

P928A
V. 17
No 3-4
1924

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 65.—JANUARY, 1904.

I.

JONATHAN EDWARDS.

THE 5th of October marked the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of this great and good man. In many parts of the country notice has been taken of this fact. Especially in New England, the region of his birth, and to which the labors of his life belonged, have fresh laurels been wreathed for his brow. But it is doubtful if any part of the country, or any section of the church, can pay him as sincere a tribute as the Southern Presbyterian Church. He thought as we still think on the great doctrines of grace, being a zealous Calvinist, and was in accord with the Presbyterian Church in his views of government, though he lived and wrought and died in the Congregational Church. If, therefore, any class of persons should honor the name and cherish the memory of Edwards, those should do so who hold Calvinistic views of doctrine, and Presbyterian principles of polity.

Moreover, while Edwards commands our admiration on many grounds, yet his chief title to our esteem is the almost unparalleled excellence of his Christian character. His life was radiant with the beauty of Christ, sweet and fragrant with all the tender and winsome graces of the Holy Spirit. To pass his life in review, and reflect on those qualities that marked him as the eminent Christian, must be a wholesome spiritual exercise.

The story of his life, quiet and uneventful for the most part, is quickly told. He did not figure as the hero in any great and thrilling conflict; there were few dramatic episodes to give variety to the usually smooth tenor of his career; but his days

IV.

THE PAPACY UNDER A SEARCHLIGHT:

A REPLY.

THE object of the following pages is to arouse interest in a subject of great practical importance to American Protestants, and to give accurate and reliable information about it. The discussion of it in the present form has been suggested by an extremely discourteous review of *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*¹ in the July number (1903) of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*. The writer begins by speaking of it as "a worthless little book," and remarks that "It is the mission of this *Review* to concern itself about higher game than Mr. Flournoy and his *Searchlight*. The duty of catching 'the little foxes that destroy the vines' we may safely leave to others." He, however, does condescend to concern himself about it, and undertakes the duty which he would otherwise assign to humbler hands "because requested to do so by persons whose friendship we value." It is surprising, too, that of the book reviews—to which this quarterly gives much attention and large space—the review of this book is the longest but one. We are immediately impelled to ask, "Why such large shot if the game is so small?" It would be strange to see a lion-hunter hunting sparrows at all, and certainly much stranger to see such a mighty hunter go forth to kill sparrows equipped with ammunition suitable for the destruction of the king of beasts. There is a good deal in the same strain which can hardly be worthy of notice. Some remarks on the unwisdom of belittling a task set before one might be *a propos* here, and, especially, of boasting while girding on the harness; but it is not my intention to undertake to teach the editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* either wisdom or good manners. My purpose in writing is not to defend "the

¹ See note at the end of this article.

worthless little book" either. It has gone forth, and having received the approval of many scholars whose judgment may well be relied on, can safely be left to take care of itself. My aim, as has been intimated, is far higher. It is a further vindication of the principle back of, and pervading, the book.

For years the impression has been bearing with ever-increasing weight upon many minds that Romanism is one of the very darkest clouds on the horizon of our country's future.

Those who see the emigrant ships discharging their cargoes on our shores can have no doubt of the fact that a large amount of the scum of Europe is flowing our way; and this scum is generally Romanist. America has shown a wonderful power of assimilation in the past, and has made real Americans out of much foreign material, and material of excellent quality much of it has been. But all must recognize the fact that there is a limit to this process, especially when the material to be assimilated declines in quality. Dr. Strong, in his suggestive book, *Our Country*, tells us: "Mr. Beecher once said, 'When the lion eats an ox, the ox becomes lion, not the lion ox.' The illustration would be very neat if it only illustrated. The lion, happily, has an instinct controlled by an unfailing law which determines what, and when, and how much he shall eat. If that instinct should fail, and he should some day eat a badly diseased ox, or should very much overeat, we might have on our hands a very sick lion. I can conceive that, under such conditions, the ignoble ox might slay the king of beasts."

