

"A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE."

The conclusions to which we came in our notice of Mr. Jenkins' first lecture—on the "One source of Religious truth"—were—1st—That the Bible is not, to Christians, the sole fountain of all revealed truth; because Christianity is older than the Bible, having flourished long before the Bible was written, and, therefore, without it; 2nd—that the Bible is not the sole source of all religious knowledge; because it cannot be proved from the Bible, of what scriptures it should be composed; and 3rd—that most important truths and doctrines can be established without the authority of a written word of God; because the whole of the truths of Christianity were so established. Having done this, it would appear almost a work of supererogation to attempt the refutation of the other "principles of Protestantism," which, as a religious system, must stand or fall with the truth or falsity of its first principles—that "the Bible is the sole fountain of all revealed truth,"—p. 15; and that, "no truth, or doctrine, can be established but by the authority of the written word of God"—p. 50.—We shall however continue our dissection of Mr. Jenkins' lectures; and though, in a mere newspaper review, it is impossible to notice all his objections against Catholicity, we will do our best to pick out, and reply to the most prominent of them.

Mr. Jenkins quotes largely from Catholic writers; but as he rarely gives any references to the places where his quotations may be found, and still more rarely, the originals, we cannot vouch for their accuracy, having no means to verify them. From some specimens, however, which he has given, we should not feel inclined to place much reliance, either on his ability, or his honesty, as a translator, or copist.—For instance, by way of showing the "idolatry" of the writers of the Catholic Church, when speaking of the Blessed Virgin, he gives, at p. 98, a translation of some of the expressions used towards her—"Oh most adorable body of my dear Mother." At page 124, he favors us with the original of this idolatrous invocation, which runs—"O adoloratissimo Corpo della mia cara Madre." Literally—"Oh most afflicted body." &c. With such evidence of Mr. Jenkins' fidelity as a translator, in cases in which he does furnish us with the original, we must confess that we can place no great reliance on his translations of those passages which he more prudently suppresses. We will endeavor to avoid giving Mr. Jenkins' reasons to urge a similar complaint against ourselves, by acknowledging the sources from whence we borrow any quotations which we may happen to use. We will now continue our examination of our author's Protest against the Catholic Church.

Mr. Jenkins' first lecture, as we have shown, treats of the "Rule of Faith"—a subject which covers the whole ground of controversy between Catholic and Protestant; having disposed of it to his satisfaction, the lecturer proceeds to attack the doctrines of Catholicity in detail, beginning with the doctrine of Papal Supremacy, against which he enters the following Protest:—

"The Reformed churches of Christendom protest against the assumption by any particular church, and therefore by the Church of Rome, of the right to apply to itself alone, the title of Catholic, or Universal."—p. 55.

The "Reformed Churches of Christendom" might have spared themselves the trouble of protesting, and Mr. Jenkins might have been saved from a lavish expenditure of small talk, if they, and he, had but taken the pains to ascertain if there was any occasion for such a Protest. The "Reformed Churches of Christendom," and Mr. Jenkins of Montreal, are not alone in their Protest against the assumption by any "particular church" of "the title of Catholic, or Universal." Papists as we are, we are perfectly prepared to join with them in their Protest; and to agree with them in denouncing the assumption, "by any particular church," of the title, "Catholic, or Universal," as unscriptural, illogical, and sheer, unmitigated balderdash. As against Catholicity then, Mr. Jenkins' Protest is perfectly innoxious, because the Church of Rome, in the sense in which he uses the words—a "particular church"—does not, and never did, assume to itself the "title of Catholic, or Universal."

The Church of Rome—as a "particular" Church—is merely the "particular" diocese of the Bishop of Rome; and, as "particular," no one in his senses would dream of claiming for it the title of "Universal," any more than he would for the "particular" churches of Paris, or Lisbon, or Montreal, or Quebec. Members of these "particular" churches—though all Roman Catholics—are no more members of the "particular" Church of Rome, than is Mr. Jenkins himself; and it is a ridiculous misnomer, or rather a dishonest artifice on the part of Protestant writers, to include them as members of the Church of Rome, in the sense in which they employ those words, and intend them to be understood. It is not then to any "particular" church, but to the universal body of faithful, dispersed throughout the world, holding communion, through the Bishops of their "particular" churches, with the Bishop of Rome, that we apply the title of "Catholic, or Universal."

