

the Welsh monks were murdered by the Saxons, it was looked upon as a just judgment on them because they did not submit to Augustine, and it was regarded as in accord with a prophecy of Augustine at the time. So much for succession from that quarter. Freeman's testimony is of the same nature as Green's. He regards the Church of England as even more the child of Rome than any Church on the continent of Europe. And then supposing that the succession from the old British Church could be proved, there would be a difficulty of the same kind, if not greater, to connect the historical steps of conversions in Britain with the apostles. The thing is utterly unhistorical. What does Bishop Lightfoot say of the first bishops of Rome, as some call them, or the first Popes, as others call them, and the historical basis on which they rest? As regards discrepancies in lists that are presented by early writers, he says "they may be explained by assuming two distinct Churches in Rome—a Jewish and a Gentile community—in the first age; or they may have arisen from a confusion of the earlier and later senses of *Episcopos*" (that is the word which is translated bishop). Further on he says: "With the many possibilities of error, no more can be safely assumed of Linus and Anecletus than that they held some prominent position in the Roman Church. But the reason for supposing Clement to have been a bishop is as strong as the universal tradition of the next ages can make it. Yet, while calling him a bishop, we need not suppose him to have attained the same distinct isolated position of authority