

Is the author of "Hindrances" aware of the following facts?—(1) That Canon Gore admits with us that our Blessed Lord promised to build His Church upon St. Peter, and that St. Peter himself is the rock. (2) That our Lord's words gave to St. Peter a headship among the Apostles that he was the Coryphæus, the leader of the Apostolic band. (3) That the Fathers, even the early Fathers, generally accord a certain primacy to the bishops in St Peter's See, *not merely because of the secular importance of Rome but because they connect the position of its bishop with the words of our Lord to St. Peter, if only as a symbol of unity.* We have shown the contrary of what the author of "Hindrances" asserts as to "St. Peter never imagining he had any supremacy." He always acted as the chief, with consciousness of the supremacy, because he believed that our Blessed Lord meant what He said when He bade him confirm his brethren, when He assured him that his faith should never fail, because He, Eternal Truth, had prayed that it might never fail, that he might be the head and guide of the whole flock committed to his keeping, shepherds as well as sheep.

The author of "Hindrances," repeating the assertions of his masters, Littledale and Gore, affirm that St Victor, Bishop of Rome, in 192 approved of the heresy called Montanism. I challenge him to produce any authority for this assertion except the discredited account of Tertullian. Let the author of "Hindrances" give us proofs of the condemnation of Popes Liberius and Honorius. As usual he makes gratuitous assertions on the authority of Dr Littledale and Canon Gore. We know the worth of the former, and the latter follows too blindly his master, Dr Pusey, who rests his supposition of the Pope's fall on the disputed letters of St Hilary, and a half quotation from the letters of St Jerome. The learned Bishop Hefele has ably refuted the errors prejudiced writers have fallen into with regard to the alleged heresy of these two great Popes. He has utterly demolished the "Fragments of St Hilary's Letters," and shows that St Hilary was an ardent admirer of Pope Liberius. I might add that had not the whole world, before the so-called Reformation, always looked upon the Pope as infallible in their teaching and ruling of the Church of God so much notice would never have been taken of supposed mistakes, which I repeat have never been proven. No proof has ever yet been given that any Pope defined aught contrary to faith.

Then the author of "Hindrances" says: "We find that the Western Church, on its own authority, deposed five other Popes, one John XXIII. as a simoniac, sorcerer, schismatic and heretic. And what are we to say of the time when there were rival Popes, sometimes as many as three at a time—excommunicating one another?" Has he never heard what is done when rival claimants appear in the State? or put forth their right to some property? Has he never read of pretenders to the crown? Does he not know there can be but one true owner or claimant? Are not the rest practically deposed? Does he not know that though there may be great delay justice is generally done at last to the lawful heir?

In the next paragraph the author of "Hindrances" tells us:—"In no way is the absurdity of the modern Roman claim of an infallible Pope shown more strikingly than in the fact that the decree of 1870 is directly opposed to the utterances of Pope Gregory the Great, who speaks of the 'blasphemous sin' of ascribing either to the Roman Pope or any other person the title and office of Universal Bishop, and so the decree of 1870 expresses its own disbelief in the very doctrine of Papal infallibility which it so loudly asserts." We answer that out of humility Pope St Gregory the Great chose as his title one which his successors have always since used, "*Servus servorum Dei.*" He refused the title of Œcumenical Patriarch. Why? The ambitious Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster, claimed the title of Œcumenical Patriarch. St Gregory declined the honour of the title but never did he shrink from the duties and rights imposed by the title of Supreme Pontiff. Otherwise how could he write, "As to what they say of the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See? This is constantly owned by the most pious Emperor and by our brother the Bishop of that city" (Lib. IX., Ep. 12); and again, "If any fault is found amongst Bishops, I know not any one who is not subject to the Apostolic See."

The author of "Hindrances" declares that the Church of England, whilst refuting the infallibility of any one man, has always held, in obedience to her Lord's words, the infallibility of the Church, and so accepts the first four General Councils, at which Bishops from every part of the Church were present. Does he not know that at the fourth of those Councils—that of Chalcedon, held in 451, at which Bishops from every part of the Church were present—the Fathers of that Council made public acknowledgement of the Papal supremacy? Here are the words as given by Harduin II., 660:—"In the person of Peter, our interpreter, you preserved the chain of faith by the command of our Master descending to us, wherefore, *using you as a guide*, we have signified the truth to the faithful; not by private interpretation, but by unanimous confession." If

"where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ He is there in the midst of them," how must He have been with 520 ministers? "Over these, *as the Head over the members*, you presided by those who held your rank; we entreat you, therefore, to honour our decision by your decrees; and, *as we agree with the Head*, so let your Eminence complete what is proper for your children."

