

some long extracts from St. Irenaeus on the point in dispute. I feel confident that such a little publication would be read eagerly by, and would do some good among, the congregations of St. Paul's, Dunedin, and St. Mary's, Invercargill.

'7. Continued Ill-treatment of Eusebius.—The Bishop says that the passage I quoted from the Chronicle of Eusebius, wherein it is expressly stated that St. Peter had been "prelate of the Church" at Rome, "is considered to be an interpolation"! The lovely Littledale so considers it. Is it? The passage is perfectly genuine, and well authenticated; it is found in the original Greek fragments preserved by Syncellus; it is found in the Armenian version; it is found in the independent Syriac version; and it is found in the Latin translation by St. Jerome! How unfortunate a thing it is for a man to have anything to do with that lovely Littledale! The Bishop tells us that Eusebius's Chronicle is contradicted by many passages in his history. Perhaps so, when both are interpreted by persons who will not grasp their plain meaning.

'8. Valesius to the Rescue.—By-the-bye, Sir, you remember that his Lordship introduced to us an old gentleman by the name of Valesius—a narrator of some "curious facts" about old engravings; facts which did not turn out very propitiously for the Bishop. Now, had his Lordship taken Valesius a little more into his confidence, the old Gallican would have enlightened him considerably in the matter of understanding Eusebius. Valesius was endowed with an acute mind, and he used it much in the study of

The Ancient Fathers

—of Eusebius especially. Hear what he says:—"We would observe that Eusebius never reckons the apostles in the number of the bishops; and, in fact, he has said already that Paul together with Peter had founded and planted the Roman Church, appealing to the words of Dionysius of Corinth, as, later on, he does also to those of Irenaeus. When, however, he speaks of the Roman Episcopate" (mark this) "he attributes it to Peter alone, as is clear from his Chronicle. It is thus too," (mark this also) "we must reconcile Irenaeus speaking of Hyginus (Adv. Haer., Bk. I. and Bk. III, 4) 'as holding the ninth place of episcopal succession from the apostles' with what he says in Bk. III., c. 3; since Irenaeus, in the same way as Eusebius, speaks of the Apostles Peter and Paul having both founded the Roman Church, though he does not reckon them in his catalogue of bishops. It is in a like sense that St. Epiphanius, treating of the heresy of the Cerdonians, says that Hyginus held the ninth place of episcopal succession after James, Peter and Paul. Now, should anyone maintain from this passage, that James was Bishop of Rome along with Peter, he should simply be laughed at. And in the same way we may argue in regard to Paul" (III. 21). What a shame! There is old Valesius, introduced to us by Bishop Nevill himself, turning round and laughing at his Lordship's interpretations!

'9. Some Trifling Items.—My letter should run to length too great were I to treat even briefly such petty points as the episcopate of Linus, "superstite Petro"; Tertullian's mention of the ordination of Clement by Peter; the chronological mess made by the compiler of the Liberian Calendar, etc. To one who has any firm grasp of the literature of the subject these are no difficulties whatever; they can be swept away like dust. His Lordship just referred to the "Clementine Recognitions" as being responsible, however, for the universal belief that St. Peter had been Bishop of Rome. If his Lordship cares to enlarge upon those writings—no new matter with those from whom he gets his information—I shall undertake to show that the Clementine romance had about as much to do with propagating the belief under consideration as these, my letters, shall have to do with promoting Bishop Nevill to the Primacy of the Anglican sect in New Zealand.

'10. The Records of Councils.—His Lordship volunteered to quote the records of Councils for me; he did so, as we have seen, "with exhaustive effect"! In the matter of Councils, he took, he thought, a pace with which I could not dare to keep up. "But the records of Councils—no, not these—I don't think he will quote these," said the Bishop. Well, now, I shall exhibit a few examples, just to please his Lordship:—(a) The "acts" of the first General Council, that of Nice, are lost; but the Council of Sardica, held in 342, and attended by more than 300 bishops, is commonly regarded as a continuation of that of Nice. This Council says in its third canon, repeated in the synodical letter to Pope Julius "This will seem the best, and by far the most fitting, if the bishops make reference from all the provinces to the Head—that, is the See of the Apostle Peter." Now, we must remember that those ancient bishops, assembled in solemn deliberation, knew what they were about. They also knew the history of the Church up to their time; they had before them evidences of that history, since lost. Those old Fathers were not,

as some people, themselves not overburdened with cerebral grey-matter, would have us think, mere simpletons prepared to swallow any bolus presented to them. Yet they all admitted and declared the Bishop of Rome to be

