

practically placing it in a subsidiary position to their theories. They, in fact, aim at the total annihilation of one great Christian virtue—Temperance. To effect this they are showing the people that the text of scripture is mere clay to be moulded into any form which pleases human fancy. Dr. Carry's language is, at times, severe but entirely merited. When dealing with those who tell falsehoods with deliberation it is sin to be mealy-mouthed.

THE CANADIAN ELOCUTIONIST, by Anna R. Howard, L.L.B., teacher of elocution. *The Rose Publishing Company*, Toronto. This work is neatly got up, as is usual with the publishers who send it forth. It contains a considerable amount of valuable instruction on the art of elocution, with some 140 or 150 well selected pieces for the student to illustrate his powers.

CATHOLIC VERSUS ROMAN.

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

On Sunday evening, October 25th, Rev. John Langtry, M.A., rector of St. Luke's Church, Toronto, delivered the third 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 following this injunction we have already seen that the organization of the Catholic Church as she came forth from the hands of apostles and apostolic men was that of a visible, organized spiritual kingdom, with constitutional democratic government, all her bishops being invested with equal spiritual authority and jurisdiction, and all her doctrines defined and maintained, not by one man for all, but by the testimony and judgment of all for each individual. We saw, too, that the Church of Rome differs now fundamentally from this original constitution and order; that she has subverted this representative government, has silenced this universal testimony, and has swept away this legislative control of all questions of morals and of discipline. For this she has substituted an absolute autocracy ruled by one irresponsible head, who has plenary and absolute power, not only over the whole Church, but over the whole world. For Gregory the Great (Pope Hildebrand) maintained (and the Roman Church is committed to his position) that the Pope is by Divine right the universal and paramount lord of the world; that all monarchs held their dominions as fiefs of the Holy See, and the bishop and clergy formed the court of the sovereign Pontiff. In virtue of these assumed powers the Bishops of Rome claimed the right, and, by taking advantage of the necessities of kings and princes, were allowed, in many lands, the right, not only to control the appointments of bishops and pastors, and to interfere in the affairs of national Churches, but to depose kings and princes, to take away their dominions and to bestow them upon whomsoever they would.

The question for to-night is, How was this change brought about? How did this power grow up? And why was it suffered to exist and to exercise such influence, as it unquestionably did exercise, both in the affairs of the Church and of the world? Manifestly, from what has been said, it did not spring into being all at once, and it manifestly did not exist from the beginning. This is placed beyond dispute by an authority to which our Roman Catholic brethren must bow. For when that which was afterwards known as the Papal system was first broached in words only, in the year 598, it was repudiated with horror by Gregory, the best and greatest of the Popes. When John of Constantinople, who was eager to be acknowledged as primate of the Christian world, had assumed in a public document the title of Œcumenical or Universal Bishop, Gregory, burning with indignation, wrote:—"The one sole head of the Universal Church is Christ, and I confidently affirm that whoever calls himself or desires to be called Universal Bishop is in his pride the forerunner of Antichrist." (Ad. Imp. Maur., vii., 83) "No one," he says, "of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a term." (Epp. Lib. v. 43, ad Eulog.) "Therefore," he says, "presume not either to give or to receive letters with this false title of universal. Far from Christian hearts be that blasphemous name, in which the honor of all priests is taken away, for on this theory the Pope has the plenitude of power, all other bishops are only his servants, from him all the power is derived, and he is concurrent ordinary in every diocese, for Œcumenical Bishop means sole bishop. If therefore the Œcumeni-

