TWO SERMONS,

PREACHED IN THE

CHURCH OF ST. ANDREW, SYDNEY,

AT THE

ORDINATION OF PRIESTS AND DEACONS,

ON SUNDAY, 19TH SEPTEMBER, 1847,

AND

SUNDAY, 17TH DECEMBER, 1848;

WITH AN APPENDIX;

BY THE RIGHT REV.

WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON, D.D.,

BISHOP OF SYDNEY.

SYDNEY:
PRINTED BY KEMP AND FAIRFAX,
LOWER GEORGE STREET.
1849.

THE reasons which have induced me to take the earliest favourable opportunity of preaching the following Sermons a second time are sufficiently known to the congregation before which they were delivered. The Appendix is designed to illustrate and confirm the course of reasoning employed in the Sermons. Several passages which were, for the sake of brevity, omitted in their delivery last year, are here inserted; so that the printed Discourses, excepting a few verbal corrections, correspond with those which were preached yesterday.

Sydney, 18th December, 1848.

A SERMON.

The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder.
1 Pet. v. 1.

THE Church has thought good to direct that on days appointed for the ordering of Priests and Deacons, there shall be a sermon, declaring the duty of such as come to be admitted to the sacred ministry. In such general statements of the importance of that office arising from the momentous nature of the duties which appertain to it, there must necessarily be much uniformity, much which in substance will be applicable not in our Church only, but in every communion which retains the apostolic rite of ordination, and the three orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, which are known from the Apostles' time to have been in Christ's Church. Nevertheless, while there exists this degree of resemblance in the general aspect of the ministerial character everywhere, there will be some distinguishing features or traces of a family peculiarity, prevailing in the ministry which we ourselves have received. This is but a necessary consequence of our engagement in the service of a Church occupying a position so remarkable, and bearing towards the collective body of Christ relations so peculiar, as belong to the Church of England. This position, this insulated position, as some have chosen to call it, we must continue to maintain, until by the mighty working of Providence, this little leaven of doctrine and order, both apostolical, which God has been pleased to keep

together among us and by our agency, shall have fulfilled His great purpose in moulding to a conformity with itself the entire mass of visible Christianity. That such a conformity of the entire Church with the apostolical model will finally be wrought, the voice of prophecy does not permit us to doubt. God grant that I assume not too much in naming the Church of England as the chosen agent for accomplishing this result. Yet He alone can tell whether before the time of the end such a connexion, as we are fond of dwelling upon, between the name of England and the Church, may not have been finally abandoned, and England itself have ceased to be heard of among the nations. We have this treasure in earthen vessels; and we may provoke the Lord to anger, so that he may dash us in pieces as with a rod of iron. But the truth which we had in charge will not be, on that account, nearer to perishing. Though we be scattered, the Church itself *must* survive. The fragments are gathered up, nothing is lost. If forfeited by us, the office will but be transferred to others inheriting our apostolical constitution, that they may gird themselves (I trust more earnestly) to the combat which we so irresolutely maintain. Others in our stead will be the appointed keepers of that pearl of great price which we, through disregard and insensibility to its value, seem more than half disposed to cast away.

But to return to the direct line of observation, I wish to notice in general that whatsoever Church it be, whether the Church of England or any other, which is to hold the deposit of truth and order while the great mysterious trial of Christ's purchased possession is going on, that Church so chosen must become as it were a wonder unto many, while the statutes of Christ are her songs in the house of her pilgrimage. Such a seclusion or alienation from the unreformed portion of the Church, is but the attendant consequence of her call and election to such a charge. It is in every just sense of the term *a setting apart.*

In that position the office and work of the ministry must at all times have somewhat of peculiarity attached to it. And besides, there will be seasons ever and anon occurring, when, by the force of circumstances, such peculiarity will be brought more prominently into notice. And then, in declaring, as the Church has thought fit to order, at seasons like the present, the duties of the pastoral office, the intention of the Church will not be carried into effect unless attention be drawn to such peculiar junctures, and an endeavour be made to convey just ideas of the emergency which they create, and to suggest the proper mode of meeting it. Thus only can they who are entering upon the office and work of the ministry receive a distinct impression of the nature of the conflict in which they are about to engage. Thus only can they be provided with the weapons on the right hand and on the left, which may serve them most effectually for attack or for defence in this great encounter; this state of the Church which is justly described as "militant here upon earth." And may God give us, at such a crisis, resolute hearts and prudent spirits; a great reliance upon Him, and a proportionate distrust of ourselves. In these, through his mercy and goodness, we may find the best of all supports, until it please Him to remove the danger, and to "bring forth judgment unto victory."

There need be then no hesitation on my part in expressing a belief that the more immediate duty to which the ministry of the Church of England is at this time summoned, is that of resisting the revived pretensions of the Church of Rome. I mean its claim to a spiritual sovereignty "over all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord; both theirs and ours." This is not the first occasion of my stating from this place that the clergy of the present day ought to be aware of the altered terms upon which, comparatively with their predecessors, they are required to meet the aggression of the Roman See. Its pretensions now affect no less than they have in any past age aspired to. That Church

distinctly claims for its Bishop at this day, as it has done during ten centuries or more, a primacy by divine right over the whole world, as successor to blessed Peter, the first of the Apostles and the true vicar of Christ. It is held that in the person of St. Peter our Lord committed to the Bishop of Rome as his successor, full power to feed, direct, and govern the Church universal till the end of the world. We know how this pretension was supported during many centuries, and until recently, by a supposed chain of tradition reaching down uninterruptedly, it was said, from St. Peter to the regnant pontiff; and upholding the conclusion that the authority exercised by the latter had been exercised invariably by each and all of his predecessors. But this resource appears to be now mistrusted, or rather has been to a great extent abandoned. The theory favoured by authority among them at the present time is that the first occupants of the See of Rome were not aware of, or did not assume or exercise the privileges which its later and present possessors have claimed and claim. The papacy as it now exists, is acknowledged to have been the growth of time. As the emergencies of the Church rendered it necessary, the prerogative awoke into activity if not into existence; and the strongest argument why such an authority should be established, is now admitted to be the need which has been found to exist for it. The origin of the papacy must, however, according to every hypothesis, be sought in Peter. The intention to constitute such a perpetual authority and to confer it upon him first, is manifest, they say, from the terms in which our Lord on several occasions addressed him. Hence they infer that the Roman supremacy is but the seasonable manifestation of that same superiority which with a view to its future extension, was deposited latently in the constitution of the Church; and has but wrought out for itself by slow degrees the ascendancy to which it was predestined from the beginning.

It is well for us that this position has been taken, because it

reduces the whole question to the single enquiry whether such a supremacy as the Pope now claims, was in fact committed to St. Peter; whether the expressions of our Lord necessarily amount to this, or were understood by those who must have been best informed as to our Lord's intention, to imply the conveyance to Peter of a perpetual and heritable jurisdiction over the whole Church. We have every disposition to deal candidly with the representation, and willingly allow to its supporters every latitude for the discovery of truth, if truth there be in the system which they have adopted. We do not require or expect to find the power in operation upon an extended scale from the moment of its establishment. We should infer nothing against the fact of such establishment if the authority were discovered in a nascent state; and if the delineation of it were not all at once perfect. But there must be some evidence at least to show that the words of our Saviour were intended to convey, and did convey, to Peter, in substance and reality, a pre-eminence of the same description with that which is asserted to be now possessed by the Popes; that is to say, a power to preside over the whole Church with one uniform degree of authority; and to decide infallibly upon its doctrines; and to exclude from its communion all who will not acknowledge their supremacy. This is the prerogative now assumed by the Bishops of Rome as the supposed successors of St. Peter; and it ought to be shown beyond dispute that this authority was first exercised by him. But the proof of this is pressed by insurmountable difficulties. While the origin of the supremacy is still asserted to have been in St. Peter, an unreserved admission seems to have been made that there are no clear traces of his having openly assumed it; and that it can still less be traced back to him through an unbroken line of connexion. My purpose is to show that no such authority was possessed by St. Peter. Even the first link in the chain is wanting. The establishment of the papacy seems never to have been a de-

duction from sound catholic principles; but having been determined on at first from motives of policy and expediency, it must now be defended by the most plausible arguments that can be found. Yet how vain must all argument be to prove the derivation from St. Peter of an authority such as was never *in* St. Peter. Out of nothing nothing can proceed. The first step must be taken from a well-ascertained certainty, or else that which is called development will be no better than innovation. A very distinguished degree of pre-eminence we do not seek to withhold from the Apostle to whom Christ has said "Blessed art thou." And no one entertaining with good faith the principles of the Church of England can be disposed to deny that "blessed" he is. Only we are entitled to claim that the nature and extent of eminence assigned to St. Peter should be accurately represented. For the determination of this, an appeal to the words of Christ is necessary, and their intended force must be gathered from the events; that is from the facts connected with the history of St. Peter, which may be ascertained from Scripture and ecclesiastical history. If it be found that these are utterly at variance with the supposition that any such powers as are now claimed by divine right for the Pope were assumed by Peter, or were understood by others to belong to him, then I say again that the vast system of pontifical authority which has been elaborated out of the assumption that Peter was the first holder of it, cannot be a development, but must be a corruption of the truth.

The question then which presents itself for determination is, whether the terms in which our Lord on several occasions addressed himself to Peter do actually imply, or must necessarily be understood to denote the conveyance to him of perpetual authority to feed, direct, and govern the Church; so that nothing connected with its doctrine or discipline could be lawfully undertaken or determined except by his appointment, or under his express sanction. And first and specially

let it be asked, is this the just conclusion to be drawn from the well-known words "I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church?" From an early date the question has been debated whether, as this saying of our Lord was drawn forth by the preceding confession "Thou art the Christ," that confession were not itself the rock upon which Christ declared his intention to build his Church. In a certain sense it is so. "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God," is the fundamental truth of the Gospel. Until this was laid down, and faith was rested upon it, there could be no Church; and therefore this acknowledgment, this truth eternal and immoveable, is fixed as the basis upon which the Church is founded. But this, although a consistent and allowable sense, is not the full and only sense designed by Jesus. The attendant expressions prove this. For what could be the object proposed by the introduction of those words—"I say unto thee thou art Peter," except they were meant to express a distinct reference not to the confession only but also to the personal acts of Peter?

It is often urged as an objection that Christ is himself the rock upon which the Church is built; and certainly in the highest, and that an exclusive sense, he is the true and only Rock. But to imagine that when he said "upon this rock I will build my Church," he had this in contemplation and pointed to himself, is to strip his words of all their force and pertinency. Christ is the Rock; but there is nothing in this admission at variance with St. Peter's being held to be the rock in an entirely different and immeasurably inferior sense. In this way Jesus Christ is "the chief corner-stone;" and yet this does not hinder but that the apostles and prophets are the foundation upon which the Church is built. Christ had all power to build his Church by his own sole agency, or by the ministration of angels, or as it should please him in any other way. He needed not the agency of man, yet he employed it; and in particular he employed the agency of Peter in a way which

made it peculiarly appropriate to apply to him this figurative distinction. The important question is, how is the expression to be interpreted; what does it imply; what must it necessarily express? The words are used metaphorically, not literally; and the true interpretation must be such as may be deduced without violence from the terms of the figure. "Upon this rock I will build my Church." Admitting Peter to be that rock, must the meaning therefore be, I will make thee the perpetual and supreme pastor of all my flock? There seems to be no direct or necessary connexion between these two ideas. But we shall arrive at a more natural solution if we call to mind that every act of ministerial duty which St. Peter was selected or singularly appointed to discharge, until after the calling in of the Gentiles, partakes of the character of laying a foundation. In this sense the Church may in strict propriety of speech be said to be *built* upon him; inasmuch as in him it had its first formal origin; or for its first institution according to a fixed plan, it depended, mediately upon Peter. This was his peculiar distinction; not to govern the Church, but by his agency to be the first that gave rise to it. It is a just principle of interpretation, not in this passage only but universally, that we are not to deduce from Christ's expressions anything more than is properly included in them; or is in strict harmony with their figurative signification. Take then the circumstances of the case, and observe how closely literal facts correspond with and interpret the expressions which our Lord was pleased to employ. He declares that he will build his Church upon this rock; and it rests, even from its first rudiments, upon the man who had been the first to enunciate the leading truth; who would be steadfast and immoveable in the maintenance of his own confession; and by whose firmness his brethren would be strengthened to continue that work which had its original in St. Peter. Thus interpreted the words of our Saviour suffer no violence. There is a fulfilment both morally and

personally of the figure of building upon a rock. But when an endeavour is made to deduce from this St. Peter's title to a supreme headship over the Church, all must be sensible that this meaning can be derived only by a distortion of the image. Examine as we may the records of Peter's subsequent ministry, not one of his acts will be found to bespeak any precedence assumed by him further than in training and preparing the rest for the discharge of the office of the ministry. No instance afterwards appears of his assuming a right to exercise authority over his brethren; and the conclusion from this cannot but be that our Lord, in saying, "upon this rock I will build my Church," had no design thereby to confer upon him a supremacy over it.

But, admitting this, it may be said, is there not more distinctness in the succeeding clause "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"? and must not these words imply the conveyance to St. Peter of a supreme controlling power? The conveyance of a power they certainly do imply, but its extent and duration will have to be ascertained from other considerations. The custody of the keys may be granted temporarily, with a view to some special act of duty which a single application of them may accomplish. The kingdom of God did at that time present a state of circumstances to which this condition is applicable. Under the former jealous dispensation, exclusion had been the general rule, for all were shut out except one single nation. Nor as yet had the introduction of the Gospel led to any relaxation. To the Jews alone the gate had been opened by the hand of Jesus himself, ever since the day in which he began to preach and to say unto them "Repent ye and believe the Gospel." But this was all. He was not sent "except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Peter was conscious that without any further commission he was authorized to invite their continued entrance. Thus did he on the day of Pentecost, when he addressed to them these words—"Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at

Jerusalem, repent ye and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." And shortly after this, they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen—preached the word of God unto none but unto the Jews only. The door was therefore opened effectually to them if they should be willing to enter. But against the admission of any beside, an obstruction had been erected which seemed to be insurmountable. The Gentiles were forbidden to enter. The key had been turned against them by God's own appointment; and the way could not be opened except by his special authority. All indeed had heard the saying "rejoice ye Gentiles with his people" but could make no application of it. Of the Church it had been foretold by her own prophet "thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." The time for the fulfilment of this mystery was come; and the key which should open the door for their admittance he promises he will commit to the charge of Peter. "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." It is a promise limited to him individually. No mention made of that which the patriarch so often heard, "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee;" but exclusively and personally "I will give unto *thee*." This proves it to be a power distinct from that which is expressed in the words following, "whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This promise was extended to the other apostles also. Not so the office of the keys. That extends no further than "I will give unto thee." Peter should be the chosen instrument for putting the first hand to the fulfilment of the blessed promise "open ye the gates of righteousness that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in." The spouse of Christ had been long enough "a garden barred; a spring shut up; a fountain

sealed." The key which should give access to the world at large to these waters of salvation was placed in the appointed hand; and the mind of the Lord as to its employment is revealed to him in that mystical vision on the house-top; and then follows the question "can any man forbid water, that the Gentiles should not be baptized?" and it was felt and acknowledged that God had granted unto the Gentiles also repentance unto life. But the gifts of God are without repentance, and the privilege once given cannot require repetition. The appointed use had been made of the keys once for all, and Peter can have no successor, where there is no question as to the full sufficiency of the license for ever granted to the Gentiles of entering into the kingdom of God. And it seems as if Divine Providence had an intention to guard against the supposition that from this appointment to bring them in, Peter was to derive any pretension to supremacy over them. The apostleship of the Gentiles was committed to another hand which had "the care of all their Churches." If then, as this appears to prove, the commission of the keys to Peter expressly for the introduction of the Gentiles, confer upon him no supremacy over them, it cannot well imply the conveyance of supremacy over other portions of the Church, and much less over the Church Universal.

Another passage upon which much reliance is placed, as if in itself sufficient to support every pretension which has ever been advanced under cover of St. Peter's alleged supremacy, is that which contains the threefold injunction addressed to him by Christ—"Feed my lambs;" "Feed my sheep;" "Feed my sheep." According to the ordinary interpretation, these words, on each repetition, have but one and the same meaning: preach the Gospel, take under thy pastoral charge my universal Church. The lambs and the sheep are supposed to comprehend the entire flock of Christ; the former designating such among believers as are young and feeble in faith; the latter such as are more advanced and confirmed. But if this

be admitted, there is not anything in the recorded history of St. Peter which renders the injunction peculiarly applicable to him, nor which amounts to a special fulfilment of it by him. All teachers had in this sense "lambs" to feed. When and where then did St. Peter specially execute this office? Neither, again, does it appear why, according to this interpretation, there should *twice* be such an emphatic reference to the "sheep." These objections are difficult to be disposed of. There may be great probability in the conjecture that the three enquiries by Jesus into the reality of Peter's love are meant to have a correspondence with his threefold denial of his Lord. But then, an accurate parallel seems to require that as each denial constituted an act of unfaithfulness, each assurance of love should be supported by the fulfilment of a distinct act of duty. "Jesus saith unto him, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" Is thy love towards me (imperfect as thou hast proved it to be) yet more confirmed than the love of these thy brethren; whom I am sending out "as lambs among wolves?" Take heed, then, to the ministry which I now confer upon thee:—"Feed my lambs." Nourish this my little flock. Teach them to love me as thou thyself dost; for that feeling alone can fortify them to sustain the assaults of persecution which will come upon them from furious adversaries seeking to make them their prey. Again he saith to him, the second time,—"Lovest thou me?" No longer "lovest thou me more than these?" as if the question had a designed reference to the persons then present, but simply "lovest thou me?" and then,—"Feed my sheep." And here a remark must be offered, which is of much importance for the correct explanation and comprehension of these words of Christ. In our translation, and indeed it may be said in every translation, the same expression "feed" is thrice repeated.* Yet in this

* That *he* taught which said "Petre amas me? *pasce, pasce, pasce.* Peter, lovest thou me? *feed, feed, feed.*—LATIMER'S LETTER TO SIR EDWARD BAYNTON.

second injunction, according to the original, our Lord employs a different and much more emphatic term. It is the same word as by the prophet and the evangelist is applied to Christ himself as the chief shepherd:* and by St. Peter to all those elders whom he as a fellow elder is exhorting in the text. It is a word which denotes much more than a simple charge to feed. It includes also a commission to exert a direct pastoral control and authority. We must, as in other instances, seek the true interpretation in the acts of St. Peter himself; among which must necessarily be that which was intended to be, and actually was, a fulfilment of our Saviour's charge "be the shepherd of my sheep." And when we call to mind the relation in which that apostle stood to his own countrymen, as having peculiarly the ministry of the circumcision committed to him, we obtain the most satisfactory explanation, in supposing that they, whom Christ would by this injunction commit to the charge of Peter, were none other than "the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" to whom he was sent. Again he says a third time "lovest thou me?" and then, as at the first, the commission is simply to feed; not to control or govern: "Feed my sheep." "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring;" even the great family of the Gentiles. Feed them therefore; make disciples of them; and baptize them. To them the porter openeth. Thou hast received the key. Admit them into the fold; that they may go in and out and find pasture.

Thus in the records of St. Peter's life, (the source from which it is more natural to seek a solution), we derive an interpretation which seems without violence to express clearly the purport of our Lord's threefold injunction. But can as much be said for the opposite interpretation? Is there any-

* Out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel,—and he shall stand and *feed* in the strength of the Lord.—MICAH, v. 2, 4.

Out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule (or *feed*) my people Israel.—MATTHEW, xi. 6.

thing to justify the hasty conclusion of the Romanists that it assigns to Peter a supremacy over the whole Church, from which the title of their own bishop to such a universal headship may be legitimately deduced? On the contrary this passage alone refutes the supposition that St. Peter enjoyed any such pre-eminence. The mode of expression adopted by our Lord, and the very remarkable change introduced by him into *one* portion of his commission, indicates most convincingly his intention to confer in that one instance, a kind and an extent of pastoral controul, exceeding what he would grant in the other two cases; and the history of St. Peter shews clearly that he did exercise his ministry with this degree of difference in the cases alluded to. His commission to direct and govern was limited to one portion only of the Church. He held among the Jews a primacy of a peculiar kind; such as was not assigned to him over the remaining portions of the flock of God.

