# National Republican.

PUBLISHED EVERY MORNING (Sundays excepted) BY W. J. MURTAGH, Northeast Corner of Tenth and D Streets, (fronting Pennsylvania Avenue,) and is furnished to subscribers (by carriers) at 50 cents per month.

Mail subscribers, $6.00 per annum; $3.00 for six months; and $1.50 for three months, invariably in advance.

THE WEEKLY REPUBLICAN is published every Saturday morning, and is furnished to subscribers at the following rates: One copy one year, $2; three copies one year, $5; ten copies one year, $15; single copies in wrappers, 5 cents.


# THE PAPACY.

## Dr. Sunderland's Reply to Dr. White, Delivered at Lincoln Hall, Thursday Evening, February 24th, 1870.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 26, 1870.

*Rev. Dr. Byron Sunderland:*

DEAR BROTHER: We, the pastors of the Protestant churches in Washington, believing the interests of Protestant Christianity would be promoted by the repetition of your learned and conclusive argument against Romanism, respectfully request you to repeat your lecture at such time and place as you may deem convenient.

J. P. NEWMAN, Pastor of Metropolitan Church.
B. PEYTON BROWN, Pastor of Wesley Chapel.
CHARLES W. BALDWIN, Pastor of Ryland Chapel.
O. W. HOBBS, Pastor of Gorsuch Chapel.
W. H. HOLLIDAY, Pastor of East Wash'n M. E. Church.
ARTHUR FOSTER, Pastor of Uniontown Circuit.
ALEX. E. GIBSON, Pastor of Foundry Church.
L. T. WIDERMAN, Pastor of Hamline Church.
SAMUEL M. SHUTE, Professor in Columbian College.
A. J. HUNTINGTON, Professor in Columbian College.
E. J. DRINKHOUSE, Pastor of Ninth street M. P. Church.
J. H. CUTHBERT, Pastor of First Baptist Church.
JOHN N. COOMBS, Pastor of Western Presby'n Church.
WM. HART, Pastor of Fifth Presbyterian Church.
CHARLES B. BOYNTON, Pastor of Central Congregational Church.
SEPTIMUS TUSTIN, Senior Member of Potomac Presbytery.
J. E. RANKIN, First Congregational Church.
JOHN CHESTER, Capitol Hill (Met'n) Presby'n Church.
LOUIS R. FOX, Pastor of North Presbyterian Church.
B. F. BITTINGER, Pastor of Seventh Street Presby'n Church.
J. GEORGE BUTLER, Pastor of St. Paul's Church.
SELLA MARTIN, Late Pastor 15th Street Pres'n Church.

WASHINGTON, March 3, 1870.

*To Rev. Dr. Newman and Others:*

DEAR BRETHREN: I should be entirely wanting in appreciation could I remain insensible to the very grateful expression of fraternal confidence which you have rendered me.

I claim no special credit for having endeavored to speak some words, not so much in defence of evangelical Christianity as to expose the corruptions and errors of the Romish Hierarchy; for I do not assume to have done more than any Protestant clergyman might have done, seeing that the argument is clearly on our side, and its material so abundantly supplied to our hand.

It is a matter of regret that the evening of the delivery of the lecture to which you allude was so unfavorable for the attendance of many of our friends. Though a notice appeared in two of the city papers inviting "the clergy of the city, without distinction, to seats on the platform," yet I now feel that I should have caused special invitation to be sent to them, as I would have done but for a pressure of extra duties which on that occasion rendered it physically impossible.

In regard to your very flattering request to repeat the lecture, I have to say, dear brethren, that while I desire to comply with your wishes, yet, as it would be a severe tax on both audience and speaker, and as when your letter was received the lecture was nearly ready for publication in the NATIONAL REPUBLICAN, perhaps its immediate issue may answer all the purposes of its repetition.

The conductors of that paper, so far as I can see, have been impartial in presenting both sides of the question, and deserve credit for the pains they have taken to furnish the public with the means of examining what has been presented on either hand.

In the full confidence of the great principles of our common Faith, and praying always for your health and prosperity as the ministers of Christ, I remain ever truly, &c.

B. SUNDERLAND.

### EXORDIUM.

The limits of time and strength in this world compel us to leave many things unexamined, if not unnoticed. In the discussion of any important question, all we can hope to do is to study its main features, and endeavor to comprehend its vital points. Even then, for many reasons, our work may be far from perfect. If upon the publication of this reply to the lecture on the subject of the Papacy, recently delivered by the Rev. Dr. White, of this city, any mistake or error should be discovered, I trust that when pointed out I shall be ready to explain or to correct it. And in regard to the future, I may here say that while I intend this reply to be final in respect to the reverend gentleman himself, to whom I have alluded, I shall at all times claim, what I concede to others, the privilege of a frank and candid expression of my views and convictions, as occasion may require, upon this and every other topic.

### CHANGE OF TACTICS.

In the month of June last, the Rev. Dr. White, pastor of St. Matthew's church, of Washington, on Sabbath morning, preached to his congregation a regular sermon, involving, among other things, the claims of the Papacy. When, therefore, some months afterward, it was announced that in reply to certain "attacks" he would lecture on the subject, Sabbath evening, in Carroll Hall—seats free—public invited—the course adopted seemed a little singular, and I must confess I did not fully understand it until after the delivery of the lecture. From the printed and verbal reports of the performance I came gradually to the conclusion that the reverend pastor of St. Matthew's church, having in his discourse last June assumed the role of a scholar and a priest, determined in the present instance, for reasons best known to himself, to act a little the part of a merry-andrew; and not feeling that his lecture was quite the thing for a church service, or for promoting any great amount of religious devotion, he adopted the plan of an entertainment in the Hall, where for the space of two hours they all had a very happy time, while the reverend doctor scored away upon the heretics, and cracked his jokes (some of them rather coarse, it is said,) upon the Protestants to his heart's content. But now, when the publication of his remarks is called for, he quietly slips back into the character of scholar and priest, expurgates from his lecture certain portions of the raillery, and assuming rather an injured air, writes a note to the editor of the REPUBLICAN about being called "nick-names." He complains, in effect, that the terms *Romanist, Romish, Papist,* &c., so freely applied to the members of that Church, are "terms of derision and contempt" that have never been recognized by them, and adds that "the cause of truth requires no such weapons."

From this latter statement, we beg leave wholly to dissent. We believe the cause of truth does require to use just such weapons. When a body of people, who constitute only one single section of christendom, set themselves up to claim that they shall be recognized and called by a name which signifies *all, the whole,* to the exclusion of those who are *of christendom,* though not *of the body* of the people so assuming the title, such a claim in the face of the Bible, in the face of history, in the face of the present condition of the Christian world, really deserves nothing but "derision and contempt." And this is precisely what the Romish church does, when it claims to be *the Catholic Church*—"Catholic," signifying *all, universal.* When the Romish Church claims to be *the universal Church,* and Dr. White thinks we ought to acknowledge the claim. This, however, upon our conscience, we cannot do, because we know we should be *confessing to a lie.* But if he has changed the word with another import, if by the term *Catholic* he simply means *all the Romanists,* and nobody else, and then wants us, in our "charity or refinement," not to call them *Romanists*—not to give them "nick-names," I confess I do not see where "the charity or refinement" will come in. If it is not "charity" nor "refinement" to call a man by his own proper name, by the name of his *mother,* of whom he boasts, and about whom he proudly quotes the brilliant language of the poets, what can be done to satisfy the caprices of his nature?

### CONTENTS OF HIS LECTURE.

We come now to the lecture itself. This remarkable composition, as set up by the typographer, and garnished with an occasional scrap of latin or puff of poetry, has no less than fifty-eight distinct paragraphs, some of them numbered and some not numbered. But for the sake of convenience let it be supposed that we begin *from the beginning* of the lecture, with No. 1, and so go on, marking each paragraph by its respective figure to the end, without regard to the numbers affixed to certain paragraphs by the printer. This will facilitate the analysis, and give us, as briefly as possible, the substance of the whole. And so, for example, paragraph No. 1 embraces a statement of the origin of this discussion, which needs no comment. No. 2 is a reference to myself, with a little attempt to be facetious, by dragging in the silly story of Simon Magus, and the very respectful, good-natured insinuation that as Simon is said to have fallen and broken his legs, so I and everybody else who assails the Papacy will do. Here, giving himself just a trifling, magisterial air, which, considering the Romish instinct, was quite natural and perhaps hardly to be avoided, he administers to us all a passing caution, how we meddle with the mysteries of the Popish succession, lest we might get a shock from its great Leyden jar that would knock us into shivers, and then strides on to the next point. No. 3 is an allusion to the progress of the discussion, in which he takes leave to say of his opponents, "I shall endeavor to show that in their reply to my arguments they have evaded the main question," that "their interpretation of Scripture, in opposition to the primacy of Peter, amounts to nothing more than their own uncertain or rather false opinion," and that, "in quoting the works of the ancient Fathers as against the primacy they have grossly misrepresented the times and conduct of those illustrious men." Nos. 4 to 9 inclusive are principally a reproduction and extension of his *former* disquisitions in reply to Dr. Newman. No. 10 is a notice of Mr. Williamson's Tract, entitled "Peephos." Nos. 11 to 13 inclusive are a rather ambitious and high flown exhibition of the Romish dogmas and assumptions in regard to the origin, transmission, and interpretation of the Bible. No. 14 is truly a "settler," wherein we are plainly told to take notice that "the Church is not obliged to prove any of her doctrines from Scripture," since "she was commissioned by Jesus Christ himself." No. 15 contains a specimen of Romish exegesis expanded upon the passage in Matt. xvi. 18, which is certainly entertaining. Nos. 16 and 17 are devoted to answering the objection to Peter's primacy derived from his denial of Jesus, and also that derived from the scriptural statement that Christ is the *sole foundation* of the Church. No. 18 is a delectable dish of discourse relating to the wonders and glories which *tradition* works out, and centers upon the Church some of the "jewels" of which, as they are proudly styled, may possibly shine out before this discussion is finished. Nos. 19 to 30 inclusive constitute a very labored and protracted attempt to enforce a conviction of the Romish sense of the passage in Matthew, and of the Romish claim in regard to the Papacy. Nos. 31 to 34 inclusive contain an attempted reply to my discourse on "Peter never at Rome." No. 35 is the indulgence of a harmless Romish conceit in respect to the relative number and antiquity of the Papal Church. No. 36 is quite an affecting tribute to Napoleon, who, it is claimed, after all, and notwithstanding in forbidden paths, came back to his senses like a true son of the Church, and died, figuratively speaking, in his mother's arms. No. 37 prescribes a personal warning, by the fate of such an one as Luther, while No. 38, and the last, winds up with a grand flourish of trumpets over the greatness and perpetuity of Romanism, and the principal music comes not from the lips of the faithful, but from two outside barbarians, the one a historian and the other a poet. Here, then, are eight crowded columns, which, to use his own elegant phraseology, are "nothing but a tissue of sophistry, misrepresentation, and gratuitous assumption from the beginning to the end." As a piece of logic, it has more holes than a skimmer; as an expression of Romish dogma, its view of things in general is about as broad as that of the man who lived in the barrel and saw through the bung-hole. In our present review of it, we hope to simplify and to make intelligible the principal topics.