The Successor of Peter,

Peter's Roman episcopate must, therefore, have been regarded by them as a fact admitting of no possible question. (b) Let us come to the General Council of Ephesus, held in 431. The attending bishops were all Easterns, and not at all inclined to "obsequiousness" towards the Bishop of any Western See, no matter how great in itself. St. Cyril, of Alexandria, presided as representative of Pope Celestine, and the rapal legates Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip attended to "carry into effect what we have before determined; assent to whom we doubt not will be accorded by your Holinesses"

(letter of the Pope to the Council). The Fathers did assent and carry out the Pope's directions, "compelled by the sacred canons and the letter of our most holy Father and fellow-minister Celestine." They call the Pope "Bishop of the Apostolic See," "the successor and place-holder of the blessed Peter. . . who even until now lives and exercises judgment in his successors." These few extracts give an idea of the spirit running all through the "acts" of this Council (Hard. v., 1). (c) In the year 451 was held the General Council of Chalcedon, at which were present about 630 Eastern bishops—none of whom was likely to have been ignorant of the early traditions of his own Church, or to have been unduly biased in favor of those of the Latin world. Yet the bishops of this great council, in their synodical letter to Pope Leo, tell him that by his legates he "had presided over them as head over the members . . . being appointed unto all men interpreter of the voice of the blessed Peter." When Leo's "tome" was read in the second session the Fathers unanimously cried out, "Peter has spoken these things by the mouth of Leo"! (Hardouin's "Council," II., p. 305.) I think, Sir, I am keeping up pretty well with his Lordship in the matter of quoting councils, especially when we remember his "ego krino," and his absurd mutilation of the sixth canon of Nice!

'11. Compulsory Omissions.—The fear of exclusion from your columns, Sir, compels me to omit reference to the canons of the Western Councils, to the "acts" of the Popes themselves, to the declarations of great Fathers like Augustine and Ambrose, and to the teaching embodied in liturgies and hymns, etc. I have by me pages and pages of Greek originals testifying to the grand historical fact attacked by Bishop Nevill. I must also, out of deference to his Lordship, omit the learned conclusions arrived at by Protestant experts like Pearson, Cave, Lardner, Milman, Harnack, Schaff, etc. Of course, the great works of Catholic historians are out of court; mere Ultramontane opinion, no matter how erudite, is not to be for a moment entertained!

'12. Some Light on a Dark Corner.—Those who talk loudly of the pretensions of the Popes find apparent support in "the historical blank," to use an expression of Lightfoot's, beginning in the last quarter of the first century and extending on through the second. Those were days of direst persecution; Christians hid away or went about in constant fear of death. The heads of the Popes were knocked off, during those times, in regular succession, by the swords of the Pagan legionaries; vast numbers of Christians were put to death. That was not a time for exercising much authority or for making a display of it. On the contrary, men in high places hid away, for they were sought after particularly. That was not a time for writing books; yet some were written, but nearly all have perished—(Lightfoot, "Hist. Essays.") Now the dark literary barrenness of that period is lighted up by

The Patristic Works

and the ecclesiastical "Acta" of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. These testify, constantly, universally, unmistakably to the Roman episcopate of St. Peter. The testimony of these must have been grounded upon the universal belief and testimony of the previous period. A grand universal effect must always owe its existence to an adequate cause. To say that this great Petrine fact, so intimately and actively intertwined with the entire growth and development of Christianity, with the spread of missions, the contest with heretics, the disciplinary legislation, and the doctrinal unfolding of the Church—to say that it was based on an unaccountable second-century "figment" is to introduce historical scepticism and to subvert the principles on which the human mind acts and must act. Beside, let us not forget that fragments remaining from that dark corner confirm, as I have shown, the later teaching, and not one of them supplies a word against it. Still, the "historical blank," referred to above, affords a happy hunting-ground to faddists and theorists of all sorts from Straus and Baur to the "authorities" relied upon by Bishop Nevill.