Thus we have examined attentively and impartially some of the passages of Scripture, containing the words of Christ addressed to St. Peter, upon which the attribution to him of a proper supremacy, that is, a right to feed, direct, and govern the whole Church, is usually rested. The just conclusion from such a survey will be, if I am not altogether mistaken, that there is no conveyance of such supremacy. The Church as an institution upon earth is built upon St. Peter, because, so far as human agency was employed, the first rise of the Church is attributable to him; because his personal acts were such that but for them, it may be said, the Church would not have been. It had not been but for the revelation made to him of that truth which is the basis of the dispensation; but for his prompt confession of the same, and his firm energetic maintenance of it. Humanly speaking, the Church would not have been but that the conception formed in his mind was expanded, by his teaching, in other minds than his; unless his brethren had been nourished in the same belief, and

confirmed in the profession of it, that they might teach others also. The Church could not have been catholic, as it was designed to be, without the admission of the Gentiles; and to this work Peter was specially designated. Thus, under God, in a manner, every thing grew out of him. All that the Church has been, or is, or will be, till the end of time, if regard be had only to its springing up in the first instance through human agency, will be found to be the consequence, more or less remote, of the preliminary proceedings of the great Apostle of the Circumcision. Therefore it is described as being built upon him. This solution fully satisfies the figure which our Saviour employs; and the test of experience, or of an appeal to the actual proceedings of St. Peter, proves that it is not an imaginary explanation, but a substantive, and true one. But the deduction from the words of Jesus of any claim to a perpetual supremacy, is remote from the original idea, or natural sense; and if there be any point clearly made out by an appeal to the same test of experience, it is that neither did St. Peter claim such a supremacy for himself, nor was he considered by his brother apostles to possess it.

So numerous are the questions connected with the subject which yet require to be considered, that the remaining portion of this discourse must be postponed until this afternoon's service. Purposing with God's permission to conclude it then, I will desire no more than that you will join with me in the Collect for this day* on behalf of the Church of which Jesus Christ is himself the chief corner-stone.

O Lord, we beseech Thee, let thy continual pity cleanse and defend thy Church; and because it cannot continue in safety without thy succour, preserve it evermore by thy help and goodness through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

* Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, 1847.

A SERMON.

The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder.
1 Pet. v. 1.

THE variety and extent of the subjects which we have to consider compelled me in the earlier part of this day to break off my discourse, and to reserve for this afternoon the remainder of the argument on which we had entered. I would fain believe that in this line of reasoning there is nothing too intricate for a plain understanding to follow; provided that it be well versed in Scripture and interested in the enquiry. And interested we ought all to be; for it is a matter of incalculable importance, not only to our own happiness and liberty, but to those of the world at large, to be able to maintain the purity of the Gospel against the innovations and encroachments of a system which is irreconcileably opposed to it. The plea by which the Church of Rome pretends to establish its title to supremacy over all Christendom is the asserted conveyance of such a power by our Lord to Simon the Son of Jonas. It includes a supposed right to dictate to all Christians by infallible authority what they must believe to be saved. Exercised by St. Peter in person as long as he lived, it is described as having descended to the Bishops of Rome as his successors in the government of the Church. The line of argument during many ages used to be, that the Church of Rome being gifted with infallibility cannot be guilty of innovation; and if its infallibility be admitted, this

is a sound process of reasoning. The possession of such an endowment necessarily excludes the possibility of such a defect. But now the discovery has been made, that innovation cannot be so positively disclaimed. It is admitted that there has been a deviation from the primitive and apostolical system of the Church. The advocates of the popedom at present avow that the so-styled successors of St. Peter were *long* before they became aware that such a power had descended to them. Circumstances alone revealed to them that such authority was theirs by a divine right; and its applicability to the wants of the Church, rather than its recognised existence from the beginning of the Gospel, awoke the exercise of such a prerogative. The proof that any such prerogative was committed to St. Peter, or that he could by divine right claim a supremacy, universal, perpetual, and endowed with the prerogative of infallibility, is not only unsupported, but is decidedly contradicted by the testimony of Scripture. The authority conferred upon him was limited in degree, temporary not perpetual, and such as conveyed no assurance of exemption from partial error even in matters of faith. The correctness of this representation as to his authority being limited, will be more fully confirmed by reference to the acts of St. Peter, when he was assuredly engaged in fulfilling the commission he had received, "feed my lambs," and "strengthen thy brethren." An example immediately follows the return of the disciples from the Mount of Olives, after witnessing the ascension of their Lord into heaven. "In those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples." The number of names was altogether but about a hundred and twenty. "They returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Yet was there in the prospect before them so much to dispirit and discourage, that during the days of their appointed waiting for the baptism of the Spirit, there might be almost a danger of their giving way to despondency, and abandoning the undertaking, unless they should be instructed, invigorated, and held together

by the influence of some superior mind. They had not discovered the true application of what was written in the Book of Psalms concerning Judas. They required to be enlightened in the knowledge of these things; and Peter was their teacher, giving a resistless interpretation of the passage "his bishoprick let another take." Nor did he only feed his brethren with the knowledge of the truth. He strengthened them in their resolution to persevere by proposing the ordination of another apostle under the sanction of that passage so expounded. That measure, would be, in itself, a sufficient manifestation of their decision that the work of preaching the Gospel to all nations should *not* be relinquished. The occasion was of the greatest moment. This would be the first step in a progress, which, once begun, would never afterwards be arrested; and so again the building of the Church is by derivation established upon Peter. This proceeding also serves as a touchstone of the correctness of the opinion "that our Lord purposed to institute in his Church a source of authority to which all subordinate rulers should be subject; and from and by which they should, directly or indirectly, receive their jurisdiction."† If it were purposed to institute in Peter the model of such an authority, that it might from this source be continued in a perpetual succession, the most natural occasion for manifesting such a purpose might have been in the instance of the appointment of Matthias. But whatever might be the office borne by Peter on this occasion it was from its very nature such as not to admit the possibility of his having successors in it. His peculiar vocation consisted not merely in assisting at the ordination of a disciple, but essentially and properly in *this*—in shewing, once for all, that it was necessary and lawful to make such an appointment. Thus was the Church to be built upon him; inasmuch as he was the first to suggest and prove that the succession of the ministry was

† Wiseman's Lectures on the Doctrines of the Catholic Church. Vol. 1, p. 263, Lecture VIII.

to be continued; and thus to establish the principle on which the continuance of the Church itself depended. But who can be second in establishing a principle? Done *once* it is done *for ever*. And as to the question of supremacy, there is no symptom of Peter's aspiring to it. He takes the lead in suggesting the sense of Scripture. The rest concur in his exposition, and make the practical application. They appoint two; they pray to God; and the determination is given from on high. Had Peter been even so distinguished from the rest as to have the choice between these two, or the selection of the new apostle, committed to him, there might have been perhaps some ground for speaking of an authority having its source in him, to which all rulers in the Church were to be subordinate. But thus it is not. "They appointed two," the choice of the whole body, not of Peter; and the determination is left to God. It is a conclusive contradiction of any claim to universal supremacy, or jurisdiction over subordinate rulers of the Church, which may assume to be inherited from St. Peter; for he, it is evident, possessed it not.

Scarcely indeed is there any act of his ministry from this time forward which does not present the same character of being suited to laying a foundation for the Church, but has no necessary connexion with the government of it. An example of this is found in the miraculous cure of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple.

The gift of healing had been conferred by our Lord upon his apostles at their first appointment; and the promise of its continuance had been made to them immediately before his ascension into heaven. (Mark, iii. 15, xvi. 18.) During their Lord's abode on earth the ability to exercise that power had been on one occasion suspended through their feebleness of faith. (Mark, ix. 18, 19.); and the remembrance of this circumstance, and the consciousness of their still remaining slowness of belief, might create an apprehension that it would again fail them; and in proportion to the strength of

that apprehension would be their backwardness in attempting to employ the gift. While, therefore, it was necessary that miracles should be wrought by the apostles for the conviction of those to whom they were sent to preach the Gospel, there was a necessity preliminary even to this: namely, that the apostles themselves should be corroborated in the persuasion that the power to work miracles really resided in them. The most direct and obvious course would therefore be that some one of them there should be whose faith was sufficiently firm to render him superior to that apprehension. One instance of visible success would carry conviction more readily to the minds of the apostles than any reasoning could; and so far as it was the purpose of God that the doctrine of the Gospel should be supported by the evidence of miracles, the Church might be said to be built upon him who should occasion that evidence to be supplied. The object in view was not merely to work a miracle, but to show that miracles could be wrought; and in convincing his brethren of *this*, the peculiarity of Peter's office consisted. Sensible that the entire success of the mission in which he was engaged depended upon the issue of this critical effort, (critical because the first), he felt the power of faith prevailing over every apprehension. "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," he said, "rise up and walk"; and at the power of that name the helpless cripple sprang upon his feet; and the proof of the validity of Christ's commission was at once complete. In the exercise of miraculous power Peter would have many followers; but he could have no successors either in the hazard of failure which necessarily accompanied the first assumption of it, or in the distinction of making his own act a groundwork for all of the same kind which were to follow. And as he could have no successors, so he needed none. This one example was sufficient to dispel all doubt and hesitation afterwards.

Thus it is shewn that neither do the words of Jesus imply the conveyance to St. Peter of a supreme control over the

Church, nor do the acts of Peter show that he considered himself to be exercising such an authority. There is nothing in what is said to him, or in what is done by him, which necessarily leads to such a conclusion, and still less to the persuasion that the degree of eminence assigned to him was meant to be perpetuated in a line of successors. It is in the nature of things impossible that any one of these should do any acts corresponding in character with those which were done by him whose successors they affect to be. Whether he be the first to expound the sense of Scripture for the election of an apostle, or to explain the terms of salvation to the Jews, or to open the door of the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles, or to show practically that miraculous power was conveyed to the apostles, not to mention other instances favouring the same view, his doings all bear one interpretation:—that of supplying the groundwork for all that should afterwards be done. Others might repeat his acts; but this was only to build upon the foundation laid by him, so that even they who did the same things with him were not on this account in the true and proper sense his successors. And it will be found that all the peculiar parts of Peter's occupation, those which alone gave him personal priority among his equals, are by a single exercise rendered unnecessary. His commission expires of itself as soon as he has gathered and arranged the rudiments of a Catholic Church, and so enabled others to continue the work. Henceforth the duties of an apostle, which were to be only for a season, and those of an ordinary pastor, which were meant to be of permanent continuance, were exercised by each of the twelve upon terms of equality with him; for to all of them, and not to Peter only had the Lord declared, "Ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel," that is the Universal Church.

But beyond these reasonings, which show only that it might not have been the intention of our Lord to confer a supremacy upon Peter, there are other facts which ascertain that point

more positively; and seem to render it quite impossible that he should have meant this to be the force of his words. I say that the position assigned to St. Peter in the apostleship, and his course of proceeding in the work of his own ministry, might alone suffice to show that it was not the purpose of the Divine will to appoint one supreme earthly head over the whole Church. It seems indeed as if all which relates to St. Paul, after he became a Christian, had been fore-ordained and ordered as we find it to have been, with an express design to nullify the title of either apostle to such an office; and especially to confute the claim of any who should pretend to inherit a succession from St. Peter. If, in a certain sense, St. Paul built upon his foundation (as there can be no more than one foundation) it is nevertheless independently of any previous fellowship with St. Peter, or instruction proceeding from him. If it be urged that Peter had acquaintance by immediate revelation with the mystery of the Gospel, and was the appointed organ for the conveyance of that knowledge to the other apostles, it must be replied, that however true this may be as concerns the apostles in general, there was one apostle to whom the statement does not apply. St. Paul declares that he was an apostle "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father." He therefore was not taught any more than Peter by the intervention of flesh and blood, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. If, in the instance of St. Peter, so much were meant to depend upon such a communication of the truth immediately from the Father, that this almost alone is sufficient, as the Romanists are persuaded, to establish his claim to supremacy, it seems necessarily to follow that no *other* such instance would have been exhibited. It is surely most difficult to comprehend how such a distinction should be common to two, without entitling them to equal privileges. St. Paul, as if to vindicate his claim to such equality, says, he "conferred not with flesh and blood;" Peter in conference added nothing to him; or he

would have known no less of the Gospel if he had not known Peter. Peter was put in trust to strengthen his brethren, yet here is one "called to be an apostle," acknowledged as a brother and an equal, whom he had not strengthened. If it be set up as a plea on behalf of St. Peter that as he had been first the instructor of the eleven apostles, their converts were indirectly his, and that he might upon this ground claim a general superiority, we may oppose to this the case of an apostle who had preached the Gospel several years before he saw the face of Peter, and over whose converts therefore Peter could not upon that ground lay claim to such ascendancy. An immense proportion of the Church derived its knowledge of the truth originally and entirely from the preaching of St. Paul; who, as the apostle of the Gentiles, so magnified his office as to maintain that he was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles. Therefore, whatever spiritual authority Peter could claim or exercise over those believers to whom directly or indirectly he had communicated their knowledge of Christ, the same for the same reason must St. Paul have been entitled to assume over that larger portion of the Church which he had begotten through the Gospel. Larger I say upon his own authority, when he writes "I laboured more abundantly than they all." To these, his own converts, he declares "though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers." But *one* father; and that not Peter, but himself: "for in Christ Jesus *I* have begotten you through the Gospel." It is not very safe to pronounce upon the designs of Providence, yet one cannot but acknowledge the reasonableness of the presumption that among the purposes for the attainment of which St. Paul was ordained to stand in such a peculiar relation towards the Gentile portion of the Church may have been that of obtaining from St. Peter himself an admission that he held no supremacy over the entire body of the Church, either as an apostle, or in that other capacity of ordinary

pastor which has been imagined to belong exclusively to him. This acknowledgment he plainly made when he gave the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul, recognising him as the apostle of the Gentiles in a manner as full and ample as that in which he was himself the apostle of the circumcision. And the superiority which is hereby acknowledged to belong to St. Paul, includes a power of ordinary jurisdiction. It is a superiority of the nature of that which was to endure perpetually in the Church. It carries with it a right to preside over and direct the internal affairs of all the Churches; for the settlement of controversies of faith, the correction of offences against order and discipline, the regulation of ceremonies and forms of worship, the ordination of bishops, and the conveyance to them of their peculiar jurisdiction within their appointed limits. In short we recognise here a power to feed and govern the Gentile portion of the Church corresponding with that which our Saviour directed St. Peter to exercise over the believing Jews.

The Scripture, with a view to one particular object, allots to St. Peter, for a season, a position among the apostles which gives him a personal pre-eminence. Yet even that is not attributed to him in his relation to St. Paul, who affirms of himself that he was "not a whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles." On the authority of Scripture then we know that a distinct and concurrent rule was instituted, committing different portions of the Church, at one and the same instant, and upon a footing of perfect equality, to two separate men; neither of whom was entitled to interfere with the other's province. This establishment of equality expressly excludes supremacy. Neither can such an arrangement be reconciled with the Romish theory which vests all power in one; of any resemblance to whose authority no other can partake; and whose duty and commission is to interfere with the proceedings of every other Bishop in the world.* There is an obser-

* Wiseman's Lectures—as before cited.

vable difference between the exercise by St. Peter of those powers which he received for the establishment of the Church, and such as he might afterwards seek to exercise for its direction and control. As an instance of the first, he says himself, "men and brethren, ye know how God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word and believe." As an example of the second, when he would assume authority to separate from communion with the Gentiles except upon condition that they should live as did the Jews, he was resisted by St. Paul. In the former case his commission is temporary. When once executed it expires of itself. He cannot himself repeat it. He cannot have any successor. It is plain from this circumstance that neither is his authority over the Church supreme, nor his judgment in matters of faith infallible.

The argument which I have endeavoured from Scripture principally to maintain has been, that if the powers at present claimed by the Roman Pontiff be no more than the magnified image of powers originally attached to the person of St. Peter, we ought to be able, by reversing the perspective, to trace in St. Peter the same powers existing upon a contracted scale. But it has been shewn, and the more minutely the New Testament is examined the more evident it will appear, that those powers were not in St. Peter. Much less therefore can they be legitimately in his nominal successors.

It is truly difficult to make head against the force of inveterate prepossession, or to induce enquirers to look at any subject in a fresh light: or under an aspect different from that in which, through deference to their instructors, they have been accustomed to view it. In this way it has come to pass that a kind of popular impression has been created that the passages from Scripture which we have been considering contain proof that the power which the Popes now claim, and have for centuries claimed, does in some manner correspond with that which by our Lord's appointment was exercised by

St. Peter. Persons believe this because they have heard it, and have been long accustomed to think so. This is the parent fallacy. St. Peter had, as we most fully admit, a pre-eminence among the apostles; but it has been shewn that this was in every sense personal, and such as from its nature even to exclude the possibility of its being inherited by any other. What greater fallacy can there be then than to assume that the supremacy claimed and exercised by the later Popes must be acknowledged to have descended to them by inheritance from St. Peter? Neither is this sophistical mode of reasoning confined to this portion of the controversy; its influence is discoverable in all parts of the system, leading to those other mistaken conceptions which have been adopted by that erring Church as Catholic doctrines. Because, for example, the Blessed Virgin is to be regarded and remembered (as by us she is) with a holy veneration and gratitude, *therefore*, it is assumed she is to be deified, and adored with a worship which can hardly by any ingenuity be distinguished from divine. Because it is certain that the body and blood of Christ our Saviour are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper (as we religiously believe and confess) therefore it is concluded that this can be no other than a carnal and corporeal participation, in which the wicked also can unite. Because it is acknowledged that they alone can be saved whom the Lord adds daily to the Church, therefore it is assumed that there is no salvation except in the Roman communion; which arrogates exclusively to itself the title and character of the Catholic Church. Thus it is in every case. Premises are laid down which in themselves are true; and then by a dexterous shifting of the meaning of the terms, a conclusion is brought out which has no connexion (beyond an apparent one) with the original assumption. Yet to the unpractised and unobservant mind, it may appear to follow naturally from it. Of this there are many instances; but one more flagrant cannot be named than that which assumes the

Bishop of Rome to have had committed to him, as the successor of St. Peter, a supremacy of such a nature as I trust it has been shewn St. Peter neither claimed nor exercised. Hence, or from such an indolent habit of taking opinions upon trust, arises a disposition to look with less jealousy upon the pretension to supremacy; and the adverse cause is proportionably assisted and promoted. And experience shows that when the current has long been running in one direction, and when most persons have been habituated to float along with it, there is very great difficulty attending the endeavour to bring it back into the proper channel. The strong and binding hold which the belief of the papal supremacy takes upon the minds of Roman Catholics arises from their never having been allowed to "prove all things," nor even to entertain a doubt whether or no the Scripture does prove that supremacy according to their sense of the term to have been so certainly attached to the person of St. Peter as they, from their earliest years, have been trained to believe. This too is the secret of the favour with which they welcome the revival of the theory that what they now behold in the administration of their chief Pontiff, is but the image magnified of an authority which, though at first manifested upon a slender scale, has always been essentially the same as it continues to the present day. Yet whosoever will look attentively into the circumstances, must find that the exertions of St. Peter, until after the calling of the Gentiles by the baptism of Cornelius, had a reference, more or less direct, but always natural and certain, to the act of laying a foundation; and doing that which was required to render it stable and permanent, strong in his own purposes, he was to be the instrument for strengthening others: and thus to afford proof of the truth and certainty of the promise that the Church built upon him should be built upon a rock. This, let it never be forgotten, was his peculiar distinction; not to govern the Church, but to provide that there should be a Church to be governed.

