

these enormities these men (his sect called Callistians) are lost to all sense of shame, and presume to call themselves a Catholic Church."

In this narrative we recognize one or two important things, namely:—

1. That there was a Presbytery at this time in Rome for the government of the Church, of which the ministers or Bishops of the surrounding churches were members.

2. That a Bishop was not an overseer of Churches, but of a flock. Hippolytus was Bishop at the harbour of Rome, and at the same time member of the governing Presbytery of Rome.

3. Whatever progress Episcopacy may, up to this time, have made in the Church, it is evident that Prelacy was still unknown—that even the Bishop or Pope of Rome, was not supreme within his own diocese, much less in the Christian Church beyond it.

4. That the original Presbyterian polity still, in all its essential features, remained intact. The teaching elders were called Bishops; the ruling elders Presbyters; and the Deacon's office was to attend to the wants of the poor.

Such is the historical and ecclesiastical value of this resuscitated and uncorrupted ancient document. It bears all the marks of genuineness. The political and social events which it notes are corroborated by contemporary histories, and the ecclesiastical events are such as the writer himself was personally concerned in, and bear all the marks of veracity.

As regards the whole system of the Papacy, this work is as if one rose from the grave to give solemn testimony against its flagrant departures, not only from divine truth, but from the teaching of the third century. We find nothing in this treatise concerning prayers for the dead; the adoration of saints or the Virgin Mary; purgatory; the sacrifice of the mass, or the power of the priests to forgive sins.

This treatise is, besides, valuable as a statement of the Church doctrine of the time. At the end of the tenth book there is "a discourse concerning the truth, that the reader recognising the power of truth may be saved by worthily believing in God." This is simply a confession of Faith, in which the chief doctrines of the Gospel are briefly stated. It begins with these words—"O Greeks, Egyptians, Chaldeans, and every race of men! learn ye what the Deity is, and what is his well-ordered creation from us who are the friends of God." Then follow statements concerning God and Christ; the creation and fall of man; the revealed will of God; concluding as follows:—"By this knowledge you will escape the coming curse of the fiery judgment and the dark and lightless eye of Tartarus. Christ is he whom the God over all has ordered to wash away the sins of mankind, renewing the old man."

C. Bunsen has taken exception to this confession as wanting the article about the Holy Ghost, and attempts besides to make it appear as if the personality of the Spirit was no part of the christian faith of those days. It is certainly not easy to account for the omission of this article from the confession of Hippolytus. But when we consider—1st, that this treatise is but a mutilated fragment; 2nd, that the errors against which he is writing do not pertain to the personality of the Holy Spirit; 3rd, that in another treatise, which Bunsen himself acknowledges to be an undoubted work of Hippolytus, we have most clear statements on this very doctrine. Considering these things, it does seem strange that such an idea should have entered the mind of so accurate a critic as Bunsen. What, for example, could be more pointed than this: "We beheld the Word incarnate in Christ; we comprehended the Father by Him; we believe the Son; *We worship the Holy Spirit.*" Again: "I will not say two Gods, but one, and two persons and a third dispensation, the grace of the Holy Spirit. For the Father is indeed one, but two persons, because there is the Son; and the *third* the