

among the Anglo-Saxons, and constituted him the first Archbishop of Canterbury, committing all the British Bishops to his government, and dividing the country into new Dioceses, so that he is justly regarded as the Founder of the Church of England in Catholic times. He thought, however, that the title of "Universal Bishop" appeared to savour of pride, and to interfere with the ordinary jurisdiction of Bishops, though, at the same time, he asserts that every Bishop is subject to the Apostolic See*; and thus he explains his own meaning, when he says that "the care of the whole Church was committed to Peter, and yet he is not styled the Universal Apostle".† It is perfectly clear, then, that while the expression admits of different senses, it was virtually admitted by this Pope in its usual signification, and thus there is not the slightest real foundation for this objection, which you regard as the strongest that can be brought in opposition to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. I need not dwell upon your remark as to the "precise seat of the infallible power", as all Catholics are fully agreed that its *source* is the perpetual teaching of the Holy Ghost in the Church, according to the promises of Christ, and its *channel* is the voice of Peter and his successors in the See of Rome, whether acting with, or without, the assistance of a General Council.

Still, however, you consider the modern Church of England as approximating most nearly to the standard of the primitive Church, and challenge us to "name one ancient Creed of the three first Centuries, which contains the doctrines now set forth by us as necessary to salvation." Now, my Lord, you are surely fully aware,

* S. Gregorii M. Opp. Tom. II. pp. 941, 976. (Ed. Ben.)

† Ibid. Tom. II. p. 743.