I have herein addressed myself more particularly to my brethren of the clergy, and especially to those who have been this day admitted to the holy orders of Priest and Deacon. But in discoursing on their duties, I have been compelled by circumstances to confine my observations to one particular portion of those duties. It is however that portion to which the earnest attention of us all is required by the strongest of all motives—the principle of self-defence, and the desire to maintain the cause of God and truth. And it occasions me less regret that my attention should have been confined to this one subject, inasmuch as I feel confident that you, my brethren, are not deficient either in acquaintance with those duties of which I have omitted to speak, or in a disposition to discharge them faithfully through the grace and help of God. One observation only let me add, with reference to the openly avowed design of the Church of Rome to recover that supremacy from which she was cast down by our Reformation, that the Romish system can never be defeated or superseded except by a system older than itself. Catholic truth is of an earlier date than heresy or error, seeing that it has "always" been. It is therefore in vain to seek it in the papal system, the very origin of which may be discovered centuries after the age of the apostles. Thankful let us be, for thankful indeed we ought to be to God, that we have in the Church of England a faithful model and an unimpeachable witness of that primitive Church which was built indeed upon St. Peter. But be reminded that what we need is not a fondness for controversies nor skill in the conduct of them. It is not so much required that we work in ourselves by argument a conviction of the identity of our Church system with that which existed in the beginning, as that God should implant in us by his spirit a love of the truth, and a disposition to promote the truth as it is in Jesus, for the love of men's souls committed to our trust. May God work in us a disposition to adorn the doctrine which is in itself so perfect, by a stricter, humbler, more earnest,

more devout, more scrupulous conformity of our lives to the spirit of that model from which the Church whose ministers we are, has been derived. It is not in a presumptuous feeling of sufficiency, arising from our communion with a Church so pure in doctrine, and so apostolical in constitution, that we are to repose, as if we had already attained, or were already perfect. "The elders which are among you I exhort which also am an elder. Feed the flock of God which is among you," remembering that our sufficiency, whatever portion may be allotted to us, is from God. Every Church is builded upon Peter in proportion as it has embraced and continues to hold the belief which he avowed in Christ, the Son of the living God. Wheresoever that doctrine is taught in purity and fulness, there, it ought to be acknowledged, is the chair of Peter, from which it may in a just sense be said he still teaches all. The Church sets him before us as our example in fulfilling the work of that ministry which he was the first to exercise. And very earnestly and constantly should we unite in the appointed prayer wherein the goodness of God is implored to bestow upon us a portion of his pastoral faithfulness; and upon you, my brethren of the laity, the disposition to receive meekly and with pure affection the word of him who is the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

LET US PRAY.

O Almighty God, who by thy Son Jesus Christ didst give to thy Apostle Saint Peter many excellent gifts, and commandedst him earnestly to feed thy flock; make, we beseech thee, all Bishops and Pastors diligently to preach thy holy word, and the people obediently to follow the same; that they may receive the crown of everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

APPENDIX.

In the preceding Sermons it has been assumed that by "my lambs" (John, xxi. 15) our Lord intended to describe the first disciples and preachers of the Gospel: whom he had before so designated (Luke, x. 3), and by "my sheep" (John, xxi. 16, 17) the converts from the Jews and Gentiles, to whom he had applied this name (Matthew, x. 6; xv. 24; John, x. 16.) It does not occur to me that there can be any mode of interpretation more fair or more secure than that which makes our Lord himself the expositor of his own intentions. In the original, St. John employs two words (*βόσκω* and *ποιμαίνω*) which are generally regarded as alike answerable to our single expression "feed:" and it is upon the existence of a difference in force and comprehensiveness supposed to subsist between these words, that I rest my opinion of our Saviour's having intended to convey to St. Peter a different degree of authority over the several classes to whom those words are respectively applied. Schleusner (Lex. N. T.) refers to the New Miscell. of Leipsic, and to Wetstein N. T. for information as to the difference here spoken of. Neither of those works is within reach. But we possess the Scriptures; in which I have carefully examined every passage, (so far as I am aware) which can throw light upon the question. In the 34th chapter of Ezekiel, vv. 10 and 23, the 70 interchange the two words (as representing the sense of a single Hebrew term) in a way which might prove that they are perfectly synonymous, if that passage alone were to be taken into consideration. But there is a great frequency and preponderance of instances of an opposite tendency, favouring the conclusion that *ποιμαίνω* always includes (when figuratively used) the sense of directing and ordering as well as of instructing; while *βόσκω* seldom if ever implied more than the latter. I must be understood as alluding only to the figurative employment of the words: because in their literal sense I see no reason to suppose they differ I refer to the following passages. Mich. v. 2, 4. where *ποιμανεῖ*, it will be observed, is associated with the office of a "ruler," and with "strength" and "majesty." 1 Chron. xvii 6: here it is expressive of the office of the "judges" who were *rulers* in Israel. Psal lxxviii. 71, 72, where it denotes the regal government of David: and also 2 Sam. 1, 2, his appointment as Captain over Israel: and the same 1 Chron. xi. 2. Again, in the prophetical description of Christ, Isa. xl. 11, the same word implies not merely the ministration of wholesome doctrine,

but the control and direction exercised over the flock: as in Psal. lxxx. 1, "hear O thou Shepherd of Israel: that *leadest* Joseph like a flock," and Mic. vii. 14, "feed thy people with thy rod;" or preside over them and conduct them by that emblem of authority. Thus when our Lord himself had taught the people and healed their bodily infirmities, he was moved with compassion that they had "no shepherd" (Matth. ix. 35, 36) or spiritual guide to order and direct continually those who had been so instructed by him. And it may be observed that this explanation is further supported by the passage in which the expression "as sheep having no shepherd" was first employed. It is Num. xxvii. 17, and the description therein contained of the duties of such director and guide, is in these terms: "that he may go out before them and go in before them; and may lead them out and bring them in:" or may control and direct them in all their proceedings. And this comports accurately with the nature of Peter's supremacy over the Jews, as the Apostle of the Circumcision; but not at all with the relation in which he stood (as exhibited in the New Testament) towards either the Apostles or the Gentiles. His brethren in the ministry he instructs and strengthens, upon a footing of perfect equality; and the Gentiles he renders up to St. Paul as their proper superior. In the version of the 70, with the exception only of the chapter of Ezekiel which I have referred to, there are few if any instances of such a use of the term *βόσκω*. In the New Testament there is no opportunity of comparing it with *ποιμάινω*, there being no instance of its use in a figurative sense except in this single passage of St. John. But the word *ποιμαίνω* is of frequent occurrence, and *always* in the sense of exercising authority. Matth. ii. 6; Acts, xx. 28; 1 Cor. ix. 7; 1 Pet. v. 2; Rev. ii. 7; vii. 17; xii. 5; xix. 15. The only other passage is Jude 12, which in our version is "feeding themselves." But as the context speaks of these persons as "murmurers, complainers, walking after their own inclinations" (v. 16), I rather think the expression relates to such heady high-minded persons as scorn the duty of "submitting themselves to their governors and teachers, spiritual pastors and masters" and are therefore described as following no guidance but their own; or, as it may be translated, "*directing* themselves without fear."

My argument therefore is, that the injunctions of Christ apply to three separate classes in the Church; and that over *one* of these he gives St. Peter an authority differing both in extent and character from that which is assigned to him over the other two; and that this distinction (the reality of which is proved by the subsequent history) is incompatible with the establishment of a supremacy extending over every portion of the Church alike.

As to the promise of the keys, I have no scruple in admitting that it is a promise limited to St. Peter: "I will give *thee* the keys." It is a plain simple personal engagement which was never afterwards extended to any other. Not so the succeeding promise, "whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, &c." In the first instance indeed, that promise also is peculiarly addressed to St. Peter: but subsequently the same power to bind and loose, to retain sins or to remit, is extended to the twelve, and confirmed

to them in perpetuity even to the end of the world. (Matt. xviii. 17; John xx. 23.) Herein is a visible difference, which of itself is sufficient to show that these were separate engagements. And in the language itself what is there to encourage the belief that they are one? The Scripture teaches us the proper distinction. "I saw an Angel come down from heaven, having the *key* of the bottomless pit, and a great *chain* in his hand: and he laid hold of that old serpent which is the devil, and *bound* him, and cast him into the bottomless pit and *shut* him up." (Rev. xx. 1, 2.) The key and the chain are both significant of a deputed authority, but for different purposes. The Angel does not bind by means of the key, nor shut up with the chain. Each serves its proper office, and those offices are independent of each other. The devil might be bound, yet not imprisoned: or shut up without being bound. There is no incompatibility in distinguishing between the gift of the keys, and of authority to bind and loose.

The dominion of our Lord over his kingdom may be represented by the key of David which he bears (Rev. iii. 7). It is the emblem of all power given to him in heaven and in earth. When therefore the same emblem is transferred to any created being, (whether man or angel) it cannot but be accompanied by limitations and abatements. What the nature and extent of these are, must be collected from subsequent events, which may be said to speak for themselves. Let the transactions of Peter's life and ministry be impartially investigated, and I am confident that no one, forming his judgment from them, can say that he conducted himself as he naturally would have done if he had felt that the words "I will give thee the keys" were meant to invest him with supreme authority. In what instance does he claim such authority; or the power of discipline over all persons within the Church? Neither can it be shown when or where the Apostles gave any sign of their regarding him as the holder of an office *more* than apostolical; which placed them under his control as much as sheep are under the shepherd, and instead of brethren, made them his subjects. This however is the vital principle of popery. But how is it made out by a reference to this example? One of the main properties of Christ's regal power is to give admission to whom he will into that kingdom of heaven which by his death he has opened to all believers. Thus he himself describes the office of the key of David, in the instance of the Church of Philadelphia; saying, "Behold I have set before thee *an open door*, and no man can *shut* it." (Rev. iii. 8.) In his hand is also the sceptre of righteousness; the emblem of a continuing authority to govern whom he admits. But is it necessarily so when the key alone is committed to the hand of a created being? Was it thus in the case of St. Peter, to whom indeed it was given to set such an open door before the Gentiles, that so an entrance might be ministered unto them abundantly into the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? But the parallel is not extended by the assignment to him of a supremacy over those whom he admits. On the contrary the Apostleship of the Gentiles was conferred upon

another; the natural interpretation of which is that Peter could not claim, as the holder of the keys, a supremacy over the whole Church such as he did not possess over every part of it.

There is in Scripture an instance which strongly confirms this interpretation, as it shews that the keys may be held abstractedly from all possession or increase of spiritual superiority. It is that of Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, who in the reign of Hezekiah was appointed to be over the household, or keeper of the temple. (Isa. xxii. 15–22.) The badge of this office was "the key of the house of David," which, saith the Lord, "I will lay upon his shoulder:" and, as if for the purpose of contrast with the neglect on account of which his predecessor had been degraded and dismissed, it is said with emphasis of Eliakim, "he shall open and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open." There might be a sufficient occasion for this urgency. But a few years before, King Ahaz had "shut up the doors of the house of the Lord," excluding all who came to worship. At the very outset of his reign Hezekiah re-opened the doors after they had been kept closed during fifteen years, (2 Chron. xxviii. 24; xxix. 3,) and he required a firm and faithful officer to whose hands he might commit the keys; or that portion of his own regal charge which consisted in ensuring an open door for the admission into the house of God of as many as were entitled to come in. If it be said he was the type of Peter, and of the office held by him him in the Christian Church, I have no objection to offer; provided that the admission be accompanied with proper explanations. The "government" of Eliakim, or his "station," as it is termed in a previous verse, was limited, not universal; ministerial rather than discretionary. It had reference to one duty only, so far as we are informed; and the manner of exercising that duty was very strictly pointed out. He was to open to the people of God, who then were the Jews only. To them our Lord was sent, and to them the door of admission into his Church was sufficiently opened by his explicit personal invitation to them to come in. The office of Eliakim was to shut the door against the Gentiles; insomuch that he is the contrast, rather, of Peter, as the second Adam was of the first; their offices being directly opposite in effect. But of whomsoever Eliakim may have been the figure, his employment, although exercised with a view to spiritual objects, gave him no spiritual character. The possession of the key of David entitled him to no authority to forgive sins, or to sanctify even to the purifying of the flesh. It was not his province to convoke the solemn assemblies; or to decide upon matters of faith, or points of religious obligation and ceremony; or to exercise any spiritual superiority or jurisdiction. These duties were by God's ordinance committed to other hands: to the high priest and other members of the levitical order. Eliakim held an office connected with the regal not the priestly function of Christ. He was ordained expressly to carry into effect the ordinance of the king; who had now by his edict opened the door that had been shut. In this, I think, he may have been the emblem of Christ; who, as the representative of the King Immortal and Invisible,

holds the key of the Church. So also Peter held the keys for a corresponding purpose; but any charge which he had to *feed* and *govern* within the Church, was derived not from the keys, which were committed to him alone, but from that commission to remit and retain sins which he as an Apostle held upon terms of equality with the rest.

The eminence of his personal office consists in this, that it brings him near to being a partner and fellow-labourer with his Lord in his employment of gathering a Church out of all nations. His work in the admission of the Gentiles seems meant to be the complement of Christ's call to the Jewish people. And this condescension of the Son of Man in associating a human creature in his own labour of love, is strikingly set forth by an incident which does not more clearly signify the pre-eminence of the employment to which Peter was called than it betokens its absolute limitation to him by the exclusion of all other men: I mean the payment of the tribute money at Capernaum (Matthew, xvii. 27)—"That take and give unto them *for me and thee.*" One payment shall suffice to make satisfaction for the "children" whom I have introduced, and for those "strangers" whom thou on my behalf art to admit into the kingdom of God.

It will have been seen that I do not question many of the premises insisted on by the advocates of Romanism, because no mode of reasoning can less recommend itself to my regard than that of disputing visible truths through apprehension of the consequences which may arise from their admission. But those advocates require to be narrowly watched at every stage. Never has the world beheld their equals in the art of deriving false conclusions from acknowledged facts. The image perpetually before their view is that of an universal supremacy, a right permanently conferred upon St. Peter to feed, direct, and govern the whole Church. Nothing short of a continuance of the same right to their chief prelate, as the successor of St. Peter, Vicar of Christ, and centre of Catholic unity, can satisfy their exorbitant pretensions.

Yet the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians, contain in them sufficient for the overthrow of such pretensions; nor can I regard it as other than an appointment of Divine providence that the distinction to which St. Peter was really elevated, that of presiding, as chief pastor, over the Jewish section of the Church in every place, should have been made to furnish a refutation of the claim which others have set up on his behalf, to a universal and perpetual supremacy over the Church in the aggregate, and over every part of it alike. It does appear to me beyond expression remarkable that out of the ministry of the circumcision, which unquestionably was committed to him, a controversy should have arisen which in its progress drew from him a renunciation of all those prerogatives in which, if it have any reality, the Papal supremacy must consist. In the Church at Antioch a question was raised whether it was necessary, as the Jewish zealots maintained, that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised after the manner of Moses. When Paul went to Jerusalem, upon a

reference of this dispute to the Apostles, he took this opportunity of communicating to the chief Apostles the principles upon which he had acted in refusing to permit Titus to be circumcised; but obtained from them no more complete satisfaction. On the contrary, James, Peter, and John acknowledged him as the appointed spiritual director of the Gentile converts; having as perfect a right of jurisdiction among them as St. Peter had over those of the circumcision (Galat. ii. 9). I am sure no one can candidly examine the statement contained in this chapter without coming to the conclusion that if St. Peter had ever exercised a presidency over the affairs of the entire Church, it arose from the single circumstance that all the converts were in the first instance of Jewish origin. But as soon as the numbers of Gentile Christians had so increased that their voice began to be heard, and their influence to be felt, his title to any such superiority over them was not acknowledged by St. Paul, and was abandoned by Peter himself. "When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." I am entitled to say, then, that the primacy entrusted to Peter was limited and temporary, and we are able to point to the precise moment at which it terminated even by his own acknowledgment. This giving of the right hand of fellowship to a brother Apostle, who should exercise over one portion of the Church the *same* jurisdiction as he over the remainder, is fatal to the very conception of a supremacy belonging to either.

Again when this preliminary had been determined, namely, that there was no distinction either in kind or degree between the powers of order which the two great Apostles were to exercise, each over his respective portion of the Church, the assembly was convened to consider the necessity of Gentile circumcision. Peter rises up, after there had been much disputing, and declares his persuasion that the yoke of the Jewish rites should not be laid upon the Gentiles. Then Paul and Barnabas declare what miracles God had wrought among the Gentiles by them. Afterwards follows James, saying "my sentence is," or "I determine." Now it is common enough to hear, "Rome hath spoken;" but there would be something unusual in another rising up *after* Rome had spoken, not adopting Rome's opinion as conclusive, but passing his own judgment upon it; and with an air of authority setting the seal of his approval to the determination which the head of the Church had already pronounced. This, then, is beyond contradiction, that St. Peter did not on this occasion lay claim to superiority. He spoke as a witness, and voted as an ordinary member; and the denial of five hundred Popes could not shake the conclusion that it was St. James who put the question to the assembly, collected its suffrages, and declared its determination; in other words, that he was the president of this Council.* It is

* He was the Bishop of the Church in Jerusalem, therefore he speaks last." Chrys. Hom. in Act. Apost. Serm. 33. "What means this, '*my sentence is*'? It is equivalent to *I say with authority that so it is.*" Id. Ed. Sav. t. iv. p. 795—797.

incumbent surely on the affirmers of the Papal supremacy to explain how these things could be, if it were the intention of Christ, when he said, "upon this rock I will build my Church," to confer upon Peter a supremacy which should entitle him to feed, guide, and govern the whole body of the Church; and by right to convoke and preside in all General Councils for the determination of points of faith. These acts of superiority, it is undeniable, he did not exercise; and we are entitled therefore to say he did not arrogate to himself the possession of any such authority. A convincing proof, it appears to me, that the interpretation which the Roman controversialists have put upon the expressions of Christ was unknown to the Apostles; or, if it were known, was not admitted by them to convey the *true* signification of those expressions.

This conclusion follows from the recorded acts of St. Peter himself: and a similar process of reasoning leads to the overthrow of another attribute which is fondly claimed for his so-called successors; and is indeed an indispensable qualification for the exercise of that universal supremacy which they would fain be supposed to derive from this first of the apostles: I mean the power of pronouncing infallibly upon matters of faith; or of unerringly declaring the sense of the decrees of Councils. With such a qualification it may be plainly shewn St. Peter was not invested. The superscription of the apostolic decree is highly expressive of the divided state of the Christian body at Antioch. It is addressed "to those brethren at Antioch who are of the Gentiles" (*τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν*). It was quite natural that these, when they read a decree so completely establishing their exemption from Judaical observances, should rejoice for the consolation. Paul also and Barnabas remained with them preaching the word of the Lord. Shortly afterwards arrived Peter, who had a strong natural connexion with this Church; the original members of which had been "Jews only." (Acts xi. 19). At his first coming he lived after the manner of the Gentiles, and scrupled not to eat with them. (Galatians, ii. 12, 14.) Afterwards, fearing the hostility which this concession had provoked among those who were of the circumcision, he separated himself and withdrew from association with the Gentiles, except upon the condition of their consenting to live as do the Jews. In this he was followed by the other Jews: that is by the whole of that portion of the Church which consisted of converts from Judaism; not even excepting Barnabas. (Gal. ii. 11—13.) Thus was St. Paul left singly, with his band of Gentile followers, to face this display of party feeling. The question then to be asked is, whether the interpretation which St. Peter put, or connived at others putting, upon the decree of the Apostles, gave the true and genuine sense of it? According to the letter, that decree determined no more than that the Gentile converts should not be required to be circumcised after the manner of Moses. It does not proceed to say, although it implies, that they must be admitted to association by those who were of the circumcision. Of this the jewish party evasively took advantage, and without actually

contradicting the terms of the decree, rendered it almost as inoperative as if it had never been framed. This was the interpretation which St. Peter encouraged others to maintain, and himself acted upon. The question is whether he was then an unerring expounder of the word of the Holy Ghost, or an infallible guide and director upon a point of faith? St. Paul was resolute in his opposition: and declares that he withstood Peter to the face "because he was to be blamed:" he was reprehensible; deserving censure; because he sanctioned a virtually false interpretation of an apostolical ordinance; or at least, an interpretation which contradicted its spirit and intention: thereby misleading others, and occasioning a schism in the Church. It does not avail to say that his conduct was the effect of dissimulation, or a suppression of his own convictions under apprehension of the violence of others. If he could lead others astray from the truth, it matters little from what cause it may have arisen. To satisfy the Romish theory, which requires implicit submission to the authority of the Church declared by its visible head, it is necessary that there should be not only hypothetically an incapability of being deceived, but also an exemption practically from the possibility of teaching error.