### HIS MAIN ARGUMENT.

The Doctor presents to us what he calls his main argument. He has nursed and fondled it till he seems to think it is unanswerable. He complains that everybody has studiously evaded it, and he wants somebody to notice it. Now the truth is, that what he calls his "main argument" is so perfectly flimsy, so supremely shallow, so futile in theory, and so unreal in fact, that hitherto we have not thought it worth while to waste words upon it. But just to gratify its author we will pay it our respects for a very few moments. And first of all what is it? Why, when stripped of its verbosity it amounts simply to this: in order that Christ may have a visible church on earth there must be one sole visible ecclesiastical government throughout the world, and for all time—and of this government the Popes of Rome, in succession, have been the sole, exclusive head from the beginning, and will so continue to the end. That the Church of Rome has been, is now, and ever will be in the exclusive possession of the primacy, as acknowledged by the great majority of Christendom; that there is an analogy between the structure of the Romish Church and that of the civil government of the United States, and just as the President is the sole exclusive executive head of this republic, so the Pope of Rome is the sole exclusive executive head of the whole Christian Church on earth! And further, that as this society, with the Pope of Rome at its head, existed before the New Testament, it alone produced that volume, and it alone has the right and the power to transmit and interpret it, and all attempts of individuals to read the Bible, or to ascertain its meaning for themselves, are presumptuous in spirit and contumacious in act against the sovereignty of the Romish Church! And to elucidate and establish these most gracious propositions the Doctor has laid himself out to the extent of about one third of his entire lecture.

Now, the answer to this piece of Popish fanfaronade is very plain, and needs only to be stated to be seen in all its force. The unity of the Church taught in the Scriptures is a spiritual unity. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink," and "cometh not with observation;" but it is in the heart of the believer, a kingdom of "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Then, as to the outward state of the Church, it is no more essential to the existence of ecclesiastical government that there should be an exclusive form of polity than that the same thing is essential to civil government. The external form is largely conventional, and must be conditioned almost wholly upon the necessity of circumstances as they arise under the Divine Providence. Thus, civil government, which in its sphere is as much of divine appointment as ecclesiastical government, has always existed in separate forms and organizations; and by the force of analogy, as well as by the nature of the thing, the same is true of the Christian Church. There are no more "sects" to-day, as they are called, than there have always been since the fourth century of the Christian era, when paganism was overturned throughout the Roman Empire. Then, as a matter of fact, no such organization as the Romish theory requires ever existed in the world [illegible] it. On the other hand, we know that from the beginning just the opposite state of things has transpired. The Romish polity of Church government is but one among a great number of differing forms. It is true that, counting as they do all children born in the Romish faith, they are able to compute a large communion. But their relative strength in the Christian world, after all the propagation of the last 18 hundred years, is never anything like what they would have us to believe.

From the National Almanac, Philadelphia edition, 1864, which is probably as reliable as any proximate authority can be, we learn that the total Christian population of the world is 335,712,000 souls, of which number the Roman Catholics are 170,[illegible]; and we learn also the fact that during the 350 years since the epoch of the Reformation, and in the same countries where Romanism has exerted its greatest influence, the Protestants have increased to 95,000,000, or more than half the entire Romish communion throughout the world! If, therefore, we reflect that there has never been a moment when the whole of Christendom submitted to and was governed by one sole exclusive earthly head we shall see that, if the Romish theory be correct that the Church of Christ can only exist under one exclusive, visible polity, there has never been any such Church of Christ among men, and so they prove that God has been without any visible Church in the world for the last 1800 years!

Then, as to the Romish Church existing before the New Testament—becoming, indeed, the author of the New Testament—and having the sole right to transmit and interpret it—if the Romish claim on this point be correct, it must be shown that all the books of the New Testament were written by the Popes of Rome or by subordinates under their direction; because if they were written by men who were neither Popes themselves, nor yet in subjection to the Popes, they could not have been produced by the Romish Church. What then is the fact? Out of the whole 27 books not one of them was written by a Pope of Rome, or by anybody who acknowledged the Pope of Rome. In fact, when the books of the New Testament were written there was no Pope of Rome! In the sense in which we now speak of the "Pope of Rome," it was not till the commencement of the seventh century that any such character, with any such office or title, came to exist. The books of the New Testament derived their authority from the direct inspiration of God; were all composed in the first century, and immediately published in the churches, and recognized throughout Christendom as the word of God. They never derived their binding, sovereign character from any sanction of bishops, or decision of councils, but from their own internal evidence of divine derivation and authority. Their transmission was committed to all the churches of Christendom alike. They were adapted to the wants of all mankind. They appeal to the individual understanding of human beings everywhere, and imply everywhere the exercise of private judgment and the responsibility of personal obligation. Under this view of the matter, it is something more than ridiculous; it is verily impious to claim and to insist that the human soul shall be excluded from the study of the sacred oracles themselves, and that it shall bow down to an interpreter as imperfect and as fallible as itself, and shall be subjected to that direful obscuration of God's word which the Romish Church has so long and so fearfully promoted by attempting to deprive the common people of the Bible, and by "teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." At all events we know there are millions upon millions in the world to-day, and the multitudes are constantly augmenting, who will never submit to any such priestly arrogance—who will resist to the bitter end any such extinction of their inalienable rights! As well might Americans set up the claim that the President of the United States is of right, and ought to be acknowledged, as the sole supreme head of civil government on earth, and everywhere the arbiter of truth and the lord of the human conscience, as the Romish priesthood assert a similar claim for the Roman Pontiff. The argument is clear, and the conclusion is inevitable! We hand the problem back again to the reverend Doctor and his friends to consider it at their leisure, simply reminding them that the claims they thus put forth are everywhere regarded by the more intelligent and candid minds of this age as the most assuming, the most superstitious, and at the same time the most absurd and ridiculous that can be imagined—and, that in endeavoring to maintain this attitude before the nations, they are making themselves the laughing-stock of the world!

### HIS FATAL ADMISSION.

But the Doctor does more than offer a fallacy—he gives up the whole case when referring to 1st Cor. iii. 11—he tells us that Christ is the sole foundation of the Christian Church on earth. That passage thus literally reads: "For no one can lay another foundation except that laid which is Jesus the Christ." It is intimated that this is what they all admit and believe. He calls it "the Catholic doctrine." We think it is the doctrine of all sincere believers in Christ wherever found over the entire world. And it does positively and absolutely exclude all idea of any other foundation of the Church whether temporal or spiritual, visible or invisible. This being so, it is utterly idle for any man to attempt to prove that Peter or any other apostle, or any successor of them should be thought to be in any sense the foundation of the Church. It hence results that the Romish sense of the passage in Matt. xvi:18 is wholly gratuitous, and no amount of special pleading can upset this conclusion. Now, here, so far as Protestants, as such, have any interest in the question *the case is at an end.* This is yielding all they claim or have ever claimed; for it is in effect declaring that no single body of Christians can lay an exclusive claim to the exercise of Church authority, and that there is no divine right in those who adhere to one form to lord it over or to anathematize those who adhere to another form of ecclesiastical polity. "There are differences of administration, but the same Lord."—1st. Cor. xii:5.

But lest it should be thought that we are not inclined "to read and mark," to say nothing of "inwardly digesting" the various positions assumed by Romanists of to-day, and so faithfully represented by the reverend Doctor in this lecture, I shall call attention in the next place to a somewhat suggestive subject, which may be styled

### HIS CONTRADICTIONS.

1. He contradicts *himself.* He teaches in one place that the Romish Church, being prior to and the author of the volume of sacred Scripture, therefore the Scripture is of no value separate and apart from the authority of the Church; yet right in the teeth of this he teaches in another place that the primacy of the Romish Church is derived from the authority of the divine Scriptures.