The next negation, or "Protestant principle," in so far as we can gather it from amidst the mass of verbiage in which Mr. Jenkins shrouds his meaning, is—That there is no visible head of the Church upon earth; and that therefore, the claims of the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, to be that visible head, is an usurpation to be resisted, and protested against. Of course, if Protestantism be the Old Religion, this claim was never asserted during the period before corruption commenced—i.e., before the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, A.D. 590; or, if asserted, was constantly and universally resisted, or protested against. Let us see if history will throw any light upon this Protestant principle, or bear out Mr. Jenkins' thesis, that "Protestantism is the Old Religion."

Three things we will undertake to prove from the

earliest records of Christianity, as contained in the writings of the Church, prior to the end of the VI. century:—

1. That, before the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, it was the general opinion of the Christian Church, that special privileges, and a special office, had been conferred by Our Lord upon St. Peter, who was thence denominated the Prince of the Apostles.

2. That it was equally the opinion that these privileges were transmissible; and that this office was to be perpetuated in the Church.

3. That it was also equally the prevalent opinion, that these privileges, and this office, had been transmitted to the Bishops of Rome, as successors of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

If we can prove the truth of these propositions—that, prior to the time of Gregory the Great, these opinions did obtain in the Christian Church—we shall have proved, from history, that modern Protestantism, is at issue with ancient Christianity, and therefore is not the "Old Religion."

We shall have but little difficulty in establishing the truth of our first proposition—that, before the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, it was the general opinion of the Christian Church, that special privileges, and a special office, had been conferred by Our Lord upon St. Peter, who was thence denominated the Prince of the Apostles. Mr. Jenkins even, is ready to admit, not indeed that this opinion once obtained, but that it is strongly borne out by the words of St. Matt. c. xvi., v. 18 to 20, if it can be shown that Our Lord said to Peter—"thou art a rock, and upon this rock—or, thou art a stone, and upon this stone"—that is, if it can be shown that He employed the same word used to designate Peter, to designate also the rock upon which He promised to build His Church. Mr. Jenkins' reasons for holding that Christ employed different words are, that, in the Greek, Latin, and English translations of St. Matthew's Gospel:—

"The two words are different—one is 'petros' which means a small stone or pebble—the other is 'petra' which signifies a rock. The vulgar so far as the Latin language enables it to do so, maintains this distinction. 'Tu es Petrus et super hanc Petram.' If Our Lord had said, 'thou art a rock, and upon this rock—or, thou art a stone, and upon this stone,' we might be ready to allow that the literal interpretation of the words would seem to favor the meaning that Jesus Christ intended to affirm that He would build His Church upon Peter."—p. 77.

If Mr. Jenkins will but call to mind that our Lord spoke neither Greek nor Latin, nor yet English, he will at once perceive how puerile is his objection based upon mere grammatical peculiarities. In rendering the original Syro-Chaldaic of his text, the unknown translator of St. Matthew's Gospel was obliged to adapt himself to the genius of the language in which he wrote. In this it was necessary to give the word rock, when applied to a man—Peter—a masculine termination—and hence the difference of genders, "Petros, Petra." But in Syriac, the language in which Our Lord spoke, there is no difference of genders, and therefore no difference, betwixt the word used to designate Peter, and that which Our Lord employed to designate the rock upon which He intended to build His Church. In support of this we appeal to the Peschito, or ancient Syriac version of the Bible,* a version made at the time when the language of Our Lord was still the vernacular to those who made it; and in which—as admitted by a writer in the last number of the *North British Review* we have in many cases, "the exact words employed in their public ministrations by Our Lord and His Apostles"—an advantage which we certainly do not possess in any Greek or Latin versions of the Bible. Now, in this Syriac version, we find no such differences of termination as those which occur in the Greek or Latin translations, and upon which, the whole force of Mr. Jenkins' objections, to the value of the text, in favor of the special dignity of Peter, rest. In the Syriac the words—in all probability the *ipsissima verba* of Our Lord—are—

"Anath Chirra, vallah hada Chirra."

the self-same words being applied by our Lord to "Peter"—and the "rock" upon which Our Lord promised to build His Church. The argument, therefore, founded upon the distinction of genders, in the Greek translation of Our Lord's words, falls to the ground: and if true to his promise, Mr. Jenkins must be "ready to allow that the literal interpretation of the words favors the meaning, that Jesus Christ intended to affirm that He would build His Church" upon the rock Peter.

