

ng before their images, and adoring and venerating their relics.

These rites of invoking the mediation of departed saints are a direct violation of scriptural precedent, which admits but one God and one mediator.

The Church of Pius the Fourth (being the Church of Rome) which commands such an anti-christian system of worship, defined by the apostle—"doctrine of demons, is not therefore built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner Stone. Therefore, the Church of Rome is not apostolic, neither can she be the "mother and mistress of all the Churches," since that claim rests upon the assumption that Peter was Bishop of Rome and Prince of all the Apostles ; and this leads to the re-production of an old problem, which may be styled the "pons asinorum " of the Roman Church, viz.: the stubborn fact that Peter never was Bishop of Rome. It is even doubted whether he had ever been a resident of the *eternal* city of the Cæsars. Bishop Strossmeyer did not scruple to submit this proposition to the sense of the assembled prelates at the great Œcumenical Council. In his speech, from which I have already given an extract, he says—"St. Peter having been at Rome, my venerable brethren, rests only on tradition, but if he had been Bishop of Rome, how can you, from that Episcopate prove his supremacy ?" Scaliger, one of the most learned of men, has not hesitated to say that Peter's episcopate and residence at Rome ought to be "classed with ridiculous legends." If, then, Peter's episcopacy, residence at Rome and vicarship are controverted facts, and that Peter never was Bishop of Rome, how can the Roman Pontiffs be Peter's successors?