2. He contradicts *nature.* He teaches that "we cannot *believe* doctrines that we do not *know.*" But in the nature of things, if we know a matter, we are no longer said to believe it. He teaches that "the Scripture is a dead letter and cannot speak for itself," and yet that "it contains a revelation," but the revelation is "infinitely above the reach of any human intelligence" in the subjects of which it treats. He teaches that the Romish Church is the only proper, adequate and rightful interpreter of the subjects contained in "the revelation" of the Scriptures, which subjects, although thus interpreted, still remain "infinitely above the reach of any human intelligence."

And thus he teaches that the very nature of revealed truth is such that the mind cannot perceive it when written in a book, and only has the power to comprehend it as it is expounded by the functionaries of the Romish Church. He then proceeds to quote scripture to prove that men cannot understand scripture except through "the exposition of an authorized interpreter." And the scripture quoted is the very language of Peter himself. (2d Epist. 1:19,20.) The whole passage reads literally as follows: "And we have more secure the prophetic word, to which attending as to a light shining in a dark place ye do well, until the day shall dawn and the light-bearer rise in your hearts; knowing this first, that every prophecy of scripture is not derived from *self-solution*—for prophecy came formerly not by the will of man, but holy men of God spake moved by the Holy Spirit." Falling into a grievous error by asserting that this passage means that "the scripture must be understood in accordance with the teachings of authority"—when it simply means that the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are not humanly *derived,* he perverts the very intention of the apostle, by thus seeking to show that the scripture has no meaning to mankind until interpreted by the Romish Church. Why, the Doctor appears to know nothing whatever of the true exegesis of this passage. He suggests that the scripture is of no consequence whatever unless it is explained "in accordance with the teaching of authority." But this "authority" being inoperative except as it is derived through and exercised by persons whose *private* opinion concerning the sense of scripture constitutes "the authority," we have really a very ingenious device for silencing adversaries and confirming disciples. The only trouble about it is that it is a flat contradiction of nature itself, an eminent instance alike of folly and absurdity.

3. He contradicts *history.* He teaches that the New Testament was born of the Church, and that hence the Bible is the exclusive property of the Romish communion; that it is her will and sentiment; that the Pope of Rome is "in possession," as he terms it; that, independently of the Romish Church, we should have been altogether ignorant of the existence of the New Testament; that it was from her hands that the reformers of the sixteenth century received the Bible; that it was upon her testimony that they accepted the Gospel as the inspired word of God. He puts these things in the interrogatory form, it is true, but this is the meaning of it, and I think it hardly possible for the same space to be crowded with more untruth. The evidence of history is a direct denial of every one of these assertions. What are the facts upon this point? Will he contradict them in open day? One-half the Bible, the Old Testament certainly, was not subsequent to the existence of the Romish Church, and was not born of that Church, and is not, in truth, the sole property of that Church, nor in the exclusive possession of its Popes. How then was it with the New Testament, the other half of the Bible? Let history tell the story. The Romish Church, as it now subsists with a Pope at the head, and as the vicegerent of God, now claiming all spiritual and temporal power on earth, as we have before observed, was not fairly put afloat till the beginning of the seventh century. And this Romish Church, of which Dr. White is a member and a minister, and a most redoubtable champion and defender, had no more to do with making the New Testament, or with its exclusive transmission and interpretation, than the Japanese or the Hottentots. The reformers of the sixteenth century gained access to the Scriptures in spite of her, and it was mainly due to the condemnation of Romish tradition and practice, which they perceived the Bible so clearly and solemnly to pronounce, that they could no longer live in the guilty connection. This is the secret of the Reformation! But that we may have a little further light on the exclusive transmission and authoritative interpretation of the Bible, I beg leave to cite a few facts, without any more explicit reference, from Dr. Malan's Inquiry, as translated by Dr. Baird, New York edition, 1844. In this work those who wish to pursue the subject will find a fund of interesting matter, especially of quotations from the early Fathers and Doctors, with faithful references in the foot-notes to all the passages as found in the original. From this compilation of authorities we shall discover a very [illegible] which is called in History the Western Church, the Latin Church, and the Latin version of the Bible, commonly called the "Vulgate," was finally declared by the Council of Trent, A. D. 1546, to be the only authentic text, and the standard by which all disputations, expositions and sermons were to be tried. And still it has undergone several revisions. An edition was published under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V, about A. D. 1587, to which he fixed the seal of infallibility. But his successor, Clement VIII, some dozen years after, ordered it to be suppressed, as swarming with errors, and another equally infallible edition was brought out, differing from the former in upwards of two thousand instances. This is but a specimen of matters enough to fill a volume showing the way in which the Romish Church has transmitted the word of God. Now on the other hand the Greek may be called the mother tongue of the New Testament, and it was in the possession of the Greek Church, the Armenian, the Nestorian, the Syrian, the Indian, the African and the European dissenting Churches, all of whom received it from the apostles themselves, and from the apostolic age, without intermission, have kept it either in the original languages or in their own dialects. What an utter absurdity then it is for Romanists to talk about the exclusive transmission of the Bible by the Church of Rome, and what a piece of ridiculous arrogance to say that if it had not been for the Romish Church we should never have known even of the existence of the New Testament; and what an exhibition of duplicity to profess that it was on her testimony that the Reformers received the gospel as the inspired word of God, while she was doing all she could, as she is to-day, to conceal the light of the Bible and to prevent the Scriptures from being read by the people, and by the children of the people, who are one day to hold in their hands the destinies of nations.

4. He contradicts the *Scriptures.* He teaches that the New Testament originated with the Romish Church, she having fixed the canon of the sacred books; and that though Protestants may read and quote the Scriptures, yet they cannot be certain that they understand them or that the views they derive from the Bible are correct; and there is no possible way for any human being to be sure that he has received the right sense of the Scriptures until the Romish Church sends him an expositor to tell him what it is! And this, we find, is in direct conflict with the whole tenor of the Bible. We read in the word of God, "to the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isa. viii: 20. "The entrance of thy words giveth light; thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies," &c.—Ps. cxix. It is said of the Bereans that they "were more noble than those of Thessalonica," because "they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."—Acts, xvii: 11. And Paul writing to Timothy says: "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them, and that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—(2d Epist. iii: 15.) Here we see, instead of the Bible "being born of the Romish Church," it has been given "by the inspiration of God;" instead of a canon of Scripture being fixed by that Church, "the word came not by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" instead of getting light and certainty from an interpreter, we may go directly to the word of God, and even in childhood we may know "the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation!"

5. He contradicts the *most eminent Fathers.* He teaches emphatically that the Scripture is a dead letter, and cannot speak for itself; that it has no certain meaning without an authorized interpreter; that its doctrines cannot be comprehended apart from tradition; that it is of no essential use in proving the existence of the Romish Church; that this Church is wholly independent of its authority, and that the opponents of Rome have no right to argue from the Scriptures, or to interpret the sacred volume so as to clash with the Romish sense. This is the very liberal and magnanimous position of the pastor of St. Matthews. But how is it with his so-much-lauded witnesses and Fathers? The extracts which I now give are collected in Malan's Inquiry, pp. 10-13, where the references to each original authority may be found:

Irenæus says: "The Scriptures are perfect, for they are the words of God, dictated by his Spirit, and they are the *apostolical tradition,* manifested unto the whole world."

Tertullian says: "I reverence the plenitude of the Scriptures, and I admit nothing without their testimony. Let him therefore who produces any other standard of faith than the written word fear the curse pronounced against the man who adds unto the Scriptures."

Clement of Alexandria says: "The prudent man will use Scripture alone to refute those who dogmatize against it."

Cyprian exclaims: "Whence comes this tradition? God declares that we must do that which is written."

Theophilus of Alexandria writes: "What a diabolical thought, to imagine that there is any Divine instruction besides the holy and sovereign Scriptures!"

Athanasius says: "Cease expounding to us that which is not written. The books of God suffice for the acquiring of all truth." They alone form the school of piety, and we will neither hear nor quote anything not contained in them."

Basil says: "It is publicly denying the faith. It is a criminal arrogance to add to Scripture that which is not written; for it contains the all-sufficient teaching of the Holy Spirit."

Chrysostom says: "It is the oracles of God that we produce as the true rule of the true faith and of all truth, and they suffice against all those who oppose the instruction of the Holy Spirit."

Jerome says: "Should you wish to make clear the things that still remain doubtful, have recourse to the law and to the testimony of Scripture, for without it you will remain in the darkness of error."

Gregory the Great says: "All that can teach at all is contained in the *volume of the Scriptures.* It is by them that preachers should instruct the people. It is in the words of God that one must seek the thoughts of God."

But why need we multiply the evidence or refer to names. They are too many to be mentioned, and yet, in the face of this patristic testimony, as he styles it, Dr. White has the hardihood to assume and undertake to enforce the opposite opinions. Who then is it here that may be said "to have grossly misrepresented the opinions of those illustrious men?"

6. But to crown all, he contradicts *our Lord Jesus Christ himself.* He tells us that we have no right to argue from the Scriptures, or to have any opinions of our own as to the meaning of the Scriptures or of their obligations upon us. And yet the Saviour says: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me."—John v. 39. Again: "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man which built his house upon a rock."—Matt. vii. 24.

