

Church, because, if in addition to the inevitable trials of his life, the Missionary's already insufficient salary is to be muted at the whim and caprice of the Bishop, the difficulty of obtaining men will be materially increased. This is not a question of deserts. But even if it were such a question, I can fearlessly say I have done nothing to deserve such treatment from my Bishop. I therefore appeal to S. P. G., who have been such good friends to me, that they will bring such pressure upon the Bishop of Algoma as will compel him to do me justice. I am the only clergyman he has so treated. Will you kindly give my respects to Mr. Kempe, and accept the same yourself for the courtesy and kindness with which you treated me when in London. With respect, I remain your grateful servant

REV. MR. TUCKER, M. A., WILLIAM CROMPTON,  
Sec. S. P. G., Agent S. P. G.  
19 Delaney St.,  
London.

### CATHOLIC VERSUS ROMAN.

REV. JOHN LANGTRY, M.A., REPLIES TO ARCHBISHOP LYNCH.

On Sunday evening, November 8th, Rev. John Langtry, M.A., rector of St. Luke's Church, Toronto, delivered the fifth of a series of sermons in reply to a lecture delivered recently by Archbishop Lynch, on "The difference between the Catholic and the Protestant religions." The rev. gentleman selected as his text the 12th and 13th verses of the 48th Psalm: Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof.

Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following.

The rev. gentleman said:

In trying to follow out the duty here enjoined we have seen:

1. That the Catholic Church of the first days was a visible, organized society, which began at Jerusalem and extended itself in ever-widening circles, first into one land and then into another, till it filled all the world, and has reached down to us.
2. That for two hundred years we hear nothing of the superiority of one bishop over another.
3. Then out of the mere necessities of government, as difficulties and disputes arose, they were referred by a natural instinct to churches where one or other of the Apostles had lived and taught, and where it was felt that the apostolic interpretation and traditional usage would be best known.
4. Out of this there grew up the system of metropolitan sees, whose bishops presided at the Provincial Synods that were held in their see cities. No doubt, the rank and importance of the city politically, or as a centre of civilization, intelligence, and Christian activity, had its weight in determining these metropolitan sees.
5. Then, by an equally natural instinct, the bishops of the capitals of the three great continental divisions of the Empire, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, acquired a somewhat similar patriarchal jurisdiction over the metropolitans of the European, African and Asiatic sub-divisions of the one Church.
6. And among these the Bishop of Rome, the capital of the world, was conceded a primacy of honor and precedence. Two general councils solemnly assert that that precedence was based upon Rome's political importance, as the capital of the Empire; and they give no hint of any inherent right she had to that position by virtue of any Petrine claims.
7. The appeals that were naturally made by mutual consent from all parts of the west to the Bishop and Church of the Imperial City—which was also reputed to be the only apostolic see of the west—were soon transformed into the rights of an appellate jurisdiction over those churches.
8. This claim was based wholly for a long time on a canon of the local Council of Sardica, which gave the bishops of the Provinces represented permission to appeal, not to the bishops of Rome generally, but to a particular bishop of that city, Julius II. The canons of this local synod were, either by accident or design, bound up with the canons of the General Council of Nice; and the one referring to appeals to Pope Julius was again and again quoted, with necessary changes and interpolations, as a canon of the General Council of Nice, and as binding, therefore, upon the whole Church. This was the only ground upon which the Roman bishops for generations based their claim, not to infallibility, nor even to supremacy, but to the right to hear appeals from other Churches.
9. Then the assumed supremacy of St. Peter over the other Apostles was seized upon, and it was asserted that that supremacy descended from St. Peter to the bishops of Rome, though it is only a vague guess that

St. Peter was ever at Rome at all; and a vaguer one still that he was ever bishop of that city; while it is a wholly groundless assumption, without one particle of evidence of any kind to support it, that, even if St. Peter possessed the supremacy ascribed to him, he intended to transmit or did transmit that supremacy to the bishops of Rome, and not to the bishops of Antioch or some of the other Churches over which he presided for a longer or shorter period.