cal Bishop should err the whole Church would fail." This was the judgment of Pope Gregory on the doctrine of the Papal supremacy in its ecclesiastical aspects merely. It proves beyond dispute that the claim to this supremacy had not been put forth at the very end of the sixth century. And as all Popes, according to the Vatican decree, have been alike infallible, when speaking on questions of doctrine, it therefore follows that all the Popes who since the time of Gregory VII. have claimed this title and headship have, according to the judgment of their infallible predecessors, been forerunners of Antichrist. The Papal system was evidently unknown at the time of even the sixth and last general council, A.D., 680. It is not referred to or thought of in any of those great councils, or in the provincial councils held in England, France and Germany. And the same is true of the earlier North Italian and African councils. And yet there is no doubt that the germs out of which this huge system has been developed are discoverable at an earlier period than this. The claim grew out of the Roman primacy. Our Lord tells us that His kingdom is not of this world; it does not seek to usurp the powers of earthly kingdoms, or use their methods, or pursue their ends; and so the Church did not set itself to overturn the orders of human society or to subvert human governments. Its object was to leaven them with its own regenerating principles, and thus to purify and elevate, and strengthen and reform them. It therefore conformed itself as far as possible to the usages of the different parts of the empire and of the other nations into which it spread, and for the purposes of its own government adopted their civil divisions. The synods of the different nations or provinces, or larger divisions of the empire, assembled at the metropolis or capital city of each. The bishop of such a city would naturally be given precedence and elected chairman of the council. Hence there grew up a system of metropolitans. And in process of time the bishops of the capitals of the three great continental divisions of the empire, Antioch, Alexandria and Rome, were by a sort of tacit consent accorded the presidency of the council—which from time to time assembled at one or other of these great centres. Their bishops were early entrusted with the guardianship and enforcement of the canons adopted at these councils, and with a certain supervising power over the other bishops in their respective divisions. After a while they were called Patriarchs, though not till after the time of the first Council of Nicaea, which recognised the order that had grown up; and as questions of the precedence had begun to be agitated, the council fixed the limits of each of these metropolitan sees and confined that of Rome to the city and suburban provinces—this is Southern Italy, Corsica, Sardinia and Sicily—to which by a decree of the general Council of Nice the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome is still confined. At the same time a primacy of honor and precedence was accorded to Rome, not because, as is now claimed, it was the see of St. Peter, but simply and solely because Rome was the capital of the empire. This origin of the precedence accorded to Rome among the other patriarchates is distinctly stated on the highest possible authority, viz., that of two general councils, Constantinople and Chalcedon, to have been political and not religious. It was because Rome was the capital of the empire, "the mistress city," and not because it was the see of St. Peter, that the primacy was given to it. And when Constantinople became the second capital, it was raised by the second general council to the honorary dignity of a patriarchate, and precedence was assigned to it over Alexandria and Antioch, and next after Rome, "for as much as it is New Rome." But this primacy of Rome was entirely titular and honorary. It did not entitle the Bishop of Rome to interfere in any other patriarchate than his own. The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch had each the same authority over their respective provinces as he of Rome had. The metropolitan jurisdiction was the same which every metropolitan exercised in his own province. Milan was another metropolitan see in Italy; and while Ambrose was archbishop there, it entirely overshadowed Rome. Aquileia and Ravenna were two other metropolitan sees and centres of ecclesiastical government in Italy. And each was entirely independent of Rome, acknowledging only a primacy of honor in that see. This primacy of honor, however, soon began to be pressed by the occupants of the Roman see into one of right and jurisdiction. In very early times the Churches which had been founded by the Apostles themselves were looked up to with considerable and natural respect as a sort of models of apostolic faith and discipline. It was naturally assumed that the mind and teaching of the Apostles would be better known and remembered in these Churches than elsewhere; and so when difficulties and disputes arose, they were naturally referred by mutual consent to these apostolic Churches for solution; and as Rome, in addition to being the capital city of the empire, was the only apostolic see in the Western Church, these appeals from the west were naturally made to her. But as Rome stretched