That this was the general opinion of the early Christian apologists and controversialists, is clear from the language employed by them whenever they have occasion to allude to St. Peter. St. Ignatius—Tertullian, before yielding to the errors of Montanism—Origen and St. Cyprian—St. Cyril, St. Basil, and St. Crisostom in the East—St. Optatus, St. Ambrose, and St. Jerome in the West—nay, the Bishops of Rome themselves, long before it "may be said that the corruption of the Church of Rome had commenced"—all unite in admitting that special privileges had been conferred on St. Peter; and not only admitted it, but almost invariably appealed to it as a universally recognised fact, in all their disputations with the heretics of their time—more learned, more formidable, antagonists, but not less bitter opponents of the prerogatives of the See of Peter, than the heretics of ours. Titles, such as—"Prince of

* In the opinion of many learned men, the New Testament portion of the Peschito version of the Scriptures, was made, at the latest, at the beginning of the third century, and from a Greek text. This strengthens our argument: for it shows that, within two hundred years after our Lord's departure, there were, in the language which He spoke whilst on earth, no means of marking the distinction between "Petros" and "Petra" which obtained in the Greek text, and which the Orientals would have been sure to have maintained, if the grammatical structure of their language had afforded them the opportunity, or religious opinions, analogous to those of Mr. Jenkins had imposed upon them the necessity, of so doing. In proof of the antiquity of the Peschito it is sufficient to mention, that it is constantly referred to, as, even in his time, of old standing, by St. Ephrem, who lived in the fourth century.

the Apostles—Supreme Herald of the Church—The Blessed one who was preferred to the other disciples—"The mouth of all the Apostles, the summit of the whole college" (St. Chrysostom). "The Doctor of the whole world," &c.—abound in the writings of the Fathers of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th centuries, and were by them freely conferred upon St. Peter. But it is unnecessary to multiply quotations: we would refer the reader to Archbishop Kenrick's admirable book on "The Primacy," in which he will find them at full length, with ample references given, and means of verification. We will proceed to the proof of our second and third propositions—that it was the general opinion of the ancient Church, that the special privileges of St. Peter were transmissible, and had been transmitted, through the Bishops of Rome, as the successors to the privileges, and office, of the Prince of the Apostles.

And here our only difficulty arises from the abundance of materials at hand; we know not which to select. But as Mr. Jenkins has been pleased to quote, and comment upon a well known passage from St. Irenæus, in which that Father bears most explicit testimony to the abhorred tenet of "Romish Supremacy," we will commence with that. The passage in Latin—for the Greek original has been lost—reads thus:—

"Ad hanc ecclesiam"—the Church of Rome—"propter potentiam" many read "potentiorum"—"principalem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam."

How are we to understand "convenire?" "If we take the word in its intellectual sense" says Neander, the passage must be taken to mean—"All Churches must agree with the Roman Church, as the one having pre-eminence over the rest."—Neander, vol. 1. Eccl. Hist. Sec. 2. But this meaning would not square with Mr. Jenkins' theory; so he seeks to evade its force, by attaching another meaning to the word in dispute—"convenire"—and gives, as the true rendering of the passage—"To this church it must needs be that the whole church should resort."

We do not deny that the Latin is susceptible of this interpretation; but, in the absence of the original, Mr. Jenkins has no right to pronounce so positive an opinion, not even pausing to mention that the true meaning of the passage has been the subject of long and laborious discussion amongst the learned—and that the contrary opinion to that of Mr. Jenkins has very generally obtained amongst Protestants.

"It is very questionable" says Neander, "what Greek word the term 'convenire' corresponds to; whether to *subiungere* as is supposed by Dr. Geiseler, and by Dr. Nitzsch; or to *conversari*." If the latter, then by coming, must be understood a coming to that place in person."—1b.