Such is a specimen of Romish arrogance and audacity exhibited in the full blaze of the nineteenth century, on the part of one who does not seem to have profited in any particular by the events of the last thousand years; of one who talks about the authority of the Romish Church over the human conscience; about the people having no freedom of private judgment, and no right to read and interpret the word of God for themselves. The reverend Doctor must have strangely forgotten who and where he is, to whom and of whom he is speaking. He has virtually played out a marvelous anachronism, and exhibits himself as one who is living in the days of the Leos and the Urbans, instead of the free and enlightened period which had its dawn in the Reformation, and has been growing brighter with every century until now.

### NECESSITY OF A WITNESS.

But the Doctor says we must have "a witness," "an authorized interpreter," not only to create the Scriptures, but to hand them down and expound them to posterity. This witness must be older than the Bible, and must lend its authority to the Bible, otherwise the Bible is of no account and must be discarded. This witness must be the mouth-piece of tradition, and this tradition must serve as a glass in which the meaning of the Scriptures is to be reflected! He then looks about to see where such a witness can be found, and after searching all over the world and down through the historic periods, he fixes upon the Romish Church as the only organization which fully answers the requisition. He says this Church is, through the Pope, in exclusive "possession," and so makes it a *party* to the suit in court—though what the Pope is in exclusive "possession" of does not so clearly appear. He then says the Church of Rome is the *witness* by whose testimony every point must be decided. He further claims that it is the only authorized interpreter, and thus makes it the *advocate* of the cause. And he finally completes the picture by comparing the functions of this Church to those of the civil *courts,* and thus makes it all in one, *client, counsellor, witness* and *judge,* to try the title of its own exclusive authority and sole prerogative of jurisdiction over the truth of God, over the human conscience, and over the entire extent of ecclesiastical government on earth! Now, this is really a very note-worthy contrivance—and it is no wonder the Doctor dwells upon it to so great a length, that he is fain to turn it about and view it from different stand-points, with so much complacency, and that feeling himself unable to utter all its praise, he should press such men as Shlegel and Rousseau into service for the completion of its eulogy. But now, if this doctrine be true, it certainly suggests some curious reflections. And, first, why not banish the Bible altogether? What is the use of a book which has no meaning in itself; which cannot speak for itself; which is an utterly dead letter? And where was the sense of composing it in the first place? Yet, again, if the Bible be set aside, still how are we to know of the very origin of this witness? Who is to certify us of its authority as "an interpreter;" who is to define the nature and limits of its "possessions;" who is to confer upon it judicial prerogatives; who is to explain the fact that it has historic rivals, some of them centuries older than itself, and whose voice cannot be stifled; and, finally, who is there that would ever be willing to undertake the task of threading the maze of contradiction, falsehood and absurdity of its fifteen centuries of tradition? Now, is not this a famous witness to be presented before the tribunal of Christendom?

### HIS GREAT REMEDY.

But, having made sure of his witness, the Doctor returns to expatiate upon the evils which flow from the exercise of private judgment and free speech in regard to religious matters, and especially the teaching of the Scriptures. He is deeply scandalized at the great number of modern sects and opinions, and with a lugubrious manner, and a melancholy spirit, he dwells upon the catalogue, and at last, as a temporary relief, seeks refuge in Butler's Hudibras! But the great, and only efficacious remedy is the Romish Church, and the unity of her faith. To this he points with pride and satisfaction as the cure-all and the end-all of divisions, contentions and party strifes! Now, let us see how this splendid conception really operates. Let us inquire for a moment whether human nature has really been made worse in this respect by the [illegible] of the Papacy, and see if we find any turbulence or controversy in the Churches and the Councils of that early period. It is not a topic in dwelling on which we need take any special delight, and therefore we shall treat of it as briefly as possible. Let us then hear St. Hilary, of the fourth century, one of the Doctor's original witnesses, as quoted by Gibbon in his history of Rome, (vol. 1, page 449:) "It is a thing," says Hilary, "equally deplorable and dangerous, that there are as many creeds as opinions among men; as many doctrines as inclinations, and as many sources of blasphemy as there are faults among us; because we make creeds arbitrarily, and explain them as arbitrarily." * * * "Every year, nay, every moon, we make new creeds to describe invisible mysteries. We repent of what we have done; we defend those who repent; we anathematize those whom we defended. We condemn either the doctrine of others in ourselves, or our own in that of others, and reciprocally tearing one another to pieces we have been the cause of each other's ruin."

And was it any better after the establishment of the Papal supremacy? In answer to this question we might fill volumes showing that the history of the Romish Church has been little more than one continual series of disputes, hostilities, and persecutions. Take a single statement concerning the mode of administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to the laity, as it was regarded by the 190 voters of the Council of Trent. "Twenty-nine were for permitting the people to take the cup. Thirty-one voted the same, subject to the decision of the Pope. Thirty-eight formally opposed it. Twenty-four wished it referred absolutely to the Pope. Nineteen were for permitting the cup to the Bohemians and Hungarians. Fourteen were for postponing the question, and eleven attempted to remain neutral!" (Malan's Inq., p. 30.) Such indeed was the dissension and the corruption of the Romish Church that "some Romish writers acknowledge without hesitation that in the days of the Reformers the Papal doctrines and authority would at once have fallen into ruin in all parts of the world, had not the force of the secular arm been employed to support the tottering edifice. In the Netherlands alone more than 100,000 persons were slaughtered by Charles V., and still greater cruelties were practised upon the people by his son, Philip II." (Brit. Cyc., vol. 16, p. [illegible].) And this is the Doctor's matchless remedy for the prevention of diversities in religious opinion!

### LOVELINESS OF TRADITION.

But enamored of his Church in those palmy days, when the dungeon and the faggot silenced all objectors, and left a conviction of her authority as profound as the grave, he takes the liberty of calling us to admire the loveliness of her apparel. He enters upon the subject with evident zeal, like a true son of his mother. He calls us to observe "her splendid jewels of unity, sanctity, apostolicity and catholicity, which distinguish her by a broad and unmistakable line from all the spurious offshoots of error." And in the heights of his ardor he even goes so far as to declare "that if the Scriptures did not exist, or any other writings in relation to the dogmas of Christianity, we should still have in her official teachings a sufficient ground of belief!" And yet he condescends to explain to us how it is that this truth "is transmitted from age to age" by the public teaching of the Church, by the acts of councils, by the deeds of martyrs, by the sacred liturgy, and by all the literary and ecclesiastical monuments and memorials of her great estate. And he intimates that the only object of appealing to the Fathers is not to seek any support for the Church, because she needs nothing of the kind; but it is wholly and entirely to prove that the Fathers themselves are orthodox and unanimous in their opinions. In other words, instead of putting the claims of the Church on trial, and bringing the Fathers as witnesses for her support, which was evidently his first intention, he has changed his mind, and now proposes to put the Fathers on trial, and to show that they are all right because they agree with the Church. In pursuance of this end he has had the good sense, it is true, openly to abandon a great mass of spurious testimony that has been heretofore, and is likely to be again, seriously urged in favor of the claims of the Church of Rome, and especially in favor of the idea that Peter was at Rome.

But even after making this generous deduction, there is an immense amount of tradition remaining, which, to retain the striking figure of the Doctor when placed upon the body of the Romish Church, appears like what the ladies of our day so frequently speak of as "illusion." And this fabric of tradition certainly possesses the most variable and illusive qualities. It is susceptible of taking on all shapes and colors and combinations. By selecting and matching it together there is no end to the diversity that may be produced. We must admit therefore that it is perfectly lovely. Could the world of fashion attain to anything like the variety, and I may add gorgeousness of Romish tradition, it would be able to exist in a condition of perpetual rapture! But dropping the metaphor, and speaking according to the nature of the subject, the tradition of the Romish Church, while it brings to view much that is good and unexceptionable in itself—and if it did not it would be purely monstrous—nevertheless presents one of the most fearful records of division, discord, rancor and violence that can be found in the annals of the human race. What is it but one scene of bitterness and cursing; Popes calumniating Popes, councils condemning councils, monkish orders quarreling with each other, every synod a fighting ground, and every convention a battle, aggravated by the intrigue, the infamy, the perfidy, the outrage which men clothed in the sacred garb of religion, and in its holy name, have practiced on their fellows. These evils were only too sadly prevalent in the first six centuries, but they were moderate compared with the enormities of disorder, impurity and public rejection of the Scriptures which disgraced the seventh and the following centuries. "Though," as one writer says, "the Lord raised up from time to time pious men, jealous of his word, and gave them strength to oppose the general depravation, yet these witnesses to the truth were very few in number in a church which having grown almost entirely worldly, became daily more enslaved to its passions and lusts, supposing that gain is godliness."

