

ever, to the contrary. In Acts vi., not Peter, but the Twelve called together the multitude of disciples; in Acts x., 47, instead of performing his work as head, he asks permission from the inferior attendants who were present; in Acts xv., he has the first word, but James gives the judgment which the Apostles and elders, together with the whole Church, sanction by the Holy Ghost, in II. Peter i., 16; iii., 2, he speaks by *we* with the other Apostles; in I Pet. v., 1, he is only a fellow-elder; in Gal. ii., he receives a rebuke from the reformer Paul. What does the Rev. gentleman think of this? He knows that no man dares rebuke the Pope though wicked as a fiend, nor say to him, "What doest thou." Must I go still further to show how the Papists with their Peter are completely overthrown, if they would only read the Bible, and let it be read. Our Lord, looking forward to the homage that would be paid to His Mother, uttered a sharp prophetic rebuke against it, and also against the false father on earth over the equal brethren (Matt. xxiii., 8, 9); and afterwards Peter himself is called to testify in the Scriptures against almost all the principal parts of the Papacy. He lifts up his voice against lordship over the Church, I. Pet. v., 3, 4; against a separate priesthood, chap. ii., 5, 9; against assumption over the civil magistrate, vers. 13, 17; against silver and gold and shameful gain,—Acts iii., 6, I. Pet. v., 2; against unbecoming marks of honor and slipper-kissing,—Acts x., 25, 26; against infallibility, ver. 34; against celibacy,—I. Cor. ix., 5; against all righteousness by works, in harmony with Paul,—Acts xv., 10, 11; I. Pet. i., 13, &c. From the above it will be seen that if Peter were alive at this hour, the Church of Rome could not find a more determined enemy than she would find in her favorite Apostle. The Rev. gentleman goes on to say that, "Christ Himself prayed that Satan might not have Peter, Christ Himself prayed and the prayer must have been efficacious, that Peter's faith fail not," &c. How does it come, that after this efficacious prayer had been offered, Peter's faith failed him so far that he denied his Lord three times? Was Peter infallible? His shortcomings show that he was not, nay, they show that all the rest of the Apostles were nearer, if I may so speak, to infallibility than he was. If Peter was fallible, how can the Pope, his assumed successor, claim to be infallible? Further, I find no mention of the doctrine of infallibility till the XI. century, when it was claimed by Pope Hildebrand. Is the Pope the successor of Peter? If so, it is necessary to suppose that Peter was Bishop of Rome, but that he never was. But granting that he was Bishop of Rome, does not the Rev. gentleman know that whenever Peter entered upon the office of diocesan Bishop, he ceased to be an Apostle? As an Apostle he dared not remain permanently in one place. As a Bishop, he must. He could not be both an Apostle and a Bishop. The two officers were incompatible. Which then was he? Viewing him as the Bishop of the Church at Rome, what was the nature of his office? Did he claim universal authority over his fellows? Did he sit upon his chair, and like Pío Nono, welcome princes and pilgrims to bow before him and kiss his sandals? How absurd! His duties were to feed and oversee the flock; to preach the gospel, and to direct men to Christ for salvation. How does a lifetime of preaching, and teaching, amid persecutions and trials contrast itself with the princely life of the Pope! My Rev. opponent ought to know that there is a difference, wide as the poles, between the simple and laborious duties of the Bishops of the I., II., III., and IV centuries, and the power and the state of the Popes