A very important thing to be considered in this connection is that the great and rapidly increasing Romanist foreign element of our population is in the hands of the most powerful and astute organization that exists in the world, an organization, too, which has always claimed, and when able has maintained, an authority superior to all human governments. It is an organization which, in spite of minor internal differences, has a marvellous unity of action, and, since the Vatican Council, that whole power may be directed by one supposedly infallible hand. It is an old saying that the papal power is "a sword whose handle is in Rome and its blade everywhere." It is certainly here—apparently

harmless it may be now; but the time may come when the edge will cut as cruelly as ever in the past. Although so quiet and apparently harmless now, it hangs by a hair over the head of the press of our country—and a free press is the chief guardian of our liberties.

It is impossible to tell what will be the political power and influence of the lately formed "Federation of Catholic Societies." Does it mean the unification of the Catholic vote of this country, so that the pope, in some crisis of our political affairs, can place that vote in either scale, and thus decide the question at issue? I do not assert it; but all must acknowledge the possibility.¹

But Rome may do something worse for the American people, even, than this. Religion is the chief concern; and if the light of the gospel should be replaced by the errors of Romanism and a spiritual darkness like that of the middle ages, the hope of our country would surely be blasted. All history shows that God's blessing has been upon those who have kept his Word. Protestantism is the religion of the Bible; Romanism, whatever may be its professions, is not. There is a danger here of which many are strangely oblivious, and about which many are indifferent. A very observant friend lately remarked, that never since the Reformation has Romanism received from a Protestant nation the favor shown it in the United States at this time; and

¹ It may be well for those who think lightly of the peril which Romanism brings to our country and its free institutions to consider such facts as these:

"Rome, with characteristic foresight, is concentrating her strength in the Western Territories. As the West is to dominate the nation, she intends to dominate the West. . . . Not including Arizona and New Mexico, which have a large Roman Catholic population, the six remaining Territories in 1880 had four times as many Romanists as there were members in all Protestant denominations collectively. . . ."

"When the Jesuits were driven out of Berlin, they declared that they would plant themselves in the Western Territories of America; and they are there to-day with empires in their brains." . . .

Lafayette's warning was: "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, they will fall by the hands of the Romish clergy."—*Our Country*, pp. 89-91. Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D.

In our two largest cities, New York and Chicago, and in New England, the Romanists probably equal in number the members of all Protestant churches, while in California they out-number them four to one.

another, who has laid down his life in Christ's service in Brazil, said to me some years ago, that his impression in coming from a Romanist country, and seeing the rapid progress the Church of Rome is making here, and the utter apathy of Christian people about it, was such that, if he could give up his work in Brazil, he would devote the rest of his life to the task of trying to awaken our people to their peril.

Now, the editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* is naturally displeased with any attempt to show the falsity of the claims of Romanism, and vents his spleen on this little book. The book shows that during the life of Hippolytus, a man born little over a half century from the death of the Apostle John, and dying about 235, there was no pope in Rome, and that no such personage had ever been heard of there. It asserts (p. 77) that "Hippolytus has evidently never heard of Peter as primate and of popes as his infallible successors." This is shown by quotations from *The Refutation of all Heresies*, the work of Hippolytus, discovered at Mount Athos, and the remark is made that "thus, *The Refutation of all Heresies*, while intended for the refutation of the heresies of those early times, refutes also, by the facts which it lays bare, that which has been the arch-heresy of the Christian era, the infallibility and supremacy of the popes."

The reviewer does not seem to think that it is at all necessary to bring any evidence to show that there were popes in those days. Like other Romanists, he takes it as an axiom that there is an unbroken line of popes beginning with Peter. A celebrated philosopher thought it necessary to prove logically even that he himself was in existence. "I think, therefore I am," was his argument. Most of us feel that we exist, and so have no need of logic to prove it. Our existence is the basis of all our thinking, instead of thinking being with us a logical proof of our existence. The reviewer seems to take the existence of the papacy from the first as a thing so necessarily true, as the basis of all his thinking, that proofs of it are entirely unnecessary. One would naturally suppose, however, that Hippolytus, the contemporary of Zephyrinus and Callistus, and knowing them well, was better

qualified to decide whether or not they were infallible popes than the editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, in the third year of the twentieth century.