The Romish doctors themselves tell us that, in the year A. D. 606, the Emperor Phocas, one of the most vicious tyrants the world ever produced, and obedient to the vilest motives, conferred the title and power of universal bishop and visible and supreme head of the Church upon the Bishop of Rome; and that it was by the force of arms between the two parties in the Church then known as the "Arians" and the "Orthodox," and after a bloody contest that Pope Sergius was placed upon the throne. In the eighth and ninth centuries the dogma of transubstantiation appeared; idolatry came rushing in; the Bible was no longer used, and even supplanted by pagan books; the power of the Pope became more exhorbitant and oppressive; the people were burdened with ceremonies and taxes; "the Church had become a widow and her own sons afflicted her." At the tenth century, it was the commencement of the "iron, leaden ages of darkness in the Church." Monsters were placed at her head. Crime, obscurity, assassination cover them with eternal infamy. "The West was on fire." "Fifty Popes, rather apostate than apostolical, succeeded each other in a few years, scarcely five of whom are worthy of being named." In the eleventh century, "the Popes continued their quarrels with the emperors; the celibacy of the clergy, in direct opposition to the word of God, was established; the divine laws were corrupted, and those of man despised." "The Court of Rome was a den of wild beasts." "They were all worse before God than Jews and pagans." "In that den the sentences of judges were bought, prayers were sold, the rights of the people and all order and prudence trodden under foot. At the bar were seated men of cruelty; in the assembly of the cardinals, vipers; at feasts, buffoons; while the laws were issued by harpies." In the twelfth century, "Rome was only a field of battle." "The seat of the Beast was there." "Divided into opposite parties the people and the cardinals were under arms, and it was power thus obtained that placed or displaced the chief of the Church, whom synods and councils either favored or opposed." In the thirteenth century "the Bible was literally unknown even to the clergy as a class. The philosophy of Aristotle had taken its place. Monks of different orders filled the world with their contentions, and to go in the wars of 'the crusades' was declared to be an infallible expiation for all sins." In the fourteenth century, for nearly fifty years, two or three Popes, each claiming to be head of the Church of Rome, were simultaneously and mutually excommunicating each other. The books were abandoned, the churches fell into ruin, so that complaints and public accusations rose up on all sides against Rome, this hell of the living." In the fifteenth century "the annals of the Romish Church may be read by the fires of martyrdom," and the very cardinals themselves, writing to the *King of France,* declare that "the Church is buried in ruins; that faith is departed from her, and that her destruction draweth nigh." (Malan's Inq., pp. 21, 25.)

Was it not time for some morning to dawn upon "this night of death?" Are these the boasted "jewels" which bedeck the Church of Rome? Are these the "unity, the sanctity, the apostolicity, the catholicity" of which the reverend Doctor speaks?

### ROMISH PHILOLOGY.

Yet, having thusfully prepared the way, he now returns to the point of his departure—to the famous passage in Matthew xvi., 18, and offers an exegesis at once curious and suggestive. He tells us that our Lord did not speak to Peter in Greek, but in the Syrio-Chaldaic tongue. And what is more, he tells us precisely the very words which Christ employed, saying to him, "Thou art Kipha, and on this Kipha I will build my Church." At what particular moment of time the reverend Doctor was let into this secret he *does not* tell us, but he has certainly been very highly favored to have discovered the exact construction of the sentence used by Christ, in the Syrio-Chaldaic, on this occasion. Well, for a moment, for the sake of the argument, suppose it were so. What then? Why, when the sentence comes to be translated into Greek it must read thus: "Thou art *Petros,* and on this *Petros* I will build my Church." Such, however, does not happen to be the construction of the Greek translation, and hence the second *Kipha* in the Doctor's famous Syrio-Chaldaic sentence must be removed and replaced by some other Syriac word, such, perhaps, as *eben* or *sela,* both of which signify "rock," to correspond with *Petra* in the Greek. But then again that will spoil all the force of "the Romish sense." It is really a pity, but it cannot be helped. Facts are stubborn things, and the construction of language has its rules and regulations which "the whole authority of the Romish Church" cannot set aside. Yet withal it is amusing to see how industriously the Doctor works round about this impregnable "rock," in his first discourse calling it *kipha,* in his second calling it *kepha,* and in his next he may as well call it *keepha,* and then we shall have a declension of the word containing just about as much sense as the old nursery triplet—

"Fee-faw-fum,
I smell the blood of an Englishman,
Dead or alive I will have some!"

Growing a little more cautious just at this point he drops the *indicative* and adopts the *socratic* style. "May not," he asks, "two nouns of different terminations be placed in apposition with each other as signifying the same thing?" And the grammar answers "No, reverend Doctor, not when, as in this example, the nouns are of different cases—*petros* in the nominative, *petra* in the *dative;* for all nouns put in *apposition* must be of the *same case.* So feeling still a little uncertain whether he has made it quite clear he runs the matter further into the fog by supposing something that he thinks would be pleasing to his Greek friends, that christendom for 1000 years did not understand Greek half as well as Brother Williamson and Dr. Sunderland." But has he already forgotten the statement of Launay to the effect that out of seventy-seven of the most eminent fathers and writers of the early Church sixty of them agree with us in saying that the *Petra* does not mean Peter. Put those sixty authors, with the host they represent, over against his "beggarly account" of three or four names, and we really think that "the hellenists of Washington," as he terms them, are not likely to feel very deeply the sarcasm of this expression, knowing how they are supported by an array of those so many of whom "spoke and wrote the Greek language in its classic purity." The remainder of this paragraph being devoted to the argument of Mr. Williamson upon the particles *Hoti* and *Kai,* I leave for that gentleman, in his own time and way, to dispose of, and for which he is fully competent.

### A SHARP CRITICISM.

Yet here, in passing, we may as well notice an attempt to throw discredit on the translation of a passage from Cyprian, which I had cited in my former discourse. It occurs in a letter written to Stephen, bishop of Rome, giving him an account of the action of the council just held at Carthage in the year A. D. 256. Over that council Cyprian presided, and made an opening address. He held that the bishops of his day were the successors of the apostles, and as such were accountable to God *only!* But Dr. White affirms that by inserting the word "*only*" in the citation "I used a license which is altogether unjustifiable." Now, upon this point I propose to call him to a reckoning. And first of all I would inform him that the idiom of language often requires in translation the use of *one* word for *two,* and *vice versa,* in order to express the exact idea of the author, as in the present case. The Latin phrase, *rationem actus sui Domino redditurus,* may indeed be rendered by omitting the word "*only,*" but in that case the full doctrine of Cyprian will not be expressed. And for this conclusion I refer the reverend Doctor to Marshall's Translation, London edition, 1717, letter 72, where he will find the passage *as I have cited it.* I also refer him to the preface of Carey's Translation, Oxford edition, 1844, where on page 17 it is said of Cyprian, "With an intense feeling of the responsibility of bishops to their Lord, he claimed for each the right of acting with no *human responsibility,* and disclaimed for himself, as Primate, the right of controlling others." I likewise refer him to note No. 4, p. 184, vol. 1, of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, where it is said of Cyprian "that he inculcates on all occasions that bishops derive their office not so much from their election by the people as from the attestation and decree of God, so that bishops are amenable to none but to God *only.*" * * * "None but God can take cognizance of their actions." And then there is one other authority to which I will refer him, and that is the opening address of Cyprian himself at the Council above mentioned, where he says, "For neither does any one of our brethren constitute himself a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical threatening force his colleagues to a necessary yielding to him, since every bishop has full liberty and power over his own judgment, while he cannot be judged by another, nor he in turn can be judge another. But we all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who ONLY (*unus et solus*) has the power both of establishing us in the government of his Church, and of judging us for our acts." (Paris edition, 1726, p. 329.) Here, then, are *four* witnesses for the sense of the passage on which the Doctor sets up *his* authority, and says that "I have used an unjustifiable license." Now, the probability is that Marshall, Carey, Mosheim, and Cyprian himself would be quite as apt to know what is the idea of the phrase in question as the reverend pastor of St. Matthew's, who thus affects to be one of the *latinists* of Washington!

But we have not yet done with the matter. The Doctor says, "Dr. Sunderland quotes a letter from Cyprian to Pope Steven, and makes him say that each bishop in his particular diocese is accountable only to God, as if there were no superior authority in the Church to which he owed submission. But I would beg leave to state that St. Cyprian says nothing of the sort." Now, upon this statement of the reverend Doctor I have several remarks to make. The first is that Cyprian was just as much a Pope as Steven was. The next is, there *was no* superior authority in the Church to which the bishops were obliged to submit, but to Christ only. The third is that I do not make Cyprian say thus and so. He says it himself freely and frankly, and I only report what he says. The fourth is that if the Doctor did not know what was the teaching of Cyprian he should not have been so assuming in his ignorance as to assert that "Cyprian says nothing of the sort." And on the other hand, if he did know the doctrine of Cyprian, taught so clearly in so many places, then it is disingenuous—it is disreputable, and designed to mislead the public in regard to the matter in question by taking the small advantage which lies in a choice between two possible translations, and conveying the idea that the word "only" has been interpolated without any justifiable reason. I was prepared for a good deal of *squirming,* but I did not expect to see the contortions become quite so minute.

### A SLIDING SCALE.

But it is interesting to trace the workings of the Doctor's mind, and to see how he gradually comes to modify his statements about Peter and the rock from one point to another as the evidence in the case comes out. And thus he furnishes a sort of sliding scale by which the lofty pretensions of the beginning come to be in the end very moderate indeed. The man that in the outset is seen riding an exceedingly high horse, may afterwards be observed quietly slipping down toward the ground where at length he comes to stand among other people. Let us examine briefly this interesting procedure. In his June sermon he undertook to establish "the Romish sense" of Matt. xvi:18, and in so doing he called up a number of witnesses to give their testimony upon the case. After drawing them out to his own satisfaction, he then dismissed them and proceeded to sum up the evidence. He naturally came to this very fine Romish conclusion, which I give in his own words—"Many other testimonies might be adduced to the same effect, but these will suffice to show in what sense the representative men of the ancient Church understood the language of our Saviour to Simon Peter. The early Fathers are in fact unanimous in affirming that Christ designated Simon Peter as the rock on which he was to build his Church—that he was to be the solid foundation which would insure its unity and indefectibility to the end of time." And this appeared to be a plausible deduction from the testimony as then presented. But afterwards, when the witnesses were recalled, and upon their cross-examination, it was found that the reverend Doctor had on his part so conducted the case as to *leave more than half the truth suppressed,* and when it appeared upon a fuller statement of his own witnesses that "the Romish sense" of the passage must be given up, or something done to restore the evidence which had been so effectually impaired, we find him, so to speak, coming back again into court to try and save his sinking cause. And after in effect reiterating the high pretension that Peter was the rock, "the solid foundation" of the Church, his first position is that we virtually concede that he is on his high horse and has a right to be. His language is as follows: "My opponents admit the patristic authorities cited, and in order to defeat my argument they undertake to explain them away."

