

with my learned father, who seemed to think it of trifling import, and sought to discourage an inquiry from which he evidently anticipated no good result. He requested me, however, to read Barrow on the Supremacy; and as my disposition always led me to examine both sides of a question, I willingly accepted his advice. The tone of Barrow seemed to me to resemble that of a lawyer who had grave doubts about the merits of his case. St. Peter had manifestly *some pre-eminence*, he thought, in the apostolic college, but it was only that of "a ringleader in a dance." Considering that his pre-eminence, whatever it was, must have emanated from God's appointment, the comparison did not seem to me felicitous. If the Apostles had been dancing dervishes it would have been unexceptionable. On the whole, the book produced upon me an impression extremely unfavourable, not to the Supremacy, but to Dr. Barrow.

I conversed on the same subject with many of my clerical friends. Their views, which in this case were identical, may, perhaps, be succinctly represented in the following series of propositions:

1. If Simon received, like Abraham, a mysterious call, it was full of significance, they thought, in the case of the Patriarch, but wholly without meaning in that of the Apostle.

2. If the Most High, who probably acts with design, gave to each of them a *new name*, in the one it signified the introduction of a new dispensation, but in the other, nothing at all.

3. If Abraham was called "father of the faithful," it was because he was really destined to be so; if Simon was called "the rock," he might as well have been called anything else.

4. If his Master added "Upon *this* rock I will build my Church," there was no allusion to the singular name which He had just given him, but only to his profession of faith; so that every believer is just as much a rock as he was, without the perfectly needless process of changing his name.

5. If a whole series of magnificent prerogatives were conferred upon him as soon as his Creator had named him "the rock," an eternal supremacy against "which the gates of hell shall not prevail;" a benediction which the Seraphim might envy; the power to open and shut heaven; a power almost without limit, like to the power of God;—all this was only a cumbersome way of saying that his faith was much to be commended.

6. If he was always named *before* the other apostles, "the first, Simon, who is called Peter"—in a book which purports to be inspired, this is only the result of an accident.

7. If to him alone it was said, "To *THEE* I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," it probably means something, but not what all Christians supposed it to mean for more than a thousand years.

8. If he was told to work a miracle, in order to satisfy the demand of a tax-gatherer, and when he had obtained money by such unusual means, to "give it for *Me and thee*," no peculiar connection with his Master, much less any supremacy in the Church, can be reasonably inferred from so slight an incident.

9. If St. Paul is careful to record that he "went up to Jerusalem to see Peter," while he adds, "other of the apostles saw I none," it is idle to suppose that he had any special motive in doing so, or that Peter had any special claim to be visited.

10. If the same apostle relates of the risen Saviour, that "He was seen by *Cephas*," and after that by the eleven, perhaps this was because Peter chanced to be in the neighbourhood, or it may be only another of the innumerable passages of Holy Scripture which mean nothing in particular.

11. If even the angel contributing to the general delusion said to those who found him sitting in the sepulchre, "Go tell His disciples *and Peter*;" this also was no recognition of his personal dignity, but, like all the corresponding texts, a purely accidental form of words.

12. If St. John relates that although he "outran Peter and came first to the sepulchre, yet he went not in," in spite of his ardent love, but waited till Peter had preceded him, this was not out of respect for Peter's office, nor was there any more significance in the act itself than in his care to record it in the Gospel.

13. If to Peter *alone* was committed by the Master, now triumphant over death and the grave, the superhuman task "feed my sheep, feed my lambs;" this again does not distinguish him in any way from the other apostles, to whom nothing of the kind was ever said, nor from the rest of man-

kind, who are perfectly competent to feed themselves, without any assistance from Peter.

14. If he was the sole child of Adam to whom the Holy One ever addressed the amazing assurance "I have prayed for *THEE* that *THY* faith fail not," and this because it would be henceforth his incommunicable function to confirm his brethren, this does not imply that the solidity of his faith was in any way connected with the majesty of his office, or needful to the integrity of Christian doctrine; and though human lips would not have uttered such words without at least a grave purpose, divine lips could employ them without any purpose whatever.

15. If, when Peter was imprisoned by Herod, "prayer was made without ceasing by the church unto God for him," though no such universal supplication was offered for any other apostle, not even for St. Paul in all his bonds and scourgings, it does not follow that the liberty of her chief was necessary to the infant church, nor that "the Lord sent His angel" to release him from prison for that reason.

16. Lastly, if two hundred and fifty Roman Pontiffs, surviving, by a perpetual miracle, all human dynasties, and every vicissitude to which human affairs are inevitably subject, baffling all the assaults of men and "the gates of hell," have claimed during nineteen centuries to succeed him in office, and Christians have always believed that they did so by most evident warrant of Holy Writ, this only proves, on the one hand, that the long line of Pontiffs, for the most part men of singular virtue, profanely usurped an authority which God never intended to confer upon them; and on the other, that all the friends of God—saints, doctors, prelates, martyrs, virgins and confessors—basely connived, without any imaginable motive, at the audacious usurpation, misconceived every luminous text of Scripture on which it was confidently, but ignorantly founded, and meanly bowed down before a self-elected ruler, generally a feeble and helpless old man, who had no power whatever to coerce their submission, except what their own free convictions gave him.

Such were the opinions of my clerical friends. If they were true, it seemed to me transparently evident that Christianity was false. If they were true, the New Testament requires to be written again, with omissions and expurgations adapting it to Anglican views. The history of the Christian Church on the same supposition is only a tissue of fables and crimes, and the annals of all Christian prelates and people a record of impudent usurpations on the one side, and still more shameless betrayals on the other. Such is the inevitable conclusion from the Anglican hypothesis. In order to prove itself a Church, the National Establishment is obliged to prove first that there never was one. Holy Scripture records, with less than its usual mystery, and more than its usual emphasis, the appointment of a *Supreme Ecclesiastical Ruler*—Vicar of God, Immoveable Rock, Pastor of Sheep and Lambs, Joint Governor with Christ, Sole Janitor of Heaven, Confirmer of his Brethren, Infallible Witness of Truth. Ecclesiastical history displays him, from that hour to this, in the tranquil exercise of his office! And now I was asked to believe, by my clerical friends, that the one had no purpose in what it said, the other no authority for what it did. My powers of belief were unequal to this extreme effort. When I considered further, that the new Church, in whose interests a theory so impious and subversive had been gaily invented, is itself a thing of yesterday, begotten in lust, and cradled in sacrilege, shamefully notorious for extreme divergencies of doctrine, and, having no other credentials than it could derive from the obscene Henry and the buffoon Barlow, I was more than ever convinced that St. Peter would have called such a Church "a sect of perdition."—From My Clerical Friends.

CANADIAN CHURCH NEWS.

Archbishop Duhamel, of Ottawa, left for Rigaud, to attend the ordination services at College Bourget on Wednesday, accompanied by Father Champagné, of Gatineau Point.

The authorities of Notre Dame Church, Montreal, announce that Mgr. Gravel left Havre for Canada on Saturday, with Mgr. Soule, of Paris, to preach a series of Lenten sermons in the church of Notre Dame, Mgr. Soule