He asserts, indeed, that Victor, the immediate predecessor of Zephyrinus was "every inch a pope," and that Pope Callistus (the ex-slave, who became a defaulting bank officer and fugitive from justice, and then an encourager of immorality among church members, and a promoter of the Noëtian heresy) was a "glorious proof of papal infallibility."

He seems to forget that we have part of a letter written by Irenæus, the teacher of Hippolytus, blaming Victor for his uncharitable treatment of the Christians in Asia Minor, and another from Polycrates of Ephesus, claiming for these very people, of whom he himself was one, that they had a better right to their view as to the Quartodeciman practice than Victor had for his. Irenæus and Polycrates, his contemporaries, evidently did not consider him infallible, whatever may be the view of this twentieth century writer.

It is undoubtedly true that the bishop of Rome exercised wide influence even in the latter part of the second century, and that this influence, from the prestige of the city, increased as time went on, especially after Constantine made Christianity the state religion. This was due to the fact that Rome was the capital of the Roman Empire; that it was a gathering-place for many nations; that it was the only apostolic church of the West; and that eventually the tradition that Peter founded the church there, and was its first bishop, and that Peter had been made the primate of the church by our Saviour, gained increasing credence. This last reason, however, was an afterthought, and did not have its influence for a considerable period. The decree of Valentinian (445) places the then claimed supremacy of Rome on (1) "the merits of Peter; (2) the majesty of the city of Rome; (3) the authority of a council."

Irenæus and our Hippolytus both thought that Peter had something to do with founding the church in Rome; but neither ever dreamed of his primacy and a transmission of the same authority to a line of successors who should be popes. Irenæus

gives a list of Bishops of Rome, but names Peter and Paul together without a hint that Peter had more authority than Paul.¹ The Liberian Catalogue (352 A. D.) is the earliest Latin list of the Bishops of Rome, and names Clement as one of them. Yet we have the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, and it is not in Clement's name at all, but in that of "the church at Rome."

Ignatius, in his epistle (105-115), in writing a letter to the Romans, addresses it to no pope, but to the church. When Jerusalem was destroyed, the city of the mother church of Christianity, the church at Rome, being an apostolic church, and the church of the city which was the capital of the empire, naturally rose to prominence and extensive influence among the metropolitan churches; but there was in it no more official authority than in the other metropolitan churches of Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Thessalonica.

Indeed, it seems not to have gained such authority, even over the churches of the suburbicarian provinces, until after Constantine had erected these provinces under the political control of the city of Rome.²

¹ As to "the Roman Episcopate of Peter" Kurtz has this to say:

"The tradition that Peter, after having for some years held the episcopate at Antioch, became first Bishop of Rome, holding the office for twenty-five years (A. D. 42-67), and suffered martyrdom at the same time with Paul, had its origin in the series of apocryphal writings out of which sprang both the romance of the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, and the Ebionite Acts of Peter; but it attained its complete form only in the fourth century, after it had been translated into the soil of the church tradition through the *Acta Petri et Pauli*. . . . According to the Acts, Peter, in A. D. 44, lay in prison at Jerusalem, and according to Gal. ii., he was still there in A. D. 51. Besides, according to the unanimous verdict of tradition, as expressed by Irenæus, Eusebius, Rufinus and the Apostolic Constitutions, not Peter, but Linus was the first Bishop of Rome."—Kurtz's *Church History*, Sec. 161, Macpherson's Translation.

² The Council, therefore, as Rufinus also, and the oldest Latin collection of canons, the so-called *Prisca*, understood this canon, maintains that the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Roman chair extended, not over all the West, but only over the ten *suburbicarian* provinces belonging to the diocese of Rome, according to Constantine's division, *i. e.*, over Middle and Southern Italy, with the islands of Sardinia, Corsica and Sicily.—Kurtz's *Church History*, Sec. 46, 3, Macpherson's Trans.

The first "decretals" from the Church of Rome (and these were addressed to the churches of the West only) were issued by Siricius, who was bishop from 384 to 398.

Several influences helped to the extension of this authority, such as the removal of the seat of the emperor to Constantinople, the Arian controversy, the invasion of the Goths, and the division of the empire. It was not till the time of Innocent I. (402-417) that the idea of universal authority arose. It was not till 445 A. D. that Rome became a court of appeal.