10. But as this claim was felt to be too vague and unreliable to support the ambitious projects which the bishops of Rome began to entertain, first of extending their patriarchal jurisdiction, and then of establishing their sovereignty over the whole Church, interpolations and forgeries of the most subversive and wholesale character were resorted to now to meet every emergency.

I had intended, as I announced last Sunday, to pass from a hurried consideration of some of the effects of this evil work, to a brief review of some of the points in which the Roman Church differs from the Catholic Church in doctrine. But, in thinking the matter over, I have felt that in order to present to you a connected view of the progress of events, I ought to point out as well as I can, in the brief space allowed me in this lecture, the way in which the Papal claims that grew out of these earliest forgeries were obtruded upon one after another of the nations of Europe and won their way to general acceptance.

Nicholas I. was Pope when the forged decretals of Isidore first came to general knowledge. He surpassed all his predecessors in the audacity of his designs. He was greatly favoured by the confusion and ignorance which prevailed during the seventy years of anarchy which followed the break up of the empire of Charlemagne. Nicholas grasped at the new weapon with eagerness, and silenced the doubts expressed by the Frankish bishops, with the assurance that all these forged documents had long been preserved with honor in the Roman archives; and as the object of these forgeries was to represent the Roman bishop as ruler and judge and teacher of all churches, Nicholas set himself to inculcate and enforce the principles which they laid down. For two hundred years after his time, however, the Roman see was not in a position to enforce these claims. They were allowed, however, to germinate and spread. They became embodied in the laws and theology and popular belief of the nascent nations. In the meantime, the Papacy became the prey and plaything of rival factions of nobles, and for a long time of ambitious and profligate women. The Tuscan Counts made it hereditary in their family; again and again, dissolute boys like John XII. and Benedict IX. occupied and disgraced the Papal throne, which was now bought and sold like a piece of merchandise, so that nearly three centuries passed before the seed sown by these fabrications produced their full harvest. Leo IX., who died 1054, inaugurated a new era in the Papacy. The design was now deliberately formed to weld the States of Europe into a theocratic priest kingdom with the Pope at its head. It was Gregory VII., however, who was the first, and, in fact, the only one of the Popes that set himself with clear and deliberate purpose to subvert the old constitution of the Church, and to introduce a new one. He regarded himself not merely as a reformer of the Church, but as the divinely-commissioned founder of a wholly new order of things. Only Popes and their legates were hereafter to hold those synods by which the Church for over a thousand years had regulated her affairs. In every other form the institution was to disappear. He was aided greatly by Anselm, the canonist of Lucca, who first extracted and put into convenient working shape everything in the Isadorian forgeries, for the accomplishment of Papal absolutism; and next, by altering the law of the Church by a tissue of fresh inventions and interpolations in accordance with the requirements of his party and the standpoint of Gregory. Gregory himself, in his letter to Archbishop Herrmann, of Metz—designed to prove how well grounded is the Pope's dominion over emperors and kings and his right to depose them—set an example of the sort of work he wanted done, by so distorting and interpolating a letter of Pope Gelasius to the Emperor Anastasius, as to make Gelasius say the very opposite of what he did say, viz: "that kings are absolutely and universally subject to the Pope;" whereas what he did say was "that the rulers of the Church are always subject to the laws of the emperors, only disclaiming the interference of the secular powers in questions of faith and sacraments." (Regist. Ed. Jaffe, p. 457.) Anselm and his confederate canonists Deusdedit and Gregory, of Pavia, compiled new text books in which they boldly placed the pretended decrees of Popes that had been forged by Isidore in place of the canons of councils, and thus supplied a pretext for Gregory and his successors in their contest with the princes and bishops of their own day. One main pillar of Gregory's system was borrowed from the false decretals. Isidore in his forgeries had made Pope Julius, about 338, A.D., write to the