Now, Mr. Jenkins has no right, arbitrarily to assume, in opposition to critics like Geiseler, that "the latter" was the Greek word corresponding to the Latin "convenire;" more particularly when he has the authority of Salmasius, on this very passage, dead against him. To the testimony of the latter no Protestant will object; a zealous Calvinist, his literary qualifications as a classical critic are thus recognised by the Protestant Hallam:—

"But the greatest in this province of literature was Claude Salmasius, best known in the Latin form, Salmasius, whom the general suffrage of his compatriots placed at their head. An incredible erudition, so that it was said, what Salmasius did not know was beyond the bounds of knowledge; a memory such as none but those great scholars of former times seem to have possessed; a life passed, naturally enough, in solitary labor, were sufficient to establish his fame among the learned."—Hallam, *Intro. to Lit. of Europe*, c. 1, sect. 1.

Now, the commentary of Salmasius, in his treatise "De Primatu Papæ," c. 5, on the above quoted passage, from St. Irenæus, is as follows:—

"Necesse est, dicit, omnem Ecclesiam convenire ad Romanam—quod significat convenire, et concordare in rebus fidei, et doctrina cum Romana Ecclesia."

Backed then by the opinion of scholars like Salmasius and Geiseler, we will adopt the "intellectual" meaning of the word "convenire;" and, despite of Mr. Jenkins, claim St. Irenæus as a witness to the fact, that, in the second century, it was the general opinion of the Christian Church that it behoved all churches to agree "in matters of faith and doctrine with the Roman Church;" and that, therefore, Protestantism, which rejects this opinion, is not the "Old Religion."

But we can afford to dispense with the testimony of St. Irenæus to the fact, that, before the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, it was the general opinion of the Christian world that the special privileges, and office, of St. Peter had been inherited by the Bishops of Rome, as the successors of St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles. In the V century, "it may be said," that the corruption of the Church of Rome had not commenced; yet at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, we find the following claims openly put forward by the Presbyter Philip, in favor of this corrupt Roman Church, and the Supremacy of Celestine I., as successor of St. Peter:—

"It is beyond doubt—yes, known throughout all ages—that the Blessed Peter, to this time, and for ever, lives in his successors."—Act. Conc. Eph., quoted by Geiseler.

But not to multiply quotations, which we might do without end, we will content ourselves with citing Protestant testimony to the facts, that, in the earliest ages of Christianity, the Bishops of Rome claimed for themselves, and the Church generally recognised in them, certain special privileges, as successors of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles:—

"Very early, indeed, do we observe in the Roman Bishops traces of the assumption, that to them, as successors of St. Peter, belonged a paramount authority in ecclesiastical disputes; that the *cathedra Petri*, as the source of the Apostolic tradition, must take precedence of all other *ecclesia apostolica*. Such an assumption was put forward by the Roman Bishop, Victor, when, about A.D. 190,—long before 'it may be said, that the corruption of the Church of Rome had commenced,'—he excommunicated the churches of Asia Minor on account of some trifling dispute relating to a mere external matter. In the Montanistic writings of Tertullian, we find indications that the Roman Bishops already issued peremptory edicts on ecclesiastical matters, endeavored to make themselves considered as the bishop of bishops—*episcopos episcoporum*—and were in the habit of appealing to the authority of their *antecessores*."—Neander Eccl. Hist., Vol. 1, Sect. 2.

The same author admits that, in the time of Cy-

prian, "the transference of the political supremacy of Rome in this spiritual form" was "already complete;" and cites, as "uncontroverted," the passage from St. Cyprian, Ep. 55, ad Cornelium—"where he styles the Roman Church the—*Petri cathedra, ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotialis exorta est*."—1b.—1b. He also cites St. Optatus, of Mileve, in the IV century, as beholding, in Peter the head of the Apostles, and "in the Roman Church the indestructible *cathedra Petri*, standing in the same relation to the other episcopal churches, as the Apostle Peter stood to the rest of the Apostles."—Neander Eccl. Hist., Vol. 3, Sect. 2.

"In urbe Roma, a Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederet omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur."—1b.—1b.

But were these "assumptions of the Roman Bishops" recognised in the early ages of Christianity? We answer unhesitatingly—If history may be believed, they were. We turn to the Canons of the Council of Sardica, A.D. 346; and we find the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs fully recognised, in the recognition of their right to appoint judges to hear the appeals of all Bishops, condemned by inferior tribunals. We have already seen the high, and, in the opinion of Protestants, the arrogant pretensions of Pope Celestine, through his legates at the General Council of Ephesus; in its solemn sentence of deposition against Nestorius, we find that august assembly fully ratifying, by its decrees, those pretensions:—

"Cuncti per sacros canones, et epistolam sanctissimi patris nostri—Celestini Romane Ecclesie episcopi."

