bible to be human facts, which ordinary history can prove, the inspiration of the bible can be made more satisfactory to the human reason than any theory of papal infallibility." He will be satisfied with comparative evidence—a strange basis for divine faith, which requires the shedding of one's blood rather than the denial of a tenet of its teachings. And then such comparative evidence, from Mr. Thomas' standpoint! More satisfactory than any theory all of papal infallibility! Mr. Thomas declares theories of papal infallibility utterly untenable, and then boasts that he has more grounds for inspiration than we have for infallibility. The only conclusion his hearers would be likely to draw, is that no form of Christianity, Catholic or Protestant, can be established upon absolute moral certainty. He finally gives what proof he can. "I rest my belief, he says, in the inspiration of the new testament in the words (recorded by credible witnesses) of the blessed Master Himself." His mode of arguing is in itself correct. He takes up the books of the new testament as reliable, historical documents, and ascertains what the founder of christianity may have said regarding inspiration. This is precisely the mode of arguing, which Catholics follow, when proving the church—a mode of arguing, which, when we use it, Mr. Thomas called, arguing in a circle. Well, what are the words of Christ? His words relating to the church are plain and significant. On another occasion I will place them before you. His words, which could be made to prove the inspiration of the new testament—history records no such words. Here is the one fact upon which the whole controversy depends for its solution. Our Lord never even made any allusion to the new testament. Mr Thomas quotes this promise to the disciples that, "He would send them the comforter, who would bring to their remembrance all that He had said unto them, and would lead them unto all truth." But what conclusion do these words furnish for Mr. Thomas' thesis? The comforter was promised to the apostles for the fulfilment of the office to which Christ had appointed them. This office was plainly marked out. It was not the writing of books, which our Lord never bade them to do. It was the teaching of the nations, the preaching of the word. "Preach the gospel to every creature. Teach all nations. And going forth they preached everywhere. And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me." Then, the words quoted apply either to the first apostles exclusively, or to the apostles and their disciples. If to the apostles exclusively, how are we to prove the inspiration of Luke, Mark and Paul? If to the apostles and their disciples, why do we not accept as inspired the writings of Barnabas and Clement, who, as the disciples and associates of the apostles, were the same in rank as Luke, Mark and Paul? The dilemma, taken either way, is most conclusive against the arguments of Mr. Thomas. Other considerations advanced by Mr. Thomas I will scarcely pause to notice, as they have no probative force whatever. "The facts and teachings of the bible are all in harmony." So are the facts and teachings recorded in the epistles of Barnabas and Clement. "They contain truths which could never have been known had they not been revealed." The question is not on revelation, but on the record of revelation. "The whole church in every age has always appealed to the bible as the infallible work of God"—the testimony of the church avails only in the supposition that the church is infallible in her teaching and the divinely-instituted rule of faith, and, furthermore, as a fact of history, we know that the early church has not for centuries come to a final decision regarding the canonicity of certain books of the bible.

Protestant controversialists will never prove, on Protestant principles, the inspiration of the several books of the bible; they will never prove that Christ instituted the bible to be the rule of faith, or the complete record of revelation. Protestantism, as a religious system, will always remain a mere castle in the air, with no foundation whatever in history. Christ instituted the church as the keeper and teacher of His revelation, and all who set aside the infallible church are necessarily at sea on the most vital questions of religion.

I now take up my third charge, that the Protestant Episcopal church is not a branch of Christ's church. The affirmation of this charge will occupy me during the remainder of the present lecture. Whatever points contained in the discourses of my opponents, I may not this evening review, will be considered in another lecture, which I will give next Sunday on the infallibility of the church.

The Protestant Episcopal church is no branch, no part of Christ's church. What has already been said proves this statement. Christ established His church for a purpose, and Christ does not fail in His purposes. The church was instituted to teach, to take on earth the place of the Master, to continue during ages the school of divine truth, which existed in Palestine, when He himself spoke, and the multitudes watched eagerly for the words falling from His own divine lips. Christ's teaching, as became the teaching of a God, was clear, positive, definite, authoritative: the same features the church will reproduce in her teaching—her mission and her authority are His own—"as the father sent me, so also I send you." Glance now upon Anglicanism—will it remind you of Christ's school of truth? It discards all idea of infallibility: in its organic articles it announces that no reliance can be placed on church utterances. So conscious is it, that no authority inheres in its ministers, that it will not even teach; it merely "begs men to think." And men in the fold of Anglicanism do think, each one for himself, until the opinion of Anglicans are multitudinous on most vital matters of religion, until the Anglican church is simply religious communism, in practice, as well as in theory. How intense the misery of the poor soul, entangled in the meshes of Anglicanism! It pants for truth; it sighs for a knowledge of the conditions of salvation—and when it calls for a teacher of revelation, the answer is—you must judge for yourself, from scripture and creeds, the church does not teach; she is silent at least, for the last thirteen hundred years. No; such a church is not Christ's work, neither a part nor a branch of that church into which He breathed His own life, when He said to the apostles: "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going, teach all nations. Teach to every creature, he that believeth not shall be condemned, and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."

