

REMARKS

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.

Chohàmar Jehovah, imedou al derachim ou reouve shaelou lenithboth hòlam éi zeh derek
ha tòb ou lechou bah ou mitfeou margoaha le naphshechim. — IER. vi.

Thus saith 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 leopards 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 leopard; 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. (*Ex. 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 disclaimer 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 Pre-
 late, might excite some sentiments of native pride in
 these Irish Papists, and wisely suppressed it. However,
 we who have not that boundless charity, which pre-
 vents vanity in others, at the expence of our own re-
 putation for veracity, and who know how to catch the
 lineaments of fraud and flattery, very naturally con-
 clude, 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 represent 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 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 accuser 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 preserving 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 Parliament; 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 objected 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 retent-

“ 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 court-
 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 Exchequer.”—*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 themselves, each man with forty five shillings in his pocket. Shortly after followed the dissolution of the great Abbeys; 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 abbeys, 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 sighing and groaning, to see her wealth exhausted, her money embased and mingled with copper, abbeys demolished which were the monuments of ancient piety, the blood of the nobility, prelates, papists, and protestants, promiscuously spilt, and the land embroiled in a war with Scotland.”—*Camb. Intro. Hist. of Eliz.*

The ministers employed in these scenes of sacrilegious plunder had recourse to means at which nature

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 leis “ 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 Protestant historian describes the men and measures employed 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 Canterbury, and some others as proper instruments for such a work ; and in his description he discloses such a complication of hell invented stratagems and monstrous 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 Bishoprics, "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 tissue, 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, "'twas 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 relicks 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, Virtus 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 work 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, Manuels, 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 extoilentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam & Catholicam fidem, quam superimus exposuimus condemnantes hereticos universos, quibuscumque nominibus censeantur: facies quidem diversas habentes sed Caudas ad invicem alligatas, quia de Vanitate conveniunt 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 heresy against the Holy Orthodox and Catholic Faith,”—whereas in the decree 'tis said:—“we excommunicate every heresy 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 clearfighted enough to discover any such thing : —“ I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other “ things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred “ Canons, 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 authorized 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 surprize, 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. *Alphonfus*, 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 omoiōmati 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*, “ 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 *Wesley* 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.

“and there was none who followed the house of *Da-*
vid but the tribe of *Juda*.” A more unlucky ex-
 ample Mr. S. could not have found to shew the in-
 competency of the people who rejected *Roboam*, and
 substituted *Jeroboam*, were guilty of any act of rebel-
 lion, 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 con-
 tradiction 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 *Ro-*
boam’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 de-
 “clared to be with himself he actually and universally
 “exercised: the three first, *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon*,
 “he appointed by name, and then established an heredi-
 “tary 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 sac-
 rifice, 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 *tu* 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'rs. 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 surprize 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 po-

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 incontestably 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 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 Janfenists? 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 iudicium est, in sacra Cænâ post Consecrationem & benedictionem, panem in illud ipsum Corpus J. C. vivum 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 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 *Chrysofoms*, 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 Cæfarea, 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 hebèlous kenophônias,*” *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*, *dichostasiai 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 religion.”—the first— another figment akin to this is, “that every (Christian) *may be saved in his own religion.* But this to one evil introduces another 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 established Church of England, not for a meer difference of opinion, but for an absolute disagreement in the doctrines 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 inconsistent 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 fundamental errors being taught in that Church, so true it is that this alone can justify the separation of any reformed Church from all other Churches.

When then our Ex. thus extends salvation indistinctly and indiscriminately to all descriptions of Protestants, he substitutes his private opinion to the authentic doctrine of the established Church, which expressly excludes 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 dam-

ning

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 reconcilable 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

“ 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. "Allthings 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 increased 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 katartismou ton agion.*" The Greek verb *katartiso* 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

setting 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 : “ *ὑπερ Χριστου ουν πρεσβυομεν ος του Θεου παραskalountos 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 “ *ὑπερ ου πρεσβυο*” “ 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 *Theffalonians* to hold fast the *oral traditions* "*paradoscis*" *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 jicarot lah lo jahaberenou tamé, ve liou 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 "*holck derek*," a common highway, 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 noéta*."—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 explanations; 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 apax paradotheisèi tois ágiois pistel*" 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

H

have

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 deposite 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

ceramental 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. *Chrysofome* asserts in his 69th Homily to the people, "that these things were not rashly instituted by the Apostles, that in the tremendous mysteries (Mass) 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 *Palæologus*, 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 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 “worshipped on the summit of his rod or sceptre” “*prof-kunesen 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 “*upotuposin* 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
“proly

“**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 of 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 confusion 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 mul-
 “ titude was silent then *James* answered say-
 “ ing: 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 faith-
 ful 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 for-
 bid 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 for-
 bidden 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 deci-
 ded 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 inno-
 vators 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 or-
 der; 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.

ties. 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 *Silas* 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 *phulassain*, 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 incontestibly 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. 5, 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 fallihood 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

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 placed 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 resurrection.”

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 controversy

verfy 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 transubstantiation, though not the real presence of J. Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. 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. *Guilmundas*, Lib. 3, near the end, says, “*notissimum est hoc tempore prius quam Berengarius insanisset, hujus modi vesanias nusquam fuisse.*”—“’Tis publicly known that before *Berengarius’s* madness such folly was no where.” And we know from *Paschasius* 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
Wiclef 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

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's. 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 encrease 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 instructs

structs 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 Thes. 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 writ-

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 Sesophisai*, 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 *Gamaliel*, 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'rs. 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 nowhere 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

N 2

distinctly

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 by 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.* 'T would 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 hitherto 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 sifthei Cohen*
 “ *jifmerou dahath vethorath jibakshou miphihou chi*
 “ *Maleak 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 flight 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 édraiôma 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 tó 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 ab-

solutely

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 he 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-
 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 fúgil*, 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 darkness. If the Church be the Assembly of Saints, why do you separate yourselves from it? to separate yourselves from the Assembly of the Saints is to acknowledge 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 Adly.* In the next edition of the Examination a refutation 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 Protestant version of the Bible, though he takes some texts from it. The translators themselves honestly acknowledge 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 Messiah 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 *rejorenou* 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,” *Pf.* 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 presbutmen.*” *2. Cor.* v. 20. “ As God exhorting by us *òs theou parakalountos di èmbn :*” This is manifestly a consequence of that authentic promise, which Christ made to his Apostles, that he would be with them teaching and baptizing 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 Zion” “ *chi mission thése 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 êrei 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 cin 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 mountains shall be moved and the earth shall tremble, but my mercy shall not depart from thee, and the covenant 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 Redeemer 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, faith the Lord, from henceforth and
 “ for ever. *I/. ix. 20, 21.* Here we have the most
 exprefs 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 Apof-
 tles ; and his words are in the mouth of her feed, that
 is, in the mouth of the immediate fucceffors of the Apof-
 tles whom they fpiritually begot by the word of God,
 as *St. Paul* fays: “ In J. Chrift. by the Gofpel I have
 “ begotten ye:”—“ *engar Chrifto Jefo dia tou Evange-*
 “ *liou Egoumus egenefa;*” *1 Cor. iv. 15.* and in the
 mouth of their feed’s feed, that is in the mouth of
 thefe who were fpiritually begotten by the immediate
 fucceffors of the Apoftles, and fo on, fays the prophet
 from now and for ever *meattha ve ad holam.* If this
 be not a pofitive 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 direktion of his di-
 vine fpirit, the Writer does not underftand the force of
 language. However, for the greater fatisfaction of the
 Ex. and his Ally, he begs to introduce a fpeaker of
 high authority on this fubject: J. Chrift himfelf fays
 that his divine fpirit will inherit his Church and re-
 main with her till the confummation : “ I will ask the
 “ Father and he will give you another Paraclete that
 “ he may remain with you for ever, *eis aiona:* the
 “ fpirit of truth.” *John xiv. 16.* The Apoftles were
 not to continue in this world for ever, the fpirit of
 truth muft therefore continue with them in their fuc-
 ceffors. The Saviour affigns the end for which this
 fpirit of truth is fent : “ when he comes the fpirit of
 “ truth he will lead you *odegefei* into all truth. *John*
xvi. 13. He had faid, *John xvi. 26,* “ the Paraclete,
 “ the H. Ghof, whom the father will fend in my name,
 “ will teach you all things and bring to your memory
 “ all the things which I have faid to you. From this
 paffage

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 *úpemnései 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 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 Apo-
 stle 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-
 ture 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 Jerusalem 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 *Ishaac*, 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 dissipated." *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." *1 Cor. xv. 25*. If J. Christ be a King to reign over his kingdom, as St. *Paul* says, till death be absorbed 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 *Zwinglius* had the assurance to contest this prerogative with him. *Zwinglius* 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 “*Zwinglius* 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 nonsense. 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. denies *Peter* to be a Rock.—Would he condescend to assign some other sense in which the epithet may be applied to *Peter*? Christ certainly intended to say something. 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 passage 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 subvert it. 'Tis known to every man who reads the scriptures, that justice was distributed at the gates of cities in them early times; that the public officers and councils were assembled there. Hence 'tis said in *Deuteronomy*, “and thou see that the judges vary within thy gates.” xvii. 1700

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

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 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 sordid 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
faints

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 disobeys 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 dissen-

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'r's 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 *Wesley* 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 cal 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 Apostlé 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 edraïoma 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 *Euseïus, 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 fetrenched, 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 spake to them, saying: all power is given to me in hea-*

“ *ven*

“ *ven and on earth ; go ye therefore and teach all nations, 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 consummation 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, *behold 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 insure 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 προφητεῖαι τους σοζομενας καθ' ἑμερον τῆ ἐκκλησία.*" Hence that article in the baptismal creed: *I believe the Catholic Church keeps 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 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 Bishops) 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 *Manichæans*, 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.

2^d *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 fall 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? *ejus sunt Scripturæ?*—*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 *Murcion* 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

“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 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 xvth. 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 subordination 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 religion, 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 adoption 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 thousand souls to that flock which Christ himself had formed 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." *Johr.* 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. "*ô de meizon úmon estai úmon diakonos.*" 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.”—*katakou- “ rientes ton 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, Cappadocia, 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-
 “ fas eis Epheson.*”—“ sent for the Priests of the
 “ Church,”—“ *meta kalefato tous prësbuterous tés Ec-
 “ clefiás.*”—*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*,” signifies
 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 “*poimante*” 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: “*эгουменος οςις ποιμανει τον ιων μου
 “ ισραελ.*” Thereby giving us to understand that the

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 intured 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," "*oikodomeſó 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,

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 surprise 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 "*proesttotes 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 ústereja tón 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 circumci- " sion."—*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, jancy, 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 indiscreet 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*, with-
 " stood 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,) be-
 " fore 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 see'st, 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 accor-
 " ding

“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.
 ’Twould 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 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 *Wicief'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 *Salemina* in Cyprus, a man of unquestionable authority, says: “the first in Rome were *Peter* and *Paul*—*Pan. Con. Heres. 17.*”

Chrysoptom 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 Wirtemberg. 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.*
& *sive 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 *Wicief*, 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 *Caus*, 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, lest he should seem to be equalled to his master.”

Theodoret, in his letter to Pope *Leō*, says, “ Rome has the sepulchres of the common fathers and teachers of truth, *Peter* and *Paul*.”

Chrysofom, in his 32nd Homily on the Epistle to the Romans, says: “ The Heavens are not more enlightened, 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: (E).”—*Tert. de. Pra.*”

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, *Vespasian* 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 *Aurontius*: “ 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 referring to his cross and being arrested he honored our Lord Jesus by his crucifixion.”

St. Jerome, a man of the most consummate erudition,

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

Athanasius, in his letter to the *Ascetics*, 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 asperged 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 lest the
 “other Apostles might erect and defend chairs to
 “themselves, so that he now is a schismatic and offen-
 “der, who sets up another against the only chair.” p. 25
 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 *Macro-*
bis, successor to *Euculpius*, who succeeded *Boniface*
 of Balli, and *Boniface* was successor to a *Victor Garbi-*
ensis, whom the Donatists had sent from Africa to
 Rome, to preside over their little separate Church in
 that city. To this *Optatus* replies, “can *Macrobis*
 “say that he sits in the chair of St. *Peter*, which per-
 “haps 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? *Macrobis* your
 “brother must then confess that he is seated in the
 “chair of *Euculpius*, *Boniface* of Balli, and *Victor*
 “*Garbiensis*. This *Victor* is a son without a father, a
 “disciple without a master, a successor without a pre-
 “decessor.”

Whatever the Ex. or his Ally may think of the au-
 thority of *Optatus*, his reasoning is irresistible. *Parme-*
 nian

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 *Anastasius* 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 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.”—*ton journal prôtous.*

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

The Ex. defends 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 *Damaseus*, 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 ós oikeia mele proskalesasthe*. Tom. 2. Com. p. 962. C. D. In his letter to them Prelates *Damaseus* twice calls them his most honoured Children. "*vioi timifatatoi*," *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 ópou. eisi duó é treis sunégmenoi eis tou auto uónoma ekeiephé*
B b " *einai*

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

Athanasius, in his letter to the *Ascetics*, 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 asperfed 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 lest the
 "other Apostles might erect and defend chairs to
 "themselves, so that he now is a schismatic and offen-
 "der, who sets up another against the only chair."
 2. 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 *Macro-*
bis, successor to *Euculpus*, who succeeded *Boniface*
 of Balli, and *Boniface* was successor to a *Victor Garbi-*
ensis, 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 per-
 "haps 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 *Euculpus*, *Boniface* of Balli, and *Victor*
 "*Garbiensis*. This *Victor* is a son without a father, a
 "disciple without a master, a successor without a pre-
 "decessor."
 Whatever the Ex. or his Ally may think of the au-
 thority of *Optatus*, his reasoning is irresistible. *Parme-*
nius is an endless torrent. A Donatist. *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, nor 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 *Pelicans* Letters, says: "What has the chair of the Roman Church done to thee, in which Peter sat, and in which now *Anastasius* 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.”—*tôn jou-daïôn prôtous.*

How defenceless the cause must be; how destitute of solid reasons, in support of which even restless 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's* 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 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 te 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 proskalesisthe*. Tom. 2. Com. p. 962. C. D. In his letter to them Prelates *Damasus* twice calls them his most honoured Children. "*vioi timifatatoi*," *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 *Casiline* 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 cisi duo e treis sunegmenoi eis tou auto uonoma ekei phe*

“ *einai en meso auton. Posen peri pentakosious eikosta*
 “ *iereas ten oikeiasin epedeik neuto on sui men*
 “ *os kephale melon egemoneuen en tois ten sen taain epo-*
 “ *chouisti 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 phylaken para tou soteroros epitemmenou ten mani an exeteine; legomen de tes jes 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.*”—*anaginomenon 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 *Tharaxius* 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 pason ten oikomenen proteuon dialampeu, kai kephale pason ton ekklesion uparchei to tou kuriou prostagmati poimanon ten ekklesian ekratese pantote kai kratesi 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 *Ursace* 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 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?

Chrysoptom, 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.” *Chrysoptom*, 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 Communion.” 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.

Cyrl, 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 *Dioscirus* 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."

Soyömen, 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 extant, 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 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 judg-
 “ ing: 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 at-
 suming 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 *Da-*
 “ *masus*, a man worthy of eternal praise, as soon as he
 “ heard that this hereby began to spread, did not only
 “ depose and excommunicate *Apollinaris*, but also *Ti-*
 “ *mothy* 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 depo-
 sed and excommunicated by Pope *Damasus*. This
 we know from the oriental writers.

“ *Innocent* the Ist. in his letter to the Council of Mi-
 levis, 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's* '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 *Melchisedech*, 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 profligate 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 devided 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 colleagues to obedience since each Bishop has the free disposal of his own power for the liberty of his opinion not to be judged by any other, but we all expect the judgment of J. Christ, who has the power of proposing 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 collège 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. Cyprian*) 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. Dionysius* 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. Irænus* 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. Irænus* 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 *Irænus* 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 *Chrysoptom*, a Greek author whose style is compared to that of *Plato*, by some judges. St. *Chrysoptom* in his 14th Homily explaining the Acts of the Apostles, on his text says: "*touto esti Cheirotonia*" 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 Cheirotoneion monen "anabekekasti."*

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 katalesomen epi tès chercias tantes;*"—*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: “*in katastefes kata Polin Presbuterous.*”

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 Præs.*

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

Nicephorous 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 sixth 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 sovereign 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 Naariin.*" 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 jisa 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 Jerusaleem 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 tsiba 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 paying honor to whom honor is due, according to that instruction 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. Celsum*. 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 Antichrist, 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 *Chrysofotom* 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 *Luther* 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 viiiith. the inspired writer says: “ as *Ciezi* 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, *femeia kai terata*: “ were wrought among the people.” Did the sacred penman 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.⁶

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 authorise 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.” *Pasu Phuteia en ouk ephuteuson o Pater mou ouranios ekristhsetai.*—*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.



REVIEW.

SOME severe strictures on Catholics in a charge delivered to his clergy by the Right Rev. the Protestant Bishop of Nova-Scotia, in the months of June and August 1808, and published in the ensuing month of February, gave rise to the present controversy; Mr. B's Letter of Instruction was in the press at the time of publication; to this letter a Postscript was added, written in a hasty manner, under a strong irritation, with some unjustifiable asperity of language. The Postscript gave offence, 'twas natural to expect it—in consequence a letter signed *Palaeologus*, and addressed to Mr. *Burke*, was published in the Nova-Scotia Royal Gazette, of the 13th of March, 1804. This letter fills six columns. The author by distorting some expressions in Mr. B's letter of instruction and affixing to them a sense of his own invention, gave the public to believe that Mr. B. was a Republican in principle; he then inveighs with great vehemence and asperity against Republicans, and their principles. Though Mr. B. did not presume to censure any form of Government, his Letter of Instruction is decidedly monarchical; in it he teaches obedience to the Ruling Power as of divine right and indispensable. To this unfair and injudicious attack Mr. B. returned the Reply, No. 1. on the Tuesday following. This immediate, and perhaps unexpected, refutation produced some unpleasant sensations: a friend to P. made some strictures on it with a good deal of ill-humour. He then laid down a pen, which he should never have taken up. This produced the Letter, No. 2. from an anonymous writer.

ter. P. who in the whole of the controversy was but the echo of party writers, whose thread bare arguments he took upon credit, and lent them to the public as from his own stock, finding no reply to these productions, very wisely passed them unnoticed.

In a second Letter, after admitting that Mr. B. had shewn to demonstration that Popes, as such, have no temporal jurisdiction, he produces some quotations in order to induce the public to believe that the Pope's deposing power is a Catholic tenet. That some Catholic writers have taught the Pope's deposing power under certain restrictions and limitations as meer matter of opinion, Mr. B. did not deny; but that no Catholic ever taught such doctrine as a Catholic truth or term of communion, is manifest from this consideration, that the whole body of French divines who unanimously teach the contrary, were never accused or suspected of heresy or even of disrespect to the Holy See, which must have been the case if the deposing power had been thought a revealed truth.

However, if the authors adduced had been subject to that mistake, as P. calls it, 'twas the height of absurdity to pretend to find or correct it in Mr. B's Letter of Instruction, in which the contrary opinion is expressly and professedly taught, as P. himself admits. To this second Letter, in which matter totally foreign to the subject in debate, was introduced either to enable the author to vent his spleen on Catholics at large, or to divert the attention of the public from a theme which he found no longer tenable, Mr. B. made the Reply, No. 3. This Reply, in which there are some mortifying reflections on P. and his friend, received no answer: the works, from which was copied P's. abuse of Popes, Councils, Catholic Princes and Prelates, afforded none; 'twas therefore prudently declined.

A third Letter in the same strain with the former was published. This Letter is remarkable for a number of quotations from voluminous and mostly obsolete works,

works, which P. neither did, nor could have read, though he modestly gives them to the public as the fruit of his deep researches in antiquity. 'Tis rather unfortunate that all his discoveries only tend to shew how universally popery in its present form was professed before *Luther's* days; that not one man was found on earth with whom *Luther* joined in communion; that of all these, who adopted the reformed doctrine, not one can be assigned who did not renounce the tenets and terms of communion of that Church in which he was baptised; 'tis therefore indisputably true that truth was extinct in the world, or that the chief reformer substituted false doctrine to existing truth.

To this third Letter Mr. B. made the Reply, No. 4. and the continuation of that Reply, No. 5. in which he has shewn that no historical fact, of which there is not legal evidence, is more certain than that *Cecil* was the contriver of the Gun-powder Plot; 'twas not a pretended plot: 'twas a real, a well concerted, a deep laid plot, to blow up, not the King and Parliament, but the few Catholic noblemen and gentlemen who had yet some lands to forfeit, to rob them at a stroke, of their estates, of their lives and reputation.

The informed reader must know that this *Robert Cecil, Lord Salisbury*, was son to *William, Lord Burleigh*, a celebrated contriver of plots. In one of these, that is, *Babington's* plot, *Mary Queen of Scots* was sacrificed to the jealousy of her sister Queen: *Whitaker*, a Protestant writer, has shewn by authentic documents, and without a contradiction, that *Cecil*, that hoary hypocrite was the chief manager and actor in that bloody and disgraceful scene. His son was not a degenerate child: he inherited all his father's talents: began his ministry by that comic tragedy, called *Sir Walter Raleigh's Plot*, disposed of one man, who was peculiarly obnoxious to him, and would have disposed of some others of higher rank if the King's conscience had not interfered and saved them from execution.—

See *Milner's History of Winchester*, vol. i. p. 300. for an accurate account of the Gun-powder Plot, see his seventh Letter to Doctor *Sturges*.

To the authorities adduced by Mr. B. in his Reply to P. the writer adds the concurring testimony of some other dispassionate and unprejudiced Protestant writers: the Rev. Mr. *Higgon*s, in his short view of English History, says: "this design was first hatched in the forge of *Cecil*, who intended to have produced it in the time of *Elizabeth* by his secret emissaries he engaged some hot-headed men, who ignorant whence the design first came, easily engaged in it."

The author of the Political Catechism, a well-informed writer, says: "*Cecil* did not carry on his schemes so secretly but that some of his own domestics got a general notion of them. Accordingly one of them advised a Catholic friend of his of the name of *Buck* to be upon his guard, as some great mischief was in the forge against those of his religion. This was said two months before the disclosure of the Gun-powder Plot."

And the author of the Political Grammar, another writer well versed in that science, says: "*Cecil* engaged some Papists in this desperate plot in order to divert the King from making any advances towards *Pojery*, to which he seemed inclinable in the minister's opinion."

In *Burleigh's* and *Walsingham's* school he had learnt the invaluable political secret of sending forged letters to the houses of Catholic noblemen and gentlemen, where these letters were to be found by emissaries stationed for that purpose: this *Cambden* attests, whose testimony against his benefactress *Elizabeth* and her favourite ministers is free from suspicion. The fact is; *Cambden* was a man of truth, though he was at times obliged to conceal it; he says, ad Ann. 1584: "underhand artifices were practised to discover people's
" inclination.

“inclination.” In another place he says: “forged letters in the name of the *Queen of Scots*, and of the English emigrants abroad, were conveyed to the houses of Catholics.”—*Ad. Ann.* 1586.

Such was the letter sent to *Lord Monteagle*, a Catholic nobleman, which gave rise to the suspicion of the plot. The letter was immediately brought by his lordship to *Cecil*, the original author, by which precaution his Lordship saved both his life and estate to *Cecil's* great mortification and disappointment, nor was he able by all his diabolical stratagems to involve any one noblemen or gentleman of repute in his plot. However it answered one good purpose, which was to inflame the minds of the populace against Catholics, and deter the King from making any concessions in their favor. To the same purpose 'tis yet applied—and to that end has the mock P. introduced it. 'Tis but fair to inform the reader that there were but sixteen accused of this plot in the Act of Attainder—3 *Jac.* 1. *Cap.* 2.; that but seven individuals were acquainted with the worst part of it—*Catesby, Piercy, Fawkes, Thomas Winter, Keys, Bates, and Tresham. Everard Digby, Robert Winter, Grant Rockwood, John Wright, and Christopher Wright*—these last knew in general that something was going on for their party, on which their services would be wanted. They accordingly agreed that they would be ready “with their horses and servants.”—*See Stow's Cont. Patinson.* The three Ecclesiastics knew it as a conscientious secret which they could not divulge, they endeavoured in vain to prevent it. Of these the men who were deeply concerned were rash and profligate youths, not one of them a professed Catholic: they had conformed to the established religion, and were considered by Catholics as Apostates. They were thus described by a cotemporary writer: “A few wicked and desperate wretches whom many Protestants termed Papists, although the Priests and true Catholics

“ Catholics knew them not to be such ; nor can any Protestant say that any one of them was such as the law terms Popish Recufants.”—*Prot. plea. p. 56. ud Ann. 1621.*

Tresham was one of *Cecil's* agents, had access to him at all hours of the night or day.—*Pal. Cut. p. 94.*

Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, cited by *Foulis* in his Popish treasons, says that *Tresham* wrote the letter to Lord *Monteagle* ; from whence we must conclude that his master *Cecil* dictated it.

It may be said that *Garnet* knew of the plot from *Catesby's* confession. True—and from that circumstance the writer concludes, that *Catesby* was not a real Catholic ; but a tool artfully managed by *Tresham*, *Cecil's* agent, to involve that ecclesiastic in his plot, out of which he could not possibly extricate himself. As a Catholic clergyman he could not reveal what he knew under the inviolable seal of confession. The law disregarding this obligation, condemned him for concealing treason, and he was executed accordingly. If *Catesby* had been a real Catholic he would have known, that past offences are confessed, not future ; that pre-conceived pernicious designs are renounced, not persisted in. This all Catholics know. 'Twas not the case with *Catesby* : all the efforts of *Garnet* could not prevail on him to desist. 'Tis therefore manifest that his confession was but a feint, that he was directed by *Cecil's* agent to involve that ecclesiastic in his plot.

To these who are not well versed in our history the writer offers this short sketch of that memorable transaction :—

In the reign of King *James* the 1st. thirty six barrels of gun-powder were deposited in a cellar under the Parliament-House, in order, if we believe the contriver *Cecil*, to blow up the King and Parliament on the first day of their meeting ; a letter was conveyed to Lord *Monteagle* by an unknown hand, desiring him to absent

sent himself from the meeting on that day. *Monteagle* instantly brought the letter to Secretary *Cecil*, who pretended ignorance; said he did not rightly understand the purport of that letter, in which this mysterious phrase: "the danger is over when you have burned this letter," he thought was totally unintelligible. The Secretary referred the letter to the King, who through inspiration, as he imagined, unravelled the secret. Though without being a witch or fortune-teller a man might discover thirty-six barrels of powder under a few faggots. Though this letter was written the 26th of Oct. *Cecil* did not think proper to examine the cellar till the day before the meeting on the 5th of November, on which he made this wonderful discovery—a solemn commemoration of which is annually celebrated. When the pulpits ring with invectives against these treacherous Papists—thus a plot of destruction, of which they knew nothing, is imputed to the whole body of English Catholics, and from them transferred by this mock P. to the Catholics of Nova-Scotia, many of them born near two centuries after, on the opposite side of the Atlantic.

The fools who were cajoled into this plot were deservedly hanged like knaves;—even *Tresham* himself, *Cecil's* agent, was sacrificed by that adept in Machiavelian politics. Thinking himself secure in the protection of the secretary, he did not attempt to fly on the discovery of the plot. He offered his services to arrest his accomplices, but that commission was conferred on others, and *Tresham* committed to the Tower to take his trial, as was thought, but not intended: by one of these suppers which *Cecil* knew how to season for importunate visitors, he was dismissed from his labours in this world, and sent to receive his reward in the other below.

If the reader will but reflect that twenty Catholic noblemen then sat in the House of Lords, of whom none received any notice to absent themselves on the
day

day of meeting, who must have perished in the common ruin, and with them all the hopes of the Catholic party, he will see the injustice as well as the absurdity of ascribing that plot to the Catholics of England.

After taking a short view of the Gun Powder Plot, its causes and effects, Mr. B. in the same No. gave a short sketch of the memorable transaction of 1641, at the time of the insurrection in Ireland, and from the express testimony of the actors in the scene, shewed that the pretended massacre of Protestants by Irish Catholics was an infamous imposition on the public credit, in order to advance the interested views of the then Lord's Justices, Parsons, Borlase and their creatures, and to give some colour of justice to their boundless rapacity, and the atrocities, by which they forced the people to take up arms in defence of their lives. To the testimonies adduced by Mr. B. the writer begs leave to add others, and some observations tending to corroborate the truth, and undeceive the unwary, who are but too apt to give implicit confidence to *Hume* and *Clarendon*, without attending to the motives of these writers.

Doctor *Warner*, who is confessedly the most accurate writer on that subject, in his preface to the Irish rebellions gives the character of *Temple*, *Borlase*, *Clarendon* and *Hume*, the motives of their infidelity he assigns in the same place. On the professed encomiast of *Ormond*, no suspicion of partiality to Catholics can fall, 'tis well known that *Ormond's* hatred to Catholics, though all his relatives and his very parents were of that communion, was surpassed but by his rapacity, which knew no bounds. To these qualities is justly ascribed his obstinate disobedience to the King's repeated orders, and his treacherous surrender of the sword of state and city of Dublin, to the Parliamentarians. 'Tis true they promised him 15,000l. but upon consideration they thought the money might be applied to a better purpose, and would have paid him

him with a halter if he had not escaped to France, where his duplicity secured him an atylum and recommended him a second time to the confidence of *Charles*, which he continued to abuse till the death of that infatuated Prince.

“ The original Protestant writers, (says *Warner*,) of
 “ this period are *Sir John Temple*, and *Dr. Borlase*,
 “ the first was Master of the Rolls and Privy Counsellor,
 “ he confined himself to the massacre and the rebellion
 “ in the early part of it, and the sense of what he
 “ suffered by the insurrection, together with his attachment
 “ to the ministry, led him to aggravate the crimes and
 “ cruelties of the Irish; the other was the son of *Sir John Borlase*,
 “ one of the Lords justices of that time, and seems to
 “ have been an officer in the civil wars—he made great
 “ use of *Temple’s History*, and as far as he liked it of
 “ *Lord Clarendon’s vindication of the Marquis of Ormonde*;
 “ if these authors are to be read with great suspicion
 “ of partiality as they certainly are *Sir Richard Cox*,
 “ who has done little more than transcribe the accounts,
 “ which they have given is open to the same
 “ suspicion the original English Historians
 “ are the *Earl of Clarendon* and *Mr. Carte*
 “ the noble historian’s attachment to the cause of *Charles*
 “ the 1st. has evidently given a bias to the whole of his
 “ great work, and on the most critical part of the King’s
 “ conduct with regard to Ireland, his commission to the
 “ *Earl of Glamorgan*, his Lordship to our astonishment
 “ is entirely silent *Mr. Carte* treats of the
 “ whole rebellion but there are so many
 “ flagrant instances of his partiality for the King, and
 “ of his prejudices against the Irish ministers at the
 “ breaking out of the insurrection, that he is never to
 “ be read where the conduct of the one is palliated,
 “ or the other censured without the utmost caution
 “ all others having compiled from some one or other of
 “ these have also copied their

“ mistakes and imperfections : hence they are so inaccurate, partial and uninformed, that whoever contents himself with the accounts that he meets with of it in any of our English Histories may be said to know little of it. The same writer in the body of his work speaks of *Hume's* infidelity with a sort of horror:”—“ To such miserable shifts, (says he *p.* 359,) are able men reduced, when they write to please a party, or to support a character without regard to truth ! It is but very little Mr. *Hume* hath laid on this critical part of *Charles's* reign ; (his conduct to the Irish) but unless he could have said something more to the purpose than he hath said, he had better have taken the way *Lord Clarendon* took, and have said nothing at all.” That *Hume* wrote to please a party and insure an extensive sale, is manifest from his having suppressed and effaced from his original manuscript some passages not very honorable to *Elizabeth*, on information from the publisher that they would diminish the sale: he honestly acknowledged his insincerity:—“ No man has yet arisen, (said he *Hist. of Eng.*) who has been enabled to pay an entire regard to truth, and has dared to expose her without covering or disguise to the eyes of the unprejudiced public.”

As to *Borlase's* History—Doctor *Nelson* says of it, *p.* 13: “ Tis rather a paradox than a history, his distorted plagiarism of *Lord Clarendon's* manuscript rendered him suspected not to be overstocked with honesty and justice, so necessary to the reputation of an unblemished historian. He wrote for the avowed purpose of defending the harsh government of his father *Sir John Borlase*, and *Sir William Parsons*.”

“ Tis notorious, (said the same author) that *Sir John Temple*, in writing his History of the Rebellion, was bound by confederacy to assert the proceedings of these Lords Justices.” *Int. to ii. vol. Hist. Col.*

Thus we see that *Temple* and *Borlase*, the first writers

ters were actors in these scenes of bloodshed and devastation, by which an insurrection was forced in view of forfeitures which could not be otherwise obtained: "Whatever, (says Dr. *Leland*,) were the professions of the chief governors, the only danger they apprehended was that of a too speedy suppression of the rebellion: extensive forfeitures was their favourite object, and that of their friends."—*Hist. of Ire. vol. iii. p. 160.*

"On the 23d of February 1641, the Marquis of Ormond received the following resolution of the Lords Justices and Council: it is resolved that it is fit that his Lordship do endeavour with his Majesty's forces to wound, kill, slay and destroy, by all the ways and means he may, all the said rebels and relievers, and burn, spoil, waste, consume, destroy and demolish all places, towns and houses, where the said rebels are, or have been relieved or harboured, and all the coin and hay there, and to destroy all men there inhabiting, able to bear arms." "Can any one think after this, (says Dr. *Warner*,) that these Lord Justices had any reason to complain of the cruelties committed by the ignorant and savage Irish?" *Hist of Irish Reb.*

"The favourite object of the Irish Government and the English Parliament, was the utter extermination of all the Catholics in Ireland. Their estates were already marked out, and allotted to their conquerors."—*Leland's Hist. vol. iii. p. 166.*

For this barbarous purpose at which human nature recoils, proper agents were chosen.—Sir *Charles Coote*, a remorseless miscreant; Sir *William St. Ledger*, little inferior to the Bengal Tyger; *Cole* and *Brughill*, and many others of equal merit.

"The arbitrary power exercised by these Lords Justices, (says *Warner*,) their illegal exertion of it by bringing people to the rack to draw confessions from them, their sending out so many parties from Dublin

“ and other garrisons, to kill and destroy the rebels, in
 “ which care was seldom taken to distinguish—and
 “ men, women and children, were promiscuously put
 “ to death; but above all the martial law executed by
 “ *Charles Coate* and the burning of the Pale for seven-
 “ teen miles in length, and twenty-five in breadth, by
 “ the Earl of Ormond; these measures not only exas-
 “ perated the rebels and induced them to commit like
 “ cruelties, but they terrified the nobility and gentry
 “ from all thoughts of submission, and convinced them
 “ that there was no hope for pardon, nor any means of
 “ safety left but in the sword.”—*Hist. of Irish Rebel.*
vol. iii. p. 166.

This massacre in the Pale, inhabited by English Catholics, amongst whom there was not one rebel, shews that these merciless tyrants intended to exterminate all the natives without distinction: Dr. *Warner* admits it: “ ’tis evident, (says he) from the Lord Justices letter to the Earl of Leicester, then Lord-Lieutenant, that they hoped for an extirpation, not of the meer Irish only, but of all the old English families also, that were Catholics.”

“ Sir *John Clotworthy*, in a public speech had declared that the conversion of the Papists in Ireland was only to be effected with the bible in one hand, and the sword in the other.”—*Cartes’ Om. vol. i. fol. 235.*

The contrast between these new teachers and the venerable *Patrick* and his companions, to whom the Irish were indebted for their conversion to Christianity was so visible, that they very naturally concluded if their primitive teachers were missionaries sent by heaven, these new teachers with sword and bible were emissaries from hell.

Sir *William Parsons* intended to reform them in a more compendious way: “ he declared before many witnesses at a public entertainment, that within a twelvemonth no Catholic should be seen in Ire-
 “ land

“land.” From the rapid progress of destruction which his agents were then making amongst defenceless women and children—and an inoffensive peasantry, who as yet knowing no guile, feared no evil, induced Sir *William* to make this memorable prediction. The event shewed that the most sanguine expectations are sometimes disappointed, and the best concerted measures of destruction ineffectual. The Catholics, though oppressed, were not exterminated; penal laws and persecution only served to encrease their numbers: in the patience and humility of the Catholic under the most galling oppression, the man of sense and reflection saw the prediction of Christ to his disciple verified:—“*You will be sad.*” And in the insulting arrogance of his oppressor, he saw the other part of the same prediction verified:—“*The world will rejoice.*”—*John* xvi. 20.

“Among the several acts of public service performed
“by a regiment of Sir *William Cole*, consisting of five
“hundred foot, and a troop of horse, we find the following hideous article recorded by the historian *Borlase*, with particular satisfaction and triumph:—
“Starved and famished of the vulgar sort, whose goods
“were seized on by the regiment seven thousand.”—*Leland. Hist. of Ireland*, p. 172.

