

Christian Church has no reigning queen on earth to lord it over her. As Paul says, on another occasion, Jerusalem is the mother of us all.

If the gentleman will admit Luke to be a faithful historian, he must not only place the Hebrew church first, but the Samaritan, Phenician, Syrian, and Hellenist churches as older than the church in Rome. I say, if we speak of churches as respects antiquity, the Hebrew, Samaritan, Syrian, and Phenician churches must be regarded as prior to her. The Acts of the Apostles close with Paul's first appearance in Rome.

But that the Roman Catholic institution may stand before you in bold relief, as a sectarian establishment, I will give you a definition of her pretensions from an authentic source, one of her own standards. The *Doway Catechism*, in answer to the question, "What are the essential parts of the church?" teaches, "a Pope, a supreme head, bishops, pastors, and laity." (Page 20.)

These, then, are the four constituent and essential elements of the Roman Catholic Church. The first is the Pope or head. It will be confessed by all that of these, the most essential is the head. But should we take away one of these she loses her identity, and ceases to be what she assumes.

My first effort, then, shall be to prove, that for hundreds of years after Christ, she was without such a head, the most indispensable of these elements, and, consequently, this being essential to her existence, she was not from the beginning. Because no body can exist before its head. Now, if we can find a time when there was no Pope or supreme head, we find a time when there was no Roman Catholic party. By referring to the Scriptures, and to the early ecclesiastical records, we can easily settle this point.

Let us begin with the New Testament, which all agree is the only divinely authenticated standard of faith and manners, the only inspired record of the Christian doctrine. This is a cardinal point, and I am thankful that in this we all agree—What is not found there, wants the evident sanction of inspiration, and can never command the respect and homage of those who seek for Divine authority in faith and morality. I affirm, then, that not one of the offices I have enumerated as belonging to the Roman Catholic Church were known in the days of the apostles, or are found in the New Testament. On the contrary, the very notion of a Vicar of Christ, of a Prince of the Apostles, of a universal head and government in the Christian Church, is repugnant to the genius and spirit of the religion.

We shall read a few passages of Scripture from the Catholic version, to prove that the very idea of an earthly head is unscriptural and anti-scriptural. Matt. xx. 25. (See the passage.)

Does this convey the idea of a Prince of the Apostles, a Vicar of Christ, a lord over the people of God? Does it not rather say, there shall not be any lordship amongst you? His command is express, that there shall not be a Pope, a supreme Lord of the Chris-