This, therefore, makes good the assertion that the primacy of order, with which St. Peter was invested over the *Jewish* converts to Christianity, furnishes occasion for the disproof of the supremacy claimed for him over the whole Church. The dispute between the circumcision and the Gentiles in the Church at Antioch led immediately to the question whether the Apostle of the circumcision should have the guidance and control of all the brethren; and the position which St. Peter was led to take in consequence of his closer connexion with the circumcision, did give rise to admissions fatal to the idea of his universal supremacy. He abdicated every claim to it when he acknowledged the title of another Apostle to an ordinary jurisdiction over one great portion of the Church. His appearance in the Council at Jerusalem betokens that the assumption of a supremacy over all the rest was foreign to his thoughts, and that no such impression prevailed among the Apostles as to the relation in which he stood to them. His dissimulation at Antioch shews that he might and did err in faith and doctrine; for if he did not err on that occasion, then could it not be correctly maintained by St. Paul that "there is no difference between the Jew and Greek." (Rom. x. 12.) It is remarkable that there is no further mention of St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. We lose sight of him involved in the maintenance of an error of such a nature, that, if his views had prevailed, if he had not been withstood and corrected by St. Paul, the unity of the Church must have been destroyed, or the Church must have resolved itself into two divisions, each apostolical but neither of them Catholic. These are not questions of mere curiosity. Their importance can hardly be overrated as bearing upon the Romish controversy. The common argument on that side is, that the attainment of such a degree of authority as the Bishops of Rome have, during many centuries exercised in the Church, is of itself an unanswerable proof

of the correctness of their interpretation of our Lord's expressions to St. Peter. In reply to this I produce the testimony of the apostolic age, shewing that the supremacy contended for was neither admitted by St. Paul, nor recognised by the other chief Apostles, nor claimed by St. Peter himself. Could these things have been so, if the expressions of our Lord had really been meant to convey the sense in which the Roman Catholic Church expounds them?

Here then we lose sight of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. Whatever information we may henceforth obtain respecting him, must be derived from sources less authentic indeed, but still so far trustworthy that, by carefully examining and confronting them, the portion of truth which they do contain may be brought to light, and established for our guidance with a sufficient degree of certainty. It appears to me worth while to pursue this train of investigation for the sake of some important conclusions to which it leads. The first of them is, that St. Peter did, at a subsequent period, virtually acknowledge, by his altered mode of proceeding, the error into which he had fallen in countenancing the party divisions in the Church at Antioch. The establishment of a twofold co-ordinate apostleship of the circumcision and the uncircumcision led to the result that, wherever the converts in any Church were partly of Jewish and partly of Gentile origin, the chief pastorship over the former was undertaken by St. Peter, and over the latter by St. Paul, during their continuance in the same place. When they departed from any such Church, they constituted Pastors or Evangelists, (or by whatsoever name they might be distinguished) to act for the time as their respective substitutes.*

Theodoret indeed explains that the pastors and teachers were stationary, one in each city or town, (ἀφωρισμένους κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην) and were thus distinguished from the Evangelists whose ministry was itinerant. (Interpr. Ep. ad Ephes. cap. iv. 11). There are many evident instances of this branch of the apostolical economy in the writings of St. Paul, who appears in this manner to have administered the Churches of which the care came upon him. To the Philippians for example, he states his inability as yet to come to them, or so much as, at the present time, to send Timothy. (Philip. ii. 19, 23, 24.) Therefore he says, "I thought it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus my brother and companion in labour, and fellow soldier, but your messenger" or angel: their bishop and pastor.† The appointments of Timothy and Titus are too well known to require a reference:

* Whenever those two great Apostles came to the same city, the one constantly applied himself to the Jews, received disciples of such, formed them into a Church, left them, when he departed that region, to be governed by some bishop of his own assignation; and the other in like manner did the same to the Gentiles. (Hammond on Schism, chap. iv. Works vol. 1. p. 514.

† Tertullian *in Præsc.:* saith that St. Paul instituted an Episcopal See at Philippi. Chrysost., Hieron., Theodor., and others, name Epaphroditus to be the first bishop: and the epithets here given him by the Apostle do seem to confirm this. Bishop Fell, *Paraphr. on the Epistle to the Philippians.*

and when St. Paul sent for the former of these to attend him at Rome, bringing Mark also with him, he continues by saying "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus:" as if to convey assurance that the Church there should not be left without a suitable pastor for its superintendence during the temporary absence of its ordinary chief ministers.

A plain analogy would lead to the conclusion that a similar provision would be made at Antioch, during the absence of the Apostles, even if there were no historical evidence to confirm it. But there is such evidence, as will be shewn: and its force and credibility is very much strengthened by its accordance with the state of things which, reasoning *a priori*, we should expect to find prevailing. We know that Peter and his followers *separated* themselves, refusing to eat with the other portion of the Church. And as they would not eat, so neither could they worship in common. St. Peter's first assurance of the lawfulness of holding religious communion with men uncircumcised was grounded on the vision which shewed him that he might eat their food. When he afterwards declined to partake of it, he would naturally hold himself aloof from the religious association also. Could it be otherwise? When they would not eat in company with gentiles, how were they of the circumcision to unite with them in their religious assemblies, where the principal ordinance, and at that time of daily celebration, was breaking of bread; the feast of love upon a common meal? The consequence *must* be that while "one said I am of Paul, and another I of Cephas," Christ's body was in effect divided. The Apostles' doctrine was indeed maintained, but not the fellowship. The Apostles were themselves divided, each confining his care to his own body of adherents. It is evident therefore that when they quitted the city, no *one* substitute could be capable of regulating the entire concerns of a Church separated into two distinct and at that time irreconcilable classes. Not only, therefore, does all antecedent probability support the conclusion arrived at by Baronius, that Euodius and Ignatius were *jointly* constituted to the charge of the Church at Antioch by Saints Peter and Paul respectively, but every particle of surviving evidence confirms it. The Apostolical Constitutions (vii. 46) expressly mention Euodius as ordained by Peter; and Ignatius by Paul. And the probability of this is strengthened by the evidence which Scripture supplies of the condition of the Church at Antioch rendering such a two-fold nomination, for a time at least, altogether unavoidable. On the other hand there is scarcely a point in ecclesiastical history established with more certainty than that Ignatius was constituted Bishop of Antioch in succession to the Apostles: and St. Chrysostom represents him as having been so ordained *by the Apostles*: "the hands of the blessed Apostles were laid upon that sacred head," (Panegyr. in Ign. M. tom. v. p. 499, 32. Ed. Savil:) or by both Peter and Paul. It is evident this joint ordination could not have been the primary arrangement: for the current of history runs with a uniformity not to be resisted in favour of the persuasion that Euodius was in the first instance appointed by St. Peter. Chrysostom states moreover the additional fact that it was when St. Peter himself was

finally quitting Antioch that he substituted Ignatius as his successor. It is impossible that this circumstance should be assigned to the time when Peter quitted Antioch after the dissension between him and St. Paul: (for, as has been observed, it is too plain to admit of doubt that his *original* appointment was that of Euodius:) and it will thence follow that St. Peter on some subsequent occasion must have visited Antioch again, and *then* have laid hands on Ignatius; concurring in the previous appointment of him by St. Paul. All circumstances conspire to support the accuracy of the statement given by John of Antioch, (surnamed Maléla). "As Peter was on his way to Rome, passing through Antioch the Great, it befel that Euodius the Bishop and Patriarch of that city died; whereupon Ignatius succeeded to the rank of the Bishoprick of Antioch the Great: St. Peter the Apostle having laid hands on him, and placed him in the episcopal chair." (Chron. Jo. Ant. l. x.) It cannot be maintained that implicit reliance is to be placed on writers of Maléla's class excepting when, as in the present instance, their statements are supported by internal probability; and have the effect of reconciling other accounts which, separately considered, appear to be irreconcilably at variance. This fragment of history does heal a vast variety of such discordances; and incidentally supplies a fact of no small importance in itself: that this establishment of Ignatius took place as St. Peter was on his way to Rome. It is indisputable that he was not in that city during the time of St. Paul's imprisonment: and had not arrived there when the latest of his Epistles, (2 Timothy). was written thence. It is also tolerably plain that jealousies and separations at that time pervaded the Roman Church, corresponding in character, so far as the description which we have of them enables us to judge, with those which St. Peter had countenanced at Antioch. In the latter city we are informed, "certain men," whom St. Paul calls "false brethren," taught the disciples, "troubling them with words subverting souls." At Rome similarly, "some preached Christ even of envy and strife; of contention, not sincerely." I cannot but conjecture that it was one and the same class of men who in both cities pursued this course; tending alike, it is evident, in both cases to provoke a separation within the Church. And this explanation is so much the more credible as the disturbers at Rome were avowedly incited by the hope of aggravating the affliction of St. Paul; knowing from his previous conduct in withstanding St. Peter, how opposite such a course of proceeding would be to his sentiments. But without relying greatly upon this conjecture, however probable, we may remark that there are not wanting express evidences of the original prevalence of a two-fold episcopate in Rome itself, no less than in Antioch; and the most remarkable circumstance is that, in both instances, this ecclesiastical anomaly should have been corrected by the same hands. I think it worth while on this account to pursue the subject somewhat more extensively; because it has a direct bearing upon the assertion which has been made, that St. Peter himself by his ultimate course of proceeding, set the seal of condemnation upon that which had been his original practice: thus surrendering by anticipation that

assumption of infallibility which, to serve the purpose of worldly men, was invented ages afterwards and attributed to him. In the first place, no account so probable can be given of the cause of that obscurity which hangs over the order of succession among the first possessors of the Roman See, as that some of those who afterwards held it undividedly, had been originally nominated as pastors, or substitute bishops, to superintend separate portions of the flock during the absence of the Apostles. Both the dates and the order of the succession may have been misrepresented by writers who were not sufficiently careful to distinguish the prior employments of Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, acting simultaneously in the same Church, from their proper appointment, as bishops, to the exclusive charge of it after the Apostles were no more. If this explanation be not adopted, I know not what account can be given satisfactorily of the dissonance as to the era of their several successions, which is discoverable in writers the most worthy of credit. Epiphanius expressly affirms such a divided rule to have prevailed in the Church of Rome in the instance both of the Apostles and of their immediate successors. "The appointment of bishops during the life-time of the apostles, may be accounted for," he says, "by the necessity that the Church should not be left without superintendence during the progresses of the apostles to preach in other cities and countries." "But any way," he adds, "the order of succession of the Bishops of Rome is as follows; Peter and Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clemens." (*Adv. Hær.* tom. 1. p. 107. Ed. Petav. 1682.) He implies that Linus and Cletus had at one period at least, the joint administration of the affairs of the Church in the life time and during the absence of Peter and Paul, whom he describes as being "both bishops and apostles." He does not speak of the separate appointment of Linus to the bishoprick: but we learn its occurrence from the well known statement of Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* iii. 3,) adopted by Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* lib. iii. v. 276,) and not disputed by Eusebius (E. H. lib. iii. c. 2, and c. 4). It is not to be denied that after every possible enquiry there is much remaining uncertainty connected with these questions. But it may be considered as an authentick portion of history, that "when Peter and Paul were establishing and ordering the Church at Rome, shortly before their decease, they committed to Linus the ministry of the episcopate."

In proceeding, as we shall now do, to enquire whether any traces are discoverable in the writers of the first three centuries, of an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome by the Church at large, I should desire to direct attention to this consolidation of the episcopate in charge of an individual ruler of each see. We find traces first at Antioch of its superseding the previous system in the appointment of Ignatius: and afterwards an instance more conspicuous still at Rome. These examples were gradually extended to all Churches of the East and West. I wish attention to be given to this; because in process of time it was frequently taken for granted that writers were speaking of *one universal bishop* presiding over the *entire* Church, when their intention in reality was only to describe the establish-

ment of *one* bishop *in his own See*. At any rate I am sure that this misrepresentation has been, and continues to be, habitually practised in the instance of one very distinguished writer, St. Cyprian. Placed as he was in the heart of the western portion of the empire, he would be less likely to appeal to the examples of Crete, or Ephesus, or Antioch, or Jerusalem. To him and to those whom he was appointed to feed and govern, the Church of Rome was the most important object within the range of their observation; and with the history of its establishment by two chief apostles both he and they were necessarily most familiar. According to the view of Cyprian the unity of the Church consists in the universal acknowledgment of the faith professed by Peter in the coasts of Cesarea Philippi; and in the repetition every where of the setting up of the chair of St. Peter; that is of the government of each distinct diocese *by one bishop*, after the example of the system established by St. Peter and St. Paul conjointly at Rome. So far as his experience went, he might truly describe this as the first instance of the kind; as the root and origin of episcopal unity. In the same manner Irenæus speaks of the Church of Rome as "the most ancient:" not meaning absolutely so, as the Roman Catholic annotator justly observes, but comparatively with the other Latin and Western Churches. But the views of Cyprian in making appeal to the chair of St. Peter, will not be correctly understood unless we bear in mind the peculiarity of his own position which drew from him those appeals. He was harrassed by the pretended consecration of a second bishop (Fortunatus) within the limits of his own See: and his object is to shew that this was in violation of the appointed order of the Catholic Church.

He desires no accession of authority from Cornelius, nor any exercise of vigor by him for the correction of Fortunatus and his fellows. He, with the Bishops of his own province, had already asserted what the discipline of the Church required, by their excommunication and deposition. He knew, he says, that Cornelius was well acquainted with the previous character of these men, and he had therefore been in no haste to write to him concerning them. Indeed he states he might hardly have considered it necessary to send any account of their proceedings, so little does he think it consistent with the majesty and dignity of the Catholic Church to concern itself with the audacious devices of heretics and schismatics. His chief purpose was to warn Cornelius against being induced, by the threats and violence of these men, to shew them more countenance and encouragement than was proper. The tone of Cyprian in the opening of his letter is not that of a subordinate appealing to his superior for protection, but it is that of an equal forcibly admonishing his brother as to the firmness with which the duties of a bishop should be discharged by all who held the office. It should be borne in remembrance also, that in making an appeal to Cornelius in a season of difficulty, he was but copying a precedent furnished by Cornelius himself. On the occurrence of a similar outrage in his own diocese, in the setting up of a pseudo-bishop in opposition to him, the Bishop of Rome had communicated the information of it, and had expressed his feelings upon it, in a letter to

the Bishop of Carthage; and in another also to Fabian, Bishop of Antioch. (Cyprian, Opp. Epp. 47, 48, 49, 55. Euseb. E. H. lib. vi. c. 43. Routh Reliq. Sac. iii. p. 6–17.) If any one will carefully read and compare the tone of these epistles, he will be unable, I am sure, to point out in them any indications of a difference in rank or authority between the writers. If anything is to be inferred from the style of the correspondence it is only that the bishops were accustomed, on terms of perfect equality, to communicate with each other upon questions relating to their several Churches, and especially that each might warn his brethren not to admit into communion any who had been separated from it by the sentence of their own Church and Bishop. It would have been little or not at all to the purpose of Cyprian to have appealed to the chair of St. Peter, as if he attributed paramount *authority* to all who in succession sat therein. It was more in keeping with circumstances that he should point to it as supplying clear *evidence* of the form of ecclesiastical government set up and sanctioned by the Apostles. And this he does. His argument involves no question at all upon the degree of authority annexed to that chair. He goes entirely upon the admitted fact of St. Peter having, with the concurrence of St. Paul, determined that one bishop should govern that particular See: and this chair he regards as the type and model of that which should be set up in every diocese.

It was a precedent most applicable to the circumstances of Cyprian himself, for no other could be so conclusively pleaded in condemnation of the act of Fortunatus and his abettors. And thus he applies it: "Post ista," that is, after their many previous infractions of truth and order which he enumerates, "navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque ad eclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." They have the audacity to take ship even to the chair of Peter and the most important Church, whence episcopal unity took its rise. Wherein then consisted the hardihood of this shipment of themselves? In the determination which it expressed to appeal without the permission of their own primate to a *transmarine* authority, a practice even then disapproved by the African Church, and afterwards expressly prohibited by its canons.* And wherefore "even to the chair of Peter;" why is that so censurable? He means that the very aspect of that chair, awakening the remembrance of the terms on which it had been established, ought to reduce them to confusion. And in proportion as the Church to which they carried their cause was celebrated and conspicuous, in the same degree would their degradation be more notorious in the world, and more disgraceful to themselves. Condemnation they could not escape when they came literally to flaunt their own violation of the rule which forbad the appointment of more than one Bishop at the same time in any Church, in the face of *that* Church which had first set the example of conforming to that rule: or, "whence episcopal unity had taken its rise."

"There is one episcopate," he says, (*De Unitat. Eccls.*) "a portion of which"

* Ad transmarina qui putaverint appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem recipiantur. Concil Milev. cap 22.

(namely, his own See) "is held by each bishop *in solidum*:" that is, I conceive, as a thing which does not admit of being separated into parts, and must therefore be held *undividedly*. He not only lays it down as an impossibility that a second bishop should be obtruded upon him, but he denies the right of appeal to Rome for the reversal of the sentence which had been passed by him against the intruder; and hereby disclaims and declares himself against the supremacy of that Church over his own. "What rational ground can there be," he asks, "for their going to announce that a pseudo-bishop has been instituted in opposition to bishops? Either they rest content with their deed, and will persevere in their crime; or if they repent and draw back, they know *whither* they should return. For whereas we all have decided, and it is both just and reasonable, that every man's cause ahould be heard in the place where the offence was committed, and every pastor has a portion of the flock allotted to him which he is to guide and govern, and to give account of his acts to God, they who are under our jurisdiction ought not to be running hither and thither, by their crafty impetuosity to break asunder the good understanding and harmony of bishops; but they were bound to try their cause *here*, where they could have the accusers present, and the evidences of their crime: unless indeed the authority of bishops established in Africa, who have already passed sentence upon them, be looked upon by these few desperate and despicable men, as an inferior one:" that is, unless they be so abandoned as to believe that there is a *superior* authority to ours, to which they may legitimately appeal to obtain a reversal of our sentence. It is plain that Cyprian means to *deny* that there is such an authority. He recognized no supremacy or infallibility either in the particular Church at Rome or in the particular "chair of Peter" which stood there. But what if he had believed, as Dr. Wiseman at present holds, "the pope to be the source of authority, as *all* subordinate rulers of the Church are subject to him;" that "the executive power is vested in his hands for *all* spiritual purposes within her," that "his office is to watch over the correction of abuses, and the maintenance of discipline *throughout the Church*." Surely if Cyprian had held such to be the character of the pontiff, divinely established, and universally acknowledged by the Church, he *could* not have expressed himself in such peremptory terms as he uses in the above extract in maintaining that the judgment of the bishops of his own province, presided over by himself, was the ultimate authority for the maintenance of discipline and the correction of abuses within his Church. Imagine him to have held, as Dr. Wiseman now believes, that there existed a general right of appeal from all parts of the Church to "the chair of Peter;" would he have so expressed himself concerning the act of Fortunatus? At the very utmost it was but a mistake, an irregularity, in having recourse to the privilege of appeal in an instance in which it could not legally be claimed; and a man of Cyprian's judgment, knowing that the general right of appeal to Rome was indisputable, would have been satisfied with shewing that in this particular instance it was not a legal course. Let him be supposed to have held as an