“In the execution of an order issued to destroy the
“Pale without excepting any, the justices declare that
“the soldiers slew all persons promiscuously, not sparing the women, and sometimes not the children.”—*idem. ibid.*

The Earl of *Castlehaven*, who disgusted at the insolent conduct of the independents to his Prince, the unfortunate *Charles*, had retired to Ireland, and was a witness to these barbarous scenes of devastation, says: “I began to consider the condition of this kingdom, as that the state did chiefly consist of men of mean birth and quality, that most of them steer’d by the influence and power of those who were in arms
“against

“ against the King ; they had by cruel massacreeing,
 “ hanging and torturing, been the slaughter of thou-
 “ sands of innocent men, women, and children, better
 “ subjects than themselves ; and that by their actions
 “ they looked for nothing but the extirpation of the na-
 “ tion and the destruction of monarchy.”—*Desid. Cu-
 rio. Hib. vol. iii. p. 132.*

Sir *William St. Ledger*, Lord president of Munster, surpassed if possible *Coote* and *Cole*, even Sir *William Parsons*, was a moderate man compared to him.

Lord *Upper Assory*, in a letter to the Earl of *Ormond*, speaking of the ferocious tyrant, says : “ that
 “ he was so cruel and merciless, that he caused men,
 “ women, and children, to be most execrably execu-
 “ ted, that he ordered amongst others a woman great
 “ with child to be ript up, from whose womb three
 “ babes were taken, through every of whose bodies
 “ the soldiers thrust their weapons, which, (adds
 “ that nobleman,) puts many to a sort of desperation.”
Carte's Orm. vol. iii. fol. 51.

In order to rescue the reputation of an injured people from the calumnious misrepresentations and violent invectives of *Temple*, *Borlase*, and their hireling sycophants, the writer has been forced to bring before the public many of the bloody scenes and shocking barbarities which disgrace the annals of his country, and are hardly to be paralleled elsewhere. He has advanced nothing but on the credit, and in the language of respectable Protestant writers, who were not suspected of partiality to Catholics, whose testimony in their favour can have no other foundation but truth.

From the same sources of information the writer has shewn that the insurrection was forced ; that some thousands of innocent persons, women and children, had been put to death under the direction of the Lord's Justices and by their express order before a drop of Protestant blood was spilled by the insurgents. Lord *Clarendon* himself, forgetting that flourish by which he had mas-
 sacred

sacred so many thousands in the very beginning of the insurrection, speaking of the massacre in *Magee's Island*, where three thousand women and children had been massacred by the Scotch soldiers. These poor people had been collected by a proclamation from Sir *Arthur Tyringham*, and Colonel *Chichester*, and came to *Carricfergus* as a place of safety. *Clarendon* calls this the *first massacre*. These Scotch soldiers by the different blasts of *John Knox's* trumpet, as he called his admonitions, were worked up to a pitch of fanatical fury unexampled in history. In their rage and hatred to Popery there is no excess however barbarous or inhuman which they did not commit; in these excesses they were encouraged by the ruling party, as they were extremely favourable to their views of forcing the people to a rebellion, from which only they could expect forfeitures, the great object of their administration, and so keen were they in the pursuit, that in the space of two days by the assistance of the rack and a few convenient witnesses, indictments were found against 4000 land-holders in the province of *Leinster* alone. Lord *Coke*, in his letter to the speaker of the English House of Commons, which he sent with indictments against 1100 men of large property, says: "If the house please to direct to have them all proceeded against to outlawry, whereby his Majesty may be entitled to their lands and possessions, which I dare boldly affirm was at the beginning of the insurrection not of so little yearly value as £.200,000. per annum.—This the Earl of *Cork*, noted for rapacity, called *the work of works*."

This unprovoked murder of defenceless women and children, together with the devastation of which Sir *Henry Tichbourne*, boasts when he had driven *O'Neil* from *Dundalk*, saying: "That there was neither man nor beast to be found in sixteen miles between the two towns of *Drogheda* and *Dundalk*; nor on the other side of *Dundalk*, in the County of *Mona-*
"ghan

“ghan, nearer than Carrickmacross,” provoked a spirit of retaliation amongst the lower class in Ulster, and some barbarities, were committed in the first fury by *O’Nial’s* followers. “ ’Tis not strange, though absolutely inexcusable, if this incensed leader or rather his savage followers, would be provoked to retaliate in some measure, such cruelty and destruction on the unhappy English, whom they had in their possession.” But that these barbarities were neither intended by the insurgents nor countenanced by their leaders, when committed in the spirit of retaliation, we have besides historical evidence, the confession of the adverse party : *Temple*, says : “ That which these rebels mainly intended at first and most busily employed themselves about, was the driving away Englishmen’s cattle, and possessing themselves of their goods.

“ The leaders had issued a proclamation forbidding their followers upon pain of death to molest any of the Scottish nation in body or goods.” And *Temple* acknowledges that this proclamation was for a time observed. *Carte’s Orm.*

“ Whatever cruelties are chargeable on the Irish in the prosecution of their undertaking, their first intention went no farther than to strip the Protestants of their power and possessions, and unless forced to it by opposition, not to shed blood.”—*Warner, p. 47.*

The writer concludes this article with *Doctor Warner’s* opinion on the depositions preserved in the University of Dublin.—They compose thirty-two volumes in folio—*Warner* submitted to the drudgery of perusing the whole. “ Of what credit, (says he) are the depositions worthy, and several such there are, that many of the Protestants, who were drowned were often seen in erect postures in the river, and shrieking out revenge.” *Temple* and *Borlase*, in their legends pretend that no man doubts the truth of these apparitions. They well knew that no absurdity was too great

great for their infuriate followers in these unparalleled scenes of blood and slaughter in which they were engaged.—May that man perish who desires to imitate them.

In his reply to a fourth letter, which does not seem to have been written by the author of the third, Mr. B. discusses more minutely the unfounded accusations against the Council of Constance, and exposes in strong colouring the duplicity and arrogance of the pretended martyr, *John Hufs*. This man was born in the village of Hufs, in Bohemia, from which he seems to have taken his name. His talents for intrigue procured him an honourable and lucrative situation in the University of Prague, in which he found an ample field for the exercise of those talents. The levelling opinions which he had borrowed from *Wiclef*, were greedily swallowed by the Bohemians. The expulsion of the Germans not only from the University, but from all places of trust and profit, was the natural consequence. The confusion incessantly increasing, *Hufs* was held accountable as being the author of the flame, and died the victim of his obstinacy. After his death his disciples formed themselves into separate parties, the one called *Thaborites* under the command of *Zisca*, and the other called *Calixtians*, under *Roquesane*. They filled the country of Bohemia with blood and slaughter, during the space of twenty years. The *Thaborites*, a furious and savage banditti, after the death of *Zisca* gradually declined; they were entirely annihilated by *Roquesane* and *Pagiebrac*, in 1461.—See *Rudiger* and *Camerarius*.

In the course of his Reply, Mr. B. said that in the greatest latitude of the term, *John Hufs* was not a Protestant, in this he is warranted by the Rev. *M. de la Roque*, a minister of the reformed church, who in his history of the Eucharist, proves from cotemporary authors, the testimony of *Hufs*' disciples and *Hufs*' own writings, that he believed transubstantiation and

all other articles of the Roman faith, except the necessity of the communion under both kinds.—And the Rev. *M. de la Roque*, jun. son to the former, has shewn without a contradiction that *Huss* prayed to the Saints, that he honoured their images, acknowledged the merit of good works, admitted seven sacraments, sacramental confession and purgatory; that his dispute with Catholics was on the necessity of communion under both kinds, ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction, which he pretended to have been lost by sin. This monstrous doctrine he had learned from *Wiclf*, whom P. thinks a Saint. The man must have been sanctified in some unusual way; not by following the maxims of the gospel, or adhering to the doctrine of the Apostles: for they taught nothing but the most perfect submission to the ruling powers, and he taught the merit of insurrection; they give no idea of a God but what is perfectly consistent with a being of infinite mercy and goodness, and he in that Dialogue which contains a summary of his doctrine, paints a God the encourager and abettor of iniquity, to whom sin is pleasing—a God whom the atheist justly rejects, so that the system of religion taught by this new-fashioned Saint is worse than atheism. At the Council of London, in 1382, he retracted his errors, of this *M. de la Roque* complains: “neither he nor his disciples had the fortitude to resist.”—*Lib. 4. Cap. 36, &c.* He then retired to his parish in Lutterworth, where he died of an apoplexy the 2d. of December, 1384.

La Roque, who was better versed in the history of *Wiclf* than P. says of him: “a prevaricating hypocrite, or Roman Catholic who died in the Church assisting at that sacrifice in which the difference of the two parties is placed.” *Wiclf*’s errors did not die with him; his pestilential works survived him; in these the celebrated *John Ball* had learned that doctrine of equality and insurrection which brought 100,000 armed peasants into the city of London, with
Wat.

Wat. Tyler, the blacksmith, at their head. That part of our history needs no comment.

No. 1.

REPLY TO PALEOLOGUS.

Mr. *Burke's* best compliments to *Paleologus*, though naturally timid, and superstitiously fearful of ghosts and invincible spectres, yet as this venerable Greek, has retained in the shades below, that politeness which distinguished Greece in his day, not that strength of arm or at least that versatility in argument, which in a particular manner characterised the Greek sophist, Mr. *Burke* thinks he may, without danger, venture a moment on the animadversions of this inhabitant of the lower regions.

He begs leave to assure this quondam emperor, that he (Mr. *B.*) is not an enemy to any one man now living, or to any description of men; that he has not learnt to hate God's creatures for the love of God; that if other men's religious opinions differ from these which Mr. *B.* thinks most consonant to scriptures, he does not thence conclude the men destitute of sincerity and veracity, as the first quotation from his pamphlet would seem to imply, when that sentence, *non est fides habenda hereticis* was cited 'twould be but fair to add that Mr. *B.* qualified it a most indecent and groundless assertion; He also wishes to inform P. that the object of that letter, which is the subject of his animadversions, was to enforce obedience to the existing laws and powers; to obviate the insinuations and counteract the machinations of dangerous emissaries; if P. can impress those duties on the public mind more forcibly, or on more solid principles, Mr. *B.* will thank him sincerely; it is the interest, as 'tis the duty of every man, who values life and liberty, and every thing which contributes to the advantage of society; of this however, from the specimen before him, Mr. *B.* is doubtful---this inhabitant of the shades condescends to admit,

what is manifest to every man who reads the pamphlet, that unqualified obedience is taught; but thinks it difficult to reconcile this doctrine with that contained in the next article, that is, the right which the people have to elect and appoint their king. 'Tis neither asserted nor insinuated in that article, that the people of England, or of any other country in which there is a finally fettered Government, have any such right: a right exercised no longer exists but in its effect---the supposition proposed is absurd in itself, and involves a contradiction. Men assembled to elect a King whilst there is one in being, are not peaceable citizens, but rebellious subjects; they would not be dispersed by a sergeant and 12 men, but lodged in the County Goal by the Sheriff and his Officers.

The churches in communion with the See of Rome, and acknowledging her spiritual supremacy, don't pretend to reform or disturb the different forms of Government which are established in different countries. Why cite Dr. *Troy*, or Dr. *Huffey*, in support of an opinion which no man ever disputed? If this Ghost, (which might be done with safety,) had taken a midnight trip to Dublin, he would find that there are no two men more obnoxious to republicans, and few who stand more unblemished in the sight of government, whatever Sir *Richard Musgrave's* private opinion may be.

Two castles with a covert way between is a new mode of defence not known to *Vauban* or *Cohorn*. Mr. B. expected no attack: he thought an unskilful engineer would not venture on so rash an enterprize, and he knew that an intelligent officer, from a view of the out-works, would judge the body of the place impregnable, and not risque his reputation without a possibility of success. However an attack was made, 'twas injudiciously planned and badly executed---the ordnance served with boiled apples in place of hard shot.

'T would have been singularly unfortunate indeed, if
Mr.

Mr. B. had undertaken to teach obedience by telling the people that they possessed an imaginary right; but he has taught obedience on other principles, that is, on principles of religion and reason by example, and that in simple and intelligible language, without any pedantic display of erudition.

In speaking of the clause which requires an abjuration of the Pretender, P. thinks that Mr. B. has entered into a needless discussion of the principles and origin of civil government. Are the non-jurors extinct in Scotland? is every trace of blind attachment to the House of *Stuart* effaced in England and Ireland? if so, why not expunge the clause as useless?

Mr. B. thinks it necessary to inform P. that whatever ideas the people of Constantinople might have had whilst he was an inhabitant of these upper regions, the Roman Catholics of these times are not disposed to take and subscribe oaths, which they do not clearly understand. They assert nothing but what they believe to be true, and promise nothing but what they intend to perform; 'twas therefore necessary to shew them, that by the abdication of James the Second, the throne became vacant, and that the people had a right to fill it; by the people he understands what the Romans called *populus*, not that part of the community which they called *plebs*; but he did not say, nor intend to say, that the right and power which was then exercised continued to exist: it exists no more but in its effect.

Mr B. states that political power is from God through the ministry of the people. P. concludes with Dr. *Price*, that the people is the Sovereign, and Kings and Princes their deputies and servant.

The conclusion flows from the principle, like that of the Algebraist, who says, x more y is equal to z ; therefore the cow is red.

A shade in the Elysian fields, old *Aristotle* would have told him, if consulted, that where there is a principal and a ministerial cause, the action and effect are

are ascribed to the principal, not to the ministerial; the absolute right resides in the principal; the ministerial is the channel through which it is conveyed: hence it follows, that nothing more than a ministerial right can exist in the people.

This shade, learned in the law, must know that if an attorney be constituted to transfer a right of property, the attorney is but the channel through which the right is conveyed; his commission once executed, his powers cease; he can neither cancel nor limit the transfer which has been perfected. Hence 'tis manifest that when God makes use of the ministry of the people, 'tis he himself who constitutes and appoints the King, not the servant or deputy of the People, but the sovereign to reign over and rule the people.

David was not versed in *Dr. Price's* logic, when he said, "the house of *Juda* has anointed me King over themselves,"—he did not think himself their deputy or servant, he knew that he was their lawful Sovereign.

There never was a more incongruous assortment of ideas than a Sovereign People: sovereign and subject are relative terms; where there is no subject there can be no sovereign, the people have no subject, it therefore cannot be a sovereign.

If *P.* wishes to know why this principle was not thus minutely discussed in the pamphlet, *Mr. B.* tells him there was no necessity for it: a philosopher knows how to draw a logical inference when the principle is posed, the uninformed Roman Catholic, conscious of his own inability to decide on abstruse questions of law or right, confines himself to the advice of his pastor, which is there given in terms not to be misunderstood; if a pretender to science draws a conclusion, the reverse of the natural, as *P.* has done, and is the victim of his own vanity, 'tis his misfortune, not *Mr. B's* fault.

Mr. B's ancestors would not have spoken this language

guage in the days of James the Second.—This remark of P. is true, and their posterity know it; but if they have been the dupes of political gamesters that does not justify the illusion; nor is it a sufficient inducement for Mr. B. to imitate them.

P. seems astonished that Mr. B. should think the express or tacit consent of a great majority of the people, the most certain indication that supreme power is lodged in any man or body of men! as Mr. B. possesses no powers of divination, and expects no particular revelation, he knows no better criterion to judge by—prays P. to substitute some other, and he will adopt it in future.

In his first attempt to invalidate Mr. B's reasoning P. is not fortunate. Length of time has diminished, not to say entirely effaced, his logical powers;—perhaps he took a second draught of the waters of Lethe on his way to the Elysian fields. “You are greatly mistaken,” says he, “in thinking that the different forms of Government are of that right which lawyers call the Law of Nations.” To expose this great mistake, he says, that the Law of Nations does not depend on the will and consent of the people at all.

Mr. B. begs leave to state this argument in form. The Law of Nations does not depend on the will or consent of the people at all; therefore particular forms of Government are not of that right which is called by lawyers the Law of Nations. How this consequent is deduced from the antecedent in which it is not contained is to Mr. B. totally inconceivable; a logician would call them disparate propositions.

Mr. B. did not say that the Law of Nations is dependent on the will and consent of the people; he said and says again, that the different forms of Government are.

No Lawyer says P. ever gave such a sense to the Law of Nations as you have here bestowed on it. Mr. B. bestowed no sense at all on it: he did not say what
it

it is, what is its object or its end; he neither defined nor described it, 'twas not his intention to determine how the Law of Nations differs from the natural or divine positive law; he now tells P. that an eminent lawyer, and perhaps with great propriety defines the *jus gentium* “*quod usu exigente & humanis necessitatibus gentes humanae sibi constituerunt.*” If this definition be admitted, particular forms of Government are evidently of that right, *Justinian's* definition of the *jus gentium* confounds it with what other lawyers call *jus naturale*, because 'tis impressed by the Author of Nature on the minds of all men. P's quotation from *Vattel* does not say what the law of nations is, but what it teaches; but whether it be called *jus gentium*, or *jus municipale*, or *jus civile*, the position advanced by Mr. B. is not the less true, that particular forms of Government are dependent on the will of the people: for the *jus gentium* of *Cabassut*, and the *jus civile* of *Justinian*, and the *jus municipale*, of *Blackstone* signify that right which every people constitutes for itself; 'tis therefore neither less nor more than the expression of their will. Thus P. detecting blunders which exist but in his imagination, blunders on in his own way.

By drawing a conclusion from premises, the very reverse of which would have been a logical inference; he raises a phantom on which he expends a long and elaborate piece of declamation, which fills a whole column. As the principles laid down in Mr. B's pamphlet are diametrically opposite to these under P's lash; he shall pass his strictures unnoticed, simply observing, that there are men of equal sense and science with P. who avow some of them.

'Tis time to discuss the complaint of injustice to P's friend *Blackstone*; “you quote him to support “your opinion,” says the offended Ghost. Mr. B. does not admit the position: his opinion is supported by a more respectable authority, *St. Paul*. How Mr. B. could
cite

cite an opinion which he modestly disclaims in support of his own, is more than difficult to conceive: 'tis true Mr. B. did not presume to censure *Blackstone's* opinion; he thought it impertinent and indelicate to censure an opinion, which many great and good men publicly avow. That the passages were not cited as a single quotation as P. pretends, is manifest from the different pages in which they are contained, being cited by Mr. B. as by P.; no man could think that *Blackstone* filled four or five pages with half a dozen lines. Mr. B. did not cite that part of the passage which ascribes to the King more than human perfection, because he thought the regal power more venerable as an emanation of divine authority, than any fiction of law could make it. *Blackstone* wrote for men of science. Mr. B. did not think it judicious to tell the public at large, that any of the King's perfections or qualities were fictions of law. *Tom Paine* would have thought it a subject of merriment.

P. is surpris'd that Mr. B. should cite a philosophical opinion from a law authority, his surprize will cease if he considers that a philosophical opinion stated by a great lawyer in a didactic work, is at least not contrary to law, but whether it be consistent with law or inconsistent, 'tis an opinion which Mr. B. does not think fit to adopt.

Mr. B. is in turn surpris'd to find P. proposing his own political creed in the following words: "The King ought to observe the laws which he himself has sanctioned; and the law makes him King just as it makes the son inherit his father's estate, when there is no legal bar." In a quotation from the institutes, he gives a definition of this law, "*quod quique populus jus sibi constituit.*" That right which every people establishes for itself. P. asserts that the people make the law, and the law makes the King: the law is nothing else but the expression of the will of the people, the people is therefore in his opinion the principal, and

the law the ministerial cause; consequently the people make the King, and that by the mere expression of their will, this is the doctrine of *Price* and *Priestly*, of *Voltaire* and *Rouffseau*, of *Napper Tandy* and *Emmet*, and of *P.* What, *P.* an anti-royalist! he most certainly is in avowed principle, what he may be in his private opinion or in practice is not known to Mr. B; so he is himself the subject of all these strictures which fill his publication. When he says that the law makes the King, as it makes the son inherit the father's estate, there can be no doubt of his meaning the state can unquestionably divest the son of the father's estate. Mr. B. forbears to make the inference. 'Tis true, that though he publicly avows the principle, he denies the consequence; a strong indication that dialectics made no part of his studies.

P. proceeds in his vindication of *Blackstone* rather awkwardly: "We may now," says the justice, "be allowed to lay down the law of redress against public oppression; if therefore any future Prince should endeavour to subvert the constitution by breaking the original contract between Kings and People." *Blackstone* thought there was an original contract, so did *Rouffseau*; he believed this state of nature to have existed which *P.* positively denies; "it never did, never could exist." Yet this state of nature is the state of uncivilized society, which did and does exist; this Mr. B. asserts on the testimony of his senses, which, though not so acute as to discover what does not exist like this inhabitant of the shades, are not so obtruse as to mistake what is visible to the world. Why does *P.* attempt to vindicate *Blackstone* by contradicting him? The quotation complained of is taken from notes—the sense is nearly the same, though the words may differ.

Now I do assert, says *P.* that *Blackstone* does not draw any such conclusion from these principles, nor does he bring these principles together any where in his work to draw any conclusion from them at all.

The

The principles are in the work, and the conclusion naturally follows: when in any work principles are found, however unconnected they may appear, and an insulated assertion which is a logical inference, either the conclusion was intended, or the writer was a fool. Mr B. had therefore a right to say that the conclusion was drawn from them principles.

In the next paragraph there is an injudicious comparison between the coronation of *David* by the men of *Juda* and *Israel* in Hebron, and the nomination of rebellious leaders in Poland and Vinegar Hill. P. forgets that the Christian Religion is part of the common law of England, and that precedents taken from the scriptures are not viewed in the light of tumultuous meetings of an enraged rabble.

Surely P. does not intend to apply to the sober people of Nova-Scotia, his invectives against the people of Athens, of Rome, and Paris, in an access of fury? why this unqualified conclusion, “the voice of the people bears a nearer resemblance to the cry of fiends than to the voice of God?” if this strange assertion be combined with another more strange, in a former paragraph, “the evil disposed, the turbulent, the seditious, (of which sort we have too many) a stranger would not hesitate to think the province in a critical situation.

Mr. B. declares that he knows no such seditious men, that he believes the inhabitants of Nova-Scotia, to be a peaceable and orderly people.

P. To shew that the Doctors of the Romish Church can shift their ground as time requires, introduces the deposition of *Henry*, the 4th Emperor of Germany, by Pope *Gregory* the VIIth. with what propriety Mr. B. is at a loss to guess. If the Doctors of the Romish Church knew how to veer about with every wind, they would now share the loaves and fishes, which, others more condescending, divide among themselves. The Bishop of Halberstat wrested the text from the intended

ded sense, but not so grossly as P. who being a Greek, is not obliged to understand modern French. *The powers which are from God are orderly, not ordained.* Men are ordained, not powers. Emperors were crowned and consecrated, not ordained in the Romish Church. The Bishop did not allude to any such thing. Though Mr. B. does not intend to justify the deposition of *Henry* by *Gregory*, he must tell P. that if *Henry* had been king of England, according to the rule laid down by *Blackstone*, he would have been deposed without consulting the Pope. *John Calvin*, not very friendly to Popes, in the IVth. B. of Ins. 11th ch. gives this account of *Henry*:—*Imperator Henricus* “*cjus nominis quartus homo levis & temerarius, nullius consilii, magnæ audaciæ, & vitæ dissolutæ Episcopus totius Germaniæ habebat in aula sua partim venales, partim prædæ expositos.*”

Having taken this cursory view of P's animadversions, Mr. B. dismisses the subject, praying the Grecian Ghost to retire to the shades and rest in peace; and if he be subject to any penalty there, the good old wives will say their beads for his relief.

Halifax, March 17, 1804.

No. 2.

To the Reverend Mr. BURKE.

SIR,

Being struck with the unfairness and falsehoods in P's letter, I wrote the enclosed answer to it, merely for my own amusement, recollecting that the duties of your profession may perhaps not have afforded you time to answer it, I take the liberty of sending it to you.

YOUR SINCERE, BUT UNKNOWN, FRIEND.

TO PALÆOLOGUS,

UNKNOWN SIR,

I ADMIRE your spirit and perseverance: though defeated, you again return to the charge with fresh vigour,

vigour. Your zeal is really deserving of a better cause: and, for your own credit, it is to be wished that it was according to knowledge; but, believe me, the well constructed fortrefs which Mr. *Burke* defended is not to be conquered by such slight engines as you have brought against it. Your mode of bush fighting indeed has given you some advantage. If *Palæologus* is detected in falshood, you slip your neck out of the collar, and leave the old Greek to suffer in your place. It would be more to your character for courage and discretion, to meet him in your proper person. Is it of yourself, or of your arguments, that you are ashamed? If the first, I can say nothing: but I own I should blush to affix my own signature to some things which appear under your *mascarade hommede guerre*. In spite of precautions mischief will out: a part of your secret has already escaped. Though the real parent still continues concealed, the reverend midwives who brought to light your abortive conceptions, and stood godfathers to them, are publicly talked of: as to your unknown self, thought is free—for some time I took you for the Ghost of an Apothecary, from your delicate allusions to sores, your familiarity with scabs and matter, and your readiness in recurring to the probe; you have none of the qualities of any of the Emperors, whose name you assume, as whatever I may suppose of *Palæologus* can apply to no real man breathing, I may say what I please of him, without any person having a right to be offended. Whatever body you may now inhabit, your soul, eager and fretful, positive and self-conceited, vapouring and pedantic, your boast of so many, and such good, books, inspire a conjecture, that you are only the Ghost of some Pedagogue in the mountains of Thrace, who had access to some great library. But, take my word for it, there is a great difference between the eight parts of speech, and an ecclesiastical controversy, and that a man may be a great adept in nouns and pronouns, who makes an

an indifferent figure upon more important subjects, and is not capable of applying his voluminous advantage to any account. For your intention of correcting Mr. *Burke's* mistakes, he ought to think himself under great obligations to you, and no man would be readier than himself to acknowledge them ; but I really see, in your own letters, so many errors, that I cannot think he could with a safe conscience resign his opinions to your bare assertions ; and, in proof, I find them quite defective. You begin by a mis-statement : you make him say that an enlightened legislature knew Catholics only by seeing their principles disfigured in flying sheets and pamphlets, and then you say this answer does not seem satisfactory : candour and truth required that you should have stated the real and substantial reason he had given, and which followed in the next sentence, that those doctrines had been painted in times of general commotion, and great irritation. You know this reason too well-founded to be shaken, and therefore you wisely omitted it. You know in what manner political faction, and religious bigotry, had misrepresented the tenets, and the conduct, of the Catholics. No decent historian now attempts to give any credit to the supposed Gun Powder Plot, to London being set on fire by the Catholics, and an hundred other malicious party stories, believed in violent times, and then consigned to eternal contempt ; you keep his account out of sight, and fire off your wit at a man of straw, of your own stuffing.

As to your preliminaries, as you call them, they consist of what is usually stiled chopping logic, a dish sometimes compared to chopt hay, full as nice to the palate, and as full of nourishment ; his meaning, which you attempt to confound is plain enough, nor shall I stop to untangle the skein of sophistry, which you try to wind from very unintelligible assertions. If *Tillotson*, upon any particular head, held doctrines decidedly Catholic, I certainly should deny that, in that respect,

he

he was a Protestant, as I should as certainly contend that *Newton* was not a true philosopher, in respect to any question upon which he maintained a false or unphilosophical opinion. It is very certain, notwithstanding your endeavours to convert plain sense into nonsense, by nearly a whole column of ingenuity, that a man might, in other respects, be a Catholic, and yet might be wrong upon some particular points. Where is the obscurity unless in your own pate?

As a proof of your opinions, you refer us to *Bellarmino*, who, you say, is nearly followed by all the rest; but you have not had the goodness to quote one passage from him; you have given us only the copy where we might have expected the original. I have always understood that hearsay evidence is not admissible, where the principals can be produced; according to your own statement the authors you have quoted are mere echoes of another, whom you do not produce—the mere shadow of a shade.

You bring forward *Maimbourg* and *Fleury*, two Frenchmen, to prove the doctrines of, what you are pleased to call, the Italian Doctors; why did not you bring these Doctors to speak for themselves? Are you so little acquainted with history, which you are so fond of referring to, as not to know that both of those authors are party writers, in the service of the French King, and his Clergy, in the dispute with the Pope; you state their contest yourself, and the violence with which it was carried on; yet from the furious pensioners of the French King, hired to fight his battles, and deep in all the tricks and manœuvres of party, do you pretend to state the opinions of their adversaries, the Italian Doctors; you certainly did not intend it, but you afford a most conspicuous example of Mr. B's assertion, that the doctrines attributed to the Catholics were taken out of the mouths of their enemies, who painted them in times of great commotion, and under great irritation, from controversy. *Maimbourg* was
actually

actually obliged to quit the society of Jesuits, on account of the falsehoods contained in that book, which you quote as genuine proof of Catholic doctrines, and which he had written in his warmth in favour of the cause of the French King. *Fleurey's* principles, in many respects, are so extremely dubious, and so little Catholic, that *Voltaire*, one of the most insidious adversaries of the Christian Religion, has complimented him as a brother philosopher.

Next you quote *Thomas Aquinas*, with an air of triumph, and you ask, insultingly, if this Angelic Doctor was not a Catholic? I never heard that the Catholic Church was bound to adopt every vague opinion that may be extracted from every part of the works of all the schoolmen; they were often too metaphysical, and carried their notions beyond what is always reconcilable with truth, and the Catholic doctrines. If any particular opinions, in their works, were not formally condemned by the Pope and Council, it does not follow that they were, therefore, all approved of. Had you been better acquainted with Church affairs, you would have known that *Aquinas* had been repeatedly charged with maintaining indefensible doctrines, and that many very great Divines of the Catholic Church have treated his orthodoxy, in many points as very doubtful. If such an author is to be found in your vast library, I recommend you to consult *Boulay*, upon this head, in his history of the University of Paris. You may cease, therefore, your shouts of victory upon having, as you suppose, pressed the father, and sovereign judge of all sciences, into your service. Remember the old proverb, not to halloo before you are out of the wood.

In your quotation from *Aquinas* you make him say, the Church being in her cradle, and not able to crush Princes, dissembled; your translation is not correct, the dictionary tells us that the word *COMPESCERE*, signifies, to pasture together, to check, to bridle or curb,
to

to allay, assuage, and many other such meanings, but not one that resembles crushing. I really till now did give you some credit for being a scholar, but, in this translation, you are either ignorantly, or maliciously, in a blunder.

Your histories are as incorrect as your interpretation: you assert that the Pope was the vassal of *Charlemagne*, of whose grant he held the city of Rome. No Sir, the Popes were possessed of Rome, long before the family of *Charlemagne* quitted their native forest. As independent Sovereigns, for many centuries they had no connexions with France or Germany, much less did they hold their authority under an empire which did not exist. It was not till Italy was nearly conquered by the Lombards, that Pope *Stephen* the III. applied to *Pepin* the father of *Charlemagne*, for assistance against those barbarians. *Pepin* when he marched to the relief of Rome, assumed no higher title than that of Champion of the Roman Church. In return for this benefit, the Pope actually made *Pepin* king of France: *Charles Martel*, the father of *Pepin*, and his posterity, were voluntarily invested by the Romans with the office of Patrician only. *Charlemagne* was the first of his race who was stiled Emperor, and he owed his title to the Pope, from whose hands he received it: from that time no Sovereign of Germany could assume that title of Emperor till he received it from the Pope. This statement of facts is to be found in every impartial historian; but the original authority of *Eginhard*, *Charlemagne's* own secretary, will outweigh cart loads of such party writers as *Fleury*. *Eginhard* says, in the most express words that the family of *Charlemagne* was established, *Auctoritate Pontificis Romani*—By the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

The Italics signify what stress is laid on your own, or *Fleury's* words, that *Charlemagne* administered justice even in the case of the Pope himself. If you allude to the accusations brought against *Leo*, at that

time, History is against you; for *Pfeffel*, the most impartial writer on German affairs, informs us, that when *Leo's* Accusers attempted to bring forward their charges against him, before *Charlemagne*, all the Prelates protested that the Holy See, and the Pope, were not subject to any jurisdiction; which protest *Charlemagne* admitted, and refused to take cognizance of the case.

You ask, what is meant by the transfer of the Empire from the Greeks, to *Charlemagne*; your Friend *Fleury* says, nothing about it. I do not wonder at it: it did not suit his purposes: his was to set up his idol the King of France at the expence of the Pope; but other historians might have supplied you, both with the term and the explanation of it. The Popes having been in fact independent, though retaining a nominal subjection to the Greek Empire by their own voluntary act, abolished all the claims of the Eastern Emperors and raised *Charlemagne* to be the Roman Emperor of the West; this act is always called, very properly, the translation or transfer of the Empire: You say the Pope had not a shadow of right to bestow this dignity: *Charlemagne* thought otherwise, since he condescended to accept it from his hands.

One is struck with your self contradictions: the people of Rome you say gave *Charlemagne* this mark of their gratitude, that of chusing him Emperor of the Romans; here you make the Empire a gift of the Roman people to *Charlemagne*: In the next column the City of Rome itself is made to be a grant from *Charlemagne*, to the Pope; had the people of Rome authority enough to make *Charlemagne* an Emperor, and yet at the same time did Rome itself belong so entirely to him that he could grant it, and all its inhabitants, to the Pope?

You dwell much upon the ceremonies used at *Charlemagne's* coronation, and the form of the Pope's congratulations to the new Emperor, whom he had just crowned: *Fleury* has much misrepresented this affair; it

it is differently related by better historians ; But even *Fleury* will not bear you out as you quote him. The Pope, he says, paid him adoration : real adoration he certainly did not pay him, by actually worshipping him. *Fleury* does not say, though you do, that he did homage to him, which was the only ceremony by which he could have acknowledged himself to have been his vassal ; homage indeed he might have done in the proper sense of the word, for territories which had been granted by *Charlemagne* to him ; but this homage was consistent with his general independence ; as it was not unusual for one Sovereign to do homage to another, for lands held in each others territories : the Kings of England did homage to the Kings of France, for Estates in their Country, yet no one will assert that they were vassals to the French King, as Kings of England : but *Fleury* does not say, they did homage at all.

You ask likewise, were there not Greek Emperors, acknowledged as such by the Popes, many hundred years after *Charlemagne* : If you mean only that the existence of Greek Emperors was acknowledged, the Popes know, as well as every body else, that there were Greek Emperors at Constantinople, for above 600 years after *Charlemagne* : But if you mean that the Popes acknowledged those Greek Emperors as their Lords, you have forgot what you before mentioned that *Charlemagne*, and his successors were the Popes Lords and Masters during that same time.—Do be consistent, *Palæologus* !

What you charge then, in language modest enough, as two gross and palpable errors, turn out to be plain historical truths ; and it appears that Mr. *Burke* had good reason to pass slightly over the disputes between some Popes and German Emperors, as the Empire was considered as a fief of the Romans. Whether that opinion was well founded or not, certainly such claims were made by the Roman See, and these disputes were in consequence of it. You cannot but allow there

was some colour for it; the Roman See had elevated *Pepin* to the Throne of France, and it conferred the title of Emperor on *Charlemagne*. His successors, for many centuries, never assumed the title of Emperor, till they received it from the Pope. You are very fond of throwing about your charges of ignorance, but for your assertion that antiquity knew nothing of the Emperors being thought vassals of the See of Rome, let me put you to open shame by producing the clearest proof of it.—Pfeffel informs us that by the oath required of the Emperor, he was to promise fidelity and obedience to the Holy See, and to acknowledge himself the vassal of the Prince of the Apostles. This oath was administered as early as the year 1080, yet antiquity knew nothing of this pretext of vassalage! Has *Palaeologus* never heard of the ancient painting placed in the Vatican, to preserve the memory of the solemn homage paid by the Emperor *Lotharius II.* to Pope *Innocent II.* in which the Emperor was represented prostrate before him, with two verses underneath, expressing that he was in the act of doing homage, and of becoming the man, or vassal, of the Pope, and receiving the Imperial Crown as a gift, or *benefice*.* It was under this claim of Seignory, that *Henry* the IV. was deposed by the Pope, as a vassal who had revolted against his liege Lord. It was declared at the time by the Archbishop of Mentz, in the name of the Holy See, we have a right of consecrating the Emperor, and of investing him with his kingdom, but if we can consecrate him when he appears worthy of the throne, we can degrade him when he ceases to be so: thus, when it happened, it was clearly understood to be a question between the Lord and his Vassal: Yet Mr. *Palaeologus*, with unparalelled impudence, says antiquity knew nothing of such a pretext, and charges Mr. *Burke* with falshood and ignorance.

* Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores
Post homo nō papa, tumit quo dante coronam.

The examples you bring, therefore, do not prove that the Popes claimed a right of dethroning Kings, because they are all taken from the disputes between the Popes and the Emperors, of which the ground was a claim of feudal sovereignty, and a supposed disobedience in the vassal, nor can any general expressions on the part of the Popes, employed in those contests, be extended beyond the particular instance to which they refer.

