw them into the open grave of the great-hearted Pope, mourned by men of every creed and class, lamented—and that with good reason—by the dark children of Africa, as well as by the working men of our great civilised cities. Strange that our “Catholic Bishop of Dunedin” should be so out of harmony and sympathy with his kind! But then he reads, admires, and recommends the “coarse,” “brutal,” and “ill-feeling” book of Littledale.

The Bishop, with an ogle at the gallery, says that I “want to draw off my forces under the shadow of a charge” that he should produce some evidence for his assertions. As to the drawing off of my forces, the Bishop makes a huge mistake. I desire to get some excuse to draw them on. Why does his Lordship, who is the invader, give me an opportunity? Why does he content himself with a few feeble pin-pricks at the scouts I sent out to reconnoitre and give him a chance of showing what he has got in his camp? I am ready to maintain my position with extracts, genuine and authentic, from

The Writings of the Fathers,

the records of Councils, the decrees of Popes, from ancient catalogues of the Roman Pontiffs, from Greek and Oriental chronographies, from ancient inscriptions, monuments, missals, martyrologies and hymnologies of the Eastern and Western Churches, from the absolutely unanimous agreement of all Catholic historians and archaeologists, and from the emphatic declarations of learned and fair-minded writers among Bishop Nevill's own co-religionists.

As to my demanding that he should produce some clear, positive evidence for his assertions—yes, he is bound on all accounts to do so. “In courts of law,” says a recent writer, “the importance of possession, as a presumptive title which throws the burden of proof on the invading party, is fully recognised. It needs to be recognised in history also, wherever history occupies itself with rival claims.” Where, then, is Bishop Nevill's evidence? Where are the protests of the early Bishops against the peremptory exercise of the Papal right, deriving from succession to Peter, to rule, remove, and govern them? Suppose that Pius X. issued to-day a peremptory decree to the Anglican bishops, both Protestant and “Catholic,” what protests and indignant denials would resound from pulpit and platform and press! We need not, in that case, travel far to hear “language.” But to be generous, exuberantly generous, with Bishop Nevill, let him bring forward a protest made during the first thousand years of the Church's history by one obscure heretic—Ebionite, Marcionite, Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian—rejected and excommunicated by the Popes; and then we shall begin to think that he has got—well, something to say for himself.

Why, I would ask, does not his Lordship as a student of the philosophy of history, give us some rational explanation of the rise and spread of the early, universal, indubitable, primitive belief that

St. Peter had been Bishop of Rome,

and that the Popes were his successors (Pearson)? Has he not given us to understand that he knows all about the matter. Has he not given us reason to think, by his rushing into print on an untimely occasion, that the episcopal brain is bursting with historical information? I fancy I can give a rational account of the rise and spread of Bishop Nevill's own fiction. It rose not from calm, philosophical examination of the records of history, but from the promptings of excited religious controversy. It was spread by that sweeping spirit of denial and contradiction which prevailed in Germany in the sixteenth century. “I wish I had more arguments to worry the Pope with,” said the beer-swilling gentleman of Wittenberg: “may the name of the Pope be damned”; “may his kingdom be abolished; if I thought that God did not hear my prayer I would address myself to the devil”; “Pestis eram vivus, moriens tua mors ero, papa” (see Luther's Tisch-Reden, passim). Animated by this hideous spirit, Udalric Balen concocted (1502) his “XVIII. Arguments,” partially and feebly echoed by Bishop Nevill to establish his “figment . . . of St. Peter having been Bishop of Rome.”

I would remind his Lordship that his “I say,” “I hold,” “I repeat” do not go so very far with myself or with many of your readers. “Tantum valet auctoritas quantum ratio”—a dignified gentleman's “I say” is just of the value of the reasons he alleges for his “I say”—was a principle of the hard-headed medieval logicians. We, too, want arguments, evidence, quotations, extracts from ancient sources, clear, solid, convincing. The