

had been one who stood valiantly for the faith we can be sure he would be recognized as a martyr in the Roman Church. He is recognized as one of the bishops who died in the persecution, there is no evidence as one who had stood faithfully, no contemporary evidence ~~it~~ in that direction and there is ~~no~~ claimed, made a century later / as if it was something that was quite generally known, so that is not conclusive evidence at all but it is evidence that looks very strongly in that direction. I am glad you raised the question. On these points, there are many little things on which it may not be so important to have exact evidence but there are many points which enter in discussion, definitely in which it ~~is~~ is very vital to have the evidence. Any time any question which seems to you to be important, the evidence is not as clear as it might be. (question) Now there is an interesting thing on all these matters, ~~that~~ that when you get any thing that is questionable in those early days you will find a century or two later there is apt to be a great deal written about them. People sometimes let their imaginations run freely, but it is important to find out if a person is using his imagination or not. Now I have mentioned to you one ~~of~~ very important matter recently, about St. Patrick, I picked up an English Church History, a rather large Ch. Hist. published by written by a man whom I believe was a ~~member~~ member of the church of England, 50 years ago, and I took for granted that the reliable and facts at least was a preliminary approach and I read what he had to say about St. Pat. and he said that a bishop who was sent by the pope to France made Patrick a bishop in order that Patrick should convert the Irish, and then it said, that after Patrick had been in Ireland for a time he made a trip to Rome to see the pope in order to find out from the pope what was the best means of organizing the church of Ireland and establishing a permanent arrangement within the church. Now this book written by a protestant gave those ~~the~~ statements about Patrick. Schaff said there is absolutely no evidence until centuries later that shows any connection what ever of Patrick with the bishop of Rome. Which flatly contradicts these rather details statements contained in