In fine, I have proved all your assertions to be false, and all your authorities incapable of sustaining you : Your statement of Catholic doctrines is taken only from the mouths of enemies, and party writers, and your history is misrepresented, or inapplicable ; and I now consign you to shame, or ridicule, for making pretences which you cannot support ; and as a palpable instance of the falshood with which you charge others. The immense folios in your library are weapons too weighty for you to wield ; you sink under the burthen, and your cause with you. Take my advice, instead of souring your temper with the acidity of controversy, and drying up your brains in the dust and aridity of musty volumes, spend your leisure time in taking a walk to dissipate your splenetic humours ; if you must fire away at something, take your gun, Robbins they say are plenty at this season, and die fat : wholesome air and exercise will mend your temper ; and if you contrive to instruct the ghosts of any young Grecians, whom you flogged whilst in their mortal bodies, they will have reason to rejoice at the happy effects of this change of your vacation amusements.

A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

REPLY to PALÆOLOGUS' Second LETTER.

“ *Ad reprehendenda aliena dicta, et facta ardet omnis animus, vix satis apertum os aut lingua prompta videtur.* ”—SALLUST.

MR. BURKE prays P's. friend not to consider his long silence as a mark of disrespect:—'Twas caused by attention to his professional duty, at that time indispensable. 'Tis true, a gentleman in disguise, has no right to complain of neglect; nor has an anonymous writer, whatever form he assumes, whether that of a substance or a shadow: Mr. B. might, with propriety, pass his adimadversions unnoticed.

Answer to the first remark:—The theory of military tactics is peaceably taught in the schools, though reduced to practice in the field. If P. or his friend, had given writers on that subject even a cursory reading, they would have known, that a **COVERT-WAY** does not lead from one castle to another—'Tis that space outside the ditch of a fort in which the soldiers are placed under cover of the glacis for its defence.—A farmer would have drawn a simile from a mouse with two holes, and confined himself to a subject with which he was acquainted. A writer who takes a simile from any science, ought to have, at least, a superficial knowledge of its first elements. P.'s friend requests, that Mr. B. would confine himself more to the point of attack:—To continue the metaphor, 'tis a general rule, that, when an injudicious attack is made, if the assailant's frontiers be exposed, the repulse carries the war into his own country. Mr B. was, therefore, perfectly right, in shewing P's principles inconsistent with his meaning.

In his next remark, P.'s friend mistakes the tenor of Mr. B.'s reply—'tis, perhaps, one of those passages which

which he could not understand. So far from presuming to dictate to the legislature—on their authority he justified the necessity of that part of his letter, which went to invalidate the pretended claims of *Charles Stuart*, or his representatives. It could not be supposed, that an enlightened body of men, possessed of such means of information, would have inserted a clause, which they themselves knew to be useless; they, therefore, suspected some lurking attachment to the excluded family—Consequently, that part of Mr. B.'s letter was not useless lumber.

His next remark is rather unfriendly to his friend: If P. understood the people, in contradistinction to the populace, his assertion that the voice of the people resembles the cry of fiends, is extremely offensive. Our late Prime Minister had a more favorable opinion of the people: He stated on a most important occasion—That if the executive branch of the government was incapable of governing, and that the law had not provided for such a case, no one could prove a right to the government; but the people had a right to consult their own interests and grant a right to one, who had it not before. On the same occasion, he states—“ That ‘twas the duty of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and of the House of Commons, as the rightful representatives of all the estates of the people of England, to provide for the deficiency in the Legislature, by the interruption of the Royal authority.” He there stated that the Lords and Commons are the legal organs of speech for the people, through which the sense of the people might be taken: [See his speech on the Regency Bill.]

Mr. B. has not heard, that this great Statesman was ever accused, or even suspected of disseminating republican principles.

P.'s friend, whether intentionally or inadvertently mistakes Mr. B.'s illustration of regal power communicated by the ministry of the people: He did not say,

as is pretended, that the right of the people does not exceed that of an attorney authorized to make a particular conveyance ; that sentiment is lent him by P.'s friend, from whom he is not disposed to borrow. Mr. B. adduced the example of the attorney, to shew that a right may be conveyed through a channel in which it is not absolutely and exclusively vested. He knows, that the absolute and inalienable right of governing the world, and all the different states which compose it, resides in the Supreme Lord, from whom all power is derived, as from its source ; that the power is communicated to the different rulers, by the ministry of the people : By what chemical operation P.'s friend could extract from such a doctrine, that the people convey themselves, is not easy to conceive. Does he think, that a right to govern and rule a people is synonymous with the term PEOPLE ? This is an extract from the feculence of his own brain, on which he vents his spleen. No ! the King is that " faithful steward which the Lord confutes over his family, to give them their measure of " wheat in due time."—*Luke xii. 42* The King is the steward ; but the family belongs to the Lord who appoints him, as he does himself ; and to him he is accountable for his administration.

Once more, P.'s friend either mistakes or mistakes Mr. B.'s reply : he did not call P. a pedant, or pretender to science ;—he said, 'tis true, that in his Letter of Instructions, there was no pedantic display of erudition he thought it unnecessary. The scope of P.'s letter is different and might authorize quotations. A man may draw a conclusion, not warranted by the premises, without being a pretender to science ; it may be the effect of inadvertence, or proceed from some obscurity in the expressions. After all, both P. and his friend must admit, that, if an inference not warranted by principle, be deduced ; and invidious charges, with some asperity of language, be founded on this inference, it must be ascribed, to a defect in the reasoning, or malice

lice in the intention:—Mr. B. chose to ascribe it to the former, as the less offensive. A defect in sound reasoning is a fault in a writer; malice in the intention, is a despicable and detestable vice in the man, with which Mr. B. was not warranted to charge P.—as, in the preamble of his letter, he had disclaimed it. Mr. B. recommends patience: The time will come, (from the great exertions piously made for the non-instruction of the rising generation in Halifax, 'tis not far distant,) when loose declamation, in which sound usurps the place of sense, and confidence in asserting supplies the want of proof; when ingenuity in distorting words from their natural and intended signification, to that which they are wished to signify, and imputing that intention to a writer which never crossed his imagination, will be the indication of science; then *Tom Paine*, the boasted father of the Age of Reason, and his friend *Cobbet* of abusive memory, will take precedence of *Newton* and *Descartes*. Even P. and his colleagues, will obtain a distinguished place in the temple of fame:—Till then, the lucubrations of this corps of literati, which now amuse, or rather murder an idle hour, may, without injustice to the authors, or injury to the public, be consigned to the grocer's shop, or perhaps a more appropriate place.

P's. friend in his great zeal to correct Mr. B's. mistake does not spare his friend *Blackstone*:—This writer does not say, nor does Mr. B. say he did, “That the people retain powers to correct all abuses in Government;” he says that, “there are in society inherent latent powers to correct abuses.” He understands, as P. says, abuses subversive of the Constitution; but, if these powers extend to great abuses, they unquestionably do to small; if P. or his friend, will not teach us to believe that greater power is necessary to correct a small abuse, than a great one, which is a manifest absurdity. If *Blackstone* thought the exercise of this power either necessary or useful, he would not say,

that 'twas a *latent* power ; and if he thought it could be diminished or effaced, he would not say that 'twas an inherent power.

Though it may give offence to P. and his friend, Mr. B. begs leave to quote a passage or two from the Earl of Abingdon's Thought on the Letter of *Edmund Burke*, Esq. to the Sheriffs of Bristol ; without pretending to approve, or presuming to censure it, he says, p. 19.—“ Parliaments have ever been the “ works of men's hands ; as thank God we now “ know, that Kings are ; or otherwise, we had not had “ our present Most Gracious Majesty on his Throne, “ nor yet that additional solemn contract between king “ and people—I mean the Act of Settlement.” He too, thought there was an original contract, which was so displeasing to P. and his friend :—He too, thought that the voice of the people did not resemble the cry of fiends ; he too, thought, though a Peer of the Realm, that all political power was derived from the people ! Against that opinion Mr. B. enters a protest ; What are Parliaments ? says he, p. 29. “ Parliaments make “ the formal, as rights do the substantial parts of the “ constitution ; and are the deputies, the agents, or “ appointees of the people, entrusted by them with the “ power of legislation, for the purpose of preserving, “ not of destroying the established rights of the consti- “ tution.” He had previously said, p. 27. “ That in “ the great machine of the state there are found three “ principal powers ;”—the first of these powers, is the power of the people ; the second the power of the constitution ; the third, the power of the law : he defines that *Constitution* to be—“ those agreements entered “ into ; those rights determined upon, and those forms “ prescribed, by and between the members of any so- “ ciety, in the settlement of their union, and in the “ frame and mode of their Government,” this, he calls the *original compact*, which he clearly distinguishes from the *original contract*, between king and
people.

people. The compact he finds in Magna Charta, obtained in Runny-Mead, between Windsor and the Staines :—" King *John*, and his adherents, appeared to be an inconsiderable number ; but the Lords and " Commons filled the country," he eludes, but does not attempt to invalidate, the opinion of *Edmund Burke*, Esq. " That government is an institution of " divine authority ; though its forms and all the persons who administer it, originate with the people." The very doctrine stated in that Letter of Instruction, which is so offensive to P. and his friend.—Was *Burke* a loyal man ? was the Earl of Abingdon suspected of disloyalty ?—Why then these insinuations against a man whose language is infinitely more modest, and has rather a tendency to unlimited monarchy ?

In the same letter, the Earl of Abingdon finds that very state of nature, (the possibility of which is denied by P. and his friend,) not amongst wandering hordes of Indians, of whom he knew no more than P's. friend ; but, amongst the civilized inhabitants of the now United States ; and if the Earl did not find it there, Mr. *Burke* would—Why is P. and his friend so crazy as to deny it ? For, whether the royal authority continued in force, during the whole of the unhappy contest, or not, an abstruse question ; 'tis certain, that there was some point of time, in which the people were in a state of nature ; that is, a point of time ; in which the supreme power was not yet vested in any Body Politic. The declaration of Independence, even when admitted in England, did not vest the supreme power any where.

To this query, if the R. Catholic Missionaries are uninformed ; Mr. B. replies, they, like their brethren or other Churches, are, some well informed, others not better than they ought to be ; whether well or ill informed, they are not the only men who read.

What amazing sagacity P's. friend discovers in his next remark !—he sees, that the contrast between Mr. B's.

B's political principles, and those of his ancestors in *James* the II. time, is precisely this, that his ancestors believed the title to the Crown hereditary, and Mr. B. thinks it elective. In point of sagacity, he surpasses the doctor, who seeing an old saddle in a sick man's chamber, wisely conjectured he had eaten the horse, bones and all: The physician had a substance to found his conjecture; P's. friend has not even a shadow. No Sir; the question in debate in *James'* time, was not whether the title to the Crown was hereditary or not; no man of common sense doubted it: but, whether that title was indefeasible or not:—Mr. B's ancestors thought it indefeasible; so did *James* and his ancestors; the nation was of the contrary opinion, and their opinion prevailed. They defeated the title, and other titles, which sent Mr. B's. ancestors, and their descendants, to seek six feet of land, where they could find it.—A just punishment for their persevering obstinacy in support of a family, which had commenced the ruin of Irish Catholics under *James* the first: encreased it under the *Charles'*; and reduced them to the ultimate point of wretchedness, under *Anne*; from which they have gradually emerged under the illustrious house of Brunswick—May they long continue to reign and bless their subjects.

However irksome, Mr. B. finds himself obliged to follow this *ignis fatuus* through all its windings. He must then tell this friend, that, with respect to the question originally in dispute, which was simply this, “whether particular forms of government depend on the will of the people or not;” ’tis of little consequence, whether the *jus gentium* be defined, “*quod naturalis ratio, inter omnes homines constituet,*” as by *Justinian*; or—*quod usu exigente, et humanis necessitatibus gentes humanae sibi constituent,*” as by other lawyers:—That’s an incidental question foreign to the controversy. However, to pass nothing unnoticed, Mr. B. will state his reasons, why he thinks the latter definition

definition the more correct: Christian lawyers distinguish the natural law, from the divine positive law, and the law of nations; this could not be expected from *Trebonian*, the principal lawyer employed by *Justinian*, in collecting the *PANDECTS*, in composing the *INSTITUTES*, and digesting the *NOVELLÆ*, which form the body of the civil law; This *Questor* was a heathen, a man who openly sold his sentences, and suppressed or made laws, as his interest or passions inclined him:—See *Proc. Lib. de Bello pers. Ca. 24 & 25*; and *Suidas v. Treb.* The definition given by *Trebonian*, does not distinguish the law of nations from the natural law, of which he knew nothing; the definition adduced by Mr. B. does; 'tis therefore, the more correct, and consequently the more admissible; at least, amongst Christians. Let the terms be examined as they stand—*municipium* signifies a corporate town; the *jus municipale* must, of course, in the genuine sense, signify the right of a corporate town, not the right of a whole nation. *Gens* signifies a nation; and the *jus gentium*, that right which nations constitute for themselves, not for others, over whom they have no jurisdiction; There is but the author of nature, possessed of sufficient authority to constitute an universal right, to which all nations may have recourse; 'tis therefore the law of nature, not of nations. Mr. B. does not pretend to convince P. or his friend: Men who cavil at every word, and grasp at every shadow, are not open to conviction; to the public he submits his opinions, with the greatest deference.

In a paragraph increasing in corpulence, as the sense diminishes, P's. friend endeavours to shew, that Mr. B. had no right to draw an inference from principles which were not classed together by *Blackstone*. If, he says, a major and a minor be taken from different syllogisms, an inference may be drawn, which would make the reasoner, not the writer, pass for a fool. What! does not P's. friend know, that a major
and

and a minor belong to the same syllogism; that they are co-relatives; that, if taken from different syllogisms, they would become independent, unconnected, disparate propositions, from which no inference at all can be drawn. 'Tis quite otherwise with principles. If in any work this position can be found; *The man who reasons inconclusively is not a logician*; and in the 100th page antecedent or subsequent, this other position be placed, *P's friend does not reason conclusively*; the natural inference is, that he is not a logician; and if this position be found in any part of the work, whether insulated or connected with others, 'twas the intended conclusion.

An inconsistency is found in Mr. B.' declaration, that he knows no seditious men; and that he believes the inhabitants of Nova-Scotia a peaceable, orderly people; and one of the motives of writing his Letter of Instruction to obviate the insinuations, and counteract "the machinations of dangerous emissaries;--- Does P.'s friend think, that the epithet dangerous emissary. is applicable to a settled inhabitant; If so, Mr. B. does not envy him his sagacity.

This shadow, in his great zeal for the Pope, (who would expect it?) is surprized at the boldness with which Mr. B. rails at cardinals, accuses Bishops, and differs with Popes; Why not rather rejoice at a sinner's conversion from idolatry? Has not one of his friends told him that, the Pope was to Catholics an idol? And the other, by an unusual concatenation of ideas a *little God*? he must be little indeed, who united the terms, *little and God*.

In the discovery of the mistranslation of the text, this friend of P. gives another specimen of his sagacity. Mr. B. did not translate the text from the Greek original, or the Vulgate; he gave the genuine sense of the Bishop of *Halberstadt's* translation. The good man was as dexterous at wresting a text from the intended sense as either P. or his friend. The text stands
thus,

thus, in the Vulgate, “*quæ autem sunt, a deo, ordinatæ sunt.*” By changing the punctuation, ’twill stand thus, “*quo autem sunt a deo, ordinatæ sunt,*” and bears the construction which the Bishop thought would answer his purpose: “The powers which are from God, are orderly;” hence he concluded, that the Emperor’s powers were not from God, because his conduct was disorderly. The original favoured his exposition; if Mr. B. does not mistake, the Greek verb *tasso*, from whence *tetagemenai* in the text, is to dispose according to order; he is convinced that *Zenophon* used it in that sense.

Mr. B. has yet one more thing to explain; not to P. or his friend, for they are not pretenders to science, must know the first elements of that science, without which the higher sciences are not attainable—*Algebra*; in the language of the algebraist, the letters x, y, z, signify unknown quantities; because two unknown quantities, are equal to a third equally unknown, is no reason why a cow or any other animal should be red or black; ’tis intended to scout a ridiculous consequence, such as P. pretended to draw. In the next edition Mr. B. will substitute—three more four, are equal to nine.—The inference is equally just. This substitution will bring it to the level of P’s. friend, who injudiciously confesses, that he did not understand Mr. B’s. reply.—*Hoc testimonium verum est.*

He will now give a direct answer to P’s. second letter.

In the first paragraph P. says, he cannot think it a matter of indifference, to see historical truth neglected; especially, if it should seem to proceed from a desire of reflecting on the supreme legislature of our country.

P. is yet to learn, that prejudice and party spirit is a false glass, which distorts every object seen through it, yet P. is himself a striking instance of this truth. Mr. B. disclaims the most distant intention of reflection on that enlightened body, who are an ornament to their country;

country ; but cannot bring himself to believe, that a great majority of the members, at least of the lower house, are well versed in polemical theology. Attention to the public business, and the interests of the empire at large, is an inseparable bar against a close application to abstruse and speculative theories, not in the line of their profession. He does not think it necessary to transmit P.'s letter : they are already in full possession of all the information which can be taken from such poisoned sources ; he recommends to P.'s perusal *Melchier Canus de Lucis theologicis* ; *Bossuet's Exposition of the Catholic faith* ; *Orris's Ecclesiastical History* ; in it he will find *Fleury's* conjectures refuted by original pieces. Let us suppose *Fleury's* work as correct, as it is incorrect, 'tis no rule of faith ; nor is that of *Aquinas*, nor that of any other schoolman. The approbation to *Aquinas's* work, has no more weight than the work itself ; 'tis a compliment of men, having no authority in matters of faith, to a work, in which, though there may be, and are, many opinions indefensible, there is yet a vast fund of erudition, and great strength and perspicuity in the reasoning.

2. Mr. B. begs leave to inform P. that a Catholic, as such, does not believe any article of divine faith, but that which has been revealed, and declared by the Church, (the keeper and witness of Scriptures.—see the 20th Art. of the 39.) to have been revealed ; that he admits no new revelation since the time of the Apostles ; that the deposit of faith was committed by them to their successors as St. *Paul* says, writing to his disciple *Timothy*, 1st. Epist. chap. ii. v. 2. with an injunction of committing it to faithful men capable of teaching others, and thus in regular succession to the present day.

This principle founds that excellent rule laid down by *Vincent* of *Lerins*, *Commonitory* chap. 3. “ *that doctrine is truly and properly Catholic, which has been believed in all places, at all times, and by all the faithful.*”—This rule adopted by all Catholic divines of
note,

note, strikes off at once all novelties in religion, and reduces the opinion of schoolmen to their proper place, that is to matters of meer indifference, which no man is obliged to know, or believe ; All truths are not matters of faith ; nor are all falsehoods matters of error in faith. Thus, for example, if a man seriously maintains, that other men walk on their heads, he would be convicted of folly, at the tribunal of common sense ; he would not be accused, or even suspected of heresy, or any other crime against Church or State ; the man who would undertake a serious refutation of the error, would be as stupid as the author. The opinions of some schoolmen, are equally false, tho' not so grossly absurd ; and on these wild speculations, are the invectives against Catholic doctrine founded ; though as independent, on these speculations, as it is on the opinions contained in the Alcoran. Hence 'tis manifest, that if the opinions of which P. speaks, were believed by any, they were never believed as Catholic truths, nor proposed as such.

As to those Popes, Bishops, and Doctors, who are extolled to the skies, however wicked their lives or principles might have been, Mr. B. begs leave to differ from P.---the Catholic Church extols no men for wicked lives or principles ; an act of immorality, does not constitute a wicked life ; a man may be drunk, and not a drunkard ; 'tis the habit which denominates not the act ; nor does an error, the effect of inadvertence, or invincible ignorance, denote wicked principles ; if so, we should call *Moses, David, Ezekias, Peter and Paul*, wicked men, which is rather uncommon amongst Christians. When a saint is canonised by the church, his virtues are proposed as models to our imitation, not his faults, from which few or none are exempt. What does P. think of the celebrated thief, canonized in the Gospel ? was it the wickedness of his life, or the sincerity of his conversion, which the Evangelist praised ? To have recourse to invectives

against persons, in default of arguments against avowed principles is a meer artifice to impose on the credulity of the public, and divert their attention from the proper object, Mr. B. has not undertaken, nor will he undertake, to vindicate the conduct of any man, or his particular opinions; he reasons on general principles, universally admitted; and on these principles he tells P. in the most pointed and explicit manner, that if the Pope should direct him, Mr. B. who believes the Pope to be infallible, though not of faith, to disobey his Sovereign, or pretend to annul the oath of allegiance, which he has sworn to him, he would neither believe nor obey the Pope; for this simple and peremptory reason, that such an order would not be a doctrinal decision, to which the infallibility, not only of the Pope, but of the whole Church, is exclusively confined; 'twould be an act of authority, proceeding from a supposed jurisdiction; a jurisdiction which Mr. B. has shewn to demonstration that the Pope does not possess.

In the quotation from *Aquinas* there is a parenthesis inserted by P. either stupidly ignorant, or intensely malicious; it imports that Popes make what articles of faith they please. No Sir! Popes make no articles of faith; they believe those articles of faith contained in the deposit transmitted by their predecessors—*nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est*, is their maxim, they feed their master's flocks in his pastures, not in their own; they resign to wild and restless speculatists, the exclusive privilege of exploring the unknown regions of religion, and making new discoveries in the range of imagination. The Pope is a bug-bear, which haunts P's imagination; a ghastly form; a ghost of menacing aspect:—P. stares! he looks wild! he thinks he sees a Pope in every petty schoolman!—Be calm, P.—the danger is not great; the Popes boundaries are fixed—we know them; should he attempt to transgress, to forge any new articles of faith, the very attempt

attempt to subvert the ancient constitution, would amount to an abdication; and the subordinate pastors who, of divine right, feed their respective portions of the flock in the same pastures, would declare his place vacant, and fill it. Every stretch of prerogative has produced a reclamation; usurpation was always opposed; P. admits it---no citation is necessary.

Surely P. cannot complain of the exorbitant power of the present Pope; it is confined within very narrow limits; it is almost annihilated; his estates curtailed; the bellowing of his *bulls* is as harmless as the bleating of *lambs*; his very *horns*, are transferred to other dignified heads, which they gracefully adorn.

Mr. B. thinks it unnecessary to traverse the ground which *a friend to truth* has done already, he hopes, to P.'s satisfaction; yet as P. may pretend to delicacy and object to the authorities adduced, Mr. B. will add a few against whom no objections can lie.

EXTRACT FROM HISTORY.

When Constantine had built Constantinople and communicated to it all the privileges of old Rome; a Consul, a Senate, &c. the empire, which had been till then one and indivisible, was divided into two parts; one of them was called the empire of the East, and the other the empire of the West; at his death, in the year 341, the western empire fell to Constantine jun. and Constant; and the Eastern to Constantius. After the death of Constantine and Constant, in 353, Constantius governed the whole empire; Julian succeeded Constantius; his successor, Jovinian, was succeeded by *Valentinus*; who confined himself to the West, and gave the Eastern empire to his brother *Valens*, in 368; from that time to *Little Augustus*, in 476 different Emperors ruled both empires; but by the same laws; when *Little Augustus* was forced to abdicate by *Odoacer*, the *Herulian*, the western Empire, seized on by the Barbarians; and the Eastern emperors confined to the East, till

the time of *Justinian*; who, by the conduct and bravery of *Bellisarius* and *Narsee*, having expelled the Goths and Vandals, from Italy and Africa, recovered the Western empire; in the year 556 the empires were united and governed by the same emperor. The Greek, residing at Constantinople, governed Italy by Exarchs; but could not preserve it from the inroads of the Lombards. From that time, the Western empire was extinct, till the year 801: when it was revived in the person of *Charlemagne*. *Illyricus*, one of the writers of Magdeburg, in his book against the primacy of the Pope, says—"Antichrist will appear, when there will be a revolt from the Roman kingdom, and restore liberty to the Romans, not in his own name. This happened about 700 years ago, when the Roman empire had fallen, and was something reinstated by the Pope; not as Cæsar, Dictator Consul, or Senator; but as Roman Pontiff." And, in the 8th Century, Chap. 10th, Col. 757, he and his colleagues say—"Thus, *Leo* the Third, transferred the Roman empire to *Charles* and the Franks; yet reserved to himself the right of ruling the Franks; and hence it happened after, (deirceps) that they who received the Sceptre of the empire were inaugurated, (that is invested with solemn rites) by the Pope; and this transfer is the principal of Antichrist's Miracles." And in Col. 706, they say,—“Pope *Zachary* gave *Pepin* the kingdom of the Franks, and insured it to him, by deposing the former King *Childeric*, and his own Brother *Carloman*, and consecrating them monks in a monastery.” That the Pope did not pay homage to *Charlemagne* or *Pepin*, is manifest from the same authority;—6th Cent. Chap. 10th, Col. 724, “they say, *Pepin*, and *Charles* his son, prostrate on the earth, kissed the Pope's (*Stephen's*) feet; took hold of his stirrups, and holding the bridle of his horse, done for him the office of a groom.”

David Chytræus, in his Commentary on the Revelations,

lations, chap. 13, gives *Luther's* opinion, and his own, in these words—" *Luther*, and others, explain that " part of the vision (*St. John's*) of the new Empire of " the Romans, reinstated by the Pope altoget- " ther extinct— *Leo*, the third Roman Pon- " tiff, gave to *Charles*, King of the Franks, the title " of Roman emperor the Roman emperor " had hardly any power or right, or dared to usurp " any in this new form of the Empire; but, as much " as the Roman Pontiff and the beast allowed him."

Theodore Bibliander, in his Chronicle, table 10th, near the end, says of this transfer—" As the Pope " of old Rome expelled the Emperor of new " Rome (*Constantinople*) from Italy by the Lom- " bards, by the Arms of the Franks; and by the " same right and power, by which he transferred the " Roman Empire from the Greeks to *Charles* the " Great, he transferred the kingdoms of the Franks, " from the Merovingian, to the German princes."

Whether these authors proved the Pope to be Antichrist, or not, they prove, beyond a contradiction, the truth of Mr. B's assertions, and the inaccuracy of P's information, on a point of History to which, with such confidence, he refers; declaring that to be a palpable error, which is a plain historical truth! 'tis attested by Greek and Latin cotemporaries; *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus*, *Eginhard*, *Paul* the Deacon, &c. by Popes and Princes, by friends and enemies; if there be truth in history, this fact is true.

As a corrective to that abuse which P. lavishes on *Gregory* the 7th, whom he knows but from the report of his enemies, that is, from the writers of *Magdeburg*, in their Centurys; or others who have copied them; Mr. B. begs leave to inform him, that these writers in their zeal to prove the Pope to be Antichrist, imposed on their disciples *Benno's* rhapsody for truth, concealing what they must have known, that this *Benno* was a pretended Cardinal of the Antipope,
Clement

Clement 13th, set up by *Henry* the 4th; that his whole work is a tissue of bare-faced calumnies; contradicted by all cotemporary writers; one of whom, *Marianus Scotus*, tells us in his Chronicle, that *Gregory* acted on the complaints, and at the request of the German princes. Perhaps P. may think his favourite author *Dupin*, worthy of credit; he won't suspect him to flatter the Pope—he says, Cent. 11th, chap. 1st, p. 67; “There is not the least colour to think that he “was not unblemished in his morals and we “boldly say, that no Pope since *Gregory* 1st, wrote “such strong and fine letters as this *Gregory* did.”

In concluding this letter, Mr. B. has to apologize to the public, for trepassing on their time and patience:—He well knows, that controversy is always productive of some irritation; and on that principle, would willingly have declined it; but he has been called upon peremptorily, and in a manner which left him no alternative.—He knows no time when unprovoked aggression diminishes irritation, or imperiously imposes silence, if not that silent hour, when the midnight ruffian seizes without resistance his sleeping prey; nor does he know a place, where insulted innocence is denied the paltry privilege of complaint, if not in those once flourishing but now enslaved countries, where the iron hand of despotic power, in wanton sport, murders the man and his reputation, at one blow; nor does he know a man so dull of apprehension, so destitute of every manly feeling, as to think himself flattered in being told, that he and all his brethren of the same communion, are assassins in principle, and perjurers in fact.

To make insinuations of disloyalty is an old artifice—'twas practised with success in Pilate's days; but there are no Pilates here:—Of this we R. C. have the most authentic evidence, in a late decision of our worthy chief magistrate, who with that solidity of judgment, liberality of sentiment, and integrity of heart, which

which characterise the good and great man, suppressed an unguarded doctrine, which, if admitted, would have unhinged the property of many, and had excited a general alarm.

Halifax, April 16th, 1804.

E. B.

P. S. Mr. B. has just read an EXAMINATION of his Letter of Instruction, by the Rev. Mr. STANSER, in which it is stated, that some strong expressions, taken from different parts of that Letter, and collected into one quotation, are aspersions on the whole body of Protestant Ministers,—To which Mr. B. simply replies, that those expressions in his Letter, can by no propriety of language, or possible implication, apply to any clergyman at all:—the clergy of the Church of England, and of Scotland, are not self taught and self constituted; they are regularly bred, and acknowledge superiors.

E. B.

No. 4.

REPLY to PALÆOLOGUS' Third LETTER.

“Fingere qui non visa potest, commissa, tacere qui nequit, hic niger est hunc tu romane caveto.”

HOR. S. 4.

“This man is black, of him beware.”

THIS short but energetic admonition of the Satyrift was not confined to the times in which he lived, nor to the Roman citizens exclusively; 'tis applicable to all times and places: the same insidious arts which were practised with effect in his days are yet resorted to; they have acquired additional force, and of course exact additional precaution: the welfare of the republic was then the only veil which masked ambitious, interested or vindictive views, the cloak of religion now thickens the veil; this will appear manifestly upon a minute discussion of P's bold assertion that the lawfulness of murdering or “destroying persons under
“pretence

“pretence of heresy, was taught and reduced to practice in the Catholic Church,” and a close and critical examination of the authorities by which he pretends to substantiate the charge.

Either P. is extremely circumscribed in his knowledge of history, or he thinks Mr. B. a perfect stranger to the transactions of the fifteenth century: his statement of the case of *John Hus* is not simply inaccurate, it has strong symptoms of something worse; however, as P. has already given a specimen of inaccuracy, Mr. B. is willing to ascribe it to neglect—the truth is, he seems to know nothing of this same very pious *John Hus*: The following statement is taken from the Acts of the Council;—

Abstracts of evidence against John Hus and Jerome of Prague, as facts in order to determine the judgment of that Assembly with regard to these men.

ART. 9th AGAINST HUSS.

“Likewise that on account of the premisses (the teaching and preaching *Wiclef’s* levelling principles which will be given in this letter,) respectable and religious Catholic men were forced to quit the city and seek hiding places without, and *Massacres, General Robbery, Sacrileges,* and other horrible and execrable deeds took rite and effect by the cause and procurement of the said *John Hus*.”—See *Con. Const. Labb.* 131 *ult.*

These are not surmises—the facts were proved to the satisfaction of the whole Assembly, who had eyes and ears like other men.

“This Article is proved true by a Parish Priest, who is cross-examined at length, by a Doctor of Divinity in like manner; by an Abbot in like manner; by a Vicar of the Church in the city as simply true; by a Doctor of Canon Law; from the report of credible persons, by a Master of Arts as true; by another Master of Arts and Doctor in Divinity cross-examined; by a priest of the diocese of *Litholmussitz* as to
the

the truth; by a Prothonotary as to the truth and notoriety." (*ibidem.*)

5th Art. against *Jerome* of Prague, item, "That on account of the said doctrines (*Wickef's*) certain clerks, nobles, and lay persons—forcibly ransack churches and make and procure sedition against the Clergy and faithful."—(See 504 *Hard.* 1559, *Lab.*) Mr. B. has chosen these articles because they were juridically proved and no attempt made to deny them, not even by *Huf's* fidus Achates, *Jerome* of Prague, a consummate dissembler.

We shall now take a view of these doctrines of *Wickef*, in which P. sees nothing seditious.

Articles condemned 8th Sess.

Art. 4th.—"A Bishop or Priest in mortal sin, neither ordains, nor blesses, nor consecrates, nor baptises."—(against the 26th of the 39.)

Art. 6th.—"God is forced to obey the devil."—(a horrid blasphemy.)

Art. 10th.—"It is repugnant to holy writ that Clergymen should have possessions."—(this doctrine is rather unpleasant.)

Art. 15th.—"No temporal sovereign is a sovereign while in the state of mortal sin."—(Nothing seditious in this P!)

Art. 17th.—"The subjects may at their pleasure correct the sovereigns when they sin."—(Nothing Jacobinical in this?)

Art. 18th.—"Tithes are mere alms, and the parishioners may at their pleasure withhold tithes when the superior has committed sin."

Art. 27th.—"Every thing happens by absolute necessity."

Art. 29th.—"Universities, academies, colleges, degrees, are a heathenish vanity, and benefit the church just as the devil does."

Art. 32nd.—“ To give wealth to the Clergy is
“ against the rule of Christ.”

Art. 43d.—All oaths are unlawful which are used
“ to fortify civil contracts and intercourse of traffic.”—
(against the 37th of the 39.)

A General Council asserts that these doctrines invented by *Wiclef*, were taught and preached by *John Hufs*; and we R. C. take it for granted what a General Council asserts on the testimony of their senses.

Forty-five assertions of *Wiclef* were condemned by the Council; the censure of the University of Oxford against 260 was confirmed, if to these inventions of *Wiclef* you add 30 new articles of his own coinage, they will compose a new Creed consisting of 335 Articles, of which some are diabolically blasphemous, and others manifestly seditious. The Rev. Mr. STANSEY in his Examination of Mr. B's Letter of Instruction, calls *Hufs* a Protestant martyr—Mr. B. begs leave to inform him that *Hufs* was a Protestant of such a stamp and character as would be more dangerous to the established Church than the most inveterate Papist: he believed in all our sacraments; he said Mass with seeming devotion; he prayed to angels and saints; he prayed for the dead; if he spoke against the Pope he did not deny him an exterior primacy. *Luther*, whose testimony Mr. Stansef will not reject, says of him, “ that he had no little reverence for the *Roman Idol*,” (in Affer. Art. 30.) and *Melancton* says of the doctrine of *Wiclef*, so zealously propagated by *Hufs*, “ that fanatical tenet of *Wiclef*, by which he condemns the “ Church ministers to beggary and denies to them the “ right of property in any sense is pernicious and Seditious.” (See Mel. Loci. Com. de Clav.) and in his work (de Jur. Mag.) he calls him “ a frantic Sophist, “ who had been the author of great disturbance, arguing that they who have lost sanctifying grace have “ lost external authority.” *Osfander* stigmatizes his
work

work as infamous (Epit. Hist. Cec. 459.) and well he might, for the unhappy man had taught the most monstrous spinosism mixed with the most plebian malice : “ Every thing,” said he, “ is God, but it must not be told to the peasant that his horse is God only “ in the Schools.” (See Thom. Wald. 2 Lib. C. 1. 4, 6, 17, and in Proc. Art. in Con. Cons. Edit. Labb.)

It may not be amiss to give a short sketch of *Hufs*' History before he was summoned to the Council, and of these transactions, which brought the ill-fated man to an untimely end ; 'tis taken from a defence set up by his fellow convict *Jerome* of Prague. (See Resp. Hy. Pr. Con. Bas. Hard.)

The University of Prague had been founded by *Charles* of Lutzemburg, father to *Wenceflaus* and *Sigismund*, and in it four colleges, the Bavarian, Saxon, Polish and Bohemian; the three former naturally coalesced against the latter, and presented to all the college livings ; this was thought a grievance, on the deposition of *Wenceflaus* from the Imperial throne by the Princes of Germany, *Hufs*, with some noblemen his disciples, insist on the expulsion of the Bavarian, Saxon, and Polish tongues ; the degraded fellows and professors quit the University and are followed by a large body of students ; (See Dubr. Ep. Olm.) hence the Leipzig University, and the ruin of the Schools in Prague.

There remained another grievance to be redressed by *Hufs*' patriotic zeal :—*Charles* had placed his German favourites in the highest places of trust and profit in Bohemia ; *Hufs* exhorts the peasants not to bear this imposition, hence a dreadful commotion, in which *Hufs* acted a manly part, and several men were killed on the spot. What ! P. nothing seditious in all this ! if any popular preacher dared to tell the good people of Nova-Scotia that they must not permit an Englishman to hold any place of trust or profit in Halifax, would he not be deemed seditious ? if in consequence

violence were offered to their persons and murders committed, would he not deservedly forfeit his life to the laws of his country?