The usual high-church doctrine among Anglicans, regarding the church of Christ, is that wherever there may be apostolic succession, or valid orders, there the church is, or rather there is a part of the church. There would be thus three main branches of the church upon the earth to-day—the Latin or Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican. The supporters of this doctrine defend Anglicanism, proving it to be a branch of God's church, by tracing back its orders, not only to Augustine, of Canterbury, whom Pope Gregory sent to evangelize the Saxons, but to the early British bishops, through whom Christianity had been preached in the island long before Augustine set his foot upon the shores of Kent, and who had received their orders from the church of Lyons, in France, this church itself being the child of Ireneus, a disciple of Polycarp of Smyrna. This theory of the church is set forth by Dr. Pusey, a writer, as we know, of no slight authority among some St. Paul Episcopalians. However, on this one point, my opponents do not agree with him. Alluding to a previous assertion of mine, that Anglicans claim to be a branch of Christ's church, because they suppose they have bishops and valid orders, Mr. Ten Broeck waxes wroth and exclaims: "Indeed! And what Anglican doctor ever said so absurd a thing as this? Whatever else the defenders of Anglicanism are, they are not fools." Mr. Ten Broeck is severe on Pusey and Palmer, and on the many ritualistic and high-church Episcoplians of both England and America. But he dislikes them heartily. In one of his lectures he intimates that they are but croaking bull-frogs, who disturb the whole Episcopal church by their ceaseless noise—the other Episcopalians being the quiet, plodding oxen of the fold. Mr. Ten Broeck's own theory of the church is singular. "No Anglican"—*i. e.*, I suppose no Anglican of Mr. Ten Broeck's way of seeing things—"ever thinks of assigning any other reasons for his church being a branch, except that the historic church, the church of the olden times admitted her." Mr. Thomas' theory is most comprehensive, so much so that I can scarcely understand how an old-time Episcopalian can tolerate his words—communism is most rapidly developing among Episcopalians. Mr, Thomas says: "Let me be distinctly understood by the church. I do not mean simply the forty millions of Anglicans, or the one hundred millions more or less of the Greek church, or the 250,000,000 of Papists,"—we are the only ones whom Mr. Thomas nicknames—of the twenty millions of Lutherans, or the ten millions of Presbyterians, or the five or six millions each of Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists, or the many millions of Scandinavians, Danes, Copts, Armenians, Noravians, Jansenists and old Catholics. This is the church of which I speak; this is the church in which I express my belief, when I say, "I believe in the holy Catholic church," and this is the church which has my prayers, and love. I believe in no Catholicism less wide than this." Generous, large hearted Mr. Thomas! I believe he takes them all in, Scandinavians and Armenians, Methodists and Congregationalists, &c.; even the Congregationalists, whom in another lecture, when defending his church against communism, he consents to throw overboard, because they reject one of his co-ordinate supreme courts—the creeds of the ancient church. But no, not all yet, Mr. Thomas excludes one sect, —the Reformed Episcopalians, the church of Bishop Cummings, whom the Episcopalian conference excommunicated, after he had left them, to form a church of his own.

These several theories, from Dr. Pusey's and Mr. Thomas' are all, one as much as another, most destructive of the divinely, established unity of the church; to recall to mind this unity, is to refute them.

The church which Christ established was a polity, a religious commonwealth—consequently, a social unit. The word itself, church, implies this fact. Christ's church is, literally, Christ's society, and when we speak of a society established by some persons we at once have presented to our minds a corporate body, with its conditions of membership, its rules of government, distinct and separate from all other societies, or organizations. Christ always speaks of the church, in the singular number: "On this rock I will build My church. Tell the church." Other appellations, under which He presents it to us, have the same force of meaning. He designates it as His kingdom, His fold. A kingdom is one political organism, a social unit —indicating, not an endless number of separate kingdoms, but one particular commonwealth. So is it with the word, fold. When using this latter word Christ brings out definitely this idea of social oneness: "Other sheep I have who are not of this fold; these, too, must I bring, that there be but one fold, and one shepherd." In the Protestant theories Christ's words cannot apply. They place before us churches, kingdoms, folds; but no one church, no one kingdom, no one fold, To use these words in the Protestant theories is a violation of the rules of language. These churches and folds may be similar in many respects to one another; they remain separate social organizations. The several States of our Union might have similar constitutions and laws; the language and customs of the people might be alike. But, yet, were there not in Washington a central government, locking all the States into one social body, we would have so many republics, but not *a* republic.