The Refutation of all Heresies plainly shows that in the time of Hippolytus (who died about 235 A. D.) there was no pope in Rome, and that such an office was undreamed of. The turning on of the searchlight which reveals this naturally shocks and enrages this reviewer, for it does indeed tend to destroy this imaginary "vine" of the papacy by showing that it is not rooted in the first or second century, but springs up in a later age.

The universal authority of the Bishops of Rome is disclaimed explicitly as late as the seventh century by one of them who did most to extend the influence and increase the power of that see, Gregory the Great.

Just before Phocas waded through blood to usurp the imperial dignity, and gave the title of universal bishop to the occupant of the Roman see, Gregory, writing to the Emperor Maurice (whom Phocas murdered), says: "I say it without the least hesitation, whoever calls himself the universal bishop, or desires this title, is, by his pride, the precursor of Antichrist, because he thus attempts to raise himself above the others. The error into which he falls springs from pride equal to that of Antichrist," etc.

Writing to John the Faster, after telling him that even "Peter, the first of the apostles," did not claim this title and dignity, he says of the Bishops of Rome, after the Council of Chalcedon had conferred the title, "And yet none of us hath permitted this title to be given him; none hath assumed this bold title, lest by assuming a special distinction in the dignity of the episcopate we should seem to refuse it to all the brethren." ¹

¹ See *The Papacy*, by the Abbé Guetteé, pp. 210 and 211-236.

That this is the true view of the development of the papacy, undistorted by Protestant prejudice, will be clear to any one who will candidly examine the facts as given by such historians as Milman¹ or Kurtz,² men whose honesty and thoroughness as investigators do not need to be commended to any who are well informed. If mere monkish legends and traditions, without the slightest evidence to substantiate them, are accepted as historical, of course almost any extravagant and baseless claim, such as the universal authority and infallibility of the papacy from the first, can be proven. The conclusion, of course, always depends on the premises; and if one takes a free rein, and makes his premises just as he wishes them to be, then, of course, he will have no trouble in arriving at the desired conclusion. This has evidently been the method of this reviewer, who announces that the course of Callistus "is a glorious proof of papal infallibility." Take the theory that the decision of a universal council of the Roman Catholic Church is absolutely correct, then the fact that the Vatican Council in 1870 declared the Pope of Rome infallible, then disregard the facts stated by Hippolytus about Callistus, and it is easy to bring in the decision of this reviewer—indeed, it comes in of itself. Pursue the same course, and discredit all that Tertullian says about the immediate predecessor of Callistus, Zephyrinus, and his course becomes another "glorious proof of papal infallibility." We may say, "But what is to be done about the facts stated by these contemporaries of these two notorious men, which show that they were both at the opposite pole from infallibility?" Our reviewer's answer can only be that of all reasoners like him, that "If the facts, in any measure, fail to agree with this conclusion, it is just so much the worse for the facts. The decision of infallibility has been made, and the facts must conform or get out." Accordingly, he does try to put the facts out of court.

It is refreshing to see that at least one Catholic historian does not follow the method of the reversed syllogism employed by this reviewer and Romanists in general, in this matter. The Rev. William Barry, D. D., "formerly scholar of the English

¹ *Latin Christianity*, Vol. I.

² *Church History*, Sec. 46, Macpherson's Tr.

College, Rome; Professor of St. Mary's College, Oscott," has written a book on *The Papal Monarchy*,¹ and a few extracts will convince the reader that the view just given of the development of the papacy is not due to Protestant prejudice and misrepresentation, but that which accords with the facts of the case, even as viewed by a Roman Catholic scholar.

Dr. Barry tells us that the title of the pope, "Pontiff," is derived from that of the Roman rulers, Pontifex Maximus. From the half legendary Numa down, they exercised the functions of chief priest of religion. Dr. Barry points out the fact that the determination of times and seasons, especially as connected with religious functions, came in the line of their duties, and that Julius Cæsar, in 46 B. C., and Pope Gregory, in 1582 A. D., are found making, the one the Julian, and the other the Gregorian calendar. On page 13, he says of the Roman Emperor: "He was Pope as well as Consul and Emperor. He continued to hold it (*i. e.*, the title Pontifex) for some time afterwards; and not only Constantine, but his more Christian successors, Valentinian I. and Gratian, are mentioned under this name on inscriptions now extant. Theodosius, however, gave up all pretence to be the high priest of a heathen worship; and the title passed to the bishops of Rome, for whose office it must long have seemed a fitting designation."