Hufs having got possession of the Univerfity gives a tranflation of his favourite author *Wiclef*, and explains in the moft natural fenfe the doctrines already adduced. 'Twas not difficult to forefee the confequences which that *shrewd commentator*, an infuriate mob piously inflamed by a popular preacher would draw from this doctrine—that the people have a right to correct their fovereign and fpiritual fuperior, when they fin; and that the tythes are to be withheld from thofe who fin. Thefe fpeculations were immediately reduced to practice: *Wenceflaus* is forced to allow the tythes of the finful clergy to be withheld; an inquisition of finfulness is eftablifhed for that purpofe—the Clergy are treated as their brethren were lately in France. P. may object that the Clergy were Popifh—Yes! but they were the Clergy of the eftablifhed Church of Bohemia; and if they had been Proteftant, *Hufs* and his associates would not have fpared them—for once more *Hufs* was not a Proteftant in the greateft latitude of the term. He was a leader of Brigands, men fo infamous in principle and practice that we have as yet no terms in our language fufficiently expreffive of the idea. Mr. B. blufhes for P. who calls *Hufs* an innocent and injured man; for though P. be ftrongly tinctured with party prejudice, and injudicious in his choice of Hiftorians, he is not to be numbered amongst the herd of Pamphleteers. But *Hufs* wrote againft the Popifh Clergy, Popes and Cardinals! what then? fo did *Voltaire*, *Rouffeau*, and *Diderot*—they were not Proteftants; fo do Atheifts and Deifts—they are not Proteftants.

P. inadvertently ruins his own caufe: He admits that *Hufs* preached and wrote againft the vices of the Clergy—did any man ever expatiate on the virtues of the men againft whom he inflamed a mob? 'twas juridically

dically proved to the Council in presence of the Emperor and many other Princes, that the Clergy and some of the laity were in consequence of this preaching murdered. Why then call the man innocent? Such a plea would have justified Lord *George Gordon* and the many victims of his enthusiastic zeal, whom the public justice did not spare.

As to the recommendation of *Wenceslaus*, the Queen and the Bohemian Noblemen, the King was at the mercy of the insurgents; the Bohemian Lords were *Hufs'* agents: they shared the spoils of the German Lords, who had been some expelled and others murdered, and of the Bohemian Clergy.

The canonization of *Hufs* as stated by P. has rather a burlesque appearance: His disciples in Prague hear of his death, and in a fit of that pious zeal with which their beloved Pastor had more than once inflamed their minds, they rush into the Archbishop's house and into the houses of other ecclesiastics, plunder them and massacre several persons; *Hufs'* best friends, no doubt, whom they sent to hear his lectures in the other world; whilst their goods and chattles were consecrated to the pious uses of the new plantation of Saints of *Hufs'* manufacture.

Though this ceremony of his canonization gives no exalted idea of the meekness of the Martyr or his disciples, we turn with horror from the manner of his death.

Let us now return to the Council of Constance accused of perfidy by P; this is an old theme.

The conduct of this Council with respect to *Hufs* had been so clearly stated; all objections against the equity of its judgement so ably refuted; and all the artifices of its Enemies to involve the whole in obscurity so manifestly detected by different writers in different countries, that Mr. B. once thought the subject would never more come before the public. In this
however

however perhaps he has been deceived : there are men proof against conviction, of such unsurmountable obstinacy, that in the face of evidence they will persist in asserting what any party writer offers to flatter their prejudices, and on the credit of such writer without further discussion, hazard opinions an hundred times refuted to the total ruin of the credit of their own understanding. This is precisely the case of P. he confidently asserts, that the legality of destroying persons was taught as a catholic principle and reduced to practice by the Council of Constance. This assertion has been a thousand times refuted and if he has not seen the refutation, 'tis because he has not read polemical words. Does P. imagine that there is no other Spring of Action amongst Catholics but religious Principle ? does he think all Catholics totally divested of pride, of avarice, of resentment, of envy of jealousy, of all these passions which have such influence over the actions of other Men ? why not ascribe some of these crimes with which he charges Catholics to the true source ? that is, to one or other of these tumultuous passions which neither Law nor Religion can eradicate. Catholics know, how to distinguish between Principle and Passion : they never impute the Crimes of Protestants to principle, they attribute them to the true cause, that is to passion. This truth presupposed, Mr. B. tells P. with the utmost confidence, that there is no principle of persecution in the Catholic doctrine, that such a principle was never taught or reduced to practice by the Council of Constance or any other General Council, and of this he produces the testimony of a witness whose credit and competence are unquestionable with P ; 'tis *Collier* in his Ecclesiastical History, he says, “ the antient fathers thought methods of ex-
“ tremity were by no means agreeable to the Christian
“ institution, *non est religionis religionem cogere*, mis-
“ belief in religion was no forfeiture of life by the
“ doctrine of the primitive Christians : 'twas their per-
“ suasion

"suasion to let the tares alone till the harvest is come,
 "thus *St. Martin* and *St. Ambrose* refused to com-
 "municate with those who moved for the execution
 "of the heretic *Priscillian*." 'Tis therefore certain that
 there was no principle of persecution till the close of the
 fourth century; if P. will please to reflect that, that
 is truly and properly Catholic which has been believed
 at all times according to the rule stated by Mr. B. in
 his reply to P's second Letter, he will readily conclude
 that persecution is no principle of Catholic doctrine:
 the source of persecution must be sought for elsewhere,
 we shall soon discover it: 'tis a weed of that noxious
 kind which shews that there is nothing sound in the
 root, and from which it springs so immediately that
 'tis hardly possible to mistake it. Let us begin at
 home. In England the punishment of heresy was a
 censure of excommunication; if the error was consi-
 dered of a dangerous tendency, application was made
 to the secular power for a commission to confine the
 delinquent in the prison of the diocese; if he renoun-
 ced his error he was set at liberty and declared *Rectus*
in Curia (see *Collier* in his pref. to the 2nd vol. of *Ec.*
Hist.) he cites a licence from *Edward* the 3rd to the
 Bishop of London. The detestable faggot was intro-
 duced by the secular power in England as the inqui-
 sition was in Spain and Portugal. 'Tis not difficult to
 assign the occasion of this law: *Wicief's* punishment by
Courtney, Bishop of London, and by the Synod of
 Lambeth was simply an order of *Silence*, and he after-
 wards lived and died in his Parish of Lutterworth, in
 Leicestershire; the treatment of *Aystrton*, *Sundurbury*,
Rigg, *Ropingdon* and *Hereford*, was equally mild;
 but *Wicief* had sown the seeds of insurrection and the
 growth was strong and rapid. "*Wicief*," says Doctor
Heylein, in his *adimadversions* on *Fuller's Ecclesiasti-*
cal History, "declared against the lawfulness of oaths,
 "required an exact probity to give a title to property;
 "he affirmed than an ill man forfeits his right to domi-
 "nion,

“ nion, and that as long as a Prince continues in mortal sin his prerogative is lost.” Tenets contrary to peace and civil order. *Jack Straw*, and *Wat. Tyler*, military divines of true Mahometan breed, with some thousands of armed Saints at their back, undertook to dispossess the sinful Possessors of Estates and convey them to the Saints. *John Ball*, *Wat. Tyler's* Chaplain in ordinary, preaching to the levy en Masse deliv- his text from *Wicief's* revelation :—

“ When *Adam* delved and *Eve* span,
“ Who was then the Gentleman ?”

This commotion produced the Penal Statute of Ric. 2. An. 5. 6, against incendiary preachers.

The better sort among the Lallard's. *Wicief's* offspring, Sir John Latimer, Sir John Trussell, Sir Lodowick Clifford, Sir John Peche, Sir Richard Story, Sir Reginald Hamilton, brandished their swords and tongues against all who dared to think that sinful men had any title to power or property. This induced the Lords and Commons to complain to King Henry IVth. and in that very Parliament which curtailed the Pope's power in England, was enacted the famous statute which condemn'd the Lollards to the faggot. The Lollards had frightened the legislature and in their fright they pass'd this memorable law : the preamble of the Act states, “ that they excite and stir up the people to sedition and insurrection.” The tumult continuing under Sir John Oldcastle and others, a second Act was made against them in the reign of Henry Vth. in which they are charged with a design to subvert and destroy all the estates of the realm spiritual and temporal. 'Twas therefore the secular powers which enacted these very severe laws in their own defence with which the Catholic Clergy are now charged. The part consigned to the Clergy is easily deduced from this Act of Henry Vth. “ And forasmuch as the cognizance of Heresies, and errors and Lollardries belong to the judges, of Holy Church, and not to secular
lar

"lar judges, such persons indicted shall be delivered to
 " the ordinaries of the places or to their commissaries,
 " &c. to be acquit or convict by the laws of Holy
 " Church." From this it appears that a man must
 have been indicted for a crime against the state before
 he was sent to the ecclesiastical tribunal; the crime
 was complex, heresy exciting sedition and insurrection;
 the judgment of heresy unquestionably belonged to the
 ecclesiastical court, that of sedition to the secular
 judges; the Parliament assigned no greater jurisdiction
 to the ecclesiastical courts than what they always pos-
 sessed, and of which they could not divest themselves;
 when the ecclesiastical court delivered the delinquent
 convict to the secular power its jurisdiction ceased, and
 desiring the secular power not to proceed to extremi-
 ties was a formal protest against the severity of the law,
 which they had not power to cancel or controul. This
 inference is denied by *Collier*, whom P. has however
 imperfectly copied, "this endeavour," says he, "to ex-
 " cuse the Roman Clergy from being concerned in the
 " burning of Heretics is weak and trifling: for when
 the inquisition or the orderly delivers a Heretic con-
 " vict to the secular magistrate, the execution follows
 " as certainly as it does from the sentence of a Judge
 " when he condemns a malefactor for felony; to desire
 " that the Heretic may be gently used is little better
 " than jest and grimace, and signifies just as much as if
 " the Judge should desire the Sheriff to uie a man
 " condemned for murder kindly, when he knows
 " 'tis not in that Officers power to overrule the
 " sentence and stop the execution of the law." Mr.
 B. is surpris'd that a man of *Collier's* penetration did
 not immediately see the weakness and fallacy of this
 reasoning: the objection would have been unanswer-
 able if the secular court had given its jurisdiction and
 functions to the ecclesiastical court as it does to its own
 judges; but no such thing has happened; the eccle-
 siastical court judges of heresy as it did before any pe-

nal law was enacted; its judgment has no reference to penal laws; the ecclesiastical court knows that when its jurisdiction has ceased, in passing judgment on heresy, 'tis yet in the option of the secular court to pass sentence of death or to pardon, which is not the case of the Sheriff. Its recommendation to mercy is neither jest nor grimace, but a serious and solemn protestation against the severity of the law. If therefore an ecclesiastic recommends severity or threatens censures in case of lenity, 'tis not according to any principle of Catholic doctrine, but in direct opposition to every known principle of religion and law. P. admits it when he says that ecclesiastics were forbidden by the canon law to meddle with blood, and 'tis in consequence of this law that the Bishops in England retire on the trial of a Peer. If any ecclesiastic therefore directly or indirectly contributes to the effusion of blood, 'tis in him a personal crime of which he only is guilty, the effect of passion not of principle which condemns it.

Other writers remarking the weakness of *Collier's* reasoning and unwilling to give up a favourite theme, pretended that the Ecclesiastical Court might wink at the proofs and mitigate the verdict of heresy, not considering that such conduct would be a downright prevarication, and that the civil power is not to be eluded by indirect means.

Having thus clearly shown that so far from thinking it lawful to destroy persons under pretence of heresy there is no principle of persecution whatsoever in the Catholic Doctrine, that if any persons have been destroyed, on that, or any other pretence, their destruction must be ascribed to a malevolent disposition, a vindictive temper, or some other human passion in the principal actors in these bloody scenes, for which they stand accountable at the bar of justice.

Let us now return to the Council of Constance accused of perfidy by P. and by other writers of teaching that no faith is to be kept with heretics.

It must be premised that the Council exercised no jurisdiction over *Hufs* but that which the Church of England and the reformed Churches in Germany have exercised and continue to exercise, that is, to exclude from their communion by sentence of excommunication such of their own members as teach doctrines contrary to their established tenets and obstinately refuse to retract. Of the Church of England there can be no doubt: the 33rd Article is express. The reformed Churches of Germany, in the Synod of Dort, 1604, issued an excommunication of a smarting tendency; many Armenians were sent to the shades in consequence. This power of excommunication is claimed by all churches. Did the Council of Constance violate the safe conduct granted by the Emperor to *John Hufs*? No, the safe conduct was given that *Hufs* might appear before the Council and take his trial, not to protect him from the law in the event of conviction. The supposition is absurd, after conviction he was delivered to *Sigismund* an heretic convict; 'twas then at *Sigismund's* option to punish or pardon him: if the Emperor had granted *Hufs* a protection from punishment, in the case of conviction and obstinacy, two accusations would lie against *Sigismund*; the one of folly, for granting an unheard of protection, and the other of perfidy, for breaking it; but neither the one nor the other would be against the Council; whether *Sigismund* was an honest man or not he was not a despicable politician: the insurrection of *Zisca* and his Thaberites shews what he had to fear from the return of such a firebrand to Bohemia; and his expressions in the Council shew that he was aware of it: "there is not a single opinion of his," said the Emperor, "that does not call for the punishment of fire; I am for having him burned if he does not retract all, and even though he should obey the Council, I am of opinion that he should be forbid to preach and teach, or ever let foot again in the kingdom of Bohemia." From

these words of the Emperor two things are certain: that *Hufs* was condemned for obstinately refusing to retract doctrines manifestly blasphemous and seditious; and that he had already formed a strong party to support him against the authority of a sovereign, which is an overt act of treason in all countries.

Let us now examine the decrees complained of by P. and other Protestant writers. There are two ascribed to the Council of Constance, and one to the fourth of *Latran*; the copies of the former are taken from *Collier*, and that of the latter from *L'Enfant*, two Protestant writers of note but of different characters: *Collier* possessed the honest sincerity of the English Protestant, and *L'Enfant* all the duplicity of the French Hugonot.

“The present Synod (of Constance) declares that every safe conduct granted by the Emperor to persons accused of heresy ought not to be of any prejudice to the Catholic Faith, or to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction . . . and the person who shall have promised them security shall not in this case be obliged to keep his promise by whatsoever he may be engaged when he has done all that is in his power to do.”

How does this Canon authorize a man to break his engagements? the Council says that he is not obliged to keep his engagement when he has done all that is in his power to do. What! is a man obliged to do more than is in his power to do? was it in the Emperor's power to annihilate the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Council? the Emperors of Germany claimed no spiritual authority; and if they did, their claim would not be admitted. The Emperor did not promise to protect *Hufs* from the temporal jurisdiction of the Council, they exercised none without his sanction nor would he permit them. The Bull of *Martin 5th*: published by the approbation of the Council. (*sacro approbante Concilio*) clearly explains its meaning: the following

following is one of the questions proposed to a person suspected of heresy, “ whether he does not think that “ all wilful perjury committed upon any occasion “ whatsoever for the preservation of one’s life, or another man’s or even *for the sake of faith* is a mortal “ sin !” — Here we see the Council of Constance by a public and authentic act make it a term of Communion to disclaim this very doctrine with which *L’Infant* charged them. *L’Infant* admits that the Bull is inconsistent with the decree; he ought to have said that ’twas inconsistent with the sense which he endeavoured to affix to that decree : if there had been any obscurity in the decree the Bull would have been an authentic explanation of it, by the men who had a right to explain it.

This Bull, the authenticity of which was never disputed, shews that Canon which *L’Infant* pretended to find in some Vienna manuscript to be spurious. This Canon is not found in any authentic copy of the Council, and contradicts the sentiments of these Prelates clearly expressed in the Bull. The following copy is taken from *L’Infant*, who, as he could produce no other authority but an anonymous manuscript found in some library must pass for the father of it. “ Where- “ as there are certain persons who traduce not “ only the Emperor but the sacred Council, saying “ that the safe conduct granted to *John Hufs* . . . was “ basely violated although according to the na- “ tural divine and human laws no promise ought to “ have been kept with him to the prejudice of the “ Catholic Faith” Though the Bull of *Martin* the Vth. gives a direct contradiction to this spurious Canon of *L’Infant’s* invention, and Catholics have continually disclaimed it; yet it served the author’s purpose : it impressed on the minds of the Calvinists an irreconcilable aversion to their Catholic Brethren, and an unconquerable diffidence in all the overtures of Government : would to the Heavens it had been confined

fined to France, and that the poison had not infected the native sincerity of some virtuous men in England.

Let us now pass to the Canon of *Latran* which P. gives nearly as it is given by *Collier*, there is however this remarkable difference that *Collier* says in the fifth book of the first vol. of *Ecc. Hist.* that this Canon is not found in any Copy co-eval with the Council. *Dupin* also rejects it as spurious, the fact is, 'twas produced some centuries after in Germany, by somebody who found it in a manuscript compiled by somebody; thus a decree found by somebody whom we don't know, and compiled by somebody whom he did not know, is obtruded on the credulity of the public as a Canon of a General Council which we all know, and in the authentic copies of which there is no such Canon. Some Catholics believed it genuine, not suspecting the forgery as some credulous men believed the idle tale of *Pope Joan*, yet before the forgery was detected, the proposition of *Sanctorellus* asserting that, the Pope could depose Kings guilty of heresy, was declared to be "new, false, erroneous, contrary to the word of God, calculated to bring an odium on the See of Rome, to impair the supreme civil authority that depends on God alone, and to disturb the public tranquillity."—Sentence of the faculty of Paris against *Sanctorellus*, An. 1626. Did P. ever hear that the university of Paris taught any doctrine contrary to the principles of religion universally admitted? the university believed the Council infallible! yes, in doctrinal decisions, so does Mr. B; but the university knew that the Council could not engraft the temporal power on their divine spiritual commission, and break the boundaries which God had set; all Acts therefore of Pope or Council concerning the prerogatives or disposition of civil Government are extra-judicial beyond the limits of their sphere; if therefore this spurious Canon had been genuine, 'twould only prove that the fathers of that Council had strayed beyond the limits within which they

they claim infallibility. Nothing can set this argument in a stronger light than the reception of the Council of Trent; its doctrinal decrees are universally admitted by Catholics, its dispositions of discipline interfering with the civil power are not received in many Catholic countries; they have been adopted in France, but under the sanction of the *Edict of Blois*.

In 1682, the Clergy of France published a declaration in which they assert that the Pope's power is purely spiritual; that he has no authority either directly or indirectly over the civil or temporal concerns of Princes. The same doctrine was taught in Spain after the death of *Sebastian*, King of Portugal—*Philip*, King of Spain, claimed the succession as did other Princes on different titles. Pope *Paul IV*th. wished the competitors to be tried before him—the Spanish divines consulted by the King declared that the Pope had no authority in worldly possessions. When the Bull of excommunication was published against Queen *Elizabeth*, her Catholic subjects directed by the Clergy, offered to support the Queen with their lives and fortunes, against the Pope or any other invader, so true it is, that this power which some Popes pretended to assume, was never believed to exist but in their ambition.

Nor were these two spurious decrees of *Constance* and *Latran* ever believed authentic but by some Protestant Writers, whom we Catholics have not commissioned to compose our creed, and if P. possessed that omnipotence which *Blackstone* ascribes to Parliament, though the simplicity of our ancestors thought omnipotence an attribute of a higher power, or even that infallibility of surmise of which P. is so jealous, which by the bye was never claimed by any human tribunal before; he could not persuade us that any doctrine which we do not believe is a part of our creed, nor that these doctrines which our ancestors disclaimed was any part of theirs. Of this Mr. B. brings the most convincing evidence,
 Penal

Penal restrictions during the space of 100 years could never force them to renounce their creed, what therefore they disclaimed they did not believe. To this Mr. B. adds anticipating what P. may insinuate, that stubborn facts against which all supposition is vain, demonstrate to the world that the C's of the united Kingdom never believed that the Pope or any other power on earth could dispense with their oaths or engagements. Surely P. will admit that to take and subscribe the qualifying oath would have freed Catholics from all restraints; they have never done it, therefore they never received any dispensation to do it, nor did they ever apply for any such dispensations, because they know that no such dispensation is granted.

P. perhaps is not aware that to charge Catholics with principles which they disclaim, or to accuse them of intentions which they abhor, is the most effectual means to confirm them in their faith: few Catholics or Protestants discuss the controversies on abstruse speculative doctrines in which they differ; but the most ignorant Catholic knows that imputations of doctrines, the contrary of which he has been taught from his infancy, are false, and he readily concludes that the spirit of truth and charity does not preside over the Counsels of men who make imputations, which, whether intended or not, are calculated to bring an odium on their brethren.

As to the crimes with which P. charges some Popes and other Catholics, Mr. B. in his next will throw Popes into the scale in favor of P. and on settling accoupts P. may find the balance against him; he will also discuss the gunpowder plot, and the business of 1641.—P. does not seem to be well informed of these transactions.

POSTSCRIPT.

Mr. B. begs leave to inform the constant reader of the *Weekly Chronicle*, that we R. C. believe Holy Orders

Orders to be a Sacrament ; that whether the ordination of Ministers in the reformed Churches be valid or invalid is no more an article of our faith than whether the Sun revolves about the Earth or the Earth about the Sun. Mr. B. is in the habit of considering and calling these Gentlemen, Clergymen who are publicly deputed to exercise clerical functions without inquiring whether their ordination be valid or invalid, or whether they be ordained at all or not ; and he apprehends that this is a general rule.

Mr. B. wishes to know by what extraordinary powers of divination this constant reader has discovered that to be a principle of Mr. B's religion which is no principle of religion at all ; or how he has detected Mr. B's private opinion on a subject on which he has formed no opinion, nor even bestowed a serious thought. He also wishes to inform him that these strong expressions in his Letter of Instruction, are not of his own invention : they are taken from a book of great antiquity, and high authority published some 1700 years before Mr. B. was born ; the application was then made, and will continue to be made, as long as the work exists ; 'tis an awful lesson, and the man is not wise who applies it to himself.

E. B.

Halifax, April 28, 1804.

CONTINUATION OF A
REPLY to PALÆOLOGUS' Third LETTER.

ὁ γὰρ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ ὁ Ποικίλος οὐ τὸ ἐμμετρά λεγὼν ἔμμετρα διαφερουσίν ἀλλὰ τούτῳ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λεγόν, τὸν δὲ βία ἀνομοίωτον.

Arist. de arte poet.

The Historian does not differ from the Poet, because the one speaks in Metre, and the other in Prose, but because the one relates facts and the other the qualities of facts.

If P. had been attentive to this rule of his countryman, Aristotle, he would not have committed himself in publishing facts on the authority of writers, whose errors have been more than once refuted, and whose artifices have been publicly detected; he would have left to Poets the care of embellishing facts, and confined himself to truth, which cannot be discovered without observing that rule of justice, *audi alteram partem*; or if he had been observant of his own declaration, that even passion should not induce him to use any expression unbecoming a Christian or a Gentleman, he never would have published facts of an infamous nature, reflecting on the dead, and manifestly intended to bring an odium on the living, and that on the furnish of party writers, whose character for veracity is not so high in the literary world as P. imagines. If P. thinks that a maxim of the Christian Religion, Mr. B. tells him without hesitation that he is a stranger to the first elements of Christianity.

It has been shewn already that the Canon of the Council of Letranon which he founds his charge against 400 Prelates and 800 Dignitaries of the C. Church is spurious, a piece of forgery intended to widen the breach, which was caused by the separation of the reformed Churches in Germany and France from the Church of Rome, as was that pretended Canon of the Council of Constance, which is said to authorize breach of faith with Heretics.

A friend to truth has told P. the general opinion of Fleury's and Maimbourg's veracity, to which Mr. B. for the information of the public whose credulity might be imposed on, adds that the continuator of Fleury's history was not a Catholic in any sense; he was a Jansenist, or if you will a Hugonot in disguise, whose object was to ruin the authority of the Roman See in France, and upon the whole a contemptible scribbler.

Mr. B. is willing to believe the quotations from three or four Schoolmen correct. He has already told

P. that Schoolmen are neither Popes nor Councils; that it is not a rule of Catholic doctrine to admit the opinions of Schoolmen, but on the contrary to oblige them to submit their opinions to the decisions of the Church.

As to the thought which Pope Pius the Vth. had of procuring the murder of Queen Elizabeth, the author of his life must have been a shrewd fellow to discover it: he does not appear to have been the Pope's Confessor or very intimate in his family; and the sagacity of Fleury's continuator must have been equally strong to discover that he had sent Norton to comfort the discontented noblemen in England.

Mr. B. would advise **P.** to read some treatise on the nature of evidence: this is a material enquiry, "how did the witness come at the knowledge of the fact?" does **P.** think all biographers infallible? Strype might have found Como's letter amongst Lord Burleigh's papers; he ought to have told us how it came there, and we should have concluded that the Cardinal was both a knave and a fool—a knave for writing such a letter, and a fool for entrusting it to such a messenger; but as he has not told us how this original letter got amongst Burleigh's papers, we must suspend our judgment; and not take Strype's bare assertion for proof that such a paper was an authentic original, written by a man whom Strype never saw.—Such originals, if report tells truth, were not scarce in Burleigh's days, and answered a very good purpose. To all these crimes with which **P.** charges Popes and Bishops, **Mr. B.** gives the answer which St. Austin gave the donatists who in this time accused the Popes Marcellinus, Marcellus, Sylvester, Melchiades and other Prelates of the Catholic Church, as they are now accused by **P.** and others, "it is a great and glorious comfort." said he (*Lib de un Bap. con. Petil. Cap. 16.*) "for any of us to be falsely accused as the Church is, by the enemies of the Church; but the defence

“ of the Church does not consist in the defence of these
 “ men, whom they unjustly accuse: for let Marcellinus,
 “ Marcellus, Melchiades, &c. be what you please,
 “ it does not in the least prejudice the Catholic Church,
 “ which is spread over the world, we are neither to
 “ be crowned for their innocence, nor condemned for
 “ their sins, if they were good, they were cleansed on
 “ the Catholic floor like corn, if they were bad they
 “ were crushed like straw, on the Catholic floor:
 “ within that floor there may be good and bad.”
 From this P. may see that accusations against Popes
 began as early as the 4th century, and that they have
 been then, and ever since disregarded by Catholics; that
 to bring such accusations before the public has been at
 all times considered as a mere artifice to divert the
 public attention from the real state of the question
 in dispute between Catholics and their opponents.

The Gun-Powder Plot being well calculated in P's
 opinion to raise a prejudice against Catholics, he breaks
 the order of time to introduce it; he gives it in the
 words of an Historian, whom he calls impartial. It
 is rather singular that P. should discover the impar-
 tiality of a professed sceptic, of which he was never be-
 fore suspected. 'Tis true in speaking of Wiclef's sy-
 stem fearing to be detected in infamous fraud, he ad-
 mits that one of Wiclef's tenets was, “ that dominion
 was founded in grace.” a maxim truly jacobinical, tho'
 P. finds nothing seditious in Wiclef's disciples. Mr. B.
 begs leave to give the history of the gun-powder plot
 from others either more impartial or better informed than
 Hume. These gentlemen don't deny the Plot: they
 admit that Catesby and twelve associates did intend to
 blow up the King and Parliament; but they pretend
 that 'twas no more a Popish Plot, than that of the
 Plot of the Earls of Murray, Morton and Bothwell
 and others of the reformed Church, who did in fact
 blow up King James' father, was a protestant Plot;
 and to this they add that the King and Parliament was
 in

in no danger from the Plot, but that the Estates of many Catholic Noblemen and Gentlemen were in imminent danger. Cecil, a man deeply read in politics, who had inherited a double portion of Walsingham's spirit, a man who knew well how to contrive and discover plots as the unfortunate Mary knew, was in all appearance the chief Engineer. Mr. Osborne, a protestant writer says, page 34, "that 'twas a neat device of the Secretary." Saunderson in his life of Mary Queen of Scots, says of Walsingham, Cecil's master, that he had bribed Sir Amias Pawlet to counterfeit a fidelity to the queen in prison, and thro' a private hole, convey letters between her and Conspirators, "which letters were sure to be opened and read by Walsingham who got the keys of the Cyphers, and had answers counterfeited to involve whom he pleased to suspect in the Plot." King James himself, after the hurry was over, used to call the 5th of November Cecil's Holiday. Lord Cobham and others say Mr. B's authors, declared that they heard it from the King's mouth.

A minute discussion of all the circumstances of the letter sent to my Lord Mounteagle, which led to a discovery of the Plot, plainly indicates the author of the Letter: 'twas written in a mysterious style, yet sufficiently expressive of some plot, 'twas sent ten days before the meeting of Parliament, consequently afforded full time to investigate the matter. If the letter had been intended merely to save Mounteagle's life, the night before the meeting of Parliament, or the very morning of the meeting would have been a more proper time; but the writer had other objects in view. These considerations induced Saunderson to say, p. 334, "The Jesuits had a note of Cecil's name in their register not as a day labourer that carried some few stones or sticks, but as a master workman, whose foreign and domestic engineers wrought in the mine."—And More, in his history of the English province,

province, p. 210, says, “ there was no light suspici-
 “ on of a Peer’s knowing the conspiracy, long before its
 “ discovery, who cunningly pretended ignorance that
 “ more might be involved.”

P. pretends that these men who were at the tail of a Plot, involved in mystery without knowing who was at the head, were not of desperate fortunes or otherwise of profligate morals—this is an indecent imposition on the credulity of the Public. King James and his privy Council who examined the circumstances of the Plot, expressly declare the contrary, “ whereas” said the King in his second proclamation, “ Thomas Piercy, “ and some other confederates, being of lewd life, intolerent dispositions, and for the most part of desperate Estates, &c.” If the many inaccuracies in P’s Letters had not already reduced his credit as low as possible, this daring contradiction to the assertion of King and Council is alone sufficient to blast it forever. Now Mr. B. is willing to admit that the Conspirators were such as P. would wish them, not such as the King and Council thought them, by what rule of equity will he pretend that the Catholics in England were engaged in a Plot, of which they knew nothing? or how will he teach them to believe that traitors act according to the principle of their religion when to a man they know that the principles of the faith which they believe and profess, denounce the vengeance of Heaven against every species of treason?

’Tis undeniably true that there were at that time many who wished that the desperate enterprize of these miscreants might be imputed to the whole body of English Catholics; ’twould have produced many forfeitures—the men are now no more: but that the spirit which actuated them is not yet dead appears manifestly in P’s letters. King James and his Council was of a different opinion; in his Proclamation of the 7th of November, 1605, he says, “ We are by good ex-
 “ perience so well persuaded of the loyalty of divers
 “ subjects

“ subjects of the Romish religion, that they do as much
 “ abhor this detestable conspiracy as ourself;” and of
 this persuasion King James gave sufficient proofs in the
 latter half of his reign; he admitted Henry, Earl of
 Northampton a R. C. into his Council, and made Sir
 Giles Calveit a Hispaniolized Papist, as Wilson a Pro-
 testant Historian calls him, Secretary of State, King
 James therefore knew that there was nothing traitero-
 us in the principles of his Catholic subjects.

Before this subject be dismissed Mr. B. begs leave to
 rectify another error in P's statement;—he says that
 the Jesuit Garnet removed their scruples with respect
 to the legality of the Plot. The Jesuit Garnet was
 not amongst the conspirators; he knew of the conspi-
 racy but under the seal of confession, and endeavoured
 to dissuade the pretended penitent from an enterprize
 which Garnet knew well would terminate in the de-
 struction of the conspirators, and so far were the con-
 spirators from concealing their associates that they ac-
 cused even their confessors; Garnet was in conse-
 quence arrested and executed for not revealing what
 he knew but under the inviolable seal of confession.
 At his death he condemned the Plot and every species
 of treason, strenuously recommended loyalty and pa-
 tience to his suffering brethren; the Plot, therefore,
 was not consistent with his principles, or he would at
 that awful moment, avow it. Did P. ever hear that
 the Catholics who were executed for denying Henry
 the VIIIth's supremacy disavowed the principle at their
 death?

It must be admitted that P. is an indefatigable col-
 lector, or a most diligent transcriber of Murders and
 Massacres committed by Papists against Protestants
 some two or three hundred years before Melancton as-
 sumed the appellation, or even before Luther thought
 of the reformation.

No French writer pretends to justify the proceedings
 of the league, much less the massacre of Paris, but they
 unanimously

unanimously ascribe them to the true cause, that is the blood which was spilled in the league to the ambition of the Duke of Guise and his party, and the massacre of Paris to State policy, the Hugonots had maintained an obstinate rebellion against their lawful Sovereign ten years; they had made themselves masters of the strongest places in France, Montauban, Rochelle, &c. they had introduced a foreign enemy into the country, and the question was become serious, not whether the new religion should supplant the old, but whether Charles 9th was to be a King, or a King of Clouts; add to this that the Hugonots had set the example of spilling blood; immediately after the release of the Prince of Conde from prison, who had been condemned for treason under Francis 2nd. and liberty of conscience universally established, the Hugonots in a fit of that zeal to which Frenchmen are strangely addicted, massacred many people in Paris, burned the Church of St. Medard, rifled some of the Monastries and committed other excesses (see Davila) and when Montbriffon was taken on capitulation by Francis de Beaumont Baron des Adrets, he brought the soldiers and their general, whom he had under the faith of the capitulation, to the platform of the Castle, from which they were thrown and received by his soldiers on their pikes. Catholics ascribe this unparalleled act of cruelty, and perfidy, to the savage ferocity of the man, not to any principle of that religion for which he fought, Doctor Heylin in his History of Pres. Lib. 2 v. page 70. says, “ a greater diffidence was raised against the Hugonots by the unseasonable zeal of the Queen of Navarre, who, not content with settling the Protestant religion in the country of Berne, where she was absolute, and supreme, suffered the Catholics to be infested in the provinces, which she held immediately of the crown insomuch that at Pamiers, (the chief city of the Earldom of Foix,) the Hugonots taking offence at a solemn procession held upon Corpus Christi

“ Christi, An. 1566, betock themselves presently to arms,
 “ and falling upon those whom they found unarmed, not
 “ only made a great slaughter amongst the Churchmen,
 “ but in the heat of the same fury burned down their
 “ houses, which outrage being suffered to pass unpunished,
 “ gave great encouragement and example to some furious
 “ zealots to commit the same in other places as namely at
 “ Montauban, Calion, Rodez, Perjeuæ, Valence, &c.”

All this happened six years before the massacre of Paris, which was a mere Cabinet plot between a weak and wicked Prince and the Queen mother, an artful and ambitious woman, whose religion sat as loosely on her as her cloak, inclining to either side as best suited her purpose. (See Davila, Lib. 5.) Mr. B. has once more to request that P. will cease to impose on the public by pretending to quote Catholic authors. Fleury's continuator, from whom he borrows most, was a catholic, as Gibbons was a christian, that is, he assumed the name to give some colour of truth to his malevolent slanders and furnish matter for other envenomed pens to add to the abuse which he lavishes on Popes and others. As to Musgrave's authority which he quotes, his countryman, Counsellor Scully, who seems to know Musgrave better, in a loyal work published in Dublin, qualifies his memoirs, *Musgrave's Fables*.

P. gives a tragical description of the massacres of the innocent and enlightened Albigenes—does he intend to insinuate that the Albigenes were Protestants? if so, Mr. B. begs leave to undeceive him, or rather the Public, whom P. studiously endeavours to deceive. Protestants do not believe that the devil is the creator of this visible world—the Albigenes did. Protestants do not believe that the devil was the God of Moses and the Jews—the Albigenes did: Protestants do not believe that marriage is damnable, and impurity discipline—the Albigenes did. In a word they believed all the impieties and absurdities which were disseminated in the world by that arch impostor *Manes*; of this we have the testimony of all cotemporary writers, and of two Gen. Councils, the 3d and 4th of Lat-

ran, and that they were as diabolical in their actions, as in their principles, we know from the same authority. The 3d Latran, after giving an account of that abominable sect, whose strongest visible garrison was at Thoulouse, proceeds thus, "item concerning the Brabanions, and Arragonians, Men of Navarre, of Basque Coterels, Triaverdivci, who exercise such horrid cruelty upon Christians as neither to regard Churches nor Monasteries, nor to give quarter to widows or to orphans, to old men or boys, or any age or sex; but who, like heathens, destroy and desolate all before them, we likewise establish, &c." When in any Canon of these Councils the temporal authority is assumed, P. will please to remark that 'twas with the consent of temporal Princes, present either in person or by their ambassadors, and sanctioned by their authority. We know from the Abbot of Urberg and Matt. Par, that there were present at the fourth of Latran, Ambassadors from 2 Emperors, 7 Kings, many other Princes and Noblemen, the Pope, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, and Germanus the Deacon, proxy for Alexandria. These innocent Albigenses were massacred as Jack Catch massacres highwaymen and assassins at Tyburn; and their army amounting to 70,000 was massacred by Simon of Montfort, as the Rebels were massacred at Vinegar Hill, by the King's troops; their leaders were massacred as the Lord Mayor of London massacred Wat. Tyler, who led his Lollards to battle, or as Sir John Oldcastle was massacred by the common hangman in Henry the 5th's reign for the honourable cause of rebellion and treason. What does Fox and Southwell mean by calling the Lollards and Wickliffites Martyrs? 'tis the cause, not the punishment which makes the Martyr. Jack Catch makes many such Martyrs per annum—do they intend to canonize Rebellion and Treason?

But P. may object to the testimony of a general Council. Be it so! we Catholics are inclined to believe that six or eight hundred men, who had a character to support them, and in future ages did not combine to impose on the world,

world, and in concert attest a falshood ; and P. must permit us to continue in this belief, till we have something more than his assertions, or the conjectures of his new modelled historians, to induce us to change our opinion.