Christ impressed upon His church oneness as her distinctive feature among men. The Jewish high priest prophesied that "Jesus should die to gather together in one the children of God that were dispersed." And His own words, in the prayer to His Father, after the last supper, are as significant as they are solemn. "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We also are. And not for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in Me; that they all may be one, as Thou Father in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given to them, that they may be one, as We also are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one, and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou also hast loved Me." How the Savior reiterates, again and again the prayer that His followers be one! Well, Christ's prayer was surely heard, and oneness must forever mark His disciples. It is, too, visible oneness; a oneness which the world will perceive, since it is to be to the world the proof of Christ's own mission.

The Protestant theory before our eyes, what of Christ's prayer! Hundreds of associations not only distinct from one another, but endued with the most contradictory features, in ceaseless war with one another! Why, surely, Christ has not gathered together into one those that were dispersed; the Father has allowed His prayer to pass unheard; the Father has refused Him the proof of His divine mission, for which in a special manner He had besought Him "that they be one." To extend the name of Christ's church to a multitude of jarring sects, is denying the prayer of the Savior.

Mr. Ten Broeck admits the original oneness of Christ's church, but admits also that in the course of time it was broken up into fragments. In yonder sky, he tells us, there whirls a host of little worlds, beyond the pathway of Mars, fragments of a majestic planet which once, perhaps, vied with Jupiter in brilliancy. These fragments all circle round the same central sun, held to their place by the same force that once held them, when united. These fragments are to Mr. Ten Broeck's mind images of the divisions now existing among Christians. Ah! but that planet, after it came forth from the hands of the Maker, received no solemn promise that He would Himself care for it, in a special manner, until the end of time; no assurance was given to it, that all created power, even hell itself, would be powerless to assail it; no prayer ascended from lips divine that this planet should be always one. Well, the church was launched upon time, strong with God's own strength, assured through Christ's word of being always one, and as her founder framed her, so she remains.

To St. Paul the church is a "body." A body is some one organism, not an aggregation of fragments. She is "the body of Christ," He being the head. Surely Christ will maintain the integrity of His body. The church is a body, consisting, indeed, of many parts, but having these parts, subordinated and united together so as to make one complete and harmonious whole. "From Christ the whole body, compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the working in the measure of every part, maketh the increase of the body to the edifying of itself in charity."

What, then, the consequence, since we behold around us organizations beyond computing, each one asserting its right to be recognized as a church? The answer is easy: There is in the world but one church of Christ, all other organizations are sects and schisms. Christ instituted His church to last during all ages, and, side by side, men have never ceased putting forth fabrications of their own. The spectacle, sad as it is, was seen in the very first days of Christianity. "There must be heresies," said St. Paul, who knew well the spirit of insubordination that sways the heart of unregenerate man. But, most criminal, he declares are these separations from the church; sects and schisms he numbers among the sins that exclude from the kingdom of heaven. The language of other apostles is no less expressive, both in setting forth the fact that there shall be sects and schisms, and in condemning the authors and fomentors of these spiritual rebellions. "There shall be lying teachers among you, "says St. Peter, "who shall bring in sects of perdition and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift retribution." "Remember the words," says St. Jude, "which were spoken * * * that in the last time there should come mockers. These are they who separate themselves, not having the spirit."

The existence of sects and schisms, recognized by the inspired writers as a necessary evil, proves to us the oneness of Christ's church. There would be no heretics, nor schismatics, if all religious organizations found to exist were parts and branches of the church. There would be no sin crying to heaven for vengeance in sect or schism, if there were no one church to which all men are obliged to submit. When you have listened to Mr. Thomas' definition of the church, which I have repeated for you, you will ask in vain how there could be any longer sects and schisms. The case is the same with Mr. Ten Broeck's statement. To him the Anglican church is to-day a part of Christ's church "because the historic church, the church of the early times, admitted her." Once in God's church you never can leave her, is Mr. Ten Broeck's doctrine. Because England was once a dutiful child of the church, no matter what she may since have done or said, she is still a part of the church; she cannot fall into schism or heresy. On Protestant theories, there would be practically no sects nor schisms, and whole pages of the new testament become meaningless.

In all polities and corporations, there is necessarily a form of government, which controls the several elements and unites them into one body. Without this centre of unity, there can be no society. A kingdom has its sovereign; a fold its shepherd; so must the church have a chieftancy of some kind. We know well that Christ Himself remains the high priest, and first head of His church, over which from the skies He watches with tenderest love. But, since He formed the church to be a polity upon earth, since He marked as a distinctive feature of this polity, a visible oneness, so must He have appointed for her a centre of unity upon earth, a visible government. Her mission for good, is to be pursued among men, and without a leadership, that would combine into one army all her forces, her power for the spreading of truth, and the defense of virtue would be reduced to nought. A church without one central government would not only be a monstrosity among polities, but morever would be struck from the beginning of her career with sterility for all good works.

We are led to inquire what centre of unity Christ did institute for His church. This inquiry will have the further effect of establishing the perfect unity of this church, and of giving us a sure and easy token by which at all times we can distinguish her from sects and schisms.