article of faith, that if the judgment of that Apostolic See were deliberately pronounced in a case of this sort, it must be as unerringly just as if it had proceeded from the lips of Christ himself, and what could he desire better for his own cause than that it should be carried before this tribunal? It is clear he was not afraid that Cornelius would judge amiss. What he objected to was that he should judge *at all* in this case, which had been already determined before the lawful superior. He felt that this would be an inroad upon the authority with which he was canonically invested; and would recognise in Cornelius that superiority which always belongs to the party to whom an appeal lies; which superiority, it is certain, Cyprian would not admit. Hear again his words in the Treatise on Unity. Speaking of heresy and schism as invented by the Devil for the subversion of the faith, he says:—"It arises from this, beloved brethren; it arises from their not returning to the source of truth; and not seeking the head; and not abiding by the teaching of the heavenly master." Why then so severe upon Fortunatus and his associates, if he held *Rome* to be the source, and head, and centre of all true doctrine? If anything be evident, it is that he could *not* hold Rome to be so; and yet in the very next paragraph he intimates that the source and head to which he alluded *was* that which our Lord instituted when he said to Peter "Upon this rock," &c., and "Feed my sheep." The supporters of the pseudo-bishop, he says, "did not consider that they to whom they were the bearers of letters from schismatics and heretics were Romans, whose faith had been commended by an Apostle; to whom perfidy cannot have access;" and this is supposed to express Cyprian's opinion, that to the end of time the particular Church of Rome could never err, nor give admittance to any false doctrine. A candid critic would acknowledge the meaning most agreeable to the context, and to the line of Cyprian's reasoning, to be this: that men who had been guilty of such faithlessness, or of such a breach of discipline and unity, could have no hope of gaining admittance to the Romans whom St. Paul had commended for their faith. He does them the justice to suppose that they *had* not swerved from that faith; but his words imply no such meaning as that it was impossible they ever *should*. The Roman clergy themselves had acquainted Cyprian that they regarded unity and discipline as essential to the maintenance of faith, if they were not even integral parts of that which the Apostle had commended in them. "He never would have uttered such praises concerning us, saying 'your faith is spoken of in all the world,' unless, even from that period, this strict discipline (vigor iste) had derived its root from those days of faith." (Cypr. Opp. Ep. xxxi.) They explain what this means by other words used descriptively: as *ratio disciplinæ*, *antiqua severitas*, *fides*, *disciplina*; and they most cogently declare their persuasion, that faith cannot survive where the vigorous application of this discipline against disturbers of unity shall be neglected. The Romans of that day who still held the *fides* for which they were commended by the Apostle, and which is so closely connected with the maintenance of unity and disci-

pline, *could* not give encouragement to *perfidia*, (which is always taken as the opposite to *fides*) nor hold any intercourse with its supporters. Indeed, as to Cyprian's intention being to express his belief that the Roman Church *could* not err, an occasion soon occurred which very clearly shewed that such was not his opinion: I mean in his controversy with Stephen. The nature of this controversy was such that it could not fail to raise the question, how far all Churches were bound, upon points of faith, to submit to the determination of Rome. Yet let the epistles of Firmilian to Cyprian, of Cyprian to Stephen, and Jubaianus, and Pompeius, and of Dionysius to Stephen and Xystus, be attentively read (Epp. 75, 72, 73, 74.—Euseb. E. His. lib. vii. c. 5), and it will be found that they maintain their own tenet in opposition to the Pope's decision, utterly unconscious (bishops though they were) that in so doing they were infringing any law of the Church. From this I infer it to be impossible that any law should then have been in force declarative of his supremacy over the Church; or excluding from its communion all who did not adopt every point of belief ratified by him with the unanimous assent of his Church and clergy. Stephen indeed was well enough disposed to exercise dominion; yet although he threatened excommunication, he ventured not to carry the menace into effect. He felt that the time had not yet arrived for claiming implicit submission to Rome; and that to anathematize all who refused to yield to it, was not the legitimate method of maintaining unity in the Church. That the Roman pontiff possessed metropolitan authority, and so was, as Tertullian truly describes him, "episcopus episcoporum," no one disputes. The delusion consists in representing the acts done by him in this capacity, and which the other metropolitans had an equal right to do within their own provinces, as affording evidence of his assuming, and being allowed to exercise, the functions of a universal bishop. The case of Marcian offers one example of this deceptive practice. Cyprian writes to Pope Stephen, representing the Bishop of Arles (which city was within the jurisdiction of Rome) as an avowed Novatianist; and reminding the metropolitan that the same accusation had been brought before him by Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, and his colleagues of that province. "Wherefore," he says, "it is your duty to send very explicit letters to our fellow-bishops in Gaul, directing that *they* should *no longer suffer* Marcian to insult our brotherhood; in that he does not yet appear to be excommunicated *by us*." (Cyprian, Ep. 67.) By omitting all reference to this passage, and by the help of a little false translation, an attempt is made to represent Stephen as desired by Cyprian to take *upon himself* to excommunicate and depose this offender; as if it were meant to admit that he, as Bishop of Rome, enjoyed the prerogative of exercising a universal jurisdiction within the diocese of any other bishop. "Let letters be directed to the province," (that is to the bishops and clergy of the province) "and to the people settled at Arles, *by which* Marcian may be excommunicated, and another be in his stead appointed to the office:" so the words are translated, as if both these acts of discipline (the deposition and the fresh appointment) were to be effected by the mere

virtue of the letters to be sent from Stephen. But how is this? Are we to suppose Cyprian guilty of so much inconsistency as first to suggest that Stephen should, by letters, admonish the Bishops of Gaul that *they* should not permit Marcian any longer to disgrace their order (which is to say in other words that it was *their* duty to put an end to the scandal by excommunicating and deposing him) and yet, by the very same letters, Stephen should *himself* remove the offender, and institute a successor? It is plain that *quibus* does not mean *by which* (letters), but *by whom;* that is the bishops, clergy, and people of the province. After *their* election of another bishop (for by canonical usage it rested with *them*) it was necessary that the appointment should be confirmed by the metropolitan, and by him announced to other bishops; and to this practice Cyprian is referring when he says—"Let us know distinctly who has been appointed at Arles instead of Marcian; that we may know to whom we are to introduce our brethren, and to whom we ought to address our letters."

The interference of Stephen is limited to that which falls properly within the province of every metropolitan bishop; and has nothing in common with the supremacy, which, out of all rule, has been assumed by his successors. According to the original ordinance of the Church, the apostolical Sees furnished the pattern according to which all others were framed and regulated; and among the apostolical Sees, Rome was the principal; not only on account of the dignity of its position, but, I admit, because it was, in the western parts, the only See founded with the approval and concurrence of Peter, to whom was committed the distinction of giving the *first pattern* of every thing which should be established in the Church. But it is as an example or pattern only, of what episcopal rule ought to be in other places, that Cyprian refers to the chair of the principal city. And in this he copies his master Tertullian, who after enumerating the apostolic Sees, as yet continuing where they were originally founded, says "si Italiæ adjaces habes Romam unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est;"—if you are near Italy you have Rome to refer to, whence an authority or sanction* for us, (that is, for our form of doctrine and church-order) is not far distant. It would be a proof of blindness not to see how Rome, through the prepossession of a neighbouring greatness, attained to such an ascendancy in the estimation of the western writers, (as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian,) that they were inclined, unconsciously perhaps, to forget the precept of "doing nothing by partiality." Rome was comparatively every thing to them; and they allowed the claims of the eastern Churches to be cast into the shade by her towering magnificence. Irenæus for example says, "all who are willing to see the truth may behold the tradition of the Apostles manifested *throughout the world*, in *every Church*, (toto mundo, in omni ecclesia). And yet to what extent does he range the world in search of truth; or to how many among all

* Vitruvius uses the phrase, "ædificiorum *auctoritates*," (l. iii. c. 2,) to describe houses built and arranged upon so perfect a plan, that they may serve as *models* or *patterns* for the construction of others.

the Churches does he direct attention? I scarcely think, or at least am not aware, that he mentions the Church of Antioch at all. This is observable, because it seems to prove that when this writer and others in the western regions were exalting the importance of Rome to an unrivalled degree, they were not speaking the sense of the Church at large, but rather were under the influence of a local impression that there was nothing, comparatively, worth attending to beyond the little world to which they were most accustomed: that is the urbican province of Rome. Tertullian, not yet a heretic, acknowledges this; saying "si Italiæ adjaces habes Romam." If indeed you happen to be near Italy, as the Churches of Africa were, then you can refer to Rome. But what of those who were not near Italy? Then he admits that any who would obtain satisfaction of their enquiries in the work of their salvation, were under no obligation to appeal to Rome: but might have recourse to other cities more conveniently situated, and have their faith equally well established by the authority of some other apostolic See. "Is Achaia nearest? thou hast Corinth. If thou be not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast Thessalonica. But if thou art in a condition to visit Asia, thou hast Ephesus." He suggests an appeal to Rome, not upon the ground of its superior, much less of its exclusive, authority; but upon that of local convenience. There is yet a more distant Church, that of Antioch, to which he does not so much as allude. This could not be occasioned by his esteeming it a Church of inferior importance, for it was the primary See of Peter: but he felt that they to whom he was writing, and who were capable of reading what he writ, had no acquaintance with it. Yet hear what is said of it by another eminent Father St. Chrysostom, "I have come back to my mother; this Church" of Antioch "the object of love and affection to all: our mother, and *the mother of all Churches*. For she is the mother not alone in consequence of being of more ancient date, but because she was founded by apostolic hands. Wherefore, although frequently demolished on account of the name of Christ, she has been raised up by the power of Christ. For not only did apostolical hands lay her foundation, but the edict of the Lord of the Apostles hath enclosed her within a wall of defence both new and extraordinary. For neither did he by any combination of wood and stone construct the enclosure, nor by compassing her around externally with a moat, nor by driving down stakes, nor by raising towers, did he render her impregnable. But he spake two naked words, and these sufficed her for wall and tower, and moat, and for every description of safeguard. And what are these words which possess such strength? 'Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'" (Chrysost. Sermo. in Inscr. in Act Apost. *in init.*) Will it be possible to find men bold enough to maintain that Chrysostom regarded the Church of Rome as "the mother and mistress of all Churches"; or as the only Church built upon St. Peter? or as alone included in the promise of the Lord that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" Hear again the sentiments of the same Father as to the peculiar connexion of the Apostle Peter with the Church of

Antioch, and say whether it can with fairness be maintained that Rome was in that age considered to possess the privilege of an exclusive title to his chair. "*Thou seest that even his receiving the name of Peter, had its rise, not from the working of miracles by him, but from his manifestation of a burning zeal. But having thus made mention of Peter, I am put in mind of another Peter,*" (namely the then Bishop of Antioch) "*the common father and teacher, who having inherited the former's excellency, has also succeeded* TO HIS CHAIR. For this is the one great privilege of our city, that it had for its first instructor the chief and leader of the Apostles; for it was suitable that, as it preceded the rest of the world in having the name of Christians attached to it, this city should have the first of the Apostles as its shepherd. But though we received him as our teacher we retained him not to the end, but yielded him up to Imperial Rome; *and yet rather we did keep him to the last. For the body of Peter we retain not, but the faith of Peter we do maintain as we are Peter's; and thus holding fast the faith of Peter we have Peter himself. Thus also looking upon one who emulates him, we have him within our view. For Christ called John Elias, not because Elias was the same with John, but because John came in the spirit and power of Elias. In the same manner, then, as John in consequence of his coming in that spirit and power was Elias, so this our bishop being with us in the confession and faith of Peter, may very properly claim to be called by the name of Peter.*" (Ibid, *prop. fin.*) What closer degree of affinity with the chief and leader of the Apostles could be claimed on behalf of the Church of Rome or its chief pastor? Here we perceive it stated, the Bishop of Antioch occupies the chair of Peter; his church by holding the faith of Peter possesses Peter; and its chief pastor, as he abides by the confession and faith of that Apostle, is entitled to be called by his name, or is his true successor. Is this then the mere private opinion of Chrysostom himself, or a doctrine newly imagined in his age? No; what Chrysostom recorded as his own belief, that "the chair of Peter" was at Antioch, and that Antioch was "the mother of all Churches," was believed and held by all previous bishops of that See, by Ignatius, by Theophilus, by Cornelius, by Babylas, by Fabius. Nay, and at the very instant that Cyprian was describing "the place of Fabian" at Rome, as "the place of Peter" (Ep. li.), there must have been at Antioch a bishop maintaining with no less confidence that *his* See (of Antioch) was the chair and place of Peter.

It is worthy of observation, though I shall make no attempt to account for it, that the latter of these passages from Chrysostom is quoted on behalf of the Papal Claim, with the suppression of the first and concluding paragraphs, here printed in italic. In the case of Cyprian, this system of extracting what is supposed to be favourable, and nothing more, is extended even to single words. For instance, the mere employment by him of the word *primatus* is supposed to prove that Peter held a *primacy* in and over the Church. There is not in the entire sentence wherein this word occurs, any other which lends the slightest countenance to this persuasion. On the contrary, if instead of deducing the meaning of the sentence from a single

word, the more reasonable course of determining the sense of that word from the context were followed, it would be found to afford no countenance whatever to the interpretation which it is challenged to support. In his 71st Epistle to Quintius, on baptism by heretics, Cyprian is commenting on the air of superiority assumed by Stephen in enforcing what he regarded as "ancient custom." Eusebius says "he would have no departure from the tradition which had prevailed from the earliest times." (Ec. Hist. vii. 3.) Cyprian replies they must not dictate to him from custom; but must prevail by dint of reason; for that "even Peter, whom the Lord *first* elected,* and upon whom he built his Church, when afterwards Paul withstood him, did not haughtily lay claim to any thing, or magisterially assume it, so as to say that he had a *primatus*, and ought to be obeyed by those who had been more recently called" to the apostleship. What then *is* this *primatus*, to which Peter did *not* lay claim, though he might have done so to silence the opposition of his juniors in the ministry? (*Novellis et posteris.*) The allusion from *primatus* to the previous *primum* is too obvious to be mistaken: and if St. Peter had said that he, being of longer standing in office, ought to have the first place, or consideration assigned to him, and to be treated with deference by those who were more recently called, although it might have been a haughty and magisterial mode of treating them, yet there would have been some connexion between the premises and conclusion. But suppose the sense of *primatus* to be that he had, by divine right, a spiritual supremacy *over every human being*, what could have been his meaning if he had said that they who were comparatively in their novitiate ought on *this* account to obey him? If he had used *primatus* to betoken *such* an office, surely he would not have confined the assertion of his title to respect merely to those of more recent appointment. Cyprian in that case would have commended him for not assuming that every living soul, old or young, called long ago or only yesterday, ought to submit to the decisions of him whom Christ had ordained to such an office of supremacy over the universal Church. Any conclusion short of this would be most lame and impotent. Neither is this an unauthorized sense of *primatus;* signifying priority in point of time. Tertullian so uses it. "Our system," he says, "is not of later date than others, but anterior to all: and the sure warrant of the truth is, its always holding priority of date.' (De præscr. xxxv.) So also (De Anim. xxvii.), speaking of the simultaneous generation of the body and soul, he argues "if we allow the one to have an *earlier*, and the other a *later date* in coming into being, (si alteri principatum damus, alteri secundatum) then must their productive causes operate also at successive times." This sense of the word also shows exactly the position in which the apostolic Sees stood in relation to others. From the very nature of things the foundations of the Apostles must be earlier in date than those which were derived from them. In this sense Rome had a *primatus*, or seniority, among the western Sees, as Peter had among the

* Matt. iv. 18—20; Mark i. 16; Luke v. 1—9; Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 12. Matt. xvi. 18.

Apostles. Stephen we perceive stood upon superior antiquity: and the reply of Cyprian is in effect, so might Peter have done; but as he did not so neither ought you: you ought to hear our remonstrances and to answer them by argument, "as Peter without reluctance yielded to the legitimate reasoning which Paul maintained." I do not design hereby to vindicate the solidity of Cyprian's argument, or the correctness of his views relating to baptism. On the contrary my persuasion is, that he was in error. But this is not the question. The real point for consideration is, whether he held that Stephen, in virtue of his office and *jure divino*, possessed a spiritual supremacy entitling him to require from all Churches and countries an unconditional compliance with his decision upon any point of faith. No one could exist under a stronger dread of excommunication from the Church of Christ, than Cyprian entertained. But he sets at nought all the menaces of Stephen; and evidently shews his persuasion that separation from the Church of Rome was not to be confounded in its character and consequences with exclusion from the Church of Christ; in which he felt that the real risk and penalty attendant upon excommunication resided. The one of these he provoked, if he did not undergo; but there are scores of passages in his works, which prove that no consideration would have induced him to encounter the other.

Previously to quitting the consideration of his writings, which, from their importance, deserve all the attention that can be bestowed on them, I will remark that he does *not* refer the word "matrix" to the Church of Rome exclusively as if the mother of all Churches; he applies the same word in the very same sense to his own Church of Carthage. In an account given of the system pursued, as to persons who had been baptised *there*, and had afterwards been seduced into heresy, he says, "this practice we also observe to this day; namely, that as many as were indisputably baptised here, and have gone over from us to the heretics, if after a discovery of their fault and a dissipation of their wandering, they return to the *truth*, and to *the mother* (matricem)," that is the Church in which they were baptised, which certainly was not at Rome, "it shall suffice to lay hands on them in token of repentance." (Ep. lxxi. ad Quintum). In his vehemence of opposition to Stephen, he assigns as a justification of his own separation from him that "we ought in all things to hold the unity of the Catholic Church;" nor ought we "in any article of the faith and truth to surrender to its enemies," or else (for the words will bear either sense) "to surrender, upon any points, to the adversaries of the faith and truth:" one or other of which things he therefore more than implies the entire Church of Rome had been guilty of. I firmly believe that in this dispute Cyprian was wrong; but that is not the question. His authority is produced, and greatly relied on to prove that he not only acknowledged the papal supremacy, but evidently spoke of it as acknowledged universally throughout the Church. We therefore quote his words to shew that he thought and wrote as it was impossible any one should write and think, who held that the Bishop of Rome possessed, in

virtue of his occupying the chair of St. Peter, such a right of government over the Church at large as has been pretendingly claimed by the successors of Stephen. In many cases the expressions of Cyprian offer a direct contradiction to such a claim; and, at the best, he is referring to an entirely different subject when his evidence is held to be confirmatory of that claim. Take the following instance:—"Forasmuch as the perverse unmanageable obstinacy of the adverse faction repelled the bosom and embrace of the root and mother." He is speaking of those presbyters at Rome who had elected Novatian to be their bishop in opposition to Cornelius, the canonical occupier of the chair; and *to them*, no one disputes that the Church of Rome *was* the root and mother; because they were members of it. So, we have seen, was the Church of Carthage, and so was Antioch, and so is every lawful Church to all who have been admitted to its communion, and are resident within its limits. Yet these words are relied on as containing proof that Cyprian spoke of the Church of Rome as the mother and root of *all* Churches; whereas nothing could be more alien from his meaning, as nothing was less within his contemplation at the time. "The discord," he proceeds, "still spreading, and becoming more inflamed, they set up a bishop of their own; and in opposition to the once declared sacrament of the divine order and of Catholic unity, established an adulterous and hostile head outside of the Church." (Ad. Cornel. ep. xlii.) That the abettors of Novatian believed they had made him the head of the particular Church at Rome, there can be no question; but that they ever contemplated making him thereby the head of the Church universal there is not one word in any remaining authority to prove or to render probable. The sacrament of divine order and catholic unity, which they were charged with violating, was that which forbad the appointment of a second bishop to a See which had already a canonical occupant. The words of Cyprian here have no reference, direct, remote, or implied, to any breach of unity but this; of which (if the election of Cornelius were valid) they certainly were guilty. This is Cyprian's explanation of his own meaning. In his epistle (lii.) to Antonianus, written expressly to acquaint him with the true state of the controversy, he puts the offence of Novatian entirely upon this footing. "Cornelius had been appointed bishop by the judgment of God and Christ, by the testimony of nearly all the clergy, by the suffrages of the laity then present, and by an assemblage of ancient bishops and good men; no one having been previously elected, and the place of Fabian, that is the place of Peter, and the station of the episcopal chair, being then vacant. Which being entered upon according to the will of God, and confirmed by the consent of all of us, if any one should aim after this at being made a bishop, he must necessarily be made so outside the Church *(foris)*, nor can he receive ecclesiastical ordination who holds not the unity of the Church. Whoever he may have been, and however much he may boast of himself, and claim for himself, he is a profane person, he is an alien, he is out of the Church. And forasmuch as after the first there cannot be a second, whoever is appointed after the one who ought to be the

only one, he is not the second (bishop), but none at all." It is an easy thing, by extracting a few words from any writer, and by applying them, in a sense which he did not intend, to a subject which he had not in his thoughts, to find proof of any opinion; even of the supremacy of the See of Rome. But to expose the groundlessness of the conclusion, nothing more is necessary than to state the case in full. A few years afterwards the usurpation which Cornelius had sustained befel Cyprian himself. An intrusive bishop was ordained without his knowledge or consent within his diocese. *Now* it becomes manifest that his expressions on the attempted usurpation of the See of Rome by Novatian, had reference not to any superior iniquity attending the invasion of it, but to the breach of the general ordinance which forbad more than one bishop at once in any See; and of which appointment the chair of Peter was, in those regions, the only symbol. This is manifest I say, because he repeats on the invasion of his own See of Carthage, precisely the same language as had been called forth by the outrage of Novatian upon the rights of the See of Rome. "Since these examples, so conspicuous and of such a character, and many others, have occurred aforetime, whereby the episcopal authority and power is confirmed by divine approval, in what estimation do you hold these men who being enemies of the priesthood and rebels against the Catholic Church, are restrained neither by the threatenings of the Lord giving them forewarning, nor by the penalty of a future judgment? For heresies have arisen, and schisms have sprung from no other source than that due obedience is not paid to the priest of God: and it is forgotten that in a Church there ought be one bishop at a time, and one judge at a time in Christ's stead. If in conformity with the divine ordinances the whole fraternity were respectful to him, no one would engage in cabals in opposition to the episcopal college, no one, after the divine appointment had been made known, after the suffrage of the laity, after the consent of the bishops of the province, would set himself up as the judge, not of the bishop, but of God; no one, by the rending asunder of unity, would cause a breach in the Church of Christ; no one through self-pleasing, and being puffed up, would establish a new heresy, separately from and outside of the Church *(foris)*: unless indeed it be some one of such sacrilegious rashness, and such depraved principles, as to think that a bishop can be appointed without the sanction of God:—plainly they are made bishops not agreeably to the will of God; but they are made who are without the Church; they are made in opposition to the instituted order and tradition of the Gospel." (Ep. lv. ad Cornel.) If any Roman Catholic could be induced without prepossession to study attentively these two compositions of Cyprian, the one relating to the intrusion of a pseudo-bishop into the See of Rome, the other to a like violation of ecclesiastical discipline in the See of Carthage, and to remark the perfect parity of feeling and expression which Cyprian exhibits on these two occasions, most certain am I that he must from that moment surrender the testimony of Cyprian as vouching for the supremacy of the See of Rome. As an apostolical seat, or as *the* apostolical seat *in that*

part of the world, deference was due, and deference was paid to it; but this was all. I say it advisedly and deliberately: if the writings of Cyprian be relied on to furnish proof that the Church of Rome either claimed or was allowed in those days a supremacy for its bishop over all Churches and persons in the world, such pretended proof is no better than deception, which the skilful may practise, and by which the uninformed may be deluded. It amounts almost to the crime of falsification; alleging statements as if connected with one subject, when in reality it was the intention of their author to apply them to an entirely different question.

