

words keep ringing in the brain of the surging onrush of new population: 'Go West, young man! Go West!' A great overflow of this tide of immigration is spreading over British Columbia. The country is being fast opened up by the active and judicious enterprise of the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, and many of our readers will live to see that remarkable Province develop into one of the greatest mining, industrial, and fruit-raising countries on the face of the earth.

(To be continued.)

ST. PETER'S ROMAN EPISCOPATE

DEAN BURKE AND BISHOP NEVILL

The following additional letter from Dean Burke on the above subject appeared in the 'Otago Daily Times' of October 3:—

'Sir,—Lest Bishop Nevill should tax me with "omissions," "suppressions," and divers wickednesses in regard to his "proofs," I shall make a brief reply to his last two-column letter. It does not, indeed, call for a reply in itself; there is not a word in it, except the heading, as to Peter's Roman episcopate. No wonder; he has got no evidence; he has made no attempt to give a rational account of his "figment." His great authority, Bright, found himself, notwithstanding all his abusive talk in his "Roman Claims," etc., in the same straits as to this question. He, too, had to fall back on "cans" and "mays" and "perhappes," and, as a last refuge, on quoting—whom, for all the world?—Salmon!

'1. Those Ante-Nicene Synods:—Bishop Nevill charges me with omitting all mention of Councils, "the Canons of which were fatal to my allegation—e.g., those held to define the time for keeping Easter." Where are those Canons to be found? He tells us that Councils were held in Gaul, Palestine, the Pontic Provinces, and Osrohoene. What a useful thing it is to have a history with a good table of contents. Osrohoene! What profound scholarship, even though spelled incorrectly, that one word betrays! Bishop Nevill's reference to these ante-Nicene Synods shows gross confusion as to the distinction between doctrine and discipline. But, his wish being father to the thought, he thinks those Synods were opposed to Rome anyway! Yet Eusebius (Hist. v., 24), our sole source of information, assures us that the Bishops in these Synods and Assemblies were all of one mind with Rome and its custom—there being only one exception—the Bishops of Asia Minor—who followed a custom derived from the Apostles Philip and John, yet "preserved the rule of faith in everything."

'2. Those Cyprianic Synods.—Bishop Nevill gives us to understand that Cyprian and his African Synods indignantly rejected the authority of Pope Stephen. Yet anyone acquainted even with a small text-book of Church history knows that those three African Synods held in 255 and in the spring and autumn of 256

Sent their Decrees to Rome for Approval.

"It was our duty," said the Fathers to the Pope, "to write to thee most especially and to confer with thy gravity and wisdom concerning that which pertains more closely to the unity and dignity of the Catholic Church." (Ep. 72, 1). The decrees in regard to rebaptism were found not to be in harmony with the general teaching and practice, hence Pope Stephen, the Roman "Judas Iscariot," wrote back condemning them:—"Let there be no innovation upon what has been handed down." Thereupon Cyprian and an excitable friend of his used "language." Does strong language always imply the rejection of authority? Did the strong language wired through the Colony as having been used by one of his curates a few months ago imply the rejection of Bishop Nevill's authority? Was the gentleman excommunicated by his Lordship? Neither was Cyprian excommunicated, as we know from the best authority, St. Augustine, though Bishop Nevill, with his usual accuracy, tells us that "the Archbishop of Rome had gone so far as to excommunicate his brother, the Archbishop, of Carthage!" What was the upshot of the matter? A few words from the Pope became the rule of conduct for the Universal Church, and Cyprian and Firmilian's syllogisms and tall talk were heard of no more. He who runs may read.

'3. Those Augustinian Synods.—Bishop Nevill would have us believe that St. Augustine was an "independent" Bishop who occupied himself strenuously in holding Councils and writing strong letters to drive that strangely ambitious man, the aged Pope of Rome, out of Africa. But, curious, is it not, those Councils sent their decrees to Rome for approval? The Bishops received the letters sent back with joy: "The rescripts have come; the case is ended," said Augustine—words which have

since become as a maxim in the Church. The insolence, the "typhum superbiae," complained of by the African Bishops was not that of the Pope as Bishop Nevill represents, but that of the Legate, Faustinus, a proud, domineering man of whose ways the Africans justly complained. The question at the time between Rome and Africa was not as to Papal jurisdiction, taken for granted, but as to the best and most efficient mode of procedure in settling disputes and appeals. The documentary evidence establishing this point is abundant. Why, Sir, Augustine himself was a Papal Legate; he was sent by the Pope to settle a dispute among the Bishops of Mauritania; he went, he says, "enjoined by the venerable Pope Zozimus,

Bishop of the Apostolic See."