Protestants generally profess that Christ gave no government whatsoever to His church. He made it on a principle of social communism. Episcopalians are in favor of half-way measures, and are more inconsistent and less logical than other Protestants. According to them Christ institutes priests and bishops—but nothing more. Wherever there is a diocese, within its limits there is some unity, as all are subject to the bishop, but the bishop himself has over him no superior authority. So many bishops—so many churches, so many kingdoms of Christ. They object to the doctrine of one visible head, because, say they, Christ is the head; but while refusing one head upon earth, they give to themselves as many hundred or thousand heads, as they can find bishops.

Various forms of supreme government would have been conceivable in the church; we are interested only in the one which *de facto* Christ instituted. The controversy turns only on one form; if this form is not of divine origin, no disputant has ever made mention of another, and the conclusion follows that Christ gave to His church no centre of unity.

The sole form of supreme government for the church of which history speaks—need I tell it? is that to which Catholics to-day, as during past centuries, bow in reverence—the supremacy of the Roman pontiff. It proves itself at once. Christ's church is a social unit —a complete polity. Outside of the Catholic church there is but endless divisions, headless aggregations, with no existing, and no possible unity. But one existing body corresponds to the ideal of the gospel; she then, alone, is Christ's society. With her there is oneness; the Saviour's prayer produces its effect. Catholic bishops are scattered over the globe; no one language do they speak; to no one race do they minister. Around some one of them, as the immediate shepherd, disciples entwine themselves in love and obedience. They, in their turn, from the four winds, waft their homages of submission to the pontiff of the vatican, beneath the dome of whose cathedral repose the ashes of Simon Peter of Galilee. This pontiff is the centre, towards which all lines converge, from whatever point of the circumference they are drawn, and the church, Catholic in her members, becomes supremely one in her head.

The social organization of the Catholic church assuredly, is not unworthy of a Divine hand. The human race, in all its numberless elements, is brought together into one family, under one father upon earth, as there is but one father in heaven. What power for the triumph of truth over error, of virtue over vice! The forces are vast—men of all nations—and the one hand puts them instantly in motion! Nothing like it has ever existed. History tells of potent monarchs, the feats of whose conquering legions read as fabled stories; but their was always a limit to their empire—a desert, a river, a chain of mountains had arrested their onward course. Leo XIII. has a universal empire—Catholics in name and in fact; he speaks, and hearts thrill from pole to pole. Those monarchs needed armies to enforce obedience to their commands. Leo has but the moral power of his voice. Their empires were always of short duration—the life-time of a monarch. How long the spiritual empire of Rome has lasted, her enemies dare not to say.

The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was in full possession, before the name of Protestantism was heard in the world. Clement VII. was the sovereign of the universal church, when Henry VIII. of England, petitioned in vain from Rome leave to make Anne de Boleyn his wife, and Luther in his quarrel with rival monks appealed to Leo X. to decide in his favor as the supreme doctor of christendom. During medevial ages the names Innocent III, Gregory VII, Alexander III, conjure up before us facts that do not allow us to doubt of the exercise, frequent and unquestioned, of all papal prerogatives. When in A. D. 858, Fotius, of Constantinople, laid the foundation of the Greek schism, by usurping the see of the legitimate patriarch, Ignatius, Pope Nicholas, of Rome, anathematized him, and obliged him to relinquish his claim. At an earlier date Gregory the Great, as uiversal father of nations, sends Augustine to convert the Saxons, and Celestine bestows Patrick to Ireland. The fathers and councils of those first centuries, during which Anglicans themselves proclaim that the church was most pure in doctrine, are most loud in their assertion of Rome's spiritual supremacy. Ireneus, of Lyons, only two steps removed from St. John, says: "To it, this church of Rome, on account of its princedom, it is necessary that every church should agree, i. e. the faithful on every side." Tertullian calls the Bishop of Rome "the sovereign pontiff, the bishop of bishops." St. Cyprian asserts: "It is from the chair of Peter, the unity of the priesthood has issued." "Thy communion," he says to Cornelius of Rome, "is the unity and the charity of the Catholic church. St. Ambrose exclaims: "Where Peter is, there is the church:" St. Jerome: "Whosoever gathereth not with thee, scattereth;" St. Optatus: "He is a schismatic and a sinner who against that singular chair sets up another;" St. Augustine, speaking of the duty of all Christians to Rome: "Come, brethren, live in the root, be grafted into the vine—this is the rock which the gates of hell prevail not against." Pope Celestine thus instructs the legates whom he is sending to the general council of Ephesus: "We charge you to take care that the authority of the apostolic See be maintained. If a discussion ensues among the bishops, you are to judge of their sentences, not to enter into a contest." And the legates address the council: "You are not ignorant that the blessed Peter is the head of the whole faith, and of the apostles likewise." The bishops of Chalcedon, hearing Pope Leo's letter, declare: "Peter has spoken through Leo," and the acts of this council they send to the same Leo, to receive his approbation, some of which he rejects, receiving the others, according as he himself thought best. The constant direction of the Church in all parts of the world by the Roman Pontiffs in these early ages is a matter most manifest on the pages of history. They received appeals from East and West, excommunicated and deposed bishops, confirmed, or rejected local councils. Even while the Apostle John still lived at Ephesus, not he, but Clement of Rome interfered to put an end to the divisions of the church of Corinth, and that he interfered, not as a friendly mediator, but in his own name, as one having authority, the first pages of his letter abundantly testify.