Yet another word has been fixed upon as affording proof of the supremacy of Rome: that is *principatus*, which is connected with the church of that city by Augustine, when he says that in it "hath always flourished the principality of an Apostolical Chair;" or *the* Apostolical Chair, as some would interpret him. It is truly surprising that any person should be found disposed to urge these words, picked out of the middle of a long letter, as if they could by themselves carry any weight. If men's expressions may be dealt with after this manner, exhibited nakedly without regard to the subject they relate to, and stripped of their connexion with the context, anybody's authority may be easily cited, in proof of anything. To judge with fairness and to arrive with any certainty at the meaning of Augustine, we ought, unquestionably, to weigh his words with the circumstances. Let us then review them. Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, was accused by the Donatists before a Council of seventy African bishops; Secundus, bishop of Tagasta and then primate of Numidia, being the president. For reasons which seem sufficient Cæcilian and his colleague, Felix, bishop of Aptonga, did not appear, and in their absence were condemned. Augustine blames Secundus for this proceeding. He thinks it would have been better if the accusers had been recommended to forego the charges, and to leave the accused to the judgment of God; or else, he thinks, *Secundus might have said* to the promoters of the trial, "If there be any among you who can of their own knowledge so depose to these charges as to bring them home by proof which admits of no contradiction, yet are unwilling to communicate directly with such persons as these, they may go to our brethren and colleagues, the bishops of the Churches beyond sea. There let them in the first instance lodge their complaint against these men, for their contumacy in declining, under a sense of guilt, to appear before this Council to undergo the judgment of their African colleagues; and in the next place let them be summoned to attend, and there to answer to the charges laid against them." I must here remark that Archbishop Laud was not very wrong in stating that "the Catholics gave them leave to be heard before foreign Churches." For when Augustine would have had it said "they may go," he was in reality speaking his own sentiments. He puts his own words, if I may use such an expression, into the mouth of Secundus, only to show what *he* would have said had he been presiding instead of Secundus. Unless, therefore Augustine were of one opinion, and the Catholics of another, it seems to follow as surely as that two

and two make four, that the Catholics did virtually express *approval* of their being heard by foreign Churches. In what material respect this differs from Archbishop Laud's statement, that the Catholics *gave them leave* to be heard, I do not understand. It was to the foreign *Churches* that Augustine thought the case ought to have been referred, not singly or especially to the Church of Rome, as if its bishop held a supremacy or plenitude of pastoral authority over the entire Church of Christ. And as Augustine lays down on the one hand the course which Secundus *ought* to have pursued, he imagines on the other what the position of Cæcilian would have been if that course *had* been adopted. The option being left to the accusers of carrying their charges to the Churches beyond sea for a hearing, suppose them not to have availed themselves of that permission, but to have continued spreading calumnies and invectives against Cæcilian. They would not thereby, as Augustine surmises, have injured him at all; because as the bishop of so great and eminent a city as Carthage, he might very well set at nought the malice of his enemies, especially as that city was not remote from those transmarine countries, and Cæcilian might reflect (videret) "that by letters communicatory* he was associated with the Church of Rome, in which from the first the principality of an apostolic chair hath flourished, and with the other countries whence the Gospel passed over into Africa itself." (Epist. ad Glor. et Eleuth. tom ii. 91, D.) But in case the accusers should prosecute the suit, and strive to induce those Churches to break off communion with him; then Cæcilian would be prepared to answer before them for himself. In all this there is nothing whatever to countenance the claim of Roman supremacy, unless it can be extracted from the single word *principatus*. But let it be observed what is the general usage of that word, and the equivalent *primatus*, by the same writer. He says, "Peter from *petra*, called blessed, in a figure representing the Church, holding the *principatus* of the Apostles." (Serm. lxxvi. in Matth. xiv. 25, tom. v. p. 416, B.) Again, "behold how Cyprian relates, what we also have heard from Holy Scripture, that the Apostle Peter, in whom the *primatus* of the Apostles shines forth with so distinguished grace, when he was accustomed to treat the question of circumcision otherwise than the truth required, was corrected by Paul, a later Apostle (*posteriore*). If then Peter might walk not uprightly in anything pertaining to the truth of the Gospel, so as to compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews, as Paul writes in that epistle wherein he calls God to witness that he lies not, (Gal. i. 20) and, after this so solemn and terrible attestation of God, proceeds to relate all that he said to Peter before them all,—if Peter,

* The *literæ communicatoriæ* were letters written by bishops on their election to make notification of it to the bishops of other churches, whose admission of those letters was a token of their reception of the writers into communion. In another letter to the same Glorius Eleutherius and others, Augustine says "Quærebam utrum epistolas communicatorias, quas *formatas* dicimus, posset quo vellem dare?" This he proposes to Fortunius, the Donatist bishop, as a test or gage to determine whether he were acknowledged to be in communion with the Churches to whom those letters were to be addressed.

I say, could compel the Gentiles to live as the Jews, in contradiction of the rule which the whole Church afterwards adopted, why cannot Cyprian have compelled heretics or schismatics to be baptised again, in violation of the rule which the entire Church held at a later period? I presume that without degradation Cyprian may be compared with the Apostle Peter, so far as relates to the crown of martyrdom; but rather I ought to apprehend that I may be disrespectful to Peter; for who is not aware that that *principatus* of the apostolate is to be more highly esteemed than any bishoprick;" *or*, according to a different and perhaps preferable reading, "that he, on account of that *principatus* of the apostolate, is to be held superior to any bishoprick." (Contra. Donatist, lib. ii. c. 1, tom. ix. p. 96, D.) Augustine, it is very evident, sets the *inerrancy* of Peter and of Cyprian entirely on a level. If the former were wrong, which cannot be disputed, why might not the other also be? Again, he uses *principatus* and *primatus* as perfectly synonymous; and by the latter he denotes priority in point of *time*, not of *order*. He speaks of St. Paul as *posterior*, that is *later called* to the apostleship, or born out of due time; for Augustine would hardly use the word *posterior* to denote inferiority, when St. Paul had himself declared that he was "not a whit behind the very chiefest of the Apostles." The true sense of *principatus* is no more than priority among equals, arising from his having been first called, and from the frequent marks of distinction which he received from Christ. St. Augustine himself confirms this sense, by using the same word to denote a primate's *right* to preside, or the *act* of his presiding, in an assembly of the bishops of his province. Thus in the very instance before us, he applies the term: saying "cum etiam Secundus ipse concilii *principatum* teneret" (ub. sup. p. 89. F.). Every apostolic See, not that of Rome alone, had a *principatus* of this nature and extent: entitling its bishop to a presidency in all assemblies of those of his own order.

So therefore, as according to established rule, the Bishop of Rome would preside at any Council of transmarine bishops assembled to decide upon the cause of Cæcilian, it might naturally give confidence to the latter to know that he should be heard before the bishops of Churches with which he was in communion, and especially that the President of the Council would be one of these. This accounts for the mention in this place of "the principality of an apostolic chair." Communion with these chairs was thought to afford a presumption of catholicity. Whether this were a sufficient test is another question. But St. Augustine says, it was so esteemed in his time. "What has it done to thee, that chair of the Roman Church wherein Peter sat, and in which Anastasius sits at this day; or of the Church at Jerusalem in which James once sat and John now sits; with which (*quibus*) we are connected in catholic unity, and from which, in your frantic impiety, you have separated! Why callest thou *an* apostolic chair (that is *either* of the two that he had mentioned) a seat of pestilence?" (Cont. lit. Petil. lib. ii. 118. tom. ix. p. 254. C.) The bishop of an apostolic See it might be concluded would be above the reach of influence or intimidation: and his

presence would ensure the attendance of judges and advocates qualified to conduct and decide the cause: which might not be so certain if it were tried in some obscure quarter. These are reasonable causes why St. Augustine should refer to the existence of an apostolic chair at Rome when he was enumerating the circumstances likely to afford encouragement to Cæcilian. He does not thrust in the mention of it by the head and shoulders as he is supposed by some to have done, merely for the sake of magnifying the pretensions of Rome. The remainder of the history does but afford a continual refutation of those pretensions. When the Donatists made their appeal, according to the license they had received, demanding the trial of Cæcilian, their application for a hearing before the foreign bishops was addressed not to Melchiades but to Constantine: not to the successor in the chair of Peter, but to the emperor on the throne; a layman, and then but a catechumen. "We beseech you, Constantine, most powerful emperor," they said: "you are descended from a just race, whose father was the only person of all the emperors who put a stop to persecution; that forasmuch as Gaul is exempt from this crime, *you* would assign us judges to decide the differences which we have in Africa with the other bishops." (Fleury E. H. Book x. c. 10.) Hereupon the emperor directed the proconsul to send both parties to Rome. He himself directed a letter to Melchiades the pope, jointly with one Marcus, whose rank and station in the Church are not well ascertained. "*It is my pleasure*," he says, "that the same Cæcilian together with ten bishops who are prepared to bring charges, and ten others whom he regards as necessary for his defence, should proceed on their voyage to Rome; in order that in presence of *you*," (that is of Pope Melchiades *and* Marcus), "together with Retecius Maternus and Marinus, your colleagues, whom for this purpose I have directed to hasten to Rome, he may be heard after such manner as you shall find on inquiry to be most conformable to the holy law." (Euseb. Ec. H. lib. x. c. 5.) This Council, in which Marcus, whoever he may have been, is placed on equality with Melchiades, assembled according to the emperor's instructions; and having examined into the case, pronounced a sentence iu favour of Cæcilian, the equity and moderation of which were highly spoken of. Still, as was very natural, the adverse party were not satisfied. Augustine more than hints that objections were raised against the entire proceeding, resting upon the *unlawfulness* of the bishop of Rome interfering with the determination of an African Council. "But perhaps it may be said," a delicate way of expressing that it *had* been said, "Melchiades, the bishop of the Church of Rome, ought not with his colleagues, the transmarine bishops, to assume the right of judging in a case which had been already decided by seventy African bishops, the primate of Tagasta presiding."* If Augustine were really impressed with a belief that Melchiades in virtue of his see was, *jure divino*, the source of all jurisdiction,

* "Ubi primus Tigisitanus præsedit:" the same as he had before expressed by "cum ipse Secundus *principatum teneret*." The true meaning of *principatus* cathedræ apostolicæ" after this cannot be doubtful.

and the centre of unity, could he have had a more favourable occasion for asserting that supremacy than against those who thus malignantly questioned his right to adjudicate upon an appeal from the decision of seventy African bishops? But how does he reply? He evades the question. He asserts not that Melchiades *had* the right; but he says, "I suppose he did *not* assume it, but merely acted as he was ordered by the emperor." "The emperor being applied to, sent certain bishops as judges, who should sit with Melchiades, and come to such a determination as justice should require upon the entire cause."

Constantine had ordered his pro-consul to enquire into the accusation against Felix, and when some unfortunate ventured to hint that a bishop ought not for an ecclesiastical offence to be judged before such a tribunal, he is visited with a reprimand, and Augustine justifies the proceeding by saying, "As if he (the bishop) had brought this upon himself; and as if the Emperor had not *ordered* the affair to be thus enquired into; to whose care, for his discharge of which he was to render an account to God, this matter chiefly belonged; for they (the Donatists) who had applied to him, to whom they afterwards appealed, had *made* him the judge and arbiter in a cause respecting the surrender of the Scriptures (traditionis) and schism." This might all be very just reasoning as an *argumentum ad homines* addressed to the Donatists, who could have no right to complain of their own act; but what satisfaction was it to the Pope or to the Church, that at the solicitation of acknowledged heretics the office of the Vicar of Christ should be thus encroached upon by the civil authority; and he himself required to sit and judge by virtue of a commission from the Emperor? when, if the papal theory be well founded, he held a commission from Christ; under which all human beings (the Emperor himself not excepted) were under an obligation to come and be judged by him on pain of forfeiting their eternal salvation. A fine process of development, certainly, the papal power must have been under, when such was its state and condition almost 250 years after its supposed establishment by St. Peter! These proceedings are important also in another point of view; for they entirely contradict the inferences which have been drawn from the expressions of Cyprian. If all that he had said of the chair of Peter, the primacy of Peter, the source, and head, and mother, and matrix, and the principal Church, and a great deal more, had really been meant to convey the meaning which mistaken devotion now seeks to deduce from them, how is it to be accounted for that, eighty years afterwards, the Emperor should have ventured to place the head of the principal Church in this degrading position, and should have been enabled to do so without objection or remonstrance on the part of Melchiades, or of any portion of the Church; and with the expressed approval of Augustine? There is yet more. After the Pope with his fellow-commissioners had pronounced in favour of Cæcilian, the Donatists, very naturally dissatisfied, persevere in again making application to the Emperor to appoint other judges to review that decision. And by a concession altogether incomprehensible, *if* he be-

lieved the Bishop of Rome to be the Vicar of Christ, and the visible head of his Church, Constantine again yields to their desire: he issues his own mandate, addressed to bishops in various countries, enjoining them to assemble at Arles. The subjoined extract shews the true character of imperial interference, and the regard which was *then* paid to papal supremacy—"Constantine Augustus, to Chrestus, Bishop of Syracuse. Both now and heretofore, when certain persons had begun to dispute in a wicked and froward spirit concerning the worship of the holy God of Heaven, and concerning the Catholic faith, *I had so appointed* that certain bishops being dispatched out of Gaul, and the adverse parties, who earnestly and obstinately opposed each other in controversy, being ordered to attend out of Africa, the Bishop of Rome being also present, all disputed questions might in their presence be determined after careful argument. But inasmuch as some, according to usual custom, forgetful of their own salvation, and of the reverence which is due to the most holy faith, cease not even yet to manifest their personal animosities, and at the same time will not acknowledge the judgment then delivered, but are dissatisfied that the sentence was pronounced by a few, and that these proceeded precipitately and over hastily to decide, without having carefully examined all matters which ought previously to have been enquired into, it has become necessary for me to take measures carefully for now finally bringing to a close in the presence of many, those disputes which ought to have been settled by voluntary assent, after that judgment had been pronounced. Having therefore ordered very many bishops from many different places to assemble in the town of Arles by the first of August, we think it right to signify to you also," &c., &c., (Concil. tom. ii. p. 24.) How many points are there in this short extract, utterly destructive of the bold pretence that the chair of Peter was then the acknowledged source of jurisdiction, and centre of Catholic unity. The emperor is informed that there is a vehement controversy raging in Africa concerning the Catholic faith. The accusers had had leave given them to bring their charges before the Churches of Europe. This they declined doing, but addressed them to Constantine, desiring that *he* would name the judges. If the station of the Pope in the Catholic Church were at that time the same as it is now supposed to be, the determination of these dissatisfied men to address themselves to the emperor, could be but an intentional mark of disrespect, and of their want of confidence in the Roman Pontiff, and it is therefore unaccountable that the emperor, if he held the Pope in veneration as the Vicar of Christ, should have made himself a party to such a proceeding. He assumes to himself the entire preparatory arrangement of the *ecclesiastical* conclave, without reference to Melchiades, and merely appointing (as if it depended entirely on the pleasure of the emperor) that he should be present, he orders the accusers and the accused to appear. I shall not go farther into particulars; but merely observe that it is impossible to reconcile the subsequent proceedings of the emperor with even the most guarded acknowledgment of the Pope's spiritual

supremacy. If he had held this belief, if the Pope himself had held it, if any body in the Church had then adopted it, things could not have been carried as they were, without provoking some remonstrance. Yet even Augustine does not find fault. He expresses no dissatisfaction at these affronts to the papal supremacy in the days of Melchiades; although in his own age that power had begun to show some symptoms of consciousness. It was awakening from its previous trance, or rather non-existence.

It may be shewn how adverse these acts of civil authority are to the *theory* of the papacy, by a reference to the forged epistle attributed to Melchiades; which pretends to have been addressed to the bishops of Spain. "Forbear to judge bishops; forbear to condemn without the authority of this old man: (meaning himself) for it has been appointed from the age of the Apostles that this privilege be reserved to this holy See; and it continues inviolate to this day. Bishops therefore whom the Lord hath chosen for Himself as His eyes, and hath ordained to be pillars of His Church, to whom also He hath given power to bind and loose, He hath reserved unto His own judgment: and this privilege He committed to Peter, the holder of the keys, as His vicegerent. Which prerogative of his justly comes by succession to the See, to be inherited and possessed in all future time; since even among the blessed Apostles there was a certain partition of power. And although the appointment of all were equal, yet to blessed Peter it was granted that he should have preeminence over the rest, and by his prudence should settle and arrange those questions and differences about which complaint should be made to him. This we believe to have been so appointed by the ordinance of God, in order that in after times all parties might not lay claim to all power, but that at all times the more important causes, such as those relating to bishops and affairs of moment, should bend their course nowhither but to the single See of blessed Peter, the chief of the Apostles, that they (the bishops) might thence obtain a final judgment on their cause, whence they received the original of their institution; lest at any time they should be at variance with their head." (Concil. tom. i. p. 695.) This, I repeat, is one of those audacious and crafty forgeries, the Decretal Epistles, which made their way into the world in the eighth and ninth centuries, with a design to establish the supremacy of St. Peter and of the Roman See. Even some of the Popes themselves, whether through ignorance or wickedness cannot now be determined, have availed themselves of this polluted evidence. This pretended epistle of Melchiades contains so many internal marks of falsehood that it is universally abandoned as spurious.*

* Melchiades or Miltiades succeeded St. Eusebius in the popedom, on the 2nd July, A.D. 311, and died, according to the ancient catalogue given by Father Boucher, on the 10th or 11th of January, A.D. 314, under the consulship of Voluscan and Anienus. The date of the Decretal Epistle attributed to him is the 1st of March in the year last named; that is, more than six weeks after his death. It cannot therefore be his; in further proof of which the Scriptures are quoted in it agreeably to the version of St. Jerome; (A.D. 382) In it is found a sentence from Sextus, the Pythagorean, taken verbatim from Rufinus, (A.D. 397); and different passages from the writings of Sts. Celestin and Leo. (430 and 450.)