Mentioning the designation of the Church of Rome in the time of Soter, "the church presiding in charity in the country of the Romans," Dr. Barry remarks, "and Pope Soter speaks as representing a community so late as 170 A. D."

As to the way in which Rome began to have a præminent place of influence among the churches, he says, "The Christian system moulded itself on the imperial, and bishops fell into their places according to the importance of the cities over which they ruled."

Cyprian very stoutly opposed the Bishop of Rome, and certainly considered him very far from infallible; yet his sacerdotal ideas did more than anything else to elevate the Roman see into the region of those supernatural powers which were to hold sway

¹ A recently published volume of *The Story of the Nations* series.

over the superstitious for all succeeding time. Cyprian spoke of it as "the chair of Peter, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise." Dr. Barry remarks, "These words and this conception were to furnish the Magna Charta of the Papacy."

The influence of the central city of the world's power naturally helped on the developing aggrandizement of this bishopric. "An endemic 'custom of the city,' acting on a creed not fully developed, and on the strength of what was allowed to be apostolic tradition, enabled this church at the centre to gain in preëminence."

The legend of the so-called "donation of Constantine" has been used very extensively for establishing and extending the temporal power of the Pope.

The story is that Constantine had leprosy, and was told that he could be cured only by a bath in the blood of a child, and that Bishop Silvester saved him from taking the horrible measure of murdering the child by miraculously healing him by baptizing him; and that thereupon, Constantine, in gratitude, gave the aforesaid "donation." "Hereupon, Constantine made over to the Pontiff, Rome and Italy, with the islands of the West." Of this legend, on which so much has been built, Dr. Barry remarks that it was "told in the eighth century, and believed down to the end of the fifteenth."

As to the temporal authority of Silvester, or any Bishop of Rome near his time, he says, "Neither Pope Silvester, nor any pope for centuries, dreamt of disowning the imperial rule."

He adds, "The powers of its government, used in the disputes of local churches or contending sects, was afterwards applied to provinces and kingdoms."

It may seem strange that the removal of the seat of the imperial government, and then the fall of the Roman Empire of the West, under the incursion of the Goths, Visigoths and Vandals, should have tended to increase the power of the Roman see, instead of absolutely destroying it. But, when we remember that the Bishop of Rome at that crisis was none other than Leo the Great—one of the greatest, in ability, of the sons of men, indeed he was—and that the Goths had received the gospel, Ulphilas, the apostle to the Goths, having translated the Bible

into their language three-quarters of a century before this time, it does not seem so strange. The great Leo had more power over them than any emperor could have had. Their reverence for this able and earnest head of the Roman Church enabled him to conquer, in great measure, the conquerors of Rome.

Siricius had nearly a century before this issued the first genuine "decretals" [decisions on questions in dispute], and now Leo could threaten Hilary of Arles when he exercised powers to which he was not entitled.

Ambrose of Milan, near the same time, had uttered the telling sentence, "Where is Peter? there is the church;" and on this Dr. Barry remarks, "On this classic sentence the policy of excommunication, interdict, and even deposition—which is the story of the middle ages—may be made all to depend."

As he says, and we may plainly see, "The church was steadily mounting toward preëminence."

"The primitive church," he says, again, "was the empire, taken a second time, but for spiritual and heavenly purposes." We can hardly agree with him that all the purposes were "heavenly," but his explanation of the aggrandizement of the Roman see is certainly in accord with the facts of history. For he goes on to say, "It is the old Roman vision of a world-empire, expanding and realizing itself as a Catholic Church, which, if not yet governed by a supreme head, was by all its institutions calling for one."