There is one doctrinal decree of the 4th of Latran, 'tis awfully worded, and tho' recorded in the days of ignorance and popish superstition, Mr. B. thinks he hears in it the deep voice of that universal spirit who was promised to conduct the church to the end of time, and who speaks beyond the visible limits of being, " it declares the unity and perfections of God ; the creation of visible and invisible things ; that the fallen angels were created by God and were good ; that the same God, who gave the first covenant and inspired the Prophets, did also give the Gospel ; that the incarnation, death and resurrection really took place ; that the Church of believing men is one, out of which not one at all is saved ; that Christ is the Priest and sacrifice, that his body is verily contained in the eucharistic mystery, by a substantial, not imputed change of the elements, to the end that we might receive of his own, what he assumed of our own, the mystery of union ; that this sacrament is accomplished only by a Priest lawfully ordained ; that baptism administered by any person is efficacious ; that repentance after baptism is allowed ; that Christians in the state of marriage may obtain salvation."

These were the articles denied by the Maricheans, the Waldenses and Albigenes—all chips of the same block.

We are come at length to the memorable transaction in Ireland, that is the massacre in 1641. This P. touches with a delicate hand ; he fears to detail it ; 'tis too interesting, too moving, too near home ; like a mute he points at the shocking barbarities ; hangs his head in sorrowful silence, and withdraws from the scene : in his collection of murders and massacres, as he calls them, interspersed in a space of 800 years, he has given a strong specimen of his delicacy ; and in his unwearied efforts to shew that all the murders and massacres were to be ascribed solely to
the

the principles of that faith which we Catholics now profess, he has given a stronger specimen of his fears to irritate the public mind; we give him credit for his benevolence, and his conciliating disposition. Protestants, he says, are willing to forget these things, we verily believe it; and hence we conclude that he is not a Protestant, but a Jacobin in disguise, who has assumed the name of Protestant the more effectually to deceive, and we add that hitherto his publications have made no impressions on our minds, nor caused any irritations amongst us, and we have strong reasons to believe and hope, that they have been equally ineffectual on the minds of our Protestant brethren: however as Mr. B. has followed P. through so many scenes of blood, he must not be terrified at this. He means to probe the sore, to speak P's language.

Mr. B. premises, that all the writers on that subject, from Lord Clarendon down to P; Hume, Brook, &c. have not added an atom of credit to the primitive tale told by the Lords' Justices, Borlase and Parsons. This must be admitted, because they all draw from the same source, they cite the same authority.

My Lord Clarendon tells us, "that in this blessed condition of peace and security, the English and Irish, the Protestants and Catholics, lived during the whole reign of James the First, and from his death every degree of happiness was increased and improved, under the government of His late Majesty King Charles the First." Here is a great display of oratory; it wants but a few grains of historical truth to make it a finished piece. His Lordship's memory thought proper to fail him at times, and it found no times more convenient to play him such naughty tricks, than when an impression unfavourable to Catholics was the result. Of this he gave a signal instance in his account of the escape of Charles the Second, after the battle of Worcester, passing in silence the six days immediately after the defeat, during which critical time the King was in the hands of Catholics, and by their exertions escaped the vigilance of his pursuers, though his Lordship acknow-
ledget

ledges that he had the particulars of his escape from the King's own mouth. His memory thought proper to fail him in the same manner, in his account of the happiness and security of Irish Catholics during the reigns of James and Charles. His Lordship might have remembered that in the 2d of Elizabeth a statute was passed which obliged Irish Catholics to attend the Protestant worship, of which they did not understand a word, under the penalty of 12d per Sunday, no trifling sum in them days; that in 1629 a Proclamation issued against the exercise of Popish rites and ceremonies; that in 1633 the Catholic Clergy were so tyrannically persecuted in Dublin, that Doctor Borlase, a Protestant writer, jestingly says, some of them hanged themselves in their own defence, a ceremony at which their countrymen were not much edified.

In the beginning of the reign of James the First, the most of the lands in Ireland were in Catholic hands; some courtiers in England, whose estates had not been diminished by confiscations and forfeitures, thought the business might prove equally profitable in the neighbouring island: an inquisition of titles is instituted, against which that first of all titles, and most universal, patriarchal possession for ages, gave no security: Escheats on defective titles were numerous in James' reign. Sir Arthur Chichester, his deputy, had 10,000l. sterling per annum for his dividend. The inquisition continued to act with energy in Charles the First's reign. Lord Falkland had 10,000l. gratuity. The Earl of Strafford, whose diligence was quickened by a retrospect of the rewards of his predecessors, added to the court a body of 500 horse, whom he called *good lookers on*; he sought fit men to sit on juries, and found it advantageous to give a certain portion to the judges. In the county of Galway when a jury refused to dispossess the natives, he fined the Sheriff, who returned the jury 1,000l. and bound the jury to answer in the *Castle Chamber*, where, said he, "we conceive it is fit that their pernicious carriage be followed with all just severity." In consequence four whole counties were found for the King in Connaught,

naught, and a vast extent of country in Munster.—(See Temple's Hist.) In those happy days, was that memorable transaction of Mullomast, where the *good lookers on* dispossessed some proprietors of all useless lumber, heads and titles, &c. Poor Strafford was dispossessed in the same manner himself by *other lookers on*—peace to his manes.

A Committee of the Irish House of Commons in 1634, complained that “neither the laws of nature, of reason, custom or profession, for centuries, could preserve to Irish Catholics the inheritance of their ancestors, to the utter overthrow of many noble and deserving persons, that for valuable considerations of service, of money, or both, honorably and fairly acquired their estates.”

If this be a state of peace, security, and happiness, Mr. B. is at a loss to guess what his Lordship would call a state of alarm, anxiety, and misery. Perhaps his Lordship thought it a state of happiness compared to the universal alarm excited by the terrific measures of Borlase and Parsons, and the inhuman cruelties exercised under the inspection, if not by the direction of these traitors to their King, and worse than tyrannic oppressors of the unhappy Country over which they were placed.

That on the 23d of October, 1641, some of the Irish who had been in Tyrone's Rebellion, took up arms in Ulster is true, and that some excesses were committed is equally true; but that the insurrection was not general until the Irish were driven to desperation, and left no alternative but death by a halter or sword, by Borlase and Parsons, is not less true, and that even then the numbers destroyed have been scandalously and maliciously exaggerated, to serve the most wicked purposes, has been shewn to demonstration by the ingenuous author of the *Trial of the Cause*, a Protestant writer.

The inquisition of titles having deprived so many proprietors of their estates, an application was made to the King to put a stop to its proceedings and indemnify the proprietors; His Majesty having signified his intentions of giving the Irish Agents satisfaction, two bills were prepared by

by the Lord's Justices for settling the Irish estates; to these the King agreed and sent them back in order to have them passed into laws by the Irish Parliament: at this time the independents taking advantage of the general discontent occasioned by an unwarranted stretch of prerogative, had gained an ascendancy in Parliament, and the King's power was visibly on the decline. Parsons and Borlase who were well informed of the state of things in England, greedily seized the opportunity of increasing the existing clamours in hopes of forcing some insurrection which would produce a plentiful crop of forfeitures and confiscations; they prorogued the Parliament for three months regardless of the King's express command, by his letter of the 28th of March, to continue the Parliament until he should think proper to determine it.

On the memorable 23d of October, when the rising took place in Ulster, a report was industriously circulated in England, that the insurrection was universal, and that 100,000 Protestants had been massacred, though there was not a drop of blood spilled as yet. A proclamation of Borlase and Parsons was issued to give a colour to the report: 'twas without distinction against all Irish Papists as traitors to the state. 'Tis something remarkable that the King's Generals, the Earls of Clanricarde and Castlehaven, were both Irish Papists at the very time, and their armies composed of Irish Papists. This proclamation having produced its effect, was corrected by a second in which they say, that by the words *Irish Papist*, they understood the old mere Irish in the province of Ulster, who had plotted, &c.

That there were no others as yet engaged in the rebellion we know from the Earl of Clanricarde's letter to the Lord Chamberlain, dated the 14th of November, 1641. "None," said he, "appears in the detestable conspiracy but the remains of the ancient Irish Rebels in the North, and some in the planted country of Leitrim." And from the letter of Sir John Borlase, and Sir William Parsons, to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, then in England,
 this

this letter is dated the 14th Decembèr 1641.—“ The fire which was first kindled in Ulster, and lay awhile smothered in other parts, begins now to break out generally.” ’Tis unfortunate for these men, that, being high in office, their public dispatches, which remain, contradict the private reports which were circulated by their agents; in their letter of the 25th of October, to the Lord Lieutenant, they give him an account of some houses and villages being plundered, not one word of murder; and in their commission of the 23d of December, 1641, to magistrates to enquire and examine witnesses as to the robberies, spoils, &c. in which the most minute enquiry is ordered; there is not a word of murder or massacres, so that all these massacres of the months of October, November and December, were committed upon English paper.

Borlase tells us that in his time it “ was confidently averred by the Irish, that not above seventeen were killed at the beginning of the insurrection.” This he calls a bold assertion, why not refute it? Sir John Temple admits that many murders were not committed “ that which these rebels intended at first and most busily employed themselves about, was driving away Englishmen’s cattle and possessing themselves of their goods.” What you’ll say, was there no murder? yes too many on both sides; but not before Borlase and Parsons had forced the great body of Catholics to take up arms in defence of their lives, and left them no alternative but to see their wives and children butchered in their presence by a fanatical and infuriate soldiery, or defend them, of this we have undeniable proof: the King finding his situation critical in England and desirous of suppressing the flame which began to shew itself in Ulster, directed the Lords’ Justices to offer a pardon to such of the Rebels as would come in within a stated time, they had already disobeyed his orders in refusing to give some satisfaction to the ruined proprietors, and in proroguing the Parliament against his positive injunction, and this offer of pardon was most traitorously perverted.

In the month of November, immediately after the raising in Ulster, the Parliament met in order to pass the Bills of Limitation sent by the King to quiet the distracted minds of the people, and suppress the rebellion in its infancy. In a most loyal address they offered with their lives and fortunes to support the Government and suppress the insurrection, “ this way of proceeding did not it seems square with the Lords’ Justices designs, who were often heard to say, *that the more were in Rebellion, the more Lands should be forfeit to them*, and therefore, in the very heat of the business, they resolved upon a prorogation, which the Parliament understanding, the Lord Viscount Costelloe, and myself, were sent from the House of Lords, and others from the Commons to the Lords’ Justices, to desire the continuance of the Parliament till the rebels, then few in number, were reduced: but our address was slighted, and the Parliament the next day, prorogued to the great surprize of both houses, and the general dislike of all honest and knowing men.” This is the testimony of the Earl of Castlehaven, one of the King’s Generals, and a Peer of the Land, he continues to inform us “ that although His Majesty and both Houses of the English Parliament had recommended it to them to bestow His Majesty’s gracious pardon to all such as should, within a convenient time, return to their obedience: yet these Lords’ Justices did by their proclamation limit these, His Majesty’s and the Parliament of England’s favorable and general intentions to the inhabitants of a few Counties only, *provided always they were not freeholders*, and allowed them but ten days to come in.” In the late French Revolution the most unpardonable crime was to possess an Estate, ’twas so in Ireland in the opinion of Borlase and Parsons. The Earl of Clanricarde, in his letter from Ireland to the Duke of Richmond, dated the 23d January, 1641, says, that “ all were discontented with those that managed the affairs of state, whom they charged with secret practising both there and in England before the commotions began to raise parties and factions to destroy their religion, to

divert and hinder the King's graces intended towards them, and by that means to put them into desperation that they might forfeit their lives and fortunes, and as the distempers began that they had so disposed of affairs as if the design was laid to put the whole nation into rebellion." There is a letter of the Earl to the King, in date January 22, of the same import, "the first motives, and the encrease of those distempers are offered to be proved by the testimonies of several persons of worth and quality." Mr. B. does not think it necessary to add any thing to the testimony of these noblemen, who, from their situation, must have a thorough knowledge of the subject. Yet he borrows from the history of independency a passage of two; the author was an avowed enemy to the Irish, his testimony in their favor is of great weight, "the independents, says he, in the (English Parliament) insisted openly upon it, to have the papists of Ireland rooted out, and their lands sold to adventurers, and passing an Act to that purpose, necessitated the Irish, to murder the English protestants, which was purposely done by the independents, that both papists and protestants might destroy one another." Achilles wished that the Greeks and Trojans should destroy each other, that he and his myrmidons might enjoy the spoils.

'Twas publicly known that Parsons and Borlase were connected with the independents, and Parsons had publicly declared more than once that there would not be a papist left in Ireland in the course of the year. These declarations, and the refusal to obey the King's orders, drove them to despair, and in despair they took up arms, but they neither murdered nor massacred, till they saw their wives butchered, and their children tossed on pikes. Lord Clarendon himself says "others (of the Irish) were, by the passion and rigour of those, who were thus in authority, and had power enough to destroy, whom they had inclination enough to suspect, or accuse, driven to put themselves under the protection of those, whose ways and courses they totally disapproved."

Parsons's declaration that, in twelve months, no papist should be seen in Ireland, and the furious orders issued to the party in arms, instead of the amnesty, which had been expected, and the bloody execution of these orders on the very infants, "not only exasperated the rebels, and induced them to commit the like cruelties to the English, but frightened the nobility and gentry round about, who seeing the harmless country people, without respect to age or sex, thus barbarously murdered, and themselves openly threatened, as favourers of the rebellion, for paying the contributions they could not refuse, resolved to stand upon their guard." Does P. know the transaction of 1641 better than the Earl of Castlehaven, one of the King's Generals then on the spot? that monster Borlase himself admits it, he says, "that the report that His Majesty's Protestant subjects, first fell upon, and murdered, the Roman Catholics, got credit and reputation, and was openly and frequently asserted; and Nalson, a Protestant historian, adds, "'tis most evident that the Lords' Justices Parsons and Borlase did by their authority command many things, which did not only exasperate, but render the Irish desperate, as will appear by their own Letters and public Acts of State." 'Tis therefore certain, that the massacres were commenced by the express orders of Parsons and Borlase; and that the numbers destroyed by way of retaliation, were most maliciously exaggerated is equally clear. An English writer, some time since, making a last effort to keep a sinking cause above water, after complaining of the aspersions on Borlase and Parsons, thinks the number may be 8,000 as Peter Walsh computes; but Peter Walsh makes no such computation in his letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, p. 225, he protests, "that after using the greatest diligence in the year 1662, to inform himself rightly on this subject, out of every particular county in Ireland, he reduced the number of Protestants murdered in cold blood by the Popish conspirators even to the lowness, that they did not all amount to more than some hundreds, this (adds Walsh)

Walsh) I did attest publicly, and in print, to the Duke of Ormonde himself." He says elsewhere, "these murders were committed by a very few of the rude rabble." The Duke of Ormonde commanded against the Irish during the whole of the rebellion, he therefore could not be imposed on: to this may be added that my Lord Castlehaven, in his memoirs, affirms that, "In Sir John Temple's muster rolls, of whom the subsequent scribblers borrowed all their catalogues, hundreds are mentioned as murdered, that lived many years after, and he adds, "that not a twentieth part of the cruelties said to be committed on the English were actually committed."

'Tis painful to Mr. B. to dwell on so disagreeable a subject nor would he have given this unfinished sketch of an event which took rise in the worst of human passions, and has been maliciously misrepresented by the authors and their confederates, in order to cover their own villainy and prevent an enquiry, which would have shewn to the world scenes disgraceful to the annals of mankind, if not necessary to obviate the impressions which the dark insinuations of P. are intended to make.

Mr. B. acknowledges the receipt of his 4th letter, will attend to the contents of it.

E. B.

May 11th, 1804.

R E P L Y

To PÆLAOLOGUS' Fourth Letter.

Occidit miseris crambe repetita magistros.—HOR.

Hush, once more upon the carpet! either P. is extremely short of memory, or there is more than one who has trespassed on the premises of the old Greek, and without any authority from him usurped his name: this truth is manifest: the fourth letter repeats the third, and adds some garbled quotations: 'tis therefore true that the fourth was not written by the author of the third, or
tha

that he has most injudiciously, and contrary to all established rules, intruded on the public, assertions which had been already decisively refuted, without attempting to invalidate any one of the reasons on which the refutation was founded.

Let us first dispatch his quotations from different authors of no weight or authority in matters of faith or religion : these men offer their opinions good or bad, but have always the modesty to submit them to the decisions of their superiors, by whom they are frequently obliged humbly to retract what they confidently asserted ; if at times they escape censure, 'tis because they are not considered as dangerous to society in these countries where they are published ; or because from their obscurity, or the neglect of their immediate superiors, they escape the notice of the proper ecclesiastical judge. The right of private opinion in controverted points of doctrine is not assumed by Catholics ; that right they have long since resigned to others, who transfer to themselves that unerring judgment, which the simplicity of our ancestors thought exclusively vested in the body of pastors placed over the flock by the original proprietor. But P. will please to remark, that propositions not censured, are not for that reason approved ; nor does the approbation of a work, in whatever terms it may be conceived, countenance every opinion contained in that work : the university of Paris demonstrates this truth : it censured some propositions of John Montesson in 1387. Montesson attempted to justify the propositions on the authority of St. Thomas of Aquin, whose works had been approved by Urban the 5th, the university in defence of its censure, states, “ that a doctrine may be approved by the Church, 1st as probable and common amongst Scholastic divines, 2d as a doctrine, which every one is obliged to believe to be true in all its parts, 3d as a doctrine which is neither erroneous in faith, nor heretical in any part, for there are many propositions false, which do not concern the faith, which do not bring a man into a damnable error, which cannot be accused of
heresy,

heresy, because that implies a corruption of Christian faith."

The university proceeds to state " that the doctrines contained in St. Thomas of Aquin's works have been approved by Urban the 5th, but in the first sense, not in the other two, and they shew, that in his works there are contradictions and errors; they produce instances from other works of greater authority than his, that is from the works of St. Cyprian, St. Jerom, the master of sentences, Gratien, St. Anselm, &c. hence the reader will conclude that we Catholics disregard the private opinion of any man, let his authority or name be ever so great; we attend to the unanimous consent of the fathers and the doctrinal decisions of the Church. When ecclesiastical writers of authority, all agree on any point of doctrine, we say that doctrine is universal, in other words, 'tis Catholic; 'tis a part of the deposit of faith derived from the Apostles; if an individual dissents and offers an opinion inconsistent with this unanimous consent of the Doctors and Pastors of the Church, we conclude, without hesitation, that his opinion is a novelty, and without farther discussion reject it; for we admit no new revelations in matters of faith. The reason is simply this, 'tis an article of the Apostle's creed, that the Church is holy; as holiness and corrupt doctrine is absolutely incompatible, the man, whose new opinion contradicts the received doctrine of the Church in his time, does not believe this article of the Apostle's creed, we therefore cannot believe him. If P. will attend to this principle, universally admitted and avowed by Catholics, he will conclude, that all these quotations by which he endeavours to persuade us that, what we never believed, is a part of our creed, are vain. We reply to him that this very Council of Constance on which he vents his indignation, has declared by an authentic instrument open to the perusal of the world, *that 'tis not lawful to break faith with heretics or others.* In an attested copy of the Council of Constance published at Hagenau in the year 1500, we find a Bull published by
Martin

Martin the 5th, approved by the Council, (sacro approbante concilio) in which 'tis expressly made a term of communion to disclaim this error, that 'tis lawful to break faith, as has been remarked in a former reply, the question proposed to a man suspected of heresy is, "*whether he does not think that all wilful perjury committed upon any occasion whatever, for the preservation of one's life, or another man's, or even for the sake of faith, is a mortal sin?*" Does P. pretend to know the doctrine taught by the Council better than Martin the 5th and the Prelates, who composed it.?

Add to this, that amongst 60 propositions condemned by Innocent the 11th, we find the following, extracted from the writings of Schoolmen 18th. "If by public authority a man be interrogated to confess his faith ingenuously, to be silent is not sinful. Condemned."

24th, "to call God to witness in a lie of little moment is not so great an irreverence, that for it God either would or could damn a man. Con. 25th, "'tis lawful to swear without an intention of swearing, whether the matter be light or weighty. Con." 28th, A man promoted to a public office by a recommendation or gift, may with a mental reservation take the oaths, which by the King's command is exacted from such persons, without any regard to the intention of the person who exacts the oath." Con. Here then is an authentic condemnation of all these equivocations and mental reservations, which P. finds in some writers; and Mr. B. has now before him 138 propositions taken from the same authors and others of greater note condemned in the same manner, so that if P. be diligent in his researches he may yet find an hundred quotations to amuse the public, of the same authority with these which he has produced, and tho' written and published by Catholics have no more of truth or Catholic doctrine in them, than the errors of John Hus or Wiclef, or than the assertions of P.

Does P. know any more of that letter published by Burke, the titular Bishop of Ossory, than some garbled fragment in Musgrave's Rebellion, from which he quotes

it?

it? if so, why not publish the whole letter, and let the public comment on it? if not, why assert, with such confidence, what, every man who reads the letter and understands the language in which it is written, knows to be a glaring falshood.

In P's statement of this letter there are as many errors as lines: he seems to think every party writer whose sentiments coincide with his own, infallible. In the first place 'twas not an official letter: it contained the Cardinal's private sentiments, who seems to have had something more of the politician in his composition than of the pious prelate. The letter was severely censured by the Right Reverend James Butler, titular Archbishop of Cashel, in a meeting at which all the R. C. Prelates of Munster assisted; they did not consider it as an official letter; but rather an officious attempt to continue divisions between the Government and the King's loyal Subjects. In the second place the Cardinal did not assert, that no faith is to be kept with heretics, but that credit is not to be given to their promises, "*non est fides habenda hereticis,*" that very sentence, which had been distorted from the intended signification, and which P. in the face of conviction continues to distort: where Horace in the third satyr 2d Book, says, *crede mihi* in the order we find as a more familiar phrase, *fidem habe mihi*, believe me.

Nor did he speak a word of the murder of Princes. The Cardinal believed, or pretended to believe that the Pretender's title to the Crown was indefeasible. Burke seriously believed it, as appears in every part of his work; on that supposition he condemned any oath of allegiance to his present Majesty as unlawful and invalid; there were other reasons which induced him to censure the form of the oath proposed to him: in it was stated that certain positions are heretical, which tho' absolutely false are not heretical; it has been already remarked more than once, that a proposition may be manifestly false tho' not heretical. On the same principle the form of an oath proposed by King James the 1st to his Catholic subjects was censured

renewed by Paul the 5th. The form of the oath and the Bull which condemned it are now before Mr. B. In King James's time that new creed made out for Catholics by P. and some others, "that 'tis lawful to break faith with heretics," was not yet published; there is no mention of it in King James's form, tho' cautiously worded: this new creed was invented for us, when 'twas thought necessary to misrepresent the principles of Catholics, in order to prevent the alleviation of penal laws, intended by our most gracious Sovereign and his Parliament.

To P's queries Mr. B. replies, that we Catholics traduce no man before the public without a necessity; that we ascribe to ignorance or neglect, what might have been the effect of malevolence, presuming every man humane and equitable, if there be not evidence of the contrary.

Mr. B. can't but admire P's nice sense of honor: he feels sensibly hurt at the accusation of ignorance against one Prelate of the Church of England, whilst with true theatrical modesty, he himself accuses so many Prelates of the Church of Rome, of something worse than ignorance, and is not sparing of his strictures on Popes, Emperors, and other sovereign Princes. However, if P. wishes to gratify his curiosity, let him enquire who was the leader of opposition to the first Catholic Bill in the Irish House of Lords; who 'twas that introduced that *Hibernia dominicana* of Dr. Burke, in support of the measures of opposition. Let him read the history of that session and he will find, that all the arguments which he has hitherto offered to mislead the public; all his artifices to misrepresent, mistranslate, distort, and garble quotations, have been tried in vain, by men of superior abilities to himself; and if his efforts had been added they would have been equally ineffectual: the majority of both Houses was not to be imposed on; they could not be taught to believe that Catholics, who, during a century would not take one oath, which would have freed them from all legal disabilities, would then take an oath in a different form, to free themselves from some of these disabilities, without an intention

tention of fulfilling their engagement. 'Tis thus that a stubborn fact, confirmed by the experience of more than a century, contradicts all P's. bold assertions and wild suppositions.

P. gives a conference between a Pope and the Cardinal of Offat, a French ambassador, in which he makes the Pope reason, as Corneille does Photin in the tragedy of Pompey.

“ Laissez nommer sa mort un injuste attentat.
La justice n'est pas une vertue d'etat.”

In plain English, let his death be called an unjust crime ; justice is not a state virtue. Mr. B. does not pretend to translate for P. who is so profoundly versed in the French language and history, tho' of this Mr. B. has some reasonable doubts. What ideots these Popes and Ambassadors must have been to publish their private conferences ? We Roman Catholics don't believe slander upon surmise, that, like many other privileges we resign to P. and his friends, “ he who easily gives credit, says an author of very high authority, is light of heart, and will be lessened, Eccles. 15th Ch. 4th v.”

The tale of Friar Walsh and Talbot, and many such tales taken from the *preservative against popery*, together with the tale of the Jewish girl, burned by the Inquisition in Spain, may be consigned to the nursery ; they will serve to impress on the minds of the children, a horror of that bugbear popery ; but P. ought to know that such tales, are to papists a most powerful preservative against artifice and illusion ; and have been eventually, to many well meaning protestants, a strong inducement to return to the old path of popery : for when men of enlarged ideas and unfettered minds, in a social intercourse with papists, discover that they are not less virtuous, nor more vicious, than others, they very naturally begin to suspect, that the authors of these tales had something more than truth in view, and that impressions were made in early life thro' sinister views.

In the next edition of the Popish creed which P. may
have

in parturition, 'twill be necessary to remove that troublesome article, "*the communion of saints*," from which R. C. draw strong inferences, "and substitute," *the communion of sinners*, he will then be able to shew that a Catholic in Spain cannot be guilty of an act of cruelty, which is not imputable to the Catholics of Nova-Scotia, nor commit an excess of intemperance in Russia, which will not make our fishermen tipsy, but whilst crimes are personal, and they only, who commit them, accountable, his quotations are vain, his tales nothing to the purpose, and his insinuations misplaced,

He introduces Gregory the ninth speaking much to his purpose in a letter to the Archbishop of Milan, apud curepel, 'tis a mock decree made out by Raymond of Pennafort by perverting the 17th of the 3d of Latran, and scouted, from its first appearance, by all Catholic States for its folly and illegality, and tho' it be of no authority whatever, P. wrests it from the intended signification to serve his purpose: in the original language as cited by him, 'tis manifestly an act, declaratory of the cessation of the duty of allegiance to persons publicly professing the then prevailing heresy manicheism, under different denominations. P. whether thro' ignorance, or design, strains the words, and makes them say in his version, "that they are freed from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics in general."

If we suppose the canon genuine, it cannot bear the sense which P. affixes to it; nor can it by any legal construction, be wrested to signify, "that faith is not to be kept with heretics," 'twas a judicial act of a joint power, the *temporal* and *spiritual*; the temporal power declaring that all feudatory Lords, were, by abetting the then prevailing heresies deprived of their *fiefs*, and the spiritual power declaring that in consequence of this privation, the immediate vassals of these feudatory Lords were absolved from their allegiance.

Has P. an adequate idea of the powers exercised by general Councils, in the days of popery? Does he know
that

that all popish princes assisted, either in person or by their ambassadors? Can he prevail on himself to believe, that the *civil law* was then the standing law of the land in the eastern and western empires, and even in independent states, with very few exceptions? Let him consult Blackstone's introduction: does he know that all the disabilities, incapacities and penalties, stated in this canon or papal sentence, against the then prevailing heresies, are exactly the same in the Justinian code: they were declared *infamous*, fallen from all privileges and honors (see D. L. ec Man. 165. 3.) they were dispossessed of all military honors if they fostered manicheans, (see cod. Thes. v. Lib. 1.) this was the case of Raymond of Thoulouse. And they were subject to capital punishment if they obstinately persisted to remain in the empire, (see D L. Ariani). All these laws were in force, in the east 600 years before the Council of Latran, and tho' they had ceased in the west for some time, upon the destruction of the western empire, they had been renewed by the Emperor Lothaire, 80 years before the Council, (see Ab. Ursb.) so that the provisions in this decree were neither less nor more than the existing laws, sanctioned by temporal authority. If the temporal powers then in being had a right to enact and enforce laws, introducing disabilities and incapacities, to dispossess feudatory Lords incurring these disabilities, there can be no doubt but their immediate vassals were absolved from their allegiance. Kings are not feudatory, nor are they to be understood under the term of *Temporal Lords*, because not expressly mentioned, this is proved by Nat. Alex. T. 7. p. 349, 350.

Mr. B. wishes to know from P. or some of his friends, if the subjects of the different Princes deprived of their states at Luneville, and after, under pretence of immunities, or indemnifications of others, whom they had never offended, were by that act absolved of their allegiance? or if the Congress of Luneville possessed greater powers than a general Council sanctioned by all the Sovereign Christian Princes then in Europe? or, finally,

if

if the disabilities against papists and non-conformists in the English code, were, or are, of any force? the answer which P. must make, will solve all difficulties with respect to this decree or papal sentence.

There was an excommunication issued, not against heretics in general, but against the manicheans, and their adherents then in rebellion against their lawful sovereigns, and introducing their doctrines in the mahometan style: le Gendre. hist. de fr. t. 2. p. 364, informs us, that King Philip Augustus, in one day, cut in pieces 10,000 of this banditti, in the province of Berri, who had penetrated into the heart of his kingdom, and committed the most barbarous excesses and inhuman cruelties on his subjects, flaying some alive, and scourging others to death. We excommunicate, said the Council, "and accurse every one of the heresies, rebelling against the Catholic faith, just now set forth." In the *authentic of Barbarossa*, Frederic 2d. treating the same subject, in the same manner, they are named, "Bulgaires Papulicans, Leonists, Speronists, Passagini, Paterani, Cathari, Albigenes, Arianists, Circumcisi, Carracenses, &c. all these professed, and practised the manichean impieties, with some additions, by which they were distinguished.

Does P. think a defensive war lawful? If an insidious enemy, beaten into his strong holds and fastnesses, from thence dispatches his emissaries, to excite rebellion, and inure subjects to perjury and treason, is it lawful to pursue him into these fastnesses? Was it lawful for our most gracious Sovereign to declare war against the rulers of France, on discovery of the new fashioned daggers sent to London? If so, there never was a more lawful or laudable war, than that against the Albigenes, and their adherents.

The next quotation from Gregory the 9th, as taken from Fleury, confounds both P. and his friend Fleury, and is totally foreign to his purpose: if the canon of Lattran inserted in the decretal, by Raymond, of Barcelona, on which P. founds his strictures, or to speak more properly,

properly, his sarcastical abuse against the Prelates assembled at the Council, had been genuine, Gregory would have quoted it, as of greater authority than the Bull of Urban the 2d, which could add nothing to his own authority, Gregory possessed all the powers of his predecessors. If we suppose the entire quotation genuine, it will only prove, that Gregory thought a Sovereign Prince who swerved from the established religion and persecuted its professors, would have abdicated the throne, in consequence of a public convention sanctioned in more than one general Council, by all the Christian Princes then in Europe; a doctrine which was acted on in 1688, and is now expressly taught in England: by the existing laws, for the settlement of the Crown, it is declared, that if any future Sovereign should profess the popish religion, or be reconciled to the Pope, he is by the fact, an abdicating Prince, and the next protestant in succession is to take his place. Does not the King consent, that, in that case his subjects should be absolved from their allegiance? Let P. apply this doctrine, against which it may not be safe to reason, to the case of Frederic, and he will find, that the absolution of his subjects from their allegiance, or rather the declaration that his subjects were by the fact of his prevarication, disengaged, proves at most, an error in judgment in the Pope, which other men, upon good grounds, positively deny.

If P. will recollect what has been already remarked, that the imperial Crown was considered as dependent on the Roman See, he will admit that the Pope had another title to support his pretensions. Mr. B. does not enquire whether the claim was just or unjust, that is foreign to his purpose; but that the claim was made, is unquestionably true.

To conclude this article, Mr. B. cannot help expressing his surprize at the persevering obstinacy of P. incessantly repeating the same tales of Popes again and again, *ad nauseam usque*, he begins to think that it was some unlucky Pope with pointed horns, who drove P. from the lower
regions.

regions, and greatly fears, that if any Pope should find his way to Heaven, P. will take the opposite direction, with the rapidity of Milton's demon.

Let us once more return to P's. innocent and injured friend John Hufs : If P. be a Clergyman of the established Church, there is at least one article of Hufs's doctrine not very friendly to him : in his book against the Prætorians, as he calls the writers who affirm the authority of the Church in controversial matters, an authority, by the bye, which in the 20th of the 39 articles to which P. must have sworn, is expressly admitted, " the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." Hufs maintains, that tithes are mere alms ; that the payment is voluntary ; that the Clergy forfeit every right and authority when they sin. In the same work he maintains a doctrine equally unfriendly to Kings, Princes, Governors, &c. that is, they lose all right to dominion and property when they sin.

If P. will not believe the Council of Constance, let him consult his friend Dupin, in his English dress, cent. 15th, chap. 7th, and if he will not believe Dupin, let him consult Hufs's own writings, printed at Nuremberg, 1558 ; in the same work he reasons against these pretended errors of the Church of Rome, which P. has adduced, absurdities which were never affirmed or believed by any Catholic, as Dupin remarks (*ibidem.*)

P. is an acute reasoner : if he makes out that the Emperor broke his faith with Hufs, as the Emperor was a Catholic, his position is good, that persons of that religion think it lawful to break faith with heretics, *rifum teneatis amici.* If Mr. B. could make out, that P. in the many publications with which he has enriched the literary world, has advanced a most ridiculous falsehood, then this position would be good, " that falsehood is a principle of the religion professed by persons of his communion : " plain men, who cannot see consequences in premises, where they are not, would make out, that P. had asserted a falsehood,

falshood, and no more. By a parity of reasoning, these men pretend that if the Emperor broke his faith with Hufs, Sigismund was guilty of an act of perfidy, and that is all. The man who denies this truth is not within the reach of argument.

To this Mr. B. adds, that if the Council, conjointly with Sigismund, had broke their faith with Hufs, it would have been simply a crime in them, no part of that faith which they publicly professed, and transmitted to us by an authentic instrument, the Bull of Martin the 5th, approved by the Council.

The fact is, that neither the Council nor the Emperor broke any engagement at all with Hufs : the Council is out of the question : they gave no safe conduct to Hufs, therefore they could not break it. P. is well assured, that they advised the Emperor to put Hufs to death ; that is, by these wonderful powers of divination, of which he has already given so many instances, and that astonishing penetration which enables him to discover what does not, nor ever did exist, he infallibly conjectures, that a Council held in Constance, in 1415, did advise the Emperor to put Hufs to death, though of this he has no proof at all ; and he is equally certain that they approved the fact, though his certainty on this head is founded on an anonymous manuscript, which Mr. B. has shewn to be a forgery, and is demonstrated such, by the attested copy of the Council, printed at Hagenau in 1500, presented to the Council of Trent, in which that spurious canon is not to be found ; and yet more forcibly, if possible, by the unanimous consent of all Catholics who reject that canon as spurious. Will P. permit us to know the doctrine which is taught in our own Schools, and Churches ?

Let us now return to the Emperor. John Hufs applies for a safe conduct. To what end ? unquestionably to appear before the Council, to take his trial, and exculpate himself from the crimes with which he was charged. All the world, says P. knows that the public faith was pledged to him to go to the Council, remain there, defend

send himself, and return, without injury. If a continued repetition of bold and groundless assertions, could wear out truth, P. must succeed; unfortunately the world knows the contrary; and if P. does not know it, it is because he knows nothing of the matter: John Hufs before his departure from Prague, challenges all men to come and witness his conviction or acquittal by the Council. (See L'Infant, B. 1, No. 24,) and he declares, that if convicted of any error against the faith, he will submit to all the punishments against heretics, (*ibidem*) and the Bohemian Lords, Wenceslaus, de Duba and Chlum, to whom the safe conduct was given in charge, though addressed to Hufs, in their representation to the Council, complain, "that Hufs had been arrested in disparagement of the safe conduct of his Majesty, before *conviction*, before an *audience*, before the *Congregation* of the Council;" "and although the said Lord the King, and petitioners, earnestly required, and asked, that the honor of his *safe conduct* should be regarded; namely, that the said master Hufs be heard publicly, and render account of his faith: and, if convicted to hold obstinately any thing against scripture and the truth, then to remain subject to the full powers and decision of the Council, &c." and the Emperor himself, told Hufs in the Council, "that he had given him a safe conduct to the end that no injury might be done him, and that he might freely speak and render account of his faith in open Council." (L'Infant. 3d, 6.) It is therefore manifest, that the safe conduct was given to Hufs in order to appear before the Council and take his trial: a safe conduct for a man to appear before his judge, and take his trial, is not a protection against the law, in case of conviction, he was not therefore deceived; he might have been disappointed.