And what does he mean by "authorities?" If he intends the fathers themselves, how do we try "to explain away" a batch of old gentlemen who have long since disappeared from the earthly stage? But if he means the *statements* of the fathers, then we do not seek "to explain them away," but only *to reconcile them with each other.* How, then, does he proceed with the case? We presently find him beginning to lower the crest a little. He now suggests that Peter was appointed the foundation of the Church "in a secondary and vicarial sense!" At first he was "the *solid* foundation," now he is only "a *secondary* and *vicarious* foundation." This, then, by the Doctor's own showing is the first modification of "the Romish sense" of the text in question. This is the first movement in his descent from the high horse he had mounted at the beginning. Let us now see what is the next. He comes to say that "Peter was built upon Christ." Though it is difficult to see how by this process he would obtain "a supremacy of jurisdiction" above the other apostles, all of whom were built as he was upon the same foundation. If then Peter, like the rest, was built [illegible] Augustine must be construed accordingly, as conferring only a distinction of honor, not of official rank or authority. Thus you perceive the reverend Doctor is reluctantly but surely coming down. It is no longer now the Church built on Peter, but "Peter built on Christ!" And what now, again, is the next step in the descent? Alluding to the testimony of Origen, he proceeds to say "if his words avail anything against the primacy of Peter, they are equally conclusive against all ministers of the Gospel." And to this we agree, only we deduce from it a very different result from that which the Doctor is seeking to obtain. The inevitable conclusion is that this passage in Matthew xviii, as shown by Origen, has no reference whatever to the ministerial office, or to the ecclesiastical supremacy of one man over another; but to that grace of God in the soul of every believer, which is derived through Christ as the divine Messiah and the only "rock" on which the Church is built. It is indeed singular that in the sentence above quoted, the reverend Doctor should so completely give up the last remnant of "the Romish sense" of the text in question, get down off from his high horse entirely, and stand on the ground along with other people, while he yet pretends to insist upon my retracting the testimony of Origen for fear it may militate against myself! What a presence of mind is here exhibited! His high horse is gone, to be sure, but his solicitude for me remains. The sliding scale has brought him down from the loftiest summit of human arrogance to the lowly exercise of a neighborly concern!

### A BEAUTIFUL SOMERSAULT.

But we shall never be done with the surprises he occasions. In the very midst of his lecture he strikes a new attitude altogether. He at once cuts the matter short by taking a position to the effect, "that the primacy of Peter and the Popes is prior to, and independent of all Scripture or patristic writings, and might still exist if no such writings had ever appeared!" If this be so, what in the name of common sense induced him to hunt up all these old musty authors, and to put people to all the trouble of going after them and groping about in the dead languages to find out what they said and what they thought? And why, to use one of his own classic terms, does he pause "to squabble" over this text in Matthew? Why does he not close the business right here? What further need is there of trying to restore his witnesses, or of making an appeal to tradition to help him out? If, as he affirms, "the primacy of Peter and the Popes is a fact," and "is so recognized by the great majority of the Christian world," how does he propose to *fortify* the case by wading through ponderous tomes of Greek, Latin, and other languages, and by wandering about in the wilderness of councils along the line of centuries to prove—what? Why, that these same primary witnesses, after having *in their writings* entirely relieved the passage in Matthew xviii, of "the Romish sense," or else flatly contradicted themselves—then, *in their conduct* went still further and did *the same thing* only *a little more so!* He does not pretend to deny any of the citations we have made from these Fathers. He knows the attempt must be idle, and the labor prove in vain. So he rolls himself up into a ball after the manner of a gymnast, gives one spring and goes heels over head away beyond the limits of all historic evidence, into the wild region of imagination, [illegible]. We must remember, is the grand privilege of the faithful, while it is purely a condescension to hold any debate with those who are still outside the doorway of the fold.

### THE ISSUE STATED.

With such a condescension we are, however, favored. The reverend Doctor undertakes at last to leave his aerial realm and come to the important question of fact, whether his own witnesses are *for* or *against* him, and whether their testimony is of any account whatever. So having garbled and misquoted the language of his opponent, he twists *about* the issue and makes it stand out thus: "That is to say that if we can show that the patristic testimony adduced by our adversaries is not irreconcilable with the Catholic sense of the Scriptural text, 'Thou art Peter, &c.,' then we have gained our point?" And with this view he accepts "the task." Now in contrast with this representation let us hear the whole passage *as it stands,* not as garbled and perverted by the Doctor, and which reads as follows: "But the point which these advocates of Rome have to meet is this; to reconcile the testimony of their own witnesses with itself so as to support the Romish interpretation of the passage in question, and at the same time save their witnesses from utter discredit." How different is *this issue* from *that* which he proposes! Now what we say is, that the witnesses having at one time asserted one thing, and at another asserted another thing, those apparently conflicting assertions must be harmonized with each other, and when so harmonized they will not support "the Romish sense" of the passage in question. But if they cannot be harmonized, then the witnesses contradict themselves and their testimony becomes worthless. But "the task" he so "cheerfully accepts" is simply an audacious assumption of the thing to be proved; namely, that if the witnesses are good for anything at all they must testify for the Church of Rome, and they are not good for anything at all if they do not so testify. I do not think that any heathen divinity ever sat in the clouds of a more sublime abstraction. For, to start out with the purpose and promise of proving, by positive human testimony, a given interpretation of a Scripture text, and then to *change the issue* and say "our assumption of the truth of our interpretation *must stand,* and whatever the witnesses say or do *must be held to be compatible with it,*" is certainly one of the most eminent and extraordinary feats of jesuitical paralogy.

### A LUCID METONOMY.

But there is a motive for all this, as we shall presently discover. The Doctor seems to be not a little troubled, as well he might be, about the sixty witnesses against him adduced by Launay, a doctor of the Sorbonne. He attempts to neutralize the force of their overwhelming testimony by saying that "they have recourse to a figurative explanation, and by *metonomy* transferring the name of the effect to the cause they term Peter's confession of faith the foundation of the Church." And having laid down this most astounding *postulate* he draws from it these three sapient conclusions, that all who wish to be members of the Church must profess the faith which Peter taught; that Peter must have superior authority to teach and enforce this faith, and that he still lives in his successors to do it. How exceedingly "brilliant" this piece of Romish criticism appears, we shall see if we are ever able to get at the meaning of the *postulate* laid down. What is "the cause" and what is "the effect" of which he speaks? Is Peter "the cause" and *faith* "the effect?" And what "faith" is it which Peter confessed, and was his confession "the cause" of the "faith?" The simple secret of the whole story is that not knowing what to do with this great fact in the history of Scripture hermeneutics which Launay has brought to light, he has attempted "to mystify" it by a *metonomy,* as he calls it, by getting up a confusion of words by a paragraph of mere printed paper, in admirable imitation of the cuttle-fish, which is provided with an ink-bag for defence, and which, when hard pressed by an adversary, opens this ink-bag, discolors the waters and so eludes pursuit! Such is his famous commentary on the opinions of *sixty out of seventy-seven* fathers cited by Launay directly in the face of the Romish claim!

### ASHAMED OF HIS WITNESSES.

But how is it with those witnesses which the Doctor himself has brought into court? He certainly evinces a strange disposition in regard to them. I scarcely know how to interpret it, unless it be that he is really at heart *ashamed of them,* and would gladly be quit of the whole of them. At one time he brings them forward and formally arrays them before us. At another, he seems to have misgivings about their testimony, and says in effect that they are of no account whatsoever in the case; and then again he adds to their evidence and to their number, and finally takes a leap into the almost unearthly uproar of the early councils. And in regard to the list of modern authors outside of the Romish Church, whom he so gravely at the first put forward in support of the cause, he still claims *that part* of their testimony which he thinks can be used in proof of "the Romish sense," but attempts to repudiate all their overwhelming evidence against the Romish inference from Matt. xvi: 18. Now, this is a kind of child's play, which we think would not be permitted in any civil court. Let it be remembered that these are the Doctor's own witnesses introduced by himself into the case, and now having brought them in for his own purposes, he cannot turn them out at his pleasure. He may be *ashamed of it,* but he must take all their testimony together, and taking it together, they only add their evidence to that of antiquity, showing that the sole, exclusive *primacy* of the Romish See is what I have styled it, "a stupendous delusion."

