



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

REMARKS

4.

ON THE

Rev. Mr. STANSER'S EXAMINATION

OF THE

Rev. Mr. BURKE'S LETTER OF INSTRUCTION

TO THE

C. M. of Nova-Scotia;

Together with

A R E P L Y

TO THE

*Rev. Mr. COCHRAN'S Fifth and Last LETTER
to Mr. B.*



PUBLISHED IN THE NOVA-SCOTIA GAZETTE;

As also

A Short Review of his former Letters,

AND THE

REPLIES WHICH WERE MADE.

Ebchamar Jehovah, imedou al derachim ou recoue shaclou lenithboth hōlam ſi zeh derak
ha tōb ou lechou bah ou mitfeou margoha le naphſhechim. — IERM.

Thus faith the Lord: ſtand on the ways, and ſee, and aſk of the old paths if this be the
right way, and walk in it. — JER. vi. 16.

Halifax:

PRINTED BY A. GAY.

1805.

REMARKS, &c.

THE Revd. Examiner draws a flattering picture of the Province of Nova-Scotia: it may be a highly favoured country;—but that no other country on earth unites so many circumstances, which contribute to human happiness, is a flourish of rhetoric;—this may pass for one of these irresistible traits of eloquence which his friend admires; but other men, who are not the dupes of empty sound, may ask, what has this to do with the Letter under Examination? Has Mr. B. made any remarks on the soil and climate of Nova-Scotia? has he endeavoured to rouse these wolves and leapords from their slumber? in the whole of his publication he supposes them at a distance, and cautions his flock against their wiles. He did not compliment any of the inhabitants of Nova-Scotia with the appellation of wolf or leapord; he did not point out any description of men concealing a dagger, and waiting an opportunity of plunging it into the heart of an unoffending and defenceless neighbour, when it could be done with impunity; if he had, he would well deserve the execration of every man who boasts the name of Christian. (*Er. p. 5.*) Mr. B. prays the Revd. Ex. in his next publication, to apply this stricture to its proper object. To enforce obedience to the Ruling Power, and to evince the merit of patience in sufferings, was the object of that Letter, which Mr. S. so severely censures.—The writer begs leave to assure him, that 'tis a lesson of great importance

tance to the Roman Catholics of Nova-Scotia; for whom the paltry privilege of teaching their own children at their own expence, is thought by some Rev. gentlemen too great an indulgence; though in the day of danger they have come forward with their fellow-subjects, and are always ready, when called on, to repel either a foreign or domestic foe.

The Rev. Ex. seems offended that the Catholics of Nova-Scotia were not informed that their ancestors thought it lawful to murder Princes, and break their faith with Heretics: in his opinion that would have been the most eligible mode of instructing them in their relative duties to their Prince, and their fellow-subjects, of different religious persuasions; but as the Ex. admits that there are scarcely two men of the same way of thinking, even on common topics, he must not be surpris'd that Mr. B. thought otherwise, he thought, and continues to think, that to asperse the memory of his ancestors with so foul an imputation, would have been something worse than ingratitude:—'twould have been an atrocious calumny, as he has shewn in his replies to P's Letters, and will appear more clearly from the answer of five Catholic Universities, to the queries proposed by the Catholic Committee in England, at the request of Mr. Pitt, who desired authentic evidence that these imputed doctrines were not taught or believed by Catholics, before a relaxation of the penal laws took effect in that country.—*See the Answers, No. 8.*

The Rev. Ex. pretends that the professed objects of Mr. B's Letter, (which are, he says, extremely laudible) occupy the smallest part of that publication: the greater part is filled with doctrines of an adverse complexion, with plausible misrepresentations of the tenets of the Romish Church, and a revival of its haughty pretensions. *Ex. p. 5.* The Ex. thus inadvertently informs the public that such doctrines as are ascribed to Catholics by artful adversaries, are not taught by C. Missionaries:—Mr. B. does not misrepresent—
sent—

sent—he clearly states the doctrine of Catholics: in an official letter to which he has affixed his name, he would not dare to misrepresent the tenets of the C. Church—he vindicates them from misrepresentation; he does not borrow colours from fanatical enthusiasts to paint the doctrines of the church; he finds the true colours in which it must appear to the unprejudiced and impartial eye, in her public profession of faith, and in the doctrinal decrees of her councils—imputed doctrines he disregards;—the disingenuity of the declaimer he forgives, and pities the credulity of the dupe.

It has been remarked by some philosopher that prejudice is a false glass, that it distorts every object;—but the writer was yet to learn that a glass, whether true or false could shew an object which does not exist at all:—in the whole of Mr. B's Letter, he has not once mentioned the Romish Church, nor has he said a word of her privileges or pretensions; how then it could occupy the greater part of that Letter is an inexplicable paradox. The unbiassed reader will easily conceive what may be expected from a writer, who under pretence of examining a Letter, substitutes to its contents the suggestions of his own imagination.

The Rev. Ex. consulting his sensibility in preference to his understanding, bitterly inveighs against some reflections in the publication which he examines; in it there are some strictures which may appear severe; but they don't affect the innocent: they were not intended for the Rev. Ex. or his friend, why pretend to feel the smart of a stroke intended for another? Mr. B. is insensible to the most pointed accusations, and invidious insinuations:—all shafts are blunt against conscious innocence.

As the Rev. Mr. *Cochran*, in his first Letter under the signature of P, whilst declaiming against the supposed democratical sentiments of Mr. B. announced his own political creed purely democratical, as was shewn to demonstration in the reply to that Letter, so his
friend

friend and ally declaiming on the same subject, which seems to be a favourite theme, speaks a language purely and simply democratical : “ the duty of allegiance,” says he, *Ex. p. 7.* “ arises from the first principles of the social compact ;” and a few lines after he says : “ ’tis wrong to claim the benefit of a contract without performing the conditions.” Obedience therefore in the opinion of the Rev. Ex. is the effect of this compact, or if you will a consequence resulting from the contract of individuals with the Prince ; and as oppression is no part of the contract, the doctrine of non-resistance is here, by necessary consequence, excluded.

The coincidence of these powerful allies in the same democratical principle, which they pretend to censure, is not the effect of chance, though it may be inadvertent : predetermined to censure, and not finding a proper subject, they collect some garbled passages into one or more sentences, so disposed as to make them speak a language in direct opposition to that intended by the author, and having by this artful contrivance conjured up a phantom for their purpose, their strictures flow without restraint ; nature is unbent, and the real sentiments of their hearts are disclosed, of this the Ex. gives a striking instance :—in his first quotation from Mr. B’s Letter he garbles three several passages, and forms them into one, in which the terms “ *calumnious misrepresentations,*” are so insidiously disposed as to have an immediate reference to the legislature, whereas in Mr. B’s pamphlet they are ascribed to Clergymen, who abjure the *Catholic*, and conform to the established religion. Let the reader compare the Ex’s quotation with the original, he’ll be charmed with Mr. *Stanfer’s* fidelity and candour in quoting passages from the work which he undertakes to examine ; and if he adds to this, the Rev. Mr. *Cochran’s* quotation from the Bishop of *Nova-Scotia’s* Charge, he will exclaim with the Poet, “ *par nobile fratrum ;*” “ all who are acquainted with
“ their

“ their character (the native Irish Romanists,) must
 “ be sensible that they are naturally a compassionate,
 “ friendly, hospitable people”—*Bish. Ch. p. 8. 1 ed.*—
 Right Mr. Cochran! but why conceal the remainder
 of this remarkable passage? “ yet under the malignant
 “ influence of superstition, they will without remorse,
 “ plunge a dagger into the heart of that very person,
 “ if he should be what they call a heretic.” Why
 suppress what follows? “ they think they are serving
 “ God and his truth by these enormities.” The reader
 may imagine that Mr. *Cochran* thought a compliment,
 so honourable from so pious and learned a Prelate,
 might excite some sentiments of native pride in these
 Irish Papists, and wisely suppressed it. However,
 we who have not that boundless charity, which prevents
 vanity in others, at the expence of our own reputation
 for veracity, and who know how to catch the lineaments
 of fraud and flattery, very naturally conclude, that
 writers so steeled against conviction, who notoriously
 garble quotations from pamphlets written in plain
 English, and in the hands of the public, have not been
 very delicate in their citations from works confined to
 great libraries, and written in languages which the bulk
 of mankind does not understand; some of them in a
 language, which however mortifying to vanity, the
 writer has strong reasons to believe that neither the
 one or the other of these allies understands. When he
 hears such men compare French writers; call one who
 has been, ’tis true, “ a laborious compiler,” the glory
 of French writers, he fancies that he sees the old
 Senator repress the arrogance of the young Athenian,
 who wished to have all the laws of Athens reformed.
 Have you studied them? said the Senator—No: know
 them first, and then decide, replies the Sage—’tis
 not difficult to make the application.

The frivolous pretence of vindicating the Legislature
 from any imputation, is assumed as a mask to cover the
 most virulent attack and pointed invectives: Mr. B.

had

had assigned solid and sufficient reasons to justify the conduct of the Legislature for which he expressed, and entertains the greatest respect and deference ; he said, 'tis true, that some political characters, see the principles of Catholics disfigured in penal statutes, and in this he is supported by the authority of *Hume*, whom *Mr. Cochran* calls an impartial historian, he says, “ a horror of Papists, however innocent—a terror of the Conspiracies of that sect however improbable, the Commons at all times endeavoured to excite.” And again he says, “ the adversaries of the Papists seem to have thought that no truth is to be told of Idolaters : encouragement was given to informers as appears from the memorable Plot of *Titus Oates*, and his perjured gang of accomplices.” “ This abandoned man Oates,” says *Hume*, vol viii. 72, “ when examined before the Council, betrayed his impostures in such a manner as would have discredited the most consistent story, and the most reputable evidence ; but the violent animosity, which had been excited against Catholics, made the public swallow the grossest absurdities, when they accompanied an accusation against those Religionists.

“ The leaders of the party were so little scrupulous as to endeavour by encouraging perjury, subornation, lies, impostures, and even shedding innocent blood to gratify their ambition.” vol. viii. 99.

The Ex. admits that the Catholic Religion was the established religion in England, till the reign of *Henry VIII.* he might have added, without fearing a contradiction, that if the principles which he, his Bishop, and other friends ascribe to the Catholics, had been a part of their Creed, it might yet continue : the power of resistance was as great in *Henry's* days as in the time of *James II.* : but the principle of obedience to the ruling Prince, whether a Christian or a Heathen, was a part of the established doctrine ; a doctrine which our ancestors believed, and reduced to practice in the most trying circumstances.

circumstances. The cruelties exercised in *Henry's* reign were not by Papists: they were in possession of their estates and religion before his birth, and were by him arbitrarily and tyrannically deprived of both. There were some cruelties committed in *Mary's* reign; but she was *Henry's* daughter and *Elizabeth's* sister. If the softness of her sex, or the lenity of the Christian, had been a prominent feature in her character, she would have been a most degenerate child. Add to this that *Mary* had a personal dislike to some leading characters, *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Northumberland*, and others of King *Edward's* Council. "The King being
 " far gone in a consumption, from a concern for preserv-
 " ing the reformation, was persuaded to set aside the
 " succession of his sisters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, and of
 " the Queen of Scots, the first and last being Papists,
 " and *Elizabeth's* blood being tainted by Act of Par-
 " liament; and to settle the Crown by will upon Lady
 " *Jane Grey* the King was a minor and
 " incapable of making a will they set their
 " hands to the validity of it." *Neal, His. of Pur. ch. 3.*

"The judges who were appointed to draw up the
 " King's letters patent for the purpose, warmly object-
 " ed to the measure; they gave their reasons before
 " the Council, and begged that a Parliament might be
 " summoned, both to give it force and free its partizans
 " from danger; they said that the form was invalid,
 " and would not only subject the Judges, who drew it
 " up, but every Counsellor, who signed it, to the pains
 " of treason."—*His. of the Wars of England, p. 170.*

Thus we see *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, whose fate the
 Ex. laments, by their private authority, in the face of
 law and equity, disregarding the official opinion of the
 Learned Judges, disposing of a Crown, which of all
 right belonged to *Mary*. If she had forgiven it we
 might be tempted to suspect that she had not a drop
 of *Henry's* blood in her veins. *Neal* giving a sketch of
Mary's character, says, *ch. 3.* "She had deep relent-

“ ments of her own ill usage in her father’s and bro-
 “ ther’s times, which easily induced her to take re-
 “ venge, though she covered it over with zeal against
 “ heresy. *Neal*, though a violent Anti-papist, assigns,
 the true motive of the persecution in *Mary’s* days, that
 is, the Queen’s resentment of personal injuries. That
 she had cause for resentment against *Cranmer*, is un-
 questionably true; he had declared her mother’s mar-
 riage invalid; he had authorised by his presence her
 father’s marriage with *Anne Bolune*, even before that
 declaration; he had signed King *Edward’s* pretended
 will in order to exclude her from the Crown, and had
 openly declared in favour of *Jane Gray*. These
 facts, of which there exists not the shadow of a doubt,
 are not of the number of slight transgressions, which
 Princes easily forgive, there were other reasons, which
 excited the indignation of the Queen and her cour-
 tiers, when in peaceable possession of the throne,
 “ what could be more provoking, says *Mr. Collier*, to
 “ the court, than to see the Queen’s honour aspersed,
 “ their religion insulted, their preachers shot at in the
 “ Pulpit, and a lewd imposture played against the
 “ Government? Had the reformed been more smooth
 “ and inoffensive in their behaviour; had the eminent
 “ Clergy of that party published an abhorrence of such
 “ unwarrantable methods, it is possible, some say, that
 “ they might have met with gentler usage
 “ the misbehaviour of some people about this time
 “ seems to have soured the humour of the Court, and
 “ brought the reformed under farther disfavour: for in-
 “ stance one *Edward Featherstone*, alias *Constable*, coun-
 “ terfeited himself King *Edward* the Sixth
 “ he was seized, and confessed that he had been impor-
 “ tuned by a great many to undertake the imposture.”
 The learned historian gives other instances, and con-
 cludes that from the jealousy of men in power, some-
 times a whole party suffers for the faults of a few.

Does the Ex. imagine that Catholics don’t feel inju-
 ries

ries like other Men? that the moral precepts of the Gospel have such force as to restrain all Men's passions and at all times? are there no delinquents amongst Protestants? none who say with the Poet, "*video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor?*"

I see and approve what's right, and do what's wrong.

The principles of Catholics were well known in them days says our Ex.—true! but they were strangely disfigured, as were their actions, by men whose interest was incompatible with a system of religion, in the destruction of which they found wherewith to aggrandise themselves and their associates.—Of this we have authentic evidence: *Henry*, whose avarice kept pace with his lust, which was the great spring of his actions, having in vain endeavoured to induce the Clergy to acknowledge his spiritual supremacy in order to enable him to dismiss an old wife, caused an indictment to be preferred against them in Westminster Hall, on the statute of *Præmunire*, for acknowledging Cardinal *Woolsey's* legantine powers without the King's sanction, and having obtained judgment on the statute, the whole body of the Clergy were declared out of the King's protection, their goods and chattels forfeited to him. He, good man, offered pardon on two conditions: the first was that the provinces of Canterbury and York should pay into the Exchequer £.118,840 sterling, an immense sum in 1530, when money was scarce and of proportionate value; the second condition was that they should acknowledge him *sole Supreme Head of the Church*: this last condition was inadmissible: they qualified it by the addition of a clause destructive of its intent, that is, "as far as it is agreeable to the laws of Christ;" but what the Clergy in the most desperate situation did not grant, the Parliament without their concurrence did shortly after, in the year 1533. By the Act of Supremacy, 26. Hen. 8th. Chap. 1st. "this, says *Neal*, was the rise of the refor-

“ mation : the whole power of reforming errors and
 “ heresies in doctrine and worship was transferred
 “ from the Pope to the King, without any regard to
 “ the rights of synods or Councils of the Clergy, and
 “ without a reserve of liberty to such consciences as
 “ could not comply with the public standard. This
 “ was undoubtedly a change for the better, but is far
 “ from being consonant to scripture or reason.”——
Neal, ch. 1st. p. 12.—*Neal* must have been a profound
 philosopher to have discovered, that a change incon-
 sistent with scripture and reason, our only rules of con-
 duct, was for the better.

In consequence of this parliamentary concession, in
 virtue of his new, and till that unfortunate period un-
 heard of Apostleship, *Henry*, under pretence of esta-
 blishing order to the religious houses, but in reality to
 fill his exhausted treasury, and reward the services of
 his creatures, appoints visitors with the most extensive
 powers. “ *Cromwell*,” says *Mr. Collier*,—*2nd part,*
2nd book, p. 104,—“ being authorised by the King’s
 “ letters patent, under the broad seal, to constitute de-
 “ puties for a visitation made choice of *Richard Layton*,
 “ *Thomas Leigh*, *William Petre*, doctors of the law ;
 “ *Doctor John London*, Dean of *Walsingham*, &c. for
 “ this purpose they were furnished at least
 “ some of these first named with a plenitude of power
 “ to visit all Archbishops, Bishops, and the rest of the
 “ Clergy and as to the Monasteries, they had
 “ as it were an unlimited authority.”

Such were the powers conferred on *Thomas Crom-*
well, an outcast from the dregs of *Pultney*, a menial
 servant to *Cardinal Woolsey*, raised by this insatiable
 Prince to high dignity, and constituted his Vicar Ge-
 neral, “ in which quality he sat diverse times in the
 “ convocation house amongst the Bishops, as head over
 “ them.”—*Sir Richard Baker, p. 408.*—and these
 powers were stretched by the miscreants whom he
 chose for this memorable visitation.

“ The

“ The images of a great many pretended saints were
 “ taken down and burnt, and all the rich offerings
 “ made at their shrines was seized for the crown,
 which brought an immense treasure into the Exche-
 “ quer.”—*Neal, ch. 1st. p. 19.*—All Monasteries under
 the yearly value of £.200 Sterling, were suppressed on
 the first report, they were 376 in number, and their
 yearly value £.32,000.—Plate, jewels, and furniture,
 £.100,000, the lead, bells, and other materials were
 sold ; a new court called the court of augmentations of
 the King’s revenue, to receive the rents, dispose of the
 lands, and bring the profits into the Exchequer, was
 erected, 27. *Hen. VIII. chap. 27, 28.* Ten thousand
 Monks, old and young, were sent to shift for them-
 selves, each man with forty five shillings in his pocket.
 Shortly after followed the dissolution of the great Ab-
 beys ; they were rated at the yearly rent of £.131,607
 6s. 4d. but at least were worth ten times as much in
 real value. Most of the abbey lands were given away
 amongst the courtiers, or sold at easy rates to the gentry,
 to engage them by interest against the resumption of
 them to the church.—*Neal, ibidem*—thus this new
 Pope established order in the religious houses !

The men and means employed by *Henry* were
 well adapted to the end which this reforming Prince
 had in view. The destruction of abbeyes, monasteries,
 colleges, hospitals ; in a word, of all the monuments of
 ancient piety, was rapid beyond expression under the
 direction of these architects of ruin. “ England sat sigh-
 “ ing and groaning, to see her wealth exhausted, her
 “ money embased and mingled with copper, abbeyes
 “ demolished which were the monuments of ancient
 “ piety, the blood of the nobility, prelates, papists, and
 “ protestants, promiscuously spilt, and the land em-
 “ broiled in a war with Scotland.”—*Camb. Intro.*
Hist. of Eliz.

The ministers employed in these scenes of sacrilegi-
 ous plunder had recourse to means at which nature
 shudders :

shudders : Sir *William Dugdale* in his celebrated history of Warwickshire, speaking of the dissolution of a monastery of nuns called Polesworth, thence takes an occasion to describe the dissolution of all the monasteries and abbeys in England. “ I find it left recorded by “ the commissioners that were employed to take sur- “ render of the monasteries in this shire, An. 29. *Hen- “ ry VIII.* that after strict scrutiny not only by the “ fame of the country, but by examination of several “ persons, they found these nuns virtuous and religious “ women, and of good conversation. Nevertheless “ it was not the strict and regular lives of these devout “ ladies, nor any thing that might be said in behalf of “ the monasteries, that could prevent their ruin then “ approaching. So great an aim had the King thereby “ to make himself glorious, and many others no less “ hopes to be enriched in a considerable manner ; but “ to the end that such a change should not overwhelm “ those, that might be active therein, in regard the “ people every where had no small esteem of these “ houses for their devout and daily exercises in prayer. “ Alms deeds, hospitality and the like, whereby not “ only the souls of their ancestors had much benefit, “ as was then thought ; but themselves, the poor, as also “ strangers and pilgrims constant advantage ; there “ wanted not the most subtle contrivances to effect “ this stupendous work, that I think any age has be- “ held. Whereof it will not be impertinent, I pre- “ sume, to take a short view.” This Learned Prote- stant historian describes the men and measures employ- ed in this work of darkness and devastation. The promotion of *Thomas Cromwell*, to the place of King’s Vicar-General, the tragical fate of that arch villain, the promotion of *Cranmer* to the Archbishopric of Can- terbury, and some others as proper instruments for such a work ; and in his description he discloses such a complication of hell invented stratagems and mon- strous crimes as startle horror itself.

To the testimony of this well informed Protestant writer, the writer begs leave to add that of Mr. *Thomas Hearn*, taken from his observations on Mr. *Brown Willis's* View of the Mitred Abbeys, "Popery, as I take it," said he, "signifies no more than the errors of the Church of Rome, had he (*Henry VIII.*) therefore put a stop to those errors, he had acted wisely and very much to the content of all truly good and religious men, but then this would not have satisfied the ends of himself and his covetous and ambitious agents. They all aimed at the revenues and riches of the religious houses, for which reason no arts or contrivances were to be passed by, that might be of use in obtaining these ends. The most abominable crimes were to be charged upon the religious, and the charge was to be managed with the utmost dexterity, boldness and industry. This was a powerful argument to draw an odium upon them, and to make them disrespected and ridiculed by the generality of mankind. And yet after all the proofs were so insufficient, that from what I have been able to gather, I have not found any direct one against a single monastery. The sins of one or two particular persons do not make a Sodom, neither are violent and forced confessions to be esteemed as the true results of any one's thoughts. When therefore even these artifices would not do, the last expedient was put in execution, and that was ejection by force."

Burnet himself, though full of the most virulent animosity against the monastic state, acknowledges that in the nunnery of Godstow, where all the gentlewomen of the country had their education, there was great strictness of life.—*Hist. of the Ref. v. 5, p. 238.*—'Twas here that sacrilegious miscreant *London*, was appointed visitor, and behaved with brutal insolence; he was afterwards convicted of perjury, and condemned to ride with his face to the horses tail, at Windsor and Oakingham

Oakingham, with papers about his head declaring his crimes.

Henry and his ministers did not find wherewith to satisfy their cravings in the plunder of the abbeys and monasteries: they turned their eyes towards the Bishopsrics, "concerning which there goes a story," says Doctor *Heylin*, "that after the Court harpies had devoured the greatest part of the spoil, which came by the suppression of monasteries and abbeys, they began to look some other way to satisfy that greedy appetite, which the division of the former booty had left unsatisfied, and for the satisfying of which, they found not any thing so necessary as the Bishop's lands."

But there yet remained a something to be gleaned in *Edward's* days: *Henry* had not yet abolished the Mass; the altars, of course, censers, chalices and candlesticks kept their place, some shrines and images remained, "on these," says Doctor *Heylin*, "some great men about the Court had cast a longing eye, and under colour of removing such corruptions as remained in the church, they were cried down, and the chantry lands parcelled out to the improvement of their own fortunes." Then speaking of a proposal from some of the Zuienglian party to pull down altars, he says, "the touching on this string made excellent music to some of the grandees of the Court, who had before cast many an envious eye on the costly hangings, the massy plate, and other rich and precious utensils, which adorned those altars . . . besides there was no small spoil to be made of copes, some of them made of cloth of tiffue, of cloth of gold and silver or embroidered velvet. And might not these be converted to private uses, to serve as carpets for their tables; coverlets to their beds, or cushions to their chairs and windows? Hereupon some rude people are encouraged to beat down some altars, which makes way for an order of the Council-table to take
" down

“down all the rest, and set up tables in their places,
 “followed by a commission to be executed in all parts
 “of the kingdom for seizing of the premises for the
 “use of the King. But as the grandees of the Court
 “intended to defraud the King of so great a booty, and
 “the Commissioners to put a cheat upon the Court
 “Lords, who employed them in it; so they were both
 “prevented in some places by the Lords and gentry,
 “who thought the altar cloths, together with the copes
 “and plate of several churches, to be as necessary for
 “themselves as others.”—*Pref.*

“The Parliament met on the 4th of November, in
 “which the cards were so well packed, that there was
 “no need of any other shuffling to the end of the game;
 “because they all agreed in the common principle,
 “which was to serve the present time for tho’
 “a great part of the nobility, and not a few of the
 “gentry in the House of Commons, were cordially af-
 “fected to the church of Rome, yet were they willing
 “to give way to all such acts and statutes as were
 “made against it, out of a fear of losing such church
 “lands as they were possessed of, if that religion should
 “prevail and get up again. And as for the rest who
 “either came to make, or improve their fortunes, there
 “is no question to be made, but they came to further
 “such a reformation as should most visibly conduce to
 “the advancement of their several ends, which appears
 “plainly by the strange mixture of the acts and results
 “thereof.”—*Hey. p. 47 & 48.*

The measures adopted by these artful men were perfectly correspondent to their flagitious pursuits: ’tis not therefore difficult to assign the motives which induced them to disfigure, and misrepresent the doctrines of that church, the destruction of which must ensure them success: Vows of celibacy of obedience, &c. were declared unlawful and impracticable, to enable them to seize on the abbey lands, and all the wealth of the monasteries;—crimes which were never committed, were

supposed, and industriously circulated to silence the murmurs and complaints of the public, at seeing the property consecrated by the piety of their ancestors; and in which they found an assured resource for themselves and their children embezzled by the Exchequer, and squandered on Court minions:—"they represented their offences in such multiplying glasses, as made them both greater in number, and more horrid in nature, than indeed they were."—*Hey. p. 202.*

Sir William Dugdale asserts, "that the Commissioners threatened to charge the Canons of Leicester with buggery and adultery, unless they would submit."

Burnet admits that complaints were made of the violence and bribery of the visitors, and adds, perhaps not without reason, so great is the force of truth, that it has extorted a confession even from *Burnet*, and in his abridgement, p. 182, he says, "it was complained that Doctor *London* had corrupted many nuns."

Burnet's attempt to asperse the chastity of the nuns, exposes to the hatred and detestation of the world, the visitor and the men who employed and instructed him.

The sacrifice of the Mass abolished, altars and all the ornaments of the Churches became useless. The plate and jewels consecrated by the piety of the faithful, during a space of nine centuries, fell at once into the coffers of the Court, and its favourites.

The doctrine of purgatory rejected, the universal practice of praying for the dead must be abolished, a practice as old as Christianity, a practice in use amongst the Jews long before the birth of Christ, as appears from the history of the Maccabees, which, whether canonical or not, is a correct Jewish history. Hence all the chantry lands founded for perpetuating prayers for the faithful departed, fell to the crown.

Finally by pretending that the veneration which Catholics always expressed for the reliicks of saints, a veneration which Moses shewed to the remains of the patriarch

patriarch Joseph, favoured of idolatry, shrines and reliquaries of immense value became a prey to the sordid and sacrilegious avarice of men, who seem to have literally reduced to practice that lesson which *Horace*, in the true spirit of irony, gave to his fellow-citizens. " *Rem recte si possis si non, quocumque modo, rem . . .*
 " *oh Cives. Cives quærenda est pecunia primum, Vir-*
 " *tus post Nummos.*"

Once more were not these men under an irresistible temptation of misrepresenting, and calumniating the tenets of that church, in the spoils of which they found the aggrandisement of themselves and their families? was not *Mr. Burke* perfectly right in asserting that they were interested in suppressing Catholic doctrine through political views.

Sir William Davenant describes the destruction effected by these zealous reformers in the following lines:

" Who sees these dismal heaps but will demand,
 " What barbarous invaders sacked the land?
 " But when he hears no Goth no Turk did bring,
 " This desolation, but a Christian King;
 " When nothing but the name of zeal appears,
 " 'Twixt our best actions and the worst of theirs.
 " What does he think our sacrilege would spare?
 " Since these the effects of our doctrines are."

To conclude this article—if such men were directed by heaven, and such measures suggested by the H. G. we must acquit the devil of all the wickedness, which is practised in this world, and acknowledge that his sable Majesty, though called the father of lies, is himself foully belied in every indictment which is preferred for murder, perjury, sacrilege, &c.

The writer has not cited one Catholic author: if he were to set before the eyes of the public, scenes painted by *Saunders*, by *Stapleton*, *Hollywood*, and *Daly*, and some other cotemporary writers, horror would grow impatient, and reason stand appalled, at the unparalleled enormities committed under pretence of reforming religion, and reducing it to the primitive standard.

The writer does not intend, or even pretend, to make the most distant allusion to the present times: he knows that the men who now exist, are no more accountable for the crimes of their ancestors, than he is himself for the massacres, rapine, sacrilege, and all the other crimes committed by the merciless Danes, his ancestors, in their different incursions.

The Ex. in imitation of other pamphleteers collects a summary of what he calls Catholic doctrine, not from Catechisms, Manuals, Professions of faith, or any authentic source; but from the misrepresentation of party writers, who finding it impossible to refute any article of Catholic doctrine fairly stated, garble some quotations from obscure writers of no authority, and distort the words of others from their intended signification, and thus compose a creed for us, of which we believe no more than we do of the Alcoran. The more absurd this pretended creed, the better it answers the inventor's purpose. The confidence with which they obtrude their own fabrications on the credulity of the public in the face truth, excites astonishment. If Catholic writers reclaim, they instantly reply, that Catholic doctrine is misrepresented by Catholics, as if they were authorised to compose our creed. All these barefaced impositions have been abundantly refuted in Mr. B's replies to P. The writer adds that the Rev. Ex. grossly imposes on his readers, when he says that the Legislative Body imputes those doctrines to Catholics: their proposing an oath to Catholics is evidence of the contrary; for if they thought an oath incapable of binding Catholics, 'twould be useless to propose it. The Legislature obliges Catholics to disclaim these tenets, which are imputed to them by Messrs. *Stanfer* and *Cochran*, and other party writers, who in order to excite an odium against Catholics, pretend to know our doctrine better than we do ourselves. Catholics have disclaimed them, and given the Legislature a pledge of their fidelity, which Catholics only can give, that is,
their

their solemn tried and inflexible faith, which no penal rigour could extort for more than a century. The man who hears this, and pretends to suspect the oath of a Catholic, does not know our faith, or he does not know the truth.

The writer begs leave to correct a version of a papal decree given by Mr. *Stanfer*—'tis quoted in the original, and the translation, whether through ignorance, design, or inadvertence, is strained to serve a purpose :—“ *Ex-*
 “ *communicamus & anathematizamus omnem hæresim*
 “ *extollentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam &*
 “ *Catholicam fidem, quam superimus exposuimus*
 “ *condemnantes hereticos universos, quibuscumque nomi-*
 “ *nibus censeantur : faces quidem diversas habentes sed*
 “ *Caudas ad invicem alligatas, quia de Vanitate conve-*
 “ *nunt en idipsum.*”

The Ex. in his version, artfully passes unnoticed the terms which determine the sense of the decree, and point out the persons against whom 'twas enacted :—“ We excommunicate,” says he, “ every herefy against the Holy Orthodox and Catholic Faith,”—whereas in the decree 'tis said :—“ we excommunicate every herefy raising itself against the true Orthodox and Catholic Faith, *which we have already exposed.*” The faith which the Prelates had exposed, was the mysteries of the trinity, the incarnation, the creation, &c. against the Manicheans, under different denominations who denied them. Thus our Ex. transfers, by his private authority, a sentence denounced in 1198, against the most impious and flagitious of men, who pretended that the Devil was the creator of the world, to Protestants who made their first appearance in 1518.

Other faults in his version are passed unnoticed: they seem to argue no great knowledge of the learned languages. This may caution the public against taking the sense of any Latin quotation on his authority.

In answer to his quotation from *Bellarmino*, the
 writer

writer would advise the Ex. seriously to peruse the works of that celebrated controvertist: he will find in them such conclusive evidence in support of Catholic doctrine as such, and such irresistible force of reasoning against all new-fangled systems of religion, as have rendered every attempt at refutation vain, and few attempts were made. His private opinion of Papal power in temporals is founded on meer conjecture; he does not offer it as Catholic doctrine. It has been decisively refuted in the Universities of France and Spain, as 'twas in Mr. B's Letter of Instruction. A more unfounded conjecture is not in the whole work, than that which this Ex. has borrowed—'tis manifestly against history: in Julian's days Pagans were comparatively few: on this all historians agree.

The Ex. without adducing a single quotation from the Council of Trent, confidently asserts that all these absurd doctrines invented by himself and his friends for Catholics, were distinctly and expressly taught by that Council.—The assertion is simply false and groundless: the Council taught no such doctrines—the writer believes the Council infallible in all its doctrinal decrees, and does not believe a syllable of this doctrine which the Ex. ascribes to it, and he begs leave to inform him, that he pretends, without vanity, to understand the doctrine of the Council of Trent, as well as Mr. S. or Mr. C. who in all appearance never read a line in its decrees.

“How far,” says the Ex. p. 13, “the decrees of Popes are binding upon Roman Catholics, may be seen in the Creed of *Pius IV.* which is the standard of their religion;” is the Ex. so ignorant of Catholic doctrine as not to know that the standard of that doctrine was fixed some centuries before *Pius IV.* was born? or has he seen any of these tenets which he ascribes to Catholics in that profession of faith compiled by *Pius's* order? has he discovered that we Catholics are obliged to believe in the decrees of Popes? the
writer

writer has now that profession of faith before him, and is not clear-sighted enough to discover any such thing: —“ I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred Canon; and general Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent.” All this the writer sincerely receives and professes; in it there is not one word of Popes decrees. *Gregory I.* surnamed the Great, to whom England owes her conversion from the most stupid idolatry and barbarous superstition, in his confession of faith—*Lib. 1. Epist. 25.*—says, “ that he received the four general Councils—of Nice, of Constantinople, of Ephesus, and of Chalcedon, as the four books of the Gospel.” The decisions of general Councils were thought infallible. *Gregory* says nothing of the decrees of Popes, nor does the profession of faith authorised by *Pius IV.* As to the obedience which we Catholics owe the Pope, 'tis perfectly consistent with our obedience and allegiance to our Prince: it extends to nothing unjust or unlawful. If the King and Parliament, and every other constituted authority in England, to which both Mr. B. and Mr. S. have sworn obedience, should order them to seduce a neighbour's wife or daughter, they ought not to obey: because the obedience which they owe to a higher power, forbids it.—In like manner, if the Pope or any other authority under him, should order us Catholics to withdraw our allegiance, or break our plighted faith, we would not obey: because a Higher Power orders us to obey honor and serve our King, and religiously perform our engagements.

To conclude this article, 'tis matter of surprise, that Mr. S. should give the profession of faith of *Pius IV.* for a standard of Catholic faith, and at the same time endeavour to persuade the public, that doctrines, not one of which is to be found, even by implication, in that profession of faith, are believed by us.

A sketch of *Cranmer's* character, taken from his
great

great admirer *Burnet*, will be given hereafter. *Ridley* and *Latimer* were engaged in the same treasonable conspiracy for which he suffered. "Doctor *Ridley*, Bishop of London, the 16th of July, at St. Paul's Cross, preached a sermon, wherein he invited the people to stand firm to Queen *Jane*, whose cause he affirmed was most just."—*Baker's Hist.* p. 215. The writer is humbly of opinion that if the Rev. Ex. himself or his powerful ally, had been engaged in supporting the pretensions of a King *Guilford*, or a Queen *Jane*, against the rightful heir of the crown, they would deservedly share *Ridley's* fate: a pretext of propping a tottering church would not save their necks from the halter.

As to the punishments inflicted on heretics, Mr. B. has shewn in his replies to P. that they were decreed by the civil power, without any participation of the ecclesiastical authority; that to accuse the Church of encouraging them is an unfounded slander. That some ecclesiastics, actuated by the spirit of revenge or ambition, might have encouraged them is true; but nothing to the purpose. *Bonner* and *Gardiner* were of the number. They had been roughly handled in the reign of *Edward VI.* at no time possessed of that spirit of meekness and patience which characterize the Christian Prelate. Whilst *Heath*, the Archbishop of York, and *Oglethorpe*, Bishop of Carlisle, with the Bishops of Oxford and Gloucester, of Worcester and Hereford, discountenanced all rigorous measures. *Alphonsus*, a Spanish Friar, Confessor to King *Philip*, preached vehemently against persecution, and made the most pointed strictures against some of the Bishops, who resorted to a method of converting sinners condemned by the Christian law, and only in use amongst heathens.

From several mistranslations in this pretended Examination, the writer begins to suspect that the Rev. Ex. does not understand the language in which the ci-
vil

vil and canon law is written. Thus for example, —“*Exterminaire*,” he translates to extirpate. In the legal sense it signifies to banish *extra terminos*. To extirpate, is to root out, to destroy.

After having proved his first position, “that we Catholics think it lawful to break faith with heretics, in his usual mode by these irrefragable reasons,” *it is certain; the world knows*. And an anecdote of a Jewish girl, told by an anonymous friend, the Ex. proceeds to the second, “that we Catholics think duplicity and deceit in general lawful.”—For this he adduces something more than his old proof *it is certain*, that is a garbled quotation from the *Decretum* of Gratien, of which Catholics never heard. The writer begs leave to inform this Rev. Ex. of what he does not seem to know, that Gratien’s object in compiling that work, was to reconcile seeming inconsistencies, in which he was more than once inconsistent with himself and with truth, as the University of Paris had shewn in defence of its censure against *Montesson*—see *Rep. to P.*)—that this is one of his errors is manifest, from a misquotation of St. Paul. In the Vulgate the text has, “*in similitudinem Carnis peccati* :” in the original Greek *en omoïomati sarkos amartias*,” in plain English: in the likeness of flesh of sin, and in the intended sense of the Apostle, “in flesh like to that of sin, or subject to sin.” The Ex. has given it: *in simulationem carnis peccatricis*, a manifest perversion of the text, and even that he mistranslates: “*the false appearance of sinful flesh*.” Simulation is a plain Latin word which does not signify a *false appearance*, but the art of concealing a truth, which a man is not obliged to reveal: as if a traveller on his way to Annapolis, through Windsor, from Halifax, should reply to this impertinent question—whither are you going? I’m on the way to Windsor. When a man is juridically interrogated by proper authority no such evasion is allowed.—See *Rep. to P.*

This Rev. Ex. proceeds to quote from *Gratien*, “be- hold what lies are venial and what are damnable;”— who would imagine that so powerful a controvertist as this Ex. would thus invalidate the whole force of the argument which he draws from the *Decretum*, cited in capitals, and adding so much weight to his former proofs, “it is certain; the world knows; every body who knows any thing of the Romish religion knows.” Now the writer, who knows something of the Romish religion, tells this Rev. Ex. that we Catholics do think that some lies are venial, and some are damnable, without thinking any lie either laudable or lawful: for we have not yet learnt to believe even on the evangelical authority of the Wirtemberg Evangelist *Martin*, that all sins are equally damnable; we think that an act of intemperance on the King’s Birth Day is not so damnable a crime as murder; we think that an amusing jest is not inductive of perdition, tho’ atrocious calumny most certainly is, and this our doctrine is so evidently founded on reason, that *Horace*, an Epicurean poet, believed it.

The Pope if we believe, this Ex. has actually granted a previous dispensation from the oath of allegiance. Mr. B. has shewn the contrary; and experience shews that no dispensations are granted: if they were English Catholics might by a single oath relieve themselves from all penal restrictions and disabilities:— But here’s another decree,—“all oaths contrary to the advantage of the Romish Church are to be considered rather as perjuries than oaths.” The Ex. had added the term *Romish* by his own private authority: he takes these trifling liberties of adding and retrenching when necessary to fix the sense which serves his purpose. He then proceeds to state that ’tis the business of the Romish Church to determine what is its own interest, and consequently extend dispensations to every oath. This is a new idea of a dispensation. To declare that a lawful oath is an act of perjury, is a power for which
the

the Roman See is indebted to Mr. *Stanfer*; that an unlawful oath is an act of perjury was never doubted by any man, not yet fitted for a madhouse, and if such a declaration be a dispensation, Mr. B. has granted it to all United Irishmen without consulting the Pope, and the writer will grant it to all societies, who oblige themselves by oath to pursue any unlawful end; he thinks the King's governors could grant such dispensations without any remorse of conscience. The Ex. will remark that in the days of *Innocent III.* there were legal exemptions in favour of the established Church, as there are yet in England; that an oath in prejudice of these legal exemptions is unlawful, and consequently invalid, this Rev. Ex. must acknowledge, or admit that the White Boys, the Oak Boys, the Steel Boys, and all others who suffered on account of tythes, were murdered under colour of law.

Though not the shadow of an argument appears in 22 pages of this Examination, if you except two or three garbled quotations, which are easily explained. Mr. *Stanfer* concludes with confidence that he has shewn certain doctrines to form a part of the Romish religion, which that religion severely condemns in his ancestors the prime reformers, and which have been authentically condemned by the very Councils to which he ascribes them, thus the noted *Westley* imputes to Catholics the riots in London, in 1780, when 100,000 associated fanatics, with Lord *George Gordon* at their head, burned the Houses and Chapels. Confidence in assertion is made a substitute to proof, yet the man's face must be seasoned against shame, who publicly avows a notorious falsehood. In his next edition the Ex. would do well to remember this philosophical maxim, that assertion is no proof; that a simple denial is a sufficient refutation of a bare assertion; that a silly attempt to support a bad cause, makes it worse, and reflects a sort of discredit on the head or heart of the author—frequently on both.

In his account of the elevation of *Saul* and *David*, to the throne of *Israel*, Mr. *Stanfer* gives a strong specimen of the pretended right of every man to understand the Scriptures according to his own fancy: a more fanciful account is hardly possible. The interference of the people he totally excludes, and adds that God had declared their incompetency. If we believe him, the whole right of governing the people was communicated by *Samuel*, whatever was done by the people was meer matter of form and ceremony, something similar to that of an English Coronation. 'Tis strange that neither *Saul* nor *David* thought so:—Some years after *David* had been anointed by *Samuel*, he considered *Saul* as his lawful Sovereign; nor does it appear that *Saul* at any time thought himself a rebel. *Ishboseth* was not anointed by *Samuel*, yet neither he nor his General *Abner*, were ever called rebels by any man before this Ex. which must have been the case if his exposition of the scripture be true.

David himself thought *Ishboseth* an innocent man, who had been murdered without cause by his own officers, and put them to death for that very crime; and though it be manifest, that *Abner's* influence had placed *Ishboseth* on the throne of *Israel*, whilst the men of *Juda* obeyed *David*, their kinsman, we find no accusation of rebellion brought against *Abner* on this account.

The reader will admire Mr. *Stanfer's* accuracy, and deep penetration, in his interpretation of the Scriptures. *Saul* and *David* were vested with the supreme authority, without the consent of the people, in consequence of God's immediate appointment, signified by *Samuel*. *Jeroboam* was guilty of rebellion, impiety, and idolatry, —why so? because he was chosen by ten tribes out of the twelve, who thought proper to constitute him their King. The Ex. will find it difficult to assign any other reason, which founds his accusation of rebellion against *Jeroboam*: with respect to the divine appointment

ment he was upon equal terms with *David*:—*David's* appointment was during the lifetime of *Saul*, and *Jeroboam's* during the lifetime of *Solomon*:—"And it came to pass at that time that *Jeroboam* went out of Jerusalem, and the prophet *Ahias* the Silonite, clad with a new garment, found him in the way: and they two were alone in the field; and *Ahias* taking his new garment wherewith he was clad, divided it into twelve parts; and he said to *Jeroboam* take to thee ten pieces: for thus saith the Lord God of Israel: behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of *Solomon* and give thee ten tribes."—1st. of *K. 2nd. ch.* *Jeroboam* was so far from being a rebel, that if he had continued to serve his God, after he had taken possession of the kingdom of *Israel*, his throne would have been established over *Israel* as that of *David's* was over *Juda*:—"and thou shalt be king over *Israel*," continues the prophet, "if then thou shalt hearken to all which I shall command thee, and wilt walk in my ways, and do what is right before me, keeping my precepts and my commandments, as my servant *David* did, I will be with thee and build thee up a faithful house as I built a house for *David*, and I will deliver *Israel* to thee." That *Jeroboam* possessed no regal power, nor even claimed any, till constituted King over the ten tribes by themselves, Mr. S. will hardly dispute; that this was done in the ordinary course of providence the Scripture attests: "and the King did not condescend to the people: because the Lord had turned away from him to make good his word, which he had spoken in the hand of *Ahias*, to *Jeroboam*, the son of *Nabat*."—1st. *Ch. ch. xii.* From this last, 'tis manifest that God did not enlighten the understanding of *Roboam*, so as to discover the folly of his young counsellors.—"And it came to pass when all *Israel* heard that *Jeroboam* had come again, that they collected an assembly, and sent and called him, and made him King over *Israel*:
" and

“and there was none who followed the house of *David* but the tribe of *Juda*.” A more unlucky example Mr. S. could not have found to shew the incompetency of the people who rejected *Roboam*, and substituted *Jeroboam*, were guilty of any act of rebellion, if God be not the author of rebellion: for the Scripture says positively, that “this word was from God.” After this, *Jeroboam* fell into idolatry, and many of the people followed his example, for which, and other crimes enumerated in the Scriptures, they were deservedly punished; but that they were then guilty of idolatry, impiety, and rebellion, is a flat contradiction to the Scripture; a necessary consequence of that pretended right of substituting the reader’s fancy, to the intended sense of the sacred penman.