John Hufs himself did not think his safe conduct a protection against the law: he wrote a letter, to be dispersed amongst the Bohemians, if he should be convicted on false evidence. (See Art. pro. 414 C. H.) he therefore had no protection against the judgment of the law: if he

had, it would have been as effectual against a judgment founded on false evidence, as against a judgment founded on fact.

Can any man prevail upon himself to believe, that the Emperor would give a protection, under cover of which, Hufs might, with impunity, preach a doctrine inflammatory and seditious, which had already caused an effusion of blood, and which, from the temper of the times, might excite a commotion, of which the Emperor himself, and all the Princes and Prelates assembled at Constance, would have been the victims. The supposition is a glaring absurdity.

L'Infant admits, that Hufs did preach his new doctrine on the way, that he said mass publicly, regardless of the prohibition of his superiors; that he did intend to inflame the populace in Constance, we know from his works, in which there are two sermons prepared for that purpose.

It is an acknowledged fact, that from the 4th of November, the day on which Hufs arrived, to the 28th of the same month, the day on which he was committed to the care of the chanter of the Cathedral, Hufs was guilty of seditious practices. It was he therefore, who most scandalously abused the safe conduct, not the Bishops and Magistrates, who very justly restrained his liberty: if a foreign Ambassador in London, dared to inflame the minds of the populace, and stir up to sedition, under pretence of teaching a new doctrine, the sacred character of Ambassador would not protect him from the Sheriff or even a Constable. Hufs's friends complained, that he had been imprisoned before hearing, but they did not assign the reason, that is the intervening crime; the Emperor was himself displeased, until he was informed of Hufs's intrigues.

After Hufs had been convicted in three public audiences in presence of the Emperor and other Princes, this very Council, accused by P. of cruelty, by an unprecedented, and perhaps blameable clemency, wished to forgive monstrous crimes, proved by hundreds, and waved the sentence against

gainst the doctrines contained in his acknowledged manuscripts, reduced the points of submission to certain articles, notoriously of Catholic faith, ages before Hufs was born ; but Hufs had already seen some effects of his popular eloquence ; he proposed to himself an asylum in the fermentation of the public mind, in which he knew that a retraction must undo him ; his pride led him to cope with high authority, and he was the victim of his own intrigues, the deserved, though not invariable, fate of all seditious demagogues and traitors. The Emperor, a judicious Prince, saw in him a bold and artful incendiary, juridically convicted of more than one capital crime ; he saw in him, a deep designing hypocrite, who under the mask of religious liberty, subverted all order and subordination, as well temporal as spiritual ; a man, who had already kindled the flames of sedition, caused an effusion of blood, and obstinately determined to persevere in the same practices, he, in consequence, ordered him for execution, what any other Prince in his situation would have done, and ought to have done.

From what has been said on the subject, in this, and the former letters, the reader will see that there has been no violation of faith or safe conduct, either on the part of the Council, or that of the Emperor, even supposing the safe conduct published by L'Infant, genuine ; of this we have the most incontestible evidence, in the conduct of the Hussites, after the death of Hufs, and his confidential friend and associate, Jerom of Prague, a few years after having obtained a *safe conduct* in writing from the Emperor and Council of Basil, they went in all security to that Council, which they most certainly would not have done, if the safe conduct given to Hufs had been violated, or if the Council of Constance had taught that faith was not to be kept with heretics. It was in after days, when an unfortunate breach was made, and increased by intemperate zeal on both sides ; when the interest of some of the parties rendered it indispensably necessary that the rent should not be closed, these mock decrees of which Catholics

Catholics knew nothing, though they ought to have been the keepers of their own records, were opportunely found in obscure manuscripts of no authority, fabricated for the purpose. It is not then matter of surprize, that Bادهorn, deceived by these new fangled pieces, should tell the Council of Trent, that the Council of Constance had declared, that faith was not to be kept with heretics, though in the attested copy of Constance, then before the Council of Trent, there was not a syllable of that spurious decree ; but it is matter of serious concern and astonishment, that in the face of truth and conviction, a spurious manuscript is opposed to an authentic record.

The Council of Trent's declaration, that no advantage would be taken of the Council of Constance, proves nothing : the Council derogates, not only, " from the decrees of the Council of Constance and Sienna, but gives up all authority, power, law statute, privilege of laws of Church, and of all Councils, for once only : the style is legal, and, *ad majorem cautelam*, for the more ample security of the Lutherans, whose re-union with the Church was the great object then in view.

The Councils of Constance and Sienna were particularly mentioned, because the Lutherans seemed to dread more from them, on account of the excommunication issued against the Wicklefites and Husfites, and other legal disabilities and penalties decreed against them by the joint authority of the temporal and ecclesiastical powers acting in concert in the Council.

If any gentleman desires to know in what these Husfites differed from Catholics, it may not be amiss to inform him, that they themselves in the Council of Basil, reduced their tenets, as distinguished from Catholic doctrine, to these four, 1st, unrestrained preaching, 2d, the communion, under both kinds, 3d, the begging of the Clergy, 4th, the punishing, in public, all public sinners. The first is a levelling principle, the second a matter of mere discipline, the third destructive of an established Clergy, in any country,

country, and the fourth subversive of its authority, and in its consequences, ruinous to society : these are the principles peculiar to the Hussites : in every other point they are truly orthodox. (See Con. bas. 1099 hard.) These principles they literally reduced to practice : they beggared the Clergy, and murdered them after ; they punished the sins of the Nobles and Magistrates in a summary way ; and though the guillotine was not yet in use, they found ways and means of dispatching finners possessed of estates and titles and appropriating their possessions to the use of the saints.

In all these publications of P. Mr. B. fancies he has omitted nothing material, nothing which can form the shadow of a difficulty, and he has shewn to demonstration, that all these artifices of P. to induce the public to think, what we do not believe, is a part of our creed, or that our ancestors have been guilty of murders and massacres, and plots, of which they new nothing, are mere impotent efforts, from what principle they proceed rests with the candid and unbiassed mind to judge.

Mr. B. admits, that his attainments are slender ; that he is extremely deficient in all the qualifications of a modern controvertist ; he knows not how to wrest an adversary's words from their intended signification ; nor does he know how to garble a quotation, the sense of which depends upon the subject matter and scope of the author ; he also admits, that all the advantages of science, of eloquence, of every natural and acquired talent, are against him, and in favor of his opponents, from this principle, which will surely be admitted by P. and his friends, Mr. B. concludes, that it is simple truth in its native colours, which supports him, and this conclusion must be admitted : for there is not a proposition in Euclid more evident than this, " that truth supported by reason, sense and science, is an over match for error and ignorance."

EDMUND BURKE.

Halifax, May 29th, 1804.

R E P L Y

R E P L Y

To the Reverend Mr. COCHRAN's fifth or last Letter, to the
Reverend Mr. BURKE.

*Memnēso ōti, oucēi ó loidorōn ē tuptōn úbrizei, alla to dogma
peri toutōn ōs úbrizontōn.—EPITETUS.*

Remember that it is not the Man, who reviles or strikes, who injures, but the opinion that such things are injurious.

If the Stoic Philosophers believed this maxim to be true, and observed it in their intercourse with the world, they have but few disciples in these modern times : the Man who reviles is thought to injure ; the Man who rakes up the ashes of the dead in order to asperse the living, intends to injure, and the malignity of his intention is great in proportion to the number of those on whom he wishes to cast an odium.

The Revd. Mr. Cochran in his several letters, has, with unwearied diligence, transcribed from different retailers of slander, all the crimes and excesses, whether real, or pretended, which have been imputed to Catholics in different Countries during a space of ten or twelve centuries. These excesses having no reference to the Letter of Instruction, which he pretends to censure, it is manifest to the most inattentive reader, that his motive must have been to infuse an aversion into the minds of the uninformed, and excite a terror not of Papists now no more, but of his fellow subjects now in being, whom under penalty of disobedience to J. C. he is obliged to love as his brethren : A difference in faith does not cancel the law of the Gospel ; the Samaritan was not of the same religious persuasion with the Jew.

All this Reverend Gentleman's letters are of the same tendency : they invariably inculcate, that the crimes and excesses said to have been committed by Catholics, are not to be ascribed to their passions. but to the principles of their religion. The writer might with equal propriety

priety impute to the principles of the Reformation, murder, burglary, highway robbery, forgery, &c. for that all these crimes have been, and are frequently, committed by Protestants, is well known at Tyburn. Does Mr. Cochran think that Catholics are the only Men exempt from these passions to which corrupt nature is subject? that religious principles are their only springs of action!

In his replies Mr. B. has shewn, what was known to the heathen world, that the source of all crimes is in the unbridled passions of Man, his avarice, his ambition, his spirit of revenge, of envy, of jealousy, or some other vicious inclination.

The different quotations of which Mr. C. and his friends pretend to form our creed, Mr. B. has shewn to be so many propositions condemned by the Catholic Church, confidently to assert that they are principles believed and taught in that Communion is a barefaced imposition on public credulity; it may be the result of ignorance, but it has all the appearance of malevolence.

In his last Letter Mr. C. pretends to confine himself to Mr. B. solely; he has even the condescension to spare him: he does not wish to expose him to the indignation of the world by transcribing the P. S. of his Letter. The writer has to regret that that P. S. was written hastily under a strong irritation, for which if any cause could justify unmeasured terms, sufficient cause was given, but he apprehends that Mr. C's censure or approbation would add but little to its circulation.

Mr. Cochran's new distinction between the Rebellion, and the barbarities with which it was attended, will justify Robespierre and Marat. Protestants, he admits, were the leaders of the rebellion, his admission or denial is useless: the fact was juridically proved; but, says he, the Papists were exclusively guilty of all the barbarities. Hitherto the untaught World was accustomed to consider the leaders of all rebellions as the authors of all the crimes and excesses which are inseparable from insurrections;

but

but Mr. C. has undeceived the world : Protestant leaders may rebel, and if by promises or threats they can prevail on the lowest order of the Peasantry to follow their standards these exclusively are guilty, and the leaders innocent ! it is rather unfortunate that His Majesty's Government in Ireland had not learned this new doctrine ; under the influence of old prejudice no doubt, they ordered all the leaders for execution or exile, and dismissed their deluded followers to their usual occupations.

“ Other Politicians, as good as Lord Cornwallis, think there is no great benefit in temporising with rebellion says Mr. C.” To temporise with rebellion, is a crime of which Lord Cornwallis was not suspected. Mr. C. must have known it by revelation. Lord Cornwallis suppressed a rebellion which sanguinary measures would have inflamed. Why has not Mr. C. condescended to name his favorite Politicians ? a fiery zealot is neither a sound Politician nor a competent judge of the merits of Politicians or of their measures. Whatever opinion Mr. Cochran may have of his Lordship's political knowledge, that Nobleman thought that after the loss of 19,700 of the King's troops, and 50,000 of his deluded subjects, with some thousands of defenceless women and children, victims to the brutal fury of Orange-men, not Papists, it was sound policy to put a stop to the further effusion of blood. The numbers are taken from the War Office. See Plowden, v. iii. p. 802. His Lordship thought that the King's troops could be employed to greater advantage in ravaging the possessions of his enemies than his own ; that to sacrifice the industrious inhabitants of any country, to the rancorous malice of party spirit, embittered by religious bigotry, was not the duty of a Chief Governor. The writer begs leave to think so too. With due respect to the high political knowledge of Mr. C. he also presumes to think that, to encourage unanimity, universal benevolence, mutual forgiveness and forbearance amongst all the King's subjects, without distinction of religious persuasions, is the duty of the Governor, as it is most certainly that of the Clergyman.

Clergyman. Mr. C. is supported by Sir Richard Musgrave's authority. Mr. B. does not seem to think it of any weight. Of Sir Richard, as a man, the writer knows nothing, as an historian, the writer does not think Sir Richard a subject of admiration or imitation; his claims to veracity have been so effectually extinguished, that no writer of character would risque his reputation in support of them. Mr. C. encouraged by the distance from the scene of action, and the difficulty of procuring proper documents across the Atlantic, calls for counter testimony. Mr. B. had assigned some of the sources from which this counter testimony might be taken; the nature of the work then published did not permit him to adduce them. In compliance with Mr. C's desire, the writer brings them before the public.

The first authority he produces, is that of the Marquis of Cornwallis, whose official letter, disclaiming Sir Richard's compilation, had been already adduced; Mr. C. thinks that is not a censure on the work, as if it were consistent with the dignity of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to enter into a literary dispute with Sir Richard, and particularise, in an official note, all the false statements of a quarto volume, in which there are but few founded in truth and truly related; however, the writer adduces one flat contradiction, which damns the whole work, because it damns the principle of that spurious compilation.

It is well known, that Sir Richard's object in publishing his pretended Memoirs, was to raise a prejudice in England and Scotland against Irish Catholics, in order to prevent the Imperial Parliament from granting the concessions which were promised before the Union, by some men high in power. In this, his favourite scheme, he thought he could not better succeed, than by representing the Rebellion as a Conspiracy of Catholics, to exterminate their fellow-subjects of the Protestant communion. The pretence was so notoriously false, that the work, though highly praised by the Orange party, was

received with marked contempt, by all unprejudiced men, Protestants and Presbyterians, as well as Catholics; and, what may appear surprising, if inconsistency in a writer, who has no regard to truth, could be matter of surprise; is by himself refuted: He says, p. 194, "that most of the Presbyterians separated from the Papists in the year 1797, some from principle, some because they doubted the sincerity of persons in that order, and others, foreseeing that the plot must fail, and end in their destruction, took advantage of the proclamation of the 17th of May, and renounced their associates; numbers withdrew themselves, because they doubted of success, without foreign assistance. The Presbyterians of the counties of Down and Antrim, where they are very numerous, and warmly attached to the Union, (combination of united men,) from pure republican principles, thought they could succeed without the Papists."

To pass unnoticed his stricture on the Presbyterians, whose principles he must have known by inspiration, he then admits that the *Union* was not exclusively the work of Papists.

We have more authentic evidence of the fact: It is that of the Committee of Lords and Commons: they say, p. 10, "in order to engage the peasants in the southern counties, particularly in the counties of Waterford and Cork, the more eagerly in their cause, the United Irishmen found it expedient, in urging their general principles, to dwell with peculiar energy on the supposed oppressiveness of tythes, with a view to excite the resentment of Catholics, and turn that resentment to the purpose of the party; fabricated and false tests were represented as having been taken, to exterminate Catholics, and were industriously disseminated by the emissaries of treason throughout the provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught; reports were frequently circulated amongst the ignorant of the Catholic persuasion, that large bodies of men were coming to put them to death. This fabrication, however extravagant and absurd, was one, among the
many

many means by which the deluded peasantry were engaged the more rapidly in treason." And, p. 24 of the same report, they say, "on consideration of the whole of the evidence, your Committee are of opinion, that the Rebellion originated in a system framed, not with a view of obtaining either Catholic emancipation, or any reform compatible with the existence of the Constitution, but for the purpose of subverting the government, separating Ireland from England, and forming a Democratical Republic, founded on the destruction of all Church establishment, the abolition of ranks, and the confiscation of property.

The Catholics have thus been juridically acquitted of the Rebellion, by the Lords and Commons of Ireland, and the insidious artifices by which the ignorant peasantry were deluded, clearly stated. Hence, Mr. French, in his speech on the great question of the Union, the 24th of February, 1799, speaking of the opposition which the Corporation of Dublin gave that important measure, remarked, "that the city of Dublin had declared its sentiments unequivocally, but though he highly respected the city, yet Dublin was not all Ireland, nor was Ireland the whole of the British empire, and in the fate of the British empire was involved that of the whole world. As Irishmen, their first duty was to consult the welfare of Ireland; the Roman Catholics of that kingdom had not yet declared their sentiments, and, notwithstanding the outrages which had lately disgraced some of that persuasion, the great body of them were loyal subjects, and their opinion ought to have weight with the Legislature; if many of them had been concerned in the late Rebellion, it was not because they were Roman Catholics, but because they were ignorant and uninformed, and therefore liable to be deluded by the misrepresentations of artful leaders; the reports of the secret committees of both Houses had proved this fact; the great volume of events had proved it, that volume so lately unfolded to their view, and which every day, nay every hour, conti-

nue.

hued to develope. The late Rebellion was not a war of one sect of christianity against another."

This statement by Mr. French was not contradicted in the House: Ogle himself was silent, as was Sir Richard, even, Duigenan, who never missed an opportunity of exercising his talent for acrimonious invective against Papists did not venture to oppose a truth so notorious, which had been juridically proved to the satisfaction of Parliament.

When Sir Richard Musgrave, in the face of truth, supported by such a weight of evidence, published his memoirs, he ought not to complain of the public contempt and censure to which he unavoidably exposed himself, yet we find him bitterly inveighing against all those, who presume to correct his errors, and disabuse the public. In an advertisement inserted in the Dublin journal, he says, "that Mr. Hay had abused his work," and adds, "that the Monthly Magazines, the Critical and Monthly Reviews, and many other publications accessible to the Irish jacobins, had done the like." Thus the knight, wrapping himself up in the cloak of loyalty, which masks many a traitor, brands all the writers, who presume to undeceive the public, with the appellation of *Jacobins*.

We are informed by some of these writers, that Sir Richard, in collecting materials for his work, carefully selected the documents of particular facts, from which he thought he might deduce conclusions favorable to his views of defaming Catholics. If an unprejudiced gentleman offered any thing in favor of Catholics, he was told, abruptly, by this worthy knight, that he sought evidence against them, not for them; that as a true Protestant, the gentleman could not refuse his assistance, to make out the Rebellion, a Catholic Conspiracy. Providentially, many gentlemen, to whom the knight applied for information, were of a different opinion: They knew no Protestant principle, which authorises calumny, and thought that men of truth and honor could not countenance it.

This worthy knight strained every nerve, and had recourse

course to every artifice which malice could invent, to implicate the Catholic Clergy in the Rebellion, though it was notorious that the excommunications issued by Catholic Prelates, and the exertions of that order, had been the greatest check on the Rebellion.

His accusations against Doctor Caulfield, C. Bishop of Wexford, and some of his clergy, from whose success, in preserving the lives of some Protestants by prayers, tears, and supplications, Sir Richard pretended to infer that they were principals in the business, were disregarded by Lord Cornwallis, and a direct contradiction given to Sir Richard's assertions, in two official letters, by that nobleman, of which the following are copies:

Dublin Castle, May 11th, 1800.

SIR,

In answer to the honor of your letter of the 9th inst. which I have laid before my Lord Lieutenant, I am to inform you that Government will give to Doctor Caulfield that protection, which, from his character and conduct as a loyal subject, he appears justly to merit.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient
faithful servant,
E. B. LITTLEHALES.

The most Reverend

Doctor TROX, &c. &c. &c.

North King Street.

Dublin Castle, June 30th, 1800.

SIR,

Your letter, of the 28th current having reached me with its inclosure, from Doctor Caulfield, I have stated their contents to my Lord Lieutenant, who desires me to say, that his Excellency has no cause whatsoever to alter the opinion he has imbibed of the loyalty and proper

proper deportment of Doctor Caulfield, whose letter I return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient

faithful servant,

E. B. LITTLEHALES,

The most Reverend

Doctor TROY, &c. &c. &c.

North King street.

A more direct and mortifying contradiction was never given to man, and that by the highest authority: Sir Richard surpassed himself in his efforts to implicate Doctor Caulfield and his clergy: in all the artifices of the disappointed accuser, the Lord Lieutenant saw no cause whatsoever to alter his opinion of the loyalty and proper deportment of that Prelate, he must therefore, have considered Sir Richard as a malignant calumniator.

Doctor Caulfield published a refutation of this, titled, *Libeller's Slanders*, as he styles Sir Richard: The refutation is solid, supported by unquestionable evidence, the testimony, on oaths of respectable Protestants, as well as Catholics, clearly evincing the falshood of Sir Richard's statement. The declaration of the Rev. Mr. Sutton, Protestant Rector of the parishes of Clongeen and Fintern, is strong and pointed: He attests the loyalty of the Reverend Mr. Shalloe, parish priest of Clongeen and Adamstown, on his personal knowledge; he adds that, at the desire of the Lord Bishop of the diocese, he called on Sir Richard, then residing in Frederic street, Dublin, informed him that the conduct of Mr. Shalloe was loyal, humane, and christian like; that also the conduct of Bernard Downes, P. P. of Fintern, was, to his knowledge, exemplary, irreproachable and loyal, he also told him, that he himself was confirmed in his opinion, by John Heatly, Esq. of Rockview, an active and intelligent

intelligent magistrate, who, upon minute investigation, did believe Mr. Shalloe a correct and loyal person. This declaration is signed the 2d of December, 1801.

WILLIAM SUTTON,

Parish Minister of Clongeen and Fintern.

Sir Richard not only accused Mr. Shalloe of disloyalty, but produced a pretended affidavit of Mr. Charles Reily, of Ballyhack, in which it was stated, that Reiley saw Shalloe active and busy in promoting the rebellion at Carrigburn camp. Memoirs p. 430 Reiley disclaimed the affidavit in presence of Charles Heatly, lieutenant of the Wexford Militia, declared that he had not seen Mr. Shalloe, during the Rebellion, but once, not at Carrigburn, but riding through Captain King's lawn, neither in company with, nor speaking to any person, and that in the affidavit, which he had made at Duncannon, he had not said otherwise.

It is not possible to shew the malignity of that compiler in a stronger light : He not only public traduces a man whom he knew, on the best authority, to be innocent, but also distorts the affidavit of an incautious man to support the calumnious charge. This requires no comment.

Doctor Caulfield, in a preface to his refutation of Sir Richard's slanders, says, that if the British Critic, who appears to be the panegyrist of a certain faction, had not endeavoured to give them currency in England, he would have passed them unnoticed, as the work is self-condemned : For if the charges against him and his clergy were founded, the men would have suffered death. Sir Richard says, p. 4, " that Prelate, on the face of his work, appears the depraved tool of an interested faction : There is not in Ireland, a candid man of any religion, who does not see through the views and artifices of this party."

William Todd Jones, Esq. a Protestant of worth and character, feeling himself hurt by some reflections of Sir Richard, who seems to think common justice to Papists,

an

an unpardonable crime, called on the knight for an explanation. It was promised at first, but after some tergiversation, in compliance to the wish of the party, refused. Jones called him out, and shot him. The wound, though dangerous, did not prove mortal.

Edmund Hay, Esq. has convicted him of insincerity in his charges on him also. He promised a satisfactory explanation, yet, at the desire of his friends, as he acknowledged, refused to comply. The restraint under which he was placed, in consequence of his duel with Mr. Todd Jones, prevented a second. The writer does not pretend to justify, or even extenuate, the rage of duelling, he thinks it criminal in the extreme, he has however to lament, that all efforts to prevent it in certain cases, have hitherto proved ineffectual.

Mr. Hay, in his publication, has produced the most authentic documents, the writer inserts two of these, as they are official papers, against which no objection can be stated. The first is, from Thomas Townsend, Esq. barrister at law, member of the late Irish Parliament, and nominated by Government, Counsel to the General of the southern district. I have, says he, "my information, from my own personal knowledge, the author of the quarto, (Sir Richard,) he seems to write from prejudiced rumour, *con Amore*, whenever he can place an obnoxious Catholic under suspicious appearances. He, (Townsend,) had no other motive, than to justify those whom he knew to be aggrieved, and restore the honor of a brave and loyal body of gentlemen from unfounded aspersions, and the character of a great community from the maledictions of a most pestilential libel, standing under the singular stigma of being condemned, by the patron of its publication." See Hay's ref. p. 10.

This gentleman differs in opinion with Mr. C. He thought the Marquis of Cornwallis's note, disclaiming Sir Richard's compilation, *a singular stigma on a pestilential libel*. Mr. C. did not think it even a censure on the celebrated work of this his favorite historian. Will he
give

give us leave to think a Barrister at Law, a Member of Parliament, Counsel to the General on the spot, the more competent judge?

The second document is an official letter from B. C. Fitzgerald, Brigade Major, to General Hunter, to whose humanity and vigilant attention in discriminating truth from false rumours and reports industriously circulated by some men in power there, the Catholics of the County of Wexford are indebted for their lives.

Dublin, 14th December, 1801.

SIR,

I return, with my thanks for your polite attention, the manuscripts you were so kind as to leave for my perusal, am exceedingly glad to find through the whole of your compilation so strict an observance of facts, which chiefly came under my cognizance as Brigade Major. It is with pleasure, I observe also, your adherence to truth and impartiality, free from the rancorous spirit of party fabrications, which is the true criterion that exalts the historian above the class of paltry scribblers, who dissipate as rapidly as unerring truth unveils itself, strongly exemplified in the past and present times. I give you much credit in not retorting, as you might, for your unmerited sufferings, by exposing the errors of some respectable persons: for indeed if they are not very forgetful, and very insensible, the compunction of their consciences must be sufficiently tormenting. There is little doubt of your labours meeting their due reward from unprejudiced people, which is the wish of

Your most obedient

humble servant,

B. C. FITZGERALD.

To Edward Hay, Esq.

In a second edition of his history of the Irish Rebellion, the Reverend Mr. Gordon, a beneficed Clergyman of the established Church, has given a preface, in reply to

Sir Richard Musgrave's observations on the first edition of that work. In it we find some severe strictures both on the head and the heart of Mr. C's admired historian, p. 24 he says, *much truth has he recorded, much has been concealed from him, still more doubtless by him, and many mistakes has he committed.* And, p. 30, he says, "to all who have looked into Sir Richard's book, (very few indeed are those who had the patience to read it through) it is evidently a party production, calculated for the political and religious fervor of the day. To those who examine it with attention and discernment, it appears manifestly founded *on garbled informations, garbled affidavits, and interlarded with fictions.* I am personally acquainted with men, whose affidavits are published in the Baronet's collection, whose evidence on an examination, in a Court of Justice, would prove the truth of what I say.

The writer omits the testimony of Counsellor Scully, of the author of the *Mirror of Ireland*, a Government writer, in his second work, and of many others, who impeach the veracity of Sir Richard Musgrave, he has confined himself to official papers, though they may not be entirely satisfactory to Mr. C. they will satisfy the public that his boasted author has no regard to truth.

To this counter testimony which Mr. C. required, in order to invalidate Sir Richard's authority, the writer adds a testimony, which is a direct and authentic contradiction to the reverend gentleman's acute and newly invented distinction between the Rebellion and the barbarities attendant on that, as well as on all insurrections, in which we see nothing but scenes of blood and devastation, which fill the mind with horror.

The Right Hon. Henry Grattan, in reply to the Attorney General, who, on the 20th of February, 1796, introduced some strong resolutions against the Defenders, a lawless banditti, who had been guilty of many excesses and outrages, observed, "that he had heard the Right Hon. Gentleman's statement, and did not suppose it to be inflamed, but he must observe at the same time, that
it

it was partial; he did expatiate very fully and justly on the offences of the Defenders, but with respect to another description of insurgents, whose barbarities had excited general abhorrence, he had observed complete silence; that he proceeded to enumerate the Counties, that were afflicted by disturbances, but he had omitted Armagh: of that he had neither comprehended the outrages in his general description, nor in his particular enumeration; of these outrages he had received the most dreadful accounts: that their object was the extermination of all the Catholics of that county: it was a persecution conceived in the bitterness of bigotry, carried on with the most ferocious barbarity, by a banditti, who being of the religion of the State, had committed with the greater audacity and confidence, the most *horrid Murders*, and had proceeded from robbery and massacre, to extermination; that they had repealed by their own authority, all the laws lately passed in favor of the Catholics, had established in place of those laws, the inquisition of a mob, resembling Lord George Gordon's fanatics, equalling them in outrage, and surpassing them far in perseverance and success." After describing some of their modes of outrage, the Orator continued, "those insurgents, who called themselves *Orange Boys*, or *Protestant Boys*, that is, a banditti of murderers committing massacre in the name God, and exercising despotic power in the name of Liberty, had organized their rebellion and formed themselves into a Committee. They had very generally given the Catholics notice to quit their farms and dwellings, which notice was plastered on the house, and conceived in those short but energetic words, "*Go to hell, Connaught wo'nt receive you—fire and faggot—Will. Tresham, John Thurstont.*"—that they followed these notices by a faithful and punctual execution of the threat." In support of the truth, which no man ventured to deny, Mr. Grattan adduced a resolution published on the 28th of December by thirty Magistrates of the county, whom he severely censured for supineness and neglect of duty. It is thus conceived:

“Resolved,

“ Resolved, That it appears to this meeting, that the county of Armagh is at this moment in a state of uncommon disorder ; that the Roman Catholic inhabitants are grievously oppressed by lawless persons unknown, who attack and plunder their houses by night, and threaten them with instant destruction, unless they abandon immediately their lands and habitations.” Of the Defenders Mr. Grattan observed multitudes had been hanged and deservedly, but the Orange Men had met with impunity, with success and triumph : they had triumphed over the law ; they had triumphed over the Magistrates ; they had triumphed over the people, there persecution, rebellion, inquisition, murder, robbery, devastation and extermination, had been entirely victorious.

In this picture the colouring is strong, but not overcharged, of this we have authentic evidence in the Lord Viscount Gosford’s address to the Grand Jury of Armagh. That nobleman alarmed at the progress of devastation in the county of which he was Governor, called a meeting of the Magistrates, and addressed them in these words :

“ GENTLEMEN,

Having requested your attendance here this day, it becomes my duty to state the grounds upon which I thought it adviseable to propose this meeting, and at the same time submit to your consideration, a plan which occurs to me as most likely to check the enormities, that have already brought disgrace upon this country, and may soon reduce it into deep distress. It is no secret that a persecution accompanied with all the circumstances of ferocious cruelty, which have in all ages distinguished that dreadful calamity, is now raging in this county. Neither age nor sex, or even acknowledged innocence as to any guilt in the late disturbances, is sufficient to excite mercy, much less to afford protection.

“ The only crime which the wretched objects of this ruthless persecution are charged with, is a crime indeed of easy proof : it is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic faith, or an intimate connection with a person professing this faith.”

After

After stating that more than half the inhabitants of that populous county had been the victims of this merciless persecution, his Lordship added, "these horrors are now acting with impunity. The spirit of impartial justice, (without which law is nothing better than an instrument of tyranny,) has for some time disappeared in this county, and the supineness of the Magistracy of Armagh is become a common topic of conversation in every corner of the kingdom."

To obviate the malice of party spirit his Lordship declared, that he was himself a true Protestant, inheriting a property under a Protestant title, which he was determined to maintain.

Sir Laurence Parsons, in the House of Commons, accused the Magistrates of something more than supineness, "in that county," he said, "it had been proved on oath, that several Magistrates refused to take the examination of the injured Catholics. By some of those Magistrates they had been most cruelly persecuted; others would hear them only out of the window, and some actually turned them from their doors with threats."

The Magistrates were at length roused from their lethargy, by an event which neither Grattan nor Parsons knew at that time: they knew what was manifest, that the Magistrates had countenanced and encouraged these barbarities; but they did not know that the spirit of persecution had so far overpowered their reason, as to ruin themselves. The Magistrates saw it when it was too late to apply a remedy, 7,000 Catholics, more than half of the population, if we believe Lord Gosford, had been some murdered, and the others driven from their habitations, the lands lay waste, and the houses *racked*, as the insurgents termed it, that is, burned to the ground. These Magistrates who were the proprietors, were deprived of their rents, and forced to rent their lands for half the former value. This may serve as a lesson to other fanatics, and check that ardor of driving out
of

of the country industrious inhabitants by penal restraints, the fruits of religious frenzy.

But they were Papists who massacred the prisoners at Scullabogue. True they had been Papists, but were then, and long before, in open rebellion against the Church as well as the State: we Catholics do not acknowledge as members of our communion, any body of men retrenched from it by excommunication, which was the lamentable fate of those deluded wretches, to which may be added, that some of the Orange Men, whom the Rebels were taught to believe sworn to exterminate themselves and families, had been guilty of many and most atrocious excesses, previous to that tragical and detestable scene. The Rebels had seen their cottages smoking, had heard the shrieks of their children perishing in the flames; they had seen the old and young indiscriminately massacred; they had seen defenceless women with their throats cut, their heads cloven, and their infant children creeping about the mangled bodies: on these some savage ruffians, who mix with honest men, flew like tygers, while they fled like hares, before the Pike Men, an undisciplined rabble. Is it matter of surprise that such a lawless banditti should retaliate?

From these hateful scenes, on which, however reluctantly the writer has been forced to dwell, in order to efface the impressions which Mr. Cochran's partial statement was intended to make, he passes to other parts of that reverend gentleman's letter, of whom it is remarkable, that his confidence in assertion encreases, in proportion as truth diminishes in his different statements.

Mr. Cochran cites the Provincial letters to shew that it has been maintained in the University of Louvain, that it is but a venal sin to lessen, by false accusations, the authority of those who detract from us. The gentleman, in his several letters, has reduced to practice, that pretended doctrine of Louvain. They all tend by a strong misrepresentation of our principles, not simply to diminish our authority, but to ruin our reputation as Christians,

as Subjects, as Citizens, as Men. God will reward him according to his works.

Pafchal's object in writing the Provincial letters was the same as Mr. C's in quoting them, that is, to asperse the then powerful society of Jesuits, to whom Pafchal and his colleagues at Port Royal des Champs were particularly inimical: "these solitaries," says a cotemporary writer of the party, "were then in the heat of their disputes with the Jesuits, they sought all possible ways to make them odious. Pafchal did more, he made them ridiculous in his Provincial letters. With this view he collected the errors of some individuals in Flanders and Spain, which, though censured by the society, he confidently ascribed to the whole body. His letters were juridically declared an infamous libel." From this collection, Mr. C. gleans, and pretends to form, a creed for us of errors, which a libeller had ascribed to the Jesuits, expressly to render them odious to Catholics in a Catholic country.

To his declamation against the immorality of Popes, an old theme, the writer replies, that we Catholics never thought a Pope incapable of sin, or exempt from vice; that the Pope publicly acknowledges himself a sinner, and beseeches the people to pray for the remission of his sins; the Pope is one of these men, who say with St. John, "if we say we have not sinned we are liars, and the truth is not in us." Of 257 Popes in regular succession, since Peter's days, thirty perhaps, have been accused of immorality, whether truly or falsely is useless to enquire, and at this distance from the times and scenes of action improbable to determine. There is great reason to believe that some of them were corrupt in their morals, but of these not one will be found to introduce any new doctrines, or to patronize immorality: they professed and taught the doctrines which they found established in the Church; if they had attempted any innovation in faith, they would have been told, that the deposite of faith is sacred; that it is the inheritance of the children, who date

date their ancestors from J. Christ through his Apostles and their successors: that a Pope is not the author, but the guardian, of the deposit, which is invariably the same in all ages, any attempt to innovate would amount to an abdication, and his dismissal from office would follow of course. This is, and has been, the language of Catholics in every age, and will continue until the end of time.

The writer moreover presumes to think that the very worst of these Popes was better than no Pope, for this very obvious reason, that one chief Pastor, whom all subordinate Pastors acknowledge as their head, and in whose communion they persevere, is a common center of union to the Catholic world, the bond, which unites and forms them into one body, without which there can be no union, no unanimity, a truth which is evinced beyond a contradiction by the disputes, dissensions and discordance, which now subsist, and always did in the different reformed Churches, dissenting each from the others as widely as they all dissent from the Catholic Church, *the pillar of truth*, if we believe St. Paul, and having no visible or even possible mean of ending their disputes.

A politician would say that tyranny is better than anarchy, hence the reformed Churches, in order to support something like subordination, have been forced to substitute Popes of their own creation, to the Popes of divine institution, whose jurisdiction they disclaimed. There is no magic in the term Pope, it signifies, by common acceptation, as all articulate sounds do, the chief Pastor of the Church. The reformation has had its Popes more absolute, and, in their imagination, more infallible, than the *ultra Montanists* ever thought the Roman Pontiff.

The first of these new fangled Popes was Martin Luther, Optatus would have said in his figurative style, that he was a son without a father, a successor without a predecessor. His followers must of all necessity date from him, the immediate inference is, that they are not of the family
of

of J. Christ : for the descendants must date from the founder of the family. This truth requires no comment : it is evident on the exposition, it is an intuitive truth.