### THE BOLSTERING PROCESS.

We now come, however, to the Doctor's grand effort to show that after all the early and most eminent Fathers, in spite of what they plainly say to the contrary, and in spite of the fact that every one of them lived two hundred years before the establishment of the Papacy, are on his side of the question and nowhere else. And how does he seek to accomplish this? By adducing extracts from the compositions of *some* and by calling us to notice that *others* were members of certain conventions, which disgraced the early ages of Christianity. In this rather tedious process of bolstering up his witnesses we shall be obliged to follow him with whatever patience we may be able to command. The subject is necessarily discursive and miscellaneous. His first step is a reiteration of what he conceives to be the evidence of Tertullian, coupled with the comments of Augustine, yet neither of these Fathers, in a single passage cited by him, ascribe to Peter any other primacy than that of *dignity* and *priority* in the *order of time.* This is the full extent of their testimony, and nothing beyond it can be wrung out of them. The passage from Tertullian in regard to a report that the Bishop of Rome was not only assuming the titles but also exercising the prerogatives of a superior being, is conceived and uttered in deep and bitter irony, and the succeeding comment on this infamous and arrogant assumption is as strong in censure as any human language can well express. His next attempt is to brace up the witness Cyprian—citing a passage from this father on the "unity of the Church," in which it is plainly declared that *all the apostles had equal power and authority in the Church,* so that it distinctly appears that the only *primacy* which Peter had was in his being the first in the order of time to be called an apostle, and after our Lord's ascension the first to publicly proclaim the Gospel, as he did to Jews and Gentiles, beginning, by the direction of Christ, at Jerusalem. This is the very matter referred to by Cyprian when he says that Christ, "in order to manifest unity, has, by his own authority, so placed the origin of unity that it should be begun from one." And again, "the commencement proceeds from unity, and the primacy is given to Peter that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one and the chair as one."

Now, this was done at Jerusalem and not at Rome. There is no allusion here to any superior rank or official distinction conferred on Peter in the government of the Church, for all the apostles were equal in official honor and power. This clear and unambiguous evidence the Doctor undertakes to turn to his own account; first, by denying outright what Cyprian says, and finally by quoting a couple of letters written—one to Steven and one to Cornelius—in the course of a fraternal correspondence respecting the affairs of the general Church. Yet the testimony stands against him in all its native strength, clearly showing, not that Peter's primacy confers any superior power on him over the other apostles; nor that the unity referred to is in mere outward [illegible] authority to rule and teach, which, though commencing from one, is conferred on the whole college of apostles. He next proceeds to bolster up the witness Origen, and states to the effect that, while this early father was suspected of erroneous views in regard to the divinity of Christ, "he lived in full communion with a Church which acknowledged a primacy in the Bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter, and was himself sound on the subject, because Jerome, towards the close of the fourth century, was one of his most strenuous advocates." Now, Origen was a presbyter of Alexandria before the Council of Nice, A. D. 225, and we shall see what sort of a primacy in the Bishop of Rome was acknowledged by the Church of Alexandria, when we come to examine the decrees of that famous Council. Moreover, Origen was born A. D. 185 and died A. D. 253. Jerome was born A. D. 331 and died A. D. 420. Such being the facts, it is rather difficult to understand how *Jerome* could be "the strenuous advocate of *Origen,*" unless we suppose it was the doctrine of Origen on the subject of the *primacy* which Jerome advocated, and of the manner in which Jerome advocated that doctrine we shall soon exhibit a most conspicuous example. But in the meanwhile we cannot but feel how truly pitiful is the plight of the reverend Doctor in his attempt to bolster up this witness Origen, who continues to reiterate those thundering words in our ears, which can never be stifled by any Romish clamor, when he says: "For the *Petra* is every disciple of Christ; and if you think the whole Church is built by God on Peter himself alone, what will you say of John, the son of Thunder, and of each of the apostles?" and much more to the same purpose.

But the Doctor resorts to another method of turning these fathers to his account. After citing the language of Faber, who in view of Tertullian's statement respecting the pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, observes that "it showed considerable advancement in those *pretensions*"—Dr. White informs us that "it was no advance at all"—"it was nothing more than Clement had done toward the Church of Corinth, and Victor toward the Asiatic bishops!" Yes, and he might have also added "than Ignatius, who wrote from Antioch an Epistle to the Romans, or than Cyprian, who wrote from Carthage to Steven," and many others that might be named! For if the *mere fact* of a Roman bishop writing a letter to somebody really makes him a Pope, or *proves* him to be one, of course on the same principle every bishop who wrote a letter from the city of his residence to anybody outside thereby became a Pope; and so we have plenty of Popes scattered all over the East at the period in question. Now the Doctor, with a considerable air of triumph, asks us whence the bishops of Rome derived their authority to write letters, "if not from the primacy of Peter?" Sure enough! and we return him the question by asking whence did the other bishops derive their authority to write letters "if not from the primacy of Peter?" And when he begins to talk about "Pope Clement and Pope Victor of Rome," we must begin to talk about "Pope Cyprian, of Carthage, Pope Polycarp, of Smyrna, Pope Irenæus, of Lyons, Pope Theophilus, of Alexandria, Pope Chrysostom, of Constantinople," and many other *Popes* too numerous to mention!

We thus come to see the wretched fallacy of [illegible] superior ecclesiastical authority above that enjoyed by the Bishops of other cities. It was not owing to any divine right originally conferred on them that in after times they acquired an ascendency over so considerable a portion of the Christian Church, and over such Bishops as eventually came to acknowledge and submit to their supreme authority. Rome was the capital of the empire, and thus threw around the Bishops of that city a metropolitan importance of which in process of time they were eager to take advantage for their own aggrandizement. So that what at first had been conceded to them by the Bishops of other cities, through *deference,* they finally demanded as a matter of *right* and inforced by the authority of *power.* This one secret of history will serve fully to explain every citation from the addresses of the councils to the Bishops of Rome during the fourth and fifth centuries, which have been adduced in proof of the Romish *primacy.* Those addresses were simply matters of *courtesy* at the time, and never intended for any concession of official authority whatever. But afterwards, in the seventh and subsequent centuries, the assumption was boldly made, and the usurpation established by the aid of the civil power. The reflection of Faber amounts to nothing more than an inference that in the times of Tertullian the Romish See was advancing in its claims to an exclusive primacy. But however advancing in these assumptions from century to century the Church of Rome had to contend with powerful rivals for the supremacy, and the assumption of the title and power of *universal Pope* had yet, even so late as the year A. D. 590, to call forth one of the most withering protestations that has ever been uttered against it in any generation.

But in this bolstering process the Doctor has produced two other witnesses from whom he professes to extract proof of "the Romish sense" of Matt. xvi, 18. *One of them* is Ambrose, bishop of Milan, about A. D. 381, who is quoted as saying: "The Church was not built upon Peter's bones and flesh, but upon Peter confessing the true faith." But when we turn to the reference in the original text we find the real passage to read as follows: "Therefore faith is the foundation of the Church, for it is not said of Peter's flesh, but of his faith, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. But the confession conquered hell, and this confession excluded not one heresy alone, for when the Church, like a good ship, is tossed, smitten by many waves, the foundation of the Church ought to stand against all heresies." Now, to confuse and muddle the plain import of such language as this will require a subtlety of genius which we have no idea the reverend Doctor himself possesses; for when he attempts to draw from it the inference that "Peter was invested with a superior authority in order to declare his faith as a rule and to require conformity to it," he must mean by the phrase "superior authority" a superiority over other apostles—a mere personal, official authority, just as though the great truth of Christ's divinity, which was the faith that Peter confessed, not for himself only but for the other apostles, and indeed for all Christians, and which truth is "the faith" intended by Ambrose when he says "it is the foundation of the Church," just as though this great truth must depend for its nature and existence upon the fact whether or not one man should have a little brief official authority over another to prescribe to him articles of faith, and compel him to accept them. The very statement of such a monstrosity is its own sufficient refutation. And yet this is the position of the reverend Doctor in his attempts to force the witness Ambrose into the support of "the Romish claim."

But he has been still more unfortunate in bringing to the stand the other additional witness—that is, Jerome, the monk of Palestine. This famous father, in his letter to Damasus, bishop of Rome, is quoted as saying: "I am united in communion with your holiness; that is, with the chair of Peter; on that rock I know that the Church is built." And then, after several intervening sentences, he declares, quoting the language of the Saviour, (Matt., xii:30, and Luke, xi:23:) "He that gathereth not with you scattereth; that is, whoever is not of Christ is anti-Christ;" and thus he explains his own meaning. Now, this is the kind of testimony adduced to support the Romish claim; and what is the amount of it? He is not speaking here of official rank or of church government at all, but of the tenets of Christian doctrine, and especially the divinity of Christ, which were then challenged and assailed. And he intimates that in this respect he is in communion with the Church at Rome, the same as he is with the chair of Peter—that is, with the orthodox belief everywhere, for it is especially upon that rock of the truth of Christ's divinity he knows the Church is built, and that "whoever is not of Christ must of course be anti-Christ." But since the Doctor has put upon the stand this "illustrious father," as *he styles him,* endeavoring, if possible, to torture something from him in support of the Romish claim, we propose, as we have done with his other witnesses, to give Jerome an opportunity to tell us how he strengthens Origen and what he thinks about this whole question of Church polity in the apostolic age, and about the growth of ecclesiastical rank and power in after times. (Opp. Paris edition, 1706, vol. 4, p. 407, 444, in Com. on Tit., 1, 5; also p. 802-3, in epistle to Evangelus.)