In the next paragraph this Rev. Ex. gives a greater range of his fancy; he makes the ten tribes from *Roboam*’s days, to the transmigration rebels to a man. “God,” he says, “expressly excludes the people from electing their Prince, and reserves the choice in every case to himself; the appointments which he thus declared to be with himself he actually and universally exercised: the three first, *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon*, he appointed by name, and then established an hereditary Government in the family of *David*.”—p. 30. There are in this statement as many errors as lines. We don’t find that *Solomon* was appointed by name with an indefeasible right: *David* promised his mother *Bathsheba*, that he should be his successor, and ordered him in consequence to be anointed by the High Priest *Sadoc*, at her request. “As I have sworn to thee, by the Lord God of *Israel*, saying, *Solomon* thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit on my throne, thus will I do this day.”—1st. Ch. ch. i. 30.—First error, *Jeroboam* was appointed by name King of *Israel*, whom this Ex. calls a rebel—Second error, that *David* was immediately nominated, and a continuation of the family of *David*, over the tribe of *Juda* predicted, is true;

true ; but that an hereditary indefeasible right in that family, to rule all *Israel*, was either established or predicted, is a stupid error, which betrays in the author almost consummate ignorance of these Scriptures to which he refers with such confidence.

'Tis said of *Solomon*, “ and I will establish his kingdom for ever, if he continue to keep my commandments and my judgments as at this day.”—1. *Ch.* xxviii. 7. These are the terms on which *Jeroboam's* right was established by the prophet *Ahias*, yet he was never thought to possess an indefeasible right. From this Ex'rs. reasoning we should conclude that all the King's of *Israel*, and even *Jeroboam* himself, though appointed as *Saul* and *David*, were usurpers, and all the men who acknowledged them Sovereigns, rebels to their lawful Princes : No length of time prescribes against the ordinance of God.

The writer passes unnoticed, some ridiculous principles which are imputed by the Ex. to Mr. B ; they enable him to conjure up a subject, on which he declaims with some asperity, and fills a pamphlet, which if stripped of these adventitious ornaments, and confined to logical reasoning, would be reduced to half a sheet.

His remark, that if the people had the power of constituting their King, they might defeat the plan respecting the *Messias*, is wonderfully acute : it shews the depth of this laborious Ex'rs. researches ; the accuracy of his notions with respect to a superintending providence : 'tis to be hoped that his next essay will establish the *ineluctabile fatum* of the heathens ; and justify *Pilate's* sentence against the Redeemer, *Judas's* treachery, and the malice of the *Jews* : if these could have done otherwise, they would have defeated the plan of the redemption. And *Saul* might have defeated the plan of the *Messias* most effectually ; for *Samuel* said to him, “ thou hast done foolishly, and hast not kept the commandments of the Lord thy God, which
“ he

“ he commanded thee: and if thou hadst not done this
 “ the Lord would have established thy kingdom over
 “ *Israel* forever.”—1 Sam. xiii. 13.—’Tis therefore
 manifest, that if *Saul* had not sacrilegiously offered sa-
 crifice, not being of the *Priestly* race, his kingdom
 would have stood, and *David* would have been exclu-
 ded; ’tis equally manifest that *Saul* might have omit-
 ted that offering: for disobedience is no crime when
 obedience is impossible. In this we Catholics revere
 the prescience of God, and the wonderful dispositions
 of his providence, which directs all his creatures to
 their proper end, at the same time preserving their na-
 ture and all their natural properties entire and un-
 touched: and if in the course of his providence any
 thing transcend our understanding, we have the mo-
 desty to admit that God can do more than we can con-
 ceive. We have not the insolence to pretend, that if
 such and such an event should happen, God’s pur-
 pose would have been defeated. These sentiments
 we resign to the Ex. and his friends. We say with
 the prophet, “ *attingius a fine usque in finem fortiter*
 “ & *suaviter omnia disponens.*”—Sap. ch. viii. 1.

The writer admires another stretch of the Ex’s.
 fancy: he finds that ’twas expressly revealed that the
 Messias was not only to be *Abraham’s* race, but also
 the son of *David*, and of *all the Kings of Juda*: he
 has not told us by what prophet. ’Tis true he specifies
Jacob. But *Jacob* did not speak a word of *David* or
 his family. His prophecy is applicable to the whole
 tribe of *Juda*. And St. *Luke*, who ought to know
 something of the matter, was so far from thinking that
 the Messias ought to have been son to all the Kings of
Juda, that he has not placed one of them in the gene-
 alogy from *David* down to *Eli*, who was father to the
 Blessed Virgin, and the only father which J. C. could
 have on earth. St. *Matthew* does; but he gives the
 genealogy of St. *Joseph*, not of the Blessed Virgin;
 ’twas enough for his purpose to shew that he was of
 the

the house of *David*, which appeared from her being of the same tribe and family with *Joseph*. That *St. Luke* gave the true genealogy of the *Messias*, seems clear from his manner of speaking: he omits the article *to* before *Joseph*, and places it before *Eli*, and thence up to *Nathan*, son of *David*.

After having given these irresistible proofs of his deep skill in interpreting the Scriptures according to his established maxim, fancy, our Rev. Ex. proceeds to vindicate *Blackstone*, and *Bracton*: in this he displays his legal powers of chicane: logical inferences are beneath his notice. However as it does not appear that Mr. B. borrowed any principles from these lawyers, whom he neither approved nor censured, the writer passes unnoticed this part of the Exm's. publication. He begs leave simply to inform the Ex. that these democratical principles, which he so liberally bestows on Mr. B. are not to be found in that gentleman's Letter of Instruction, whilst the most absolute democracy is the professed principle both of the Ex. and his friend P. if they understand the force of the terms in which they have announced their political creed. Add to this the justification of *Huss*, and *Wiclef*, who were professed Levellers. The man who approves will practice, if the opportunity offers.

The Ex. comes next to examine that part of Mr. B's Letter of Instruction, which treats of political power, and expresses his surprise at Mr. *Burke's* attempting to shew that all temporal jurisdiction is vested in the King, by denying that he has any spiritual authority, power or jurisdiction whatever. The writer is not less surprized that this Rev. Ex. knowing there were a 1000 copies of that Letter of Instruction published, each containing a direct and authentic contradiction to this statement, would permit prejudice and party spirit to warp his understanding to the ruin of his reputation, without even a chance of imposing on the credulity of the public. Mr. B. had shewn that all political

litical power is from God, the author of society, and conferred by the ministry of the people; and that he has shewn on solid principles. He has also shewn Spiritual Powers are from J. C. founder of the Church, conferred by him immediately, not to King's or Magistrates, but to his Apostles, and from them derived to their successors in office. This last question the Ex. carefully avoids, and by a gross misrepresentation diverts the attention of his readers to a different object.

As a compleat reply to Mr. B's assertion, that no temporal Prince as such possesses any spiritual authority or jurisdiction, the Ex. says that assertion is contradicted by the law of the land, which declares the King supreme head of the Church of England. This compleat answer happens to be no answer at all, and leaves the question *in statu quo*. Mr. B's assertion was a logical inference from principles manifestly true, the force of which is not to be eluded. The writer does not censure the Ex. for adducing an act of parliament to silence reason; as every other evasion was precluded. However he humbly presumes that 'twould have been more philosophical, more consistent with the character of a scholar, to attempt a refutation of that inference by fair reasoning. This might have been done by shewing that the principles assumed were not strictly true, or that the inference was not logically deduced. To have recourse to an act of parliament is ingenuously to acknowledge the insufficiency of logical reasoning, to invalidate a pressing argument, the truth of which is obvious to the meanest capacity. To this may be added, that the act of parliament adduced is not a contradiction to the inference stated in Mr. B's Letter of Instruction, p. 29. The inference is thus stated: "it follows of course that no temporal Prince *as such* can possess any spiritual powers, authority, or jurisdiction." The law of England declares the King head of the Church, not in his temporal, but in his ecclesiastical capacity. Mr. B. never denied the King to be

be Supreme Head of the Church of England as by law established, on the contrary he asserts it, and so do all well informed Catholics. From this principle, which the writer thinks incontestibly true, inferences are drawn, which require more logical powers than nature seems to have bestowed on this Rev. Ex. and his powerful ally. The writer, whilst he thus publicly declares, that in his opinion the King is sole and supreme head of the Church of England as by law established, begs leave to state the reasons why Catholics do not believe that any temporal Prince as such is or can be head of the Catholic Church, or of any parcel, part, or portion of it. They say that, admitting a temporal Prince to possess a spiritual jurisdiction, it can extend no farther than his temporal jurisdiction, because 'tis subordinate to it, and dependent on it; 'tis therefore of all necessity confined within the limits of his dominions: the Catholic Church is not confined within the dominions of any Prince: "the Saviour ordered his Apostles to teach "all nations,"—*Matt. ult.* "And it was said to *Abram*, that in his seed all nations should be blessed." *Gen. xxvii. 4.* 'Tis therefore evident as the sun at mid-day that no temporal Prince as such can be head of the Catholic Church: the head must have some authority over the members; beyond the limits of his dominions, no temporal prince has, or pretends to have, any authority whatsoever.—In the next place, Catholics say, that no temporal Prince as such, can be head of any parcel, part, or portion of the Catholic Church. The reason which they offer is simple and conclusive—in the writers humble opinion, it bears no reply: the head and body, say they, compose the individual in the political and moral order is well as in the natural; an individual, as an entire and distinct whole, not a part or portion of any other: thus a head united to a leg, would be a monstrous production, but not a part of another individual. If this reasoning be not conclusive, the Rev. Ex. or his friend will easily detect the fallacy the

writer is not able to discover it, and wishes to be informed.

The Rev. Ex. at length engages in a religious controversy. His first statement is unfair and injudicious. Controversy does not seem to be his favourite study. *Non omnia possumus omnes*, but something must be said—*Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim*.

“The spiritual powers,” says he, p. 40. “which Mr. B. denies to the King, he has transferred to the Pope as successor of St. Peter.” The Pope has therefore usurped the King’s spiritual powers! not the powers which Parliament had conferred on the King surely? the Pope exercised these spiritual powers before there was a Parliament in England. Will the Rev. Ex. condescend to inform us by what means the Parliament was invested by these spiritual powers? was it by Act of Parliament? if so, the Parliament must have given itself a power, which it did not originally possess; this to a plain man has all the appearance of an unwarranted assumption. Was this spiritual power vested in the Parliament by J. C. the founder of the Christian Church, the source and fountain of all spiritual authority? Be that as it may, Mr. B. did not enquire who was St. Peter’s successor, yet the writer is willing to admit that the Pope is in fact the rightful successor to that Apostle. And he ventures to assure the Rev. Ex. that Catholics are of that obstinate disposition, that nothing less than an Act of Parliament to deprive them of the first elements of common sense, can ever induce them to believe that any temporal Prince is successor to St. Peter, or that any human legislature can invest a Prince with the spiritual powers, which J. C. communicated to his Apostles, and by their ministry to their successors in office. He at the same time assures him that there are no men living, who have a higher respect for their Prince; a more deep sense of gratitude for the many signal favours, which his present Majesty has been graciously pleased to extend to them,

or

or who are more amenable to the laws, than the Catholics of the United Kingdom: their invariable maxim is, *to fear God, and honor the King.*

“ Mr. B.” says the Rev. Ex. p. 40. “ has transferred the spiritual power from the King to the Pope, as successor to St. *Peter*, and with a superlative omnipotence, which no civil government certainly ever laid claim to.” The writer wishes to know on what principle a civil government lays claim to a spiritual authority? *civil courts*, and *spiritual courts*, as well as the powers which they possessed and exercised, have been at all times, and in all civilized countries, contradistinguished.—The heathens knew the distinction. Is this spiritual authority vested in all civil Governments, or in some highly favoured Governments exclusively? if in some only, why not in others of the same form? whence the difference? does the Divan in Constantinople possess this spiritual authority? the Dey of Algiers, or the Emperor of Persia? does the King of Spain, or the Emperor of Germany? it must be amongst these latent powers which escaped the penetrating eye of St. *Paul*. We don't find that he or any of his fellow apostles applied to the civil Government for their mission; nor had any one of the primitive Pastors recourse to the Roman Senate for authority to preach and administer the sacraments.

The Rev. Mr. *Cochran* pretends, that to deny this spiritual power to the crown, incurs the penalties of a *præmunire*. With submission to more intelligent men, the writer imagines that Mr. C. mistakes the law: the non-conformists subscribe the oath of supremacy, tho' they do not believe any spiritual authority to be vested in the civil magistrate: this practice they found on Queen *Elizabeth's* explication of her injunctions to her visitors: “ That no more was intended than that her Majesty under God, had the sovereignty and rule over all persons born in her realm, either ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power had or ought

“ to

“to have any authority over them.”—*Neal, ch. 4. p. 133.*—“this,” continues *Neal*, “They take to be the natural right of all sovereign princes in their dominions, though there had been no statute law for it.” The Queen in her injunctions expressly declared, “that she did not, nor would she ever challenge any authority and power to minister divine service in the church, nor would she ever challenge any other authority, than her predecessors, King *Henry VIII.* and *Edward VI.* used.”—*Neal, ibidem.* King *Henry* the VIIIth. in his letter to the convocation at York, assures them, “that he claimed nothing more by the supremacy than what christian Princes in the primitive times assumed to themselves in their own dominions.” Christian Princes at all times claimed the right of governing ecclesiastics as well as lay men; they never claimed any spiritual authority, and from these declarations of King *Henry* and Queen *Elizabeth*, it appears that no such claim is made in England. Thus the non-conformists understand it, and the writer is inclined to believe that 'tis understood in the same sense by the King's judges. If that menacing writer be allowed to direct the magistrates, we may expect an extensive application of penal statutes.

It's amusing to hear that she Pope, as *Melancton* calls her, *Elizabeth*, directing her ecclesiastical visitors, and protesting that she did not intend to minister divine service in person; perhaps she had seen *St. Paul's* prohibition against the prattling of women in the church, and thought the omnipotence of Parliament could not change her sex.

This Ex. states that there are but two distinct classes of Christians, who differ from each other in essential points, these are the Protestants and the Papists. Does this learned Exm. include amongst Protestants the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the modern Greeks, the Jansenists? they are Christians, and not Papists: for they most cordially hate the
Pope:

Pope; they are not Protestants: for they celebrate Mass and administer all the other Sacraments; they believe in transubstantiation, invoke the Saints and Angels, celebrate their festivals, observe the fast of Lent and abstain from flesh on certain days; they offer up prayers and supplications for departed souls, and what's conclusive; they have solemnly condemned the doctrine contained in the confession of *Ausburg*: when that confession was sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople, by the disciples of the reformation for the approbation of the oriental Churches, they severely censured it: in the 10th Chapter of that censure the Eastern prelates teach that doctrine of transubstantiation as we Romanists do, "*multa in hac parte de vobis (the Authors of the confession) referuntur, quæ nobis nullo pacto probari possunt: Ecclesiæ igitur sanctæ illud judicium est, in sacrâ Cená post Consecrationem & benedictionem, panem in illud ipsum Corpus J. C. vinum autem in illum Sanguinem virtute Spiritus sancti transire ac permutari.*" The Ex. does not seem to have made church history any part of his studies: he has perhaps adopted Doctor *Bannister's* advice to the students of the University. This zealous Pastor directs the students to read the heathen poets and philosophers in the first place, and from the heathen poets he transfers his *young divine* to Doctor *Cudworth*, against *Materialism*, and Mr. *Jortin*, on ecclesiastical history; of the latter he says, that he's rather severe on the fathers: that is, on all the pastors, whom Christ had given to his church from the Apostle's days, to the beginning of the seventeenth century; these men, so eminent for sense, science, and sanctity, whom the Catholic world rever'd. 'Tis true they were not protestants; the Saxon monk had not yet enlightened the hemisphere of religion; nor had the people yet learned to believe that apostates, regardless of vows and oaths, shaking off all the restraints of religion, and substituting a liberty, or rather licentiousness, which would have
done

done honor to the invention of the celebrated *Epicurus*, were the true disciples of that God who said, "if any man will come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow me."—*Matt.* xvi. 24.—But yet the *Justin's*, the *Gregory's* the *Basils*, the *Chrysostoms*, the *Austins*, the *Jeromes*, the *Bernards*, afford some instruction; they taught the morality of the Gospel as well as the heathen poets and philosophers, of whom *St. Paul* draws not the most flattering picture in his epistle to the Romans, "being filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, covetousness, wickedness, full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity, whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, contumelious, proud, haughty, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy."—*ch.* 1. 29. The first outlines of the picture are omitted; they are not less expressive of the genuine character of these authors in whose works our young divines are advised to study the morality of the Gospel. We find no such morality taught by the fathers whom *Jortin* censures: and to whom compared *Jortin* may pass for an ape. Why not refer the student to *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, the father of church history, who lived in the latter end of the third century, and beginning of the fourth? why not to *Theodoret* of Cyrus, whose history commenced with the heresy of *Arius*, and comprised the transactions of 105 years, as he himself says closing the work, and desiring the prayers of his readers as the reward of his labours? these writers were Papists, true; popery was then in fashion; there were no *Jortins*, nor *L'Enfants*; yet 'tis from these early writers we must learn the history of the Church in its first establishment and succeeding stages, not in the groundless conjectures of modern scribblers.

The writer refers the reader to these Greeks, passing unnoticed all later writers, both Greeks and Latins: the man must have his face double-plated

plated with brass, who disputes the universal establishment of popery, as the Catholic doctrine is called from the days of *Theodoret*, to the beginning of the reformation, that is from the 5th century to the 16th.

The essential difference between Protestants and Papists, says the Ex. is this, "that all Protestants acknowledge no other rule of faith and doctrine than the Holy Scriptures." The antithesis would have been, and Papists acknowledge some other rule of faith. Our Rev. Ex. on some principle of reasoning not known to philosophers, introduces the Pope, and under him the Popish Clergy, whom, says he, R. C. hold to be the representatives of God and of J. C. and consequently that their authority is equally a rule of faith and doctrine with the Holy Scriptures. The writer begs leave to assure this Rev. Ex. and his powerful ally, that when we Papists undertake to write, we previously endeavour to know something of the subject matter; we never venture to misrepresent the principles of our opponents: the cause is defenceless which has recourse to misrepresentation for support. This Ex. misrepresents, not his own: for he does not seem to have any fixed principle, but the principles of the established Church of England, of which thro' some strange fatality, he professes himself a member for this simple reason, that 'tis the established Church, according to the principle which he lays down, he would believe in the inamissibility of grace at Geneva, in consubstantiation at Wirtemberg, in transubstantiation at Rome or Paris. The principles which he lends us Catholics will be examined hereafter.

Amongst Protestants, says he, *p.* 42, "there is no difference as to what is the general rule of faith and doctrine," after a few lines he adds, "in choosing therefore between the different Protestant persuasions, a man may consult, his own fancy and caprice his habits or his prejudices."

Thus our Ex. introduces a new rule of faith, that is,

the fancy, the caprice, the habit or prejudice of each individual. If, as is pretended, the Scriptures be the sole rule of faith, 'tis the sense, not the sound of the Scriptures, which must be taken for such rule. To this the Rev. Ex. substitutes the *fancy, the caprice, the habit, the prejudice* of the reader. His faith therefore, is not founded on the Scriptures, but on his own fancied sense of the Scriptures, which manifestly is not Scripture. Hence instead of a rule of faith, our Ex. assigns a manifest source of infidelity.

“ The distinction of the different sects of Protestants
 “ arises merely upon the construction of the same law,
 “ which produces a difference of opinion either upon
 “ the meer external forms of Religion, or upon meer
 “ speculative points of little importance, to the sub-
 “ stance of Christianity.” By this the Ex. admits that the Scriptures are full of obscurity: for that law upon which constructions arise so widely different, as to form numerous sects of Protestants, (they are his words) must be involved in obscurity. It cannot therefore be a sole rule of faith: for faith is not to be confounded with opinion. Faith is an assent of the understanding to revealed truths, founded on infallible authority, consequently infallible and invariable, opinion proceeds from a preference given to a motive thought more probable than its opposite, and leaves the mind in a fluctuating state. From the inquisitive nature of man, opinions are continually changing, hence these variations in faith and doctrine, so numerous and conspicuous in all the different sects, who from the first establishment of the Christian Church, have at different times withdrawn their obedience from the Pastors then in being, substituting their own opinions to the faith received from the Apostles, contrary to that express command of the Apostle Paul to Timothy, “ O Timothy
 “ preserve the deposit, avoiding prophane novelties,” or as it is in the original “ *tas bebèlous kenophònias,*” not initiated empty sounds. Ep. 1. Tim. vi. 20.

That

That this Ex. misrepresents the avowed principles of the established Church of England, and of all other reformed Churches, is manifest beyond a contradiction: the act of separation of any reformed Church from all others, is not justifiable but in the supposition of some fundamental error taught in these Churches, with which they refuse to join in communion: for to make a secession or form a particular sect is, if we believe *St. Paul*, one of these crimes which exclude from Salvation: in his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle classes *secessions* and *sects*, *dichostafai kai haireseis*, with *Idolatry* and *witchcraft*, and concludes that “they who do these things will not inherit the Kingdom of God.” *Ch. v. 20.*

The *Wr.* imagines that 'twas on the authority of *St. Paul*, that the framers of the thirty nine articles composed the 18th, in these words “they also are to be held accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professes, so that he be diligent to form his life according to that law, and the light of nature: for Holy Scriptures doth set out unto us only the name of J. C. whereby men must be saved. 'Tis by faith, not by opinion, that J. C. dwells in our hearts.” *Eph. iii. 7.* “By faith we are justified,” *Rom. v. 1.* not by wavering opinion founded on fancy or prejudice.

The *viii.* article is not less explicit: in it we read, that the Creed called of *Athanasius*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed. It runs thus: “whosoever will be saved before all things, it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith, which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.” Catholic, that is universal faith, is set in contradistinction to particular opinions, and these who hold such opinions are excluded from Salvation.

Add to this, that in the synod of *Dort*, this doctrine was publicly purposed and not censured. “It remains

“ to look out for remedies to this disagreement in re-
 “ ligious.”—the first— another figment akin
 to this is, “ that every (Christian) *may be saved in his*
 “ *own religion.* But this to one evil introduces ano-
 “ ther more nocent, namely, the certain ruin of those
 “ involved in error, inasmuch as this opinion renders
 “ the error incurable, as none will care to lay it down
 “ or amend it.”—*Ora. de Com. Reli. dissidiis.*

The Puritans separated themselves from the estab-
 lished Church of England, not for a meer difference
 of opinion, but for an absolute disagreement in the doc-
 trines of faith.—“ The controversy with the Puritans
 “ had but a small beginning, *viz.* the improving of the
 “ Papiſts habits, and a few indifferent ceremonies, but
 it opened by degrees into a reformation of discipline,
 “ which all confessed, was wanting at last, the *very*
 “ *doctrines of faith were debated.*”—*Neal, ch. 8. p.*
 594. “ The violence of persecution drove some of
 “ them (Puritans) into the extreme of *Brownism*;
 “ which divided the Puritans, and gave rise to a new
 “ controversy concerning the necessity of a separation
 “ from the established Church.”—*ibid p. 595.*

In a word, the Puritans never would have separated
 themselves from the established Church of England, if
 they did not think some doctrines in that Church in-
 consistent with faith, and consequently with salvation ;
 nor would the Lutherans have separated themselves
 from the Catholic Church, which in *Luther's* early
 days was the established Church in all the kingdoms
 and states of Europe, but under pretence of funda-
 mental errors being taught in that Church, so true it is
 that this alone can justify the separation of any refor-
 med Church from all other Churches.

When then our Ex. thus extends salvation indistinct-
 ly and indiscriminately to all descriptions of Protestants,
 he substitutes his private opinion to the authentic doc-
 trine of the established Church, which expressly ex-
 cludes from the ordinary possibility of salvation all who
 are

are not of her communion; and in this she agrees with all churches which have an established code of doctrine.

The extraordinary possibility of salvation to these who are not actually of her communion, is admitted by the R. C. Church: 'tis a Catholic maxim, that they, who seek the truth, disposed to believe it if clearly proposed, are not numbered amongst sectaries, though they may be actually in the public communion of some separate Church. 'Tis also certain that invincible necessity, and invincible ignorance, excuse even fundamental errors; and St. *Thomas* of Aquin, from a decorous fitness of divine mercy, extends this extraordinary possibility of salvation even to infidels.

From the remarkable inaccuracy of his statements, it appears that this Rev. Ex. is himself grossly deceived, or that he intentionally deceives his readers: "there is no denomination of Protestants who do not candidly admit that salvation may be obtained in any other Protestant sect." says he. This must be understood of the ordinary possibility of salvation admitted by the code of doctrine in that sect, which is not only incorrect, but a glaring absurdity. Why so? because that sect would thereby condemn itself of the guilt of schism without cause, and exclude itself and all its members from salvation, according to the doctrine of St. *Paul*.

To this our Rev. Ex. adds a greater inaccuracy, which may proceed from a total ignorance of that doctrine which he pretends to examine:—" 'tis one of the Popish doctrines," says he, "that salvation cannot be obtained out of the pale of the Romish Church." If he had been conversant with our doctrine, and possessed of a little candour, he would have stated it as we do, thus—'tis an article of Catholic doctrine, "that without the pale of the Church of Christ there is no salvation." A truth manifest on the simple exposition; which no Christian ever denied. We add that
the

the Catholic Church, in communion with the See of Rome, acknowledging the spiritual jurisdiction of St. Peter in his successor, is that visible Church, which Christ instituted ; and that in it exclusively is found the *ordinary possibility* of salvation: because in it are found exclusively the ordinary means for attaining that end, that is a lawful succession of Pastors teaching and administering the sacraments according to the express promise of J. C. “ behold all power is given to me . . . “ go teach all nations baptizing them I am “ with you till the consummation.”—*Matth. ult.*

We don't pretend to confine the mercy of J. C. to the ordinary means thus instituted, and hence we admit an *extraordinary possibility* of salvation to those, who are not publicly professed members of Christ's visible Church ; whose errors may be excused by invincible necessity, or invincible ignorance ; we extend this extraordinary possibility of salvation yet farther, even to these, who have obstinately persevered in error without the excuse of invincible ignorance or invincible necessity : they may be enlightened by some extraordinary grace in their dying moments, and sincerely desire to die in the communion of Christ's Church, which we devoutly hope is the case of thousands of our dissenting brethren. Hence we never presume to judge these, who die in the public communion of any church separate from ours : because we know that the mercy and power of J. C. are not confined to ordinary means, and by some extraordinary grace he may have placed amongst his elect those whom we might rashly condemn. If it be asked why we don't offer public prayers for the deceased of dissenting communions ? to this we reply, that our prayers are offered in general for all, who die in the grace of Jesus Christ ; we don't offer prayers in particular for any deceased member of a dissenting communion, in order to deter the faithful from a neglect of the ordinary means of salvation.

If this Rev. Ex. could divest himself of that party spirit,

spirit, which so strongly characterize the whole of his pretended examination—he would admit that we Catholics are more liberal to all descriptions of Protestants than they are to us, or to each other.

Tillotson, celebrated for the solid lead of his voluminous productions, in his XIth Sermon, on the hazard of being saved in the Church of Rome, after admitting that Papists, under the influence of prejudice or invincible ignorance upon *general repentance*, might find mercy, “ adds, “ but for those, who had the opportunities of coming to the knowledge of truth, if they “ continue, in the errors of that church, or apostatize “ from the truth, I think their condition so far from “ being safe, that there must be extraordinary favourable circumstances in their case, to give a man hope “ of their salvation.” Thus one of the great lights of the established Church excludes by wholesale from the ordinary possibility of salvation, admitting merely a distant possibility; and as the errors with which he accuses Papists are common to Greeks, Syrians, Arabs, Persians, Copts, Armenians, Christians of Saint *Thomas*, to the whole Christian world, then, since, and eight hundred years before, this new luminary sends them all in bulk to the lower regions. The reader must not imagine that *Tillotson's* opinion was not warranted by the authentic code of the established doctrine: the 35th Art. declares that the Book of *Homilies* contains sound doctrine; in that: against the peril of idolatry we read: “ the laity and Clergy learned “ and unlearned of all ages, sects, and degrees, of men, “ women, and children, of whole Christendom, have “ been at once drowned in abominable and damnable “ idolatry, and that by the space of 800 years and “ more, to the destruction and subversion of all good “ religion universally.” As idolatry is an actual sin, 'tis not easy to conceive how the children were guilty of it. Perhaps the Homily, on the gifts of the Holy Ghost, may serve as a corrective to this universally damning

ning *Homily*. In the latter we read, "that the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth, has been, and will be, always present with the Church, governing and directing to the world's end, so that it never has wanted, nor ever will want, while the world endures, pure and sound doctrine—the sacraments ministered according to Christ's institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline." The writer does not undertake to reconcile contradictions: Nature has not blessed him with an understanding capable of conceiving how sound and pure doctrine is reconcileable with abominable and damnable idolatry. Nor does he rightly conceive how the Holy Ghost has been governing and directing a Church immersed in abominable idolatry.

Let us now revert to the rule of faith proposed by this Ex. "Protestants," says he, "acknowledge no other rule of faith and doctrine than the Holy Scriptures." The writer is willing to admit, that Protestants acknowledge no other rule of faith; but the Rev. Ex. must also admit, that in theory, the Scriptures cannot be a sole rule of faith; that in practice they are not, have not been, nor ever will be. This position which lays the ax to the root, is nearly an intuitive truth. A sole rule of faith must extend to every truth which is of faith. For any article of doctrine to which it does not extend, recourse must be had to some other rule. The Rev. Ex. will have the modesty to admit, there are some doctrinal truths which are not contained in the Scriptures: the first of these is, that the Scriptures themselves are divinely inspired, and transmitted to us without interpolation or corruption. In no book of the Scripture do we find that these books which we call canonical were divinely inspired, and if we did, the difficulty would be only transferred to itself: the question would immediately recur—on what authority do we believe that this book, which makes the Scriptures divinely inspired, was it-
self

self divinely inspired. This argument is from the nature of things insoluble, and precludes even the possibility of evasion: in vain this Rev. Ex. may refer to the private spirit, to a certain sensation, a certain taste, a certain something indiscrivable. All these certain things, are most certainly no part of the Scriptures, and by having recourse to them, he must admit that the Scriptures are not his sole rule of faith. To this the writer adds that in practice the Scriptures are not the rule of protestant faith; the assertion he thinks incontrovertibly true, and is convinced that every unprejudiced Protestant will admit it. Will it be denied that many Protestants are incapable of reading the Scriptures? many incapable of investigating the intended sense of the sacred writers? many who are Protestants of one description in preference to all others, but because their parents are of that particular denomination? and, to close with a peremptory reason, which bears no reply, an immense majority, who are Protestants before they read a line of the Scriptures? will any man presume to affirm that men, who cannot read the Scriptures, men, who do not read the Scriptures, men, who if they did read, cannot understand the Scriptures, or finally men, who are already Protestants before they read the Scriptures, take the Scriptures for their sole rule of faith? All reasoning is lost upon the man who would advance so gross an absurdity.

Let us hear the sentiments of some Protestant divines: for they too speak truth when not forced by untenable principles to affirm inconsistencies. Doctor *Fern*, an eminent divine, tells us, "that the Scripture contains all things of themselves necessary to be believed or done to salvation, not expressly and in so many words, but either so, or else deducible thence by evident and sufficient consequence."—*Sect. 22.* and he afterwards adds, "that things thus necessary are not deducible, all by every one, that reads; but it is enough if done by the Pastors, and guides, which

G

" God

“ God appointed in his Church to that purpose, using
 “ the means, that are needful to that purpose, such as is
 “ attention, and diligence in search of the Scriptures,
 “ collation of places, and observing the connections,
 “ also sincerity and impartiality in the collation or de-
 “ ductions, which they make, also prayer and devo-
 “ tion in the work.”—*Sect. 26.* This Doctor refers
 the unlearned Protestant, not to the Scriptures, but to
 the Pastors and guides, whom God has appointed in
 his Church, and not indiscriminately to all, but to
 such as use diligence and attention in searching the
 Scriptures, who collate passages, observe connections
 with sincerity and impartiality, and who add prayer and
 devotion. The Doctor ought to have given the un-
 learned Protestant some unerring rule to distinguish the
 devout and diligent Pastors from others, who assume
 the appearance. This unerring rule, the Doctor, for
 very obvious reasons, has not given; he has therefore
 left the unlearned Protestant in a state of anxious sus-
 pence. To pass unnoticed that groundless assertion that
 all things necessary to be believed are contained in
 the Scriptures or deducible from them; for 'tis abso-
 lutely necessary to believe the Scriptures divinely in-
 spired, and this truth is neither contained in Scripture
 nor deducible from it by any rule of reasoning as yet
 known to the world; there are many other truths of
 religion not contained in the Scriptures, and if they
 were by distant implication, the Doctor candidly ad-
 mits that they are not deducible by a great majority of
 Protestants.

Let us hear some other teachers of the reformation.
 Mr. *Jurieu*, a Protestant divine of great authority,
 pressed by some leading questions such as these: if the
 Scripture be the sole rule of faith is it necessary to read
 all the canonical books? is it sufficient to have read
 one or more of them? if so, which are the books of
 Scripture in which all the revealed truths of religion
 are contained? these questions were not easily solved;
 but

but a most unlucky one succeeded, that is, what is his rule of faith, who has neither read the Scriptures nor heard them read, who just begins to read them? is he an infidel? is he a Christian? if a Christian the Scripture which he neither read nor heard read was not his rule of faith. This was a most embarrassing question: it left no subterfuge, no evasion. *Jurieu's* last effort to extricate himself from this insoluble difficulty, has sapped the very foundation of the much boasted reformation: "the Christian doctrine;" says he, "taken in its entire makes itself felt, *se fait sentir*: to make an act of faith on the Scripture 'tis not necessary to have read it; 'tis sufficient to have read a summary of the Christian doctrine, without entering into a detail: the people, who have not the Holy Scripture may notwithstanding be good Christians. The doctrine of the Gospel makes the simple feel its divinity independently on the books in which it is contained, though this doctrine be mixed with useless things, (*inutilités,*) and some things not divine, yet the pure and heavenly doctrine mixed will make itself felt. Conscience will taste the truth, and afterwards, the believer will believe that such a book is canonical because there are truths in it which touch him in a word, the faith is felt as heat near a fire, as sweetness or bitterness in eating." *ibid. p. 453, & seq.* On this principle of *Jurieu*, the Mahometan believes the Alcoran canonical, and children believe the fairy tales, there are in them many things which tickle their fancy. This however is *Jurieu's* last shift to extricate himself from that embarrassing difficulty in which the fundamental principle of the pretended reformation involved him. "All things are to be examined, regulated, and reformed according to the Scripture."—*5th Article.—Conf. of Faith.*

Mr. *Claude*, not less celebrated than *Jurieu*, finding it impossible to give a satisfactory answer to these embarrassing questions which had forced *Jurieu* to shift

his ground from the Scripture, to that imaginary impression which revealed truths make on the exposition, took refuge in the same labyrinth;—*Def. de la Re. 2 p. C. 9. p. 296, & Seg.*—but this, besides giving up the fundamental principle of the reformation, only encreased his embarrassment: for the mysterious truths of religion not being of the number of these, which are called *intuitive*, because they are immediately conceived when proposed, as the whole is greater than a part, must be proposed by some authority, or they can make no impression at all, and the authority on which these truths are proposed must be infallible; if not, the assent cannot be infallible for the assent to truth cannot be more infallible than the authority on which 'tis founded; hence Messrs. *Jurieu* and *Claude*, must of all necessity admit some infallible authority on earth besides the Scriptures; which at one stroke levels the whole fabric of this boasted reformation with the dust.

In his next edition 'tis hoped that this Rev. Ex. will assign some other rule of faith: since 'tis evident to the meanest capacity, that the Scriptures neither are nor can be a sufficient rule. What advantage then results from the possession of the Scriptures? the greatest possible: 'tis assigned by *St. Paul*; every writing divinely inspired is useful to teach, to argue, to instruct, “to correct in justice, that the man of God may be entire perfectly prepared for every good work.”—*2 Tim. iii. 16 & 17.*—These were the ends for which the Scriptures were written, and given to the Church, already composed of Pastors teaching and administering sacraments, and of simple faithful, who were taught by their Pastors. Of these not one found the faith, which he then believed and professed, in the Scriptures: for this peremptory reason they were not yet written. The faithful received the faith from their Pastors, deputed to announce it by these whom Christ had authorized, and from them also they received the Scriptures, when written; and the intended sense of the

the inspired writers. So true it is, as St. Paul says, that "faith is from hearing,"—*Rom. x. 17.*—and that 'tis from the Pastors lawfully deputed that we are to hear it: "how will they preach," says the Apostle, "if they be not sent?" *ibid.* hence in his epistle to the *Ephesians*, iv. 11. he says: "He (J. C.) gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and teachers for the coagmentation of the Saints to the work of the ministry, to the edification of the body of Christ that we may not be whirled about by every wind of doctrine." The Apostle informs us, in language as strong and as plain as words can express it. That the Pastors given by J. C. are the lawful teachers, who by their ministry are to collect into one body, all the members of J. C; from them therefore, we are to receive the faith; elsewhere we seek it in vain. The words of the Apostle are strongly expressive of the unity of Christ's Church: "*pros katartifmon tôn agiôn.*" The Greek verb *katertiso* signifies to replace the dislocated members of the body—this office, the Apostle assigns to the Pastors and teachers.

From this sole rule of our Ex's. faith, let us revert to that rule of faith, which he has invented for our use. 'Tis strange that these Gentlemen, will not permit us to know the doctrine, which is taught in our own Schools and Churches; that in the face of Reclamation, Truth and Conviction, they continue to state doctrinal decisions for us, of which we do not believe a syllable: R. C. says, the Ex. p. 41. "hold the Pope, and under him the popish Clergy, to be the representatives of God and of J. Christ." Does this Rev. Ex. believe the divinity of J. C.? if so, why set J. Christ in contradistinction to God, in the same phrase? this is the language of *Arius*, and his disciples. The Apostles, and in imitation of the Apostles. Catholic writers say, God the Father and J. Christ, or God the Father of our Lord J. Christ, or some such expression,
 setting

letting the Father in contradistinction to the Son, whether expressed or understood; but not God in contradistinction to J. Christ; that mode of speaking is offensive to the protestant, as well as the Catholic Ear.

Catholics believe St. *Peter* to have been appointed by J. C. to feed his flock on earth, and they believe it on the most unerring authority, that is, on the faith of J. Christ himself, who said to him "feed my lambs, rule my sheep." *John* xxi. And in that sense they believe *Peter*, and his successors to represent J. Christ, as an Ambassador represents his Master. St. *Paul*, believed it and asserted it of himself and his fellow Apostles: "*úper Christou our presbuomen òs tou Theou paraskalountos diemòn.* We are therefore Ambassadors for Christ, God as it were exhorting by us." *2 Cor.* v. 20. And in his Epistle to the Ephesians, he says "*úper ou presbuò*" "for whom I am Ambassador." vi. 20.

From the principle which the Ex. states for us, according to his own fancy, he draws a more fanciful conclusion. That is, "that the authority of the Pope and popish Clergy is equally a rule of faith and doctrine with the holy Scriptures, and equally binding upon the consciences of men, nay, that the Scriptures themselves are to be understood only in that sense, which the Romish Church thinks proper to give them." A man would imagine that this Ex. had been a professor of Theology in one of our Universities, he states our doctrine with such precision. There is a trifling inaccuracy; it escaped him perhaps thro' inadvertence: the statement is simply false. We Catholics know no authority equal to the word of God; but we know no difference between the word of God spoken by the Apostles, and the same word written; we have the same confidence in their tongues, that we have in their pens, nor did the Apostles themselves know any such difference: they were not sent to write but to preach and baptise: read their commission in the
last

last chapter of *St. Matthew*. And many of them never wrote a line. Was their doctrine the less true? was it of less authority? were they who rejected their doctrine the less criminal, less accountable to the divine justice? did not *St. Paul*, strictly command the Thessalonians to hold fast the *oral traditions* "*paradoxeis*" 2 *Th.* ii. 15. which they had learnt whether by word *dia logou* or by letter "*dia Epistolés*" the Apostle, therefore thought the word of God received by oral tradition was of equal authority with the written word. But how are we to know that the doctrine received by oral tradition is the word of God? by the very same rule and the same means by which we know that the written word is the word of God, that is, by the testimony of the Catholic Church, speaking by her Pastors, in whose hands J. Christ, deposited both the written, and unwritten word, and whose testimony is of equal weight in favour of the one as of the other. In this appears his providential care of his Church, that is of all his children to the end of time, in giving them a rule of faith easy in practice, infallible, and universal, literally fulfilling the prophecy of *Isais*, who speaking of the flourishing state of Christ's Church, or Spiritual Kingdom, says, "And a high way shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness, the unclean shall not pass over it: but it will be for those, the way-faring men though fools shall not error therein." The Protestant version now cited, though not very correct, gives nearly the sense of the original text, "*ve hajah sham maseloul va derek va derick ha codesh jicarat lah lo jahaberenou tamé, ve hou lamou holek derek ve hevilim lo jith hou.*" The way which the prophet describes is such that even the most ignorant cannot stray in it: 'tis not necessary to remark that the way of holiness in the Scriptures signifies a knowledge of the divine law, and to walk in the way of holiness is to observe the precepts of the law, which must lead to holiness. Will the Rev. Ex. pretend that

that a knowledge of all the precepts of the divine law is so easily discovered in the Scriptures, that even the most stupid cannot mistake it? if so, whence this variety of opinions on the sense of certain texts? whence these endless controversies, not amongst the unlearned, who are incapable of controversial discussion, but amongst the learned themselves? with what propriety can that be called an "*holek derek*," a common high way, in which the unwise shall not wander *evilim jo jitheou*, which the learned themselves cannot find without the greatest difficulty?

St. *Austin*, justly remarks that to believe authority is a great abridgement and no labour. The Catholic finds his faith in the same Church, where he finds the Scriptures, and there also he finds the genuine sense of the Scriptures, which is an essential part of the word of God; a part of that deposit of faith which the Apostles committed to the subordinate Pastors, whom they had appointed to govern their respective portions of the one flock of J. Christ, directing them to commit this deposit in the same manner to faithful men capable of instructing others: "Thou my son be strengthened in the grace of J. Christ, and these things which you heard from me amongst many witnesses, the same commit *tauta parathou* to faithful men capable of instructing others."—2 *Tim.* ii. In this authentic instruction of the Apostle to his disciple *Timothy*, whom he had ordained Bishop of Ephesus, we have distinctly explained the manner in which the deposit, that is the doctrine and discipline of the Apostles, was delivered to their disciples, and by them transmitted to us through their successors from generation to generation. In the word of God transmitted to us we find the intended sense of obscure passages "which the unlearned and the unsettled wrest to their own perdition," as we learn from St. *Peter* speaking of St. *Paul's* epistles, in which there are some things difficult to be understood, "*dus nocta*."—2 *Pet.* iii. 16.

Thus

Thus we know the manner of administering the sacraments ; of instituting the ministers of the Church ; of their different orders ; the obligation of sanctifying the first day of the week *Sunday*, not the last *Saturday*, as ordered in the Scriptures, which ordinance of the Old Testament is no where cancelled in the New ; the necessity of baptizing infants ; of offering up prayers and supplications for the repose of departed souls.