'4. St. Augustine and that "Rock."—St. Augustine himself tells us in his "Retractations" that he had given two interpretations of Matt. xvi., 18. One of these—the common literal interpretation—cantatur ore omnium (Aug.)—made Peter the "Rock"; the other was a peculiar, accommodated, mystical interpretation of his own, of which he was not very certain. He leaves the matter to the reader's own choice—"Harum autem duarum sententiarum quae sit probabilior eligat lector!" ("Retract.", B. 1, c. 21, n. 1.). Yet, contrary to St. Augustine's own express declaration, Bishop Nevill tells us that "St. Augustine carefully explained that Christ's words in Matt. xvi., 18, could not mean that St. Peter was the Rock!" In any case, St. Augustine's opinion in the matter of Biblical verbal criticism was of little value, seeing that he knew no Hebrew or Syriac, and, as he tells himself, not much Greek. But you would find as many expressions of belief in the Primacy of the Pope in St. Augustine's works as in those of Cardinal Moran. "In the Roman Church," he declares, "the Supremacy of the Apostolic See has always been in force." (Ep. 43, n. 7.) "Even by the acknowledgment of the human race that Church from the Apostolic See, through the succession of bishops, has held the summit of authority; to be unwilling to give her the highest place is surely either the highest impiety or headlong arrogance." (De Ut. Credendi, n. 35.) Yet Bishop Nevill says: "I think some fatuity must have led the Dean to introduce St. Augustine's name!" Bishop Nevill, obviously, is deeply read in St. Augustine.

'5. "Its Suburbicarian Province."—Suburbicarian! What an evidence of profound research!—reminiscent of the misspelt "Osrohoene." This term is often found in the pages of writers like the Bishop's "authorities." In distress for argument they grasp at straws, and make the most of them. The term, as applied to Rome, was first found in a foolish paraphrase of the Sixth Canon of Nice by an excommunicated itinerant monk, Rufinus. Bishop Nevill, again misled by his authorities, calls this man "the great scholar Rufinus." St. Jerome, who had a life-long acquaintance with him, says that his language was "slovenly," "barbarous," "unintelligible." "Such was his skill in Greek and Latin, that when he spoke in Greek the Greeks took him for a Latin, and when he spoke in Latin the Latins took him for a Greek!" (Apol. ad Rufin.) Yet this man is Bishop Nevill's "great scholar"; mayhap, his patron saint! Pares cum paribus.

'6. The General Councils and Canon Bright.—"But, Sir, I am getting out of patience, and I fear your readers are too"—to borrow the rhetorical device of Bishop Nevill. Hence I shall not delay upon an analysis of his dissertation on the

Councils of Constantinople and Ephesus.

It is a mere rehash from the "Roman Claims," etc., of the anti-Papal hydrophobist Bright. So prejudiced and abusive is this man that Dr. Lock, in his preface to Bright's last and best work, "The Age of the Fathers," has felt constrained to apologise for Bright's unduly suspicious and hostile attitude towards the occupants of the Roman See! I shall here renew an offer made his Lordship in regard to the works of St. Cyprian and St. Irenaeus, not yet accepted by him, to undergo half the expenses of publishing a collection of extracts from Councils and Fathers bearing upon the subjects treated. I shall make extracts in favor of the Roman Episcopate of Peter and of the Primacy; let him make an equal number against, and in favor of the Royal Supremacy. Here is a splendid chance for him to spread genuine, undistorted conciliar and patristic royal supremacy anti-papalism not alone among his own, but among my congregation. Both shall read the collection, I am sure, eagerly, and some will be struck by the novelty of his quotations in favor of those "whose genius upset the traditions of fifteen centuries and devised an organisation without parallel in ancient or modern times; who, with one stroke of the pen transubstantiated the king of England into the Pope, and converted the Church from a free, independent, spiritual power, into a ready and submissive dependent on the State." (Dr. Brewer, "English Studies," p. 301.)