What is said by the opponents of Roman supremacy to weaken the testimony of history? The hundreds of documents and facts that assert it are ignored, and the protest of a few rebellious spirits against the exercise of authority alone listened to. Why, these very protests are the surest proofs of the existence and enforcement in those times of the claims of the Pontiffs of Rome. Words, too, of some writers, are distorted from their true meaning. Gregory, one of the staunchest upholders of the prerogatives of his see, in word and in act, objects to the title of "universal bishop"—a title, by the way, which no Pope before or since ever assumed—because the word might be misinterpreted, and lead to the belief that Gregory included in his own person the entire episcopate —other bishops becoming in the church a mere ecclesiastical institution. How little such difficulties as these effect the case in presence of the entire tradition of centuries, my auditors will not fail to perceive.

Open now, for a brief moment, the pages of the New Testament, and you will read Christ's own words, giving to His church this centre of unity, of which all history speaks. The Pontiffs of Rome ruled the church as the successors of Simon Peter. In Matthew XVI, Christ says to Simon "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jona, * * and I say to thee: "That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsover thou shalt loose upon the earth shall be loosed in heaven." Our Lord spoke in Syriac—(Mr. Thomas' quotation from the Greek is entirely out of place) "Thou art 'chipha' (rock) and upon this 'chipha' (rock) I will build my church." In both clauses the word "rock" applies to Simon; the rules of language demand it; the fathers with one voice assert it; Protestant scholars, Rosenmuller Kuinoel, Bengel, Bloomfield, Alford, Dean, Stanley tolerate no other interpretation, Some fathers strengthen the literal meaning by explaining that Simon could not of himself be a rock, but that he is associated with the first rock, Christ, and Mr. Thomas seizes upon this explanation to exclude all other meaning; a proceeding as unjust to the fathers as it is to simple grammar.

Peter, then, by Divine appointment, is the foundation stone of the building—the centre of unity for the faithful. The stone that does not rest, at least mediately, upon the foundation, is no part of the edifice. He who does not cling to Peter is no member of Christ's church. The church draws her support from Christ through Peter; she is built upon him, "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her;" he is her guide and defender. He has the keys of the kingdom—the symbol of supreme power—and there is no superior upon earth to limit the exercise of his authority. "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven."

In Luke xxii we read: "Simon, Simon, behold satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee. * * Confirm thy brethren." Peter is commissioned to strengthen, guide, and direct the other apostles; for him alone, Christ prays, although all are to be tempted, because under his guidance they will find salvation. To confirm them, he must have authority; he must be the chief of the apostles. In John XXI, the same commission is repeated in other words. Peter is told to feed the flock, lambs and sheep. "Feed My lambs * * * feed My sheep." The Greek word, *poimaine*, yet better than the word of our vulgate, expresses the idea of authority. *Poimaine*—be the shepherd the ruler of my lambs and my sheep. Among ancient peoples, Hebrew and Greek, this word conveyed regal power. Kings were called the shepherds of nations.

In numerous other places of the New Testament, allusion is made to Peter, and the allusion indicates usually a dignity, a precedence belonging to him in keeping with the powers which the direct words of our Lord convey to him. Four lists are given of the apostles; in all the name of Peter occurs first. Peter is usually the spokesman of the apostles; strangers address him as the representative of all; where other apostles are mentioned in a collective form, Peter's name is specified. The Savior Himself marks him out as a special object of attention. He works a miracle to pay the tax for Himself and Peter. He teaches the multitude from Peter's bark. He bestows a special blessing upon Peter's nets; at the last supper Peter first has his feet washed. After the resurrection Simon, first among the apostles beheld the master.

After Christ's ascension, in the apostolic assembly, Peter was first to tell of the need to fill the place of Judas, and he authoritatively fixed the conditions of election. On pentecost he was first to preach to the Jews. He speaks for all the apostles before the sanhedrim, works the first miracle, and first admits the Gentiles to the church. In the council of Jerusalem, Peter was first to speak. Before he rose up, there had been much disputing; when he had spoken, the multitude held their peace, and other apostles only repeated and ratified his doctrine. Paul, chosen by Heaven to be an apostle, before preaching, went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.