We know that Luther was a Monk of the Augustinian Order in Saxony ; that at his admission into that Order, he solemnly vowed poverty, obedience and chastity ; we know that he publicly, and professedly, in the face of the world, violated these his solemn vows, in practice ; that he professedly taught such sacrilegious violation to be not only lawful, but laudable. We also know that he taught these blasphemous positions, "*that God is the author of sin,*" as his prescience renders free will impossible, "*that for that reason Judas could not avoid betraying his master ; that all the good and evil which is done in man, is through unavoidable necessity ; that it is God that works in man all the good and evil which is done in him ; that he makes man damnable through necessity ; that the adultery of David was not less the work of God, than the vocation of St. Paul : finally, that it is not less unworthy of God to damn the innocent, than to pardon, as he does, the guilty.*"

These blasphemies have been collected from Luther's writings, by Mr. Jurieu, a minister of the reformed Church, in his *Consultation amiable sur la Paix entre les Protestans*, he says that Luther advanced these errors, as decisions of faith, which he would not have revised. "*You who hear me,*" said Luther, "*never forget, that it is I who teach thus, without farther enquiry, acquiesce.*" Never did man assume such an air of infallible authority, whilst he taught the most diabolical blasphemy. Mr. Jurieu, says, p. 214, "*that he has a horror of these doctrines of Luther, that they are impious doctrines, horrible, frightful, worthy of every Anatheme ; that they introduce the manichean impiety, and subvert all religion. I say it with sorrow,*" says Mr. Jurieu, "*and I favor as much as I can, the memory of that great man.*"

This doctrine of Luther represents God, whom we Catholics believe the source and fountain of all goodness,

as more cruel and hateful than the Devil: for if the Devil torments his slaves, they are not his creatures; they are the objects of his envy, created by God, his enemy, to possess that happiness from which sin excludes him; whereas Luther introduces God tormenting innocent souls to which he gave existence, and which he continues in a state of existence, for no other reason but to have the pleasure of tormenting them, which is something worse than diabolical malice.

We also know, that Luther pretended to have learned a part of his doctrine from the Devil, in that celebrated conversation with the Spirit of Darknefs, which he has left us upon record, in his book *de abr. Missa pri.* T. vii, 228, 229, 230, printed at Wirtemberg, in 1558, under the inspection of Melancton. He there describes, his awaking suddenly at midnight, the manifest appearance of the Devil to dispute with him: "*the fear with which he was seized, the sweat, the trembling, the horrible beating of his heart in that dispute, the pressing arguments of the Demon, which disturbed his mind; the sound of his powerful voice, his pressing manner of disputing, in which the question and answer both were felt at the same time.*" "I then," said Luther, "*discovered how it happens so often, that people die suddenly near morning:*" "it is," said he, "*that the Devil may kill or choak men, or, without that, press them so closely by his disputes, that it is enough to kill them, as I have often times experienced.*" These last words import, that he had frequent conferences with this infernal Master. For the information of the public, the writer inserts a part of the conference, as given by Luther, *ibidem.*

Satan. Hear, Luther, most learned Doctor, dost thou know that fifteen years thou hast celebrated private masses almost daily? What if such private masses be horrid idoiatry.

Luther. I am an anointed Priest. I done all this by the order and in obedience to my superiors.

Satan. All this is true; but the Turks and Heathens do all things in their Temples from obedience.

" In

“In these straits,” says Luther, “in this contest with the Devil, I was desirous of repelling the enemy, with the arms to which I was accustomed under Popery, but Satan, on the contrary, rejoined more strongly, and more vehemently. “Come,” said he, “where is it written, that an impious man can consecrate?” And Satan urged farther, “therefore thou did’st not consecrate.” What is this unheard-of abomination in Heaven and on Earth! This was nearly the sum of that dispute.

We know that he encouraged immorality in his public instructions: in his sermon on matrimony, T. v. fol. 123, he says, if the wife deny access, it is right for the husband to tell her: “*if you wo’nt, another will: if the mistress be unwilling, let the maid come.*”

The scurrilities of his language, upon other occasions, do not bear a translation. The writer passes them unnoticed.

We know, that he and his colleagues, Philip Melancton, Martin Bucer, Anthony Corvin, Adam John Leringue, Justus Winferte, and Dennis Melanther, by an authentic instrument, pretended to authorise the Landgrave of Hesse, to marry a second wife, whilst he lived and cohabited with the first, by whom he had children, that the motives assigned by the Landgrave, in his instruction to Bucer, for desiring this dispensation, were simply these: “that he fared sumptuously at the different meetings of the German Princes; that he could not conveniently transport the Landgravine, with her retinue, to these meetings; that she sometimes drank to excess, was then offensive; finally, that he could not nor would not refrain from adultery if they did not permit him to take another wife.” He offered, as an inducement, his protection to the Reformers, the spoils of some monasteries, any thing else they might desire, insinuating, in case of non-compliance, that he would have recourse to Cæsar, perhaps make some arrangement with the Pope. He knew the men.

These motives and inducements, were thought sufficient by the first Protestant Pope, in conjunction with the
great

great leaders of the Reformation, to cancel the express command of J. Christ; to authorise adultery, under pretence of marriage, desiring that it might be concealed from the public, lest they should be accused of introducing the Mahometan system: so true it is, that they who do evil, avoid the light, and conceal themselves in darkness.

The Landgrave's instruction to Bucer, the consultation of the junto, the dispensation, the contract of marriage with Miss Margaret de Saal, on Wednesday the 4th of March, 1540, in presence of Dennis Melander, the Landgrave's preacher, and Balthasar Rand de Fulda, notary public of Philip Melancton, Martin Bucer, and also of Clearhard de Than, counsellor of his Electoral Highness of Saxony, &c. were published by the Elector Palatine, as also by Prince Ernest, in the most authentic form. They are now before the writer, open to the inspection of any gentleman.

Let us now pass to a Pope of another department of the Reformation, Zuinglius; he had the assurance to dispute a right of priority with Luther, which brought on him a torrent of the waters of bitterness, which that patriarch most liberally bestowed on all competitors.

In his confession of faith, which he addressed to Francis the second, some short time before his death, he includes in the number of the elect, not only the Heathens, but their pretended Gods. "There," said he, to the Prince, "you will see the two Adams, the redeemed, and the redeemer, you will see Abel. There you will see Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Numa, Camillas, the Catos, the Scipios, &c."

Pope Luther's censure on this confession of faith, published by his brother Pontiff. "I despair," said he, "of his salvation, he has turned Heathen, placing impious Heathens, amongst happy souls, even a Scipio, an epicurean, a Numa, the organ of the Devil, to establish idolatry amongst the Romans." *Paro. Con. Luth. Hosp. 2. p. 2. f.*

Zuinglius was a warlike Pope; he fell bravely on the 11th of October, 1531, in the battle of Cappel, where some thousands of his deluded followers shared his fate. His lamentable forebodings of death, on the appearance of a comet, whilst they attest his ignorance, shew the excruciating agitation of his disordered mind. He had not silenced his conscience.

The writer passes many other Popes of the new creation unnoticed, simply observing, that they were all Clergymen of the Catholic communion, the greater number Monks, whose vanity, ambition and sensuality, were not to be gratified under the heavy restraints of monastic rules, or the severity of Catholic discipline. With what horror would a Bernard, a Bonaventure, a Gregory, an Austin, a Jerom or a Chrysoptom, have seen a band of apostate Friars, bursting from their cells, to gratify, without restraint, their sensual appetites, under pretence of reforming religion? It is unquestionably true that a reform was wanted, earnestly desired, and loudly demanded by the learned and the pious of the day; but it was the moral conduct of these dissolute Monks, which they desired to see reformed; the abuses which had crept into their communities retrenched, and prevented by wise regulations and proper restraints. To this desired, and desirable reform, these miscreants substituted the destruction of all restraints, of all order and subordination, and this new fangled system, they decorated with the pompous title of Reformation.

From these ecclesiastical Popes, let us pass to others of a different class. The first lay Pope on record, is Henry VIII. It is true he did not assume the style and title of Pope, but it must be admitted that he assumed all the prerogatives and powers, which were before that æra thought exclusively vested in the Roman Catholic Pontiff, and an infallibility of decision, which no court flatterer ever ascribed to the C. P. witness the six famous articles of Henry's new creed, which, whoever presumed to dispute, was rewarded with a flaming faggot or a halter.

His

His history is well known : two Protestant writers sum it up in a few words : the writer of the wars of England, says, p. 159, "no age or nation perhaps, was ever visited with a more remorseless tyrant than Henry VIII." And Sir Walter Rawleigh, says, "that if all the patterns of a merciless Prince had been lost in the world, they might have been found in this one King."

Nicolas Caussin, a foreign writer, gives his history a little more at large. "Of six Queens, he put four to death; he disposed in the same way of two Cardinals, three Arch Bishops, eighteen Bishops, twelve great Earls; Priests and religious men without number; of his people, without end; he robbed all the Churches of the Kingdom, destroyed the divine worship, oppressed a million of innocents, in a word, he assassinated mercy itself." We shall set him off against half a dozen of the worst Popes in the apostate Jesuits collection.

Though Mr. Cochran may not acknowledge Henry's infallibility, he will not dispute his Pontifical powers; that he was the chief instrument of introducing the Reformation into England, is universally admitted, the writer has already given a sketch of the character of Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General, he now begs leave to examine the character of his primary Agent, Cranmer. His encomiast, Burnet, says of him, that "when a private fellow in the University of Cambridge, he was a Lutheran in his heart." H. R. 1 p. p. 92. in his public conduct, he was a professed Catholic. As a Lutheran, he must have thought the Popish mass idolatrous, yet he said mass daily, as all his fellows did. This is the first remarkable trait in his character. Let us pass to the second: at his admission to orders, he made a vow of celibacy, yet, in imitation of Luther, whose example he admired perhaps more than his doctrine, he privately married a woman of low condition whilst yet a fellow of Jesus college. After the death of this first, he married a second in Germany, contrary to the express prohibition of St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 2. His German wife he brought
privately

privately into England, some say, in a large chest, for as Henry amused himself with lopping heads, and burning legs, Cranmer, unwilling to be the subject of such an amusement, wisely concealed his marriage, and his wife, during the life of that Prince; on the the accession of Edward VI he publicly avowed it; then, for the first time, professed that doctrine, which he had hitherto inwardly believed, and outwardly denied. All this he acknowledged at his trial, Burnet, 2. p. L. 2. p. 332. On his appointment to the See of Canterbury, to obtain his Bulls from the then Pope, whose authority was not yet superseded, he was obliged to take the common oath of obedience to the Roman Pontiff, as all other Catholic Bishops do. Burnet says, 1. p. L. 2. p. 129. that before he took the oath, he made a solemn protestation that he did not intend thereby to restrain himself from any thing that he was bound to by his duty to God, the King or the Country, and he renounced every thing in it which was contrary to any of these things. Here is a mental reservation, with a vengeance: a man solemnly protests against some things contained in an oath, then takes and subscribes it. At his consecration he must have said mass, which he believed idolatrous, continued so to do, during the fourteen years of Henry's life. From time to time, ordained Clergymen, imposed on them the obligation of celibacy, which he himself disregarded, though at the risque of life: the law of the six articles, 31 Hen. VIII. cap. 14. making it felony for a Clergyman to cohabit with his wife, these articles also he subscribed, and obliged his Clergy to subscribe them; the opposite of his belief and practice. We are not told what mental reservation he made on that occasion.

Cranmer's obedience to the Pope in Spirituals, was perfectly consistent with his duty to God and his King: it does not appear that his predecessors, during a space of 900 years were less attached to their King and Country than he; they were not so condescending to their vices; they did not know how to annul and authorise marriages

marriages in complaisance to inconstant fancy; they did not dream of transferring the Pope's spiritual power to a temporal Prince, who under pretence of putting the Church into the State, put the State out of the Church. The one was possible, the other not; for as the Catholic Church neither is nor can be confined to any one State, so it cannot be included in the State. A State may very well be included in the Church, many are, and many unfortunately are not. None are excluded, who do not exclude themselves.

It is well known, that Henry's object in advancing Cranmer to the See of Canterbury, was, through his interference, to dismiss his old wife Catharine, all his arts and efforts to that end, having failed in the Court of Rome. Impatient of delay, he marries Anne Boleyn, 14th of November, 1532, in presence of Cranmer, the Duke of Norfolk, &c Dr. Rowland Lee performed the ceremony. See Heylin Hist. Eliz. p. 89. The 11th of March following, he writes to Henry, that the long pending cause between him and his Queen Catharine, must be decided. Coll. Voll. ii. rec. 24. On the 25th of May he pronounced the sentence of divorce. Burnet Coll. B. ii N. 47; only four months before Elizabeth was born, that is 7th Sept. 1533. This requires no comment.

The Arch Bishop was equally condescending in disposing of Ann Boleyn, though there was evidence before him that she was under no contract previous to her marriage with Henry, yet, on an extorted confession, he pronounced a sentence of divorce. Burnet, p. 203. In the scandalous business of Anne, of Cleves; he is deserted by his ablest friends: it was said that there was some engagement between that lady and the Duke of Lorrain's son, upon enquiry it was found, that the engagement was made by their parents, whilst they were infants, and dissolved by themselves, when at age. Cranmer declared there was no lawful impediment. The marriage was celebrated Jan. 6, 1540. In six months after, the King; whose incontinence outstripped his other vices, obtains a divorce from
Cranmer;

Cranmer, under pretence of the impediment which he had but a few months before declared null, and takes another wife.

This Prelate was not less subservient to Somerset, who may be considered as Henry's successor in the reforming trade; Edward was but a child, whose actions are to be ascribed to his Counsellors. Cranmer signed the death warrant of Somerset's brother, Lord Thomas Seymour, the Admiral. Bur. p. ii B. i. p. 100. He also signed Edward's pretended will, by which his sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, were excluded from the Crown, *ibid.* forgetting that he owed his all to their father. This last act would have brought him to the block, had Elizabeth succeeded in place of Mary. If, instead of sending Cranmer to the block, where he ought to have been sent, Mary sent him to the Stake, we know that he was instrumental in sending many there before for the very cause for which he suffered: John Lambert, Anne Askew, John Frith, and William Allen, in Henry's time. "It cannot be denied," says Fuller. Ch. His. B. v. sec. 2 "that he had a hand in the execution of Lambert, Frith, and other Godly martyrs," and, B. v. sec. 6, he says, "that Cranmer argued against Lambert contrary to his own opinion, and as Lambert was burned in Cranmer's presence, for denying the corporal presence, so Cranmer was condemned and died at Oxford, for maintaining the same opinion."

We have hitherto seen a life stained with duplicity, sacrilege, perjury, murder and treason, let us come to the last act: Cranmer seeing himself in Mary's hands, the daughter of Henry, in whose breast mercy never found a vacant space, had recourse to that pliability of conscience, which had characterized his whole life. He renounced Luther's and Zuinglius's errors, subscribed the doctrine of transubstantiation, purgatory, &c. Neal, p. 101. Fearing, lest the first form should not be thought sufficiently explicit, he subscribed a second, then a third, a fourth, a fifth, and a sixth, coolly and deliberately

deliberately at different intervals. The two first are without date, the third was signed, February 14th, the fourth, February 16th, the last, March 18th. Strype's Mem. Ecc. Vol. iii. p. 234. Finding his recantations ineffectual, on the point of being executed, he cancelled them all and died.

Mr. C. will be surpris'd at this statment of facts, but as the writer did not invent them, Mr. Cochran cannot suppress them, nor will he venture to deny them, there are no historical facts more authentic. If such a life be reconcilable with the sanctity of the Gospel, the Christian world has been hitherto deceived. We shall take a view of another Pontiff, and his successor, and then conclude this article.

We know that Muncer, one of Luther's disciples, upon deliberation, finding himself as well qualified for the Pontifical chair, as his master, under pretence of reforming the too great severity of the Roman Pontiff's religion, and the unbounded licentiousness of Pope Luther's new system, introduced anarchy, taught rebellion as a religious duty, put himself at the head of 40,000 fanatics, who ravaged Germany, with a ferocity, until those reforming days, not known in Europe, and would have continued his ravages, if not overpowered by the troops of the Landgrave of Hesse, and some other noblemen.

After this Pope had ended his days on a gibbet, at Mulhausen, in 1525, his successor in office, John of Leyden, a more despotic Pope, having with his gang of fanatics, seized on the city of Munster, and their exercised cruelties, and committed excesses, which are almost incredible, constituted himself King of Jerufalem and Israel, he had his prophets, re-established polygamy, took to himself seventeen wives, whom he treated with the utmost brutality, one of them presuming to complain that the inhabitants of the town suffered by famine, was ordered on her knees by this ferocious monster, who struck off her head, whilst the others danced and sung about her. See Catrou His. des An. He was soon after dethroned by
the

the Bishop of Munster, and rewarded according to his works.

The reverend Mr. Stanfer having declared that there is no other difference between the reformed Churches, but what must arise from the different Constitutions on the same law; that it depends on the fancy or caprice of the person to join in Communion with one or the other, though he thinks a preference due to the established Church in any country; the writer has been induced to take these last Popes into the balance of his account, otherwise he would have omitted them. He has now to observe, that though, in the *ordinary succession* of God's ministers, there have been many bad men in the old law, as in the new, yet we find no man immediately chosen to make known the will of God, or form any new establishment, who was not eminent for piety, for virtue, for sanctity. Thus, a Moses, a Samuel, a John Baptist, the Apostles, these venerable Prelates who were instrumental in converting the Heathen nations. The natural inference is, that these men of perjury, of sacrilege and blood, were not sent by God.

An ABSTRACT of the ANSWERS of the six FOREIGN ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES, to the QUESTIONS proposed to them in the year 1788.—The Questions were proposed in the Latin Language, and the Answers were transmitted in the same Language. The following Extracts are faithfully translated.

The Three Questions.

I. HAS the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever within the realm of England?

II. Can the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense

pense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever ?

III. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic Faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions either of a public or private nature ?

Extracts from the Answers of the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Louvain.

The Faculty of Divinity of Louvain having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness ; but is struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of the 18th century, be proposed to any learned body by inhabitants of a kingdom which glories in the talents and discernment of its natives.

The Faculty being assembled for the above purpose —It is agreed, with the unanimous consent of all voices, to answer the first and second questions in *the negative*.

The Faculty considers the following propositions to be beyond all dispute :—1st Q. That God is the Author of the Sovereign Power of the State in civil matters.—2d Q. That the Sovereign Power of the State is, in civil matters, subordinate to God alone.—3d Q. It follows, that this Sovereign Power is in no way, not even indirectly, subject to or dependent on any other power, though a spiritual power, or one instituted for eternal salvation.—4th Q. It also follows, that no power whatsoever, whether of Cardinal, Pope, or of the whole Church assembled in General Council, can deprive this Sovereign Power of the State of its temporal rights, possessions, government, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, nor subject it to any restraints or modifications.—5th Q. It also follows, that no man, nor any assembly of men, nor even the whole Church assembled in General Council, can, on any pre-
tence

tence whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the Sovereign and the people ; still less can they absolve or free the subjects from their oath of allegiance.—6th Q. Therefore, as in the Kingdom of England the Sovereign Power of the State stands upon the same foundation, and its nature is well known : The Faculty of Divinity of Louvain has no doubt to apply what has been said before, in its utmost extent, to the Kingdom and Sovereign Power of England.

Such is the doctrine which the Faculty of Divinity has derived from the Holy Scriptures, the writings of the ancients, and the records of the Primitive Church :—a doctrine that she will maintain with her last breath, and, with the help of God, impress upon the minds of her scholars.

The Faculty of Louvain holds that the principles here laid down by her are not peculiar to her. She believes that there is no society of learned men at the present day in the whole Catholic world, who would not willingly *subscribe them*, (according to the common expression) *with both hands*.

Proceeding to the *third Question*, the said Faculty (though astonished that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers, that there is not, and that there never has been, amongst Catholics, or in the doctrines of the Church of Rome, any law or principle which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics or others of a different persuasion, either in matters of a public or private nature. The Faculty declares the doctrine of Catholics to be :—That the divine and natural law, which makes it a duty to keep faith and promises, is the same, and that it is neither shaken nor diminished, whether those, with whom the engagement is made, hold erroneous opinions in matters of religion or not.

The said Faculty strongly protests against the imputation that the Catholic Church has, at any time, held a contrary doctrine. This, she asserts, is a calumny, invented and

and enforced against Catholics by the worst of men, who, knowing their charges against the latter to be destitute of truth, endeavour to make falshood supply its place, and thereby render them odious to princes and nations.

In testimony of the above, we have caused this instrument, authenticated under the Seal of our University, to be signed by our Beadle,

J. B. DEMAZIERE, S. T. D. and Actual
L. S. Dean.

By Command of my Excellent Lords and Masters,
J. F. VANOVERBEKE, Beadle of the
Sacred Faculty.

Given at Louvain in an Extraordinary
Assembly, Nov. 18, 1788.

*Extracts from the Answers of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of
the University of Douay, copied from the Register.*

Jan. 5, 1789.

At a meeting of the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Douay, the Dean informed the Members that the Catholics of England wished to have the opinions of the Faculty upon three Questions, the tenor of which is as follows:—I. Has the Pope, &c. &c. &c.

These Questions having been privately considered by each Professor of Divinity, and afterwards having been attentively discussed at the public Meeting:—To the first and second of them the Sacred Faculty answers: That no power whatsoever was given by God, in civil or temporal concerns, either to the Pope and Cardinals, or to the Church itself; and, consequently, that Kings and Sovereigns, are not, in temporal concerns, subject by the ordinance of God, to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever;
neither

neither can their subjects by any authority granted from above to the Pope or the Church, be freed from their obedience, or absolved from their oath of allegiance.

This is the doctrine which the Professors and Doctors hold and teach in our schools: and this all the candidates for degrees in divinity, maintain in their public Theses.

To the third Question the Sacred Faculty answers:— That there is no principle of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, who differ from them in religious opinions. On the contrary, it is the unanimous doctrine of Catholics, that the respect due to the name of God, so called to witness, requires that the oath be inviolably kept to whomsoever it be pledged, whether Catholic, Heretic, or Infidel.

Decided on the day and in the year above named, and signed by order of the Most Learned Doctors.

BACQ, Beadle and Scribe.

Extracts from the Answers of the Faculty of Canon and Civil Law in the University of Douay, to the same Questions.

Having seen and attentively considered the above-written Questions, and the Answers of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity to them, the Faculties both of the Canon and Civil Law, declare:—That they, without hesitation or doubt, concur in the aforesaid Answers of the 5th inst.

Subscribed, in virtue of our order, by our Scribe, this 5th of January, 1789.

SIMON, Scribe.

[Here follows certificates of the Magistrates of Douay, that the Sieur Bacq is Beadle of the Faculty of Canon and Civil Law in the said University.]

Extracts

Extracts from the Answers of the Faculty of Divinity of Paris to the Queries proposed by the English Catholics.

Answer to the first Question.

Neither, “ the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever in any kingdom, and consequently none in the kingdom of England, by reason of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by divine authority, interest in, or any other means, belonging to the Pope or the Church of Rome.

This doctrine the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and, upon every occasion, maintained, and has rigidly proscribed the contrary doctrine from her schools.

Our Faculty devotes herself the more religiously to the defence of this doctrine, because she finds it perfectly consonant to the word of God and the Tradition of the Fathers.

Answer to the second Question.

Neither “ the Pope nor Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any persons of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve or free the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.”—The present and the former question are so intimately connected, that the answer to the first, immediately applies to the second. For what greater authority over a Sovereign can be conceived than the right of absolving and freeing subjects from their oath of allegiance to him? With what justice might it be said, *That the kingdom of Christ is of this world*, if the right of deciding and disposing of temporal kingdoms had been annexed to its authority and conferred upon its ministers.

Answer

Answer to the third Question.

There is no "tenet in the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics or those who differ from them in matters of religion." The tenet: "*That it is lawful to break faith with heretics*" is so repugnant to common honesty, and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which the advocates of the Catholic religion have complained more heavily than of the malice and calumny of their adversaries, in imputing this tenet to them. As it is rejected by Christians of every communion, and is repugnant to the fundamental principles both of natural and revealed religion, we cannot think it incumbent on us to enter upon the subject, and we think it requires no discussion.

Given at Paris in the General Assembly
of the Sorbonne, held the 11th
day before the Calends of March,
1789.

LE CHEVALIER, Dean of
the Sacred Faculty.

By order of the Venerable Dean, and the Masters of
the Sacred Faculty.

HARDY, Scribe.

*The Judgment of the University of Alcalá, upon the three
Questions.*

It is the opinion of the University, that none of the persons mentioned in the first question, either individually or collectively, or in any council assembled, have any right to civil authority. For the right of governing kingdoms, in civil concerns, as well as that of possession, was instituted before the Catholic Church was founded by

Christ our Lord, the author of that divine law by which they are governed, by which law he expressly declares he leaves untouched, saying, "*My kingdom is not of this world.*" The sense of these words are well explained by St. Augustine, *Traët 115, in Joan. n. 2.* "Listen," says he, "ye Jews and Gentiles; hear this all ye nations of the earth: I interfere not with your dominion in this world. Be not seized with groundless fears," &c.

Answer to the second Question.

Having considered the State of England and its Sovereign, the University in like manner, is of opinion, that none of the persons mentioned in the proposition has a power to absolve the subjects of his Britannic Majesty from the oath of allegiance which they have taken or are bound to take to his said Majesty, or to dispense with its obligations.

Answer to the third Question.

So persuaded is the University that a doctrine, which would exempt Catholics from keeping faith with heretics, or other persons dissenting from them in religious matters, so far from being an article of the Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets, that she could not have believed it possible there should exist any persons who would dare to impute to Catholics any thing so iniquitous, had she not learned from the sacred scriptures that the same Pharisees, who had heard our Lord openly commanding to "*Give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,*" afterwards laid this very crime to his charge: "*We have found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar.*" But the devil, who
 moved

moved their tongues to utter such falsehoods, has never desisted from perverting others in like manner.

These are the unanimous opinions of this University, after a mature deliberation, in a full assembly of the Doctors, this 17th of March, 1789.

A Decision concerning the three Propositions laid before the University of Valladolid by the English Catholics.

Answer to the first Question.

The University of Valladolid acknowledges no civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence, in the Roman Pontiff, Cardinals, or even in a General Council, much less in any individual, either directly or indirectly, within the kingdom of Great Britain, or in any other kingdom or province, whether Catholic or not, over which they possess no temporal dominion.

Answer to the second Question.

Neither the Roman Pontiff, nor the Cardinals, nor any Council, not even a General Council, can any way absolve the subjects of the King of Great-Britain, or any other persons whether Catholics or not, over whom they hold no temporal dominion, from their oath of allegiance, nor dispense with its obligations.

Answer to the third Question.

Amongst the articles of the Catholic faith, there is none which teaches that Catholics may lawfully break their faith with heretics, or any other person whomsoever dissenting from them in matters of religion. The obligation of keeping faith is grounded on the natural law, which binds all men equally, without regard to their religious

religious opinions ; and with respect to Catholics, it has still greater force, being confirmed by the precepts of the Catholic religion.

This is the decision of the University of Valladolid, signed by all and each of the Professors, February 17, 1789.

A Determination of the University of Salamanca, relating to the Concerns of the English Catholics.

All the Doctors and Professors being assembled, and the questions proposed to them having been for some time weighed, six members of the University, chosen out of the Faculty of Divinity and Canon Law, were appointed to draw up their answers, which are as follows :

Answer to the first Question.

The same power, and no other, was given by Christ to Peter and his successors, the Bishops of Rome, and to the Universal Church, which to himself, as man, had been given by his Father. *As the living Father sent me, I also send you.* Now he invariably denied that he received any temporal power, by declaring that *his kingdom was not of this world* ; by flying away when certain persons wished to make him a king ; by his answer to one who said to him : *Master, speak to my brother to divide the inheritance with me* ; and by his commanding tribute to *be paid to Cæsar*. Therefore, since the rights of the King of England, whether they persecute or tolerate the Catholics, are founded on the same principles with those of all other sovereign princes under heaven, we are firmly of opinion, that neither the Roman Pontiff, nor the Cardinals, nor any Council

Council, nor any individual in the Catholic Church, by virtue of his communion with the Catholic Church, has any civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence, in the Kingdom of Great Britain.

Answer to the second Question.

The solution of this second question, naturally arises from the principles laid down above.—We, therefore, without any hesitation, declare that neither the Roman Pontiff, nor the Cardinals nor any Council, nor any individual of the Catholic Church, can absolve the subjects of his Britannic Majesty from their oath of allegiance, or dispense with its obligations.

Answer to the third Question.

The natural rights of men were not intended to be weakened by the law and doctrine of Christ, but to be confirmed by them. Now, nothing is more clearly engraved on the minds of men by the law of nature than the principle, that all men, however differing from each other in religious tenets, are, to every intent and purpose, in a state of equality with respect to negotiations, alliances, and compacts. The Spaniards, who in point of zeal for the Catholic faith, yield to no nation under heaven, have entered into contracts both commercial and relating to peace, with the English themselves, and with other Calvinist and Lutheran states; and it would be an atrocious injury and a vile calumny to assert, that such contracts have been, at any time, violated under the pretence of religion. Because we are Catholics, it is not necessary that we should be actuated by a persecuting spirit against those who are averse to our religion. Meekness and Charity are its great characteristics, and the examples left us by our predecessors
recommend

recommend to us a contrary conduct.—Therefore amongst the Articles of the Catholic faith, there is none which teaches, that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics, or with persons of any other description who dissent from them in matters of religion.

Given in the University of Salamanca, A. D.
1789.

Signed in the name of the University, by the
Rector and the six deputed Members.

P O S T S C R I P T.

THE writer having, as he thought, in the course of his remarks and letters given a full and satisfactory account of his political and religious creed, and shewn, to demonstration, that it is not only in perfect unison with the allegiance which he owes his Prince; but that it is in liberality, at least, equal to that of any other description of Christians, finds himself unexpectedly obliged to continue his remarks on a pamphlet lately published by the reverend Mr. Norris, which he calls *A candid discussion of the Roman Faith*. If the pleasures of matrimony had not totally effaced from that *ci-devant* Catholic Ecclesiastic's mind, the remembrance of the faith which he formerly professed, he would have known, that the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, are the first and principal tenets of our faith: with these, all the professions of our faith begin; that the infallibility of the Church in its doctrinal

doctrinal decisions, with which after a rhapsodical declamation, which fills 26 pages, he begins his pretended discussion, though of faith, believed and professed by all well informed Catholics, is neither a primary nor a principal tenet of our faith: it is found by implication, not explicitly stated, in the Baptismal Creed, and in the Profession of Faith extracted from the decrees of the Council of Trent, by order of Pius IV. so that an illiterate person may be (and many such there are) a pious Catholic, who has not heard of the infallibility of the Church. It is, however, manifestly deduced from the scriptures, as the writer has shewn in the first volume of this work, from page 107 to 144. Though the reasons adduced in supporting this article of Catholic doctrine, were published in 1805, they have not yet been invalidated nor even discussed: against common sense wild declamation is trifling: they were therefore wisely passed unnoticed. The writer begs leave to observe, that if these reasons bear no reply, the cause against which they militate must be acknowledged indefensible.

In the preamble to the pretended Discussion there are some inaccuracies, which may be corrected in a subsequent edition: thus, page 7, Mr. N. says, "if the soul of man worship God in spirit and truth: it is a matter of indifference with what exterior rites the spiritual homage is expressed!" Why confine the homage due to the creator and sovereign ruler of the universe to the soul exclusively? Man is composed of a body and soul; the homage of both he owes to his maker: the body is not a mere instrument: it is a component part of the man: Atheists think it the whole of man. It is neither the body nor the soul, it is the man composed of both, who owes and must pay homage to his creator: to declare all exterior rites a matter of indifference, is the language of the Deist. Mr. N. who thought all rites a matter of indifference, p. 7th, tells us, p. 35th, "that rites and ceremonies were appointed by Christ, to bind and cement the *visible Church*, which he commissioned his Apostles to constitute

ritute. Are rites and ceremonies of Christ's appointment a matter of indifference? The man who thinks them such is not a christian. In the same place he adds, "the Most High cannot be pleased with sacrifices;" and subjoins, almost in the same breath, that "sacrifices were appointed to be solemnized as emblematical of the great sacrifice that was to be offered once for sins." What! were not these sacrifices, which he himself had ordered, pleasing to the Most High? Was not the great sacrifice, of which they were emblematical, pleasing to him? In the old law we read of sacrifices by which the wrath of God was averted—Aaron offered incense, and the fire which consumed the people, in punishment of their sins, ceased.—Num. XVI, 46. David offered a whole burnt-offering, and a peace offering, and God was propitious to the land, and the pestilence was stopped—II. Kings, XXIV, 25. These sacrifices were therefore pleasing to God. If Mr. N. had said that the sacrifices and sacraments of the old law were insufficient and incapable of satisfying the divine justice for sins, or justifying the sinner, he would have spoken in the language of truth: 'tis the doctrine of St. Paul to the Gal. IV—9, he calls them weak and wanting elements, "*asthené kai ptocha stoicheia*;" but to say, without any reserve, that the Most High cannot be pleased with sacrifices, and then add that he ordered sacrifices, which cannot please him, is the language of ignorance and impiety, if not blasphemy.

Our new modelled Theologian tells us, p. 16, "The Christian Theology has been loaded with all the surmises of human ignorance." The writer has just remarked a strong specimen in Mr. N's Theology; there are many others which he passes unnoticed, and confines himself to those in which impiety is combined with ignorance. Mr. N. complains of the confidence with which these surmises of human ignorance were taught—his own confidence in assertion is not less than that of which he complains. The writer knows no ancient Theologian, or modern Theologian of the ancient school, who presumes to substitute his own surmise to the express doctrine of St. Paul, as
 this

this Theologian of the new School has done : p. 16th, after declaring that we can never comprehend the mysteries of redemption, the objects of our faith, he immediately defines faith to be, “ *the Evidence of the Love of God, which is in Christ Jesus.*” This definition contradicts the assertion which immediately precedes it, and is as opposite to that of St. Paul as light is to darkness : the Apostle defines faith to be “ *the subsistence of things hoped for, the demonstration of things not seen.*” Heb. XI.—*1. esti de pistis, elpizomenōn úpostafis, pragmaton elenchos ou blepomenōn.* He assigns the two principal qualities of faith. It founds Christian hope, gives an anticipated subsistence to promised glory ; it is a light which impresses on the understanding a conviction of mysterious truths, as demonstration evinces natural truths attainable by reason. This definition of the Apostle does not coincide with Mr. N’s ideas, nor is it less inconsistent with the notions of the prime reformers, who confounded that faith, by which we know that the world was created, with a confidence in the special mercy of God, from which results an absolute certainty of salvation, an error which ruins the foundation of morality, and opens a door to unbridled licentiousness.

“ During the first ages of the Church, indeed, the gospel doctrine was displayed in its purity.” These are Mr. N’s words, p. 18th. The writer has shewn that the then Popes did exercise a spiritual jurisdiction over the eastern and western Churches in the first ages ; that the *real presence* was believed, and prayers offered for departed souls universally. Will Mr. N. acknowledge these doctrines pure ? Will he deny it, and contradict himself ? We Catholics expect something like proof : bold assertions may satisfy dupes.

In the next page he gravely tells us, that in those ages “ none professed the name of Christ, but such as, truly purified by faith, and upheld by the power of God, were ready to enter the list, to fight the battle of God.” If this modern Theologian has read ecclesiastical history, he

must have consigned it to oblivion, together with his Breviary.* What! did not Simon, Cerinthus, Hymenæus, Nicolas, Ebion, Menander, Saturninus, &c. begin to reform, in the first ages, some of them, whilst the Apostles were yet living? Irenæus, instructed by Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, the Evangelist, gives a lengthy catalogue of Reformers. The work is yet extant, indisputably authentic! In it, errors are refuted, on a principle, which has been in all ages, an effectual bar against innovation, that is, “*any exposition of Scripture, which is not consistent with the settled doctrine of tradition, must be rejected:*” though “the Scripture,” says he, “be an invariable rule of our faith, it does not contain all things, as it is obscure in many places, recourse must be had to tradition, that is, to the doctrine which J. C. and his Apostles transmitted by word of mouth, and which is preserved and taught in the Churches.”

Though the reverend Mr. N. may disregard the authority of Irenæus, he will surely have some condescension for St. Paul. The Apostle says, that amongst the christians of Corinth, there were some who denied the resurrection of the dead. 1st Cor. XV.—12. Were not these men, against whom St. Jude wrote his epistle, Reformers of the day? Men, who like our modern Reformers, could not, or would not, submit to the severity of the gospel, and all the restraints of religion. As an antidote against poisonous doctrine, the Apostle recommended to the faithful, in strong terms, perseverance in the faith which they had received.

In the next page, this, our modern Theologian, who complains so loudly of the ignorance of his ancestors, gives a specimen of reformed science: he distinguishes J. C. from the Lord who redeemed us: “no racks,” says

* The Breviary contains a stated form of prayer, consisting of between forty and fifty psalms, some lessons from scripture, hymns, orations, &c. different for every day in the year—which Catholic Clergymen are obliged to recite; a wilful omission is considered a capital offence, and a total dereliction is thought a mark of reprobation; it is, notwithstanding, extremely irksome and inconvenient to men engaged in other pursuits besides these of their profession.

says he, "could compel them, (*Christians*) to deny the Lord who made them, and redeemed them by J. Christ." His ignorant ancestors, with great simplicity, believed that J. Christ was the Lord who redeemed them. Nestorius, a Reformer of old, thought that in J. Christ there were two persons, the one divine, the other human, he did not think *that J. Christ* who redeemed us a mere *passive instrument*: our modern Theologian surpasses him in impiety.