Eastern bishops, "The Church of Rome by a singular privilege has the right of opening the gates of heaven to whom she will." (Decret. pseud. Is., p. 464.) On this forgery Gregory built his scheme of dominion. How, he asked, should not he be able to judge on earth, on whose will hung the salvation or damnation of men? (Monum. Greg., ed. Jaffe, p. 445.) And so when Gregory, who was notoriously the first Pope to undertake the dethroning of kings, wanted to depose the German Emperor, he wrote, "To me is given power to bind and to loose on earth and in heaven." Were subjects to be absolved from their allegiance—which he was also the first to attempt—he did it by virtue of his power to loose. If he wanted to dispose of other people's property, he declared, as in his Roman Synod, 1080, "We desire to show the world that we can give or take away at our will kingdoms, duchies, earldoms; in a word, the possessions of all men, for we can bind or loose." (Manus. xx., 536.) Personal sanctity had for some time been ascribed to every pope. Gregory VII. made this holiness of all popes, which he said he had personal experience of, the foundation of his claim to universal dominion. (Ep. viii., 21 Jaffe, p. 463.) Every sovereign, he said, however good before, becomes corrupted by the use of power; whereas, every rightly appointed pope becomes a saint. We saw last Sunday evening what sort of saints many of them became. But then, to meet this objection, we are told that if they have no sanctity of their own they become saints through the imputed merits of St. Peter. Referring to a document which had been unquestionably forged in the 11th century, Gregory VII. affirmed, in 1081, that according to the documents preserved in the archives of St. Peter's Church, Charles the Great had made the whole of Gaul tributary to the Roman Church, and had given to her all Saxony. "The most potent instrument, however, in extending the new papal system, was the decretum of Gratian, which, about the middle of the twelfth century, was issued from Bologna, the first school of law in Europe, the juristic teacher of the whole of western Christendom. In this work the Isadorian forgeries were combined with those of the Gregorian writers, and with Gratian's own additions. His work displaced all the older collection of canon law and became the manual and repertory, not for canonists only but for the scholastic theologians, who for the most part derived all their knowledge of the fathers and canons from it. No book has ever come near it in its influence in the Church, although there is scarcely another so crammed full of gross errors, both intentional and unintentional. All the fabrications—the rich harvest of three centuries—Gratian inserted in good faith into his collection; but he also added, knowingly and deliberately, a number of fresh corruptions, all in the spirit and interest of the Papal system." (Döllinger.) Gratian interpolated without scruple in order to forward the grand national scheme of making the whole Christian world in a certain sense the domain of the Italian clergy through the Papacy. By falsifying a canon he makes Gregory the Great order that the Church should protect homicides and murderers. (Cans. 72, 184.) And he takes great pains to inculcate in a long series of canons that it is lawful—nay, a duty—to constrain men to goodness, and therefore to faith, by all means of physical compulsion, and particularly to torture and execute heretics, and to confiscate their property. This notion took full possession of the mind of Innocent III. (1198-1218) the most powerful of the Popes who worked out to completion the theories of Papal monarchy which others had propounded. He maintained that the Pope is God's *locum tenens* on earth, set to watch over the social, political and religious condition of mankind like a Divine Providence, as chief overseer and lord, who must put down all opposition. He wished to make Deuteronomy a code of laws for Christians, that he might get Bible authority for his doctrine of Papal power over life and death; and so he said that as Deuteronomy meant the second book of the law, it must bind the Christian Church, which was the second Church. Yet to accomplish his purpose the words had to be altered. It is there said (Deut. xvii. 12) that if any man will not hearken unto the priest (the vulgate has, I believe, High Priest) and to the judge, even that man shall die. Innocent by a slight interpolation made this into a statement that whoever does not submit to the decision of the High Priest (whose place the Pope occupies under the new covenant) is to be sentenced by the judge to execution. (Decr. per venerabilem 4 17.) Leo X. quoted the passage with some corruption to prove that whoever disobeyed the Pope must be put to death. This same Innocent III. wrote to the Patriarch of Constantinople that Christ has committed the whole world to the government of the Popes, and he gives as a conclusive evidence of this that Peter once walked on the sea—the sea signifying the nations—whence it is clear that his successors are entitled to rule the nations. (Innoc. III., lib. ii., 209.) This Pope taught that the Papal power is to the royal and imperial as the sun to the moon, which last has only a borrowed