On oral tradition the divinity of J. Christ was always believed and publicly professed in the Church, on this principle the Arian heresy was condemned in the great Council of Nice : there is no text in Scripture, however expressive of the divinity of J. Christ, which the Arians did not elude by ingenious and artful explications ; but the public faith of the Church, founded on the oral tradition of the Apostles, was not to be evaded. The Apostles explained their doctrine in their public lectures, all difficulties and ambiguities were removed, and the faithful distinctly understood, the intended sense of their doctrine. On this simple principle, have all innovations from the very establishment of the Church been condemned. However great the numbers, who may have been seduced by any innovator or pretended reformer, we always return to the day on which he first began to introduce his new opinion ; and we tell him, this new doctrine was not taught yesterday in any one Church of the whole Christian world, you therefore are the inventor of it ; 'tis no part of the faith delivered to the Saints, which St. *Jude*, recommends to the faithful “ *té ápar paradotheisèi tois ágióis pisteí*” the faith once delivered by oral tradition as the Greek terms signifies to the Saints. *Jude* i. 'Tis no part of that deposit of faith which St. *Paul* committed to *Timothy*, in presence of many witnesses. The writer gives an instance in two articles of Catholic doctrine rejected by all descriptions of Protestants, that is the doctrine of purgatory and transubstantiation ; the motives for rejecting these tenets

have been already assigned. 'Tis undeniably true that these doctrines were believed and taught ; that prayers were offered up for suffering souls ; and that in the public sacrifice of the Mass, J. Christ was believed to be really present, and offered up to his eternal father under the appearances of bread and wine as a propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead in all Churches of the whole Christian world, the day before *Martin Luther* commenced his reforming trade ; 'tis also true that he himself believed these doctrines, and that he and his ancestors for many generations were baptised in that Church, which believed and taught them doctrines, whence it must be inferred that the novelties, which he introduced, composed no part of that deposit of faith transmitted by the Apostles thro' their lawful successors down to us ; they were therefore of his own invention. His appeal to the Scriptures is vain : did *Martin Luther*, a Saxon Monk, whose works yet extant speak the author a scurrilous buffoon, understand the Scriptures better than the *Austins*, the *Jeroms*, the *Gregorys*, *Greeks* and *Latins* ; in a word better than the whole Christian World ? the supposition surpasses absurdity. But you'll say they might have mistaken the sense of the Scriptures. To this the reply is simple : 'tis infinitely more probable that *Luther* mistook the sense, or rather perverted it, in order to support a cause in which the spirit of pride had engaged him, and would not permit him to retract. 'Tis from the Apostles that their immediate successors in the ministry received the Scriptures, and with the Scriptures, the genuine sense of the sacred writers, on this genuine sense, not the fancied sense of innovators, was the practice of the Church founded, and formed. If the Apostles had told their successors, or the different subordinate Pastors, whom they had appointed to feed their respective portions of the flock, that the words of institution " *this is my Body, this is my blood,*" were to be understood in a figurative sense, and that the sacramental

ramental species contained nothing more than bread and wine, as a simple memorial, there never would have been an altar erected, nor would the tremendous sacrifice of Christ's Body, have been offered as a propitiation for the living and the dead. The universal practice of all Christian Churches in all ages invariably the same before the reformation, shews the sense in which the Apostles understood the words of institution, and the sense in which they taught them, that is, the plain, obvious, and literal sense, as they were always understood in the Christian Church.

The same observation is applicable to the doctrine of purgatory : prayers and sacrifices were offered for the dead in the Jewish dispensation : of this we have authentic evidence in the book of the *Maccabees*, which, whether canonical or not, is at least a history written by a well informed Jew, who knew the practice of the Jewish Church. St. *Austin* says, that " the Christian Church holds these books canonical, and though, " says he, this should not be read in the old Scriptures, " the authority of the universal Church is manifest, " where, in the prayers which are offered, at the altar, " the commendation of the dead has its place."—*Lib. de Curá pro. mor. Cap. 2.*—Two ages before him *Tertullien* had said, " We make offerings for the dead, " if you ask the reason, tradition is given as a precedent, custom observes it and faith preserves it."—*Lib. de Cor. Mi.*—On this universal practice St. *Chrysostome* asserts in his 69th Homily to the people, " that these things were not rashly instituted by the " Apostles, that in the tremendous mysteries (Mafs) " there should be a commemoration of the dead." So true it is that in the practice of the Church, founded by the Apostles, the genuine sense of the doctrine, which they taught is to be found ; not in the wild speculations of apostate Monks, who, regardless of vows and oaths, and thus abandoned to a reprobate sense, pretend to find in the Scriptures a sense which

was never intended by the sacred writers; but which may serve as a mask to conceal the apostacy and profligacy of these new teachers.

But finally, to say, that tradition is of equal authority with the written word of God, is it not to make the authority of men equal to that of God? No, but to make the unwritten word of God of equal authority with his written word, which is a manifest truth: when God promised *Abraham* that all nations should be blessed in his seed, and ordered him and all his descendants to be circumcised, was the promise of less force or the obligation of observing the ceremony of the circumcision less rigorous, before *Moses* had written it in the book of *Genesis* some 430 years after? the Ex. will not venture to assert that *Isaac, Jacob, Joseph*, and many others were not faithful men; yet on the authority of the unwritten word transmitted by oral tradition, they believed, and on the same authority they observed the law, as did *Moses* himself before he was appointed to conduct the Jewish people—and, to descend to the Christian Church, in its first formation, and many years after, the faith of the primitive Christians in J. Christ was not found in the New Testament: 'Twas not yet written, nor was the morality of the Gospel explained in the Epistles of *St. Paul* before he wrote them. The people therefore believed in J. Christ, and observed his law on the authority of the unwritten word received by oral tradition.

To pretend that we Catholics think the authority of the Church equal to that of the Scriptures is a meer artifice to impose on the credulity of the uninformed and divert their attention from the real state of the controversy, which is this, whether the authority of the Catholic Church be superior to that of an unqualified individual? or in other words, whether the Pastors of the Catholic Church assembled in Council, or dispersed, and communicating to each other the immemorial practice and doctrine of their respective Churches, understand

understand the Scriptures better than a Cobler on his bulk. We Catholics think the Pastors of the Church the more competent judges of the intended sense of the inspired writings. We think the Cobler might modestly submit his judgment to their decision—and in this we are justified by the rules of common sense. If the Cobler appeals to the authority of his minister, we reply that his minister pretends to no authority but must refer him to the Scripture, whether he can read it or not, and leaves him to shift for himself; and if his minister should assume any authority, we tell him that some thousands of Bishops now living, and tens of thousands who are now no more, many of whom were men eminent for science and sanctity, as such revered by the world, condemn the pretended authority of his minister, and if he prefers the authority of one man of little note, interested in his own cause, to that of so many thousands totally disinterested, because they lived before the controversy began;—we say that he acts against the principles of common sense, and is not only criminal, but inexcusable in his error.

Let us now substitute to the Cobler his minister, whom we shall suppose a *Jortin* or a *Palaeologus*, who, professedly despise Popes and Councils, Doctors and Prelates, ancient and modern; he will admit no other rule of faith but the Scriptures, in them exclusively he must find by his own industry all that he is to believe, and all that he is to do in order to salvation. To this man of science, this *Jortin* or *Cochran* we simply reply that 'tis not true, that he can find in the Scriptures all that he is to believe: for he must believe that the Gospel of *St. Matthew* is a canonical book, and he will not find it in the Scriptures; nor will he find in the Scriptures that the Greek version of that gospel, the author of which is not known, is authentic; nor can he with all his science declare it authentic: because the Hebraic original is lost; nor can he by any human industry discover all the books which have been canonical,

many

many of them are irrecoverably lost. *Adam Contzen* proves that twenty books of the Scripture are lost. 2. 4. Ch. 8.—Thus for Ex. “it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord.”—*Numb.* xxi. 14.—This book is lost, and “*Solomon* spoke three thousand proverbs and five.”—1st *Kings* iv. 32. Where are they? “Now the rest of the acts of *Solomon*, first and last are they not written in the book of *Nathan* the prophet, and in the prophecy of *Abijah*, and in the vision of *Ido*.”—2 *Chr.* ix. 29. The first of *Chronicles* terminated in these words, “Now the Acts of *David*, the king first and last, behold be they not written in the book of *Samuel* the seer, and in the book of *Nathan* the Prophet, and in the book of *Gad* the seer.” All these books are consigned to oblivion; two of *St. Paul’s* Epistles shared the same fate, one to the *Laodicians*, which in his last Epistle to the *Collossians* he ordered to be read in that Church, and one which he mentions in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, “I wrote to you an Epistle,” v. 9. This Epistle does not appear; *St. Matthew* cites a whole quotation from *Jeremias*, which is not in his book, as transmitted to us. There is something similar to it in the book of *Zacharias*; but it must have been then in the book of *Jeremias*, or *St. Matthew* would not have cited it, that may be the reason why the Jews retrenched it; the same Evangelist had said, “it was spoken by the prophets, he shall be called a Nazarean.”—ii. 23.

Chrysofome writing on this text, “says many of the prophetic monuments have perished: for the Jews being careless and not only careless, but impious, they have carelessly lost some of these monuments, others they have partly burned, partly torn to pieces.” *Homi.* 9th.

St. Justin arguing against *Tryphon*, shews that the Jews did make away with many books of the old Testament, least it should appear consistent with the new. ’Tis not from the Jews that the Catholic Church received

received the faith of J. Christ, and with the faith the Scriptures ; but from his Apostles, whose citations are from the vesion of the seventy Elders: we have a remarkable instance in St. Paul, to the *Hebrews*, “by faith Jacob dying, blessed each of *Joseph's* sons, and “worshiped on the summit of his rod or sceptre” “*prof-kunefen epi to akron tés rabdou autou :*” in the Hebrew text, 'tis “to the head of his bed *al rosh hamitah.*” The Apostle therefore shewing *Jacob's* faith, in worshipping *Joseph's* sceptre as an emblem of Christ's sceptre and kingdom, did not cite the Hebrew text as we have it.

In short this truth is so manifest, that learned Protestants themselves, not daring to risque their reputation openly in the face of truth and conviction, have admitted it: *Chillingworth* in reply to this position of his adversary, “the divinity of a writing cannot be “known by itself alone,” but by some extrinsecal authority says,” p. 69. N. 49. “this you need not “prove for no wise man denies it.” And *Hooker* confessedly a learned Protestant, says “of things necessary “the very chiefest is, to know what Books are to be “esteemed holy, which point is confessed impossible for “the Scriptures to teach.” *Eccl. poli. le. i. f. 14.*

Doctor *Covel*, says, and common sense must have told him that “'tis not the word of God which assures “us, nor can it assure us, that we do well to think it “the word of God. *Def. Art. 4. p. 31.*

With what propriety then can this Man of science, this *Jortin*, or *Coch.* call that a sole and sufficient rule of divine faith which he himself can, by no possibility know to be divine? 'tis universally admitted that divine faith is founded on the word of God ; if then his belief that the Scriptures are the word of God, be a meer human opinion, his faith can be no more : for 'tis a manifest absurdity to pretend that the superstructure can be more firm than the foundation.

St. Paul was well aware of this conclusive reasoning:

ing: hence he does not refer his disciple *Timothy* to the Scriptures, but says, the Apostle “keep the form “*upotupofin* of sound words, which you heard from me “in faith and charity. *2 Tim.* i. 13. Nor does he permit *Timothy*, to introduce his own opinions “have, “says he, the form of words, which you heard from “me.” If the Apostle thought that the Scriptures were the only rule of faith, he would have delivered them signed and sealed into the hands of his disciple, with an injunction to transmit them in the same manner, or he would have been guilty of a most criminal neglect of duty, not providing for the propagation, and continuation of the faith in its integrity, by the only rule which our Ex. admits. However the Apostle was of a contrary opinion: he reduced to practice that sound principle which he taught in his Epistle to the Romans, “that faith is from hearing.” x. 17. The Apostle did not say “faith is from reading.” He would have excluded a great majority of the human race, by such an assertion as our Ex. does.

Let us suppose, that the Apostle had in fact delivered the Scriptures sealed and signed into the hands of his disciple, and ordered them to be transmitted in the same manner to his successors, that would not destroy nor even diminish the necessity of a living judge to determine the true construction of the law. No law ever explained itself. In all well regulated societies there must be some living authority to fix the genuine sense of the law, and prevent that variety, which must inevitably result from the fanciful constructions of ignorant or interested individuals. Therefore J. Christ, must have appointed a living judge to decide all controversies arising on the construction, which the dead letter of the law cannot decide, or he has been unaccountably negligent in the institution of his Church. In the old law we find this Judge expressly appointed: “If, said Moses, there happens a doubtful case in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, let
“ proty

“prosy and leprosy, and the words of the judges in
 “the gates do vary, *dibrei riboth beshearika* arise and
 “go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall
 “choose, and thou shalt come to the Priests of the
 “levitical race, and to the judge, who will be at that
 “time, and thou shalt inquire of them, and they will
 “announce to thee the word of judgement, and thou
 “shalt do according to the word, which will be an-
 “nounced from the place which God will have chosen,
 “according to the law which they will shew and ac-
 “cording to the judgement, which they will declare
 “thou shalt do the man who in pride will
 “not hear the priest, then standing to minister there to
 “the Lord thy God and the judge, shall die, and thou
 “shalt remove evil from *Israel*, that the whole people
 “may hear and not swell with pride in future.” *Deut.*
xvii. Here we have a living judge appointed to de-
 cide all difficult controversies which might arise dur-
 ing the whole continuance of the Jewish dispensation.
 Death was the punishment of disobedience to the de-
 cision of the Sanhedrim, over which the high Priest
 presided, the only Judge who ever presided over the
 Jewish sanctuary.

If we believe the Evangelist *St. Matthew*, J. Christ
 was not so insensible to the future wants of his Church,
 as to leave it destitute of any visible authority to decide
 controversies, a prey to divisions, sects and schisms. We
 find a judge appointed with great authority in the
 Christian dispensation: the Saviour instructing his
 disciples and giving rules for paternal correction, di-
 rects them in case disappointment to tell the Church,
 “and if said he, the offender do not hear the Church,
 “let him be to thee as a heathen or a publican.”—
Mat. xviii. 17. The authority vested in the ecclesiasti-
 cal judge in the old law was to decide, but to retrench
 the disobedient subject from the Jewish Church was
 the office of the civil Magistrate; in the new law J.
 Christ assigns the right of decision to the Church; but

he himself without consulting the Magistrate, retrenches the disobedient subject from the number of his disciples, and ranks him amongst heathens. 'Tis not necessary to remark that the Church being a moral body, speaks by its Pastors as the state does by its Magistrates.

After all let us suppose that this man of science, by dint of application, succeeds in discovering the original text, and the conformity of some one or other of our different versions, which agree in nothing else but their disagreement, with it, and thus by human industry discovers a rule of faith for himself, what rule will he give the unlearned protestant? who has neither time, nor means, nor talents, nor any one qualification for such an intricate and laborious discussion? a discussion by the bye to which no man living is equal; a discussion which *Hooker*, *Chillingworth* and *Covel*, have pronounced impossible; which *Jurieu* and *Claude* have abandoned. Which the translators of the English Bible have admitted to surpass the efforts of man: in the preface of an introduction to the English version of the Bible, published in 1655. The translators say that they can produce no copy, which they can assure to agree in all points with the true original hand writing of the authors "wherefore say they, in the variety of copies, " what better means can so much as he invented to pick " out the true reading than the conferring of the most " choice and most ancient copies, and then to stand " to that reading which agrees best with the greater " part of the most ancient and the most choice copies? " this course *St. Jerom* and *St. Austin* took, &c."

This language sounds harshly to the unlearned Protestant's ear. These learned translators refer him to the Scriptures for that faith, without which *St. Paul* tells him, that he cannot please God—*Heb. xi. 6.* and almost in the same breath inform him that the version which they put into his hands may or may not contain the word of God: for if the copies to which they have had recourse, be not conformable to the original

ginal text, which they say they don't know, or if, they have not given the intended sense of the divine writer in their version, which the unlearned protestant cannot know, instead of the word of God, they give him their own words, and thus leave him to his own sagacity. It must be great indeed, if, in such a labyrinth he finds an issue. 'Tis true *Jurieu* and *Claude* relieve him; they tell him that revealed truths are felt as heat is felt near the fire, which neither ignorance, inattention, stupidity nor prejudice can prevent.

The Ex. passes in silence, as he pretends many disputes and dissentions, which divide and distract the members of our Church upon a variety of points both of discipline and doctrine. The writer begs leave to inform him that dissentions on points of Catholic doctrine are not known in our schools; that the man, who would obstinately deny any truth proposed by the Catholic Church as of faith, would by the very act be retrenched from our communion. The object of Catholic faith are truths revealed, as such decided and proposed to the belief of the faithful by the authority of the Catholic Church. There are many truths, which are not the object of divine faith, these may found opinions, which no man is either obliged to believe or reject, or even to know or trouble his head about them:—Thus for instance, whether *Moses* wrote the last chapter of *Deuteronomy*, which describes his own death and burial, or whether this chapter was added by *Joshua*, or some other writer after *Moses's* death, is matter of opinion: the Ex. may choose without giving offence to any Church; but that the chapter is itself a part of the inspired writings the Ex. must believe, or cease to be a Christian. And 'tis a most embarrassing truth that he cannot believe it divinely inspired but on the authority of the Catholic Church; which shews beyond a contradiction that, 'tis by the divine word conveyed to us by oral tradition we know the written word of God. In his next edition 'tis hoped that this

Ex. will assign some of these doctrinal points on which Catholics disagree. In his first essay he has been unfortunate, "they are far," says he, "from being agreed
 " on that most essential question, the extent and limits
 " of the power and jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff ;
 " and 'tis to this day unsettled whether the Pope alone,
 " or a Pope and Council, or a Council without the
 " Pope, are possessed of infallibility ; that infallibility
 " is lodged somewhere in the Romish Church, they are
 " all unanimous."

If the Ex. could prevail on himself to consult Catholic writers, and not borrow their doctrines from Creed makers, whom they have not authorised, he would find them perfectly agreed on this essential point: they say that the Roman Pontiff's spiritual jurisdiction extends as far as that of his predecessor *St. Peter*, that is, over the whole flock of *J. Christ* ; that 'tis not limited to any part or portion, nor confined by geographical descriptions ; that his power consists in feeding his master's flock in his master's pastures, that is, in proposing to their belief the truths of religion, which are revealed, and regulating their conduct by the rules of morality, which *J. Christ* has immediately by himself or by his Apostles, prescribed ; and in forming such other regulations as the circumstances of times and countries render necessary for the observance of these ; they add, that if he transgresses these powers in any instance, he is guilty of an offence, and stands accountable to his master ; they think it an inversion of order for any inferior to judge his superior, and in this they are warranted by the common sense of mankind. Without order there is nothing but confusion ; hence it follows that if *J. Christ* in the institution of his Church had permitted his disciples to act and think each according to the dictates of his own fancy, to the order and unity, which he found established in the Jewish Church, he would have substituted the greatest disorder and disunion imaginable.

To this pretended disagreement of Catholics, on the Roman Pontiff's jurisdiction, a disagreement, which exists but in the Exrs. imagination, or in these fanatical pamphlets in which the doctrine of Catholics is studiously disfigured in order to deceive the public, our Ex. adds a second yet greater if we believe him: "p. 43. to this day," says he, "it is unsettled, whether the Pope alone, or the Pope and Council, or a Council without the Pope are possessed of infallibility.

To this bold assertion offered without even a shadow of proof, the writer replies that some 1750 years ago, 'twas a settled doctrine that infallibility in doctrinal decisions is claimed by the body of the Pastors united to their head on the promise of J. Christ to be with them till the end of time, *Mat. ult.* and the assistance of the Holy Ghost who was sent to teach them all truth.—*John xvi. 13.* On this article of doctrine there never was a shade of disagreement amongst Catholics: in the first Council of Jerusalem we find the subordinate Pastors in unison with St. *Peter*, their head, deciding the first controversy, which arbitrary constructions according to fancy, had produced; that is, whether the ceremonial part of the Jewish law continued to oblige in the Christian dispensation, and we find them declare their decision infallibly certain: for they ascribe it to the Holy Ghost, whom Christ had promised to send to teach them all things: *Jah. xvi. 20.*—it hath "seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, say they, "to impose no other burthen on you, but these things "necessary, that you abstain from things sacrificed to "idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and "from fornication."—*Acts xv. 28.*—The inspired writer gives a perfect model of an authentic decision of an ecclesiastical controversy: the Pastors assemble with their chief Pastor, examine the question; the chief Pastor first pronounces: "and after great disputation *Peter* rising said to them, men, brethren, you "know that in former days God made choice amongst
" us

us, that the *Gentiles* by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe the multitude was silent then *James* answered saying: wherefore I judge that they, who from amongst the *Gentiles* are converted to God are not to be disquieted." The subordinate Pastors judge with the chief Pastor, and their united sentence decides the controversy without appeal. They at the same time enact a law which the circumstance of the time rendered necessary, that is, they ordered the faithful to abstain from blood and strangled meats, which was to the Jews an abomination, and if authorized might be an obstacle to their conversion; they also forbid the use of things offered to idols, which might have been an inducement to the new converts to assist at the heathen sacrifices, and fornication, which though forbidden by the natural law, was not thought in any sense criminal by the heathens. The prohibition against the use of blood and strangled meats ceased, when the reasons on which the law was founded ceased to exist, the decision of faith subsists in its whole force: because the doctrines of faith are invariable; on this model have all religious controversies been decided by the Catholic Church, and all her decisions of faith have been formed. In these decisions there are no new articles of faith introduced, but these doctrines received from the Apostles which are opposed by innovators and pretended reformers, are solemnly declared to be the settled doctrines of the Catholic Church, a part of that deposit of faith once delivered to the saints, *St. Ju.* and by them transmitted through their successors down to us.

To pretend that these decisions are yet subject to the examination of individuals is to encourage pride and obstinacy; to authorize a palpable inversion of order; to encourage the sheep to conduct the shepherd contrary to the principles of common sense as well as to the precept of J. Christ, and practice of the Apostles.

bles. If ever that precept of J. Christ, "he that will not hear the Church let him be to thee as a heathen," be applicable 'tis in this case, where the Church solemnly speaks by the mouth of her pastors.

We find also that the faithful were not permitted to examine the decision of the Council "as *Paul and Silus* passed through the cities they directed them to observe the edicts adjudged by the Apostles and Priests in Jerusalem, *ta dogmata ta kekrimena.*"—*Acts* xvi. 4. They did not order them to examine them, but to observe them *phulassein*, the reader will please to remark that though *Paul* and *Barnaby* were Apostles, eminent in science and virtue, and conspicuous for the miracles which God wrought by them, the faithful in the city of *Antioch*, did not think their authority sufficient to decide the controversy: 'twas brought before the Apostles and Priests in Jerusalem, and there, with the concurrence of the Chief Pastor *Peter*, the controversy was finally settled. The question was not brought before the civil magistrate, nor do we find any of the laity assist at the Council but as witnesses: the Apostles frame the decision, publish and enforce it. What would the faithful of the primitive Church have thought of an obscure monk declaiming against the first Pastor, in the most indecent and scurrilous language and censuring the whole body of these Pastors whom Christ gave to his Church for the space of fourteen or fifteen hundred years? would they who obliged *St. Paul* to shew that his doctrine was the same, which *St. Peter* and the other Apostles taught, have believed a furious declaimer on his bare assertion?

'Tis irksome to be obliged to correct the inaccuracies of this Ex'rs. statement: in almost every line he blunders, whether through ignorance or design is not easy to determine: "Let us see," says he, *p.* 44, "what is the nature of the dignity, which is attributed to the Pope or Bishop of Rome. The essence of it
" indeed

“ indeed is comprehended in Mr. *Burke's* definition,” —“ all the authority which Christ exercised on earth.” Mr. *B.* gave no definition of the Roman Pontiff's authority in p. 30, and 31, which the Ex. cites Mr. *B.* offered a peremptory reason to shew that J. Christ had conferred no temporal power or civil authority on *Peter*. In order to evince this truth Mr. *B.* advances what is incontestably true, “ that the powers, which J. Christ conferred on *Peter* are not greater than these, “ which he himself exercised on earth, whilst he remained on it as a mortal man;” in the close of that paragraph Mr. *B.* said that the only authority which he vested in *Peter* was that which he himself, whilst in his mortal state and visible here on earth exercised; and having shewn that J. Christ exercised no temporal authority on earth, he concluded that *Peter* possessed no such authority; he added that J. Christ did not communicate to *Peter* all the powers which he possessed even as a mortal man: because some of them are *incommunicable*, the Ex. cites this last sentence, but suppresses the terms *a mortal man* which determine the sense of the phrase. They were not to his purpose. With what propriety then does this Ex. charge Mr. *B.* with having attributed to the Pope all the powers which J. Christ exercised on earth?

The confused manner in which he pretends to state our doctrines in that behalf would require a volume to unravel it. Why pretend to write on a subject with which he seems totally unacquainted? or if he has been forced to write, why not endeavour to know something of the matter? from titles which he in our name liberally bestows on the Pope, he concludes for us, that the Pope is infallible. Would to the heavens he were impeccable! we know to our cost that he is not. However to this first conclusion the writer replies that the Ex. may believe the Pope infallible or not, without ceasing to be an Orthodox Catholic. To his second conclusion, that is, that the Pope enjoys full power
over

over all nations and kingdoms, the writer replies that *Mr. Burke* has shewn in that very Letter of Instruction, under Examination, that the Pope does not possess an atom of civil power or temporal jurisdiction over any one town or village in the whole world beyond the territories which he governs as a temporal Prince. To the Ex'rs. next conclusion the reply is simple, "the Pope," says the Ex. "is above all Councils:" A General Council is not celebrated without the Pope's concurrence and approbation, never was, nor ever will be, 'tis a manifest absurdity to pretend that the Pope out of Council is greater than himself united with the body of Pastors in Council, an absurdity which no Catholic ever believed or asserted. If refractory men assume, to themselves the name of a Council, we call it an unlawful assembly possessed of no authority at all. Does the Ex. imagine that half a dozen apostate Monks assembled in some corner of Germany without mission or authority, form a general Council representing that Church of J. Christ, which is dispersed over the whole Christian world? "to him," continues the Ex.—that is to the Pope,—“all Catholics are bound to promise due obedience.” Yes, in spirituals; in all that regards temporal power and civil jurisdiction, they owe him no obedience at all—they promise him none. “And under his authority, the Romish Church is the only Catholic and Apostolic Church.” We Catholics believe the Church of Christ to be *one*, 'tis an article of the Nicene Creed which the Ex. is sworn to believe. All the different Churches so called in a limited sense as the Church of Asia or Africa, &c. in communion with the See of Rome, are but integrant parts of that *one whole*, the Catholic Church, as the branches are integrant parts of the tree, not the tree itself, which is composed of the root, stock and branches; or as the different members of the human body are integrant parts of the body, not the body itself, which is composed of the head, the trunk, and the members; and as the

Church of J. Christ is a living body, 'tis animated by the same spirit, thinks and speaks the same language. Hence the Apostle *Paul* says, "that faith is one *mia* " *pistis*.—*Ep. iv. 5.*—and elsewhere he says, "that you " may think the same thing have the same charity, be " of the same mind *sumpsuchoi*.—*Phil. ii. 2.* thinking " the same one thing *to én phronountes*." The Apostle was so far from permitting the faithful to think and speak each man according to his own fancy in matters of faith, that three several times, in the same phrase, he orders them to be unanimous in the same faith and charity.

As the branches receive their nourishment from the root through the stock, not the stock from the branches; and in like manner the members receive their nourishment from the body, not the body from the members, hence it follows that a branch may be lopped from the stock, or a member, which is but an integrant part, may be retrenched from the body, without destroying the body; but the head, being an essential part, cannot be severed from the body without the destruction of the individual. From this reasoning 'tis manifest that any national Church, so called in a limited sense, being but an integrant part of the Catholic Church, may be lopped off and fall into ruins; but the body of the Catholic Church united to its head never can, because 'tis the body of J. Christ as St. *Paul* expressly teaches in many places.—"And he, (that is " God the Father,) gave him, J. C. who is head over " all things *uper panta*, to the Church, which is his " body. *Eph. i. 22, 23.* And also diligently preserving " the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, one body and " one spirit, *iv. 3, 4.*" 'Tis the Holy Ghost, that animates this body, it must therefore at all times be a living body: for 'tis blasphemy to assert that the body of J. Christ should die, or that the Holy Ghost, who is life itself and author of life should animate a carcase.

The Ex. says, *p. 45.*—"taking for his ground work " that

“ that the church of Rome is the only true church he Mr. B. denies the validity of all other ordinations.” This assertion has no foundation either in Mr. B’s Let. or in truth : Mr. B. never denied the validity of the ordination of Ministers in any Church, nor inquired whether their ordinations were invalid or not : ’twas foreign to his purpose. And the Writer begs leave to inform this Rev. Ex. that Catholics have at all times believed the validity of ordination amongst the *Arians*, who denied the divinity of J. Christ ; amongst the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Donatists*, &c. and no Catholic ever doubted the validity of ordination amongst the remains of these sectaries yet scattered in the East. If some Catholics dispute the validity of the English ordination, that’s a question of fact, not of faith : the account given by *Parsons*, *Fitzherbert*, *Holywood*, and *Champney*, of the consecration of Messrs *Parker*, *Jewel*, *Horn*, &c. the first Protestant Bishop’s in Queen *Elizabeth’s* days at the sign of the Nag’s Head, in Cheapside, has a farcical appearance. ’Tis denied by *Bramhall*, *Mason*, and some others, the reasons offered on both sides may be the subject matter of a curious and critical discussion, which no Catholic is obliged to make.

The Ex. borrowing some hackneyed arguments, which have been solidly refuted many years before his birth, enters on a serious controversy, a controversy which of all others he ought to avoid. It has proved ruinous to every new modelled system which has relieved the ministers of religion from all the painful duties, which the simplicity of our ancestors thought attached to their state ; and opened to them all these enjoyments and pleasures which the severity of Catholic discipline denied them.

The infallibility in doctrinal decisions claimed by the Catholic Church is, says our Ex. a miracle. By a miracle was hitherto understood a temporary suspension of some established law of nature in the visible world : all natural agents, by that power of agency

which they hold from the author of nature, in similar circumstances produce similar effects. That such an agent should possess such a power is absolutely dependent on the will of the Creator; that these powers are inherent in natural agents we learn from experience: thus for example that a stone gravitates we know by invariable experience; if this tendency to the centre be suspended by a visible agent 'tis a greater power which overcomes a less, in it there is nothing uncommon; but if this tendency to the centre be suspended by an invisible agent, it excites admiration in the beholders, and is called a miracle, *quia mirandum*. Miracles are known to the persons who are present by the testimony of their senses, to others by the testimony of witnesses, to future generations by oral tradition. Thus *Josue*, *Caleb*, and their contemporaries believed the miracles wrought by *Moses* on the testimony of their senses, their children born in the land of Canaan, knew them on the testimony of their fathers, and we know them but by tradition: for though they be written in the Pentateuch, 'tis by tradition we know the Pentateuch to be authentic, and to contain the word of God; if we know it to be infallibly true that these miracles were wrought, the witness which attests it must be infallibly true: otherwise we might know facts to be infallibly true on the testimony of a fallible witness. 'Tis on the testimony of the Church, this day, now in being, that we know these miraculous facts to have happened: because 'tis on her testimony that we know the books in which they are related to be divine. We must therefore either believe her testimony infallibly true, or cease to be Christians. Thus all these specious arguments, which our Ex. has borrowed from men, whose object was not truth, but merely to give falsehood some colour of truth, are by this simple reasoning which bears no reply, shewn to be fallacious.

To call that which is in the ordinary course of God's providence a miracle, is a manifest absurdity: with
equal

equal propriety the rising and setting of the sun, and the variety of seasons depending on the earth's relative position, may be called miraculous; for this variety is not more necessary to fulfil the views of the Creator, in the natural order of the visible world, than the infallibility of the Church to fulfil the views of the Redeemer in the supernatural order: for since, according to the order which he has established, 'tis by believing the truths which he has taught, and observing the law, which he has instituted that his elect till the end of time are to be saved, 'twas indispensably necessary that he should give them an infallible rule to know the truths which they must believe, and the rules of action, which they must observe; no other rule has been given but the uninterrupted tradition of the Catholic Church. In vain the Ex. has recourse to the Scriptures: it has been shewn decisively already more than once that the Scriptures themselves cannot be known but by the testimony of the Church, hence 'tis evident that this infallibility in doctrinal decisions is so far from being miraculous, that 'tis indispensably necessary to fulfil the Redeemer's views.

In a series of propositions our Ex. undertakes to prove that this infallibility is a miracle. His first proposition scarcely deserves a refutation. Man, he says, is a fallible creature. Who ever doubted it? but may not this creature fallible by its native constitution be rendered infallible by divine assistance? were not the Apostles and all the sacred writers men? were not they by nature fallible? yet the Ex. believes, or at least pretends to believe their writings infallibly true. Was it from the union of many fallible beings that this quality of infallibility, a quality of the Ex'rs. invention, resulted? no—but from the divine assistance. And may not the Holy Ghost, whose influence rendered the decisions of these primitive Pastors of the Church infallible, continue to direct the Pastors of the Church to the end of time? is his power diminished?

are

are his cares of the Church lessened? his promises forgotten? in a word, the Church of the present day is it less immediately under the protection of J. Christ its founder, and the Holy Ghost its instructor than 'twas in former days? but how is this infallibility to be proved? to this the writer replies by a question of the same import: how was the infallibility of the Scripture writers proved? they wrought miracles. Many of the sacred penmen are not known to us. We don't know whether they wrought miracles or not. Of these we know, there are some, of whose miracles we have no account. What miracles were wrought by the great prophets *Jeremias*, *Ezekiel*, *Zacharias*? they asserted that 'twas the word of God which they announced. So did *Sedecias* the false prophet—so did *Martin Luther*—so do many others of the same stamp; but our Ex. replies: “that the testimony of men in their own cause, and to their own advantage was never admitted to be good evidence in any cause.” p. 49. We must according to this mode of reasoning not only reject the writings of all the prophets of whose miracles we know nothing; but also the testimony of *John Baptist* in his own favour: he wrought no miracle at all; the testimony of *St. Paul* when he said that he was transported into the heavens and heard mysterious words *arréta Rémata*, and the testimony of Christ himself when he said that “all power in heaven and earth was given to him.”—*Mat. ult.*

Let us descend from the writers of the Old Testament to the writers of the New: it does not appear that *St. Paul* wrought any miracles to confirm the truth of his Epistle to the Romans before he had seen them; nor do we read of miracles wrought in confirmation of the truth of any of his Epistles. We read, 'tis true, in the Scriptures of many miracles wrought, some by the writers themselves, and some by others of the same religious profession. All these are testimonies of men in their own favour, consequently of no force,
if

if the Ex'rs. reasoning be conclusive; finally, though we may admit that miracles were wrought in confirmation of the truth contained in all the Canonical books, not one of these miracles were wrought in the presence of the Ex. he therefore can have no certainty of their existence but by the testimony of that Church in whose hands the Scriptures were found. Hence it follows that this Ex. whether he will or not, must have recourse to the testimony of the Church for truth: because he cannot find it elsewhere.

The Ex'rs. reasoning would have been justly and with great truth and propriety applied to a *Luther*, a *Bucer*, a *Melancton*, and to all such intruders and innovators, who impudently assume powers and authority to which they have no legal right, nor even a distant claim, and of which they give no other proof but their own bare assertion; but to tell men legally vested with power and authority, that their testimony is of no force, is offensive to common sense: would the Ex. dare tell the British Parliament that their testimony in favour of the privileges of their body is of no force? they might be tempted, by force, to chastise such insolence.

Can this Ex. prevail upon himself to admit that we Catholics dispersed over the Christian world in communion with the See of Rome, believe in transubstantiation? that we believe it lawful and laudable to pray for the souls of the faithful? will he admit that the Prelates who composed the Council of Trent solemnly declared that these were the settled doctrines of all the Churches in communion with the See of Rome in 1517, when *Martin Luther* first opposed the Pope? will he admit that the Prelates, who composed the General Council of *Latran*, in 1215, declared, "that
 " in the Sacrament of the Altar, the body and blood
 " of Christ is truly contained under the appearances of
 " bread and wine." This is a testimony of Catholic Prelates in favour of the doctrine which they believed
 and

and taught, and was universally believed and taught in their days. Will he admit the testimony of the Prelates, who composed the first General Council of Nice, in the year 325, in favour of the same doctrine? thus we read in the Acts of that Council: “*item.* Here
 “ in the divine table let us not be abjectly intent on the
 “ bread and cup exposed to view: but elevating our
 “ minds by faith let us understand that the Lamb of
 “ God, who taketh away the sins of the world, is pla-
 “ ced on the sacred table; that he is in an unbloody
 “ manner sacrificed by the Priests; and that we truly
 “ receiving his precious body and blood believe them
 “ to be the symbols of our resurrection; for this we
 “ don’t receive much but little, that we may know that
 “ they are not received to satiety, but to sanctification.”
 This testimony is admitted to be genuine by Protestant writers of greatest note. By *John Occolompade*, in his dialogue with *Nathaniel*, by *John Calvin*.—*Lib. 4. Ins. Cap. 17.* By *Peter Boquin*, &c. ’tis true they make some silly attempts to distort the words of the Council from their natural and evidently intended signification: as if the Council exhorted the faithful to receive Christ by faith in the Heavens, though the Prelates say in terms as strong as language can furnish, “ that he is sacrificed in an unbloody manner by the
 “ Priests; that we truly receive his precious body and
 “ blood the symbols, that is the pledges of our resur-
 “ rection.”

And what does this Ex. think of the testimony of the disciples of the great *St. Andrew*, who wrote the Acts of his martyrdom at which they were present? they tell us that the Apostle ordered by the Pro-consul *Ægeas* to sacrifice to the Gods, replied, “ I sacrifice every day
 “ the immaculate Lamb to the Almighty God
 “ Who though truly sacrificed and his flesh truly eaten
 “ by the people, perseveres entire.” When the Pro-consul desirous of knowing how ’twas possible that the Lamb could be eaten and yet remain living and entire,
 threatened

threatened to force the Apostle by torments to explain to him this mystery of religion, *St. Andw.* replied "that 'twas not possible to come to a knowledge of this mystery without faith in Christ." If the bread and wine, as innovators pretend, had been received simply in commemoration of the death of Christ, there was nothing more easy than to tell him, that 'twas not the Lamb itself that was eaten but the figure of the Lamb, which any man possessed of common sense would have understood on the exposition.

The authenticity of this testimony has never been disputed, nor has the writer ever heard of any attempt made by invaders to elude the force of it.

This is a specimen of that tradition by which Catholics evince the truth of their doctrine. They shew by testimonies, which their adversaries are forced to acknowledge genuine, that the doctrines which they now believe and teach, were believed and taught in every age of the Church since the Apostles days. Thence they infer that they are the doctrines taught by the Apostles, and the inference is so forcibly conclusive, that all efforts to elude it are vain. As the writer does not write a treatise on the Eucharist, he omits the intermediate testimonies of this Catholic truth, which are numerous in all the different ages of the Church.

When this Ex. says, that he must totally object to tradition, he enters a protest against all the writers, who have appeared before *Martin Luther's* days, and against all the different Councils which were assembled at different times both in the East and West. But will this Ex. give us simple men leave, who do not easily conceive that an obscure Monk in Saxony was more intelligent than the *Justins*, the *Austins*, the *Gregorys*, the *Jeroms*, than all the Pastors of the Catholic Church, not only in his own time, but during a space of 1500 years before, will he, once more, permit us to believe that these men knew the doctrine which they themselves taught, that they knew the doctrine which was

universally taught in the Church? if so, the controversy is at an end. For by tradition we Catholics understand neither less nor more than the doctrines taught by the Apostles to their immediate disciples and successors in the pastoral charge, and transmitted to us in regular succession, these we know from the universal practice of the Church and the concurring testimony of its Pastors and Teachers; and the man who does not believe these doctrines true is not a Christian.

Let us consider this argument of our Ex. in another point of view, it being the first he must have thought it the most conclusive, "the testimony of men in their own cause and to their own advantage was never admitted to be good evidence in any cause." Will this Ex. tell us from whom we may learn the doctrine taught by the Pastors of the Catholic Church if not from themselves? shall we have recourse to the Jews or Mahometans? they know nothing of the matter;—shall we learn it from Protestants? there were none before the reformation in 1517. From whom shall we learn the privileges, prerogatives, and usages of Parliament if not from themselves or the public records kept by the proper officers under their inspection? where was the Court before which the *Romish Clergy*, under which denomination all the Pastors of the Catholic Church dispersed over the Christian world must be understood, was to appear, and plead? we always find the Chief Pastors assembled in Council, composing the Court and deciding all controversies which arose amongst individuals; condemning all novelties as inconsistent with the established and settled doctrines, which from the very nature of things they must have known, as these and these only were publicly taught in all their respective Churches; nor do we find that they ever referred the contending parties to the Scriptures for a decision: thus the Apostles in the Council of Jerusalem, *Acts xv.* decided the controversy on the legal ceremonies; the Council of Nice decided the contro-

verfy

verſy againſt the Arians, who denied the divinity of J. Chriſt. In the year 325, the Council of Conſtantinople condemned the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt in 381; the 1ſt of *Ephesus* condemned the Neſtorians, who introduced two perſons in Chriſt in 431; the Council of Chalcedon condemned the Eutychians, who confounded the divine and human natures in Chriſt in 451; the 3rd of Conſtantinople condemned the Monothelites ſo called becauſe that they believed in Chriſt but one will, in 680; the ſecond of Nice in 787 condemned the Iconoclaſts or Image Breakers; a Council at Rome, in 1050, condemned *Berengarius*, the firſt who denied tranſubſtanti-
 ation, though not the real preſence of J. Chriſt in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharift. As this error has been ſince revived and is now prevalent in all reformed Churches, it may not be amiſs to give a ſhort account of its author, taken from cotemporary writers: he was a profeſſor at Tours, Archdeacon of Angers, took offence at *Lantfranc*: who taught with great celebrity at the Monastery of Bec in Normandy, made heavy complaints againſt him, becauſe many had left his own ſchool to go to that of *Lantfranc*; in this perturbed ſtate of mind, he began to publiſh his error, which was immediately refuted by *Lantfranc* and others, condemned by the Biſhops *Adelman*, of Breſcia, and *Hugh*, of Langres. In their letters to *Berengarius*, they reproached him with being the firſt author of this Error, and ſeriouſly admoniſhed him to retract. *Guitmundas*, Lib. 3, near the end, ſays, “*notiſſimum eſt hoc tempore prius quam Berengarius inſaniſſet, hujus modi veſanias nuſquam fuiſſe.*”—“’Tis public-
 ly known that before *Berengarius’s* madneſs ſuch folly was no where.” And we know from *Pajchaſius* that in 865 when he wrote there was no ſuch folly in the world: in his book on the words of the inſtitution *this is my Body*, he ſays, “that though there
 “ were ſome who moved ſome queſtions on the truth

“ of Christ’s Body in the Sacrament, there was no man
 “ who publicly denied it. He alludes to *John Scotus*,
 and *Bertram* a Monk of Corbie; in whose writings
 there are some incoherent ambiguities on the question.
 “ Though some through ignorance err, said *Paschasias*,
 “ there is no body yet in public, who contradicts this to
 “ be so, which the world believes and confesses.”
Lantfrane in his Letter to *Berengarius*, describes the
 astonishment of the Prelates assembled in Council un-
 der *Leo* the IX. when *Berenger’s* Letter was read in
 which ’twas asserted that Christ was not substantially
 present in the Eucharist—a contradiction not only to
 the Catholic Faith but to the universal practice of the
 Christian world. In his last book against *Berenger*, he
 says, “ ask all these who have any knowledge of our
 “ language and our learning; ask the Greeks, the Ar-
 “ menians, ask Christians of any denomination or na-
 “ tion, with one voice they will all attest that they
 “ hold this faith.” *Ber.* finding himself con-
 demned by all Christians, retracted his errors; but
 through that inconstancy which characterises all inno-
 vators and pretended reformers, relapsed, was again
 condemned, retracted once more, and died at length in
 the communion of the Church. His followers were
 few, and soon disappeared; the Error was revived by
Wicief 300 years after, but confined to a few in Eng-
 land, who also disappeared in a short time; and so uni-
 versal was the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in
 the Eucharist in the year 1518, when *Carlostadt* and
Zuingluis began to innovate, that *Zuingluis* himself,
 in his commentaries on the true and false religion,
 says *Cap. de Eu.* that at first he had acted in a very
 private manner, and had conferred with a few friends
 on proposing his new doctrine. He feared to give
 public offence by introducing a novelty contradicted by
 the practice of the Christian world.