As a further explanation of the widening supremacy of Rome, Dr. Barry tells us: "By the time of Gregory the Great (542–604), the two patriarchal churches associated with the name of Peter [Antioch and Alexandria] had almost run their course. Rome was left as the sole apostolic see founded on the rock."

The principles of the false decretals were already acted on to a great extent by Leo the Great (390–461), though these writings were not forged till some four centuries after his times. He did, however, for his purposes, cite as Nicean canons those of Sardica. Says Dr. Barry: "The canons (real or interpolated) were those of a later assembly at Sardica, now Sophia, in Bulgaria. But they took their place in the *Corpus Juris*, and helped,

like the ever-growing pile of decretals, to furnish precedents on which the mediæval popes were really to act in every part of Christendom."

Mohammed helped later by destroying the competing power of the East; but before that took place, Phocas, the murderer of the good Emperor Maurice, and then of his widow and children, had issued the decree that Boniface III. should be obeyed as the universal bishop. Thus, in 607, the papal chair became, by the decree of the emperor, the seat of universal authority in the church.

The account of the steps by which the Roman see came to be the "Papal Monarchy," given by the Catholic scholar, Dr. Barry, is substantially the same as that of Kurtz and Milman, and makes the assertion of our reviewer, to the effect that the conduct of Callistus is a "glorious proof of papal infallibility," sound rather absurd.

Though the holders of the Roman bishopric in the first three centuries are generally called popes, now, the designation as applied to them is a misnomer. They were not popes in any true sense, but only bishops of what became the most prominent see in the Christian church.

It has already been mentioned that in the Vatican Council (1870) which made the pope infallible, there was a very large minority very much opposed to the perpetration of the blasphemous absurdity. Among the many Catholic scholars who earnestly protested was the learned historian, Dr. Döllinger—a man who, in spite of his great devotion to his church, could not conscientiously acquiesce in what, as an accurate investigator of the facts of history, he knew to be utterly false. He was excommunicated, and headed the "Old Catholic" movement. In his book, *The Pope and the Council*, he has given a great mass of irrefragable testimony to the two facts: (1) that the popes have not been infallible, and (2) that the early Roman bishops were not popes at all—two things which Hippolytus makes very clear from the facts of his own time.¹

¹The heresy of Noëtus, though favored by Callistus, was condemned by "the blessed presbyters"—the Presbytery of Rome. See *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*, Ch. VI.

Dr. Döllinger, in speaking of "the errors and contradictions of the popes," mentions, among other cases, that of Innocent I. (402-417) and his successor, Zosimus, and shows us that, in the Pelagian controversy, the latter reversed the decision of the former. The African bishops sternly rebuked Zosimus for declaring Pelagius and Celestius orthodox, "telling him that they adhered to their decision, and that he was mistaken. And, after they had again anathematized the teaching of Pelagius and Celestius at a council held at Carthage, . . . the pope assented to their judgment."

As to the case of the masterful Leo I. in the matter of Hilary, Bishop of Arles, where it has been held by some, perhaps, that the infallibility of the Roman chair is asserted, Dr. Döllinger gives "the verdict of history" to this effect, "Leo himself acknowledged that his treatise could not become a rule of faith till it was confirmed by the bishops." He proves this by a reference, not to any second-hand authority, but to the letter of Leo himself. (Leonis, Ep. ad Gall. See Mansi, Concil. VI., 181.)

Another remarkable instance of papal fallibility is that of Vigilius, in his decision about the letters of Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas, which were held to be Nestorian in doctrine, "which he first pronounced orthodox in 546, then condemned the next year, and then again reversed this sentence in deference to the Western bishops, and thus came in conflict with the Fifth General Council, which excommunicated him. Finally, he submitted to the judgment of the Council, declaring that he had unfortunately been a tool in the hands of Satan, who labors for the destruction of the church, and had thus been divided from his colleagues; but God had now enlightened him. Thus, he thrice contradicted himself."

Perhaps our reviewer would grow enthusiastic over this case, as he does over that of Callistus, telling us that his course is "a glorious proof of papal infallibility." Indeed, there is a decided likeness between Vigilius and Callistus, of whom Hippolytus tells us that "Callistus at one time branches off to the opinion of Noëtus, and at another into that of Theodotus, and holds no sure

doctrine" (*Refutation of all Heresies*, Book X., Chap. 23). "Glorious proof of papal infallibility," indeed!