But the *falsarius* does not merely betray himself; he condemns the cause which he espouses. Grant to his epistle the earliest date possible, the concluding portion of the fifth century, it must create a very strong suspicion that the papal supremacy was not even then so recognised, but that it required further confirmation and support. And to furnish these, recourse was had to this most abominable device. The effect of it is to shew what Roman ambition was ever aiming at, and that there could be no practice so contrary to the simplicity of the Gospel that its accomplices would not have recourse to it for the sake of advancing an object which they since think themselves to have attained. Their purpose was to imbue the world with a persuasion that from the age of Melchiades (and indeed much earlier) the proof of St. Peter's supremacy, and of a perpetual succession from him, was afforded by the testimony of the Popes themselves. But who that notices the proceedings of Constantine can believe that there is one word of truth in the representation of the spurious Melchiades? If in his age it had indeed been admitted as the law of the Church that bishops should be judged by the single See of blessed Peter, can it be believed that the Emperor on the one hand could have assumed, and the Pope on the other could without remonstrance have admitted, the right of the civil power to constitute a court, in the way which has been described, to examine into charges against Cæcilian; or to put Felix on his trial before a proconsol; or to assemble a Council before which the sentence of the Pope himself should be reviewed? Constantine, when the first appeal was made to him, apprehends no risk of violating the rights of the See of Rome, but briefly hesitates upon the question only, how he could set up a judgment-seat when he was himself expecting to undergo the judgment of Christ? (Optat. de Schism. Donat. lib. i. c. 23.) After all, he did take upon himself to sit in judgment even upon a bishop: "the provident Emperor," finding that the accusers were attempting to withdraw themselves surreptitiously, "compelled such of them as were still within reach to proceed to Milan in charge of proper officers. Cæcilian having arrived there, he caused him to be arraigned also, as he has written, and having gone into the inquiry, with how much diligence, caution, and penetration, his own letters shew, he pronounced Cæcilian perfectly clear of the charge, and the opposite side most culpable." (August. ub. sup. p. 97.) Augustine is evidently much perplexed by such a proceeding on the part of a Christian Emperor; and says that he would not dare to sit in judgment on the decision of the bishops who had tried the cause at Rome. But in this he contradicts his own statement; which proves most convincingly that Constantine did interpose both officially and personally in a way which could not have been submitted to without pertinacious opposition, if the supreme authority of the See of St. Peter had been at that time an understood and acknowledged principle of Church order and government.

On looking back from the point which we have now reached, we are entitled, I think, to conclude upon evidence given, that there is no recorded proof of the acknowledgment of the papal supremacy down to the age of

Melchiades. Indeed this is to state the case by far too favourably for the Roman side. It is not merely true that during the first three centuries there is nothing said in favour of the claim (which might possibly have been the case, even though the persuasion of its validity had been very widely entertained); but the Fathers of those ages, and even much later, are found continually acting and expressing themselves in a style which they could not have adopted if they had been impressed with a belief that the See of Rome held, by divine right, a supreme jurisdiction over the entire Church. They not only do not recognize, but they positively contradict this assumption. I have done my best as a candid and impartial enquirer to ascertain what sentiments were really held upon this point; and I avow my firm conviction that the facts thus gathered cannot be reconciled with the criterion of divine truth which the Church of Rome has by the highest of her authorities propounded. Her principle is, that the holy Synod, whose conclusions she adopts, "perpetually keeps in view the object of abolishing errors and maintaining the purity of the Gospel in the Church, as promised beforehand by the prophets in the Holy Scriptures, and first promulgated with his own mouth by our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and directed to be afterwards preached by his Apostles to every human creature, as the source of all salutary truth and moral discipline; and clearly discerns that *this truth* and *this discipline*, are contained in the books of Scripture, and in unwritten traditions, which have been received from the mouth of Christ himself by the Apostles, or by the Apostles themselves, through the dictation of the Holy Spirit, delivered as it were from hand to hand, until they have come down to us *(quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt.")* (Concil. Trident. Sess. iv. 8th April, 1546.) If this be admitted as a true definition of the ground of faith in the Church of Christ, (and what Romanist can deny it so to be?) then I will without scruple or fear of effectual contradiction affirm that, according to the principles of the papal communion, the papal supremacy cannot be maintained. It was not among those truths which were declared by the mouth of Christ himself; it was not delivered by the Apostles; nor has the tradition of it descended from hand to hand from the Apostles to us. I believe it must have been a consciousness of the insuperability of this difficulty of connecting it by an unbroken line with the doctrine of the Apostles, which first suggested the expedient of the not yet perfectly consistent or intelligible doctrine of developement. That doctrine is grounded upon a plain admission that the tenet of papal supremacy is of comparatively recent origin; that this principle at least of the Christian scheme was imperfectly understood by those to whom it was delivered. To those who are prepared (as the Romanists of the new-light are) to make this admission, it presents of course no difficulty that we demonstrate the unacquaintance of the first three centuries with the doctrine of supremacy. Without any embarrassment they reply—we know it: we admit that the present doctrine of the Church of Rome upon that point is of recent origin. Mr. Newman candidly avows that he cannot, and that no one *can*, determine

the point of time at which the rule of faith became fixed. (Essay, p. 107.) We must leave these theorists then to decide the controversy, not with us, but with those who may be considered the genuine Romanists, who abide by the decision of the Council of Trent in all matters involving any article of faith. We have seen what *their* theory is: and a very respectable and reasonable theory it might be, *if it could be proved.* But the Church of Rome is now evidently divided into two parties or sects; each contending for an infallible creed upon principles mutually destructive of each other. Both these theories may be false (and I believe are) but it is impossible in the nature of things that both should be true. One party maintaining that the doctrine of the papal supremacy must have been delivered down from hand to hand from the Apostles even to us, or else it cannot be consistent with the purity of the Gospel; the other side as pertinaciously affirms that the power of the popes was unknown in the ages nearest to the Apostles and even long afterwards. Nay; I have heard and believe, although, not having seen the book I will not pledge myself for the accuracy of the statement, that some of the principal apostles of this new sect go to the extreme of saying that Peter himself may have been unaware of the extent of the privileges with which Christ invested him. The whole then comes to this,—that the universality of power since claimed, and in some measure attained, by the See of Rome, has been, and was from the first intended to be, an innovation upon the original scheme of the Gospel; a scheme imperfectly proposed at first, they say, and as imperfectly understood. This is a startling proposition. But admitting for the moment a possibility that it may be well founded, the question for others, not for us, to answer is this. How is it consistent with the universally acknowledged principle of the Church of Rome, that innovation upon *any* part of her system is an impossibility? In the time of Bishop Bull it was vaunted as an "invincible argument" against the *possibility* of innovation, that if any doctrine now maintained had not been believed at first, but introduced at any subsequent period (as it is now admitted the doctrine of the supremacy was) such an innovation could never have been established. (Vindic. of the Ch. of Engl. Works, vol. 2, p. 185.) This "invincible argument," which developement entirely subverts, is now abandoned by the advocates of the new system. It is admitted, and earnestly pressed upon us by them, that innovation *may* take place; that it *has* taken place; that a doctrine on which the issue of the Christian cause depends, a doctrine at first unknown, has been engrafted upon the original scheme: and it is made even matter of boast that in this manner the originally imperfect system has been improved till it was brought, step by step, to its present state of consistency.

The theory of Mr. Newman rests upon a persuasion that all true developements of doctrine or usage which have been permitted, have been divinely approved. (Essay, p. 171.) As a general maxim, few will dispute this: but when he proceeds to assume that the Papacy is a true developement, and therefore divinely approved, it is evident that he begs the question in dispute, which is whether it *be* a true developement. Certain announce-

ments in Scripture, more or less obscure, he says, "are claimed by the Papal See as having their fulfilment in itself. Such are the words, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,' &c.; 'and I will give thee the keys,' &c. These," he urges, "need a comment;" and a comment it has been my endeavour to supply by showing that the Gospel history itself affords a natural and sufficient interpretation of these passages, and establishes their fulfilment in the acts and person of St. Peter. For the ultimate developement of these prophecies and promises in the Papal See we have no more solid ground afforded than an asserted "probability" that the Church would be established upon a monarchical principle; and a "presumption" hence arising that the Pope is that destined monarch. This would be a frail foundation at the best to rest a divine faith upon. A probable presumption, without at least some fuller confirmation than this exhibits, is no better than a house of clay, whose foundation is in the dust; and it is crushed before the moth when the existence of even that antecedent probability of a papal *monarchy* in the Church is denied. St. Peter by his acts gives no encouragement to the expectation; he nowhere acts the part of Sovereign Pontiff, nor monopolizes all power as a universal bishop. Our Lord presents an image which contradicts the presumption of such an autocrasy when he says to the twelve, "Ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This engagement countenanced a persuasion that the Church would be placed under the federal authority of many co-ordinate rulers, each exercising a parity of control within his own limits; and the original developement corresponded with it. This was the form of government in the early Church, and it is expressed by Cyprian, saying there is one episcopate, and each Bishop holds undividedly his own portion of it. If he had been aware of the predominance of one sole monarch, to whom every human creature that looked for salvation must necessarily be subject, how could he have said this? It would have been more conformable then with the true state of things to have said "There are *two* episcopates: the one of which holds dominion *in solidum* (that is incommunicably with any other); the others are alike subject to his supremacy."

It is not my intention to enter extensively into an examination of the Theory of Developement. Yet it may not be useless to shew that, independently of its wanting all positive evidence of truth, it betrays its propounders (even Mr. Newman himself) into inconsistencies which almost necessarily bespeak its falsehood. His fundamental supposition is that "there was a certain element at work, or in existence, which for some reason or other did not show itself upon the surface of ecclesiastical affairs." (Essay, p. 165). Yet he strives to make certain ante-Nicene testimonies available "in behalf of the authority of the Holy See." (Introd. p. 22.) "Thus," he says, "St. Clement in the name of the Church of Rome writes to the Corinthians when they were without a Bishop." Any one who reads the epistle of Clemens will perceive that it was written in reply to a representation which the Corinthians had addressed to him, setting forth the insubordi-

nation and consequent confusion which prevailed in their ecclesiastical state, and he, in answer, exhorts them to unanimity and patience by an appeal to Scripture and the example of the saints. But not one word or hint of authority is there in his epistle from beginning to end. What support can this application and reply give to the authority of the Roman See, as if its bishop were entitled to have "the whole of Christendom as his diocese in such a way as no other Bishops had"? Suppose that authority to have then existed as an idea, not as an institution. This is Mr. Newman's own theory. This undeveloped truth (as he esteems it) being undiscernible, the Corinthians could not have applied to Clement on the ground of his possessing or being entitled to such authority. They cannot be cited in behalf of the Roman See unless in addressing Clement they were *conscious* of his position in the Church. And how could this be when Mr. Newman admits the papal prerogatives were yet undeveloped, and therefore could not be known to them? If, on the contrary, we admit the supposition that the Corinthians were sensible that Clement held, *jure divino*, a supremacy over the whole Church, and if they applied to him in that capacity, what becomes of the theory of developement? If these parties, the Corinthians and St. Clement, were conscious of the relation in which (supposing the papal theory to be well founded), they stood towards each other, then "events" in the first, and *not* "in the fourth century were the developement of it." I say again, this incident cannot be cited in support of the papal authority, unless the Corinthians were already sensible of the divine institution of such an authority, and of their obligation, in common with the whole Church, to submit themselves to it. If they were conscious of this, then the element not only existed, but was *at work*, and if it were thus known in the chief city of Achaia, and in the metropolis of the world, there could not well be many places in which it had not already shewn itself upon the surface of ecclesiastical affairs. In that case then the theory of developement ceases any longer to afford an explanation, even in pretext, of the difficulty created by the acknowledged omission of all express mention of the supremacy by the early ecclesiastical writers.

The same remark applies to all the other instances cited (p. 22. 3.) for the purpose of proving the early existence of "a sentiment, or kind of instinct," that the Pope ought to possess supreme authority over the Church of God. If it be intended to found any confirmation of the Papal claim upon the existence of such a sentiment, then there is no longer any place for developement. Mr. Newman makes it at least a question whether this element had yet shewed itself. And yet he proceeds to argue in a manner which requires an admission that an acquaintance with it not only prevailed within the Church, but extended even beyond its limits. Even heretics were conscious of its existence; for this consciousness, it is manifestly inferred, caused Marcion to betake himself to Rome when excommunicated in Pontus, and led thither Praxeas from Africa, and the Montanists from Phrygia, "to gain the countenance of its Bishop." Surely there might be

reasons enough to render it an object of importance to men thus situated to acquire the patronage of the Bishop of Rome, without supposing, nevertheless, that he was the supreme head of the Church, or the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ. He was from his very position a man of vast influence and authority, and this consideration alone may suffice to show why his support and countenance were so extensively sought. These instances therefore, if they yield any support to the papal authority must subvert the fundamental principle of developement; and on the other hand while they are destructive of that theory, they cannot upon any other ground be cited for the authority of the holy see. The fatal deficiency of the developement system is that it involves an admission that the papal power cannot be traced back to any starting point, (let them strive to fix it as they may), at which it can with certainty be said that the finger of God was then upon it. In truth it is a very narrow and contracted system after all. A truly catholic spirit cannot tolerate or adopt it. Am I asked a reason? I reply then that the theory of the papacy, as foundéd on developement, contravenes in a most remarkable manner that condition which was from the beginning adopted as the test of truth. *Priority* is that condition. "That which was *first* is true," is the maxim of Tertullian: of Tertullian in his days of orthodoxy and sound judgment. Oh, how grateful should we be to God for it, that the Church of England can safely, and does advisedly make her appeal to this the primitive rule of faith! But in the region of developement the wind sits in an exactly opposite quarter. That which is *last*, they say, is true. The first stages were those of ignorance and imperfection, and uncertainty. It is only by giving up the search among the records of true antiquity, the testimonies of apostles and apostolical men, and taking for our guidance the opinions which had gained ground four or five centuries later, that there is any possibility, so they would make us believe, of understanding what the will of the Lord is.

Neither would I have this regarded as a simple *argumentum ad hominem* directed against Mr. Newman and his disciples, to shew how much their admissions are at variance with their theory. That theory, I do say, is itself at variance with the great argument of apostolical tradition, on which the early Christians so much relied in their controversies with the heretics: "by which," Irenæus says, "we confound all those who in whatever manner form conclusions upon false grounds," (colligunt præterquam oportet.) This is directed against the Marcionites and others, who justified their dangerous tenets by the plea that the Apostles had left certain "hidden mysteries," or elements of doctrine such as did not shew themselves upon the surface of affairs at first; but were communicated reservedly, apart from the great body of believers, to the few who were styled "the perfect." And what is the reply of Irenæus to this? It proceeds altogether upon a denial of the theory, that a mere idea was originally communicated indefinitely and partially; and was left to acquire shape and consistency, as the course of events should require and determine. He cannot be charged with admitting that the mere

fact of their system having obtained a certain hold upon the persuasions of mankind, pretending at the same time to be founded upon apostolical authority, afforded sufficient evidence that it was a true developement and divinely approved. Irenæus specially opposes himself to this, which is Mr. Newman's argument for the papal supremacy; the very principle which he urges in proof that the Bishops of Rome have the whole world for their diocese. Irenæus maintains that the Christian doctrine in its entireness was delivered by the Apostles to those Bishops whom they constituted in all Churches of their foundation; and that therefore the doctrines of the heretics were not to be received, because it could not be shewn that they formed part of that deposit which was communicated by the Apostles to all their Churches. That any doctrine had not appeared upon the surface from the very first, was held to be fatal to its pretensions to form a part of divine revelation. But of what force could such an argument have been, if the Catholics themselves had lain under the suspicion of having among them exactly such a doctrine? if the heretics had been able to retort "you hold, it is indisputable, one principle upon which, by the confession of the most perfect among you, the maintenance of catholic unity, and therefore the sum of the Christian interest, depends. If this element do not at present shew itself upon the surface yet we have glimpses of it. You cannot deny that it exists; you will not dispute that it works; you are conscious that it is a principle, if not the main principle, of your system. Yet you acknowledge it was not delivered to the whole body of believers, nor to the apostolical Churches generally. You cannot derive confirmation for the establishment of your Pope from an appeal to *them*. Your tradition upon this point has no marks of superiority to that by which we defend our doctrines. Why then are we not equally at liberty," might the heretics have said, "to hold our persuasions as of apostolical origin; and in support of the divine approval of them to refer to the same test which you rely upon? And how can you object? 'Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? and thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest us which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the just judgment of God?' " Thus might the whole band of Marcionites, Valentinians, and Gnostics have replied to Irenæus; and I am not sensible how he could have met the objection; or how it could have been warded off by the Catholic Church of that age, if its doctrine and usage had been such as the Theory of Developement supposes and assumes. I am seriously persuaded that no one can maintain this theory without surrendering apostolical tradition confirmed by Scripture as a ground of reliance; and therefore it appears to me to concern the true Roman Catholic, at least as deeply as it concerns us, to enquire carefully what this new doctrine is. But when this is done, then the other horn of the dilemma presents itself. No Roman Catholic of the older school will hesitate, I presume, to declare his persuasion that the doctrine of the supremacy of St. Peter was as openly maintained, and its designed inheritance by the Bishops of Rome as his successors was as unreservedly held and professed, by the Church at large,

in the days of which I am speaking as it is now and has been ever since. If it were so, how came Cyprian and so many others before and after, to express themselves, and even to act, in a style which betokened that they knew nothing of it? If this were the case, how came Irenæus not to address himself to that point, and to urge the infallible authority of that See as alone sufficient to confound all heretics? I cannot be unaware of the efforts made by the Roman party to give that interpretation to his expressions. But I will shew convincingly that this is not the just sense of that celebrated passage of which the following is a close literal translation. "But as it takes long to reckon up the successions through such a circuit as that of all the Churches, we, singling out the tradition of the most extensive and most ancient Church, and to all well known, founded and organized at Rome by two most renowned Apostles Peter and Paul, (the tradition) which it holds from the Apostles, and the faith proclaimed to men and, through the successions of bishops, progressively coming also to us, put to confusion all those who may in any manner whatsoever, either through vicious self-pleasing or vain glory, either through blindness or misapprehension, gather a heap of wrong notions. For to this Church on account of the superior jurisdiction, it is necessary that every Church should resort; that is believers from all quarters; in which (Church) that tradition which proceeds from the Apostles has been always preserved by those who come from every quarter." (Adv. hæres. l. iii. 3.)

The objection raised by heretics, according to the statement of Irenæus was, that the Scriptures were incorrect and without authority, because they could not be understood except by those who had an acquaintance with tradition; inasmuch as they were in a *written* form, whereas St. Paul had said "we *speak* wisdom among them that are *perfect*." When it was proposed, in compliance with this objection, to appeal to the tradition of the Church, they still demurred; affirming that the Apostles themselves had intermingled legal principles with the system of Christ, and that they alone (the Marcionites and other kindred sects) had among them the truth unadulterated, derived from those *perfect* persons to whom the Apostle describes himself and his brethren as *speaking*. To refute this foolish argument, Irenæus very justly urges that if the Apostles had delivered privately to a select class, under the title of the perfect, those doctrines which were not preached to all, they would surely have taken care above all things to make these disclosures to the bishops whom they placed over all the Churches which they founded, and whom, for the honour of the faith, they were anxious to have *very* perfect. This being the case, he argues, no doctrine could have been preached by the Apostles but it must have been, and must therefore still be, known to the Churches; for everything which was taught to the first bishops would be handed down by them to the next, and so by continual succession preserved until the time then being.

The question for determination is, what bearing have the expressions employed in support of this argument, upon the question of the supremacy

of the See of Rome? Irenæus observes that it would occupy much time to appeal to each Church, and trace the descent of the tradition through the succession of Bishops everywhere; and he therefore refers to the Church at Rome as a compendium of all the others, and as affording a testimony which might be held as an expression of their general belief. The doubt is, as to the ground upon which he so assumes the sufficiency of this single Church's testimony. "On account," say the Romanists, "of the superior authority of that Church, rendering it necessary that every other Church in the world should agree with it"; but, as *we* think, "on account of the superior jurisdiction of the city in which that Church was seated, rendering it necessary that every Church, or believers from every part of the world, should resort to the Church at Rome." Situated in so great a metropolis to which persons were continually called on occasions of business or duty from all parts of the world, there could not but be a constant communication and intercourse kept up between it and the members of all other churches, which could therefore hold no doctrines or usages but must be known at Rome.