As soon as this new doctrine appeared, *Luther* him-
 self, jealous perhaps of not having the honor of the in-
 vention

vention, undertook a defence of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. His dispute with *Carlostadt* on this subject commenced in a comical manner: *Carlostadt*, banished from Wirtemberg, retired to Orlemonde, a city of Thuringia. He there preached against *Luther*, whom he called a flatterer of the Pope because he had retained some parts of the Mass; he was very wrong: *Luther* did not flatter the Pope. This however excited tumults in Orlemonde. *Luther* was sent by the Elector of Saxony to appease the troubles: on his way he preached at Iene, in presence of *Carlostadt*, called him a seditious fellow; after the sermon *Carlostadt* came to an Inn at the sign of the *Black Bear*, where *Luther* lodged; there he told *Luther* that he could not bear his opinion of the *real presence*. *Luther*, who was not remarkable for modesty, defied him to write against him (*Luther*) and promised him a florin of gold, if he undertook it; *Carlostadt* put the florin in his pocket; they shook hands, promised each other fair play. *Luther* drank to *Carlostadt's* health and to the work which he had then in embryo. *Carlostadt* answered in the same strain, swallowed a bumper, and thus the war began the 22d of August, 1524, which continues yet between the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*—their parting is amusing enough:—"may I see you on the wheel," says *Carlostadt* to *Luther*; "may you break your neck before you leave the town," replies *Luther*—and so they parted. The fact is thus related by *Hospinian*, a Protestant writer, *Par. 3 v. ad An. 1524*, and by *Luther* himself, in his letter to *Argentini. Epis. ad. Ag. S. 7*. In a letter which *Hospinian* gives 2 part *ad An. 1534*, *Luther* says, "the Papists themselves are forced to give me the praise of having defended better than they the doctrine of the literal sense; and in fact I am sure that though they were all melted together, they could never maintain so strongly as I." This boast of *Luther* was ill-founded; for the disciples of *Zuinglius* and *Carlostadt* shewed

shewed by invincible proofs that, if the literal sense of the words of institution, *this is my Body*, be the intended sense, transubstantiation must be admitted, not that consubstantiation which *Luther* had substituted, and which the Lutherans continue to believe. Truth claims no protection from the abettors of error; light and darkness exclude each the other: the reader will pardon this digression. Let us resume the Council of Constance in 1413, condemned *Wiclef's* Errors revived in part by *John Hufs*, and finally the Council of Trent in 1564, condemned *Luther's* Errors, and a multiplicity of others, which at that unlucky epoch began to disfigure the face of Christianity. Thus we see the conduct of the Church has been uniformly the same since the Apostles days: whenever a new doctrine was introduced and from that attachment to novelty and impatience of restraint which flatters our vitiated inclinations, obtained followers, the chief Pastors assembled; they examined the doctrine proposed, compared it with the doctrine universally established, which they of all necessity must have known. Finding it inconsistent with the settled doctrine of the church universally taught and believed, they censured it, declaring it no part of the deposit of faith, no part of the doctrine once delivered to the Saints which *St. Jude* recommends. i. 6.

To pretend as the *Ex.* does that they are judges in their own cause is an artifice intended to amuse the uninformed, and divert their attention from the real state of the question: the Prelates are witnesses of the faith, which is universal, that is Catholic, which they received from their predecessors and judges of the controversy which is introduced by turbulent individuals, expressly to disturb the peace and harmony of Christ's flock, over whom these Prelates are placed by the Holy Ghost, if we believe *St. Paul* "attend to yourselves and
 "to the whole flock, in which the H. G. has placed you
 "Bishops 'episcopous' to rule 'poimanean' the Church
 " of

“of God, which he has acquired with his blood.” The Apostle did not order the flock to attend to the care of their Bishops and rule them; he did not direct a furious Monk to desert his Convent, to break his vows and oaths, to disregard all engagements divine and human, free himself from all restraints of religion, and mask his apostacy under the pretence of reforming religion. No, obedience is the duty which he recommends to him, “obey,” says the Apostle writing to the Hebrews, “your guides *égoumenois* and be subject to “them *úpeikete*, for they watch over your souls as being “accomptable, *òs logan apodosontes.*” xiii. 17. Nor did the Apostle refer the faithful to the Scriptures; but to their guides, from them they were to learn the truths of faith and the maxims of Christian morality.

Our Ex. has discovered by some new revelation that a great part of Christ's life was spent in combating the Jews, *p.* 48. We find him reproach the Scribes and Pharisees with having corrupted one of God's precepts by their own tradition that is by the false interpretation which they gave that ordinance; *Matt.* xv. *Mark* vii. he does not speak of the traditions of the Jewish Church under the direction of the High Priest and great Sanhedrim the true Pastor of that Church, but he corrects the false interpretation of some Scribes and Pharisees, Hypocrites who like all pretended reformers undertook on their own private authority to explain the law in that sense, which was most favourable to their interest and passions; when the Saviour spoke of the lawful Pastors of the Jewish Church, whose province it was to expound the law, and attest the truth of tradition, he strictly enjoined obedience and submission to their decisions and orders; “they sit,” says he, “in *Moses's* chair, whatsoever they say to you, “observe and do it.” *Matt.* xxiii. 2. By these words the Saviour authorises the infallibility of decision in the Jewish Church, which the Ex. denies to the Christian Church, though *St. Paul* expressly says that we have
better

better promises: *Heb. viii. 6.* Nor does the Saviour ascribe this authority to the personal qualities of the Jewish Pastors, who were extremely corrupt in their morals; but to the chair of *Moses* on which they sat, that is to the public ministry which by God's appointment they exercised.

The reader will easily remark that the Jews had no infallible means of distinguishing the Canonical Books from spurious works, but the tradition of the Priests and Pastors of that Church, who attested that such and such books were transmitted to them by their predecessors as divinely inspired; nor could the Jews learn the intended sense of the Scriptures but from the same source. So true it is, that in the old law as well as in the new the *Church was the pillar and ground of truth.* Does the Ex. imagine that the Jewish Church, which was but a figure of the Christian Church, possessed greater privileges than the reality?

The writer thanks the Ex. for admitting that the Romish Clergy have been in the habit of claiming infallibility for many centuries; he might have said since the Apostles days without fearing a contradiction: 'twas at all times the established doctrine of the Catholic Church, and upon the most solid grounds; 'tis true 'twas at all times denied by sectaries of every description and discrimination, from *Samuel the Magician*, down to the *universal friend Jemina Wilkinson.* As to the pretended forgeries to establish this claim they are totally unnecessary: there are authentic monuments enough which *Mosheim Blondel* and the Century writers of *Magdeburg* will not contest. Whether the donation of *Constantine the Great*, or some decrees inserted in Law Books, be genuine or spurious is foreign to the present question, and equally foreign to the writer's purpose.

“An authority derived from God, can only be proved,” says the Ex. “by an express declaration from him, manifested to mankind by methods perfectly
“incontrovertible;

“incontrovertible; either by the Holy Scriptures, or “by outward miracles.” Does the Ex. expect that God shall make a new and express declaration of his will to every succeeding generation? does he not think it sufficient that God has made this declaration once before competent and credible witnesses, and ordered them to inform their successors? if the Ex. does not think this sufficient, religion died with the Apostles, and that Spiritual Kingdom of which there was to be no end, *Luke* i. 33. ceased almost as soon as it began. The Ex. must permit us to believe that this declaration was made. We believe it on the authority and testimony of the Pastors now in being, who received that faith from their immediate predecessors, these from the Pastors to whom they were successors, and so in regular succession to the Apostles, who were the witnesses chosen by God to communicate this declaration to the world. By the same rule we know the Scriptures and the intended sense of difficult and ambiguous passages in the Scriptures. If the Ex. can assign any other infallible rule we shall adopt it. Whatever his ideas of *fancy* or *caprice* may be, or however useful these his rules may be in forming constructions on the law, they are totally incapable of ascertaining the Books which contain the law. If then the Ex. of all necessity is obliged to have recourse to the tradition of the Church for the Scriptures themselves, why not for the genuine sense of those ambiguous passages in the Scriptures? Does he imagine that the wild conjectures of every enthusiast, who pretends to explain the Scriptures according to his own *fancy* or *caprice*, convey the intended sense of the divine writers? or does he pretend that the faith of his deluded followers formed on his fanciful interpretations is founded on the Scriptures? if so our Ex. has excluded not only Church authority, but also the authority of the Scriptures, and substitutes *fancy* and *caprice* as sole and sufficient rules of faith.

In his second proposition the Ex. asserts in the most

M

positive

positive manner that the Scriptures are our only guide upon this head; thus he leaves all who are not perfectly well versed in the Scriptures without a guide to grope their way in the dark. The writer begins to fear for himself, and thinks even the Ex. in some danger; there are passages in the Scriptures, which the writer cannot understand without having recourse to the works of these early and intelligent writers whom we call the Fathers; these men who conversed with the Apostles or their immediate disciples learnt from them the intended sense of the inspired writers, and from them we must learn it, not from the conjectures of modern speculatists, who know no more of the matter than we do ourselves. To refer a man to the Scripture as to his only guide, is to refer the benighted traveller to an intricate path instead of giving him a guide to conduct him through it, and enable him to avoid the precipices, which may be in the way:—The Ex. will surely admit that all the different sectaries, who have hitherto appeared in the world, pretended to find their errors in the Scriptures, there are therefore some intricacies, some precipices in that path which render a guide indispensibly necessary—St Paul thought so when he said to the Hebrews, *obey your guides.*—xiii.

Let us descend to the Scriptures, our Ex'rs. last and only refuge, and see if they will shelter him: “All the texts produced,” says he, *p. 50*, “for that purpose are ambiguous, uncertain, figurative, and their meaning can only be discovered by conjecture, and the usual mode of interpretation.”—But three lines before the Ex. had told us that Scripture is our only guide, and now he tells us that all the texts produced are *ambiguous, uncertain, and figurative*, that their meaning can only be discovered by conjecture. What an awful lesson does the Ex. give to his Protestant Brethren? their only guide, he tells them, in a doctrine of the greatest possible consequence, in which a
mistake

mistake is inductive of perdition, is an *ambiguous guide*, an *uncertain guide*, a guide whose meaning they must *conjecture*. What Catholic writer ever told a Protestant in more expressive language that he must have recourse to some other guide? but the sense of the Scriptures may be easily collected upon other subjects, true; but not on this, of all subjects the most important, on which this guide ought to speak the most plain and intelligible language: for if it be true as we Catholics pretend that the doctrinal decisions of the Pastors of the Church in Council assembled and united to their visible head be infallible; 'tis infallibly, true, that there are fundamental errors taught in all the reformed Churches. To increase the anxiety of his friends our Ex. proceeds to lay down rules for understanding the language of this ambiguous guide—and after a multiplicity of words, which convey no determinate idea, he says at length, “if it can be shewn “that an infallible authority is unnecessary as far “as meer reasoning goes, it is a conclusive argument “against it.” This conclusive argument in the next sentence he reduces to a certain help in discovering the true meaning of a doubtful passage. What? the unlearned Protestant is first by logical reasoning, of which he has no idea, to shew that this infallible authority is not necessary, and he will thus obtain a certain help to enable him to understand these ambiguous and uncertain texts. The Ex. cannot give the man a more striking proof of the necessity of this infallible authority, than in this manner to refer him to himself, and torture him in the pursuit of the intended sense of ambiguous texts which he can never discover to an absolute certainty, and leave him in a state of anxiety and fluctuation to his latest breath; the very state in which St. Paul represents all these who withdraw themselves from that very authority to which the Ex. prohibits obedience: “always learning and never coming to the “knowledge of the truth.” 2 *Tim.* iii. 7.

The Ex. after conducting his reader through a maze of questions, the truth of the former depending on that of the subsequent as he says, comes at length, like a hare to her form, to shew that the Scriptures are sufficient without this infallible authority. But are not these ambiguous and uncertain texts parts of the Scripture? why not say at once that the conjectural sense of the Scripture is sufficient? does the Ex. imagine that the inspired writers intended contradictory senses in the same sentence? If two men understand the same proposition, "*this is my Body,*" in different senses, of all necessity one of these two founds his faith on a false conjecture. We Catholics pretend that the reformers did ground their belief of the figurative presence and real absence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist on a false conjecture: they dont admit the words which he spoke in their natural signification: therefore they conjecture, that he intended to say something else, that is, this bread is the figure of my body: or, this bread signifies my body: or, this bread is the sign of my body: or some one of an hundred different expositions given by the reformers to this obstinate text. To this we Catholics reply that ninety nine out of the hundred are manifestly false; and we add that Christ said precisely what he intended to say neither less nor more: for he perfectly understood the language in which he spoke, and hence we conclude that of the hundred not one is true. And finally, which comes directly to the point, that supposing one of the hundred to be true, there is no Protestant learned, or unlearned, can determine it but by conjecture, and that the odds are ninety nine to one against him. Is not that a critical situation in a game when a man's all is at stake?

The insufficiency of Scripture to guide us in the unerring paths of truth, has been shewn in so many different points of view in order, if possible to undeceive some well meaning men, who are unfortunately whirled about by every wind of doctrine, forming their faith,
not

not on the Scriptures which they don't understand, but on the fanciful expositions of every enthusiast who undertakes to direct them, forgetting that if the blind lead the blind they both fall in the ditch, nor is it an excuse to say: I believed such or such a teacher: because Christ has warned his disciples more than once to beware of wolves in sheep's cloathing. *Matt. vii. 15.*

The first argument which the Ex. states in support of his pretended sufficiency of the Scriptures, if rightly understood proves the contrary: "to assert," says he, "that when Christ came into the world to save sinners, he did not teach them all things necessary to that end, or that when the Evangelists were inspired to commit those doctrines to writing, the inspiration was imperfect is to deny the goodness, the wisdom, and the power of God." The Ex. was not aware that his first argument condemns all novelties in doctrine and leaves the pretended reformers without excuse; for there was no new revelation made to them and they had no possible mode of knowing the doctrine taught by Christ but by the testimony of these in whose hands it was deposited. 'Tis very true that Christ taught every thing necessary to salvation, but he did not write a line nor did he give the Scriptures as a guide to his disciples; he taught them with authority, *Matt. vii. 9.* gave his precepts in his public lectures, ordered his Apostles to teach and to preach to the people in the same manner; he reproached the Pharisees with examining the Scriptures in vain. "You examine the Scriptures because you think to have life everlasting in them, and they are giving testimony of me." *John v. 39.* As if he had said you are continually reading the Scriptures in which you think you may find life; yet these very Scriptures attest that life is not to be obtained but by faith in me. To this he adds, v. 40, "And you will not come to me that you may have life." A man would imagine that he was giving a lecture to modern enthusiasts, who think that in the
 Scriptures

Scriptures alone life is to be found and disdain to come to that fold, of which the Scriptures attest that, out of it there is no eternal life: because 'tis in his fold that J. Christ feeds his sheep by the ministry of these pastors whom he has given to his Church. *Eph. 4.*

But was not the inspiration of the Evangelists perfect? yes: and so was that of *Moses* and the prophets; but that did not exclude the necessity of instituting a succession of pastors in the old law, whose province and duty 'twas to explain the inspired writings to the people and offer sacrifices in their name. Nor does the inspiration of the New Testament, however perfect it may be, exclude the ministry of these Pastors and teachers, whom, if we believe St. *Paul*, Christ gave to his Church for the perfection of the Saints. *Eph. iv.*

11. Will this Ex. inform us of what use is a teacher to a man who teaches himself? or what is the use of a Pastor to a man who finds all the spiritual food which is necessary in the Scriptures? and not only finds it there, but according to the principles of the Ex. must find it there and not elsewhere. Why not substitute Printers to Bishops and Ministers in the Church of England? one tenth of their revenues would pay a sufficient number of Printers, and the remaining nine tenths be a great saving to the nation.

The Ex. immediately adds that the Scriptures in many places declare their own sufficiency. Not surely to a man who can't read them! must the poor fellow be damned without redemption or resource? unfortunately for our Ex. the contradictory of his assertion is manifestly deduced from the passage which he offers in proof: "from a child thou has known the Scriptures," said St. *Paul* to *Timothy*. *2 Tim. iii. 15.* The Scriptures which *Timothy* knew from his childhood were the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, not a line of the New Testament was written. Does the Ex. think the Old Testament alone sufficient? or does he imagine the very Epistle in which the Apostle in-

structs

fructs his disciple was not necessary? St. *Paul* did ~~not~~ think it useless or he would not have written it. Why does the Apostle strictly command the Thessalonians to hold fast the oral traditions, which they had received from him: "Wherefore brethren, stand and hold fast, *krateite*, the traditions, which you have been taught, whether by word or by our Epistle." *2 Thef. ii. 15.* The Apostle not only thought but taught expressly that the Scriptures were not sufficient, when he ordered them to hold fast what they had learned by oral tradition as well as what they read in the Scriptures. The text cited by the Ex. shews the ends for which the Scriptures were written, and the advantages resulting from them when rightly understood: "They are profitable," says the Apostle, "for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Does the Ex. think profitable and sufficient synonymous? Meat is profitable, and even indispensably necessary for the support of life and health, but air is equally necessary. 'Tis useless to insist on a truth which even stupidity can't misconceive.

The Ex. adds in italics, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." He might as well have cited the first verse in *Genesis* in support of the sole sufficiency of the Scriptures: who ever doubted that the Scriptures were useful for the perfection of the just man, and for his advancement in piety and good works? for what other end were they written or given to the faithful but to contribute to their perfection? is not that the immediate end of the institution of the Sacraments? of the public ministry? does not St. *Paul* say, "that Pastors and teachers are given by Christ to his Church for the perfection of the Saints." *Eph. iv.* Both are therefore necessary, or to speak more correctly the Scriptures are useful, and the public ministry indispensably necessary: for without the Scriptures the faithful have been sanctified before the Scriptures were written

ten, but not without the ministry of the Pastors and teachers. The angel did not refer *Cornelius* the Centurion to the Scriptures, that he might find perfection and sanctification in them, but ordered him to send for St. *Peter* and learn from him what he was to do, "he will tell you," said the Angel, "what is necessary for you to do." *Acts* x. 6. If the Scriptures were alone sufficient to perfect and furnish him to all good works why not tell him so? why direct him to learn his duty, not from the Scriptures, but from St. *Peter* the Chief Pastor of the Church? it seems the Angel was ignorant of this new doctrine: he thought, as plain men do now-a-days, that 'twas the duty of the Pastor to direct the sheep in the choice of pasture, and not permit them to range at large amongst poisonous herbs, and exposed to ravening wolves or wily foxes.

To expose this truth in such a point of view as must strike the meanest capacity, we shall substitute the *Ex.* to the Angel, and hear his conference with the Centurion.

Ex. You must read the Scriptures; in them you'll find every truth which you are to believe, and every maxim which you are to observe.

CORN. What Scriptures?

Ex. Some Books were written long since, by authors whom I don't know, they contain the pure word of God.

CORN. How shall I know them? you say that you don't know the authors. How do you know that they were divinely inspired?

Ex. A certain taste will direct you—a certain sensation will serve to discriminate these which are divinely inspired, you'll feel the truth as heat is felt near a fire.

CORN. Hitherto my taste directed me in the choice of meats, and all my senses served to distinguish external objects; I find I must employ them to some other purpose. My senses are subject to error, more particularly

cularly when divested from their proper object.
What if they deceive me?

Ex. No.

CORN. Are you infallible?

Ex. No, far from it.

CORN. Then I can have no more dependance on you than on my senses.

Ex. You must believe.

CORN. Pardon me Sir, you I will not believe, because you tell me candidly that you may deceive me; my senses I may trust when confined to their proper object; but if my eye pretended to hear, or my ear to see, I should believe neither the one nor the other. Now Sir, that such and such Books are divinely inspired, and that in this visible world no other Book is so, neither is nor can be the object of my senses. How many Books are canonical?

Ex. That's a subject of serious discussion and intricate controversy.

CORN. In what language are they written?

Ex. Some in Hebrew, some in Greek, some in Syro-Chaldaic.

CORN. I am a Roman Soldier don't understand a word of Hebrew or Greek.

Ex. There are many versions.

CORN. How many?

Ex. Nine hundred, more or less.

CORN. Do they all agree?

Ex. No.

CORN. The translators infallible?

Ex. No.

CORN. The Antographs in being?

Ex. No.

CORN. Any authentic copy in all things agreeable to the original writings?

Ex. No.

CORN. How shall I distinguish the most authentic copy from others less sincere? how discern all faults in

the version? all corruptions and interpolations? where the sense is ambiguous and uncertain how discover the intended sense of the author?

Ex. You must compare the versions, in doubtful passages, have recourse to conjecture and rules of interpretation, which we prescribe.

CORN. What! read them all! compare them all! in difficulties have recourse to conjecture! the labour is endless, and the issue uncertain; is there not a more compendious way?

Ex. Yes—take my opinion.

CORN. So ultimately I find I must rest my salvation on your opinion, which you say is but a meer conjecture. Pardon me Sir—I must consult some other guide.—The Angel appears and solves all difficulties in three words: send for *Peter*, says he, and he'll tell you what you have to do. So true it is as *St. Austin* remarks that to believe authority is a great abridgement and no labour.

St. Paul in this passage does not even insinuate that the Scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith. His words, if rightly understood indicate the contrary—he says that the Scriptures are profitable, that the man of God may be perfect. Hence 'tis manifest that the man of whom he speaks must have been pre-instructed in the faith, otherwise he would not have been a man of God. The truth is, the Apostle's instruction was directed to *Timothy* himself, and in his person to other Prelates; *Timothy* he calls a man of God, and in the text under consideration he says, that the Scriptures are able to make *him Sefophisai*, who was a man of God wise to salvation. *Timothy* had been pre-instructed by the Apostle himself; thus we read in the beginning of the foregoing chapter—"Thou, my son, be strengthened in the grace which is in J. Christ, and what you heard from me amongst many witnesses, that commit to faithful man who will be capable of teaching others."—and in the preceding chapter,

v. 12, he had said, "have the form of sound words which you have heard by Me." He does not say, which you have read in the Scriptures: the inspired writings are undoubtedly useful to such a man as *Timothy*, pre-instructed in the faith by the Pastors and teachers of the Church, and receiving from them the Scriptures with the sense of the inspired writings; but that the Scriptures alone without any recourse to the Pastors of the Church, were sufficient to instruct a man in faith and morality, *St. Paul* never said; he could not say it of the Old Testament, the only Scriptures which *Timothy* had known from his childhood, and in which *St. Paul* himself, though taught by that famous Doctor *Gamatiel*, had found not life but death, nor was he at his conversion referred by Christ himself, to the Scriptures, but to the Church in Damascus, "go into the city, and you'll be told what you are to do." *Acts ix. 16.*

The Ex's. next argument, if unconnected propositions unsupported by proof may be called an argument, tends to shew that the Scriptures themselves are not necessary: "Every article of faith," he says, "is distinctly taught, the existence and attributes of God, the Trinity, the character of Christ, the mysteries of redemption, the forgiveness of sins, and whatever else has been the subject of belief to Christians of all descriptions." It's presumed the Ex. intended to say, *all descriptions of Christians*, he had said, *p. 45, every man of all religious persuasions*. Such men are rare: the writer has not yet seen one of them. "This," he says, "is admitted by the Church of Rome." The Ex. is deceived or deceives: the Church of Rome admits no such thing: for 'tis an article of faith that the Scriptures are divinely inspired—that the Gospels and Canonical Epistles contain the word of God—and this is no where taught in the Scriptures; the divinity of Christ and his consubstantiality with the father, is an article of faith, and this is so far from being

distinctly taught in the Scriptures, that the Arians eluded every text of Scripture brought in proof of it. See *Eusebius* of Cæsarea; his Epistle in Theodoret, *B. 2 ch. 12*, in which he expounds even the term *consubstantial* in an arian sense; that there is but one person in Christ, the Nestorians could not see in the Scriptures, nor could the Eutychians discover that in him there are two natures, the divine and human. To come to ourselves we Catholics think *transubstantiation* clearly revealed in the Scripture, Protestants cannot find it there. Lutherans think *consubstantiation* distinctly taught, Zuinglians deny it. In a word, there is no description of Christians, who do not find or pretend to find their tenets in Scripture; and as their tenets are in general contradictory, even those which are founded in truth cannot be so distinctly taught as the Ex. pretends.

The Church of Rome makes no changes in her doctrine—she has made no alteration in the Baptismal, the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds: they are the authentic declarations of the doctrine which she professes, and always professed; she has not borrowed them from the reformed Churches: in her hands they found them, and very injudiciously retain the most solemn condemnation of all their errors:—Thus for example, the day that *Martin Luther* first opposed the established doctrine, he professed his belief in the Nicene Creed, or he did not; if he did not, he was not a Christian; if he did, he believed that there was then in existence, a *Church*; that that Church was *one* that is not divided into different dissenting societies; he believed that 'twas *holy*, that is, that there was no corrupt, impious, or idolatrous doctrines taught in it: for corruption, impiety, and idolatry, exclude *sanctity*; he believed that this Church one and holy was also *Catholic*, that is universal, which universality includes both time and place, it therefore neither could begin with him, nor be confined to him; he believed that this Church was
apostolical,

apostolical, that is founded by the Apostles, teaching their doctrine, and governed by their successors: in no other sense can a Church be called apostolical;—hence he must have believed that in this Church there were no corrupt doctrines taught, for the Apostles taught none, if he did not believe all this he was not a Christian, and if he believed it, and publicly renounced it, he was a perjured Apostate. This reasoning is applicable to every innovator and pretended reformer, from *Simon the Magician*, down to damning *Murray*.

From the extreme simplicity of the Christian religion both in faith and morals, the Ex. thinks he knows the sufficiency of the Scriptures. What! the mysteries of religion simple! the mysteries of the Trinity, of the incarnation, of original sin and predestination simple! it is apprehended that the Ex. is the first man who ever thought them so. *St. Paul*, for a solution of difficulties to some of these *simple truths*, has recourse to God's *unsearchable ways*, and incomprehensible judgments; *Rom. xi. 33.*—and in another place he declares the necessity of captivating the whole force of our understanding; *2 Cor. x. 5.*—Our Ex. has discovered that to be extremely simple, which *St. Paul* thought beyond the sphere of human reason—how these new teachers simplify religion!—how far they surpass the Apostles!—'tis true there is nothing more simple than to believe that true which tickles our fancy according to the Ex's rule of faith.

But in practice at least the morality of the Gospel is simple.—Yes, if we believe these men who have reduced it to *caprice* and *fancy*. These two precepts, “thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and soul, and thy neighbour as thyself,” in which all other precepts are radically contained, and to which they may be reduced, are so far from being simple, that the Ex. says, which bye the bye is a gross mistake, that the Gospel is only a commentary on them. Why not add the Law and the Prophets? of them the Saviour spoke.

spoke.—Why not the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles? why not the commentaries of *Luther, Melancton, Zuinglius, &c.*? Does the Ex. imagine that two precepts which require commentaries of such magnitude are simple? after all, in what part of the Gospel has he found that the Saviour reduced the whole morality of the Christian religion to the *love of God and the love of Men*, as he says, *p. 53*, “the precept of the love of God, the Saviour said was the first and the great precept, and the precept of loving our neighbour he said was the second and like the first.” He did not say that there were not other precepts. Were not all his injunctions so many indispensable precepts?

The Writer does not clearly understand what the Ex. intends by saying that outward forms and ceremonies however convenient or decent, are not necessary to salvation: does he intend to exclude the only two sacraments, which the reformed Churches have retained, that is, Baptism and the Lord's Supper? are not these outward ceremonies necessary to salvation? Infant Baptism is declared to be according to the institution of Christ by the 37th of the 39th Articles. However in favour of the Ex. we are forced to admit that the framers of the Articles jumbled them together rather hastily: for if it be true that Baptism only confirms faith as 'tis said in that Article, and that by faith alone we are justified as the 11th Article expressly declared, 'tis false that infant Baptism is agreeable to Christ's institution: for an useless institution is inconsistent with his wisdom: where there is no faith, there can be no confirmation of faith; infants know nothing, believe nothing, have no faith as faith is defined in the reformed Churches, and to assert the contrary is to insult the common sense of mankind; infant Baptism would be therefore an useless institution, a meer mockery. Add to this that the precept of infant Baptism is nowhere to be found in the Scriptures: if we understand the text as it sounds, the contrary seems to be true,

true, "Going," said the Saviour to the Apostles; "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—*Matt. ult.* 'Twould appear from this text that they were to baptize but those, whom they taught, and as infants are incapable of instruction, they seem also incapable of Baptism. For the precept of infant Baptism, therefore, recourse must be had to the unwritten word of God, known by the universal practice of the Church. A manifest proof of the insufficiency of Scripture is thus taken from the authentic doctrine of the established Church.

'Tis equally uncertain what the Ex. means, when he says, *ibidem* "that human wisdom and discretion are sufficient to determine, who are the proper persons to perform the office of public prayers." Does he intend to exclude the ministry from the Church as well as the Sacraments? in this for once he is consistent with himself: for if the Sacraments be not necessary to salvation, public ministers to administer the Sacraments are useless. He admits some proper persons to discharge the duty of public prayer.—True; but he has not told us how these persons are to be appointed, by whom, or by what authority; nor does he tell us what are the powers of these *proper persons*, or if they possess any power at all; and instead of referring us to the Scriptures for all these things, which we ought to know, he refers us to our own discretion.

In the next paragraph he acknowledges that there are difficulties and obscurities in the Scriptures; but, says he, they are confined to speculative points, all essential doctrines are clearly revealed. The Writer was yet to learn that speculative points are not essential doctrines. What! the mystery of the Trinity, the divinity of J. Christ and of the Holy Ghost not essential doctrines! these are speculative points if any such there be.

In a long and confused paragraph the Ex. states that

“ that there are in the Scriptures many obscurities,
 “ some intended by the writers, and others from the
 “ imperfection of human nature, and that even enthu-
 “ siastic brethren pervert some of the clearest to their
 “ own destruction,” From this we Catholics logically
 infer the necessity of a more intelligible guide. The
 Ex. by a sort of reasoning, to which the world was hi-
 therto a stranger, infers that these obscurities can be no
 impediment to salvation. Why then has he told us
 that enthusiastic brethren pervert them to their own
 perdition? is that obscurity which is the source of per-
 dition to so many enthusiasts no impediment to sal-
 vation? The Ex. replies that the Prophets and Apostles
 would not say that the Scriptures were sufficient
 for that purpose if their obscurity could be any obstacle.
 The Prophets and Apostles say no such thing: the
 Prophets in doubtful cases and obscurities refer con-
 tending parties to the decision of the High Priest, who
 was Chief Pastor of the Jewish Church.—*Deut. xiii.*
 And in the prophecy of *Malachi* we read, “ the lips
 “ of the Priest shall preserve knowledge, and they shall
 “ seek the law from his mouth. Because he is the
 “ messenger of the Lord of Hosts. *Chi sipthei Cohen*
 “ *jismerou dahath vethorath jibakshou miphihou chi*
 “ *Malcak jehovah hou.*”—*C. ii. 7.* And the Apostles
 by precept and example refer all difficulties and obscu-
 rities to the decision of the Pastors of the Christian
 Church: thus the Pastors assembled and decided a most
 difficult and obscure question—Whether the Law of
 Circumcision obliged in the Christian dispensation;—
Acts xv. and *St. Paul* says, “ that Christ has given to
 “ his Church Pastors and teachers.” He at the same
 time assigns the end for which these Pastors and teach-
 ers are given to the Church, “ for the perfecting of the
 “ Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edify-
 “ ing of the mystical body of Christ.” The Apostle
 continues to shew that they are to continue till time
 shall be no more, and expressly declares the reason,
 “ that

“that henceforth,” says he, “we be no more like children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of cunning men lying in wait to deceive us.” *Eph. iv.* In his Epistle to *Timothy* he calls the Church, the pillar and ground of truth “*stulos kai édraiòma tés aletheias.*”—*iii. 15.* Hence in his Epistle to the Hebrews he orders them to obey their Spiritual Guides, *xiii. 17.* of these same Guides he had said *v. 7.* “remember your Guides,”—“*tenémoneu te tò négoumenon úmon*—who spoke to you the word of God, imitate their faith.”

The next text cited by the Ex. makes directly against him, “if our Gospel be hid, ’tis hid to them, who perish, in whom the God of the world hath blinded the minds of them who believe not, lest the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them.” *2 Cor. iv. 34.* The Apostle does not speak a word of the Scriptures: he justifies the truth and sincerity of the doctrine which he preached, against false teachers, who traduced him, and he calls that doctrine which he delivered in his public lectures, *the Glorious Gospel of Christ*, so true it is, that the unwritten word is a part of the Gospel of Christ as well as the written word; he adds that if the light of the Gospel did not shine to some through his preaching, ’twas because their minds were fascinated by a love of the world: “We,” continued the Apostle, “preach not ourselves, but J. Christ our Lord, and ourselves, your servants by J. Christ.”

The Ex. cites some verses from the Psalms, to what purpose the writer cannot conjecture. The Psalmist says, “thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path.” *109.* Who doubts it? the commandment of the Lord is pure enlightening the eyes, *19.* That’s unquestionably true. The man who does not walk in the commandments of God, and according to the precepts of his law, must walk in darkness. What relation has this to the subject in debate? does the Ex. pretend that the Scriptures written in *David’s* time are

a sufficient rule of faith? that they contain all the truths which we Christians are to believe, and all the rules of morality, which we are to practise? if so, the whole New Testament is useless. The Psalmist praises the beauties and sanctity of the divine law, of which no Christian ever doubted—does not say a word of the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith; nor does he speak of the Scripture at all: for the law of God, his precepts and his commandments were strictly observed before there was a line of the Scriptures written: thus we read in the book of Genesis: “Because *Abraham* obeyed my precepts, and commandments, and observed my ceremonies and laws.”—xxvi. 5. The intelligent reader need not be informed that the book of Genesis was written by *Moses* one of *Abraham’s* descendants, some 400 years after the death of that patriarch in whose time we know of no Scripture; and all who believed in God, and served him, must have founded their faith and practice on the unwritten word of God, what we call oral tradition. So unlucky is this Ex. in his choice of texts to support his pretended sufficiency of Scripture, to direct us in the paths of Salvation, that in their intended signification, they uniformly teach the contrary. A cause must be totally defenceless when its best chosen proofs are against it. His last argument evinces this truth beyond a contradiction “it is scarcely credible, says he, p. 55.” “that the Gospel, which was preached to the poor, to the ignorant and to the unlearned, should have been beyond common comprehension.” The immediate inference from this argument, which the Ex. unfortunately overlooked, or perhaps did not think proper to make, for reasons known to himself, is that the Gospel was preached to the ignorant and unlearned, and delivered to them by oral tradition, not in writing which they could not read; that they were referred to Pastors for instruction both in faith and morality, not to the Scriptures, which to them would have been absolutely

solutely unintelligible and totally useless : the Art of Printing was not known for many centuries after the establishment of the Christian Church ; of the poor, the ignorant and unlearned, to whom the Gospel was preached, not one of a thousand knew how to read, and not one of fifty thousand could procure a manuscript copy of the Scriptures ; to refer these men to the Scriptures as a rule of faith would have been farcical, and to pretend that J. Christ had given them no rule of faith at all, is blasphemy.

The Ex. having proved, as he pretends that the infallibility of the Romish Church is incredible, that is, without offering any argument but these, of which we have already shewn the futility, he gravely tells us, that he has proved a truth, which the whole Christian world believed for fifteen centuries, and which a great majority of Christians continues to believe to be incredible, condescends at length to discuss the texts which Mr. B. produced in support of this doctrine.

If by the Romish Church the Ex. understands that portion of the Catholic Church, which is within the limits of the city of Rome, or that diocess, or even within the Pope's territories, the Romish Church is not even mentioned in Mr. B's Letter of Instruction ; if by the Romish Church he understands the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome, some texts were cited in that Letter, not in support of the Church's infallibility but of her indefectibility ; 'tis true the one is essentially connected with the other, and by confounding them the Ex. ruins his own cause : for the indefectibility of the Church, is believed and publicly professed by the established Church of England, though the infallibility of which 'tis the natural consequence be denied : in the 16th *Homily*, it is expressly declared
 “ that the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth has been and
 “ will be always present with the Church, governing
 “ and directing it to the world's end ; so that it never
 “ has wanted, nor ever will want while the world en-
 O 2 dures,

“dures, pure and sound doctrine; the sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.”

’Tis true the framers of the thirty nine Articles, these master-builders of this new edifice, the Church of England, found it convenient to give the Holy Ghost an assistant instructor and director in the Church, that is, the spirit of error—and of all others the most abominable the *spirit of idolatry*, declaring that the Church was for 800 years and more buried in abominable idolatry. How the Holy Ghost the spirit of truth settled matters with his assistant instructor and governor, the *Spirit of Error*, we leave the Manicheans to decide.

The framers of the Articles were betrayed into this unpardonable inconsistency by a servile imitation of the capital reformers in the confession of *Ausbourg*, of all confessions published by the reformed Churches the most authentic; or to speak correctly, the only one authentic, though it has been since reformed more than once. The viith. Article states:—“*That there is a Holy Church, which will remain for ever; but the Church is the Assembly of Saints, in which the Gospel is taught and the Sacraments duly administered.*” The reader will please to remark that the reformers had not yet assumed the name of Protestants, or separated themselves by any authentic act or declaration from the Catholic Church, when this confession of faith was subscribed and presented to *Charles V.* in 1530. This they themselves acknowledge in closing the exposition of their doctrine: “such,” say they, “is the abridgement of our faith, in which nothing will be seen contrary to the Scripture, nor to the Catholic Church, nor even to the Roman Church, as far as it can be known by its writers. The dispute rolls *il s’agit*, on some trifling abuses which have been introduced into the Churches without any certain authority, and though there be some difference, it ought to be tolerated: because ’tis not necessary
“ that

“the rites of Churches be in all places the same.”—
Conf. Aug. Art. 22. Edit. Gen. p. 22 & 23. The
 viith. Article already cited, is manifestly subversive of
 the whole reformation; on it Catholics proposed some
 very embarrassing questions, to which no satisfactory
 answer has been, or ever will be given: if, said they,
 “the Church be holy why do you pretend that there is
 “superstition and idolatry taught and practised in it?”
 Idolatry and sanctity are as opposite as light and dark-
 nefs. If the Church be the Assembly of Saints, why
 do you separate yourselves from it? to separate your-
 selves from the Assembly of the Saints is to acknow-
 ledge yourselves impious.

These texts which Mr. B. did not produce in his
 Letter of Instruction, the Writer begs leave to insert
 for the entire satisfaction of the Ex. and his *powerful*
Ally. In the next edition of the Examination a refu-
 tation will be expected, or a candid acknowledgment
 that a new system founded on misrepresentation, and
 substituted to the primitive faith of Christians, must be
 supported by the same means, which gave it birth.

The Writer thinks it necessary to inform his reader,
 that he does not vouch for the accuracy of the Prote-
 stant version of the Bible, though he takes some texts
 from it. The translators themselves honestly acknow-
 ledge that they have had recourse to conjecture. A
 man's credit must be low indeed when 'tis not evidence
 against himself; he also premises that he promiscuously
 cites these texts of the Old and New Testament, which
 clearly announce the indefectibility, perpetual visibility
 and infallibility of Christ's Church on earth for these
 attributes of the Church are inseparably connected, as
 will be shewn in the course of the work; he does not
 enquire whether the Church of Christ be the Roman
 Church, or the English Church, or a Church of any
 other denomination: such an enquiry is useless: for if
 it be incontrovertibly true that the Church of Christ is
 and was perpetually visible, since the publication of the
 New

New Law on the day of Pentecost, all the different societies, which have since been formed; all the Churches whose commencement is fixed by Catholics to a later date, and admitted by the members of these Churches to have commenced at that time in their present form, are manifestly no parts nor portions of the *one* Church of Christ at all times and without any cessation visible.

The first text is cited from the prophecy of *Isaias*, ii. 2. The title of this chapter in the Protestant version admits that the prophet speaks of Christ's kingdom.—By Christ's kingdom all Christians understand his Church. The Jews vainly imagined that the promised Messias would be a temporal Prince, and that he would re-establish the Jewish monarchy in its former splendor. 'Tis presumed that the Ex'r's opinion does not coincide with this Jewish fancy, "and it shall come to pass," says the Prophet, "in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it; and many peoples will come and say, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and *He* will teach us *vejorenou* his ways, and we will walk in his paths, because from Sion will go out the law *thorah* and the word of God from Jerusalem, and *he* will judge amongst the Gentiles."

The Prophet in terms as strongly expressive as language can afford announces the visibility, the universality and infallibility of Christ's Church. 'Tis *visibility*: Nothing can be more visible than a mountain elevated on the summit of mountains, the man must be blind indeed, who does not see it; its *universality*, "all nations shall flow to it, the Psalmist had said:" "he shall rule from sea to sea and from the river (Jordan) to the ends of the earth," *Psf.* 71. *Hebr.* 72. v. 8. and v. 11th, "all Kings shall adore him, and all nations shall serve him. And v. 17.
" Let

“ Let his name be for ever, his name is established before the Sun, in him *all nations* are blessed.” These words of the Psalmist require no comment : they cannot be applied but to the Saviour, ’tis simply a repetition of the promise made to *Abraham*, xii. 3. & xxvi. 4. *Gen.* “ in thy seed shall *all the nations of the earth* be blessed.” In this sense *St. Paul* understood it, see his Epistle to the Galatians third chapter. In these texts and other similar, of the Old Testament the universality of Christ’s Church is so distinctly foretold that ’tis an article inserted in the baptismal creed, commonly called the Apostles creed : “ *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.*” That this universality includes both time and place and excludes every error we shall see presently : in the text cited from the prophecy of *Isaias* ’tis said “ let us ascend to the house of the God of *Jacob*, and *He* will teach us his ways.” *St. Paul* attests that the Church is the House of God. *1. Tim.* iii. 15. ’Tis therefore God himself who teaches in his Church by the ministry of these teachers and Pastors, whom he has deputed for the perfection of the Saints. *Eph.* iv. Of this truth we have the express testimony of the Apostle “ we are the Ambassadors of Christ.” “ *uper Christou oun presbutomen.*” *2. Cor.* v. 20. “ As God exhorting by us *òs theou parakalountos di èmbòn :*” This is manifestly a consequence of that authentic promise, which Christ made to his Apostles, that he would be with them teaching and baptising to the end of time. *Matt. ult.*

God, whether he teaches immediately by himself, as when visible here on earth, or by his ministers, as since his ascension, teaches no errors at all. Would the Ex. or his Ally condescend to inform us on what authority the framers of the articles gave to J. Christ, an assistant instructor to teach idolatry and other damnable errors in his Church ?

In the passage of *Isaias* under consideration ’tis said “ the law will go out from Sion” “ *chi mitfion théfè* “ *thorah.*”

“*thorah*.” The Hebrew term *thorah* is in a particular manner applied to the law of *Moses*, including all the ceremonies, rites and observances of the Jewish worship, hence 'tis said that *Josue*, after having made a covenant with the children of *Israel* their God “wrote all these things in the book of the law of God.” “*Besepher thorath Elohim*.” The law therefore of which the Prophet speaks is manifestly the new law in contradistinction to the old, given by an Angel through the ministry of *Moses*; this law went out from *Sion*, and the word of God from *Jerusalem* by the preaching of the Apostles, who commenced their mission there; to fulfil the prophecy it must extend to all nations, which will flow to this *House of God* like the waters of a great river “*naharou elaiu chal goiim*.” Of this truth we have the testimony of Christ himself, when after having opened the disciples mind to understand the Scriptures, he told them that penance and remissions of sins in the name of Christ, must be preached to all nations beginning from *Jerusalem*. *Luke ult.* Here we have universality of place in express terms; and we find universality of time as strongly expressed; for as the preaching of the Gospel did not, nor could not come to all nations at the same time, it must come in the course of time; and the Saviour himself fixes the limit at the consummation of time: “this Gospel of the kingdom of God, said he, will be preached in the whole world, and then the end will come:” *tote érei to telos. Matt. xxiv. 14.* If the Ex. will have the complaisance to admit that Christ's prescience could extend to the end of time, his wisdom devise means to fulfil his promise, and his power employ these means, the controversy is at an end: for Christ says, in language as distinctly intelligible as ever was penned—That his Gospel would be preached to all nations; that this preaching would continue to the end of time; that he himself would be with the preachers of his Gospel all days *pasas émeras* without interruption till the

the consummation the Prophet says that 'tis he himself who will teach us *vejorenou*, as he does not teach by himself he must by his ministers or he has broken his promise, and the prophet has deceived us. To assert either, is blasphemy; and to pretend that he teaches error or permits an assistant instructor to teach error in his Church is something worse than blasphemy. So much for the first text, let us pass to the second. 'Tis the ixth. of *Isaias*. This chapter is understood of Christ's spiritual kingdom by all Christians; the title of the chapter in the Jewish edition of the Hebrew Bible, with Massoretic points, is, "the promise of a more happy age under a Great King:" "of the encrease of his Government and Peace there shall be no end upon the throne of *David*, and upon his kingdom, to order it and establish it with judgement and with justice from henceforth and for ever, the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." In these expressive terms the Prophet declares: that there will be no end to the encrease of Christ's kingdom nor to the peace and harmony which he will establish within his kingdom: *Lemarebeth ha misrah ve le shalom ein Kets*. Confirming it *le hachin othah*; and founding it *ve le shehadah* in judgment and justice from now *me hattah* and for ever *ve ad holam* this confirmation of the Church, or Christ's spiritual kingdom, in judgment and justice forever the Prophet ascribes to the zeal of the Lord of Hosts: *kinaath Jehovah tsiboath thahofeh zoth*, and he excludes the most distant idea of any interruption or intermission. Saying, from now *meattha* and for ever *ve ad holem*. Does the Ex. figure to himself that errors in faith are consistent with judgment and justice? that an interruption of 800 years is compatible with that permanent peace and unceasing encrease of Christ's kingdom which the prophet promises for which he gives the power of God as security?