Mr. Thomas overlooks Christ's words to Peter, and the various circumstances in which Peter acts as the chief of the apostles, and seeks out a few occasions where Peter's name is not specially mentioned. The argument at best would be merely negative, and the sole conclusion which the whole contest of the New Testament permits, is that St. Peter as usually acted the part of first shepherd, although the fact in the particular case was not specified. Mr. Thomas shows no breadth of mind in his interpretation of scripture and tradition; he lays hold of one slight fact, or word, and denies all that is not made positively clear by that one fact or word, however numerous testimony to the contrary might elsewhere be found.

The centre of unity in Christ's church is Peter's authority, and we can now easily distinguish His church from sects and schisms. "Where Peter is there is the church." In time of civil war, the loyal citizens are those who remain with the national flag, with the recognized government of the nation. Those who set up chieftains of their own are secessionists and schismatics.

The answer can now be given to Mr. Thomas, why the Greek church is in schism, and not the church which adheres to the Pontiff of Rome. He who excommunicated the Greeks was Peter's successor, Christ's vicar upon earth. It was in the ninth century that the Greek schism began. The Emperor Michael deposed the patriarch Ignatius and raised to the see of Constantinople Photius, a layman and a soldier. The Eastern church was then, as it had been at Ephesus and Chalcedon, in full union with Peter's see. Pope Nicholas excommunicated the usurper, and forced the emperor to restore Ignatius. The sentence of the Pope was obeyed in Constantinople, and the schism for the time being arrested. After the death of Ignatius, the Pope allowed Photius to occupy the see, and no one was more outspoken than the new patriarch in favor of the claims of Rome.

The Greek church continued in union with Rome until, some centuries later, the patriarch Michael Cerularius, through servility to the civil ruler, rebelled against the Roman Pontiff, and was with his adherents solemnly excommunicated.

I need not tell you of the sad circumstances amid which England was separated from God's church; a brutal king issued his mandate to gratify his pride and lust, and a servile clergy, in fear for their lives, obeyed. Henry VIII., by act of Parliament, became the head of the English church, appointed a layman, Thomas Cromwell, his vicar-general, appointing him to preside at synods and their edesiastical assemblies, to reform places and persons, to correct disorders in the church, and to decree censures. Paul III was then Pontiff Supreme, and would he have been Christ's servant, did he not protest against the crimes of the royal tyrant, and the vile servitude of the English people? The anathema was pronounced. The rebellion continued; under Edward, new articles of religion were decreed by Parliament, and the English church became entangled in countless heresies. The church of England, according to Mr. Ten Broeck, is not in schism, because there was no voluntary withdrawal from the church; the severance was forced upon her by Rome. No voluntary withdrawal when by act of Parliament the headship of the church was granted to Henry, and the English church assented to the act. The English church rebelled against the centre of unity, denied dogmas of faith, made new articles of religion and did not withdraw from the church of history.

Anglicanism is but a sect as the Gnostics, and Arians, and Macedonians of old. Its claims to be a part, or a branch of the church are but words.

God's church continued her onward course through time. She mourned, indeed, over the sad havoc made by schism and hersy in England and other countries of Europe, in which the so-called reformation triumphed. But her own divine features were unimpaired; she was still the church, the kingdom of Christ. Peter still presided over her. She is to-day as eighteen centuries ago, the bearer to all men of divine truth and grace, and sincerely she prays that all may accept from her the gifts with which God, in love for souls, has laden her. Christ is the great shepherd, the church his fold. Yet other sheep He has who are not of His fold; these, too, he would bring if they would but hear His voice, and there would be but one shepherd and one fold.

# EDISON.

### *More About the Wonderful Inventor and His Inventions.*

[New York Graphic.]

We went over to Menlo Park, N. S., two of us, to see Edison and his wonderful inventions and make some discoveries and sketches for the *Graphic*. Menlo Park is not a park. It is not a city. It is not a town. It is not in any way related to Mungo Park, the great Scotch-African. Although it is on the Pennsylvania railroad (just beyond Rahway), it is not even a stopping place, except when the station-agent flags the train to take on waiting passengers. It is composed wholly of Edison's laboratory and half-a-dozen houses where his employes live. It is, in short, Edisonia, and nothing else.

Just north of the track is a long, plain, white wooden building, full of windows and two stories high; this is the laboratory of the Jersey Columbus whose name has suddenly become famous. Many telegraph wires are festooned from it. The first floor is occupied by scribes and bookkeepers in one end, and at the other some ten or twelve skillful workers in iron, who, at anvil and forge, lathe and drill, are noisily engaged in making patterns and models for the genius of the establishment. His iron ideas, in tangled shapes, are scattered and piled everywhere; turning-lathes are thickly set on the floor, and the room is filled with the screech of the tortured metal.

Up-stairs we climb—to a room the size of the building, with twenty windows on sides and ends. It is walled with shelves and bottles, like an apothecary shop—thousands of bottles of all sizes and colors. In the corner is a cabinet organ. On benches and tables are batteries of all descriptions, microscopes, magnifying glasses, crucibles, retorts, an ash-covered forge, and all the apparatus of a chemist. At a table sit two earnest men each holding alternately to mouth and ear the mouthpiece of a telephone.