From these passages, as any one may see who will consult them at leisure, we derive the following results: Jerome expressly denies the superiority of bishops to presbyters by divine right. Jerome states it as a historical fact that, in the original constitution of the Church, before the devil had so much influence as he afterwards acquired, the Churches were governed by the joint counsels of the presbyters. Jerome states it as a historical fact, that this government of the Churches by presbyters alone continued until, on account of scandalous quarrels, it was thought expedient to try the remedy of choosing one from among the presbyters and placing him over the rest. Jerome says this change in the government of the Church, this creating a superior ecclesiastical order, did not take place at once, but by degrees—*paulatim*—that is, "by little and little." Jerome says this elevation of one presbyter over the others was a human contrivance, was not imposed by authority, but crept in by custom, and that the presbyters of his day knew this very well. Jerome says the presbyters originally became bishops much in the same way as if an army should make an Emperor or the deacons should elect one of themselves, and call him arch-deacon. All this testimony, and much more, may be found well summed up in the works of Dr. John M. Mason, vol. 3d, pp. 224-321. And this is the testimony of Jerome, one of Dr. White's own witnesses—one whom he himself styles "illustrious"—one who, in the judgment of Erasmus, "was without controversy by far the most learned and most eloquent of all the Christians, and the prince of Christian divines!" Can anything be more deeply philosophical than this exposition by Jerome of the whole subject of Church government? And yet, in the face of this, the Rev. Dr. White, with all his co-presbyters in the Romish communion, will still persist that they *are the* only Church of Christ on earth, and they only have the right to dispense to mankind the ordinances of God!

Thus far we have reviewed the points brought to our notice by Dr. White in his attempt to bolster up some of the witnesses of his June discourse. The remainder of these witnesses he undertakes to fortify by an appeal to the early Councils of the Church. Let us, then, follow him to this new field of observation.

### AN ECCLESIASTICAL QUAGMIRE.

The reverend Doctor has treated us to a chapter upon these Councils for the purpose of showing that some of his witnesses attended them, and perhaps likewise thinking to overwhelm the ordinary reader with an imposing array of names and numbers by assuming, as he does, that all these great convocations of Christian bishops from all parts of the then civilized world were under the authority and subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop, or, as he styles him, the Pope of Rome and that by so convening and so participating in those assemblies they all recognized and confirmed the primacy of the Roman See. That the reverend Doctor might suppose this style of argument would be satisfactory to the members of his own communion is natural enough, but that he should imagine for one moment that it could mislead any who are at all acquainted with the early history of the Church is really surprising. We can only account for it on the obvious supposition that having no better resource for bracing up his witnesses, he resorted to this far-fetched, irrelevant sort of [illegible] which may be properly characterized as the great quagmire of ecclesiastical history. We call to mind the estimation in which they were held by Gregory of Nazianzum, one of Dr. White's own illustrious witnesses, who said in his old age, and after long experience, "I never knew a Council to come to a good end"—that is, "to come together and still not discover any end of the evils, and indeed always to add tumult to tumult, is, as you are not ignorant, the greater infamy. I salute these Synods afar off. I never more will sit in these assemblies of cranes and geese," with much more to the same purport. (Opp., Paris edition, 1842, vol. 2, pp. 110-114 and 854-5.)

But that we may not seem wholly indifferent to the Doctor's labors in this quarter, let us give some attention to the first council—and in many respects the most important—that which was held A. D. 325, at Nice, a city of Bithynia, in Asia Minor. The Doctor says, for example, that this council was held under the presidency of the legates of the Pope of Rome, and refers to Gelasius in the fifth, and to Photius in the ninth centuries as authorities for the statement. He does not condescend to give us the language of these writers but fabricates a statement for them as if they had really said it. This mode of gathering evidence has every advantage but that of being true, and every merit but that of being right; neither Gelasius nor Photius pretend to know anything about the matter save what they have derived from others before them. Photius, indeed, is so much later than Gelasius, and Gelasius is so much later than Eusebius, from whose life of Constantine he literally extracts all he has to say upon the subject, that it would seem to be time wasted to pause upon their testimony. The essence of it is summed up in a Greek and Latin version of Gelasius, to be found in the *Acta Conciliorum,* Paris edition, 1715, vol. 1, p. 375, and is as follows: Hosius, bishop of Cordova, in Spain, "who obtained the place of Sylvester, bishop of sovereign Rome, together with the Roman presbyters, Vito and Vincentius, with many others, was present in that assembly." Nothing is here said about the "legates of Pope Sylvester," or "their presiding over the council." And if it be true that Hosius obtained the place of Sylvester, who was absent through the infirmities of age, there is no intimation in this passage what "that place of Sylvester" was—whether it was the place of president, secretary or janitor; whether, in fact, it was in or out of the council; and we are left to learn from other sources whatever seems to be credible in relation to this famous assembly.

I would therefore refer to a small work of some ninety pages, entitled a "History of the First Council of Nice," by Dean Dudley, esq., Boston edition, 1860, and also to the lectures of Prof. Stanley, of Oxford, New York edition, 1862, from page 144 to page 280. At the commencement of Lecture II a full list of authorities is given. From these works we distinctly learn the following facts: It was almost wholly an Eastern not a Western council. Out of 318 members not more than ten or twelve were from Europe. It was summoned upon the sole authority and under the supreme direction of the Emperor Constantine, who presided over it in person. Notwithstanding this fact it is claimed by the Romanists that the two Roman presbyters, Vito and Vincentius, [illegible] of the council; and it is also claimed by Theodoret that Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was president, and by other writers that Eusebius of Cesarea was president, and by others still that Alexander of Alexandria was president, and by still other authorities that Hosius of Spain was *president.* In the midst of this conflict of testimony let each man take his choice, for by using the convenient method of Dr. White, and garbling and culling out such statements as he thinks will suit his purpose, he will be able to show either that they did or that they did not preside over the council, as may please his fancy. Dr. White affirms that "the whole 318 members of the council recognized the supreme authority of the Pope," (meaning of course the Pope of Rome,) and it is claimed that a letter of the council received by the Consuls Paulinus and Julian in the following November states that the views of Sylvester respecting the doctrine of the Trinity were concurred in, and his *advice* in the matter adopted. What a wonderful *primacy of authority* this must have been!

Now, upon this very point of the supremacy of this bishop or of that bishop, of this church or of that church, let us have the testimony of the council itself. Twenty canons for the discipline of the churches were adopted. The sixth canon has this language: "Whereas the Roman Church has always held the first rank, but *likewise Egypt holds the same,* therefore the bishop of Alexandria may have power over all, since this is the rule in respect to the Roman Church. For the same reason he who has been established among the Antiochian churches, and moreover in the other provinces, the churches of the larger cities may hold the primacy." And again, the seventh canon holds this language: "Since an ancient custom has obtained, and a venerable tradition that deference should be paid to the bishop of Aelia, (that is Jerusalem,) therefore let him retain this, his special honor!" From all which it is evident that the bishops and churches obtained a relative rank and power, not from any divine appointment, or from any special relation which they have to Peter or to the other apostles, but from the different degrees of prominence enjoyed by the cities where the churches were planted. And above all it is evident that at the time of this council there were at least three Sees, which stood upon an entirely equal footing of ecclesiastical authority; that of Alexandria, of Antioch and of Rome. But the Doctor informs us to the effect that the primacy was alone in the Roman See, because the council decreed that for the annual observance of Easter, the Church of Alexandria should compute the time and send it forward to Rome in order, as he says, "that the Pope of Rome might proclaim it to the Universal Church!" This is about as near the truth as we could expect the Doctor to come on such a question. But he failed to get out the other half of it, namely, that a similar communication was at the same time to be made to the See of Antioch; so that, to use his style, the Pope of Antioch might proclaim it to the *Universal Church!* So much then for the testimony of the council of Nice.

But in addition to this, he desires to prove his whole Romish claim by asserting that the 150 Fathers of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, wrote a letter to Bishop Damasus, asking his concurrence in their decrees, and he having concurred, that makes him universal Pope, and renders the council ecumenical. And because Gregory and Cyril were members of that council, as James was of the council of Nice, and because another Gregory was confirmed a bishop, therefore the head of the Church at Rome is the head of all the Churches; that is to say, my Lord God, the Pope and sovereign Pontiff of the world! Then, again, because there was a council of 300 Fathers at Milan, A. D. 355, at which Hilary presided, in connection it is claimed with two legates of Liberius then Bishop of Rome, therefore, this proves that the Bishop of Rome was universal Pope, and that St. Hilary so understood it. But I should think if it proves anything, it proves that Hilary himself was the sovereign Pontiff, and not Bishop Liberius, because Hilary was doing his own work; he was presiding over his own council at Milan just as Pius IX is at this moment presiding over his council at Rome. The reverend Doctor, in resolving to bolster up his witness, St. Hilary, by showing him as president of the council, has really rendered him good for nothing as a witness for the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. But then there was the council of Ephesus of 200 bishops, A. D. 431. Now, this council of Ephesus was one of the most turbulent, and in some respects, one of the most scandalous assemblies that ever convened. He tells us that "Cyril, of Alexandria, and two other legates of Celestine, the Pope of Rome, presided over it." Whereas the council was convened by the Emperor Theodosius, and Cyril was patriarch of Alexandria, and no more a legate of Celestine than Celestine was his legate. Cyril presided alone over the first session of the council, which met on the 22d of June, and on that same day deposed Nestorius.

The three legates of Celestine did not arrive in time to take any part in the matter, but afterwards when the Council met on the 10th of July following they presented the letter which Celestine wrote to the Council. And the Doctor would have us believe that one of them made an address in which he "thanked the Holy Fathers assembled for the praise they had given to their holy head, the Pope;" all which is an utter untruth; for he said no such thing, as is plain from the words of the Latin text giving the speech of the legate Philip. (Act Opp. Paris Edition, &c.) There he is represented as proceeding with an arrogant, inflated speech, in which nothing appears but a few pompous generalities, but in which there is not one single word to show that Celestine, then bishop of Rome, was any