In the 54th chapter the Prophet speaks in terms of admiration of the universality of Christ's Church.

The title in the Jewish edition prefixed to this chapter is, "The extent and security of the new state." St. *Paul* in his Epistle to the Galatians, iv. 27. cites the first verse of this chapter to shew that we Christians are the brethren of *Isaac* according to the promise as children of the Church of the Gentiles which was in being before the synagogue was instituted; but then deserted for a time, that is, during the continuance of the synagogue, and hence is called in that chapter a widow—either St. *Paul* mistook the intended sense of the Prophet, or *Isaias* in that chapter addresses himself to the Church of Christ: "Give praise," says he, ". . . . for many are the children of the desolate
 " more than of the married wife enlarge the
 " place of thy tents spare not for thou shalt
 " break forth on the right hand and on the left, and
 " thy seed shall inherit Nations fear not for thou
 " shalt not be confounded nor blush for he who
 " hath made thee shall rule over thee *Baalika* the Lord
 " of Hosts is his name, and thy Redeemer the holy one
 " of Israel shall be called the God of *all the earth*
 " this thing is to me as in the days of *Noah* to whom
 " I swore that I would no more bring the waters of
 " *Noah* upon the earth, so I have sworn not to be angry
 " with thee, and not to rebuke thee: for the moun-
 " tains shall be moved and the earth shall tremble, but
 " my mercy shall not depart from thee, and the co-
 " venant of my peace shall not be moved, saith the
 " Lord; who hath mercy on thee:" A comment on this passage would rather tend to obscure than elucidate the sense of it:—the prophet says, "that the Redeem-
 " er will be acknowledged *God of all the Earth*; that he will govern his Church with the care and attention with which a husband rules his wife: "*Baalika*," that the Covenant which he makes with her shall never cease, nor his mercy depart from her.—She will therefore exist under his immediate direction till the end of time. All attempts to destroy a Church under the
 immediate

immediate protection of Almighty Power are ineffectual. Hence the Saviour says that, "the Gates is, that the powers of Hell will not prevail against her."—*Matt. xvi. 12.* *Isaius* had said in the same chapter, *v. 17.* "every weapon which is formed against thee shall miss, and every tongue which rises in judgment against thee, thou shalt condemn." If the first reformer had weighed well the force of this promise he would have seen that as he himself did not compose the Church to which the promise was made, his opposition to her established doctrine placed him evidently amongst these tongues, which rise up in judgment against her, and that of course, she would condemn him. This reasoning is applicable to every innovator, who has formed a party since the Apostles' days. The argument is insoluble if the Ex. will admit that the promise was made to the Catholic Church; if he denies it, let him assign some other Church visible since the Apostles' days, without interruption or intermission.

St. Paul to the Romans, xi. 26, cites the 20th, and 21st, verses of the 59th chapter of *Isaias*, to shew that after the fulness of the nations should come in then Israel would be saved. This passage therefore must be understood of Christ's Church, and his Church must continue visible till the plenitude of nations have entered that the Jews then remaining may be united to it, or as the Apostle expresses it, be engrafted on it. 'Tis ridiculous to pretend that they should unite in communion with an invisible Church—the title of this chapter in the Protestant version is, "Christ's covenant with his Church." "There shall come," says the Prophet, "a Redeemer to Sion and to those, who return from iniquity in *Jacob*, saith the Lord: this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, my spirit which is over thee, and my words, which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart from thy mouth, nor from the mouth of thy seed, nor from the mouth

“ of thy seed’s seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and
 “ for ever. *I/. ix. 20, 21.* Here we have the most
 express and intelligible declaration that the Spirit of
 the Lord is with his Church ; that his words are in her
 mouth, not errors nor fictions, but his truth : for he is
 the God of truth, and by her mouth he teaches as he
 did the primitive Christians by the mouth of the Apostles ;
 and his words are in the mouth of her seed, that is, in
 the mouth of the immediate successors of the Apostles
 whom they spiritually begot by the word of God, as St. Paul
 says : “ In J. Christ, by the Gospel I have
 “ begotten ye : ” — “ *engar Christo Jeso dia tou Evange-*
 “ *liou Egoumus egenesa ;* ” *1. Cor. iv. 15.* and in the
 mouth of their seed’s seed, that is in the mouth of
 these who were spiritually begotten by the immediate
 successors of the Apostles, and so on, says the prophet
 from now and for ever *meattha ve ad holam.* If this
 be not a positive declaration on the part of God by his
 Prophet that the Church to the end of time will con-
 tinue to teach his words under the direction of his di-
 vine spirit, the Writer does not understand the force of
 language. However, for the greater satisfaction of the
 Ex. and his Ally, he begs to introduce a speaker of
 high authority on this subject : J. Christ himself says
 that his divine spirit will inherit his Church and re-
 main with her till the consummation : “ I will ask the
 “ Father and he will give you another Paraclete that
 “ he may remain with you for ever, *eis aiona :* the
 “ spirit of truth.” *John xiv. 16.* The Apostles were
 not to continue in this world for ever, the spirit of
 truth must therefore continue with them in their suc-
 cessors. The Saviour assigns the end for which this
 spirit of truth is sent : “ when he comes the spirit of
 “ truth he will lead you *odegesei* into all truth. *John*
xvi. 13. He had said, *John xvi. 26,* “ the Paraclete,
 “ the H. Ghost, whom the father will send in my name,
 “ will teach you all things and bring to your memory
 “ all the things which I have said to you. From this
 passage

passage 'tis manifest that the end for which the Holy Ghost presides over the Apostles in their successors the Pastors of Christ's Church, is to instruct them in the truths of religion; these truths which Christ himself revealed, which without the assistance of the Holy Ghost, would have been forgotten *úpemnéjei úmas*. He will remind you says the Saviour. If the Ex. imagines that errors in faith are consistent with this promised assistance and special protection of the Holy Ghost, he must permit us Catholics to believe St. Paul, who is of a contrary opinion: "what union," says the Apostle, "between light and darkness? what agreement between Christ and *Belial*? or what part has the believer with the infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for you are the temple of the living God, as God saith, I will dwell in them and walk amongst them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people." 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15. 'Tis beyond a contradiction that the Apostle in this passage speaks of the Church of J. Christ, in which he admits the immediate presence of God as in his temple, from which his truth excludes every shade of error, as light expels darkness, and as faith effaces infidelity.

In the 60th chapter of his prophecy, *Isaias*, speaking of the glory of Christ's Church, says that, "Its gates are always open; that they will not be shut night or day, that the strength of nations may be brought into it, and their Kings adduced to it." 11. v. And he concludes thus, "the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish." 12. v. In the next chapter the prophet introduces the Redeemer speaking, if we believe St. *Luke*, or rather J. Christ himself, who after reading the first verse of that chapter in the synagogue, said, "this day the prophecy is fulfilled in your ears." *Luke* iv. 19. In the 8th verse of the prophecy we read, "because I the Lord love judgment and hate rapine in the whole
" burnt-

“ burnt-offering; I will give their work in *truth*, and
 “ make a *perpetual covenant* with them.” The truth
 therefore shall never depart from them. The lan-
 guage of the prophet is so strongly expressive that a
 comment would only diminish the force of it. Let us
 pass from *Isaias* to another prophet of equal authority.

Jeremias says: *Jer.* xxxi. 34, &c. “ Behold the
 “ days will come saith the Lord, and I will make a
 “ new covenant with the house of Israel and with the
 “ house of Juda; not according to the covenant which
 “ I made with their fathers on the day when I took
 “ them by the hand to bring them out of the land of
 “ Egypt, which they broke; this is the cove-
 “ nant which I will make with the house of Israel after
 “ these days saith the Lord: I will give my law *tho-*
 “ *rathi* in their bowels *Bequirbam*, and on their heart
 “ will I write it, and I will be to them a God and they
 “ will be to me a people thus saith the
 “ Lord, who gives the Sun to enlighten the day and
 “ the order of the moon and stars to enlighten the
 “ night, who stirreth up the sea and its waves resound,
 “ the Lord of Hosts is his name: if these ordinances
 “ shall fail before me, saith the Lord, then also the
 “ seed of Israel shall fail so as not to be a nation be-
 “ fore me for ever.” In the ensuing chapter, *v.* 40.
 the Lord says by his prophet, “ and I will make
 “ an *everlasting covenant* with them, and will
 “ not cease to do them good.” If the Ex. can prevail
 on himself to believe that *St. Paul* understood the
 Prophet’s meaning, we find him explain this promise
 of the New Testament or the New Covenant of
 Christ with his Church: from this very text the Apof-
 tle infers that the Covenant made with the synagogue
 was declared old and consequently on the point of being
 abolished, see his Epistle to the Hebrews, *viii. chap.*
 Does the Ex. know of any covenant, which is to suc-
 ceed the New? does he find in any part of the scrip-
 tures that the New Covenant was to be succeeded by
 another?

another? if not he must admit that 'twill continue to the end of time, and whilst it continues J. Christ will write his law in the hearts of his people; his divine grace will enlighten their understanding and direct their will. A law thus written is not easily effaced. The intelligent reader need not be informed that the promises made to the House of Israel and Juda, and the city of Jerufalem are understood of the Christian Church; and the uninformed Christian may rest satisfied with the authority of *St. Paul*—in the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans the Apostle shews that the promise was made to *Abraham* before he was circumcised, that he of course is father of all the faithful whether of the circumcision or not:—"Who is father of us all: as it is written: because I have placed thee father of many nations." *ver.* 16.—and yet more expressly to the Galatians, *iii.* 29. "if you be of J. Christ, therefore you are the seed of *Abraham*, heirs according to the promise;" and again *iv.* 28. "we are the brethren according to *Isaac*, the children of the promise."

The Prophet *Ezekiel* speaks of the spiritual duration of Christ's Church in terms energetic: "My servant *David* shall be King over them, and one shepherd over them all and I will make a covenant of peace with them, and an eternal covenant 'twill be to them, *Bereth holam jehejeh otham*, and I will establish them and multiply them, and I will place my sanctuary in the midst of them forever." *Ez.* xxxvii. 26.—In allusion to this promise the Saviour said: "I have other sheep which are not of this fold, (the synagogue) these I must bring; they will hear my voice; there will be one flock and one shepherd." *John* x. 16. 'Tis well known that the Saviour whilst visible here on earth did not preach to the heathen nations; in the words of his ministers they hear his voice and are collected into his fold. So
true

true it is that 'tis he himself who teaches his ways in his Church as the Prophet *Isaias* says, *vejorenou*.

Words cannot more distinctly mark the unshaken stability of Christ's Church or his spiritual kingdom than these of the Prophet *Daniel*.—"In the days of these kingdoms the God of Heaven will raise a kingdom which will not be diffipated." *Dan. ii. 49*. In allusion to this St. *Paul* says that, "J. Christ must reign till he puts all enemies under his feet, the last enemy destroyed is death." *I Cor. xv. 25*. If J. Christ be a King to reign over his kingdom, as St. *Paul* says, till death be absorpt in victory, which will not happen before the resurrection; if he be a shepherd as he says himself, will the Ex. or some of his friends be good enough to inform us what became of his kingdom before that invincible hero *Martin Luther* reinstated him on his throne? was he a king without a kingdom, a meer pretender, a shepherd without a flock? God said by his Prophet *Ezekiel*: "I will raise over them one shepherd, my servant *David*, He will feed them, and he will be to them a shepherd. I the Lord will be their God, and my servant *David* a prince, in the midst of them, I the Lord have said it, I will make with them a covenant of peace and I will expel evil beasts from the earth." *Ezek. xxxiv*.

In the prophecy of *Jeremy* we read, "I will give pastors according to my heart, and they will feed you with doctrine and science." *Jer. iii. 15*. In allusion to these promises the Saviour says of himself, "I am the good shepherd, I know my sheep and my sheep know me my sheep hear my voice; and I know them, and they follow me and no man shall take them out of my hand." *John x*. The Scriptures both Old and New represent the Saviour as a shepherd feeding his flock. By what means or by what extraordinary power was he robbed of his flock?

flock? he himself declared that no man should take them out of his hands. The Ex. will excuse a reflexion, which naturally presents itself, during them memorable days of Popish ignorance and superstition—during them 800 years in which the Church was immersed in abominable idolatry and taught fundamental errors in faith, where was the flock which J. Christ fed with doctrine and science? Papists, if we believe the framers of the thirty-nine articles, whose opinion the Ex. must adopt, were idolaters. J. Christ does not teach idolaters, nor does he feed an idolatrous flock. Protestants he did not teach: for there were none before the reformation in 1517. The first reformers did not even pretend that there was a kingdom or state, a city, town, or country village on earth, in which the reformed doctrine was taught before their own time: the father of this pretended reformation, *Luther*, positively asserts that he himself commenced it, and complains bitterly that *Zuinglius* had the assurance to contest this prerogative with him. *Zuinglius* had said in the explanation of the 18th article, that before the name of *Luther* was known, he himself had preached the Gospel, that is the reformation, in Switzerland. *Luther*, not overstocked with patience at any time, was exasperated beyond measure at this attempt to rob him of the glory of beginning the reformation; he wrote to the people of Straßburgh “that he dared to “glory in having first preached Jesus Christ; but that “*Zuinglius* wished to deprive him of that glory. How, “continues this zealous patriarch, to be silent when “men disturb our churches and attack our authority? “if they be not desirous of weakening their own authority they ought not to weaken ours.” And in the conclusion he says, “there is no mean, that either they “or he himself are ministers of Satan.” *Tom. ii. Jen. Epi. 202.*

If pride, arrogance, perjury and sensuality qualify a man for such a ministry, his title was not defective;

nor was that of his adversary. The reader will pardon this digression.

The Lord by his prophet *Osee*, after having foretold the reprobation of the Jewish synagogue under the figure of a disloyal wife, promises to espouse the Christian church in perpetual love: "I will betroth thee to me for ever; and I will betroth thee to me in justice and in judgment, and in loving kindness and in tender mercies, and I will betroth thee to me in faith, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord." *Osee*, ii. 19. That this prophecy is understood of the Christian church we know from *St. Paul*, who in the xth. to the *Romans*, cites some verses of it to prove the vocation of the Gentiles; and from *St. Peter*, who quotes it to the same purpose.—*2. Pet.* ii. 10. The Ex. will surely admit that God betrothing the Church to himself, or, as the Hebrew text expresses it, uniting it to himself as to its head *ve erefthick*; and that in judgment, in justice and faith forever, *le holam* will preserve his Church from damnable errors: damnable errors are incompatible with judgment, justice, and true faith.

The Writer passes many texts of the Old Testament unnoticed; has adduced but these for which the authors of the New Testament are vouchers. Our Ex. will have the condescension to admit the truth of their interpretation: 'tis not founded on conjecture or the usual modes of interpretation, which this learned Ex. recommends to the illiterate as well as the learned, that is to men and women who don't know what the term *interpretation* signifies. 'Tis telling a blind man that he wants no guide to conduct him through an intricate and dangerous passage in which a false step leads him to a precipice, and terminates in destruction.

Let us now consult the New Testament, and see if it be more favourable to the Ex's pretensions.

The first is that which Mr. B. adduced in his Letter of Instruction. Christ says to *Peter*, "Thou art a
" Rock,

“Rock, and upon this Rock will I build my Church,
 “and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.”
 This passage the Ex. pretends to discuss; *Zeno* denied
 the possibility of motion, and *Berkely* the existence of
 bodies; there is no truth however distinct which may
 not be denied. The Writer would not be understood
 to suppose that the Ex. had denied that these words
 were spoken by Christ. He does not contradict the
 Evangelist. He confines the contradiction to Christ
 himself. Christ said to *Peter*, *thou art a Rock*, The
 Ex. says, *Peter was not a Rock*. Decency will not
 permit us to presume that Jesus Christ spoke non-
 sense. He surely did not intend to say that *Peter* was
 an inanimate stone—he therefore said that *Peter* was
 a Rock in the only sense in which his words could be
 understood, that is, that *Peter* had that solidity, that
 unshaken stability which was requisite to support that
 spiritual edifice, his Church, which the Saviour said he
 would build on him. In this very sense the Ex. de-
 nies *Peter* to be a Rock.—Would he condescend to
 assign some other sense in which the epithet may be ap-
 plied to *Peter*? Christ certainly intended to say some-
 thing. The sense, says the Ex. is obscure, yes to the man
 who don't wish to understand it: to plain men who
 judge by the rules of common sense there is not a pas-
 sage in scripture more easily understood: the Saviour
 speaks of his Church as a spiritual edifice, which, like
 a wise man, he builds upon a Rock that is upon a solid
 and unshaken foundation. *St. Paul* calls the Church
 the *House of God*—in the same sense, *1 Tim.* iii. 15.
 the Saviour adds, that the Gates of Hell shall not sub-
 vert it. 'Tis known to every man who reads the scrip-
 tures, that justice was distributed at the gates of cities
 in them early times; that the public officers and coun-
 cils were assembled there. Hence 'tis said in *Deute-*
ronomy, “and thou see that the judges vary within thy
 “gates.” xvii.

The Ex. must be stupid indeed, if he does not un-

derstand a metaphor so common, that the most illiterate artist understands it, that is, the place for the men in power in such a place ; the government, for the ruling magistrates ; the city for the men, who preside in it ; and amongst the Jews the gates for the persons who there presided over their judgments and Councils. Hence the Saviour's words are as intelligible as sounds can be, that he would found his Church in such a solid manner, that the powers of hell should not prevail against it ; that these principalities and powers of whom *St. Paul* speaks : " for our wrestling is not " against flesh and blood, but against principalities " and powers, against the rulers of the world, of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness." That these should not subvert it.

The reader will easily conceive that Christ here promises to found, not a church indistinctly, or in general ; but *his own Church*, that is, that very Church, in exclusion to all others, to which the prophet *Isaias* foretold that all nations would flow ; that House of God in which he himself will teach his law, that Church which *Osee* foretold that God would espouse in judgment, in justice and truth, and in which by his word all his children are spiritually begotten. If in this Church at any time gross errors were publicly taught by the pastors and believed by the people, the Gates of Hell would prevail, and Christ's promise would have been false—the prophets and apostles would have deceived us, and the Christian religion would have been but a fiction.

To obviate that silly distinction, which the despair of supporting a defenceless cause invented, between fundamental and non-fundamental errors, the reader is prayed to observe that if any erroneous article of doctrine, whether primary or secondary, of great or of little importance in itself, be proposed as revealed by God, 'tis a gross and intolerable error : for this simple reason, that it makes God the author of a lie, which is
downright

downright blasphemy. Hence 'tis manifest to any man, who reasons, who is not totally blinded by prejudice or party spirit, that this promise of Christ must exclude for ever from his Church the lightest shade of error. This is what we Catholics understand by infallibility.

The Saviour, instructing his disciples on the subject of fraternal correction in the case of personal offence, directs them to settle the matter amicably between themselves, or in presence of one or two witnesses if possible; but if the aggressor be refractory, to report the fact to the Church, and in case of disobedience to the Church he orders him to be considered as a heathen or a publican.—*Matt.* xviii. 17. The Saviour did not enjoin impossibilities, nor did he speak in vain: when he ordered a report to be made to the Church, he spoke of some visible tribunal, at which some public officers authorized to hear complaints preside. Does the Ex. understand this metaphor so common amongst lawyers, that *to inform the Court* is to give a regular notice to the sitting justices not to hollow to the walls; to inform the government, is to give notice to the Governor, not to every cobbler in town;—to inform the Church is to give notice to the Pastors and rulers of the Church, to the Bishops, whom the Holy Ghost has constituted to rule the flock:—*Acts* xx. and disobedience to their decision is a crime equal to idolatry, if we believe the prophet *Samuel*: “because, said he to *Saul*, 'tis like the sin of witchcraft to rebel, and like the crime of idolatry to refuse to obey.”—*1 Sam.* xv. 23. 'Twas God's order, you'll say, that *Saul* disobeyed—yes, but an order intimated by *Samuel*, and in like manner the man who disobeys the orders of the Church, disobeys God himself, if J. Christ tells truth: “He who hears you, said the Saviour to the disciples, whom he authorized to preach in his name, hears me, and he, who rejects me, rejects my father who sent me.”—*Luke* x. 16.

Does

Does this learned Ex. pretend that disobedience to the decision of the Church in meer personal offences is a capital crime—for that must be a capital crime for which the Saviour expels a man from amongst his disciples, and ranks him amongst heathens, and disobedience in matters of faith, which is a public offence against the Christian world is in his opinion no crime at all? if so, the Writer sincerely pities him: such a disposition argues the most perverse obstinacy, or invincible stupidity.

'Tis admitted by the framers of the thirty nine articles, which compose the code of doctrine by law established in England, that the Church has authority in controversies of faith, but with this restriction, that she must not order any thing contrary to Scripture. The restriction is of their own growth, and speaks the exuberance of their fancy. It's not found in Scripture, and is insulting to common sense: the Saviour says without reserve or restriction, "if he will not hear the Church let him be to thee as a heathen."—*Matt.* xviii. Why so? because the Redeemer had promised that he himself would be with the Pastors and teachers in his Church, and of course that in it nothing contrary to the Scriptures should be taught. Hence also speaking of the lawful ministers of the Jewish Church, he said without restriction; *Matt.* xxiii. 1. "The Scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of *Moses*, all things therefore whatsoever they bid you observe and do, observe them." The Scribes and Pharisees were corrupt men, taught errors privately, gave false interpretations to the law, thro' interested views; with this the Saviour reproached them; but they taught no public error, nor was there any error authorized by the chair of *Moses* in its public judgments, their false interpretations and fordid views, the Saviour severely and frequently condemned; this he called the leaven of the Pharisees; but their public ministry he authorized, because that being necessary for the perfection of the
saints

saints was under the special protection of his providence.

Nor is the restriction less inconsistent with the Scriptures than with common sense; for to tell a man, you must obey the Church if she orders nothing contrary to Scripture, is to say, you are to be the judge in the last resort; whether you will obey or not is dependant on your fancy; 'tis to invert the established order of society, and make the inferior judge of the superior; 'tis to efface every idea of subordination, and sap the very foundation of society, by telling the subject that he is not to obey the higher powers if he does not approve their decision. If *St. Paul* was directed by the spirit of truth, the framers of the 39 articles were most certainly under the influence of the spirit of illusion: for his doctrine is as opposite to them as light is to darkness: "obey, says the Apostle, your guides and be subject to them." *Heb. xiii. 17.* He immediately assigns the reason why he exacts this obedience without any restriction: "Because, says he, they watch over your souls as being obliged to account for them." *St. Paul* did not order the faithful to watch over their Pastors and inquire whether the doctrine taught by them be consistent with Scripture or not. If any particular teacher should introduce strange doctrine, the Evangelist *S. John*, gives the most simple rule to detect it; a rule easy in practice within the comprehension of the most illiterate and absolutely infallible: "Dearly beloved," says the Apostle, "believe not every Spirit but try the spirits whether they be of God: for many false Prophets are gone out into the world." *1. John iv. 1.* As 'twas not possible for the unlearned, who in all countries compose a great majority of the people, to try strange doctrine by the rule of the Scriptures which they don't understand, *St. John* gives them this very simple rule: *Ibidem v. 6.* "We are of God, he who knoweth God heareth us:—he who is not of God heareth us not:—
" by

“ by this we know the spirit of truth and the “ spirit of error.” ’Tis not possible to speak more intelligibly or more to the purpose : we, says the Apostle, that is the Chief Pastors of the Church, of whom St. *John* was unquestionably one, *are of God*, that is are God’s appointment : *he who heareth us not, is not of God*, that is, that teacher, let him be who he will, or what he will, who disobey us the Chief Pastors, is not of God’s appointment. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error. By this obedience or disobedience to the Chief Pastors of the Church, true and false teachers are easily distinguished.

Let any unprejudiced man, whether learned or unlearned try by this rule of the Apostle, all the pretended reformers and all the innovators who have at different times since the rise of Christianity, disturbed the peace of the Church by their innovations, and he’ll see without farther discussion that they were all false teachers, not one of them of God’s appointment. There is not one of them who did not disobey the Chief Pastors of the Church then in being, and separate himself and all his followers from that Church in which Christ baptises and teaches by his ministers according to his promise.—*Matt. ult.* They are the men. Who, as St. *Jude* says “*separate themselves, v. 19.* and who did “ not stand to the faith once delivered to the Saints.” *Ibidem.*

This rule which St. *John* established for detecting all innovations in doctrine has been strictly enjoined by the other Apostles. St. *Jude* in his short Epistle beseeches the faithful “ to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints *v. 3. v. 17.* and he adds “ but you my dear brethren be mindful of the “ words which have been spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord J. Christ.” So anxious was St. *Jude* to preserve the faithful from all innovations, that he himself, tho’ one of the twelve chosen by J. Christ, appeals to the authority of his fellow Apostles against new teachers. St.

St. Paul in his first Epistle to *Timothy*, says: "O *Timothy*, keep that which is committed to thy trust avoiding the prophane novelties of words, and oppositions of science falsely so called, which some promising have erred about faith," vi. 19, 20. And in his second to *Timothy* he says: "Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard from me in faith." i. 13. And in the next chapter he says: "the things which thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also." ii. 2. And again: continue thou in those things which thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee, knowing of whom thou hast learned them. iii. 14. The same injunctions this Apostle gave to the faithful in general: "Therefore brethren," said he, "stand fast and hold the traditions, which you have learned whether by word or by our letter." *Theff.* ii. 14.

At the same time that the Apostles so pointedly directed the faithful to adhere invariably to the faith once delivered to the Saints, they warned them against the insidious artifices of innovators and pretended reformers. Thus in his first of *Timothy*, iv. 1: "Now the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy and having their consciences seared." And in his second to this disciple the Apostle says, iii. 1. "know this also that in the last days shall come on dangerous times: for men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, haughty, proud, blasphemers, having an appearance of godliness but destroying the power thereof, now these avoid, for of this sort are they who resist the truth, men corrupt in mind, reprobate concerning the faith." In his epistle to the Romans the Apostle says: "I beseech you my brethren to mark them who cause dissensions

tions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned. *Rom. xvi. 17.*

The Apostles did not confine themselves simply to warn the faithful against new teachers, they denounced the most dreadful curses against any man, who would presume to introduce any innovation or even the least deviation from the doctrine which they taught; they allowed no arbitrary constructions on the law according to *fancy or caprice*, our Ex'rs standard: "If," said St. *Paul* to the Galatians, "an Angel from Heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we said before so I say now again, if any one preach a Gospel to you besides that which you have received, let him be accursed." *Gal. i. 6, 7.*

This unerring rule delivered by the Apostles has been invariably observed by the Catholic Church in all ages, and will till the end of time, from whence it manifestly appears that even the possibility of error is excluded from her decisions.

We know that J. Christ taught his Apostles verbally all the truths of religion, "but I have called you friends, because all things whatsoever which I have heard of my father I have made known to you." *John xv. 15.* These truths the Apostles taught the Christians of the first age in their public lectures, and in their private discourses with their immediate disciples they explained all difficulties, and fixed the sense of ambiguous passages thereby removing all uncertainty. The rule of adhering to the faith once delivered to the Saints, and the curse denounced against all innovations in it, or deviations from it, obliged the Christians of the next age to adhere invariably to the doctrine taught in the first age, to reject with horror every innovation, and stigmatize every pretended reformer. Hence we Catholics distinctly mark every error, which has been obtruded on the unwary by artful and designing men, from the
days

days of *Nicolas* the apostate deacon, down to *Westley* of ranting memory ; we assign the times, the places, the authors, the then pastors of the Church from whom they separated themselves, and who verifying the prophecy of *Isaias* condemned them : “every tongue which rises in judgment against thee, thou shalt condemn.”

The next text is taken from *St. Paul's* first Epistle to *Timothy* :—“ these things I write to you hoping “ shortly to come to you, but if I delay, that you may “ know how to conduct yourself in the house of “ God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth.”—“ *Stulos kai édraibuma tes aletheias.*” The Apostle calls the Church the *House of God*. The Ex. will admit that the Church is under the immediate protection of J. Christ, as a house is under the immediate and special protection of its owner : that J. Christ dwells in his Church as the master does in his house ; if so, he must admit that its enemies will never prevail against it, or dispute the power of J. Christ : for to prevail against a house under the special protection of any power, is to prevail not against the house, but against the protecting power. Thus error leads to blasphemy.

This is that House of God, to which, if we believe the prophet *Isaias*, all nations will flow, “ *nahorou eal goim,*” and in which he himself will teach us his ways, “ *ve jorenou midarcheio.*” The Apostle adds that the Church is the *Pillar and ground of truth*. 'Tis the pillar which supports the edifice, and on its ground it rests. The truth therefore of religion, for that is the truth of which the Apostle speaks, rests on the testimony of the Church, and on that ground we may rest our faith with security, not on the wild conjectures of modern speculatists, who substitute *fancy* and *caprice* to truth.

However strong this metaphor of the Apostle, 'tis strictly just : for those truths which we know, but from the testimony of the Church, must of all necessity

rest on the credit of its testimony; the truths of religion are not to be known by us, to whom God has not spoken immediately, but by the testimony of the Church, not the testimony of the primitive Pastors, they are long since dead, not one of them have we seen or can we see; but by the testimony of the Pastors this day in being:—they are the men, who attest that the truths of religion, which they now teach were taught by their immediate predecessors. This reasoning is applicable to every age of the Church, and will continue in the same force till the end of time: 'tis a mockery to pretend that we may know the truths of religion from the Scriptures independently of this testimony of the Church: because 'tis from this testimony we know the Scriptures themselves. The Apostle therefore justly styles the Church the pillar and ground of truth, an unshaken pillar which supports the truth, a solid ground on which we rest our faith, “*Stulos kai edraiomata tes Aletheias.*”

From this passage we learn also that all the Apostles' previous instructions to his disciple were verbal; he sent this written instruction in case of long absence.

If the Ex. will admit that his tongue was as infallible as his pen, he must also admit that his verbal instructions were as authentic as these contained in his epistle. And as we know from *Eusebius, Lib. 3. C. 4.* that *Timothy* was then a Bishop,—and from *Chrysostom, Hom. 15. in 1 Tim.* that he was charged with the inspection of all the Churches in Asia,—in these verbal instructions he must have been taught the whole economy of Church discipline, the manner of administering the sacraments, their number, their effects, the necessary dispositions to receive the sacraments worthily, in a word the whole of Christianity reduced to practice. These truths thus verbally delivered by the Apostles to their disciples, whom they constituted pastors and teachers over their respective portions of Christ's flock, and transmitted by them to their successors, is, what we Catholics,

Catholics, call tradition; what the pretended reformers retrenched, and at one stroke annihilated religion.

The Writer wishes to know from the Ex. or his most powerful ally, whether this Church which St. *Paul* calls the pillar and ground of truth, does at present, or has at any time supported error? if so she was no longer the pillar of truth, but the pillar of falsehood; the Apostle was deceived, and has deceived us; if not that infallibility of decision so painful to the Ex. is infallibly true:—in truth there is no mixture of error: the least possible error makes a proposition, whatever truth it may include, simply and absolutely false. Hence this maxim amongst philosophers “*Bonum ex integrá Causá malum exminimo defectu.*”

To this the Writer adds a second question equally embarrassing: is that Church which publicly professes herself fallible, subject to error, which says, she may deceive or be deceived, is she the pillar and ground of truth? if so, she's infallibly erroneous. This involves a manifest contradiction—if not, she's not the Church of the living God: for St. *Paul* positively asserts, “that the Church of the living God is the pillar and ground of truth.” The Ex. would do well to examine this last argument with accuracy: there is no room for fundamental or non-fundamental distinctions. An able sophist may extract from a fertile imagination some specious reason to mislead the uninformed; but after all efforts the difficulty will remain entire.

To substitute invective to argument is a thread-bare artifice; to divert the attention of a deluded populace from the real state of the controversy by declaiming against the scandalous lines of Popes or others, is a meer mockery, which ruins the reputation of a writer amongst intelligent men; it shews that he is reduced to support a defenceless cause by indefensible means: for whether these Popes were scandalous in their lives or not is foreign to the question in debate: we know that *David* was guilty of adultery and murder; that

Solomon

Solomon was guilty of the most scandalous excesses, even idolatry: 1 Th. xi. 7.—“*He went after Astoreth the Goddess of the Sidonians, and after Melchom the abomination of the Ammonites.*”—Were their prophecies less true? we know that *Caiphas* was a very bad man, yet the sentence which he pronounced against J. Christ, though it exposed the most rancorous malice and corruption of heart, was, notwithstanding, under the direction of providence, so that the evangelist says, “*He did not say this of himself, but being High-Priest of the year he prophesied that J. Christ was to die for the nation.*”—John xi. 51.—So true it is that the authority of public men does not depend on their personal qualities, their virtues or their vices. It must be admitted that the scandalous lives of men high in office have been at all times a rock of scandal to weak and uninformed Christians—of this the Apostle was well aware, and in consequence he diligently instructs his disciple in his pastoral duty, assigning a motive capable of making a strong impression on *Timothy's* mind: he tells him that the Church, in which he was placed as a guide to others, is the *House of God, the Pillar and ground of truth*, that his conduct must be such as would not give offence to others: “giving offence to nobody.”—2 Cor. v. 16. or induce them to suspect that the Church, which God had chosen as the instrument to extend the faith to the extremities of the earth, was not an unshaken pillar, a ground upon which they might rest their faith with confidence and safety.

Let us now take a view of that authentic promise with which the Saviour closed his Gospel according to *St. Matthew*. The passage is remarkable; in it there is no metaphor; language does not afford terms more simple, more concise, or more intelligible. “*And the eleven disciples went into Galilee unto the mountain, where Jesus had ordered them, and seeing him, they adored him, some doubted, and Jesus coming spoke to them, saying: all power is given to me in hea-*”

“*ven*”

“ *ven and on earth ; go ye therefore and teach all na-*
 “ *tions, baptizing them in the name of the father, and of*
 “ *the son, and of the holy ghost, teaching them to observe*
 “ *all things whatsoever, which I have commanded you,*
 “ *and behold I am with you all days till the consumma-*
 “ *tion of the age. Amen.*”—*Matt. ult.*

Hence we see the Saviour assemble, not all his disciples indiscriminately, but the eleven whom he had selected for that purpose, and constituted his ambassadors to the world; he orders them to go and teach all nations: in the original text to make all nations disciples, “ *matheteusate panta ta ethna.*” An arduous undertaking indeed! a work infinitely surpassing the power of man; but the Redeemer had prefaced his order, saying, “ *All power is given to me in heaven and on*
 “ *earth.*” And accompanied it with this assurance, *be-*
hold I am with you; and to remove every shadow of doubt from their minds, he did not say, *I am with you*, at certain times, or in certain places, or upon certain occasions, no! but said he, “ *I am with you all days*
 “ *till the consummation.*” He promises a permanent presence without interruption—to what end? to make all nations his disciples. As this great work was not to be effected in a day or a year, or within any limited time, the Redeemer assigns no other limit but the consummation of time. All efforts to elude the force of this promise are vain: in express terms the Saviour institutes a society perpetually visible while time continues to run; a society consisting of ministers who teach and baptize, and of the faithful who are taught and baptized; speaking to these ministers he tells them that he himself will be with them teaching and baptizing till the end of time; that this society is Catholic, that is, universal both in time and place, he distinctly declares: *teach all nations, till the end*
of time. He gives his peace to the Jews who were heirs of the promise, “ *to him who is near;*”—*Isaias*
lvii. 19. beginning from Jerusalem.—*Matt. xxiv. 47.*

to Samaria, and in due course of time to the extremities of the earth: "*You will be witnesses to me in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the extremity of the earth.*" "to him who is far off," said the prophet *Isaias*, lvii.

St. Paul says, writing to the *Ephesians*, "coming he preached peace to you who were far off, and to those who were near".—*Eph.* ii. 17. 'Twas the same Saviour, if we believe St. Paul, who preached peace to the Gentiles, who were far off in the person of his ministers, who in his own person preached to the Jews, who were near.

This doctrine the Apostle every where inculcates: thus he says, *Acts* xxvi. 22. "*that he taught nothing but what the Prophets had foretold that Christ would suffer, and that he first from the resurrection of the dead would announce light to the people, (the Jews) and to the nations, (the heathens.)*" We know that Christ in his own person did not preach to the Gentiles; 'twas therefore in the person of his ministers that he preached peace to them, and will continue to preach according to his promise until the consummation.

To inture the success of this astonishing undertaking, that is, the conversion of all nations, their incorporation into that one society, which he then formed, and uninterrupted continuation till the end of time:—the Saviour says, "*Behold, I am with you all days till the consummation of the age, I, to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth, am with you.*" He gives his Almighty Power as an additional security to his divine veracity, that his promise would be fulfilled; that by their ministry he would incorporate in their society all the nations of the earth. Hence St. Luke says, *Acts* ii. 47. "*The Lord added these who were to be saved daily to the church.*"—*ὁ κενος προσετιθει τους σοζομενας καθ' ἐμερυν τῆ ἐκκλησία.*" Hence that article in the baptismal creed: *I believe the Catholic Church holy; the Communion of Saints.*" That is, I believe that

that in the Catholic Church there is nothing taught but what is pure and holy ; that in it all the Saints are united. This society therefore must subsist invariably the same while there will be any of God's elect on earth ; and that ministry by which the Lord added daily to his Church those, who were to be saved, must continue the same to the end of time ; that God may add in the same manner, and by the same means, all his elect to his Church, that they may be in the communion of the Saints. Thus is verified that promise : *I am with you all days till the consummation.*

The Saviour did not promise to exclude vice and immorality, on the contrary, he foretold that the tares would grow up in his field with the good grain till the harvest ; the good grain, if we believe his own explanation of the parable, are the children of his kingdom, the tares the children of the wicked one, they will be undistinguished in his field till the end of time. Here we have his express declaration that the children of his kingdom will be without intermission mixed with the children of the wicked one till the end of time. These his children must be in his Church, in the communion of his Saints. St. Luke says in formal terms, " *that the Lord added daily to his Church those who were to be saved.*" This truth, which the Ex. will not venture to deny presupposed, an insoluble argument against the pretended reformation is thus proposed : the day before Luther commenced the reformation the good grain was in the field ; the elect of God were in his Church, and he himself, according to his promise, teaching and baptizing by the ministry of these pastors and teachers, whom he gave for the perfecting of the Saints ; *Eph. iv.*—'Tis therefore undeniably true that Luther did separate himself from that Church, in which J. Christ was teaching and baptizing, and consequently from J. Christ himself ; that he was one of these unhappy men of whom St. Jude says : " *they separate themselves.*" Against this simple truth all

S

supposition

supposition is vain. When then the Ex. says that infallibility of decision in matters of faith is a miracle, he confounds ideas, and misleads the incautious and the unlearned: 'tis in the Church of Christ that his elect are perfected, 'tis not by error but by truth; not by wavering opinion but by faith; there is therefore nothing taught in the Church of Christ but truth, no faith *but that which what once delivered to the Saints.* *St. Jude.* Whilst the Ex. in order to divert the attention of his readers, and introduce confusion in their ideas, declaims against miracles as if there was any thing miraculous in the course of God, providence, and the accomplishment of Christ's promise, he himself to this pretended miracle substitutes a manifest absurdity, that is, that the elect of Christ, who have been in the world for at least 800 years before this boasted reformation, have been perfected not by the ordinary means instituted by Christ, that is by faith and the ministry of these pastors, whom he had given expressly for the perfecting of the Saints, but by some extraordinary means, of which we have no idea. That there were elect in the world, and will till the consummation of time, we are told by Christ himself; that they have been perfected by the ordinary means instituted by Christ, or by some extraordinary means is evidently true. If the Ex. admits that the ordinary means of perfecting the Saints were in the Church before *Luther's* separation; the reformation is indefensible; if he denies it, he must introduce some extraordinary means inconsistent with the order of providence, the promises of Christ, and the first elements of common sense—thus every attempt to support error leads to absurdity.

Let us hear *St. Austin's* reasoning on this subject. The Writer does not pretend to found an argument on the authority of *St. Austin*, or of any of the fathers: the Ex. would reject themselves as parties: they were all arrant Papists, their testimony in favour of Popery would be inadmissible:—as the testimony of the Jewish
ish

ish ministers was inadmissible in favour of that worship whilst it continued. The Writer has to lament that in them early ages of the Church he can produce no Protestant witness. The Ex. will not ascribe it to neglect or inattention, if he will but recollect that they were not yet known to the learned world. There were no *Tillotsons*, no *Jortins*, not even a *S.* or a *mock Palæologus*.

The *Manichæans* pretended that their founder, *Manes*, was an Apostle—'tis true his title was as good as that of the German Apostle. The Epistle of *Manes* begins thus:—" *Manes*, the Apostle of J. Christ, by " the providence of God the Father." A man would be tempted to imagine that *Luther* had this epistle before him when he stiled, or rather dubbed himself. Evangelist at Wertemberg. To this *Austin* replies in his book against the Epistle, *chap. iv.* " I ask therefore " who is this *Manes*? you will answer the Apostle of " J. Christ. I do not believe it. Perhaps you will read " the Gospel to me thence endeavouring to prove it. " What if you had to reason with one, who does not " believe the Gospel? what would you do if such an " one should say unto you, I do not believe you? this reasoning of St. *Austin*, whatever contempt the Ex. or his friend *Jortin*, may have for his authority, is absolutely unanswerable and applies with the same force to any other innovator as to *Manes*. For how will this pretended reformer shew an infidel that he ought to believe the Gospel? he must of all necessity have recourse to the testimony of the Church, in whose hands he finds it, and if he denies the infallibility of her testimony, he leaves no infallible authority; on which, to rest his belief in the Gospel. Hence St. *Austin* says, in the course of his reasoning, " I would not believe the " Gospel if the authority of the Church did move me " thereto. Why should I not obey them, (the Bish- " ops) saying to me: do not believe *Manes*, whom I " obeyed, saying, believe the Gospel."—Change the

name, and this argument has an irresistible force against any pretended reformer. It is a general theorem applicable to all similar cases. St. *Austin* proceeds to press the *Manicheans*: “Choose, says he, if you say: believe the Catholics; they admonish me to give no credit to you, wherefore believing them I cannot but disbelieve you; but if you say, do not believe the Catholics, then you do not take the proper method to oblige me by the Gospel to believe *Manes*: because I believe the Gospel itself on the testimony of Catholics; but if you say: you have rightly believed the Catholics praising the Gospel, but you are not to believe them if they censure *Manes*. Do you think me so stupid, that, whilst no reason is assigned, I shall believe what you please; and disbelieve what you please? you must not only bid me believe, but manifestly and evidently shew me the truth, make me know it; if you assign such a reason (that is, why I should not believe the Catholics,) dismiss the Gospel; if you hold the Gospel I will hold myself to those from whose preaching I have believed the Gospel, at their command I will not believe you—If in the Gospel you find any place that is manifest to prove that *Manes* is a true Apostle, then you will weaken the authority of the Catholics, who order me not to believe you; this authority thus weakened I cannot believe the Gospel. Wherefore, if in the Gospel no manifest place be found concerning the Apostleship of *Manes*, I will rather believe the Catholics than you; but if you can read me any place out of the Gospel for *Manes*, I will neither believe them nor you. I will not believe them because they have deceived me concerning you, nor will I believe you because you cite them, who have deceived me.”

In this irresistible manner St. *Austin* professedly demonstrates against the *Manicheans*, that all revealed truths rest ultimately on the testimony of the Catholic Church,

Church, and hence he concludes that if that testimony be not infallible, there is nothing certain in religion, nothing which a wise man can prudently believe.