"Well, what are you up to to-day?" asks an acquaintance who has sauntered in.

"We have got the Chicago telephone repeater in the circuit at last, and we are now talking through 800 miles of wire, via St. Louis, Cincinnati, Louisville, Washington and Philadelphia—the parabola of the West. It doesn't work well yet. This is the largest circuit ever attempted, and it would not be possible without Edison's repeating machine."

In the middle of the room is a man about five feet ten inches high, with a thin face, high cheek bones, and a long, lean neck. He would not be picked out in a crowd as a man of more than ordinary intelligence, and he is the person whom a bunco-steerer would be likely to take into his confidence. Time he evidently considers too valuable to waste on personal decoration, for his boots have not been blackened this week, and, although he is ostensibly whiskerless, his beard has had about a five days' growth. His hair is of a chestnut brown, and I judge he cuts it himself, for it stands up in an anxious way all over his head, with a striking tendency forward, and at the crown it stiffly radiates like the thorny top of a pineapple. There is a quid of tobacco in his cheek. His mouth is sensitive, the blue veins show on his hands, and the fingers flutter as if each had an intelligent purpose: but the only feature that would immediately attract the attention of a stranger as worth a second look is his keen, deep, eager gray eye, which reveals the intensity of the man. This is Thomas Alva Edison.

"You have turned out a good many inventions, Mr. Edison?"

"Yes, he answers," with a perceptible Western twang in his speech, "I've made some machines; but this is my baby," patting the speaking phonograph and taking a chair before it, "and I expect it to grow up to be a big feller and support me in my old age."

Edson showed us his dismantled aerophone. "Some of it started for Europe last week." said he, "and I can't show you how it sounds. But here, you see, is the same tympanum that we use in the telephone and phonograph; we speak against this, and its vibrations, instead of pricking a sheet of tin-foil, opens and closes a valve in the steam-pipe, and thus gives to the whistle the articulations of the human voice. It is much simpler than the phonograph, and its audible speech can be heard four miles, or even more. I will guarantee that it shall read the Declaration of Independence so that every word will be distinctly heard by every citizen of Manhattan Island. It will call out all the stations on a railroad, and the locomotive will go through the country talking whatever the engineer thinks it necessary to say. Steamers can converse at sea. Light-houses can warn ships in a storm. Fire districts can be shouted; also information whether a fire is spreading or is being mastered."

"I will have on exhibition at Paris," said Edison, "eight telephones, besides my phonograph and aerophone."

"To what uses do you expect the phonograph will be put?" he was asked. "Several," he replied.

"1. For dictating it will take the place of short-hand reporters, as thus: A man who has many letters to write will talk them to the phonograph, and send the sheets directly to his correspondents, who will lay them on the phonograph and hear what they have to say. Such letters as go to people who have no phonographs, will be copied from the machine by the office boy.

"2. For reading. A first-class elocutionist will read one of Dicken's novels into the phonograph. It can all be printed on a sheet ten inches square, and these can be multiplied by the million copies by a cheap process of electrotyping. These sheets will be sold for, say 25 cents. A man is tired, and his wife's eyes are failing, and so they sit around and hear the telephone read from this sheet, the whole novel, with all the expression of a first-class reader. See? A company for printing these is already organized in New York.

"3. It will sing in the very voice of Patti and Kellogg, so that every family can have an opera any evening.

"4. It may be used as a musical composer. When singing some favorite airs backward it hits some lovely airs, and I believe a musician could get one popular melody every day by experimenting in that way.

"5. It may be used to read to inmates of blind asylums, or to the ignorant who have never learned to read.

"6. It may be used to teach languages and I have already sold the right to use it to teach children the alphabet. Suppose Stanley had had one and thus obtained for the world all the dialects of Central Africa!

"7. It will be used to make toys talk. A company has already organized to make speaking dolls. They will speak in a little girl's voice, and will never lose the gift any more than a little girl.

"8. It will be used by actors to learn the right readings of passages. In fact, its utility will be endless."

"What will the phonograph sell for?"

"We shall charge $100 for a machine. This will limit its sale for the present."

In politics Mr. Edison is not a partisan, but has generally voted the Republican ticket, while his father was and is a Democrat of the extreme type.

"How about religion, Mr. Edison?"

"That is a matter I have studied somewhat, but I haven't been able to get the first clew to any first cause, or any hereafter. I do not dogmatize about it, because I do not know. But I may add, that I am strongly inclined to think that nobody knows any more than I do about it. I have never found that guess-work paid."