The author of "Hindrances" says:—"Now supposing that the Roman claim about Peter being the Vicar of Christ was true, we should at once find evidence for it in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles." Does he find in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles evidence at once of all the claims of the Church of England, nay, of the Catholic Church, of which he thinks it to be a branch? Still, I may ask, is not St. Peter's name always prominent in the Acts of the Apostles? Is not the first miracle recorded of the Apostles that of Peter? On the memorable occasion on which he converts three thousand souls is Peter not the first to address the Jews at Jerusalem, whilst his brethren in the apostolate stand respectfully around him? Is he not the first to convert the Gentiles in the persons of Cornelius and his friends?

At page 15 of his pamphlet the author of "Hindrances" brings forward from the *New Zealand Church News* for 1871 the "great speech" of Bishop Strossmayer "against the innovation of Papal infallibility at the Vatican Council of 1870." With a feeling of pride, the author of "Hindrances" proclaims that the conclusions of the Primate of Hungary on this important matter of Papal infallibility are very nearly his own (the author's) conclusions. Unfortunately for our learned author, the great speech in which the Primate's conclusions by a remarkable coincidence are so nearly his own is no more to be relied upon than the misstatements of Dr Littledale. What are those remarkable conclusions? (1) That Jesus had given to His Apostles the same power that He had given to St. Peter; (2) that the Apostles never recognised in St. Peter the Vicar of Jesus Christ and the infallible doctor of the Church; (3) that St. Peter never thought of being Pope, and never acted as if he were Pope; (4) that the Councils of the first four centuries, whilst they recognise the high position which the Bishop of Rome occupied in the Church, on account of Rome, only accorded him a pre-eminence of honour—never of power or jurisdiction; (5) that the holy Fathers in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build My Church" never understood that the rock was built on Peter (*super Petrum*) but on the rock (*super Petram*)—that is, on the confession of faith of the Apostle. Doubtless it were a great triumph for the Christchurch orator if the orator of the Vatican believed as he does, though we might well ask, what is one Bishop or a single Primate amongst eight hundred or more who declared their adhesion to the decree of infallibility? But, unhappily for Christchurch, the great speech of Bishop Strossmayer is a mere myth. I am not the proud possessor of a valuable copy of the *New Zealand Church News* for 1871, but I do possess the whole of the deliberations, acts, and decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870, and I find in those acts that Bishop Strossmayer, though he, with a comparatively few other Bishops, at first thought the time for the definition was inopportune (whence the name they received of Inopportunist), subscribed to that same definition, and this in the very hands of the Infallible Pontiff Pius IX., of happy memory. As to the speech wherein the conclusions of both orators are so identical, the misfortune is that it was never delivered—it was not the work of Bishop Strossmayer. "When the speech had gone the round of Europe in a polyglot form," says the late Cardinal Manning, "Bishop Strossmayer *denounced it as a forgery*, and his letter has been printed again and again in England. Nevertheless the speech is reprinted continually to this day at Glasgow and Belfast, and sown broadcast by post over these kingdoms." Had the illustrious prelate been aware of the existence of the *New Zealand Church News* he might have added New Zealand to the list of countries where this notorious lie had been propagated. I have in my possession a copy of the very letter of repudiation written by Bishop Strossmayer to a lady, who still possesses the original (Miss O'Connor Morris, now Mrs William Bishop):—"Mademoiselle,—I hasten to reply to your letter received yesterday. The discourse attributed to me is altogether apocryphal. This calumny has been several times reproduced in the German papers; I solemnly contradicted it, and contradict it now; giving you, by this letter, full power to contradict it everywhere in my name. Receive the assurance of my esteem.—I am your servant, STROSSMAYER, Bishop. Rohic, July 1, 1873."

When clergymen speak from the pulpit we expect them to state what is true. When they assume to teach their own and other people the doctrine of a Church to which they do not belong the laws of justice and equity should oblige them to study those doctrines beforehand from some reliable source. When they dare state facts which give rise to issues of grave importance, we expect them, at least, not to make such assertions without first taking the trouble to ascertain whether they are founded on truth and whether they are accurate. The author of "Hindrances" has suffered himself to be the dupe of others.