Tertullian's reasoning on the same subject is equally strong; the Ex. will find some difficulty in eluding it. "All sects," says he, "are known by the date of their commencement. *Marcion* and *Valentinus* came in the time *Antoninus*, their disciples were not before themselves, they compose no part of the family of J. Christ; his children descend without interruption from himself; the *Marcionites* have Churches, but false and degenerate as wasps have hives." A man is not admissible to say that he reforms the doctrine of the Church: the doctrine taught by J. Christ was not formed by man, nor does he want the assistance of man to reform it; he did not expect the assistance of a *Marcion* or a *Valentinus*, or of any other innovator to rebuild the edifice, which he himself had built upon a rock, declaring that the powers of hell should not subvert it. "He did not send the Holy Ghost in vain to teach all truth: 'tis impossible that the Holy Ghost would permit all the Churches in the world to err. Shew us then some Church in the world, which held this new doctrine which you introduce or acknowledge that you invented it. You pretend that you find it in the Scriptures. Don't you know that the Scriptures themselves are in the hands of these Churches, whose errors you pretend to rectify?" that the Gospels and Epistles have not formed these Churches but were written for them and addressed to them; that 'tis on their testimony they have been received:—*ejus assistente testimonio.*"—*Ad. Mar. L. 4. 23.* "To whom do the Scriptures belong? is it not to these Churches to which they were addressed, and who received with the Scriptures the true and genuine sense of them." The sense intended by the inspired Writers, whom they might consult upon every difficult or ambiguous passage? *eujus sunt Scripturae?*—*ibidem* 20.

Hence

Hence 'tis manifest that where the source of our faith is, there also is the truth of the Scriptures. "The true interpretation and all Christian traditions."—From this principle *Tertullian* concludes, that without any discussion on the Scriptures we confound all sectaries by shewing them that the Scriptures don't belong to them; that they cannot have recourse to them "we refute *Praxeas* as we did *Marcion* and *Valentinus*," "you are a new man *novellus* you come too late *posterus*," "you are but of yesterday *hesternus*. The day before you were not known to the world, you are therefore no part of the family of J. Christ, who was yesterday and this day, and who is of all ages."—*Heb.* xiii. 8.

'Tis common with all innovators and pretended reformers to reject the authority of these sublime writers whom we Catholics call fathers of the Church; but hitherto the Writer has seen no attempt made to invalidate the force of their reasoning. In the commencement of the reformation, whilst there was yet some respect for antiquity, these keepers of Catholic records were taught to speak good Protestant English; in different parts of their works, in which 'twas not possible to make them speak a language, which they never knew, efforts were made to distort their words from the intended signification. This artifice was immediately detected by Catholic Writers, and only served to ruin the reputation of the reformers; late controvertists found it more convenient to give up the works of the fathers to the right owners and confine themselves solely to the Scriptures. This is certainly the more judicious plan, but not the more safe or tenable: for that assent of the mind to revealed truths which is called faith by all denominations of Christians, must be infallible. This position is evident; it must therefore be founded on an infallible motive: for the assent to truth cannot be more infallible than the motive which produces it. The man who rejects the infallible authority of the Catholic Church has no infallible motive to believe

lieve the Scriptures true ; his assent therefore to revealed truths is not infallible, 'tis not faith but a meer human opinion. In vain we are told that man is a fallible creature—no man denies nor even doubts it ; but however fallible the man may be, his assent to truth is absolutely infallible, if the motive be so. Thus for example, because 'tis evident that two and two make four, the most illiterate man's assent to that truth is infallible, because evidence is an infallible motive. In like manner the assent of an American to this truth—*London is a city in England*, is infallible, because 'tis not possible in the present order of things, that an universal testimony should deceive us ;—by the same rule the assent of the most illiterate Catholic to his truth of religion. “ The Scriptures are divinely inspired,” is infallible—*infallible* because he founds it on the testimony of the Catholic Church, a testimony more universal ; more authentic and more forcible than that which attests the existence of London ; the assent of the most learned Protestant to the truth of Scripture is fallible and fallacious—why so ? because as he rejects the authority of that Church, in whose hands the reformers found the Scriptures, he must found his assent on his own opinion, or the conjecture of some of these pretended reformers, which is evidently and confessedly fallible, and fallacious.

Thus we see, that error considered in every point of view, is untenable ; that no artifice, no subterfuge, no power of sophistry can support it against the piercing light of truth, which, stript of every adventitious ornament, is in its native colours irresistible.

The Writer presumes that he has already satisfied the Ex. or any other unprejudiced man, that this infallibility of decision in doctrinal truths, and exemption from error was foretold in the Old Testament, promised in the New, asserted by the Apostles in the first Council of Jerusalem, and claimed by every Council down to the present day ; but what is yet of greater importance

importance, that on this very infallibility of the church, ultimately rests our assent to all revealed truths of religion; that 'tis the only motive which can render this assent infallible—which assent being perfected by divine grace and elevated to a supernatural order, is called divine faith, that faith without which, if we believe St. *Paul*, 'tis impossible to please God. He now returns to the Ex'rs. objections against St. *Peter's* supremacy. They are stated in a confused manner, whether to embarrass the subject, or from some confusion in the Ex'rs. ideas, is not necessary to enquire. In the promises made to *Peter*. *Matt.* xvi. and *John* xxi. The Ex. acutely remarks “that *Peter* was not a Rock.”—No, he was constituted by J. Christ, the foundation of that spiritual edifice, *the House of God*, which St. *Paul* calls *the House of the living God*. The house did not fall, because the owner protects it; nor was the foundation removed from it. There it rests, and will securely rest till the end of time, because the God of truth has said it.

“It is not to be supposed,” says our Ex. p. 61, “that there are material gates to hell, or actual locks to heaven; and that Christ delivered to *Peter* the corporeal keys of them, or that the binding and loosing spoken of was by ropes and chains, so respecting the feeding the lambs and sheep 'twas not the animals of that name, which are to be understood.” This passage is quoted entire as a specimen of the sublime. The orator will learn to apply epithets: actual locks, corporeal keys! and the philosopher will find that though hell be the receptacle of bodies as well as spirits, 'tis not a material place. The reader must admire the depth of our Ex'rs. penetration he has discovered that *Peter* was not a stone; that the Saviour did not speak of these bleating animals which we call sheep. He has made a second discovery not less wonderful, “that in these texts there is no pre-eminence, no power given to *Peter* over the
“ other

“other Apostles.” Hitherto the world was in the habit of considering the Apostles as composing a part of the flock of J. Christ; at that time they composed a notable part of his then little flock. On what principle does the Ex. pretend to exclude them? if an order expressly given by J. Christ to rule and feed them as the Greek terms “*poimanei* and *boskei*,” signify, imply no authority, no pre-eminence, we are yet to learn what these terms mean. The Ex. has recourse to his old rule of faith, *conjecture*: “We are left,” says he, “to discover their figurative meaning by considering the subject matter by inference, by consulting our own common sense, and by comparing them with other passages more plain and direct.” It has been justly remarked that there is no man so blind as the man who will not see; here the Ex. has recourse to every expedient which imagination can suggest to introduce obscurity in passages which are as intelligible as language can make them: the Saviour says to *Peter*, *Matt. xvi.*—*I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* We are not left to conjecture what is understood by these keys: 'tis a metaphor which is not to be misunderstood: the keys of all cities in all civilized countries, are given to the chief rulers to signify the authority and jurisdiction which they exercise over the citizens. The genuine sense and intended signification of this metaphor we have clearly explained, in the Scripture itself: the Lord said by his prophet *Isaias* to *Sobna*: *Isa. xxii. 29.*—“I will expel you from your station, and depose you from your ministry. On that I will call my servant *Eliakim* son of *Helkias*, I will clothe him with your coat, and strengthen him with your belt, and your authority I will give in his hand, and he will be as a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Juda, and I will give the key of the house of *David* on his shoulder; he will open and none will shut, he will shut and none will open.” By the key of the house of *David* is here manifestly

manifestly signified the supreme authority in the temple given to *Eliakim*. The temple was called the house of *David*, because 'twas built at his expence, and by his direction, and according to the instructions which he gave to his son *Solomon*.

In the Revelation we read: "*Thus saith the holy one, the true one, who hath the key of David, who opens and no one shuts, who shuts and no one opens.*" Rev. iii. 7. Will the Ex. admit that in this passage the key signifies the supreme power and sovereign authority of J. Christ himself? figurative expressions, says he, are to be explained by other texts more plain and direct. If there had been a shadow of ambiguity in the Saviour's words, why not explain them by these texts in which the metaphor can't be misunderstood? this the Ex. carefully avoids, and without offering or even attempting a wild conjecture at the meaning of Christ's words, he confidently asserts that Christ did not intend to bestow any pre-eminence on *Peter*, but Christ intended something. Does the Ex. pretend that his words are empty sounds? that they convey no idea at all? or that he said one thing and intended another? that, though Christ expressly declared he would make *Peter* the foundation of that spiritual edifice his Church, and give him the supreme authority in his spiritual kingdom, he did not intend it, but something else, which we don't know? this is not reasoning, but insulting reason; not an attempt to solve a difficulty, but a subterfuge to elude an argument, the force of which is irresistible.

The promise which Christ made, the xvith. of *Matthew*, he fulfilled the xxist. of *John*, saying to *Peter*, in presence of the other Apostles: "Feed my lambs. Rule my sheep. Feed my sheep." The Ex. does not think it necessary to enquire what the Saviour intended. Nor does the Writer. The Ex. thinks or pretends to think, 'tis clear that he did not intend "to give *Peter* any pre-eminence or authority over the
" other

“other Apostles.” The Writer thinks, and so must every man who knows the force of language, that he did intend it, or that he spoke nonsense, which is blasphemy to assert or think: for his words convey no other idea: to feed his sheep and his lambs can signify nothing else but to feed the whole of his flock, which is composed of sheep and lambs; the other Apostles then and there present, were the very men who were in a particular manner entrusted to *Peter's* care: of them the Saviour had said before his death, speaking to *Peter*: *Luke* xxii. 31. “*Simon, Simon,*” “behold Satan has explored you that he might sift you like wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not cease, and when thou shalt be converted, confirm thy brethren.” Were not the other Apostles these brethren whom *Peter* was ordered to confirm in the faith after his conversion?

We are not left to conjecture what is meant by the flock of J. Christ: he himself tells us they are his disciples for whom he died: *John* x. “I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep.” This metaphor is so common in the Scriptures, that even ignorance can't mistake it. And if this Ex. an Oxford scholar, does not understand it, we may apply to him what *Toinette* says in *Moliere's* comedy: “*vivent les colleges dou l'on sort si habile homme.*”

The Ex. thinks he has yet a subterfuge: though within the range of imagination he can find nothing which Christ did intend, if he did not intend to constitute *Peter* Chief Pastor of his flock: “It,” he says, “seems contrary to the spirit which he was desirous of instilling to vest a pre-eminence any where.” p. 63. What! that which he has said and done contrary to the spirit which he was desirous of establishing amongst his disciples! is the spirit of subordination, of unity and unanimity, which he and his Apostles have so strictly and frequently enjoined, contrary to the spirit

which he was desirous of instilling? contrary to the language and conduct of Christ to vest such a *pre-eminence any where*: Christ therefore in the Ex'rs. opinion has, in the true jacobinical style, established downright anarchy in his Church; a sort of equality which never was known in the most democratical society: for without some bond of union no society can be formed. St. Paul thought that Christ had given some pastors and teachers to his Church; *Eph. iv.*—and in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, he gives a description of the Church as directly opposite to this Ex'rs. ideas as light is to darkness: “as the body is one,” says the Apostle, “and has many members, all the members
 “of one body, though many, are but one body, and so
 “Christ: for in one spirit we have all been baptized
 “into one body If the foot should say, because
 “I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it there-
 “fore not of the body? and if the ear should say: be-
 “cause I am not the eye I am not of the body; is it
 “therefore not of the body? if the whole body were
 “the eye, where is the hearing? and if the whole
 “body were the hearing, where is the smelling? now
 “God has placed the members, each of them in the
 “body as it hath pleased him. If all were one mem-
 “ber, where the body? now there are many members
 “and one body—the eye cannot say to the hand, I
 “don't want you—nor again can the head say to the
 “feet, I don't want you you are the body of
 “Christ, and members each a partial—*melé ek me-*
 “*rous.*”—1 Cor. xii. The Apostle describes the
 Church as a compact body, animated by one and the
 same spirit, having of course the most perfect unity
 and unanimity; in which there is the most exact su-
 bordination in regular gradation from the head down
 to the feet. The Apostle never dream't of that perfect
 equality and independance, which our Ex. thinks Christ
 had established “*vesting no pre-eminence any where.*”
 Does he imagine that the head has no pre-eminence in
 the

the human body? the Ex. may reply that Christ is our head. True—he is head of the whole city of Jerusalem. “Which he (God the Father) wrought in Christ, raising him from the dead, and setting him at his own right hand, in the heavenly places above all principality and power, and virtue and dominion, and every name, that is named not only in this age, but that which is to come; and he hath put all things under his feet and hath given him head over all things to his Church.” *Eph. i. 22.* and in his Epistle to the *Colossians*: “who is head of every principality and power.” *Col. ii. 10.* The Apostle asserts that Christ as man is head over all the inhabitants of the Heavens as well as over his Church on earth; but to the Corinthians the Apostle speaks of Christ’s Church on earth; in which, he says, there is a head which cannot say to the feet, I don’t want you. ’Tis presumed the Apostle did not think J. Christ was that head, which could not say to the feet, I don’t want you: the Apostle was not accustomed to blaspheme. This head therefore, of which he speaks to the Corinthians, is a visible part of that visible Church on earth, which he accurately describes distinguishing the different members which compose it, and shewing their mutual dependence. The Apostle well knew that J. Christ was the supreme head of the Church without any subordination to, or dependance on any other; but he also knew that this Supreme Head being invisible to his Church here on earth, had constituted a visible head subordinate and immediately subject to himself; that his Church might not appear monstrous, that is, a visible body without a visible head. The Apostle also knew that ’twas not more inconsistent with order that J. Christ the primary head, should constitute a subordinate head, than that, he the primary foundation, should establish a secondary and subordinate foundation; hence he says to the *Ephesians*: “that they are built on the foundation of
the

“ the Apostles and Prophets, J. Christ himself being
 “ the corner stone.” *Eph. ii. 20.* This and similar
 texts the Ex. says, *p. 64,* are very intelligible, “ for
 “ since ’twas the Apostles, who taught the world the
 “ Christian religion, Christianity might be said to be
 “ built upon them as upon a rock or foundation.” If
 this be so intelligible of the Apostles in general, why
 exclude St. *Peter*, whose very name *Peter* substituted
 by Christ himself to his original name *Simon*, signifies
 a *Rock*, on which rock the Redeemer said he would
 build his Church? if Christianity be founded on
 the Apostles because they taught the Christian re-
 ligion, it must be founded in the first place on
Peter: because he first of all men confessed Jesus
 Christ to be by nature son of the living God:
 for he distinguished him from John Baptist, *Jeremy*,
Elias, and the other prophets, who were all by adop-
 tion sons of the living God; he first announced the
 Gospel of J. Christ after the descent of the Holy
 Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and by his ministry were
 added on that day—“ *profetithesan.*” as if three thou-
 sand souls to that flock which Christ himself had form-
 ed and committed to *Peter’s* care, *John xxi.*; and in
 the Council of Jerusalem he told the Apostles there
 present: “ Men, brethren, you know that in former
 “ days God made choice amongst us that from my
 “ mouth the nations should hear the word of the Gos-
 “ pel and believe:” *Acts xv.* ’Tis therefore true that
Peter was the first who after J. Christ announced his
 Gospel both to the Jews and the Gentiles; and equally
 true that the Apostles knew it. They are the men,
 who attest it. Hence upon all occasions they name
 him first, and sometimes contra-distinguish him: thus
 —“ these are the names of the twelve Apostles:”
 “ *protos, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother*
 “ *James*”—*Matt. ix. 2.*

“ And he (J. C.) imposed on *Simon* the name *Peter*
 “ and

“ and *James* and *John* and *Andrew*.”—*Mark* iii. 16.

“ And when 'twas day he called his disciples and chose twelve from amongst them whom he called Apostles, *Simon*, whom he called *Peter*, and *Andrew*, *James* and *John*”—*Luke* xvi. 13.

“ Taking *Peter* and the two sons of *Zebedee* he says to *Peter*. His words were addressed to *Peter* though he spoke to them in the plural number. *Matt.* xxvi. 37, 40.

“ Jesus took *Peter*, *James* and *John*.”—*Mark* ix. 2.

The Angel says to the women: “ Go tell his disciples, and *Peter*, that he goes before you to Galilee. *xvi.* 7.”

Was not *Peter* one of the disciples? why does the Angel distinguish him from the other disciples if in reality there was no distinction? was the Angel a babler, who multiplied words to no purpose?

“ They said to *Peter* and to the Apostles.”—*Acts* ii. 37. In this passage St. *Luke* distinguishes *Peter* from the other Apostles. Did he also multiply words in vain?

St. *Paul*, in his Epistle to the Galatians, says: “ after three years I went up to Jerusalem to inquire of *Peter*,” “ *istoresai Petron*,” and remained with him “ fifteen days.”—*Gal.* i. 18.

The Galatians had been taught to believe by some self constituted teachers, that the ceremonies of the Jewish law obliged the Christians. Against these the Apostle justifies his doctrine; to remove the impressions made against him by these artful innovators, who told the people that his doctrine was not consistent with that of the other Apostles, because he was not one of the twelve sent immediately by J. Christ, St. *Paul* says that he had been to see *Peter*, and remained with him fifteen days. And in the next chapter he says, that fourteen years after he went up again, and compared his Gospel with that taught by the other Apostles. Tho' the

the Apostle knew that his doctrine was revealed to him by J. Christ, and authorized by miracles, yet he thought it necessary, in order to remove all false impressions and suspicions, to shew that 'twas perfectly consistent with *Peter's* doctrine. *St. Paul* thus set an example to future ages. If it had been followed, the peace of the Christian world would not have been so often disturbed by innovations, and pretended reformations.

The Ex. adduces some texts of Scripture to shew that Christ did not intend to establish any pre-eminence amongst his Apostles. The Arians adduced many texts to shew that Christ was not God; the Nestorians to shew that in him were two persons, and the Eutychians thought some texts clearly shewed that in J. Christ there was but one nature; 'twas reserved for this Rev. Ex. and his potent Ally the mock P. to shew that J. Christ was the founder of a jacobinical society, a society without order or subordination: for without some pre-eminence there can be none. Admire the man's sagacity: he has discovered that J. C. did not intend to do, what he has done if the Evangelists tell truth, and what he must have done if he had the first elements of common sense.

A text from the Alcoran would have been as much to the purpose as those which the Ex. quotes from the Gospel in support of his extravagance, for an opinion it can't be called. The Saviour had said, "if any man desire to be first, he will be last:"—and, "every man who exalts himself will be humbled."—*Matt. xxiii.* In both places J. Christ condemns ambition. What is that to the purpose? what Christian ever thought ambition laudable till one of *Luther's* disciples sanctified the boasting of his master? if *St. Peter* had desired a pre-eminence over the Apostles, he never would have obtained it, nor even the last place amongst them; his ambition would have excluded him; but we must presume that the spirit of humility which the Saviour recommended

commended is not inconsistent with the exercise of authority and power, which is from God, and to which *St. Paul* enjoins obedience: "Remember your guides, who announced to you the word of God imitate their faith obey your guides and be subject to them."—*Heb. xiii.*

Would this *Ex.* condescend to inform us if there be none possessed of any pre-eminence in the Church, who were these guides to whom *St. Paul* ordered the faithful to be subject? the reader need not be told that the Apostle calls their teachers and pastors *Guides*, because 'tis their official duty to conduct them in the paths of salvation.

The *Ex.* finds another text in which the Saviour told the Apostles that they were all brethren. What then? did not the Saviour even after his resurrection call his disciples brethren: "go to my brethren and tell them." *John xx. 17.* Was he less their Lord and Master? if the *Ex.* had read the 11th verse of the same chapter, he would have seen that one of the disciples was the greater, and minister to them all. "*ὁ δε μεζὼν ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ὑμῶν διακόνος.*" These words which he quotes were, says our *Ex.* subsequent to the promise. True—but they were not subsequent to the performance of that promise, *John xvi.* when Christ constituted *Peter* pastor and teacher of his flock; and if they had been subsequent to the performance of the promise, they contain nothing but what Christ and his Apostles always taught, the necessity of *humility*, a virtue to which all reformers are strangers, a virtue as diametrically opposite to *Luther's holy boasting*, as Heaven is to Hell.

The *Ex.* pretends that expressions nearly similar to the promises made to *Peter* were applied to the other Apostles. 'Tis rather unlucky that the Evangelists forgot them: there are none such to be found in their writings: where, or to which of the Apostles did Christ say, "I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven?" to which of the other Apostles did he

say : " I have prayed for thee that thy faith should not " cease?" which of them did he order after his conversion to confirm his brethren, or to which of them did he say after exacting a testimony of his love : " Feed my lambs, rule my sheep, feed my sheep? a power of binding and loosing he gave them all, hence the Bishops; who are the successors of the Apostles, exercise these powers of binding by inflicting canonical censures, and enjoining penitential works; and also by enacting local ordinances, which oblige their respective flocks; and the powers of loosing they exercise by dispensing in particular laws upon solid reasons, but with due subordination to the Chief Pastor, to whom J. Christ committed the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the care of the whole flock; that is, the plenitude of ecclesiastical power.

As an argument against *Peter's* supremacy the Ex. quotes a passage from one of that Apostle's Epistles, to which he affixes a sense of his own invention. For the readers information the passage is here given entire : " I myself a Priest," *sumpresbuteros* " exhort the " Priests who are amongst you,"—" *tous presbuteros " en umin parakalo*" " feed the flock of God " which is amongst you;"—" *poimenate to en úmin " poimnion.*" " superintending,"—" *episcopoun- " tes:*" " not domineering over the Clergy."—" *kataku- " vieuentes tón kleron.*"

'Tis the first time, perhaps, that the actual exercise of a man's official duty was adduced as an authority against his jurisdiction. The Apostle directs the Episcopal Pastors of the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappidocia, Asia, and Bythinia, to whom his letter is addressed, to feed the respective portions of the flock over which they presided, " *to en úmin poimnion,*" not thro' compunction but willingly, not in view of filthy lucre, but cheerfully; not to lord it over the inferior Clergy but in their own conduct to set an example of all Christian virtues to the flock. Will the Ex. admit that

that these Pastors, whom the Apostle ordered to superintend the flock amongst themselves were possessed of any spiritual authority? if not the Apostle's instruction was ludicrous, a meer mockery; and his prohibition of a domineering spirit unnecessary: no man ever was known to domineer over persons not under his controul; nor is it possible for a man to domineer in whom no authority is acknowledged or vested. The Ex. by his own private authority has substituted the terms "*as being Lords over God's heritage,*" to St. Peter's words, "*not domineering over the Clergy.*" Thus the unlearned are duped and misled by arbitrary versions, which each new teacher adapts to his own opinions. Even the Ex's. version will not bear him out. For if they had no pre-eminence, no authority or jurisdiction, they could not lord it over *God's heritage*. The Apostles injunction would have been misapplied.

St. Peter directs all these subordinate Pastors to practice the same virtues, which J. Christ, whom he calls the Prince of Pastors, "*Archipoimon,*" had taught both by word and example, that is, humility, modesty and meekness, virtues indispensably necessary in all Christians, but more especially in the Pastors of the Church, who are strictly obliged to instruct others by example as well as by words.

The Ex's. next attempt to shew that no pre-eminence was established by J. Christ is extremely unlucky: in the whole Scriptures he could not have chosen a passage less to his purpose, not one which more clearly and distinctly authenticates that very pre-eminence against which he pretends to reason.—“At Ephesus St. Paul called together the elders of the Church, and exhorted them to take heed to themselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, to feed the Church of God.”—*Acts xx. 28.* This statement of the Ex. is inconsistent with St. Luke's account, and his version incorrect: 'twas not at Ephesus that St. Paul called

the Assembly: St. *Luke* says, "that *Paul* having sent "from Melitus to Ephesus,"—" *apotés Melitou pemp-
" jas eis Epheson.*"—"sent for the Priests of the
"Church,"—" *meta kalefato tous presbuterous tés Ec-
" clesiás.*"—*ibidem* 17. He did not send for all the
old men of the Church of Ephesus, nor for the inferior
Clergy, such an assembly would have given offence to
the heathen magistrates in Melitas, and was totally
unnecessary. He sent for the Bishops whom the Holy
Ghost, by the ministry of the Apostles, had placed over
the Church in that province. And to them his
words are addressed: "attend to yourselves and to
"the whole flock in which the Holy Ghost has placed
"you Bishops to rule the Church of God, which he
"purchased with his blood."—*ibidem* 28.

Is this Oxford scholar yet to learn that the Greek
word "*Episcopos*," and the Latin "*Episcopus*," signi-
fies neither less nor more than what we call in plain
English *Bishop*? he has recourse to the etymology of
the word in order to mislead the ignorant, and teach
them to believe that St. *Paul* was giving his instruc-
tions, not to the first Pastors of the flock in the whole
Province, but to a few old men in Ephesus. Yet all
efforts to wrest St. *Luke's* words from the intended
signification are fruitless: the Ex. himself is forced to
acknowledge that these men to whom the Apostle
spoke were placed by the Holy Ghost to feed the
flock; they were therefore Pastors of the Holy Ghost's
appointment, consequently had power, authority, jurisdic-
tion and pre-eminence from him to feed and rule, as
the Greek term "*poimaoate*" literally signifies.

It may not be amiss to inform the reader that the
power and jurisdiction of the Saviour is expressed in the
prophecy applied to him, *Matt.* ii. In the same terms,
by which St. *Paul*, in this passage and in his Epistle to
the Hebrews, expresses the authority of the Pastors of
the Church: "*égoumenos ostis poimanei ton iwon mou*
"*israel.*" Thereby giving us to understand that the
power

power which they exercise is derived from him. Of this truth we have elsewhere the most incontrovertible evidence:—"On whom you will see the spirit descending and remaining on him, this is he, who baptizes in the Holy Ghost. I saw and I have attested that he is the Son of God."—*John i. 33.*

"After these things Jesus came with his disciples to the land of Judea, and he abode there with them and baptized."—*John iii. 22.*

Here the Evangelist says expressly that Jesus baptized; in the next chapter, he says:—"When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus makes and baptizes more disciples than *John*, though *Jesus* himself did not baptize but his disciples *did.*"—*John iv. 1.* 'Tis therefore manifest that Jesus himself administered this sacrament by the hands of his ministers; and equally manifest that he continues to teach and administer the Sacraments in his Church by his ministers to the present day, and will till the consummation in virtue of his promise: go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and behold I am with you all days till the consummation of the age."—*Matt. ult.*

Every man, who reads the Scriptures must know, that whenever God says by himself or by his prophets, that he will be with any person, the success of the undertaking however arduous, though surpassing the power of men and Angels, is notwithstanding infallibly certain. Thus for instance, when God ordered *Moses* to go to *Pharaoh* and bring up his people from Egypt, *Moses*, to whom such an undertaking seemed absolutely impossible, replied: who am I to go to *Pharaoh?* *Exod. iii. 12.* The Lord to assure him, answered: "I will be with you." The success was insured by his presence.

The same promise was made to *Josue* and with the same success: "No man will be able to resist you all the
the

“the days of your life ; as I was with *Moses*, I will be
“with you.”—*Jos. i. 5.*

A similar promise with equal success was made to *Gideon* : “The Lord said to him I will be with you,
“and you will smite *Madian* as one man.” *Jud. vi. 16.*

Though the conversion of all nations be a more arduous and difficult undertaking than that of *Moses*, *Josue*, or *Gideon*, 'tis not too great for Almighty Power, and the promise of J. Christ to his ministers is more expressive : “I am with you all days till the consummation of the age :” he thus excludes the most distant idea of an interruption in the great work of the conversion of all nations till the end of time.

The Ex. proceeds to shew what no man denies or doubts, that the term *Church* may be applied to any assembly, and is frequently in the Scriptures ; he might have added that it sometimes signifies the building in which the Assembly meets—as we say, *St. Peter's Church*—*St. Paul's Church*. This would have been as much to his purpose ; but, says he, as the term is applicable to the whole body of Christians, the promise of Christ is not confined to one set of men in exclusion of all others. He had just told us that the term *Church* is applied to any assembly—immediately shifts his ground, and confines it to the whole body of Christians. Was that Church which *David* called a Church of the wicked a part of this new invented Church ? “*Sinethi kahel mirehim ;*” *Ps. xxvi, 5.*—was that tumultuous assembly at Ephesus, which *St. Luke* three several times calls a Church a part of this new Church ? *Acts xix.* There are Churches therefore which are no parts nor portions of the Church of J. C. for these, of which *David* and *St. Luke* speak most certainly were not. The Ex. justly remarks that the promises of Christ are not confined to one set of men in exclusion of all others, and of course that all who wish to partake of the inheritance of Christ must become members of that Church : for he will share his inheritance

inheritance but with his children. The promises of J. Christ are confined to that society, which he himself founded, which he called his own Church, in exclusion of all other Churches; against which he said the powers of hell would not prevail. From this Church none are excluded who sincerely desire to become members of it; and consequently none are excluded from the promises of Christ, but these who exclude themselves.

The Saviour did not say in general, "I will found a Church," but he said, "I will found my Church," "*oikodomefó mou tén ekklesian.*" *Matt. xvi.* He did not found many societies differing from each other in articles of faith and terms of communion; he founded but *one*, in which *one* and the same faith is believed and professed: "*one Lord, one faith,*" said St. Paul to the Ephesians: *Eph. iv. 5.*—and in his second to the Corinthians, he says: "having the same spirit of *faith,*" *2 Cor. iv. 13.* To this one society or Church the Saviour added daily these who were to be saved, "*sozomenous,*" in that one society he teaches and administers the sacraments by the ministry of these Pastors whom he has given for the perfection of the saints, and to it he will add those who are to be saved till the consummation.

All societies founded by others at different times are neither parts nor portions of this *one* society, founded by J. Christ:—J. Christ is a God of truth: he does not teach contradictions. Of all societies, whose tenets and terms of communion contradict each other, J. Christ can have founded but one: one only and exclusively believes the true faith: for truth is simple and indivisible contains no mixture of falsehood, all the others are not taught by J. Christ, for he teaches no falsehood: they do not profess the religion taught by J. Christ: for he taught nothing but truth, and in his doctrine there is no mixture of error.

That the promises of Christ do not extend to societies

ties of Christians professing a doctrine not taught by Christ, we know from *St. Paul*: the Galatians to whom his Epistle is addressed were Christians, taking the term in a certain latitude: they believed in J. Christ, but they were also taught to believe by some reformers that the ceremonies of the Jewish law obliged in the Christian dispensation. Against this error the Apostle reasons in his Epistle: "I wonder," says he, "that you are so soon transferred from him who called you in the grace of J. Christ to another Gospel." *Gal. i. 6.* The Apostle therefore thought that to believe this error was an absolute desertion of J. C. 'twas J. C. who called them to his Church by the grace of faith, and by error they are transferred from him. To justify the Gospel, which he himself taught, the Apostle says: "I did not receive it from man, nor learn it but by the revelation of J. Christ."—*ibidem.* In the next chapter he says: "Behold, I *Paul* say unto you, that if you be circumcised Christ will profit you nothing you ran well, who hindered you from obeying the truth? this persuasion is not from him, who called you, a little leaven corrupts the whole mass."—*v. 2.*

The Apostle in the whole of his letter not only teaches but invincibly demonstrates that error corrupts faith, and separates from J. Christ.

The *Ex.* admits that in virtue of Christ's promise Satan would never be able to extirpate the Christian religion from the world. It has been already remarked that J. Christ did not speak of different societies or denominations of Christians, but of that one society, which he himself formed, in which he teaches; from that society Christianity never will be extirpated. In other societies some fragments of Christianity may, or may not continue: Christ has promised them nothing, they have nothing to expect from him. Does the *Ex.* imagine that Christianity is a composition of truth and falsehood? Does he pretend to unite light with darkness?

ness? by Christianity we understand that plan of religion taught by J. Christ to his Apostles, and by their ministry made known to the world. In its speculative doctrines there is nothing but truth; in its moral maxims there is nothing corrupt or impure:— Let the reader attend to the order which he intimated to his Apostles when he sent them to instruct and sanctify the world; in it as in a mirror he may contemplate the whole of the Christian dispensation: “all power in heaven and on earth is given to me: go ye therefore and teach all nations.” What were they ordered to teach? hear what follows: “teaching them to observe all things whatsoever, which I have commanded you.”—*Matt. ult.* But how were the Apostles to remember all the things which he had taught them during the space of three or four years which they had passed in his company? he had told them, “the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the father will send in my name, he will teach you all things and remind you of all the things which I have said to you.”—*John xvi. 26.*—and to this promise he adds: “Behold I am with you all days till the consummation of the age.” This then is Christianity: what J. Christ taught his Apostles; in it there is nothing false, nothing impure; this is the Christianity which will subsist till the end of time in that Church which was built on the Rock; instructed by the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, sanctified by the presence of J. Christ, protected by his Almighty power it will forever resist the united efforts of earth and hell.

The Ex. concludes this his vith. Proposition, by saying, “that as J. Christ did not treat *Peter* with any peculiar marks of attention, or employ him in any authoritative office it does not seem that Christ himself understood his words as conveying such an authority.” Would the Ex. inform us, by what form of words Christ could convey such an authority if he intended it? we plain men know no words more

expressive, or more to the purpose than these: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep: that the Saviour did not understand his own words to convey any authority if something worse than nonsense: 'tis blasphemy. Does the Ex. believe the Evangelist when he says that by *him* all things were made? can he prevail on himself to believe that to feed Christ's flock is an authoritative commission? if he induces any other man to believe that 'twas not, that man must be fond of delusion.

Whilst the Saviour visible and in his mortal state fed his flock in person, 'twas not necessary to employ *Peter* or any other of his disciples; but when he withdrew his visible presence from his flock, the greatest mark of attention was to entrust them to *Peter's* care.

In his viith. Proposition the Ex. says, "that in *Peter's* speeches and letters, he assumed no pre-eminence which would have given additional weight to his precepts and exhortations." 'Tis matter of surprize that this Ex. does not see a visible contradiction in his own words: to give precepts and exhortations is it not to assume an authority? 'tis irksome to reason with a man who does not understand himself. *Peter* practised that modesty which he every where inculcates; he styled himself an Apostle of J. Christ: his miracles authorized the quality which he assumed, and the doctrine which he taught. If the Ex. had read the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, he would have found that *Peter* did assert his supremacy in the first Council: he told the Apostles there present, "that they knew that in former days God had made choice of him amongst them, that by his mouth the nations should hear the faith and believe.

In his next Proposition, the Ex. acutely as he thinks, remarks that *St. Matthew* is the only one of the Evangelists who mention this promise made by Christ to *Peter*; that *St. Mark* and *St. Luke* relate the same story, totally omitting that passage. Does he insinuate that *St. Matthew* advanced a falsehood? or that though
Christ

Christ did actually speak these words they convey no idea? that the words of J. Christ are mere empty sounds? he also remarks that St. *John* is the only Evangelist, who relates these words of Christ to *Peter*, "feed my lambs, feed my sheep," is not the testimony of St. *John* sufficient for any man who believes the Scriptures infallible? were not the other Apostles present when these words were spoken? does the Ex. know the doctrine, which the Apostles taught better than the Churches which were formed and instructed by them? there are but few of the Apostles, who wrote any thing; their instructions were by oral tradition, and these we know by the testimony and from the invariable practice of the Churches where they preached, and in which their instructions were given.

The Ex. thinks he finds some reason to suspect St. *Matthew's* and St. *John's* account in the silence of the other Evangelists. The omission, he says, proves that the Evangelists considered them as of little consequence. What! is the silence of one Evangelist sufficient to invalidate the positive assertion of the other? by this mode of reasoning we shall conclude that *Matthew* did not think the circumcision of J. Christ a matter of consequence: he omits it; that *Mark* did not think the presentation in the temple of any consequence; though the Catholic Church celebrates a solemn festival in commemoration of these mysteries; that St. *Luke* thought the appearance of the star in the east trifling, and that St. *John* considered the birth of J. Christ of a Virgin a trifling circumstance, does the Ex. imagine that these truths of religion were not taught by these Evangelists as well as by the other Apostles, though omitted in their Gospels. The cause must be totally defenceless, which has recourse to such artifices; they can hardly impose on ignorance; they don't even form the shadow of an argument.

"If," says our Ex. "the Christian Church ever stood in need of a spiritual and infallible guide, and

“ infallible ruler, ’twas in the distressing times immediately after the death of Christ; and we might have expected to have seen *Peter* supplying the place of his deceased master, and directing his ardent zeal to the exercise of his deputed authority.”—p. 69. Nothing like it appears.

This is the most extraordinary passage which the Writer has yet seen penned by any man, who calls himself a Christian. The Ex. not only denies the infallibility of *Peter*, which he ignorantly confounds with his spiritual authority, but also the infallibility of all the Apostles, and thereby at one stroke ruins the infallible authority of the whole New Testament: for if the Apostles were not infallible, the New Testament may or may not be true: ’twas written by them or their immediate disciples; but it most certainly is not infallible if they were not so. To this first impiety, a yet greater is added: the Redeemer is introduced as a dead man—*his deceased master*. It seems this Revd. Ex. does not believe the resurrection of J. Christ—we Christians do. ’Twas after his resurrection that he authorised *Peter* to feed his flock—*see the xxi. of John*.—He was not then a *deceased Master*, but a living Lord in his immortal state.

The Ex. does not seem to have read the Acts of the Apostles: was it not *Peter* who directed the Apostles to proceed to the election of *Matthias*? his speech upon the occasion is given in the first chapter. ’Tis true *Peter* did not constitute *Matthias* independently; as all the Apostles were chosen by J. Christ immediately, St. *Peter* did not think proper to deprive him, who was to be of the number, of that privilege. Hence the choice of a substitute to *Judas* the traitor was referred to J. Christ:—“Thou, O Lord, who art the searcher of hearts shew one of these two, whom thou hast chosen.” *Acts* i. 24.

The Deacons were required by the Apostles: ’tis presumed they did not all speak at the same instant:
order

order was established amongst them, not confusion. The Deacons, though elected by the people, were ordained by the Apostles. St. *Luke* does not specify by whom; 'tis enough for us to know that the institution is of divine authority; that their spiritual powers were conferred not by the election of the people, but by the imposition of hands; or as we term it, the ordination of the Apostles: "Praying they imposed hands on them." *Acts* vi. 6.

The Apostles invariably speak of *Peter* in the first place, and introduce him speaking upon every public occasion. If the Ex. has not seen it 'tis because he has not read the New Testament attentively, if at all—he has consequently that part of his faith as yet to look for.

Peter, says the Ex. p. 70, was sent by the other Apostles to Samaria, to instruct the new Converts: he thence concludes that *Peter* had no authority over them.

If being sent argues inferiority, *Peter* was therefore inferior to the others; consequently there was some pre-eminence established amongst them. In error there is nothing consistent. In like manner we must conclude that *Phineas* the High Priest was inferior to the people who sent him to the children of *Ruben* and *Gad*.—*Jos.* xxii. 13. *Peter* and *John* were sent amicably by the brethren, not authoritatively—as was the High Priest *Phineas*: no Apostle ever pretended to be *Peter's* superior.

The Ex. mistakes the object of their mission—'twas not to instruct the new converts: they had been previously instructed and baptized by St. *Philip*, the Deacon; 'twas to administer to them the sacrament of confirmation, a sacrament which the Deacon could not administer, that they might receive the plenitude of the Holy Ghost, to enable them to resist the violence of persecution: we read in the viii. Chapter of the *Acts*, that they were baptized, but, had not yet received the
Holy

Holy Ghost, that is that plenitude of grace, which is necessary to enable the faithful to profess their faith in times of persecution. That by baptism they had received the Holy Ghost, or if you will the grace of the Holy Ghost to the cleansing them from sin is manifest from St. *Peter's* words, "Repent, and let each of you be baptised in the name of J. Christ to the remission of sins." Hence in the viii. chapter we do not read of any instruction given to these new converts by *Peter* and *John*, "they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost then they imposed hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." *Acts* viii. 15, 17.

The controversy in the Council of Jerusalem, *Acts* xv. says the Ex. was discussed by the Apostles and elders, and decided by them, p. 70. If he had said that *Peter's* decision had been adopted by the Council, he would have told us what is there related. That controversy might have been infallibly decided by any one of the Apostles; but the Holy Ghost to whom the decision is there ascribed, assembled this first Council as a precedent to future ages, and an effectual means of deciding all controversies till the end of time; a precedent which the Catholic Church has invariably followed.

The Ex. seems to lay great stress on the term *Elder*, which in our language signifies a man stricken in years: 'tis the comparative of *old*; he thereby misleads the unlearned, teaching them to believe that all the old men of the Church were consulted on these occasions. Why not tell his readers that the Greek term *presbuteros*, which he translates *elder*, bears a different signification in the New Testament, as well as in the writings of all the Greek fathers; that it signifies a clergyman whether he be old or young. The Ex. quotes the xiv. chapter of the *Acts*, in which 'tis said that "Elders were appointed in every Church." He must be fond of deception whom this version deceives: Age
makes

makes an *elder*, he is constituted an old man by length of days, not by men. St *Luke*, author of the Acts of the Apostles, relates in the most intelligible language the ordination of priests by the Apostles *Paul* and *Barnaby*, without specifying whether they were old or young: “they returned to Lystra and Iconium
 “confirming the souls of the faithful, exhorting them
 “to persevere in the faith, and that ’tis through many
 “tribulations they must enter into the kingdom of God,
 “and ordaining priests for them by imposition of hands
 “in each Church, *Cheirotonesantes de autois presbute-*
 “*rous kat ’ekklefian*, praying with fasting, they (the
 “Ap.) recommended them to the Lord in whom they
 believed.” *Acts* xiv.—Thus St. *Luke* relates the transaction.

Does the imposition of hands make a man old? does it make him an Elder? ’tis a melancholy reflection to think that so many well meaning men are duped by such artifices: they are referred to the Scriptures and misled by false versions. That of these priests thus appointed by the Apostles many were not old, we know from the best authority.

St. *Timothy*, an Archbishop, ordained by St. *Paul*, and left expressly by the Apostle to constitute *these Elders*, as the Ex. calls them, in the different Churches of the jurisdiction of Ephesus, was himself so far from being an *Elder*, that the Apostle feared his youth might be a prejudice against him: “Preach these
 “things and teach them; let no man contemn thy
 “youth.” 1 *Tim.* iv. 12.—and in the next chapter he directs him to give a double retribution to these priests, who worthily preside. Here we see the priests presiding over their respective flocks, and *Timothy* a youth, or if the Ex. chuses, to call him a young *Elder*, presiding over them all; and not only presiding but juridically pronouncing: for St. *Paul* directs him not to receive an accusation against a priest but on the testimony of two or three witnesses; *ibid.* 19. and orders him not

to impose hands hastily on any man; 22. 'Twas by imposition of hands, not by length of days that priests were ordained. 'Twas thus that *Timothy* himself in early youth was ordained a priest by *St. Paul*: "for this cause," said the Apostle, "I admonish thee to rekindle the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands. 2 *Tim.* i. 6. In another place he exhorts him not to neglect the grace of God which was given him by prophecy with the imposition of hands of the priesthood—1 *Tim.* iv. 14. 'Twas by the imposition of the Apostles' hands that the priesthood was conferred on *Timothy*; and by the same ceremony *Timothy* ordained others, and constituted them priests whether old or young, to preside over the Churches entrusted to their care. Hence *St. Paul* calls them "*proestótes presbuteroi*," presiding priests. 1 *Tim.* v. 17.

St. Paul, says the *Ex. p.* 70, declares "that he was nothing behind the *chiefest* of the Apostles." If this version be correct, it follows that *St. Paul* acknowledged that there was a *Chief* amongst the Apostles, and not only a *Chief*, but one that was *Chiefest*. This the *Ex.* denies. As the version is incorrect, the remark is made to shew how inconsistent this *Ex.* is with himself.

St. Paul in the passage alluded, did not speak a word of his own, or the authority of any of the Apostles: he related his labours and sufferings for the Church, and said that he was not in them inferior to those who were above measure Apostles: "*ouden gar ústerefa tôn úper lian Apostolón.*" 2 *Cor.* xii. 11.