In support of this interpretation I must remark that "convenire ad" can signify nothing but the assembling of persons at one common place. It has not been sufficiently noticed, if indeed it have been noticed at all, that this phrase is almost literally a quotation from the Acts of the Apostles, (xxi. 22.) "the multitude must needs come together" *oportet convenire multitudinem.* (Vulg.) *δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν.* Again, (v. 16) "there came (together) a multitude, out of the cities round about, unto Jerusalem," *συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*: where the Vulgate has *concurrebat* (not a literal version) Sanctes Pagninus, preferably, *conveniebat.* Also 1 Cor. xiv. 23, "if therefore the whole Church be come together into one place:" *ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ τὸ αυτὸ. Si ergo conveniat universa ecclesia in unum.* "Convenire ad," in the sense of *agreeing with* would be bad Latin; although the present Pope seems to have no scruple in so interpreting it.*

In the next place, if Irenæus had meant that every Church must agree with the Church at Rome, why was he not content to leave so very plain a proposition in its simple form? Wherefore add in explanation of it "that is to say, believers who come from all quarters." If he had reference only to *conformity of belief,* surely they who remained at home were as much concerned to maintain that, as they who travelled abroad. He evidently contemplates believers who *came* to Rome from all parts. This use of the word *sum* to signify *coming* or *proceeding* is very common with this writer. To go no farther back than the previous chapter, (ii.); he speaks of the tradition, "quæ *est* ab apostolis;" which *proceeds* or *comes* from the Apostles.

* *Epist. Encyc.* Pii. D. P. Papæ ix. *Ad omnes Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos et Episcopos,* § iii. Atque hinc plane apparet, &c.; and this opportunity may be taken of observing that in the recent Rescript from the Soc. de Prop. Fide, (11th Oct., 1848), condemning the Irish Colleges, signed by Cardinal Fransonius, the expression "unitas sacerdotalis" is interpreted *unity among bishops,* and not *the sole occupation of each See by its own Bishop:* which, with submission to his Eminence, is the true sense.

Again, the employment of the word *undique* is in favour of our interpretation, for if it had been intended to speak of believers *in* all places, and not *from* all places, (the distinction between whom, in its bearing upon this question is very manifest), the word *ubique*, (i. e. πανταχῇ *not* πανταχόθεν) would doubtless have been used, in agreement with the uniform practice of Irenæus* and his Latin translator. (Compare *Adv. Hœrr.* iii. c. 11, p. 221, 6. Ed. Grabe.; i. c. 15, p. 84, 32; iii. c. 19, p. 246, 9; v. c. 36, p. 461, 5.) Gregory Nazianzen makes a precisely similar observation on the constant afflux of strangers to Constantinople, drawn thither from all parts of the world. "A city," he termed it, "which is the eye of the world; most powerful by sea and land; as it were the connecting tie of agreement between east and west; to which one point repair all those most important matters from every quarter, (πανταχόθεν) and whence they take their rise, as from a common storehouse of the faith." (Orat. xxxii.) And can a plainer comment or interpretation be desired of the words of Irenæus than is furnished by the Ninth Canon of the (heretical) Council of Antioch, A. D. 340. "The bishops of every province ought to be aware that the bishop who presides in the metropolis ought to take thought for the whole province, because all persons assemble there from all quarters (πανταχόθεν) who have any business to transact." (Concil. tom. ii. p. 644.)

With respect to this very term *convenire* it seems to have been forgotten that it bespeaks not obscurely a reference to the established constitution of the empire, under which each province was divided into districts technically called *conventus*. Each of these had its chief town where all who had public business to transact were required, and those who had private affairs to settle were accustomed, to assemble from time to time. Pliny speaks of Bætica as having four such places of general resort, (lib. iii. cap. 1,) and Cicero refers to towns of Sicily in which the prætors were accustomed to halt and hold their *conventus:* whereat the magistrates and others were bound to assemble. (In Verr. vii. c. 11.) Therefore the Roman empire being regarded as one great province, the metropolis of the world would be, and we know it was, the place of universal resort for the discharge of duty and the transaction of business: and Irenæus expresses the consequence of this very naturally in saying that every Church must unavoidably keep up a communication with the Church at Rome, because in the course of events some of its members, "believers from all places," must continually be brought into active communion with it, in consequence of the superior jurisdiction not of the Church, but of the city in which it had its seat. No one can dispute that this jurisdiction did belong to the imperial tribunals; or that the words *potentior principalitas* do accurately describe the temporal greatness of Rome they ascribe to the city a prerogative which *we know* belonged to it. But this will not suffice for some persons. They must have it that the expression

*And the practice, it may be added, of the best Latin writers; e. g. Cæsar B. Gal. ad eos defendendos *undique convenirent* (lib. iii. c. 10.) *undique* ex finitimis regionibus jubet *convenire*.

"superior jurisdiction" applies to the *Church* at Rome: and that, in deference to its authority, every other Church upon earth must necessarily *agree* with it. To this interpretation one very serious objection presents itself. There is no word in the original Latin answering to the English *its*. "On account of *its* superior jurisdiction," they would willingly render the words: but unhappily there is no word corresponding with "its." This is a mere interpolation to serve a purpose. The original of *propter potentiorem principalitatem* would probably be *διὰ τὴν κυριωτέραν ἐξουσίαν*, or some equivalent form of words: and if there had been in the original Greek any word equivalent to *ejus*, the translator, it can hardly be questioned, would not have failed to denote it in the Latin. Socrates speaks of "the Bishop of the royal city," and the Popes themselves have always been sufficiently proud of the connexion. But if "potentiorem principalitatem" *be* the rendering of *κυριωτέραν ἐξουσίαν*, and this were indeed the style and title of the See of Rome in the age of Irenæus, how remarkable an instance would it furnish of forgetfulness and disregard of that prohibition in which the words *κυριέυουσι* and *ἐξουσιάζοντες* stand forth conspicuously as embodying the spirit against which Christ would express displeasure! (Luke, xxii. 25.) This is the appropriate description of a civil, not of an ecclesiastical power. "It shall not be so with you." There can be no doubt of the truth of Bishop Overall's observation; "the Patriarch or Bishop of Rome had the first place among the rest of the Patriarchs, because Rome was then the chiefest city in the world, and the seat of empire:" (Convoc. Book. iii. c. 2, p. 315) and "it was long since said by a good friend of that See, (Gabr. Biel Expos. Can. Miss. Lect. 23) 'the excellency of the Roman *empire* did lift up the papacy above other Churches.'" (p. 315.)

But let us examine the reasoning of Irenæus. He takes a ground, or makes an admission perfectly irreconcilable with the ascription of this supreme jurisdiction to the chair of St. Peter at Rome. Suppose his meaning to have been that the apostolical tradition had been lodged in the Church at Rome; and thence disseminated to all Churches, which on account of this œcumenical authority must be in agreement with her. Suppose, I say, this to have been the meaning of Irenæus, can we believe he would from such premises have gone on to say, we single out the tradition preserved at Rome, because it would require a great expenditure of time and labour to apply to all the other apostolical Sees! If he had urged any reason for directing an appeal to Rome, it could have been no other than that, acknowledging her supremacy, he must condemn as a violation of God's appointment an appeal to any other Church. What does he make "its more powerful principality" amount to, when he not only infers, but, I think most plainly says, that if any one seeking the true apostolical tradition should not grudge such an expenditure of time, he might discover that tradition as surely and infallibly in other Churches as at Rome itself? This is what he does say. Alas! then, that any, bearing the grave character of a Pope, should be content to rest his title upon bad Latin and feeble reasoning!

And yet the present Pontiff unquestionably does so, if he quote the words of Irenæus in the sense of "every Church must of necessity *agree with* this Church." If it had even been the *intention* of Irenæus to say this, it would have been, on his part, assertion without proof. It is necessary therefore to examine more closely what he really does say.

He proceeds not upon a mere *ipse dixit*, but upon a statement of *facts*, the truth of which was self-evident, which everybody *knew* to be true.

He says that the city of Rome had a superior jurisdiction, or was the metropolis of the world.

He says that, in consequence of this, there must be a constant communication kept up by all Churches with the Church at Rome; because the members of *all* other Churches (fideles qui sunt undique) must necessarily be constantly resorting to Rome, of which necessity the superior jurisdiction of the city afforded a very reasonable explanation. Motives of duty or business must bring multitudes from all quarters incessantly to the capital.

He implies with evident reason, that if the Apostles had left any such peculiar tradition as the heretics valued themselves on possessing, it must have been found in some one or more of the Churches founded by them; and as all these Churches, by the intercourse of their members, met together at Rome, such tradition, if it existed anywhere, must necessarily have been known at Rome. But it had not been heard of at Rome; therefore it did not anywhere exist.

He says that the tradition which proceeded from the Apostles had been preserved *in* the Church at Rome: *not* by the Church itself, but "by those who came thither from all surrounding places."

What the meaning of this may be I know not very well. Grabe says, it means that "if the Church at Rome had begun to deviate from the faith, the bishops and legates of other Churches would not immediately have shared in her error, but would have admonished the offending Church, and if that failed of producing reformation, would have broken off from communion with it."

This *may* have been the meaning; but to me I confess it appears strained, and conveys no satisfactory explanation. Neither, we must suppose, can it be very acceptable to those who hold that the Church at Rome is by a divine prerogative exempted from all possibility of error. In the meantime its adherents make no attempt to untie the knot. The present Pope quotes the words, but he offers no solution, or hint at solution, of the doubtful point; how it was that tradition and faith was *preserved* in the Church at Rome, not by the Church itself, but "by the faithful who come from all surrounding parts." As a resource I once offered a conjecture that the true reading might be *coacervata* not *conservata*; and the meaning would then be that the members of every Church brought to Rome the tradition of their own Church; insomuch that the traditions of all Churches would there be collected together as into a common receptacle, emporium, or store-house, as Greg. Naz. speaks of Constantinople. If, therefore, the tradition of which the

heretics made so much account had ever been delivered by the Apostles anywhere, it *must* have been known at Rome. But it was never heard of there, and therefore never heard of in any Church of apostolical origin: which was equivalent to shewing that it never existed. Irenæus therefore was quite justified in saying "we confound all heretics by referring them to the tradition of the single Church of Rome;" because from the imperial jurisdiction of the city requiring persons from all parts of the world to attend there, the single testimony of this city was equivalent to the testimony of all. This was the point which Irenæus undertook to prove; and he does prove it by this very sound course of reasoning. But as to the superior *authority* of the Church at Rome, if it is to be gathered from his testimony, the cause must be quite despaired of. In concluding what I have to say upon this point, let me remark that if the original word employed by Irenæus were *συνεσωρεύθη*, the accidental omission of a syllable by some copyist, may have converted it into *συνεσώθη*, as easily as *coacervata* might be altered into *conservata*.

It is greatly to be desired that a history of the rise of the papacy should be written, derived entirely from the original records; minutely investigating the condition of the Church towards the close of the third century, and during the period immediately succeeding. Such a narrative, if impartially composed, could not fail to confute either of the hypotheses upon which the pretensions of the Romish See are rested; that is to say upon a supposed *uninterrupted* succession from the Apostle Peter; or upon the opposite theory which describes the papacy as *awakening* at a much later period. The truth of the assertion that it did *so* awake, would be made too apparent by such a history as I am here suggesting. It would, moreover, be shewn that the papal dominion was first submitted to from an apprehension that the regimen under which the Church had heretofore subsisted would be found too feeble to oppose the progress of the Arian faction; and that the dreaded catastrophe could be prevented only by the establishment of a form of government corresponding more nearly with that under which the empire of the world was then administered. The fear of anarchy reconciled men's minds to despotism; or dissent was the true parent of popery. In justice to our own cause we require a history having for its scope to establish this; for, as is justly observed by a periodical writer of the present age, (Foreign Rev. No. vii.), "no error is fully confuted till we have shewn not only that it is an error, but how it became one." I have made no account, it will be seen, of any testimonies subsequent to the age of Pope Julius, (A. D. 340). These are of too late a date to be received as proofs. The new system had by that time acquired a secure footing in the world, under the patronage of the Western emperors, and was finally consolidated through the good management, and unconquerable firmness of Ambrose, the politic prelate of Milan. All the leading Churches, with few exceptions, having been led, under the influence of their apprehension of Arianism, to abandon the primitive episcopal constitution of the Church, and to submit to the usurpation of one See, whose connexion with worldly greatness, it was

thought, would place them all in a more hopeful position of defence, it was but to be expected that the language of Churchmen should from this time be more and more conformed to the new circumstances under which they had placed themselves. Henceforth it was necessary that not a scrap of evidence which could be turned to account in recommending the new principle should be thrown away unimproved. Every occurrence of former times, which could possibly be bent into a conformity with the now acknowledged theory, was eagerly seized upon; and the theology of their predecessors, which up to this time had been chiefly scriptural, began to be read with the accompaniment of a *gloss;* or under the influence of a prepossession, which turned every thing into the sense most favorable to Rome. They were great men, truly great in intellect, and not inferior in piety and honesty of purpose, who exhibited this spirit. The sin which they had fallen into, was that of mistrusting the sufficiency of the rule under which the Almighty had constituted the Church; and they, like Israel of old, had insisted on having a king to reign over them. What wonder then that they were led "to believe a lie;" or to adopt the persuasion that such had been the originally appointed system of the Church? Another circumstance must not be overlooked: that all those corruptions of Christian doctrine, against which (as being unscriptural) the efforts of our Anglican Reformation were directed, have been subsequent to, and also consequent upon, the establishment of the Roman papacy. Its doctrine of purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as of reliques, and also the invocation of saints, the supposed sacrifice of the mass, compulsory and auricular confession, the sacrament of penance, the merit of celibacy and monastic vows, and many other fond things vainly invented, and grounded upon no certain warranty of Scripture, began *from this time* to arise into notice, and to claim adoption. These abuses, which one by one gained footing in the Church, are all posterior in date to the establishment of the papal supremacy, and may be traced to it as their proper source:—

> Hoc fonte derivata, clades
> In patriam populum que fluxit.

It would be out of place here to enter into all these controverted questions; but what I have said will be illustrated and confirmed by a brief reference to one doctrine—that of purgatory; to which Mr. Newman assigns much prominence. He heaps together the names of Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Perpetua, Cyprian, Origen, Lactantius, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianz. and Nyssen, Chrysostom, Jerome, Paulinus, and Augustine, as affording evidence that "the notion of suffering, or trial, or punishment, after this life, in the case of the faithful departed, or other vague forms of the doctrine of purgatory, has almost a *consensus* in its favour of the four first ages of the Church." (Introd. p. 17. Essay p. 414, sqq.) I would enquire, first, why this should be spoken of as the testimony of "the

first four ages;" when the earliest of these witnesses did not live till towards the last years of the second century: thus leaving a blank in the evidence during the exact interval when its production would have been most to the purpose? Again let me ask, what is the meaning of Mr. Newman's expression "*the* doctrine of purgatory?" Would he have it inferred that the doctrine (whatever it may be) which vaguely displays itself in the writings he has referred to, has any actual correspondency with "the *Romish* doctrine" on the subject? Excepting in the dream of the holy Perpetua, the reality of which I am not disposed to question, but only her interpretation of its meaning, there is scarcely a word or a syllable in all these writings declaratory of the theory which has prevailed since the sixth century. For example, why is Origen named by Mr. Newman as contributing to this boasted *consensus*, of which his opinions were purely destructive? Was he not condemned, and justly, as a heretic for holding that hell was no more than purgatory; and that even the most evil-minded and impure, after a definite period of suffering, would be released and admitted to the enjoyment of eternal glory? Nor is there any nearer approach to unanimity in the persuasion which was much more generally accepted in the primitive Church, that in the day of judgment the whole human race shall be involved in the general conflagration which attends the coming of the Lord; from which the just shall be released when they have cast off what Gregory Nyssenus terms "the propension of matter"; but in which the wicked shall remain for ever. There is nothing in either of these persuasions which can naturally or justly be developed into "*the* doctrine of purgatory" contemplated by Mr. Newman, according to which the souls of the faithful detained from their rest may be helped by the prayers of survivors, and above all by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar. The prayers for the dead which were offered in the primitive Church had respect only to the latter of the persuasions above-mentioned; that is the trial of the saints, in the day of judgment, by a fire which, Archbishop Ussher observes, if it be that alluded to by St. Paul (1 Cor. iii. 13) is "a probatory not a purgatory fire." (Ans. to Jesuit, p. 186.) The words of the fathers, as the same acute writer justly remarks, "belong to that praying for the dead only, which in ancient times had no relation to purgatory," but meant no more than our own prayers beseeching the Lord to "deliver us in the day of judgment;" and to grant that they who depart in Him "may have their perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul." What is there, then, in these views which could naturally or fairly be developed into "the Romish doctrine of purgatory," from which they are so alien that the one being allowed to stand the other must needs fall? The very suspicious part of the case is, that (unless indeed Perpetua correctly interpreted her vision) we find not the most remote suggestion of a purgatory out of which the sufferers might be released by intercessions and sacrifices offered for them upon earth, until after the establishment of the papal principle in the time of Julius. Then indeed this great instrument of sacerdotal

ascendancy began to rise into esteem, when it was found desirable by all practicable means to confirm the supremacy which had at last been recognized. I will extend the observation to all those other doctrines, in the instance of which the Church of England charges the Church of Rome with having overlaid and corrupted the primitive faith. These, it is impossible to doubt, are the genuine fruits of the supremacy and imputed infallibility of the Church of Rome; because when its sanction of any doctrine was once obtained, there was no longer that becoming freedom of discussion allowed which might enable other Churches to enquire for themselves whether such doctrines were contained in Scripture, or authorized by the voice of genuine antiquity concurring with Scripture. The developement of one false conclusion led to many others. Thus at the present time, the course of reasoning ought rather to be that these doctrines cannot be any other than corruptions of the Christian faith, seeing that they have no foundation in Scripture, reason, or antiquity, and that therefore the Romish authority from which they receive sanction, must itself be, of necessity, a similar corruption. Yet men hasten eagerly to the opposite conclusion, persuading themselves first of all that the papal supremacy is of divine appointment, and following up this by the further consequence that whatsoever doctrines have its sanction must be accepted as articles of faith under pain of everlasting exclusion from the presence of God. Many of those unhappy souls, we know, who have separated themselves from the embraces of their spiritual mother, with the milk of whose pure doctrines they were nourished from their youth up, are at this moment gasping with apprehension and anxiety as to the true foundation of the persuasions to which they have yielded acknowledgment with their lips while their hearts and understanding are far from them. In the true and lawful sense they do not hold the faith. It is *mere* submission to an authority which they have created for themselves to be directed by. Not that they believe from the heart, but that they dare not express their *dis*belief of any dogma of the Romish Creed, so long as they are tied by that inextricable knot of Papal Supremacy. May God have mercy. Their's is a pitiable case, which may, and I have no doubt does, make angels weep. Let me observe, then, by way of caution, that the *only* security we possess against the universal establishment of the doctrines I have now been speaking of, resides in a rejection of the Papal Claims. Purgatory, pardons, the sacrifice of the Mass, the deification of the Virgin and the saints, and all the rest, would prevail as acknowledged portions of Christian belief and worship wherever those claims were admitted; and therefore, I say again, there is no security against an entire corruption of the Church except in a resolute and inflexible denial of the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. We may judge from this what a degree of wisdom there was in the divine plan of Church-government vested in a number of co-ordinate diocesan bishops, having each an equal voice in all decisions upon Articles of faith; and we may no less manifestly see how great an evil has

attended the substitution of a different system humanly devised; according to which no doctrine may be held or taught in opposition to the determination of one single See; no doctrine supported by that See may be questioned or disowned, even though the voice of the universal Church beside, should demand its reformation.

Sydney, 4th March, 1849.

Kemp and Fairfax, Printers, Sydney.

ERRATUM.

Page 31, line 29, *for* permanent, strong, *read* permanent. Strong