her pretensions she asserted herself to be the apostolic see, and claimed to be invested with appellate jurisdiction, and to be a court of final appeal for the whole Church. Some of the fathers had made reference to this respect for apostolic sees, and councils had recognized appeals to them. Rome endeavored in later days to fortify her pretensions by the falsification of these evidences, making them speak of the apostolic see instead of the apostolic sees, as they actually did. The absence of the Emperors and the Court from Rome during the time that Christianity was becoming the religion of the masses, added to the ruin of the empire with its ancient families by Alaric and Attila, left the bishop beyond question the greatest personage in Rome and one of the greatest in Italy. And as his influence, so his pride and ambition grew apace. The imperial city was sinking into insignificance, and some other and more persuasive foundation for the assumed superiority of the Bishop of Rome was sought for; then the theory that the primacy was based upon the alleged primacy of Peter among the apostles was put forth and made the basis of the claim of the Papacy to universal supremacy. That theory was manifestly an afterthought. It assumes (1) that Christ gave St. Peter the supremacy over the other apostles; (2) that St. Peter's see was at Rome; (3) that the supremacy which Christ gave to St. Peter was to descend to his successors in that see. We reply that there is no evidence in Holy Scripture or primitive antiquity that Peter possessed any such supremacy. It was St. James and not St. Peter who presided at the first great council in Jerusalem, and who formulated and declared the decision, the very office which even liberal Roman Catholics now attribute to Peter's assumed successor. Would any ordinary apostle have presumed to preside and give judgment in the presence of the Prince of the Apostles, the infallible head and universal teacher of the Church? Would any ordinary bishop? Would Archbishop Lynch presume to preside, or be allowed to preside in a general council, while the Pope sat by speaking and voting as an ordinary member? Would any bishop of the Roman obedience now withstand the Pope to his face, and proclaim to the world that he was to be blamed in his teaching on a point that involved both doctrine and discipline? As St. Paul tells us, he withstood and denounced St. Peter. Would any Roman Bishop declare now that he was not a whit behind the very chiefest bishops, including the Pope? There are three texts which the Roman controversialists adduce to support the assumed supremacy of St. Peter: 1st. "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church." (Matt. xvi. 18) The rock, however, does not mean Peter; and if it did it would not prove that St. Peter was universal bishop and supreme ruler of the Church. But the word translated Peter does not mean a rock at all. For just as there are two words in English, viz., stone, meaning a detached piece of rock, great or small, and rock, meaning a solid mass, so there are two corresponding words in Greek. Now, if the Lord had meant to say that He would build His Church on Peter, He would have said, thou art Peter, O Petros, a stone, and upon this Petros, stone, I will build My Church. But He changed the word to the feminine Petra, thou art Petros, a stone, and then not upon this stone, but upon this Petra, this rock which thou hast just announced, this Christ, this Son of the Living God, will I build My Church. But no Roman Catholic teacher, be he bishop, pope or priest, can accept or urge upon others the interpretation upon which the Papal claims are now made wholly to rest, viz., that the rock means Peter, without involving him in the guilt of perjury. For the Council of Trent decreed, and "we are bound by a solemn oath," says Professor Dollinger, "which I myself have twice sworn to accept, to explain the Holy Scriptures not otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." And yet the learned Roman Catholic author of Janus asserts, and Dr. Littledale, who has gone over the whole ground carefully, reiterates the assertion, and challenges the Roman Catholic world to disprove it, that not one of the Fathers has explained the rock or foundation on which Christ will build His Church, of the office given to Peter to be transmitted to his successors, but they understood by it either Christ Himself, or Peter's confession of faith in Christ or often both together.

(To be continued.)

RASPBERRY OR BLACKBERRY JAM.—Pick over and mash the fruit; allow one pound of sugar to a pound of fruit. Put the fruit and one quarter of the sugar into a granite or porcelain kettle; when boiling, add another quarter of sugar; boil again, add more sugar, and, when all is used, let it boil till it hardens on the spoon in the air. Apples, pears, peaches and quinces should be pared, cut small and treated in the same way. Cooking in only a little sugar at a time prevents the fruit from becoming hard.