In the next text by which the *Ex.* pretends that *St. Paul* spoke of himself as upon an equality with *Peter*; the Apostle informs the Galatians, that he himself was called in an extraordinary manner by *J. Christ* to be a teacher of the heathen nations, *Gal.* i. as *Peter* had besides his general charge of the whole flock a particular charge of the Jews. *St. Paul* says nothing of his
own

own or of *Peter's* authority in express terms, but from the whole of that letter *Peter's* authority in matters of faith is evidently deduced: *St. Paul* says, *Gal* i. that after his conversion he did not go to Jerusalem to the Apostles, who were before him, for instruction, because he had his gospel by the revelation of J. Christ; yet three years after he went up to see *Peter*; he did not say that he went up to see *James*, though *James* was then bishop of Jerusalem, and *St. Paul* saw him there. The Apostle therefore knew that *Peter* was superior to *James*, even in the very city over which he presided as Bishop. *St. Chrysostome*, Patriarch, of Constantinople says, in his last Homily on the Gospel of *St. John*, on these words, "follow me:" "by these words he shews his care and friendly affection to him; (P.)" "but if any man asks why *James* received the See of Jerusalem, I would answer that *Peter*, the teacher of the world, had constituted him."

Again the Apostle says, *Gal*. ii. "then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem with *Barnaby*, taking *Titus* also. And I went up according to revelation, and communicated to them the gospel, which I preach in the nations, but apart to those, who seem to be something, lest I should have run in vain; but neither *Titus* who was with me being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised."

Thus *St. Paul* justifies his doctrine by having submitted it to *Peter*, *James* and *John*, and their approbation he expresses by saying: "the right hand of communion they gave to me and to *Barnaby*, that we should go to the nations, and they to the circumcision."—*ibid.* 9.

If *St. Paul* says that the gospel of the in-circumcision, that is of the uncircumcised nations, was committed to him, and of the circumcision or of the Jews to *Peter*, he does not intend to exclude the other Apostles from their share in the ministry; but he tells the Galatians that he had a particular grace and vocation for

the conversion of the heathens, as St. Peter had a particular grace and vocation for the conversion of the Jews: "for he who wrought in *Peter* to the Apostleship of the circumcision, wrought in me also amongst the Gentiles."

St. *Paul* preached to the Jews occasionally: his commission though chiefly, was not exclusively confined to the Gentiles: thus we read, "and the Lord said unto him: go for this man (*Pa.*) is a vessel of election to me, to carry my name before the Gentiles and Kings, and the children of Israel."—*Acts ix. 13, 14.*

And his epistle to the Hebrews is addressed to the Jews.

In like manner we know that *Peter's* mission was not confined to the Jews, though he had a particular grace for their conversion: he himself declared at the Council of Jerusalem, "that the Apostles knew 'twas by his mouth the heathen nations were to hear the word of God and believe."—*Acts xv.*

And in the first chapter of the *Acts* the Saviour says to his Apostles, of whom *Peter* was one: "you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and Samaria, and to the extremities of the earth." Now 'tis manifest that *Peter's* particular charge was more honorable than *Paul's*—because in it *Paul* himself and all the other Apostles are included; because 'twas the particular charge of J. Christ himself: "I am not sent said the Saviour, but to the sheep which perished of the house of Israel." And St. *Paul* to the Romans, says in express terms, that *Christ was the minister of the circumcision.*—*Rom. xv.* In the same epistle he compares the believing Jews to the olive tree, and the believing Gentiles to the wild olive, which was engrafted on the stock: *ibid. xi.* To shew the superiority of the Jews speaking to the Gentiles, he says:—"Boast not against the branches; but if thou boast, 'tis not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee."—*ii. 18.*

Hence 'tis manifest that St. *Paul* considered *Peter* as his

his superior, and superior to the Apostles, of this there can be doubt, because he says that the Gospel of the circumcision was committed to *Peter*, of which he says that J. Christ was himself the minister, and tho' all the Apostles were sent immediately by J. Christ, as was St. *Paul* himself, he does not ascribe this ministry to any one of them. Why so? because both he and they were of the circumcision, and consequently of St. *Peter's* flock, to whom the ministry of the circumcision was committed; so well assured was he that *Peter* had been ordered to feed the whole flock; that he had been ordered to confirm his brethren.

The Ex. comes at length to what he calls decisive evidence against *Peter's* infallibility. It has been remarked more than once that if the Ex'rs. reason be conclusive, the Christian religion is a mere illusion. What he calls decisive evidence against *Peter's* infallibility, is decisive evidence that he himself does not believe the New Testament infallible. In it we find two of *Peter's* Epistles which are stript of infallibility by this Revd. Ex. If *Peter* was not infallible in his doctrine, how does he know that *Paul* was infallible? how does he know that *Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John* were infallible? was not *Peter* one of the Apostles, whom J. Christ ordered to teach all nations, promising that he himself would be with him? what inherent quality or privilege had the other Apostles which insured their doctrine against error, to which *Peter* had no claim? and if all the Apostles were subject to error what are we to think of the New Testament? this may account for that new rule of faith of our Ex'rs. invention, that is *caprice, fancy, prejudice*. What a substitute to the inspired writings! this is one of these irresistible strokes of eloquence which have enchanted his admirer, Mr. *Cochran*. Fortunately for us Christians his accusation against *Peter* is forged in his own imagination, or in the work-shop of his *powerful Ally*: 'tis not founded on St. *Paul's* authority,

whom he grossly misrepresents: *St. Paul* accuses *Peter* of an error in conduct, not in faith; of an injudicious, perhaps indifereet temporizing which might have been productive of bad consequences, not of teaching false doctrine. The Ex. gives the whole passage to which he affixes an imaginary sense, a sense not intended by *St. Paul*, and which his words cannot bear. The Writer begs leave to give the passage also, and at the same time to correct the Ex's. interpretation: "When *Peter* came to Antioch, I, says *St. Paul*, withstood him to the face, because he was reprehensible." *Gal. ii.* But for what was he reprehensible? The Apostle proceeds to state the fault, "for, (says he,) before some men came from *James* he did eat with the Gentiles." For this, and this only, *Peter* was reprehensible. *Peter* was not in an error as this Ex. pretends, he knew that the ceremonial law did not oblige, that doctrine he taught, publicly professed, and authentically declared in the Council of Jerusalem some short time before: *Acts xv.* "But when they were come he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them, who were of the circumcision." This then is *St. Peter's* fault, an indiscretion in conduct, which this Ex. has metamorphosed into an error in faith. *St. Peter* knew, and so did *St. Paul*, that the prejudices of the Jews were deeply rooted, he knew that, though the ceremonial law did not oblige the Christians, it might be practised without sin at that time. Hence we find *St. Paul* himself, after the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, with the advice and consent of *St. James* and the clergy of Jerusalem practising the law: "and the day following *Paul* went in with us to *James* "thou seeest, brother, how many thousands there are amongst the Jews, who have believed and they are all zealous for the law. Now they have heard of thee, that thou teachest those Jews, who are amongst the Gentiles to forsake *Moses*, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, nor to walk according

“ding to the custom : what is it therefore ? the multi-
 “tude must indeed come together, for they will hear
 “that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say :
 “unto thee : we have four men who have a vow upon
 “them, take these and purify thyself with them, and
 “bestow on them that they may shave their heads, and
 “all will know that these things, which they have
 “heard of thee are false, but that thou thyself also
 “walkest keeping the law. As for those of the Gen-
 “tiles who have believed we have written, decreeing
 “that they should refrain themselves from that which
 “has been offered to idols and from blood, and from
 “things strangled and from fornication. Then *Paul*
 “took the men, and the next day being purified with
 “them entered into the temple, giving notice of the
 “accomplishment of the days of purification until an
 “offering should be offered for every one of them.”—
Acts xxi.

Some short time after the Council, we find *Paul*
 circumcising *Timothy* to avoid giving offence to the
 Jews.—*Acts xvi.* Was *Paul* also in an error ? was
James and all the Clergy of Jerusalem in an error ?
 were these many thousands of believing Jews, of whom
St. Luke says : “the multitude of the believers had
 “but one heart and one soul.—*Acts iv.* and
 “all things were common to them.” Were they in
 error respecting one of the most important points of
 the Christian religion ? all these not only practised the
 law, but were zealous for the practice of the law.
 “It would have been an error to believe that the obser-
 vance of the Jewish law obliged under the penalty of
 sin ; but this *Peter* neither believed nor taught : he be-
 lieved and taught the contrary, so did *Paul* and *James*
 and all the other Apostles ; though, to avoid giving of-
 fence to the Jews, they occasionally observed the law, as
 is manifest from the passages cited just now.

In what, you'll say, was *Peter's* conduct incorrect ?
 was he not perfectly justifiable to avoid giving offence
 to

to the Jews with whom he was in a particular manner charged? did not *Paul* himself in consideration of their prejudices circumcise his disciple *Timothy*? did not *James* and the other believing Jews zealously observe the law? True—yet there must have been some inadvertent fault in his conduct: for St. Paul says that he was reprehensible: there were some false teachers, who, to invalidate *Paul's* authority, pretended that his doctrine was not consistent with *Peter's*, which was well known to be the standard of Christian truth. *Peter's* observance of the Jewish law might give some colour of truth to the calumny: *Paul* was therefore strictly correct in reprehending *Peter's* conduct publicly. This argues no superiority in *Paul*: 'twas an act of fraternal correction, not of authority, an act which all subordinate Pastors have a right to exercise if they have reason to believe that the inadvertence or indiscretion of the superior's conduct may be prejudicial to others.

St. *Peter's* modesty in receiving a contradiction from his inferior, without offering any reply in justification, or even in extenuation of a fault with which he was publicly charged, shews that he practised the doctrine, which he taught: if *Peter* had been possessed with that domineering spirit, which he condemns in others, he might have left us a specimen of assuming arrogance, instead of that apostolical meekness which appears in all his words and actions, and was eminently conspicuous in the transaction which St. *Paul* relates: for 'tis yet undecided whether his conduct was in itself incorrect, though considering the calumny which it might indirectly countenance, St. *Paul* was perfectly correct in censuring it; and 'twas with respect to the situation in which *Paul* was placed, and the impediments, which calumny might give his ministry, reprehensible. We don't pretend to justify every act of *Peter's* life; that infallibility which we claim for him as an Apostle of J. Christ, and that superintendance of the flock which was committed to him by his master, does
not

not argue an exemption from venial faults: *Peter* was one of those men, whom the Saviour taught to say, “*forgive us our trespasses* ;” one of these of whom *St. John* says: “if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.” The Saviour had prayed for *Peter* that his faith should not cease.—*Luke* xxii. 32. He did not exempt him from every weakness incident to human nature.

Moses himself, though highly favoured, was not totally exempt from human frailty: witness his hesitation at the waters of *Meriba*, which was severely chastised.

“This passage,” says the *Ex. p. 72*, “is pregnant with information; it totally destroys all idea of *Peter’s* infallibility.” Thus the *Ex.* affixing to a passage of *St. Paul* a sense as directly opposite to that intended by the Apostle as truth is to falsehood, or light to darkness, attempting to invalidate *Peter’s* authority, by direct and necessary consequence invalidates the authority of the New Testament, and subverts the Christian religion.—What an awful lesson is here given to the unlearned, when they who are taught to believe that the Scriptures are easily understood, see them so grossly mistaken by their teachers?

The passage is pregnant with information—true—but this *Ex.* totally mistakes it: for in it we find that the Apostleship of the circumcision, a ministry, which Christ himself had exercised, was entrusted to *Peter*; that *Paul* and all the other Apostles, who were of the circumcision, were of his flock; to this plain truth which the *Ex.* did not see, he substitutes the ravings of his own imagination, and obtrudes them on his readers as the doctrine of *St. Paul*.

The *Ex.* having, as he imagines, destroyed *Peter’s* infallibility, and consequently his supremacy. Though infallibility and supremacy are totally unconnected; the one may subsist without the other, as appears from many of the Prophets and Apostles who were infallible, though not supreme.—Proceeds to shew in his ixth. Proposition,

Proposition, that there is no certainty of *Peter's* ever having been at Rome. To this the Writer replies without fearing a contradiction, that there is as great a certainty of his having been at Rome, and Bp. of that city, as that he wrote his first and second Epistle; that there is as great a certainty of his having established his See at Rome, as that the Scriptures are divinely inspired: for we know both the one and the other by the same means; that is, by the universal and uninterrupted tradition of the Catholic Church; the same testimony, which renders our assent to this fundamental truth of religion, *the Scriptures are divinely inspired*, infallible, renders it equally unerring, to this truth: *Peter did found his See at Rome, and transmitted his authority to feed Christ's flock, to his successor*. For this was an official authority, not a personal quality, and official authority is always vested in the lawful successor, though personal qualities or privileges are confined to the person.

Doctor *Bull's* conclusion: "it is doubtful whether *St. Peter* ever was at Rome;"—only shews how prejudice and party spirit, combined with interest, warp the understanding; and into what gross absurdities every attempt to support error in the face of truth, betrays even men of sense.

"There is not," says the Ex. p. 73, "one passage in Scripture from which it can be inferred that *St. Peter* was Bishop of Rome, or even that he had ever set his foot in that city." Admitting the assertion true, though it be totally groundless; 'tis not the less certain that *Peter* was Bishop of Rome: for there are many truths of religion which are not to be found in the Scriptures, as has been shewn to demonstration more than once already.

That *Peter* was at Rome is manifestly deduced from the Scriptures: for his first Epistle is dated from Babylon, and that under the name of Babylon, Rome was then understood, we know from the Scripture and authentic history: *St. John*, in the Revelations, speaks of

of the city of Rome, under the name of Babylon, manifestly: *Rev. xvii.* he says, 'twas built on seven hills, and commanded the kings of the earth, which description is applicable to no other city in the world but Rome at that time: Babylon in Syria was then in ruins, as *Pliny* and *Strabo* inform us; and Babylon in Egypt was but a fort or castle. Neither the one or the other of them commanded the Kings of the earth as Rome did at that time.

Eusebius, the father of Church history better informed than all the modern scribblers in Europe, says: " *Papias* (one of the Apostles disciples) says this, that " *Peter* in his first Epistle, which he wrote from Rome " remembered *Mark*; in this Epistle he figuratively " called Rome Babylon, saying the Church elect which " is in Babylon salutes you and my son *Mark*."

And *St. Jerome*, a man profoundly versed in the Scriptures, who with every advantage from nature, and every external adventitious aid, had made them the study of a long and laborious life; a man to whom even presumption would not compare *Bishop Bull*, in his book of illustrious men, speaking of *St. Mark*, he says: " *Peter* in his first Epistle, under the name of " Babylon, figuratively signifies Rome, saying the " Church collected in Babylon salutes you."

In the same manner this Epistle is explained by Greek and Latin writers, *Oecumenius*, *Bede*, &c. when *Doctor Bull* sets his conjecture in opposition to the direct and uncontradicted testimony of so many intelligent men, who wrote whilst the fact was yet fresh in the memory of the world, one of whom *Papias* was a cotemporary witness, the Doctor, in his great zeal, to render a certain fact ruinous to the reformed system, doubtful, has ruined his own credit for veracity. What would the Ex. think of a man who would undertake in defiance of all historians, to prove that *Alexander* was never in Macedon, or the *Pr. of Orange* in England?

" The circumstances of *Peter's* having been at

“Rome, (says the Ex. p. 76,) are very far from being established by authentic history.”

The Ex. has been already told that *Peter's* having established his See at Rome is known from universal, uninterrupted, and uncontradicted tradition, the most authentic of all history; because 'tis by it that we know all the revealed truths of religion. The Ex. seems to have taken *Doctor Bannister's* advice, to have consulted the heathen philosophers, and thence to have passed fifteen centuries of the Christian æra unnoticed. Does he know that during that period there were many eminent writers, Greek and Latin, whose works are yet extant? the character of credulity which he so liberally bestows on them without having read a line in their works, may be applied with great propriety to their self-constituted censors; the man must be credulous indeed who can prevail on himself to believe that all these men, so eminent for science and sanctity, were in error; and that an Apostate monk in an obscure corner in Saxony, a true son of *Epicurus*, detected their errors, and re-established the truth, which they had effaced from the world.

That *Peter* was at Rome, besides the uninterrupted tradition of the whole Christian world, a fact of which not even a doubt, ever crossed a man's imagination till *Wiclef's* days in the year 1377, we have the written testimony of many unexceptionable writers. *Papias* a cotemporary, *Ireneus*, born at Smyrna, Bishop of Lyons, who suffered martyrdom under *Severus*, in 205, says that the Roman Church was founded by *Peter* and *Paul*; 'twas founded first by *Peter*, and then by *Peter* and *Paul* together.—*Iren. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.*

Epiphanius, Bishop of *Salamina* in Cyprus, a man of unquestionable authority, says: “the first in Rome were *Peter* and *Paul*—*Pan. Con. Heres. 17.*

Chrysofom Patriarch of Constantinople, a celebrated writer of the fourth century, says: “*Peter* the fisherman, because he occupied the most royal city even
“ after

“ after death, shines brighter than the sun.—in *Ps.* 48.

Paul Orosius, a most acute and discriminating historian, praised by *St. Austin*, who was a judge of history if any man ever was, says: “ in the beginning of the
 “ reign of *Claudius*, *Peter* the Apostle of our Lord J.
 “ Christ came to Rome, and taught by faithful word
 “ that faith which is salutary to all, and by the most
 “ powerful virtues approved it, and from that time
 “ Christians began to be at Rome.—*Liv.* 7. *Hist.*
Cap. 6.

The great *Theodoret*, whose veracity was never called in question, in whose writings a solid judgment and extensive erudition are eminently conspicuous, says: “ the Great *Peter* was the first who delivered to them
 “ (the Romans) the Evangelical doctrine.”—*Com. in Epis. Ad. Rom.*

Does the *Ex.* intend to persuade us that these men who wrote in the third and fourth centuries, did not know who first preached the Gospel at Rome? we shall be told bye and bye, that 'tis not certain that *Patrick* was ever in Ireland, or *Austin* in England; that *Martin Luther* was not the first who taught the reformed doctrine in *Wirttemberg*. What progress these new-fangled historians make in science? with what perspicuity they undeceive the world?

Perhaps the Emperor *Theodosius* may have some weight with these critics: the laws of the Empire were public records, and in them days were believed authentic. Thus we read in the code: “ We desire that all
 “ the people, whom the Empire of our clemency rules,
 “ should remain in the religion which the blessed *Peter*
 “ the Apostle delivered to the Romans.”—*de in Trini.*
& fide Cath. L. ad. Cunctos.

Were all the lawyers of the Empire, the Emperor and the Senate, all the citizens of Rome, the inhabitants of Italy, and the neighbouring countries deceived? did they believe that *Peter* had taught the Romans, though no such thing had happened?

That *Peter* died in Rome is a fact of which there cannot be a shadow of a doubt: his sepulchre is there, his bones are there; in no other part of the world was it said or thought at any time that he died. In no other part of the world are his bones preserved or spoken of; 'twas universally believed in the East and in the West, for 1400 years, when *Wiclyf*, an ignorant innovator pretended to doubt it.

St. Ignatius, who lived with the Apostle, was successor to *Evodius*, who succeeded *St. Peter* in the See of Antioch, when on his way to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom in the year 107. Writing to the Romans, says: "I do not as *Peter* and *Paul* command you: they were Apostles: I am an inconsiderable person." He alludes to the martyrdom of *Peter* and *Paul*, which happened sometime before, expressing a strong desire that the Romans would give no impediment to his own: a great part of this letter is recited by *St. Jerome*, in his book of illustrious men, *Usher* gives it entire.

Eusebius relates that *Dennis* the Corinthian, who flourished some short time after the Apostles, said at Rome: "*Peter* and *Paul* were teaching at the same time in this city, and were crowned with martyrdom at the same time."—*Lib. 2. Hist.*

And *Causis*, who flourished about 50 years after, says: "I have the trophies of the Apostles, which I can shew. If you go the high way which leads to the Vatican or by the way of Ostia, you will find fixed trophies by which, placed on each side, the Roman Church is defended."—*Opur. Eus.*

Eusebius in his Chronicle on the year of Christ 71, says: *Nero* added to all his crimes a persecution against the Christians, in which *Peter* and *Paul* died gloriously at Rome."

Origenes in his third Book on *Genesis*, as cited by *Eusebius*: "*Peter* remained to the last in Rome, and
" was

“ was crucified with his head downwards, which he
 “ himself requested, least he should seem to be equalled
 “ to his master.”

Theodoret, in his letter to Pope *Leo*, says, “ Rome
 “ has the sepulchres of the common fathers and teach-
 “ ers of truth, *Peter* and *Paul*.”

Chrysoptom, in his 32nd Homily on the Epistle to the
 Romans, says: “ The Heavens are not more enlight-
 “ ened, when the Sun emits its rays, than the city of
 “ the Romans diffusing these two great lights all over
 “ the world: hence *Paul* will be carried, hence *Peter*.
 “ Think and tremble: what a sight will Rome behold!
 “ *Paul* suddenly rising with *Peter*, and ascending to
 “ meet our Lord.”

Tertullien: “ if you be near Italy, you have Rome.
 “ Whence we have authority; a happy Church to
 “ which the Apostles communicated the whole of their
 “ doctrine with their blood; where *Peter* is equalled to
 “ the passion of our Lord, and *Paul* is crowned by the
 “ death of John. (B.)”—*Tert. de. Præ.*

Lactantius, an early and elegant writer, says:
 “ Christ retiring opened to his disciples all future
 “ events, which *Peter* and *Paul* preached at Rome
 “ when *Nero* had put them to death, *Vespa-*
 “ *sian* extinguished both the name and the nation of
 “ the Jews, and effected all these things which they
 “ foretold would happen.”—*Lact. div. Ins. Lib. 4.*
Cap. 21.

St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, a man of strict veracity
 and great information, says, in his oration against *Aur-*
entius: “ when *Peter* was going out of the city at
 “ night, seeing Christ meet him in the gate, coming
 “ in, he said: Lord whither dost thou go? to which
 “ Christ replied, I am coming to Rome to be again
 “ crucified. *Peter* understood the divine answer as re-
 “ ferring to his cross and being arrested he ho-
 “ nored our Lord Jesus by his crucifixion.”

St. Jerome, a man of the most consummate erudi-
 tion,

tion, and unquestionable veracity, thus says, in his book of illustrious men: *Simon Peter* goes to Rome to “ subdue *Simon* the Magician, there he held the sacerdotal chair twenty five years to the last, that is, to “ the fourteenth of *Nero*, by whom he was fixed to a “ cross, crowned with martyrdom, his head towards “ the earth.”

St. Austin: “ Rome commends the merits of *Peter* “ and *Paul* in a more solemn manner, as they both “ died the same day.”—*Lib. 1. de Con. Evan. Cap. 10.*

St. Maximus in his fifth sermon on the festival of the Apostles says: “ *Peter* and *Paul* suffered martyr- “ dom in the city of Rome, which possesses the primacy “ and supremacy, ‘ *principatum & caput*,’ of nations, “ that where the chief seat of superstition had been, “ there the chief seat of sanctity might rest.”

Sulpitius, in his second book of sacred history, says: “ divine religion encreased in the city, *Peter* in the “ episcopal chair, ‘ *Petro Episcopatum gerente*,’ *Paul* “ was soon after brought to the city they were “ both condemned, *Paul* beheaded with a sword, and “ *Peter* raised on a cross.”

Paul Orosius: “ *Nero* tormented and put the Chris- “ tians to death in Rome, and endeavoured to extirpate “ the very name, he slew the most holy Apostles of “ Christ, *Peter* and *Paul*—*Peter* by the cross, and *Paul* “ by the sword.”—*Lib. 7 v. Hist.*

Eutropius:—in *Vita Neronis*, *Lib. 7.* “ finally to “ all his flagitious crimes he added this. He put the “ holy apostles *Peter* and *Paul* to death.”

The testimonies of these early writers may be closed with that of *Eusebius*: “ as *Nero* professed himself an “ open enemy to the deity and to piety, he first sought “ the death of the Apostles, as they were the leaders “ and standard bearers of the Christian People; *Paul* “ he beheaded in the city of Rome, *Peter* he condemn- “ ned to be hanged on a cross: to seek a testimony of “ this event elsewhere is superfluous: since the most ce- “ lebrated

“ celebrated and splendid monuments attest the fact.”
Hist. Lib. 2. Cap. 25.

This celebrated writer thought it a most stupid thing to look for other proofs of a man’s death whilst his sepulchre and other monuments were known to the whole city.

For the entire satisfaction of the Ex. the Writer begs leave to give him the testimony of three Protestant writers, not taken from these early times: they were not yet known.

Mr. *Whiston*, in the memoirs of his own life, p. 599, writes thus: “ Mr. *Bower*, with some weak Protestants before him, almost pretends to deny that St. *Peter* was at Rome, concerning which matter, take my own former words out of my three tracts.” p. 53.

Mr. *Baratier* proves most satisfactorily, as Doctor *Pearson* had done before him, that *Peter* was at Rome; the former in his chronological enquiry of the ancient Bishops of Rome, from *Peter* down to *Victor*, and the latter in a learned dissertation now in his posthumous works: “ this, says he, is so clear in Christian antiquity that ’tis a shame for a Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it. This partial procedure demonstrates that Mr. *Bower* has by no means got clear of the prejudices of some Protestants as an impartial writer of history, which he strongly pretends to be, ought to do; and he has in this case greatly hurt the Protestant cause instead of serving it.

From the testimony of these Protestant divines who candidly acknowledge the insincerity of *Bower*, the reader will see what credit is due to his history of the lives of Popes.

If such a writer, who beetle like, feeds upon putrid sores, were to give a history of the prophet *David*, he would have painted a monster: he would have insisted on his perfidy to *Urias*, one of his most faithful officers; his inhuman treatment of the inhabitants of Rabba.

Rabba, and all the cities of the children of Ammon, and thus exposing, in strong colouring, all the faults of this prince, and concealing all his virtues, passing unnoticed the penitential tears and mortifications by which he effaced his crimes, a *Bower*, or a *Musgrave* would have taught an illiterate people to believe that this king, after God's own heart, was an impious and inhuman tyrant. Thus the simplicity of the uninformed is abused by these envenomed pens.

This short digression may serve as a corrective to that abuse which the Ex. and his *learned Ally*, Mr. C. lavish on Popes. They are the echoes of *Bower*, a weak and partial writer, as acknowledged by his friends, they might have added a malignant writer, who distorted every object, and painted it, not as it was in itself, but as it appeared, disfigured by malevolence in his own confused imagination.

That St. Peter not only died in Rome, where his sepulchre is yet to be seen; but that he was Bishop of that See is manifest from this simple reason;—that the Roman See was always considered as the first See in the world both by Greeks and Latins: no other reason can be assigned why 'twas thought the first and principal See, but because 'twas founded by Peter. The same uncontradicted tradition and unanimous consent of the Christian world, which proves Peter to have been at Rome, shews also that he founded that See, and transmitted his official charge of feeding his Master's flock to his successor in office.

St. *Ireneus* gives a catalogue of the Bishops of Rome down to Pope *Elutherius*, his own cotemporary in the year 176. He begins with Peter and Paul, and says of *Clement*, that he was third from the Apostles.—*Lib. 3v. Cap. 3.*

To pretend that *Ireneus* did not know who was Bishop of Rome in his own time, or who were his predecessors for so short a space as 176 years, is an insult on the common sense of mankind.

Tertullien

Tertullien, in his book of prescriptions reasoning against some sectaries, says: "let them expose the order of their Bishops by their succession, so that their first Bishop has been some one of the Apostles or Apostolical men, as the Church of Rome numbers *Clement* ordained by *Peter*."

St. Cyprian frequently calls the Roman See the chair of *St. Peter*: "they," said he speaking of some refractory characters, "dare to sail to the chair of *Peter*, and to the principal church, from which sacerdotal unity arose; and to carry letters from schismatics and profane men, not considering that they are Romans, to whom perfidy can have no access."

And in his letter to *Antonianus* he says: "*Cornelius* was made Bishop when the place of *Fabian*, that is, when the place of *Peter* and the summit of the sacerdotal chair was vacant."—*Lib. 4. Epist. 2.*

Eusebius in his Chronicles of the year 64. "*Peter* by nation a Gallilean, the first pontiff of Christians when he had first founded the church of *Antioch* went to Rome, where preaching the Gospel 25 years he remained Bishop of that city."

Thus the father of Church history, the most learned man of his age, and very little, if at all inferior to any man of any age, expressly says, that *Peter* was the first or supreme Pontiff of Christians; that he remained 25 years Bishop of Rome, and speaks of it as a fact publicly and universally known.

Epiphanius, that celebrated writer, in his book of heresies, speaking of the heresy of *Carpocrates*, says: "in Rome the succession of Bishops is thus, *Peter, Paul, Linus, Cletus*"

He does not give the succession of Bishops in his own See, the Archiepiscopal See of Salamina in Cyprus, nor of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople. 'Tis enough for a Catholic Prelate to shew that he's in communion with the See of Rome, and that the

succession in that See dates from *Peter* the Chief Pastor of Christ's flock.

Athanasius, in his letter to the *Asterics*, speaking of the Arians, says: "they did not spare even *Liberius* the Roman Bishop, not moved with reverence that that See is Apostolical."

Dorotheus in his Synopsis or short view of the prophets and disciples of Christ, says: "*Linus* was Bishop of Rome after the great leader, '*Ceryphaeus*,' '*Peter*." This last writer is not always correct: he is not cited by *Eusebius* or *St. Jerome*. But such a public fact he could not mistake.

Soyomen, the continuator of *Eusebius*' history, says: "'twas not without Divine Providence, that when *Felix* died, *Liberius* alone presided over the Church of Rome, lest the See of *Peter* should be aspersed by any stain of infamy."

This writer can't be suspected of flattering the See of Rome, he was favourable to the Novatian sectaries as appears from his works.

Optatus, in his second book against *Parmenian*, says: "you can't deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal chair was first conferred on *Peter*."

In the same book he enumerates the Roman Bishops from *Peter* down to *Siricius*, "at this day united," said he, "in our fraternity, in which the whole world agrees with us joined in one communion."

In the same work this able writer gives, as distinguishing marks of the Catholic Church, its unity, its sanctity, and the chair of *St. Peter*, which, says he, "is ours, and by this 'tis plain that we possess its other prerogatives."

In the third book of this work he reasons thus: "Christ said to *Peter*: to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Whence therefore do you claim the keys, who with sacrilegious presumption
and

“and insolence fight against the chair of St. Peter?” pressing his adversary *Parmenian*, *Optatus* continues: “you can’t deny that you know that the Episcopal chair was first given to *Peter* in the city of Rome, on which first sat the head of the Apostles, *Peter*; which chair was one, that all others might preserve unity by the union they had with it; and least the other Apostles might erect and defend chairs to themselves, so that he now is a schismatic and offender, who sets up another against the only chair.”

He then describes the origin and the allies of the Donatists. “as to your party, (says he) inquire after the origin of your chair.” The Donatists answered that they had also a Bishop at Rome, by name *Macrobius*, successor to *Euculpius*, who succeeded *Boniface* of Balli, and *Boniface* was successor to a *Victor Garbienfis*, whom the Donatists had sent from Africa to Rome, to preside over their little separate Church in that city. To this *Optatus* replies, “can *Macrobius* say that he sits in the chair of St. *Peter*, which perhaps he never saw? for certainly he never went to the sepulchre of the Apostles, (that is, to officiate publicly in the cathedral,) that he might be known to the Catholic world, as possessed of the Apostolical chair. He is disobedient to the command of the Apostle; who would have us communicate in the memory of the saints: We see the relics of the two Apostles, Sts. *Peter* and *Paul*, are in the Church at Rome. Tell me, I pray, if he could offer in the place, where these relics are kept? *Macrobius* your brother must then confess that he is seated in the chair of *Eucolpius*, *Boniface* of Balli, and *Victor Garbienfis*. This *Victor* is a son without a father, a disciple without a master, a successor without a predecessor.”

Whatever the Ex. or his Ally may think of the authority of *Optatus*, his reasoning is irresistible. *Parmenian*

nian the Donatist, a man in every sense superior to this Ex. or his friend, found it so.

Optatus makes no inquiry about the succession of Bishops in the See of Carthage; nor did *Parmenian*, tho' he was the Donatist Bishop of that See. 'Twas then so well ascertained, so universally believed, that Rome was the Apostolical See, that all Sectaries, as well as Catholics acknowledged it.

It may not be amiss to inform the Catholic reader that St. *Austin*, speaking of *Optatus*, ranks him with St. *Cyprian* and *Hilary*; in another place he styles him a Prelate of venerable memory, who was by his virtue an ornament to the Catholic Church.

St. *Fulgentius* ranks him with *Austin* and *Ambrose*. He was Bishop of Milevum, in Nunudia; an acute and powerful reasoner—these are the men whom modern scribblers call *credulous men*. He must be unaccountably credulous who believes, that, whilst we at the distance of fourteen or fifteen centuries know precisely the Sees which were occupied by an *Austin*, an *Ambrose*, an *Optatus*, and many others of inferior note. These men so far superior to us did not know the See which *Peter* occupied, or the prerogatives annexed to that See.

St. *Ambrose*, in his third book on the Sacraments says: "Peter the Apostle, who was Priest of the Roman Church, is to us author of this assertion."—*Cap. 3.*

St. *Austin*, in his second book against *Pelilians* Letters, says: "What has the chair of the Roman Church done to thee, in which *Peter* sat, and in which now *Anastafius* sits?"

Prosper, a disciple of St. *Austin*, who continued the chronicle of *Eusebius* down to his own time in the year 445, in his book of ingratitude, says: "Rome the seat of *Peter* of pastoral honor, the head of the world"

Numberless citations from different authors are adduced

duced by polemical writers on this subject. These few from the most celebrated authors, are adduced to convince the reader how little credit is due to *Bower*, or his echoes in slander, whilst they presume to contradict upon wild conjectures, the positive assertions of all writers of all countries from *Peter's* days down to the pretended reformation, in 1517.

Writers don't agree exactly on the time when *Peter* came to Rome. What then? Chronological writers seldom agree. Are we to conclude that a fact on which all agree, is not certain, because at the distance of eighteen centuries we don't know precisely the year on which it happened? this is not reasoning, but cavilling.

The Ex. thinks *Paul's* silence with respect to *Peter* in his Epistle to the Romans, an argument that *Peter* was not there. What! does the silence of one man invalidate the positive testimony of many? perhaps *Peter* was not at Rome precisely at that time: he made many excursions in the course of his mission; if he had been at Rome *St. Paul* would not have mentioned him in a letter of instruction to the faithful: 'twould have been presumption to address such a letter to *Peter*; he did not salute *St. John* at Ephesus, nor *Timothy* the Bishop, as his letter was addressed to the faithful he did not class the Bishop with them. He wrote letters of instruction to *Timothy* and *Titus*, who were his disciples, but he never undertook to instruct his fellow Apostles, over whom he had no jurisdiction.

The Ex. concludes that if *Peter* was at Rome, he must have deserted his original vocation. This our Ex. has not read the last chapter of *St. Matthew*, in which 'tis said in very plain language that J. Christ ordered his Apostles to teach all nations. Was not *Peter* one of them? did *Peter* assert a falsehood when he told the Apostles at Jerusalem, that they knew that God had made choice of him, that from his mouth the
Gentiles

Gentiles should hear the word and believe?—*Acts xv.* did *Paul* desert his original vocation when he preached to the Jews: “and immediately he preached Jesus in “the synagogue that he is the son of God?” *Acts ix. 20.* On his arrival at Rome were they not Jews to whom *St. Paul* preached? “And after the third day “he called together the chief of the Jews.”—*son jour- dain prôtous.*

How defenceless the cause must be; how destitute of solid reasons, in support of which even rest less imagination can hardly discover a shadow?

The *Ex.* descends at length from *Peter*. “If “says he, *p. 75.* *Peter* had been possessed of such high “authority it could not be so long concealed “it must have been engrafted in Christianity.” The last proposition is true; and because ’twas engrafted in Christianity ’twas universally known to all Catholics, sectaries, and even to heathens: of this sufficient proof has been already adduced: ’twas manifestly revealed in the New Testament which was in the hands of Christian sectaries, and such heathens as could procure a copy.

That this authority was vested in the Bishop of Rome, *Peter’s* lawful successor, is manifest from the very nature of things: an official authority must pass to the successor in office;

Authority is given to the pastor, not for himself, but for the flock over which he is placed; it must therefore continue as long as the flock continues; the flock of Christ will continue to the end of time, the authority of Chief Pastor vested in *Peter* by the express words of Christ, must also continue in his successors till the end of time.

That the Bishop of Rome was *Peter’s* successor, was known to the faithful then at Rome, by the testimony of their senses, as all such facts are known; ’twas known to all other churches by authentic letters, as neighbouring nations know when one Prince succeeds another;

another; to us 'tis known by that universal and uninterrupted tradition by which we know the scriptures to be the word of God; hence all these writers already cited, and many others, passed unnoticed to avoid prolixity speak of it as a public fact known to the world, of which no man doubted.

“The Eastern Churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Asia Minor, never heard of such an authority, says the *Ex. p. 76*, and when 'twas claimed, they treated it as a pretension totally unfounded, and never submitted to it.” What never! the *Ex. dreams*: that all the Asiatic Churches did submit to the authority of the Roman See, from *Gregory's days* in the year 590 down to *Photius' schism* in 866, no Protestant, who had any remains of modesty, ever denied; 'tis strange that so many Patriarchs and Prelates should for some centuries tamely submit to an authority of which their ancestors knew nothing. By what contrivance were these clear-sighted Greeks imposed upon, and taught to believe that a superior authority did exist, of which their Ancestors were ignorant?

“It was declared by the Council of Nice, (says the *Ex. p. 76*,) that the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, had the same authority over the countries round them, that he of Rome had over those which lay about that city.” The *Ex.* most injudiciously cites this Council of Nice. Why not tell his readers that of the 318 Prelates who composed that venerable assembly, there was not one protestant; that to a man they believed in transubstantiation and celebrated mass most piously, as we Papists do yet. The *Ex.* does not cite the canon but gives a spurious version of it in order to mislead the unlearned, the writer must beg leave to correct both the *Exr's.* version and interpretation. 'Tis the 6th of Nice, to which he alludes the canon is thus conceived: “Let the ancient custom continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have the power of all these.”

The

The Council immediately assigns the motive on which this disposition was founded in favour of the Bishop of Alexandria, "because this is the custom of the Bishop of Rome, *oti kai to in té Romé Episcopo touto sunethes esti.*" Which words of the Council, whatever efforts are made to distort them from their natural and intended signification, can bear no other sense but this, because 'twas the custom of the Bishop of Rome to invest the Bishop of Alexandria with a jurisdiction over them provinces. And in fact no other reason can be assigned, for the Bishop of Alexandria was not invested by J. Christ with any jurisdiction over the Bishops in them provinces; nor could he assume it by his own private authority, nor did the Council invest him with this authority which had existed long before the Council was assembled: the Council only decided that the old custom should continue, in order to prevent disputes.

How unlucky is this Ex. in his reference to authorities; they invariably condemn him.

This Council of Nice was held in the year 325; the Prelates say 'twas an old custom for the Bishop of Alexandria to superintend several provinces, and they ascribe the source of this authority to the custom adopted by the Bishop of Rome. The commencement of this canon of the Council of Nice does not appear in printed books; but 'tis given by a Council of equal authority, that of Chalcedon, in 451. 'Tis thus cited in the 16th Action by the Bishop *Paschasius*: "the Roman Church had always the primacy. Let the old custom continue that the Bishop of Alexandria, &c." After this 6th canon of the Council of Nice was read, the judges said: "We consider that all primacy and chief honor according to the canons be reserved to the beloved of God, the Archbishop of old Rome."

The oriental Prelates assembled at Constantinople in 382, who were present at the second General Council
in

in 381, in a letter addressed to Pope *Damasus*, and the Western Prelates then at Rome, say in excuse, for not coming to Rome; "some of us cannot possibly do it, because we prepared ourselves to travel not farther than Constantinople, as we were commanded by letters sent by your Reverence to the Emperor *Theodosius*. The last year after the Council of *Aquileia*." In the same letter they thank him for calling them as his own members, "*emas os oikeia mele proskalesasthe*. Tom. 2. Com. p. 962. C. D. In his letter to them Prelates *Damasus* twice calls them his most honoured Children. "*vioi timisatatoi*," *ibid.* would these Prelates say, they were commanded by the Pope, if they acknowledged no authority in him? would they make an excuse to a Prelate possessed of no jurisdiction? the supposition is absurd.

The whole of this letter is given by *Theodoret*, and is now before the writer. *Lib. 5. Cap. 9.*

Evagrius the Syrian, whom *Photius*, a good judge of history, tho' a very bad man, thinks an accurate historian, says in his history, *Lib. 1. Hist. Cap. 4.* that the general council of Ephesus, deposed *Nestorius* Patriarch of Constantinople, by a mandate from the Roman Pontiff; but thinking the cause of *John*, Patriarch of Antioch more doubtful, did not presume to pronounce on it, but reserved it for the judgment of Pope *Celestine* himself.

The Council of Chalcedon held in the year 451, in the 1st, 2d, and 3d actions, frequently calls *Leo*, then Pope, Pontiff of the universal Church; and in their report to him of the transactions in the Council they say, "if where two or three are assembled in his name Christ has promised to be there in the midst of them, how much more especially was he with five hundred and twenty Bishops when you conduct as the Head conducts the members:" "*ei gar opou eisi duö & treis sunégmenoi eis tout auto uonoma ekeiephé*

“ *cinai en meso auton. Posen peri pentakostous eikosta*
 “ *iereas ten oikeiasin epedeik neuto on su men*
 “ *os kephale melon egemoneuen en tois ten sen taain epo-*
 “ *choufi ten eunoian epideik numenos. In relatione ad*
 “ *Papam.*”

Speaking of *Dioscorus*, the wicked Patriarch of Alexandria, whom they had deposed, after enumerating other crimes, the Prelates say: “ moreover he extended his madness against him, who was by the Saviour entrusted with the care of the Vineyard, that is against your Holiness :” “ *eti kai kat autou tou tes Ampelou ton phulaken para tou soteroros epitemmenou ten mani an exeteine ; legomen de tes ses ofiotetos.*”

In the General Council of Ephesus held in the year 431, 'twas affirmed without a contradiction, or even without the least emotion of surprise, that Peter was the head of the Apostles, and Pope *Celestine*, (then at Rome), head of the Council. “ *Petros o exarchos kai kephale kai kephale ton apostolon.*”—*anaginoskomenon umon ton grammaton tou a gia kephale tais agiais ekboesin enenochate.*”—*Tom. 3. Act 3. p. 625, A. B.*

In the seventh synod held at Nice, which *Photius*, though not a Protestant, an irreconcilable enemy to the Papal power, ranks amongst General Councils. Pope *Adrian's* letter to *Tharastus* was received with universal applause, in it we read that his See was head of the universal Church: “ *te emetro apostolico throno ostis esti kephale pason ton ekkleison;*”—*Epist. ad Tha. Tom. 7. Con. p. 125. D. E.* That it has a distinguished primacy over the inhabited world; that Peter always was and is still supreme: “ *Su ei Petros ou o thronos eis pasan ten oikomenen proteuon dialampeii, kai kephale pason ton ekklesion uparchei to tou kuriou prostagmati poimanon ten ekklesian ekratesepantote kai kratei ten archen.*”—*ibid.*

The testimony of General Councils celebrated by
 the

the Latins is omitted, though in them we have some thousands of respectable witnesses; against the Greeks and Asiatics no objection can lie, of these we have 520 Prelates subscribing witnesses in the Council of Chalcedon, 318 in the Council of Nice, some hundreds in that of Constantinople and of Ephesus; yet in the face of so many witnesses, Greeks, and Asiatics, Patriarchs and Prelates, the Ex. asserts that these Greeks and Asiatics knew nothing of the Bishop of Rome's pre-eminence! he must have scrupulously adhered to Doctor *Bannister's* rule, that is to read the heathen poets and philosophers, then pass all the writers of fifteen centuries unnoticed, till that great light of Saxony, *Martin Luther*, appeared, and with the assistance of the century writers of Magdeburg, new-modelled the history of the Church as well as its faith.

'Tis something remarkable that the first four General Councils of Nice, of Constantinople, of Ephesus, and Chalcedon, are acknowledged genuine, and declared authentic, by the established Church of England in her thirty-nine Articles. The framers of the Articles did not read the acts and decisions of them Councils. Or if they did, they did not think it prudent to reject an authority, which the Christian world had revered for so many centuries. Be that as it will, the writer begs leave to assure the Ex. and his friends, that the Acts of these Councils are yet extant in the hands of Greeks as well as Latins, who cannot be presumed in concert to have supposed or interpolated them. He has to lament that he cannot refer the Ex. to Oxford, as *Cromwell's* reforming soldiers in their great zeal for the destruction of Popery, had committed to the flames in one morning, forty thousand volumes, the monuments of antiquity, which that University in the days of Popery, had with persevering diligence and a vast expence, collected from all parts of the world; and the few volumes which had escaped the paws of *Henry* the VIIIth's ravaging and reforming monasterial visitors,

collected by *Cotton*, were consumed by an accidental fire in 1731.