Here is a story characteristic of his methods: In the development of the automatic telegraph, it became necessary to have a solution that would give a chemically prepared paper upon which the characters could be recorded at a speed greater than two hundred words a minute. There were numerous solutions in French books, but none of them enabled him to exceed that rate. But he had invented a machine that would excetd it, and must have the paper to match the machine. "I came in one night," Johnson, an associate of Edison, says to the *Graphic*, "and there sat Edison with a pile of chemistries and chemical books that were five feet high when they stood on the floor laid one upon the other. He had erdered them from New York, London and Paris. He studied them night and day. He ate at his desk and slept in his chair. In six weeks he had gone through the books, written a volume of abstracts, made 2,000 experiments on the formulas and had produced a solution—the only one in the world—that would do the very thing he wanted done—record over 200 words a minute on a wire 250 miles long. He has since succeeded in recording thirty-one hundred (3,100) words a minute. This statement will be doubted by the incredulous, but I have seen it done."

Those who have worked with him believe that he can evolve from his own brain any invention required.

"Does he know what is in those 3,000 vials on his shelves?" inquired the *Graphic*. "That he does," was the reply. "He bought them all himself. Whenever he hears of any new compound he immediately orders it, for he does not know how soon he may need it."

Edison has studied astronomy also, and, in conjunction with Prof. Langley, of Allegheney university, is now engaged in devising improvements in the telescope.

"You may say this for me," says Edward H. Johnson, an associate of Edison, "after a long and intimate acquaintance, I allege that Edison is one of the fairest and squarest men I ever knew. He is perfectly honest, and the men who are trying to avail themselves of his ingenuity by slandering him will be exposed and beaten.

Thomas A. Edison was born in Milan, Erie county, Ohio, February 11, 1847, and therefore is now only 31 years of age.

"How many patents have you taken out?" I asked him to-day.

"I don't exactly know," he said, and went to his bookkeeper to ascertain.

"That one received to-day," said that functionary, "makes 157 patents, and 77 more have been applied for and are pending in Washington."

"You understand," said Mr. Edison, "that not more than one in ten of these is of any real practical value. The rest are obtained for the purpose of protection. Not more than ten or fifteen of my patents are worth anything except to prevent somebody from stealing the rest. This phonograph, for instance—I shall have to take out a dozen patents to defend it. I shall get a patent on every kind of phonograph I can think of."

When Edison is in the throes of invention he scarcely sleeps at all. Sometimes he does not go to his house for four or five days, though it is within thirty rods. They send him his meals at such times, for he has not yet discovered any method of getting along without any food. "For ten years," Mr. Johnson says, "he has averaged eighteen hours a day. I have worked with him for three consecutive months, all day and all night, except catching a little sleep between 6 and 9 in the morning.

Mr. Edison is the originator of the electro-motograph, for which he received the eighth patent issued by the United States for original discovery; and is the inventor of the American district telegraph (the messenger service), the stock reporter, the automatic system, the chemical recorder, the Roman-letter printing-telegraph, the celebrated quadruplex system, on which the Western Union pays him a large royalty, the speaking telephone, and the electric pen for duplicating letters and circulars, of which 18,000 are now in use.

### *Millions in the Bell-Punch.*

[St. Louis Globe-Democrat.]

We have upwards of 4,000 drinking saloons in this city. Allowing the average income daily of each to be $10—a very low figure—we find the aggregate receipts to be $40,000 daily, or $14,600,000 annually. Reckoning the ratio between malt and alcoholic drinks as four to one, we would realize under the Moffett law $520 daily, or $1,898,000 annually. Large as this amount is we do not believe that it is more than half what our total receipts would be. Why not try it? The bell-punch is coming, as sure as fate, and we may as well recognize it. Nothing can be said against it. No one need pay his taxes in this way if he doesn't want to. It would be a great benefit to our city, if the load of $2,000,000 a year could be lifted from our overburdened property and placed on the consumption of liquor. Rents would be lower and the cost of living cheaper in consequence, and then, perhaps, the authorities would feel that they could afford to improve our streets and settle the blinding dust. We recommend this matter to the attention of our local Legislature at its approaching session. Give us the bell-punch.

### *Dissipated Young Men.*

For a young man to become dissipated, it is by no means necessary that he should be of a naturally depraved heart. The jolly, the witty, the generous—young men of pleasant and prepossessing attributes—are quite as apt to contract bad habits. The sunny side of their nature leads them into scenes of conviviality which degenerate into excess.

How many a young man of fine personal appearance, of education—traveled and accomplished—is seeking the hand of some beautiful girl to-day, while her parents look askant at the prospect of her alliance with one who is generally known as having borne that reputation which is summed up in the one little monosyllable, "wild?"

Should a girl marry such a man—no matter what his attractions, no matter what his possessions?

### *Drank Whisky for Ninety Years.*

[Dallas Call.]

James James, who lives in Weatherford, Parker county, Texas, was born in Prince William county, Virginia, May 10, 1764, and is now nearly 114 years old. He resides with his daughter. Mrs. Nancy Wheat, and until recently has been