The reviewer must think of the readers of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* as infants, ready to swallow whatever he may prepare for them. It is milk for babes indeed, and, alas! with swarms of hurtful bacteria in it.

It has been claimed that the early fathers looked upon the Bishops of Rome as popes, gifted with infallibility. What is the evidence?

Dr. Döllinger asserts that, "In the first three centuries, St. Irenæus is the only writer who connects the superiority of the Roman Church with doctrine; but he places this superiority, rightly understood, only in its antiquity, its double apostolic origin, and the circumstance of the pure tradition being guarded and maintained there by the constant concourse of the faithful from all countries. Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, know nothing of special papal prerogative or of any higher or supreme right of deciding in matters of doctrine."

He remarks on the interpretation, now universal among Romanists, of the words of our blessed Lord to Peter (Matt. xvi. 18; John xxi. 17), "Of all the fathers who interpret these words in the gospels, *not one single one applies them to the Roman bishops as Peter's successors.*" (Italics his.)

Thus, it seems clear that not only is it true, as seen from the testimony of Hippolytus, that there was no pope in Rome in his day, but, also, that from the light thrown on the first three centuries by the writings of these fathers, it is made clear that there was no pope in all that period. The real papacy was the result of the many influences that have been alluded to, and was the development of a later age.

The celebrated Egyptologist, Flinders Petrie, whose recent discoveries have wonderfully extended our knowledge of early civilization so far back into the hitherto unknown period called prehistoric, and shown the remarkable development of art, even before the building of the pyramid of Cheops, in making the annual address before the Victoria Institute this year, began with this sentence: "The essential difference between mediæval

thought and modern thought is that the mediæval scholar dealt with what ought to be, according to the premises and convictions with which he started; the modern student deals with what is, having learnt by bitter experience the fallacies and hopelessness of trusting to systems of theory however beautiful."

It must be evident to all that this reviewer's method is the mediæval. He liveries his facts in his own colors, and bids them wait on his theories. Or, to express it a little differently, he makes his facts the flunkies of his theories. This is the mediæval, not the Baconian, method.

Perhaps nothing revealed by the *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus* was more disagreeable to this reviewer than the view given of the regard in which he held the authority of the Scriptures.

It is well known that though the Church of Rome professes to receive the Bible as inspired, practically, the teaching of the church is the only all-sufficient rule of faith and practice for the individual. In the very number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* in which this criticism of the *Searchlight of St. Hippolytus* appears, there is a sketch of "Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewitt, C. S. P.," who, some years ago, went from the Congregationalist Church into the Episcopal, remained for a time under the guidance of Bishop Whittingham, of Maryland, and then, unable to occupy the half-way position of Bishop Whittingham and so many others, went into the Roman Catholic Church, and became a co-worker with Father Hecker. It is said of him that at a certain stage of his transition "he began to grasp the idea of tradition, and the utter lack of value in Scripture as a basis of faith unless there be a norm of external authority by which to interpret both Scripture and tradition."

The words of Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, *The Faith of our Fathers* (44th ed., Chap. VIII.), are to the same effect, as to this "lack of value in Scripture as a basis of faith," without an infallible church or pope to interpret it: "Indeed, when you accept the Bible as the Word of God, you are obliged to receive it on the authority of the Catholic Church," etc. He asserts, as the ground of this, that the Third Council of Carthage (397

A. D.) "declared what books were canonical and what were apocryphal."

The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus shows that Hippolytus had practically all of the New Testament canon which we have now, and that he viewed it as having the same authority which the most orthodox Protestant ascribes to it. Bunsen (*Hippolytus and His Age*, Vol. II., p. 144) says, "The expressions of Hippolytus on the paramount authority of Scripture in all matters of faith and doctrine are as strong as those of the Reformers." *The Searchlight*, to show that this is true, gives such expressions of Hippolytus as these: "There is one God, my brother, and him we know only by the holy Scriptures. . . . Let us, therefore, see what the holy Scriptures pronounce; let us understand what they teach, etc. . . . Not according to our own will, nor according to our own reason, nor forcing what God has given; but let us see all this as he has willed to show it by the holy Scriptures." Thus, it is shown that Hippolytus, who was born nearly two centuries and a half before this Council of Carthage met, viewed the "Holy Scriptures" as the sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practice as Protestants do now. It is made plain, then, that the Romanist's is the new view of the Scriptures, and that the Protestant's is the old and original.