These soldiers were judicious reformers: they knew that Popery was so interwoven with antiquity, that the one could not be destroyed till all the monuments of the other were effaced.

That the Popes in the first ages of Christianity did exercise their jurisdiction, and that the Greeks and Asiatics did submit to it, besides the testimony of these Councils already adduced, we have the testimony of all early writers on the subject of Church History.

St. *Ignatius*, a disciple of St. *Peter*, in his Epistle to the Romans marks the pre-eminence of that See: his letter is thus addressed: "To the beloved Church, which is enlightened by the will of him, who ordaineth all things, which are according to the charity of J. Christ our God, which *presides* in the country of the Romans worthy of God, most adorned, justly happy, most commended, fitly regulated, and governed, most chaste and *presiding in charity*."

To the other Churches his letters are addressed in a different manner: thus, "to the blessed Church which is at Ephesus—*te ous a en Epheso*," at Tralles: at Magnesia, near the Meander: at Philadelphia: at Smyrna.

St. *Ireneus*: *Lib 3. Cap. 3.* "We confound all those, who in whatever manner, whether through self-love, vain glory, blindness or unsound doctrine, collect what they ought not, by indicating to them the faith of the greatest, the most ancient, and best known Church founded at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*; and that tradition, which it has from them and is come to us by the succession of Bishops. 'Tis necessary that every Church should agree with this on account of its more powerful principality: That is the faithful, who are in all places, in which Church the tradition, which is from the Apostles, is always preserved by those
" who

“ who are every where faithful.” No modern Papist speaks in stronger terms than this learned Greek of the second century.

Epiphanius says: “ that *Urface* and *Valens* went in penance with libels (supplicatory) to the blessed *Julius*, Bishop of Rome, to give an account of their error and their crime.” *Her.* 68.

Would these Bishops appear to account for their conduct before a Bishop in whom they acknowledge no jurisdiction?

St. *Athanasius* attests in his second apology, that these Bishops did ask pardon of Pope *Julius* for their crime; and in his letter to Pope *Felix*, this patriarch of Alexandria says: “ for this that Jesus Christ placed you and your predecessors in the fortress of the summit, and ordered you to take care of all Churches, that you might assist us”

In his book on the opinions of *Dennis*, patriarch of Alexandria, he says: “ that some went up to Rome and accused the patriarch before *Dennis* the Roman Prelate.” Did they pretend to accuse him before a man, who had no jurisdiction over him?

Basil the Great, in his 52nd letter to *Athanasius*, says: “ it appears meet to write to the Bishop of Rome, that he may see our affairs, and interpose the sentence of his judgment; and because, 'tis difficult for any to be sent, thence by order of the Council, let him give authority to some chosen persons, who may be able to support the fatigues of the journey; and who by friendly and easy manners, as well as by well adapted and prudent words, may administer those, who have declined from the right way, and bring with them also, the acts of the Council of Rimini, to rescind what has been done, violently there.” This Greek Prelate, as well from his science as his sanctity, surnamed *the Great*, knew that the Pope had a power of nominating visitors for the Eastern Churches, and power rescinding the
Acts

Acts of a numerous Council, on proof of violence offered to the members who composed it. And yet our Ex. confidently asserts, that the Greeks and Asiatics knew no such jurisdiction! does he know better than the Greek Prelates themselves?

Chrysoftom, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the year 407, had been unjustly deposed by *Theophylus* Patriarch, of Alexandria in an assembly composed of some of his own creatures, and under the protection of the Empress *Eudoxia*, a woman of whom *Zozymus*, a heathen writer, says: *Op. Tom. 3. v. p. 515.* “ that
 “ her avarice, extortion, and injustice, knew no
 “ bounds; that to gratify these passions she had filled
 “ the Court with informers, Harpys and Calumniators.” *Chrysoftom*, in consequence wrote to the Pope *Innocent* the first, in these terms; “ I beseech you to
 “ write these Acts so unjustly passed, have no force,
 “ and that they who have acted so unjustly, may be
 “ subject to the penalty of Ecclesiastical Laws.”

In his second letter to Pope *Innocent*, he says: “ we return you perpetual thanks, because you have
 “ declared your paternal benevolence to us.” In the same letter he prays the Pontiff not to launch an excommunication against *Theophylus*, and his adherents tho’ they deserve it: “ I pray your vigilance, says
 “ he, that tho’ they have filled all places with tumults,
 “ if they be desirous of being healed of the disease,
 “ they be not afflicted, nor rejected out of the Commu-
 “ nion.” Here we have a Patriarch of Constantinople, the most celebrated Prelate that ever filled that See, appealing to the Roman Pontiff, against the oppression of an Asiatic Council protected by the Empress, and by a juridical Act acknowledging the jurisdiction of the Roman See, over all the Greek and Asiatic Churches.

Cyriil, Patriarch of Alexandria, in his 10th Epistle to *Nestorius*, then Patriarch of Constantinople, and in his 11th Epistle to the Clergy and People of Constantinople,

tinople, says: "that if *Nestorius* within the time prescribed by the Pope *Celestine*, did not revoke his errors, he is excommunicated." And in his 18th letter to Pope *Celestine*, whom he calls most *Holy Father*, he asks if it be his will that the people may as yet hold Communion with *Nestorius*, or avoid him.

The great *Theodoret*, Bishop of Cyrus, when unjustly deposed by *Dioscurus* and his gang, in the infamous Assembly, at Ephesus, appealed to the Roman See, and by its authority was reinstated. In his letter to Pope *Leo*, he says: "I wait the sentence of your apostolical See. I supplicate, and beseech your Holiness to give relief to me; who appeal to your just, and equitable judgment; and that, you order me to appear before you, and expose my doctrine, following the steps of the Apostles."

In his letter to *Renatus* Priest of the Roman Church, he says: "they spoiled me of the Priesthood, they expelled me from the cities, without any respect to my age, passed in religion, or my grey hairs, wherefore, I pray you that you persuade the most holy, Archbishop *Leo*, to use his apostolical authority, and order us to come to your Council: for that holy See holds the Government, of all the Churches in the World."

Soyomen, the Greek historian says: *Lib. 3. Cap. 7.* that *Julius*, Bishop of Rome, reinstated *Athanasius* in the See of Alexandria, and *Paul* in that of Constantinople: "since says the historian, on account of the dignity of his See, the care of all others belongs to him, he restored to each of them their Churches." Hence we see that his jurisdiction was known, acknowledged and exercised over all the Greek, and Asiatic Churches, which our Ex. thought ignorant of it.

Pope *Victor*, in the year 192, threatened to excommunicate the Asiatics for celebrating the Easter on the same day, with the Jews: "*Blastus*," says *Tertullien*,

de

de præ in fine.—“ fraudulently endeavoured to introduce Judaism: he said that Easter was not to be celebrated but according to the law of *Moses*, on the fourteenth day of the month.” As the Asiatics had adopted this mode of celebrating the Easter, the Pontiff applying an effectual remedy to a growing evil, either did or seriously threatened to retrench from the Catholic communion all those who obstinately persisted in the error. *Eusebius* relates the fact *Hist. Lib. 5. Cap. 24.* He adds that St. *Ireneus* and other Prelates made strong remonstrances to the Pope: “ their letters, (says *Eusebius*) are exant, in which they sharply reprove *Victor* as acting contrary to the interests of the Church.” The letters of these Prelates shew that they thought this act of authority, on the validity of which they formed no doubt, both inexpedient and ill-timed. *Ireneus* had been sent in the year 177 as deputy from the Church of Lyons to *Eleutherius*, *Victor*’s immediate predecessor, to pray him not to cut off the orientals for what he and other Prelates thought a trifling difference in discipline; *Victor*, better informed, saw that ’twas not simply a difference in discipline, but a gradual introduction of Judaism. And whether he did in fact excommunicate the Asiatics, or in complaisance to these Prelates confine himself to threats. His severity put a stop to the progress of the evil, his authority was never called in question.

That Popes have in all ages claimed this pre-eminence, no man doubts who has any knowledge of Church history. *Julius* the First, famed for science and sanctity, in his letter to the Orientals, which *Athanasius*, a credible witness, gives entire in his second apology says to them, “ Don’t you know it to be the custom first to write to us, that here what is just may be determined? wherefore if such a suspicion be conceived against a Bishop, ’twas necessary to repeat it here to our Church” And underneath he says, “ what we have received from the

the

“ the blessed Apostle *Peter* we signify to you, though
 “ we should not have written, what we think you al-
 “ ready know, if the facts had not disturbed us. *Ju-*
 “ *lius* claimed a right and exercised that right of jud-
 “ ging the Patriarchs. This we know from themselves,
 tho’ Ex. thinks they knew no such right.

Pope *Damasus* in his letter to the oriental Prelates, which *Theodoret* gives in his history, *Lib. 5. Cap. 10.* says: “ Whereas your charity most honored sons gives
 “ due reverence to the Apostolic See, you thereby do
 “ honor to yourselves: for though we hold the princi-
 “ pal place in the Church, where the Apostle sitting
 “ has taught us to steer; we notwithstanding acknow-
 “ ledge ourselves unfit for such a dignity.”

That the great *Theodoret* did not think the Pope assuming in saying that he held the principal place in the Church, we know: for immediately before the insertion of this letter he says: “ the celebrated *Damasus*, a man worthy of eternal praise, as soon as he
 “ heard that this heresy began to spread, did not only
 “ depose and excommunicate *Apollinaris*, but also *Timo-*
 “ *thy* his disciple, and gave notice to the Bishops of
 “ the East by letters, which letters I have thought ne-
 “ cessary to insert in this history.”

Apollinaris was Bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, and his disciples chose one of their party, *Timothy*, to fill the patriarchal See of Alexandria; they were both deposed and excommunicated by Pope *Damasus*. This we know from the oriental writers.

Innocent the 1st. in his letter to the Council of Milevis, which is the 93d amongst St. *Austin’s* Epistles, says: “ You diligently and meetly attend to the Apo-
 “ stolical honor; to the honor of him, on whom be-
 “ sides these things which are without, the care of all
 “ Churches is incumbent: you observe the form of the
 “ ancient rule—which you know has been observed by
 the whole world with us.

And in his Epistle to the Council of Carthage, the

91st amongst *St. Austin's*, he says : “ that the Roman
“ See is the fountain and head of all other churches.”

The century writers pretend that *St. Innocent* assumed too much. Men who do not spare *Peter* 'tis not surprising that they should censure his successors ; but *St. Austin*, an African Prelate, indisputably the most learned man of his age, says of these letters of *Innocent*, in his Epistle to *Paulinus* the 106th : “ He answered
“ us on all these transactions in such a manner as became the Prelate of the Apostolical See.” Were the century writers better informed of the rights and privileges of the African Church than *St. Austin* ?

The writer passes unnoticed passages which are adduced from the first Epistle of *Clement*, the third of *Anacletus*, the first of *Alexander*, of *Pius*, of *Anicetus*, of *Victor*, of *Zephyrinus*, the second, of *Calixtus*, the first, of *Lucius*, of *Melchiades*, and of *Marius*. He also passes in silence the letters of *Leo* the Great, of *Gregory* and all succeeding Pontiffs ; he has confined himself to these testimonies, which are warranted by cotemporary writers of greatest note. Against which no objection can be stated which is not offensive to common sense.

The Ex. has recourse to *St. Cyprian's* authority, in order to establish his pretended equality of Bishops. He could not have been more unlucky in his choice : they are not detached sentences from the works of that celebrated writer, which are adduced in support of Catholic doctrine ; but whole books professedly written to demonstrate the unity of the Church, and the unity of the priesthood descending from *St. Peter* : In his book on the unity of the Church, after having shewn by the most conclusive reasoning, that the Church is essentially *one*. He says, “ that as a visible mark of this unity, Christ built his Church
“ upon *St. Peter*, and gave the power of his keys to
“ him, though he also gave power to all his Apostles
“ he would have it take its rise from one, and settled
“ the

“ the whole upon that foundation” He lays down as a general rule in matters of faith, that, fact is to be assumed as proof; he then produces as a well-known fact the Church founded by J. Christ upon St. Peter, from whence its unity is manifest; from this known principle he infers that the man, who deserts this Church is un sanctified, an alien, an enemy; he cannot have God for his father, who hath not the Church for his mother: “ who, (says he,) is so profi-
 “ gate and abandoned as to imagine that the unity
 “ which subsists in heaven may be broken on earth?
 “ that the Church of Christ, which is always described
 “ as one, may be divided into many? to believe that
 “ this is possible is gross absurdity; and to attempt it is
 “ flagrant impiety, our Lord, (says he,) tells us there
 “ shall be one fold and one shepherd.”

In his dispute with Pope *Stephen*, on the baptism of sectaries, an abstruse and difficult question, which was not at that time ultimately determined by an express declaration of the Church, St. *Cyprian* menaced by the Pope for adhering to what the Pope knew to be erroneous, though St. *Cyprian* thought it a matter of meer discipline, dropped some unguarded expressions against his superior, but never called his authority in question.

St. *Cyprian* did not believe the Pope infallible, nor do many Catholics to this day. That is meer matter of opinion; he thought his own opinion of the invalidity of baptism without the pale of the Church founded on the Scriptures; and to consult the Scriptures alone without having recourse to tradition, which determines the intended sense of the Scriptures, he was not wrong. That tradition was not then expressly declared by the Church. If it had been from the principles which St. *Cyprian* lays down in his book of the Church and other works, we are authorized to say that he would have submitted to it—hence St. *Austin*, his countryman and great admirer, says of him, quoting

these words of *Cyprian* in a Council which he had assembled at Carthage, and to which the Ex'rs. learned author, as he calls him, seems to allude: "since there
 " is none of us who has constituted himself Bishop
 " of Bishops, or by tyrannical terror obliges his col-
 " leagues to obedience since each Bishop has the free
 " disposal of his own power for the liberty of his opi-
 " nion not to be judged by any other, but we all expect
 " the judgment of J. Christ, who has the power of pre-
 " posing us in the government of his Church, and
 " judging us for our actions." "I believe, (said St.
 " *Austin*,) *Lib. 3. de Bap. Cap. 3.* in these questions,
 " which have not yet been clearly discussed.—Thus
 St. *Austin* explains St. *Cyprian's* opinion.

'Tis not necessary to inform the reader that St. *Cyprian* spoke of the Bishops then assembled at Carthage, of whom certainly none was Bishop of Bishops, whom he himself as primate of Numidia, and president of the Assembly, invited to give their thoughts freely on what he believed meer matter of opinion or discipline, on which, before any public decision of the Church every man had a right to speak his sentiments. 'Tis true he alludes to St. *Stephen's* threats, which he considers as tyrannical, and depriving Bishops of the liberty of opinion in a question not yet decided; but that he never denied the authority of the Roman See in matters of faith and universal discipline, is manifest to demonstration from different parts of his works: his book on the unity of the Church is expressly written on that subject, in it he states the Roman See as the root, and all other subordinate Churches as the Branches.—The branches are evidently dependent on the root.

In his letter to *Cornelius*, then Pope, he says:—
 " Sects and schisms result from this only, that obedience
 " is not paid to the priest of God; nor is it considered
 " that there is but one priest of God for the time, and
 " one judge for the time in the place of Christ, to
 " whom, if according to divine instruction, the whole
 " fraternity

“fraternity obeyed, no one would disturb the college of priests.”—*Lib. i. Epis. 3.*

St. *Cyprian* shews that there is but one Priest in the Catholic Church to whom all others owe obedience; that disobedience to him is the source of heresy and schism. This is the writer whom the Ex. quotes for the equality of Bishops! in the same Epistle he calls the Roman Church the See of St. *Peter*, and the principal Church from which the unity of the priesthood arises.

In a second Epistle to the same Pope, he says of the ill-fated men, who were engaged in the schism of *Novatien*.—“We lately sent our colleagues that they might compose to the unity of the Catholic Church these members of the rent body; but the obstinate and inflexible perverseness of the adverse party has not only refused the embrace of the root and mother, but also has formed to itself an adulterous and opposite head without the pale of the Church.”—*Lib. 2. Epis. 10.*

Novatien himself, the Antipope, St. *Cyprian* calls: “a deserter of the Church, an enemy to all tenderness, an absolute murderer of penance, a teacher of pride, a corrupter of truth, a destroyer of charity.” What would he have said of the Saxon Antipope, who not only abolished penance, but raised Epicurean sensuality on its ruins?

In a letter to the people, he says: “there is one God, one Christ, one Church, one chair founded by the voice of the Lord on *Peter*, another altar, a new priesthood besides that one altar, and that one priesthood cannot be erected. He that gathers elsewhere scatters.”—*Lib. 1. Ep. 8.*

Finally, as a direct contradiction to this Ex. and his learned author, St. *Cyprian*, in his letter to St. *Stephen*, which is still extant in his third book, 13th Epistle, exhorts the Pope to order the then Bishop of Arles, *Marcian*, to be deposed, and a successor provided for that

that See. "Inform us, (continues St. *Cyrian*,) if you please, who is made Bishop of Arles in place of *Marcian*, that we may know to whom we are to send letters of communion, and direct our brethren."

It may not be amiss to inform the Catholic reader that though St. *Stephen* threatened to excommunicate both St. *Cyprian* and St. *Firmilian* the learned Bishop of *Cesarea* and other Prelates, who thought the baptism of sectaries invalid, he did not put the threat in execution: of this we have the testimonies of *Eusebius* and St. *Austin*. The former says, *Lib. 7. Cap. 5.* that St. *Dyonisius* of Alexandria interceded and obtained a respite; and St. *Austin* says: "Stephen thought of excommunicating them but being endued with the bowels of holy charity he judged it better to abide in union the peace of Christ was victorious in their hearts."

The Ex. says, *p. 75*, that the high authority of the See of Rome was totally unknown for many centuries after Christ; and *p. 77*, he tells us that St. *Irenus* and other Prelates early expressed their resentment and censure against these encroachments—did they express their resentment against a thing that was totally unknown? St. *Irenus* is a writer of the second century; he severely censured what he thought an inexpedient and ill-timed exercise of Pope *Victor's* jurisdiction, who seriously threatened, if he did not actually excommunicate the oriental Bishops for celebrating Easter on the same day with the Jews; but no man was more submissive to that very authority, the abuse of which he censured than *Irenus* himself.

How this Ex. has discovered the ignorance of these early times is not easy to surmise: he does not seem to have read a line of the works of these celebrated writers, whom the Christian world revered. Does he intend to persuade us that these men who were threatened with an excommunication knew nothing of the Pope's authority?

The Ex. states the immoral lives of some Popes as an objection to their jurisdiction. This objection deserves no answer: the heathens knew that the powers of public men did not depend on their personal qualities: virtue adorns the man, and vice disfigures him, but neither the one nor the other gives the powers of office or destroys them.

In his abuse of Popes he agrees with his ally—that's a favourite theme. This eminent writer from whom they borrow, is in all appearance the infamously famous retailer of slander, *Bower*, or *Aretin* of impudent memory. If the Ex. or his associate had studied ethics, they would have known that the man, who in order to defame, confidently advances that for truth, which he does not know to be truth, is a calumniator, a term which is in a particular manner applied to the enemy of man. All vague assertions only expose the malevolence of the writer; they require no refutation.

The Ex. under pretence of instructing Mr. B. betrays the most profound ignorance of history. Mr. B. did not want to be informed that the Popes were elected by the Clergy with the consent and approbation of the people, and in latter times with the consent of the Emperor before the institution of Cardinals; but the writer informs this Ex. that the General Assembly at Rome were heathens for near 300 years after the death of Christ; that during that period neither the nobility nor burgeses had any thing to do with the elections of Popes: they were elected by the Clergy and the Bishops of the adjacent Sees, as were all Catholic Bishops during that interval. He also begs leave to inform this Ex. that spiritual powers are not conferred by meer election, which only designates the person thought the best qualified for the office by the electors; but by the external ceremony of inauguration and consecration instituted by J. Christ, from whom all spiritual powers are derived.

This Ex. who believes nothing but what is expressly

fly declared in Scripture, will find no such right as that of appointing their spiritual Pastors given to laymen: in the Old Testament, *Moses*, who was himself a priest, by the express order of God anointed *Aaron* and his son *Eleazar* after him without consulting the people; and during the Jewish dispensation the priesthood was exclusively confined to the family of *Aaron*. The prince and people sometimes removed one of that family from his office and substituted another of the same family; but they never pretended to consecrate the priest, or confer on him the powers which were exclusively confined to the priestly office: in the new law J. Christ himself in person chose his Apostles, conferred on them their spiritual powers, and sent them in the same manner to institute other ministers of his church: "as the father sent me so I send you."—*John* xxi. That is, as the father sent me to preach and teach and to appoint others, so I also send you to preach and teach and appoint others in the same manner. Thus the Apostles understood him,—hence we find them instituting ministers in the different churches, which they founded, and authorizing Pastors without consulting the people.—*Acts* xiv. 25. *Kemonitius* and his associates pretend that the participle *Cheirotonésantes* signifies to elect by holding up hands; if so the Apostles elected the ministers by holding up their own hands; because *Cheirotonésantes* is said of *Paul* and *Barnaby*, not of the people. To pass unnoticed the arrogance of a smatterer in Greek, who, because with the assistance of his Grammar and Lexicon he makes a shift to translate a few lines of *Anacreon* or *Euripides*, thinks he knows the force of the Greek terms better than a *Chrysofom*, a Greek author whose style is compared to that of *Plato*, by some judges. *St. Chrysofom* in his 14th Homily explaining the Acts of the Apostles, on his text says: "*touto esti Cheirotomia*" That is ordination. And in his 10th Homily on the first Epistle to *Timothy* he asks why the Apostle after ha-
ving

ving enumerated the qualifications of a Bishop, passes immediately to the Deacon? to which he replies, that the qualifications of the Bishop and the Priest are similar, as the Bishop surpasses the Priest but by the power of ordination: *ten gar Cheirotoneian monen "anabekekasi."*

The Council of Nice composed of Greek and Asiatic Prelates, makes use of the same term *Cheirotoneia* to signify ordination in their letter to the Church of Alexandria, which *Theodoret*, a Greek writer of note, gives in history. *Lib. 1. v. Cap. 9.* The Prelates say of *Meletius*, that he shall have no authority to give ordination *Cheirotoneia*, or to advance any man to any ecclesiastical function. If this right belonged to the people, the Council would have been very wrong in depriving *Meletius* that Egyptian Bishop, of a right vested not in him but in others. In them early days, tho' there were some reformers but not of the modern school, 'twas thought that the right of instituting subordinate pastors was vested in the chief Pastors; the sheep had not yet learnt to conduct the shepherd.

This is so true that though the immediate office of the first Deacons was to superintend the distribution of alms, the Apostles directed the people to chuse men, whom they thought best qualified for that purpose; but reserved to themselves the right of instituting them: "'tis not right, say the Apostles, that we should neglect the word of God to serve at the tables, consider therefore brethren seven men, having good testimony from yourselves whom we may constitute over this necessary work: *ous katastesomen epi tēs chereias tautes*;"—*Acts vi. 2, 3.*—but the ministers of the altar were instituted by the Apostles without consulting the people; and strangers frequently sent from afar, who were not known to the people. *St. Paul* gives repeated instructions to his disciple *Timothy*, Abp. of Ephesus, on that subject; and tells *Titus* another of his disciples that he had left him at Crete expressly to

correct what was wanted there, and constitute priests over the cities of that jurisdiction according to the directions which he (the Apostle) had given him: “*ina katasteses kata Polin Presbuteros.*”

We know from authentic history, not from heathen poets or philosophers, that *Linus* was appointed Bishop of Rome. By the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*.—*Iren. 3. Lib. 3. Cap. 3*, that *Polycarp* was instituted Bishop of Smyrna, by the Apostle *St. John*.—*Tert. de Pres.*

Eusebius informs us that *Timothy* was instituted Bishop of Ephesus, and *Titus* Bishop of Crete, by the Apostle *Paul*.—*Lib. 3. Cap. 4*.

Nicephorus says, that a certain *Plato* was instituted Bishop of a town of barbarians named *Mirmena*, by the Apostle *St. Matthew*; that *St. Mark* was made Bishop of Alexandria by *St. Peter*.

We know from *Leo the Great*—*Epist. ad Dios. 81*. that a right of suffrage even in the elections of particular Bishops was neither assumed nor claimed by the laity in the early ages of the Church; their testimony of the man's morals was admitted; but the right of election was confined to the Bishops of the province and the clergy of the vacant Church. *St. Paul* in his instructions to *Timothy* requires the testimony even of these, who were not of the Church: “he ought to have a good testimony from those, who are without, least he fall into reproach:”—*iii. 6*.—The Apostle gives no instructions to the laity about the election of spiritual Pastors: he knew 'twas not their business.

From giving testimony of the morals of candidates in some Churches the laity began to pretend a right to vote on elections, which was considered, as 'twas in reality, an abuse, and checked: the 13th Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* in Phrygia prohibits it in these terms: “It must not be permitted to the multitude to make the election of those, who are to be promoted to the priesthood.” And in the second Council of Nice, third Canon, an election made by magistrates is declared

declared null: "every election of Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, by magistrates is to remain null: for he who is promoted to a Bishoprick must be elected by Bishops."

There is no prohibition to be found against the laity, either princes or people, which forbids them to ordain Bishops or Priests: such an extravagant assumption, or rather impudent usurpation of power, never crossed the wildest imagination before the æra of *Luther*: an unfortunate period, fruitful in monstrous absurdities; productive of all the different sects, which now disfigure the face of Christianity, and are continually encreasing.

The abuse which this Ex. lavishes not only on Popes but on the whole body of the Catholic Clergy, of whom perhaps he does not know a single man is refuted by contempt: slander is no substitute to argument.

In his xith. Proposition the Ex. pretends to prove from the internal evidence of Catholic doctrine that there is no infallibility in the Catholic Church. His reasoning on the subject is extremely curious: "if it be said, (says he, p. 80,) that the Church is infallible her decisions must be right however absurd or weak they may be." He seems to forget that infallibility excludes absurdity; that to couple them together in the same phrase is nonsense. He might reason in the same manner against the infallibility of J. Christ, with equal force and propriety: thus if J. Christ be infallible his decisions must be right, however absurd or wicked; he's told that infallibility removes the idea of absurdity and wickedness.

Learned writers, says the Ex. have proved that Rome imposes doctrines contrary to Scripture. By learned writers he seems to understand some pedagogues muttering a few words of Greek and Latin to an admiring populace, and declaiming against the harlot of Babylon. When these proofs are produced we shall

discuss them. Hitherto we have seen nothing like proof.

The Ex. instances one doctrine contrary to Scripture as he imagines, that is the invocation of saints and angels. In proof of this he musters up a number of texts to shew that soveraign homage is due to God alone, what no Catholic ever denied or even doubted. He adds with some confidence, that there is not an instance in Scripture of any man's invoking either Saint or Angel. This is not the first specimen he has given of the most profound ignorance of this very Scripture, in which he must find all truths of religion. Let him read the forty eighth chapter of Genesis, and he will see the patriarch *Jacob*, a man of some authority, seriously and solemnly invoking an angel, and acknowledging his protection through life: "may the angel of the Lord, who delivered me from all evil bless these boys:"—"*ha Maleak ha goel othi mi cal rah jibraek eth ha Naarium.*" Gen. lviii. 16.—Would the Ex. permit this holy patriarch, who candidly acknowledges that the angel had delivered him from every evil, to say once in his life: *Holy Angel pray for me?* or *Holy Angel protect me?* The patriarch done something more, for we read in the thirty-second of Genesis, that he prayed an Angel to bless him, and *Moses*, a man of some credit adds, "that the Angel did bless him:"—"*va jibarek otho sham.*"

Has not this Ex. read the express order given by God himself to the Jews? "Behold, I send my Angel to protect you in the way, and to conduct you to the place which I have prepared. Beware of him and hear his voice; don't neglect him for he will not bear your prevarications, my name is in him:" "*Hishamer mi Phanaio ve shemah Be colo al thamer Boki lo jifa le phishah chem ki shemi be kirbo.*" Though this Angel was expressly sent to protect and conduct the Jews, and they were strictly ordered to hear and obey him, they could not without idolatry in our Ex's. opinion

opinion say : *Holy Angel protect us* : This is a stretch of stupidity—it baffles description.

That the Angels do pray for us, we know from several passages in Scripture : in the prophecy of *Zacharias* we read : i. 12. “ And the Angel replied and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Juda, with which thou hast been angry now these 70 years.”—*ve jahan Maleak Jehovah vajomar Jehovah tofibaoth had Mathai Attha lo, therechem eth Jerushalem veeth ha rei jehoudah asher zehemathazeh shibebim shanah.*”

The Angels carried the soul of *Lazarus* to the place of rest.—*Luke xvi. 23.*

At the last day Christ will send his Angels and they will collect his elect from the four winds, and from the summit of the heavens.—*Matt. xxiv. 31.*

St. John saw an Angel offering to God the prayers of the Saints.—*Rev. viii. 3, 4.*

That the Saints are similar to the Angels we know from the express declaration of J. Christ : “ they are as the Angels of God in Heaven : ”—“ *os Angeloi tou theou en ourano eisi.* ”—*Matt. xxii.* “ They are equal to the Angels. ”—“ *ifangeloi gar eisi.* ”—*Luke xx.*

As power is given to the Angels over nations, so power is given to the Saints who live with Christ. This truth is expressly revealed by *St. John* :—“ To him who overcomes and observes my works to the end, will I give power over nations, and he will rule them with a rod of iron. ”—*Rev. ii. 26, 27.*

St. Paul severely censures a superstitious worship which was paid to the Angels by the Colossians, deceived by some false teachers, who induced them to believe that there was no access to God but through the mediation of the Angels, thereby destroying the mediatorship of J. Christ, through whom alone and exclusively the Apostle shews in the first and second chapter of his Epistle, we have access to God ; and that he is
the

the head of Angels as of men. Of this truth no Catholic ever doubted; nor did any Catholic ever pray to an Angel or Saint as to a Mediator, but simply as an intercessor, whose prayers are more acceptable to God than ours. To God we pray for mercy, grace, and glory, which we hope to obtain through the mediatorship of Jesus Christ; to the Angels we pray for none of these graces: we ask their prayers as more effectual than ours, and we have already shewn that they pray for us incessantly. Hence a religious honor has been at all times paid to them, of this we have many instances in the Scriptures besides these already adduced; *Josue* being told by the Angel that he was Prince of the army of the Lord, fell on his face and adored the Angel: "*jiphol Jehoshua el phanaio, vajisthacou.*" *Josue* could not mistake the Angel for his God, because the Angel had told him that he himself was chief of the army of God: "*ani sar tsiha Jehovah.*"—*Jos. v.* The Angel exacted a yet greater homage: he ordered *Josue* to loose his shoes from his feet, because the place on which he stood was holy, and *Josue* done as he was ordered.

The place was not otherwise holy, but because 'twas sanctified by the presence of the Angel.

We find *John* the Evangelist falling prostrate before the Angel, (see ixth. of Rev.) The Ex. who is singularly unlucky in his references, says, the Angel refused to receive this homage—true, the Angel did, and thereby commends his modesty and humility in refusing to receive such homage from so great and highly favoured an Apostle as *St. John*, the beloved disciple of Jesus Christ; but he will permit us to believe that *St. John* knew something of the Christian religion; that he thought he might without being guilty of idolatry pay a reverential worship to the Angel? if not, *St. John* was highly criminal in repeating the offence: for he tells us that again when the vision was finished: "I *John*, who heard and saw these things; and after
" I had

“ I had heard and seen I fell to adore before the feet of
 “ the Angel who shewed me these things.”—*Rev.* xvii.
 St. *John* was therefore convinced that the Angel’s
 modesty did not free him from the obligation of pay-
 ing honor to whom honor is due, according to that in-
 struction of St. *Paul* to the *Romans*.—xiii. 7. This
 maxim which the Apostle practised he taught: *Origen*,
 a very early and well informed writer speaks of it as
 an universal practice in the Church: “ the Angel of
 “ the Christian offers his prayers to God through the
 “ only High Priest, (J. C.) himself, also praying
 “ for him, who is committed to his charge.”—*Lib.* 8.
Cen. Celsus. In the fifth book he says, “ that the
 “ Angels carry up our prayers to God, and bring down
 his blessings to us; in his first Homily on *Ezekiel*, he
 offers a prayer to the Angel of a person who is going to
 be baptized that the Angel would instruct him.

The holy martyr *Nemesian* and his companions
 writing to St. *Cyprian*, say, “ let us assist each other
 “ by our prayers, and beg that we may have God
 “ and Christ, and the Angels favourers in all our ac-
 “ tions.”—*Ep. Cy.* 77.

Gregory Nazianzen says: “ the angelical powers
 “ are a succour to us in all that’s good.”—*Orat.* 4 v.
 In his poems he prays the good Angels to receive his
 “ soul at the hour of his death.”—*Cam.* 22.

To avoid prolixity let the Ex. and his friends take
Joseph Mede’s testimony. This zealous Protestant, in
 order to shew that the Papal power was the kingdom
 of Antichrist, has collected the concurring testimony of
 many early writers in support of the doctrine of the
 invocation of Saints and Angels.—*Book* 3. *Ep.* 16. &c.

In his exposition of the Prophet *Daniel*, explaining
 these words of the prophecy: “ and he adored the
 “ God *Maozim*, and he will raise forts to *Maozim*.”
Mede in these words discovers the Pope to be Anti-
 christ, and the Saints the forts of *Maozim*. Why so?
 Because, says he, *Basil* preached to the people that the
 relics

relics of the forty martyrs were towers by which the city was defended;—*Ora. in 40. Mar.*—and *Chrysostom* said, *Hom. 32. ad Rom.*—“That the relics of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were to the city of Rome towers “more assured than ten thousand ramparts.” *Mede* says that St. *Hilary* found ramparts in the Angels; he cites St. *Gregory*, of Nyssa, *Gennadius*, *Evagrius*, *Eucher*, *Theodoret*, and the liturgy of the Greeks to the same purpose. To these *Jurieu*, not less zealous than *Mede*, and equally intent on proving the Pope to be Antichrist, and that his reign would continue but 1260 years, adds St. *Ambrose*, who said that the martyrs Sts. *Jervais* and *Protais* were the tutelar angels of Milan, he might have added St. *Gregory*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Austin*, the author of that Chapter of the Book of Kings, in which 'tis related that a dead man was raised to life by touching the prophet *Elisha's* bones, 4 b. of Kings, xiii. 21. The pious King *Josias* who respected the bones of the prophet, who had foretold the destruction of *Bethel*—4 b. of Kings, xxiii. 18.—and *Moses* himself who returning from Egypt, took with him the bones of the great patriarch *Joseph*; in a word all these great men of primitive times, whom the world has, does, and will continue to revere, whilst the prophecies of *Mede*, of *Jurieu* of *Lutther* himself, and a croud of scribbling enthusiasts amuse children and old wives, and afford a subject of contempt and derision to all men of real science.

Are we assured, (says the Ex. p. 82.) that the Angels are in a situation to hear us? We are assured by J. Christ in very plain language that they rejoice at the conversion of a sinner;—*Luke xv. 10.*—and common sense assures us that they don't rejoice at an event of which they know nothing: two things therefore they must know: who are sinners, and who are sincere converts: for no reason can be assigned why their knowledge should be confined to a particular sinner...

'Tis matter of surprise how the first reformers could

could have prevailed on their deluded followers to believe that we Catholics who publicly profess our faith in one God, should notwithstanding adore many Gods; or that, whilst we know, and confess, that sovereign homage and supreme worship is due to the Creator alone, we should pay this homage to any of his creatures. The absurdity is so gross, that we can't sufficiently admire the stupidity of these who permit themselves to be duped by it; but 'tis a prodigy, that this scaffolding, however necessary to the architects of that work of darkness, which misrepresentation had formed, should yet continue notwithstanding the numberless dissertations published by Catholic writers, in which the essential difference between the veneration, which we Catholics have for Angels and Saints, and the relative respect we shew their relics and images, and that sovereign homage and supreme honor which we pay our God, is so clearly stated that even ignorance cannot mistake it. There must be some hideous deformities in the work, when scaffolding of such monstrous aspect is found necessary to conceal them.

The very form of prayer which we make to the Virgin and other Saints carries its justification: *Holy Mary pray for us*. Such a form of prayer addressed to Almighty God would be downright blasphemy—an abomination. Why so? because a prayer in this form shews we consider the person to whom 'tis addressed as dependent on the will of a superior power. If at any time a Catholic should offer a petition to an Angel or Saint in a more absolute form, the sense in which 'tis understood is manifest from the subject matter. There are many examples in scripture: 'tis said of *Josue*:—“was not the sun stopped in his anger, and one day made as two?” *Ecc.* 46. 4.; of *Elias*: “that he cast down fire from heaven thrice:” *xlvi.* 3. “that he raised a dead man from below, from the lot of death,” *ibid.* 5: of *Elisha*: “that in his life he did great wonders, and miracles in his death,” *ibid.*

“ that his dead body, prophesied, alluding to the man who was enlivened by his bones.” ’Tis said of him, 2 Kings, viii. 1. “ *Elisha* spoke to the woman whose “ child he had made to live,” that is, raised from the dead, as is related *ch.* iv. and in the viiith. the inspired writer says: “ as *Giezi* related to the King how *Elisha* “ had raised a dead man, the woman appeared whose “ child he had raised to life.” This mode of speaking is not uncommon in the New Testament: thus Acts v. 12. we read: by the hands of the Apostles many signs and prodigies, *semeia kai terata*: “ were wrought among the people.” Did the sacred person think that *Josue* had any power to stop the course of the sun? *Elias* any power to bring down fire from the heaven? He or *Elisha* any power to raise the dead? or that in the hands of the Apostles there was any power to work such signs and prodigies? No, but the subject matter explained the sense in which their words must be understood: that all these miracles were wrought by God at the instance of his servants, whose veracity and sanctity he thus attested; hence the inspired writers ascribed to the Saints themselves these miracles, which God wrought by their ministry.

That a religious respect is due and was always shewn to Angels, Saints, relics and images of Saints, is manifestly revealed in Scripture: we find the Patriarch *Jacob* praying an Angel to bless him. *Gen.* xxxii. *Josue* adoring an Angel. *Jos.* v. The Evangelist *St. John* prostrating himself more than once before the Angel who spoke to him. *Rev.* xvii.

We have some striking examples of the religious respect shewn to Saints both in the Old and New Testament: ’tis said of *Elias*, 1 Kings, xvii. that: “ When “ *Abdias* was in the way *Elias* met him, who, when “ he knew him, fell on his face and said: this you, my “ Lord *Elias*?” and 2 Kings, i. ’tis said that after fire from heaven had consumed two Captains and their companies

companies in punishment of their disrespect to the Prophet, a third being sent by the King, "he bent his knees before *Elias*, and prayed him, saying "now I beseech you have mercy on my soul, and on the souls of these fifty men." Or as it is in the Hebrew text; *thicar na naphshi ve nephesh abadika elleh chamishim be heneika. Let my life and the life of thy servants these fifty, be of some value in thy eyes.* In the Acts of the Apostles 'tis related that the Apostles were together in Solomon's porch, but that none of the faithful dared to join company with them, "the people magnified them:" *Acts. v. 13.* The respect shewn the Prophets and the Apostles must have been of a religious nature; they possessed no power or place under Government, to which a civil respect is due.

In like manner we read that the greatest possible respect was paid to the Ark of the Covenant, which was but an image of the throne of God, and the most exemplary punishment inflicted on those who failed in that respect. This punishment was extended even to the heathens: "The Ark of the God of Israel, said they, shall not stay with us; for his hand is heavy upon us, and upon *Dagon* our God," *1 Sam. v.* And in the next chapter we see that 50,000 Jews were struck with death for some irreverence towards the Ark. God also punished *Oza* with death for presuming to put his hand to the Ark: "And the indignation of the Lord was kindled against *Oza*, and he struck him for his rashness, and he died there before the Ark of God." *2 Sam. vi. 7.*

We know the veneration which was conceived for the Brazen Serpent, on which who ever looked when bit by the fiery serpents, was instantly healed.—*Num. xxi.* The Saviour informs us that this serpent was a figure of himself on his Cross: "as *Moses* lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up."—*John iii. 14.*

The respect and veneration shewn to relics and mi-

acles wrought by God to authorize this respect is clearly revealed both in the Old and New Testament: *Moses* going out of Egypt took with him the bones of the Patriarch *Joseph*, Ex. xiii. *Elisha*, when his master *Elias* was translated in a fiery chariot by Angels, on his return struck the waters of Jordan with the mantle which had fallen from the prophet, saying: "where now is the God of *Elias* and the waters were divided hither and thither, and *Elisha* passed over." 2 *Kings*, ii. 14. What Catholic ever expressed such confidence in any relic as this holy prophet did in the mantle of *Elias*? and we see God wrought a stupendous prodigy to authorize this confidence and attest the sanctity of his servant. A more stupendous miracle was wrought to attest the sanctity of *Elisha* himself.

'Tis thus related by the inspired writer: "and *Elisha* died and they buried him, and plunderers from *Moab* came into the land the same year, and some who were burying a man saw the plunderers, and cast the body into the sepulchre of *Elisha*, and when it touched the bones of *Elisha* the man came to life and stood on his feet." 2 *Kings*, xiii. 20, 21. Would the Ex. permit this man, who was raised from the dead, or his friends to have some respect for these venerable bones to which he was so much indebted.

In the New Testament we find many miracles ascribed to relics: thus *Acts* xix. 11.—"God wrought special miracles by the hand of *Paul*, so that even there were brought from his body handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them and the wicked spirits went out of them." If one of these handkerchiefs or aprons had relieved the Ex. from a mortal disease would he have thrown it aside to rot? would he shew no sort of respect to an instrument to which he was indebted for a continuation of life? Why then accuse us Catholics of superstition for shewing that respect to the relics of Saints, which he himself in similar circumstances would have shewn, and must have

have shewn if he retained any remains of gratitude? Does he imagine that we think any inanimate creature possessed of inherent powers of action? that we think relics capable of producing the effects, which are ascribed to them? that any invisible agent resides in them? if so, the writer begs leave to undeceive him, assuring him that Catholics, were in possession of common sense and christianity, before the reformation was thought of; that if the words of J. Christ be true, they will continue possessed of both after the reformation is forgotten: "every plant which my heavenly father has not planted will be eradicated." *Pasa Phutcia en ouk ephuteuson o Pater mou ouranios ekrisothesetai.* — *Matt. xv. 13.*

The Ex. seems surpris'd that Mr. B. should object to novelties in religion: novelty, he says, has nothing to do with truth. No—but novelties of man's invention are not revealed truths; they are not truths of religion. Does he pretend to confound Newton's Astronomical Discoveries, or Priestly's Lectures on Electricity, with Truths of Religion? All novelties are meer human inventions; they were not taught by J. Christ, nor did he order his ministers to teach them: his terms are: "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." *Matt. ult.* and *St. John* closing the Revelations, says: "if any man will add to these things, God will add to him the plagues written in this book," *Rev. ult. 18.*

St. Jude exhorts the faithful to persevere in the faith once delivered to the Saints, *St. Jude, i.* He did not think the additions of every fanatical enthusiast necessary.

The Protestant religion, says the Ex. p. 84, taking the Scriptures for its only rule and guide, is as old as Christianity. There are almost as many errors in this short sentence as there are words. The New Testament is not as old as Christianity.—This truth requires no proof: Christianity was established before there

there was a line of the New Testament written; parts of it were written forty or fifty years after. The Protestant does not take the Scriptures for a sole rule of faith: this has been shewn to demonstration more than once already, and the Ex. himself proves in the next page: in it he says: that the ministers direct their congregations to take God's word for their law; and that reason, which God gave them for their guidance as their best interpreter; hence 'tis evident that their own interpretation of the Scriptures, or as he had said elsewhere, their own fancy, is their sole rule of faith; but neither their interpretation nor their fancy is the word of God, and the man who thinks it, flatters and deceives himself.

That infallible supremacy which we so justly refuse to the Popish Church we do not claim to ourselves—says our Ex. *p.* 85. By this he admits that his Church may deceive and be deceived; that 'tis not the pillar and ground of truth which St. *Paul* expressly calls the Church of Christ; that 'tis not that Church, in which J. Christ himself teaches by his ministers, according to his promise: “I am with you to the end of time,” in a word, that 'tis not the Church of J. Christ out of which there is no salvation.

The remainder of this Pamphlet is replete with personal strictures on the author of the Letter of Instruction, which it pretends to examine: Mr. *Burke* may reply to it if he thinks proper, the writer will not; he concludes with this remark on that production: in it there are many vague assertions crowded together without order or proof; many texts adduced either foreign to the subject, or conclusive against the Ex. not one argument in the Letter of Instruction invalidated or even weakened, though that letter seems to be drawn up in haste and the author would do well to revise it.