

At this period—the commencement of the third century—and for hundreds of years after, there was no character who bore the name of “Pope.” There were bishops of Rome like bishops in other places. Next mistake,—Tertullian never, in any way, belonged to the Church of Rome, and it had no power over him. At first he was connected with a church in Africa, and *voluntarily* left it, chiefly because he thought it was not sufficiently severe in its discipline, and that its members were not strict enough in self-denial and general conduct. He joined the Montanists, an heretical sect, but after a short time left them. His departure from the African Church was not through excommunication. It was voluntary secession.

The next passage of the lecture, for remark, is truly of a most extraordinary nature, as proceeding from a learned man, skilled, as it must be presumed the Archbishop is, as to literary and logical productions. It is in the following words:—

“That the church was the infallible guide of faith then, as she claims to be now, since she required submission to her decrees.”

Now it may be concluded, that the Archbishop has been well instructed in logic; for skill in which art and accomplishment, the dignitaries, and other leading persons in his Church, are particularly distinguished,—most especially those called Jesuits. But manifestly, he is here, altogether at fault in his conclusion, that his Church has been, and is now, “the infallible guide of Faith,” since (or because) she required submission to her decrees.” By the same kind of logic, it must certainly be concluded, that the prophets of Baal, in the time of the prophet Elijah; Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, who set up the golden image, for worship; the founders of Hinduism; the heads and leaders of the system of Chinese idolatries; and also, of Mahometanism, which by its sword and devastations, required submission and acceptance, were all *infallible guides of faith*; for they all required *submission* to their doctrines and decrees. Certainly the learned Archbishop has, in this instance, committed such a blunder as to logic, as gives ground to infer the *weakness*, or *nullity*, of the whole of his arguments.

One of the concluding passages of the lecture, and the last