

iii., c. 4. I had before me in the original Greek, preserved by Eusebius, the passages—"epi Huginou enaton Kleron echontos," and "hos en enatos episkopos." Bishop Nevill, with his parallel passages, following in the wake of the Rev. Mr. Neild, quoted a different part altogether of Irenaeus to show how sadly I had misquoted and misinterpreted that Father! "Risum teneatis, amici!" Well, after that, what are we to think of all the italics and small capitals and disquisitions on the preposition "after" and so on?

2. Cyprian:—We now come to the Bishop of Carthage. Bishop Nevill does not think that Cyprian considered that St. Peter had been the first Bishop of Rome; yet Cyprian himself writes: "Cornelius was made Bishop of Rome . . . when the place of Fabian (his predecessor)—that is, when the place of Peter and the rank of the sacerdotal chair was vacant."—Ep. 51. Why, the assumption that St. Peter had been first Bishop of Rome runs through all St. Cyprian's treatises and letters, so much so that the learned Presbyterian historian, Dr. Schaff, says: "Cyprian is clearest in his advocacy of the fundamental idea of the Papacy, and in his protest against the mode of its application in a given case. Starting from the superiority of Peter, upon whom the Lord built His Church, and to whom He entrusted the feeding of His sheep, in order to represent thereby the unity in the College of the Apostles, Cyprian transferred the same superiority to the Bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter, and accordingly called the Roman Church the

**Chair of Peter**

and the foundation of priestly unity, the root also and the mother of the Catholic Church"; (Ante-Nicene Christ., vol. i., p. 161). The Lutheran historian Neander writes to the same effect (Hist., Ch., vol. i., p. 297-298). Glance at Bishop Nevill's proof to the contrary, "The episcopate is one of which a part is held by each in solidum." If this famous extract convinces anyone that Cyprian did not hold Peter to have been Bishop of Rome—well, that person is soft.

3. Eusebius:—The Bishop has a long and rather complicated dissertation, in which I must confess I see no point, explaining what, according to his Lordship, Eusebius, means. I have the Greek text of Eusebius before me, and I fancy the critical and careful Eusebius explains himself. Listen to him: "The Apostle Peter, when he had first founded the Church at Antioch, sets out for the City of Rome, and there preaches the Gospel and stays as prelate of the Church for 20 years" ("Chron." ad an. 44, Arm. version). "Linus, whom St. Paul has mentioned in his Second Epistle to Timothy as his companion at Rome, has been before shown to have been the first after Peter—protos meta Petron—that attained the episcopate at Rome" (Hist. B. iii., c. 4). Lipsius, one of the highest living authorities as to a question like the present, says that Eusebius, in adopting the particular form of words which he used in his succession lists, "expressly asserted" the Roman episcopate of St. Peter (Ap. Rivington, "Prim. and Roman," p. 13). But Eusebius is the best expounder of himself.

4. That Note from Valesius.—The Bishop derives great consolation from the fact that Eusebius places Paul twice before Peter. He says "that it is to be noted"; and he refers to Valesius as an annotator of Eusebius. "On the question of precedence between the two," writes his Lordship, "a curious fact is noted by Valesius in his notes to Eusebius, that in the most ancient seals of the Roman Church whenever SS. Peter and Paul are engraved, the right hand, or place of honor, is given to St. Paul; this fact is also mentioned by Baronius." This looks formidable, doesn't it? But hear Valesius himself: "But we must not think that he (Eusebius) therefore sets Paul above Peter, for frequently those who are more honorable are named in the latter place. For the matter of that, in the seals of the Roman Church Paul is always placed on the right hand and Peter on the left, as Baronius has remarked in his 'Exposition of the Nicene Council.'" (B. iii. 21.) The Bishop assures us that he is amongst those "who have opportunities of learning all that is to be known upon the subject"; yet if he had known one whit about the interpretation of the places of figures in those old engravings he would have left this venerable note from Valesius quite untouched.