A writer in this same number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* draws the line between Protestantism and Romanism in the first sentences of an elaborate article on "The Passing of Mary," as follows: "Among men who call themselves Christians there exist two theories in regard to the nature of the church. The first holds that a full and sufficient revelation has been made once and for all, and entirely contained within the Holy Scriptures." This, of course, is his account of the position of Protestantism. He gives that of Romanism as follows: "The second theory holds not only that a divine revelation has been given, but also that a divine interpreter has been given." This "divine interpreter" is, of course, the Romish Church.

Which is the position of Hippolytus? No one who reads his words can entertain a moment's doubt.

It is the fashion to speak of the Roman Catholic Church as

the old and the Protestant as the new. From the standpoint of the dark ages, this may seem true; but when one rises from this valley of the shadow of spiritual death, and takes his stand on the earlier age just after the time of the apostles, he finds that the position of the earliest fathers with regard to the Holy Scriptures is that of Protestantism.

Take Polycarp, for instance, the disciple of John, the beloved disciple, and we find it true, as Harnack says of him, that he "lived wholly in the ideas of the older generation and of the apostles, and would admit no addition to their teaching."

The reviewer professed to deal only with the first eighty-seven pages of *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*; but there can be little doubt that he saw these things too; but thought it the part of wisdom not to mention them. To let it be known that an honored saint of the Catholic Church actually taught the fundamental principle of Protestantism would have been too much to expect even of so eminent a Catholic scholar. This is, indeed, the fundamental principle of Protestantism, and when it is established in any intelligent human mind, Romanism becomes an impossibility.

Once establish firmly in the minds of intelligent people this fundamental principle, that the Holy Scriptures are the only divinely ordained source of authoritative teaching, they cannot be Roman Catholics. It is true that the church is appointed to teach, through its ministry, all nations; yet it is commanded to teach them "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Just as soon as mere human tradition is added, and any man, or order of men, is invested with original and infallible authority, then comes in the anti-Christian principle of Romanism. On the other hand, when we follow the divine injunction spoken on the Mount of Transfiguration, "Hear ye him," and Christ's Word alone is regarded as infallible, away goes mariolatry, away goes the mass with its altar, away go the horrors of purgatory, with priests and popes.

Hinc illæ iræ. When *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus* shows plainly that so eminent a man among early Christians as Hippolytus held the Protestant view of the Holy Scriptures,

it is not strange that this Romish reviewer lets his angry passions rise.

In writing these pages, the aim has been to avoid the example of the reviewer, who, instead of refuting the statements of the book, has performed the much easier task of hurling epithets at the author. The endeavor has been to return for his hard words some very hard facts, which, though they may not mollify the ire of the reviewer, it is hoped may draw the attention of some readers to the burning question of the papacy and its menace to America.

PARKE P. FLOURNOY.

NOTE.

At the suggestion of a valued friend, the following note, written by him, with change of a few words, is appended for the information of any who may not have read *The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*:

"In the year 1551, some excavations were made at Rome on the Via Tiburtina, or road to Tivoli. A marble statue was unearthed sitting in a chair. The figure represented a person of venerable aspect, bald, with a flowing beard, and wearing the Greek pallium. On the back of the chair is carved a catalogue of works composed, doubtless, by the person who occupies the chair. Within about fifty years several of these long-lost works have been discovered, and it is now known that the author is St. Hippolytus, a disciple of Irenæus, who was himself a disciple of Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John.

"This monument was placed in the Vatican, where it is now, and August 22d is marked in the Breviary as his *feſta*. The little book referred to (*The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus*) gathers from his writings evidence regarding the church in the city of Rome in his day, and that evidence is fatal to the pretensions of the papacy touching the pope and shows the recognized authority of the Scriptures independent of the church."