This sentence, confirmed by one hundred and eighty-eight Bishops, fully shows what was their opinion of the authority of the Holy See, and proves that it was no vain boast on the part of the Roman Presbyter Phillip, when, confirming, in the name of Pope Celestine, the acts of the Council, he addressed the assembled Fathers as follows:—

"It is not doubted by any one, but rather it has been well known in all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, the Prince and head of the Apostles—the pillar of faith, and the foundation of the Catholic Church—received from Our Lord Jesus Christ, the keys of the Kingdom: . . . and power to bind and loose was given to him, who, down to the present time, and forever, lives and judges in his successors."—Act. Conc. Eph. *Harb. Col.*—quoted by Geiseler.

At Chalcedon, as at Ephesus, the authority of Peter was recognised in the person of his successors; and a Leo, as well as a Celestine, successfully asserted the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, over the Emperors, and the Patriarchs, of the East.

"His Legates," says Gibbon, "required in a peremptory tone the presence of the Emperor; and the weary fathers were transported to Chalcedon under the immediate eye of Marcian, and the Senate of Constantinople. . . . Six hundred and thirty Bishops were ranged in order, in the nave of the Church; but the Patriarchs of the East were preceded by the Legates, of whom the third was a priest."—Gibbon, c. xlvii.

The subsequent proceedings of the Roman Pontiffs, as narrated by the same Protestant historian, are conclusive as to the fact, that, prior to the VI century, the Bishop of Rome, as successor of Peter, claimed, and exercised, supreme jurisdiction.

"For accepting the communion of Alexandria, without a formal approbation of the same synod"—Chalcedon—"the Patriarchs of Constantinople were anathematized by the Pope. Their inflexible despotism . . . finally abolished the memory of four Byzantine Pontiffs, who had dared to oppose the Supremacy of Peter."—1b.

In the West, and at the same early period, we find the same deference to the Chair of Peter. A Council of Bishops, in North Africa, send their decisions, on a controverted point of doctrine, to the Bishop of Rome for ratification. The Pope Innocent I. replies—A.D. 417—praising them, in that they "had considered themselves bound to submit the matter to his judgment," in accordance with the *divine*, not human, counsels, "that, whatever was transacted in provinces, let them be ever so remote, should not be considered as ratified until it had come to the knowledge of the Apostolic Chair."—Neander Eccl. History. On the authority of the Roman Church.

It will be objected that these assumptions were often contested; and the angry correspondence of St. Cyprian will be cited as a case in point. Without going into the merits of the Cyprian controversy, which our limits do not permit, we would observe that modern Protestant writers, on "Romish Supremacy," find, in the correspondence alluded to, such striking evidence of the recognition of the claims of the Roman Church, that, in order to get rid of their testimony, they hesitate not to pronounce them forgeries—fabrications of a late date—by a corrupt Church, in order to impose its usurped authority upon an ignorant, and easily deluded multitude. We recommend to Mr. Jenkins a perusal of the Rev. Mr. Sheppard's "History of the Church of Rome to the end of the Episcopate of Damasus, A.D. 384; in which the writer, an Anglican clergyman, is obliged, by way of freeing himself from the awkward position in which he would be placed by recognising the genuineness of the Cyprian correspondence, to treat as extremely doubtful, even the existence of such a person as St. Cyprian; as to the letters themselves, he at once pronounces them to be Romanist forgeries, so powerfully do they assert the validity of the Romish claims, and refute Mr. Jenkins' theory, that Protestantism "is the Old Religion."

But we have trespassed too long on the patience of our readers. Some other remarks which we have yet to make, we must defer until next week.

It is *rumored* that it is the intention of the Crown, to take the prosecutions of all the parties charged with murder, on the evening of the 9th of June, into its own hands.

Birth.

In this city, on the 12th inst., Mrs. John Campbell, of a son.

THE OPENING OF MONTREAL COLLEGE will take place on MONDAY, the 29th inst.

A. NERCAM, President.