5. Tertullian and the Liberian Catalogue.—The Bishop asks why I did not quote Tertullian. If I quoted all the authors I might have quoted with effect I should require not a column but a whole page of your paper, and I should even then have to add at the end: "To be continued." I have Tertullian standing in my bookshelves before me—not in a sweet accommodated-to-our-theory Oxford translation, but in the original rough, energetic Carlylian—ready to plant his feet on the chest of any man who comes in his way. The Bishop reminds me that I introduced with a flourish, but without quoting them, the Liberian Catalogue, etc. Well, here

is the Liberian Catalogue for his comfort: "The Succession, What Bishop (of Rome), How Many Years He Presided, or Under Whose Reign.—Peter, 25 years 1 month 9 days. He was in the times of Tiberius Caesar and Caius, and Tiberius Claudius, and Nero, from the Consulate of Vinicius and Longinus to (that) of Nero and Vetus. He suffered, moreover, with Paul the third day before the Kalends of July, under the aforesaid Consuls, during the reign of Nero. Linus, 12 years 4 months 16 days. He was in the times of Nero, from the Consulate of Saturninus and Scipio, until Capito and Rufus"; and so on. I really think it waste of ink, of my time, and of your space to follow his Lordship's remarks on the predecease of Linus, the ordination of Clement, the great scholar Rufinus, and the Vatican Council.

A word about Bishop Nevill's authorities. He should have quoted ancient Fathers, Councils, etc., but instead he gives us

**Bright and Littledale—**

why not add to the dumvirate Puller of the "Primitive Saints"? I must protest against this. Bright was a man with a craze against the Papacy. The subject was to him as the proverbial red rag to a bull. The personal opinions and inferences of a man like Bright on a subject like this are worthless;—see passim his "Waymarks" and "The Roman See in the Early Church." As for Littledale, I have no hesitation in designating him a controversialist of the very lowest type, congenitally unable to tell the truth. Why Salmon's shallow squib "Infallibility" is decent reading as compared especially with Littledale, and yet, "It is marked throughout," said the learned editor of the "Tablet," in last week's issue, "with shameful garbling, misquotations, and misrepresentation of points of Catholic doctrine." In my citations I referred only to ancient writers, or to respectable Protestant authors. I quoted one or two Catholic names, not as authorities against Bishop Nevill, but as summing up my matter in language better than I could use. Suppose, if I had got them, I used in support of my views rabid Catholic pamphleteers of the mental quality of Bright and Littledale, I should begin to fear proceedings "de lunatico inquirendo."

In conclusion, I would congratulate his Lordship on his new-found title. Writing to the press a few weeks ago he signed himself "Anglican Bishop of Dunedin"; now he is "Catholic Bishop of Dunedin." I like the sound of that inspiring word—Catholic. Might I express the hope that soon we both shall embrace in brotherly undivided Catholic communion. Meantime, however, your readers and my humble self are waiting for that clear, positive, decisive evidence which proves to his Lordship's mind that the Roman episcopate of St. Peter is "a figment." He is bound by the fact of his attack on a cause in immemorial possession to produce it. In order to spare a little ink, however, I would humbly submit that it will prove of precious little use to him to trot out the quarrel of Cyprian, the Meletian schism, the case of Aparius, the twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon. Those, when groomed up by Bright and Puller, may caper well on the floor at St. Paul's, but I give a premonitory hint that they will cut a sorry figure on the boards of the "Otago Daily Times."

**'TABLET' READERS!**—Watch our advertising columns. The firms whose names appear there are progressive, enterprising, up-to-date. They want your trade and are prepared to cater for it. Give them a trial. And do us the kindness of mentioning the 'Tablet.'—\*\*\*

The "EXCELSIOR" STEEL ADJUSTABLE HARROW is one of the most useful implements on a farm: it does the work of all other harrows. Prices—2-leaf to cover, 10ft 6in, £5 10s; 3-leaf to cover, 15ft 6in, £8. MORROW, BASSETT and CO. Send for catalogue.—\*\*\*

Those who regret the good old times conveniently forget that one of the most popular adjuncts of every workingman's breakfast table nowadays—a cup of pure fragrant tea—was a luxury unknown in past ages even in royal households. Tea first became known to Europeans in 1610. The first reference to it by a native of Britain is in a letter dated June 27, 1615, written by a Mr. Wickham, which is in the records of the East India Company. From this time it became gradually known to the wealthy inhabitants of London. Pepys had his first cup of tea, as recorded in his diary, in 1660, and it was then sold at four shillings the ounce. Contrast those times with the present, when the careful housewife can purchase a much superior article, such as Mackenzie's 'Cock o' the North' tea, at 2s a pound. Every good wife must feel happy to live in an age when commerce has placed within her reach at such a low figure the best product of sunny Ceylon.