In the 21st page, whether intentionally or inadvertently, he manifestly betrays the cause which he had undertaken to support: "God," says he, "has spoken the word, *the gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church of Christ*, it is decreed in the Council of the Eternal God, that the faith of his Christ shall triumph over impiety and iniquity." To justify a Reformation, iniquity and impiety must prevail, if not, a Reformation is not only unnecessary, but confessedly inexcusable. Mr. N. tells us, that impiety and iniquity cannot prevail, he must therefore, if he reasons, consequently admit that the Reformation is inexcusable.

In the same page, he says, "they, (*the Christians*,) stood fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the *Gospel*, and were truly the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth." In this sentence our commentator not finding St. Jude's words, "*for the faith once delivered to the Saints*," to his purpose, has taken the liberty to substitute his own, *the faith of the Gospel*. St. Jude's doctrine coincides with that of St. Paul, "faith is from hearing," Rom. X.—17. Mr. N. in opposition to both, instead of referring to the ministry of Preachers lawfully sent, refers his readers to the Gospel, which is as silent as the grave; and leaves those, who cannot read, to their own sagacity. He admits that the Christians, then *of one mind*, did compose the Church of the living God, which is the pillar and ground of truth. If unity of sentiment was necessary then, why not now? If the Church was then the pillar and ground of truth; why

why not now? The man is not thoroughly reformed, he is not purged of the old leaven, *intus et in cute*. In the next page he tells us, "that when the Christian religion was countenanced by imperial approbation, multitudes of profane men professed the name of Christ, and contaminated the sacred religion of J. Christ, by their impertinencies and follies:" a bold assertion, an assertion self-condemned: profane men contaminate themselves, not the religion of J. Christ. The incestuous Corinthian did not contaminate the Christian religion, nor did they who denied the resurrection. Religion is pure and spotless, it condemns vice and error, is defiled by neither, and this our modern Theologian had told us, "that it was decreed in the Council of the Eternal God, that the faith of his Christ should triumph over impiety and iniquity."

The first imperial edict in favor of Christians, was published in 313, by Constantine and Licinius; then, if we believe Mr. N. the religion of J. Christ was contaminated by the impertinencies and follies of profane men; passing an intervening space of 1203 years unnoticed, he comes immediately to the memorable æra of Reformation, in 1516, when Luther's first Theses appeared, or rather in 1525, when he publicly married Miss Catharine Bore, a nun, whom he had allured from her convent two years before, under pretence of instructing her in new principles, and began to enforce by example, his lessons of immorality, published in a work well calculated to increase the number of his disciples, by relieving the incontinence of sensual hypocrites, masked under a religious habit, from the restraints of that odious virtue, chastity, an infamous work, in which modesty is put to the blush. It is remarkable that his lessons on that subject, have been religiously observed by all his disciples. The uninformed reader will be surprised to hear, that these profligate Monks were the first founders and patriarchs of the different branches of the Reformation. They were also relieved from what this new disciple calls "*frivolous observances, and unprofitable austerities,*" p. 24. That is, from
fasts

fasts and abstinence, from obedience, from penitential works, in a word, from all the duties and restraints of religion, substituting to the severity of the Gospel, a system of licentiousness and sensuality, which would have done honor to the invention of Epicurus. This Mr. N. calls a *Work of Wisdom*.

“By pondering over the inspired pages, just sentiments of religion are awakened, p. 24.” True, there we are told, that a man, who makes a solemn promise to God, must perform it, if in his power, without injury to others. Num. VI.—We find that a man, who promised to abstain from wine, or other inebriating liquor, was obliged to observe the tenor of his vow. Mr. N. would call this a vain observance, or unprofitable austerity. St. Paul did not think so: we find him seriously acknowledging such a vow, Acts XVIII.—and religiously performing it with other Christians, Acts XXI.—26. The prophet Daniel did not think abstinence from certain meats, not prohibited by the law, a vain observance, or unprofitable austerity: “In those days, I, Daniel, had been lamenting the days of three weeks, I did not eat desirable bread, nor did flesh or wine enter my mouth, nor did I anoint myself with ointment,” Dan. X.—23, “*ecbem, chamadeth la a calthi, ou basar, ou jaain, lo bah el phi.*” John Baptist did not think abstinence from flesh an unprofitable austerity; the Angel who announced his birth had expressly ordered that he should abstain from wine and inebriating liquor, “*kai oinon kai fishera ou mē piē.*” Luke I,—15. His abstinence from flesh and bread was voluntary: “John had a garment of camel’s hair, a leathern girdle about his loins, his food was locusts and wild honey.” Matt. III.—4, and so small was the quantity, that Christ said of him, Matt. XV.—18, “John came neither eating nor drinking.” Mosheim, in his ecclesiastical history, speaking of St. Anthony, the celebrated solitary in Egypt, who seems to have taken John Baptist for his model, says, that his life resembled that of a savage beast. Why not bestow some epithet of contempt, on the Baptist himself,
who

who was a perfect model of that pretended savage life ? He thought it, perhaps, indecent to give a flat contradiction to J. Christ, who had declared John to be the greatest man then born of a woman. John's abstinence, therefore, his hair cloth, his eremetical life, his penitential works, were not vain observances, nor unprofitable austerities, whatever Mr. N. may think of them ; nor were Anthony's, nor were these of myriads of Monks and Hermits who followed their example, before our Reformers had taught the hitherto untaught world to believe, that the pleasures of the table, the amusements of the theatre, and other amusements, which the writer does not think proper to name, form that narrow gate and path of affliction which lead to life, "*ε̄ πολὺ στενὴ τῆς ἰμμενῆ ἐ ὁδός*, of which Christ said there are few, who find it, Matt. VII.—14.

If the reverend Mr. N. had been as conversant in the records of the primitive Church as he wishes his readers to believe, he would have found, that Anthony was a Monk near half a century before christianity was countenanced, as he calls it, by imperial authority, and that he had placed an only sister in a nunnery at the same time, or, as St. Athanasius terms it "*a house of virgins,*" *oikos parthenōn*. See Ath. t. 2. p. 796. *Ed. Ben.* He also informs us, that Anthony paid a visit to his sister, when she was very old, and mistress of many virgins, N. 54, p. §37. These vain observances and unprofitable austerities, from which the Reformers have relieved Mr. N. were in full force at the time when he tells us that Christianity was in its greatest purity.

To these observances and austerities, however vain and unprofitable they may appear to the reformed Mr. N. Christ very seriously exhorted his disciples, if the Evangelists tell truth : Matt. XIX.—After telling a young man what was indispensably necessary to salvation, Christ immediately subjoined : " if you desire to be perfect, go sell all your possessions, and give to the poor, and you will have a treasure in heaven, and come and follow me." If this be not an exhortation to voluntary poverty, such as

as Monks profess, the writer does not understand the force of language. We find an exhortation to perpetual chastity, in language equally strong. The Saviour having suppressed the bill of divorce, which Moses had reluctantly authorised, and declared marriage indissoluble, the Apostles, alarmed at the severity of a law, which confined a man for life to the same woman, let her native or adventitious deformities, defects, infirmities or faults, be what they may, replied, if such were the conditions of matrimony, it were better not to marry. Their answer he approved saying, "all do not conceive this word; but they to whom it is given," Matt. XIX.—2. Then, as a direct encouragement, he shews that virtue possible: in some, there is a natural incapacity; in others, it is the effect of external violence. These are obliged to perpetual continency without any reward; but where the incapacity is voluntary, the kingdom of Heaven is promised. A voluntary incapacity, must be the effect of a moral engagement, of some solemn vow or promise: the man is not blind who will not see, but he who cannot see; nor is that man incapable of marriage, who will not marry, but he who cannot marry. A proper subject of meditation for the reverend Mr. N. whether he understands the Saviour's words to imply an exhortation to voluntary poverty and perpetual continency, or not, the Apostles most certainly did; hence, we find Peter, in the name of his brethren, telling the Saviour, that they had forsaken all things to follow him, *ibid.* 27. We know from St. John 1. Ep. H.—6, that to follow J. Christ, is to imitate him. Mr. N. will not presume to say, that the Saviour did not live in a state of perpetual celibacy, and he himself, tells us, that his poverty was such, that he had not a place to lay his head, Matt. VIII.—20. St Paul was also of the same opinion: in his first epistle to Timothy, he directs that Prelate to refuse admission to young widows, amongst these, who, on their promise of perpetual continency, were maintained at the expence of the Church, lest they should presume to marry, and
break

break their promise. That this promise was exacted, and its transgression a capital offence, is manifest from the words of the Apostle : he speaks of their breaking their plighted faith, by a marriage subsequent to their admission. It could not be their faith plighted to their husbands : they were widows ; nor to their deceased husbands : that was annulled by death ; it must therefore have been a solemn promise to God, by which they renounced marriage ; if they had been under no such engagement, it would not have been in them a crime to marry, in a word, if they had not plighted their faith, they could not break it, and if their vow did not strictly oblige, the transgression of it would not have been a source of perdition. The Apostle says, it is, “ having judgment because they set aside their first faith,” *echosai krima oti prōten pistin ēthetesan*, 1. Tim. V.—12. St Paul therefore thought, and taught, that the man or woman who places him, or herself, under a moral incapacity of marriage, by a solemn promise of perpetual continency, could not marry without incurring the penalty of perdition. The reverend Mr. N. would do well to discuss this truth with candour.

To say that the Apostle did not exhort the faithful to perpetual continency, or that he did not prefer a state of celibacy to the married state, betrays the most consummate ignorance of his writings : in his first epistle to the Corinthians, VII. after giving some instructions to married people on the relative duties of the married state, he immediately subjoins, “ but I say to the unmarried and to widows, it is good for them to remain so, as I do ; but if they do not contain themselves, let them marry, it is better marry than burn.” The Apostle does not say, if they cannot contain themselves ; he knew well, that with the assistance of the divine spirit, to be obtained by prayer, and the other means which religion furnishes, they could ; that continency, like all other moral virtues, is the gift of God, to be obtained by the same means, and in the same manner ; but he says : if they do not contain
themselves,

themselves, let them marry. It is hardly necessary to remark that he speaks to these who are under no moral incapacity from vows or promises, for against them, who break such engagement, he denounces judgment. Moses had done so long before, Deut. XXIII,—22. if you make a vow to the Lord your God, you will not delay to perform it, for the Lord exacting, will exact it from you, and it will be, in you, a sin; but if you do not vow it will not be in you a sin; what proceeds from your lips you will observe according as you have vowed to the Lord your God, what you have said voluntary with your mouth, “*chi thidor neder le Jehovah, Elobika le theachey, le shalamo, chi doresh, jidorshenou, me imaka ve hajä leka cheta.*” The inspired writer, says, Prov. XX—26, “It is ruinous to a man to corrupt sanctity, or, after his vows, to seek a subterfuge.” *Moquæsh adom jalab, kodesh ve achar, Nedarim le baker.*

That this perpetual continency recommended by Christ and his Apostles, was professed and observed; we have evidence in the scripture: St. Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, XXI—9. says of Philip, that he had four daughters, *virgins prophesying*, “*propheteuousai!*” Mr. N. who thinks the scripture a sole and sufficient rule of faith, and finds there what no other man ever did, that the gospel of St. John is divinely inspired, and that the English version, which he now reads, is as authentic as the original, must know, that not only the inspired writers, but others also, who were in a particular manner, consecrated to the service of God, were called prophets: Chonenias prince of the Levites over the prophesy, “*be masha*, and instructing in the prophesy.” “*jasor, be bemasha,*” that is, instructing in sacred music, or, in plain English, master of the sacred band, because, says the writer he understood it, “*chi mebin hou,*” 1. Chron. XV—22, and 1. Chron. XXV—1. David and his ministers separated for the divine service, the sons of Asaph, and Heman, and Jedithun, *prophesying with harps,* “*hanebiim be chinorath.*” We find Saul and his compani-

ons prophesying amongst the sacred band over which Samuel presided, 1. Sam. XIX—24, not foretelling future events, but praising God with vocal and instrumental music. This appearance of devotion, in such a miscreant as Saul, surpris'd the people, hence the proverb, *Saul amongst the Prophets*. Philip's four daughters, therefore, were consecrated to God, in a state of virginity, or, to speak the language of the present day, were nuns. That women thus consecrated to God, were called simply *virgins*, "*parthenoi*," we know from St. Basil, a Greek writer of unquestionable authority, in the 4th century: "She is called a *virgin* who has voluntarily offered herself to God, renounced matrimony, and preferred a life in sanctification. Epist. ad Amp. 2. Can. 18. The monastic rule of this venerable Prelate is yet extant, and observed by the Greeks.

That this profession of perpetual continency was made in early youth, and in the first ages of christianity, whilst, if we believe Mr. N. christianity was yet pure, we know from the writers of these ages, whose works are yet in being. Athanasius, de Inc. ver. div. n. 51. "What mortal after death, or even in life, taught virginity; or did not rather think that virtue inaccessible? but our Saviour Christ, the Lord of all things, recommending that virtue, had such weight, that even youth, who have not yet attained the age prescribed by law, are not afraid to profess virginity, which is beyond the law." And in his apology to the Emperor Constantine, he offers the profession of perpetual continency, as presumptive evidence of the truth of christianity: "it is certain," says he, "that this venerable and celestial profession is no where observed but amongst us christians; this is a very great argument that the true religion is with us." Ap. n. 33. What would this celebrated Prelate of the old school have thought of a modern Monk, renouncing his vows, and in direct opposition to the Apostles, who had forsaken every thing to follow Christ, resuming every thing which he had forsaken, and grasping at what he never possessed, under
pretence

pretence of reforming abuses? For Mr. N's satisfaction the writer begs leave to give St. Austin's opinion, and in his own words: "every man," says he, "from the place in his journey to which he is come by advancing, and which he has promised to God, from thence looks behind, when he deserts it, for example, he has resolved on conjugal chastity, (there justice begins) he has renounced fornication and all unlawful uncleanness, when he returns to fornication, he looks behind." Another from the gift of God, has vowed something greater, he has "resolved not to marry, he would not be condemned if he had married a wife, if, after his vow which he made to God, he marries, he will be damned; when he does that, which another who has not promised does, he will be damned, the other will not, why, but because he has looked behind? he was then advanced, the other was not, yet come up: thus, a virgin, if she marries, she does not sin, if a consecrated virgin, (a nun) marries she will be accounted an adulteress of Christ; she looked behind from the place to which she was come." Enar in Ps. LXXXIII. n. 4.

Philip's four daughters were not sequestered in a monastery, true. Monasteries were not yet erected; but it is also true that long after the erection of monasteries, there were many professed nuns who did not reside in them: St. Austin speaks of it as a fact universally known and common in his time; censuring the conduct of some of his Clergy, who preferred living separately, at their own expence, to the community, which, in imitation of the Apostles, and their immediate disciples, at Jerusalem, he had established. This venerable Pastor says, "I know how great an evil it is to profess any thing holy, and not fulfil it." "Vow, and perform your vows to the Lord your God." Ps. LXXV.—12. "And it is better not to vow, than to vow and not perform." Eccl. V—14. Though a virgin was never in a monastery, if she be a consecrated virgin, (a professed nun,) it is not lawful for her to marry, though she is not obliged to
live

live in a monastery; but if she has begun to live in a monastery, and deserts it, though a virgin she is half fallen. Serm. 355. *alias* 49. de. civ. Cap. 1. n. 6.

To call these observances vain, and austerities unprofitable, to which the Saviour exhorted, which were practised by the Apostles and their immediate disciples, is something worse than presumption. Mr. N. seriously affected, considering the established religion of the world, at the period of the Reformation, laments that the righteousness of the Lord was forgotten, that superstitious vanities, frivolous observances, and unprofitable austerities were thought meritorious, p. 24. The writer assures him that they are thought so yet, by these millions who profess the then established religion of the world, that is, by all Catholics: that these observances and austerities, however meritorious or acceptable, were not thought to constitute Christian perfection, but were considered, and justly, as means to attain it. The Saviour thought so too, else he would not have said to the young man; *go sell your possessions, give to the poor, and come and follow me*, in these few words pointing out the means and the end. For as Christian perfection consists in this, that, cleansed from sin, we be united to God by perfect charity, no means can possibly be assigned, more likely to conduce to this end, than these which Christ himself assigns in the evangelical counsels. St. John tells us, that all the sources of sin, are the concupiscence of the flesh, the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life, *ὅτι παν τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμία τοῦ βίου*. 1. John, II—16. By Evangelical chastity, the concupiscence of the flesh is overcome, by Evangelical poverty, the concupiscence of the eyes is suppressed, and by Evangelical obedience the pride of life is extinguished. This is so manifestly true, that he must be inconceivably stupid, or unaccountably obstinate, who denies it.

Mr. N. after this long preamble, in which there are as many errors and incoherencies as would require a volume

lume to correct, states two or three of the passages adduced in the preceding volume, in support of the infallibility of the Churches for the sense of which he appeals to *sound criticism*. Grammarians determine the sense of words, criticism confines itself to literary productions, it pronounces on their authenticity, their beauties, their defects, &c. Mr. N. extending the range of criticism, discovers *from the tenor of the gospel, the spirit of the letter*, that Christ did not intend to confer any privilege on Peter, nor to give any stability to a spiritual edifice, to be raised on this mysterious rock; plain men, not inspired by the spirit of criticism, see the contrary. "When Christ," says Mr. N. p. 29, "said to Peter, thou art a rock, he only intimated, that the profession of his faith would make him immovable as a rock." Yes, but Christ added, that on that immovable rock he would raise an edifice equally immovable, which the powers of Hell should not subvert." "St. Peter's faith," says our critic, p. 29, "was the rock of salvation, on it, as on a solid foundation, the Church of Christ was to be built." This spirit of criticism, is a spirit of illusion, it has deceived our worthy critic, as it frequently happens, in this age of criticism: they are not the qualities of the materials which compose a building, but the materials themselves, properly prepared for the purpose: in like manner, they are not the virtues of christians which compose that spiritual edifice, the Church, but christians themselves, qualified by christian virtues, of which faith is the principal. This we know from St. Peter, who, though not a modern critic, is of some authority amongst us christians: in his first epistle, II—4, he calls Christ himself the first foundation, a *living stone, lithon zonta*, and adds, 6, that christians, as living stones, compose a spiritual edifice, to offer spiritual victims, acceptable to God, by J. Christ, "*kai autoi os lithoi zontes oikodomeiſte oikos pneumaticos.*" This language Peter had learnt from his master, who, knowing that the foundation is essentially a part of the building, and solid in proportion to the weight of the super-

super-structure, did not say that he would build his Church on Peter's faith, which was but a necessary qualification; but on Peter himself, thus qualified by faith, and confirmed by the almighty power of his master. If Peter's faith was then a necessary qualification, it is so now, and it will continue so, until the end of time. Mr. N. himself, has the condescension to admit, that this temple of God, established by the ministry of Peter and the other Apostles, will stand fast until the end of time, p. 29. Yet he had told us, p. 24, that the righteousness of the Lord was forgotten at the period of the reformation, and true knowledge was effaced from the public mind. It requires a stretch of criticism to reconcile these jarring opinions.

To elude the authority of St. Paul, who in his first epistle to Timothy, III—15, calls the Church, the house of God, the pillar and ground of truth, he has recourse to an exploded subterfuge: "the unbiassed reader," says he, "cannot fail of remarking in reading this passage, that it is not the exterior ministry, the body of pastors and governors of the several divisions of that multitude of men, who profess the christian faith, and enjoy the common measure of salvation, that are exclusively called the pillars of truth, but the Church of God, those who are called to be saints, those who believe the gospel, and hold the mystery of faith, in a pure conscience, are the Church of God, the pillar and ground of truth." p. 24. "the Church of the living God is only visible to him, from whom nothing can be concealed." From this comment it would appear, that St. Paul's instruction to Timothy, was at least useless, not to say ridiculous and impertinent: he ought to have told him, how he should discover this invisible Church before he gave him any directions for his conduct in it: to tell a man how he is to conduct himself in a society of which he does not know, nor can by any human means discover an individual member, is impertinent in the extreme. However, Mr. N. justifies the Apostle: he tells us in his next page that

a visible Church must be constituted, and that this visible Church, however deformed, must contain within its pale, that *spiritual house* which is holy to the Lord, and adds, that *the divine author of the christian faith gave a commission to his Apostles to constitute a visible Church*. It is humbly presumed that the Apostles did execute their commission; that it was a visible, not an invisible, Church which they did constitute; if they did constitute a Church at all, it must have been a visible Church, from the materials of which it is composed: St. Peter expressly says, that christians are the living stones which compose this spiritual edifice, and J. Christ the corner stone. The virtues by which these living stones are fitted for the building are invisible, it is true, but of these no church can be composed, no more than a material edifice can be composed of the qualities of the materials: we may, therefore, justly conclude, that St. Paul directed his disciple how to conduct himself in that Church, which he and his fellow Apostles did constitute, and that was not an invisible, but a visible Church, composed of pastors and their respective portions of the one flock, united in the same faith, cemented by the same rites and ceremonies, under the same visible Head. Peter and Paul speak of the Church, under the same denomination, *the house of god* “*oikos Theou*” composed of the faithful, whom Peter calls, *living stones*, this is the Church which St. Paul calls the *pillar and ground of truth*; not an invisible Church of modern invention of which, the Apostle knew nothing, an imaginary Church, which never did, nor could exist, if it be true, as Mr. N. asserts, p. 35, that this visible Church, however unlike that portrayed by the inspired writers still contains within its pale that spiritual house which is holy to the Lord. It is incontestibly true, that the reformed Churches are not that spiritual house, nor any part of that spiritual house, for they are not within its pale; and it is equally true, that all the promises of the new covenant must be confined to that visible Church, because within its pale is that spiritual house, to
 which

which Mr. N. says the promises were made, and St. Luke, a man of greater authority, says so too; Acts II—47, “the Lord added daily to the Church, all these who are to be saved: *ὁ κυριος προσετιθει τοις ζοζομενοις καθ’ ἑμερον τε εκκλησια.*” In the hands of the then pastors of this visible Church, which the Apostles were commissioned by Christ to constitute, were the scriptures, the authentic instruments, in which the promises are contained, deposited together with the intended sense of the scriptures, to be by them transmitted to their successors in office.

After producing some of the passages, on which Mr. N. says the Church of Rome founds her claims to infallibility, with his usual confidence, (for that man assumes to himself the infallibility which he refuses to the Church of Christ,) “most assuredly in expounding them the authority in question cannot be exerted. The meaning of these passages before us, on which the title to infallibility is founded, must be ascertained, independently of the authority it is presumed to establish. In this preliminary point the authority of either party must be superseded.” p. 28.

This opinion of our modern Theologian is subversive of all order, and in its consequences, destructive of society: a seditious subject in any country may tell the constituted authorities that the sense of the public records, which attest the authority they exercise, must be determined by sound criticism; that their authority must be superseded until they can make it evident to him, independently on the authority which they claim from the records, that their claim is well founded. Such an opposition to a wonted privilege of Parliament would procure a place in Bedlam or something worse. Mr. N. has not told us if this authority does exist, why it should not be exercised in expounding these passages as well as others. The authority is not from the scriptures but from Jesus Christ, the scriptures are but the records which attest its existence.

When

When we reason with the Deist or the Atheist, we shew him from the uninterrupted testimony of the Catholic Church, not considered as a Church, but as an united, successive and continued society, the most numerous, the most enlightened, the most attentive, the most scrupulously exact, that was ever yet formed, and consequently the most credible, that the scriptures are authentic records; and on the same principle we shew Mr. N. that the sense which we affix to these passages, is that in which they were always understood, that it is the genuine, the intended sense; as it is, in fact, the only sense which they convey, totally disregarding the *no sense*, which his criticism discovers from *the tenor of the gospel, in the spirit of the letter*, by which he endeavours, to mislead a well-meaning, but credulous people.

Mr. N. justly remarks that particular Churches may decay and wither away, p. 30. Lamentable experience confirms this truth. An army is not said to be invincible, because none of the soldiers fall in battle, but because, though many desert, and many fall in the field, the main body subsists entire, and is in every action, victorious. It is so with the Catholic Church, in the Canticles, VI—39. It is called an army in battle array. Though many desert their colours, and many fall in battle with the common enemy of man, yet the main body subsists entire, ever is, was, and will be victorious, because Christ himself and his Holy Spirit superintends and directs it according to his promise—*Behold I am with you until the end of time.*” Mr. N. acknowledges that from this promise the successors of the Apostles are warranted to expect the assistance of the Holy Spirit, in governing and feeding the Church until the end of time, p. 37. Would this modern Theologian deign to inform us, to which of the Apostles Martin Luther was successor? or in what Apostolical chair, the incorporated Society, from which he professes to have received his mission, is seated? These are embarrassing questions, they were proposed by Tertullian and Irenæus, to Reformers of the third century; by Optatus,

to Reformers of the fourth, &c. They are yet unanswered. He had said, p. 35. "the authority vested in the Apostles, and by them to be transmitted to their successors." It is therefore admitted by Mr. N. that there was some spiritual authority vested in the Apostles, and transmissible to their successors. That succession is indisputably, in the Pastors of the Catholic Church, not elsewhere; in them therefore, is the spiritual authority vested in their predecessors, and not elsewhere. Calvin, an acute reasoner, saw no possible mode of eluding the force of this argument, but by acknowledging Luther himself to be an apostle, though he did not think him infallible. "He was," says Calvin, (Lib. de lib. arb. p. 311. in Opus.) "an excellent Apostle of J. Christ, who erected our Church anew."

Mr. N. pretends, as did Mr. S. that Christ established nothing like subordination, amongst the Pastors of his Church, that he made all the Apostles and their successors perfectly independent; he, notwithstanding, acknowledges the necessity of a common faith and charity, p. 36. He ought to have told us what flock it was that Christ committed to Peter's care, John XXI. or how unity of faith could subsist in different Churches without any subordination; as he offers nothing like argument, the writer passes his conjectures unnoticed, and refers the reader to the preceding volume, from p. 144, to the end P. 43. Mr. N. tells us, that in the early ages of christianity, no assembly of men required acquiescence in their decisions, on the grounds of infallibility; and this extravagant assertion he extends to the assembly of the Apostles themselves in Jerusalem. "What seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to the Apostles, was received with joy by other Churches; but this they were prompted to, not from a sense of subjection, but from deference to, and affection for, the Apostles and the Elders." The man raves: what! the people did not think themselves in subjection to the Holy Ghost? or the dictates of this Divine Spirit, announced by the Apostles, infallibly true?

St. Paul and Silus, were therefore much to blame, in ordering the faithful to observe the precepts given by the Apostles and the Priests in Jerusalem, Acts XVI—4; and the Council itself equally to blame, in pretending to impose a burden on people not subject to their jurisdiction.

In his account of the Council of Nice, Mr. N. inadvertently betrays his cause; he does so, in almost every page of his pamphlet, advancing principles, the natural consequences of which are totally subversive of the Reformation: “no other method,” says he, p. 44. “was pursued in managing the controversy, than to establish the christian doctrines by the scriptures, and the authority of men venerable for piety, and eminent in christian wisdom, who had handed down, in an unpolluted tradition, the doctrine of the Apostles.” This is the language of Catholics, the language of truth, and hence they conclude, that the Prelates assembled in this first, great, venerable, and universally revered Council, did not think the scriptures alone a sufficient rule of faith: if this assembly laid no claims to infallibility, they acted most tyrannically, in obliging all the Prelates of the then christian world, to subscribe the profession of faith, called the *Nicene Creed*, which Mr. N. himself must have subscribed. See Art. VIII. of the XXXIX. They decided according to the scriptures. Yes, but not according to the scriptures alone: if we believe Mr. N. they consulted *unpolluted tradition*; but whether they decided according to the scriptures, or tradition, or both, they most certainly claimed unerring authority in expounding the scriptures, and determining the true and genuine sense of the scriptures, by the uninterrupted tradition of the Pastors of the Church, successors of the Apostles, and retrenched from the communion of the Catholic Church, them, who refused to acknowledge their decision infallibly true. The same method was pursued by all succeeding Councils. They were not guilty of that glaring inconsistency, which characterizes the *Oecumenical Reformed Synod of Dordrecht*, in which it

was ordered, that decisions, confessedly subject to error, should be subscribed, as doctrines of faith; the disciples of Arminius had refused to subscribe some confessions of faith, published by provincial Synods in the United States. They were considered as heretics, and schismatics, by their reformed brethren, the disciples of Gomar. On their refusal, the Synod of Dordrecht, agreed in opinion with the provincial Synod, and yet decreed, that these confessions of faith, were so far from being a certain rule of faith, that they might be re-examined. Thus they obliged men to subscribe doctrines of faith, which they themselves did not believe true. See Syn. Delph. inst. Act. Dec. Sefs. 35. p. 91. Sefs. 32. p. 123.

In the 48th page of this elaborate work, we find a direct censure on the express words of Christ, and these of his Apostle, St. Paul: the Saviour says, Matt. XVIII — 19. "if any man will not hear the Church, let him be to you, as a heathen or a publican." And the Apostle says of himself, "that by the power of God, he was making every understanding captive, in obedience to Christ," "*archmalōtizontes pan Noēma eis tēn úpakoēn tou Christou.*" Mr. N. on the contrary; says, "that Christ frowns upon all who encroach on the rights of conscience, to lead every judgment captive, or who denounce the sore woes reserved for the heathen or the publican, against all those who have *the virtue to refuse, to hear and obey.*" The writer does not remember to have seen that virtue of Mr. N's invention, *disobedience*, patronised by any heathen moralist. He makes no comment on it. Mr. N. himself, forgets this his favorite virtue: in the very next page he tells us, that "every christian is to be considered as an alien from the household of faith, if he does not obey the voice of the particular Church, within whose limits providence has placed him." What if that particular Church should disagree with all other Churches, in its doctrine and discipline? no matter, the elder, if we believe Mr. N. is a supreme, free and independent master-builder, he fashions his house according to his own skill, so that Mr.

N.

N. will have as many houses separate and independent, as there are particular Churches in the world. All these houses, if collected, would have a grotesque appearance, they would resemble, what the French call, a *chateau d'Espagne*.

It must be admitted, that Mr. N. is accommodating in his principles, "whilst the universal Church," says he, p. 55. "was divided into many separate, free and independent Churches, their unanimous testimony was a sufficient proof of evangelical doctrine." He has not told us, how a *whole*, either *natural* or *moral*, can be composed not of parts, but of *wholes*, each free, separate and independent. A free, separate and independent Church, is not a part or portion of any other Church. This universal Church of Mr. N's invention, is imaginary, or the freedom, independence, and separation of the particular Churches which compose it, is fictitious.

That there is but one house of God, one kingdom of Jesus Christ, one flock committed to Peter's care, we know from better authority than Mr. N. and that the separate independence of its component parts is fictitious and imaginary we know from common sense. "Whilst they continued separate, free and independent, their unanimous testimony was a proof of evangelical doctrine." Once more this modern Theologian deviates from his sole rule of faith, the scriptures: he admits, that the unanimous consent of the Churches, whilst separate, free and independent, was a proof of evangelical doctrine: but this unanimous consent of all Churches, when connected, dependent and subordinate, he disregards, because it is then but the testimony of one Church; and the same spirit is diffused through all. True, our ancestors knew nothing of separate, free and independent Churches, composing the universal Church; their intellects were not sufficiently refined, to conceive revolting absurdities, and manifest impossibilities.

From this jumble of incoherencies, with which our modern Theologian fills some pages, there is one truth to be

be extracted, that is, there was at that period of the Reformation, and many centuries before the reformation was thought of, one Church, mistress of all others, whose spirit was diffused through them all, their doctrine, of course, the same, and their consent unanimous. This, on the principles of common sense, is strong presumptive evidence of truth. The simplicity of our ancestors thought so, and condemned without farther discussion, the ravings of enthusiasts, the artifices of hypocrites, the inventions of innovators, of all descriptions, as pestilential errors, and branded the authors with the opprobrious epithet of impostors. How the testimony of an incalculable number of free, independent and separate Churches, on all the tenets of faith, many of them confessedly impervious to reason, could be unanimous, if the same spirit had not been diffused through them all, is an inexplicable paradox: of the many Reformed Churches, there are no two, whose faith, is in all things, the same.

Mr. N. has discovered by inspiration, no doubt, that it was after the public establishment of christianity, by Constantine, the care of sending faithful men into the provinces to preach the christian doctrine, was committed to the Bishop of Rome by that Emperor; that Bishops were appointed, and the management of the public affairs of religion entrusted to them, under the auspices of the Emperor; that ecclesiastical jurisdiction was measured out, and precedence given, according to the dignity of the cities in which their residence was first. Thus, says Mr. N. the highest feat of honor was assigned to the Bishop of Rome. The writer does not remember to have seen so bare-faced an imposition obtruded on the credulity of the uninformed reader. What! was there no patriarch in Alexandria or Antioch, before Constantine was born? no Bishops in charge of the Churches constituted by the Apostles; no ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised by the Bishops of the Patriarchal Sees? such extravagance, in contradiction to all the monuments of antiquity, deserves contempt,

contempt, not a serious refutation. The Council of Nice, assembled at the instance, and the expence of Constantine, says, Can. VI. "let the ancient custom continue in force, which was in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have the power of all, because this is customary with the Bishop of the city of Rome, in like manner in Antioch, and the other provinces; let their honour be preferred to each." It was therefore an old custom, established by the See of Rome, that the Bishop of Alexandria, of which the then patriarch Alexander was the eighteenth from St. Mark, the evangelist, should preside over Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, the patriarch of Antioch, over the provinces of that patriarchate, and other Prelates over different provinces, long before Constantine's days; that Emperor, therefore, measured out no ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In his letter to Amulius, the Pro-Consul of Africa, as cited from Eusebius, by Mr. N. the Emperor says, that Cœcilius presides over all the ministers of the Catholic Church in that province; but he does not say, nor insinuate, that he had been appointed by imperial authority, to preside over the Churches in that province. Carthage was the metropolis of Numidia, before, St. Cyprian's days, who suffered martyrdom in 259, Constantine not yet born. This celebrated Arch-Bishop's works are yet extant, and his life, written by Pontius, one of his deacons,

Admire the consistency of this modern historian, p. 60. he says, that Constantine left the Prelates, "composing the Council of Nice, perfectly free to examine the point in dispute, and that he only claimed the authority of a moderator to prevent the disorders which might proceed from two eager debates." And a few lines after, he tells us, "that through the whole of the proceeding, the Emperor appears in the character of supreme head, in Church as well as in State." Thus, in contradiction to himself, he confers on Constantine, not yet baptised, a quality of which neither that Emperor, nor the Council, ever thought. That Constantine honoured the Council

cil with his presence we know; but that so far from assuming a right to preside in the Council, he did not even sit down, until prayed by the Prelates, we know also from historians of the time, Theod. Lib. 1. Cap. 7. and Eusebius, Lib. 3. de Vita. Constan. that he did not subscribe the decision, until the Prelates had all subscribed Basilus, one of his successors in the empire, attests in the VIII. Synod. We have the attestation of the oriental Bishops, assembled at Constantinople in 552, that the Roman Pontiff Sylvester, by his legates, Osius, Bishop of Cordova, Vitus and Vincentius, Priests of the Roman Church, did preside in the Council of Nice, (T. 5. Con. p. 337. 338.) In all the editions of that Council, in manuscript, as in print, their names are first amongst the subscribers, and they are cited, in the same manner, by Socrates, a Greek historian, not friendly to the Latins: *Osius, Bishop of Cordova, thus I believe as is above said, Vitus and Vincentius, Priests of the city of Rome, Alexander, Bishop of Egypt, Eustathius, of Antioch, &c.* (Socrates Lib. 1. Cap. 13.) The writer suppresses the testimonies of Gelazeus of Cyzica, and of Cedrenus, though Greeks, they are writers of little credit. Photius, a bad man, but an able critic, says in his book of the seven Synods, that Sylvester, by his legates, gave authority to the Council of Nice; and Athanasius, a man of unquestionable authority, who assisted at the Council, as Theologian to his Bishop Alexander, says in his letter to the solitaries, "that Osius was president of that Council, and that the Nicene Creed was composed by him."

That any interference of the imperial power, in causes purely spiritual and ecclesiastical, was then considered as an unwarranted usurpation, the letter of Osius to Constantius, the Arian Emperor, and son to Constantine, is an authentic monument. This Prince had written to Osius, adding threats to entreaties, to engage him to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius, by the arians, in his reply to the Emperor, he says: "I have confessed the faith in the persecution, which Maximien, your grand
father,

father raised against the Church, if you resolve to renew it, you shall find me ready to suffer all things rather than betray the truth, or consent to the condemnation of an innocent man; I am not terrified by your letters, or your threats; do not interfere in ecclesiastical matters, give us no directions on the subject, but learn, from us, what you ought to know. God has given to you the empire, to us, (the Bishops) what regards his Church; as he, who would meddle with your government, would transgress the divine law, so, in your turn, fear, lest by arrogating to yourself the cognizance of ecclesiastical matters, you be guilty of a great crime: it is written give to Cæsar, what belongs to Cæsar, and to God, what belongs to God; it is not lawful for us to usurp the dominion of the earth, nor for you to attribute to yourself any power over holy things."

In Osius's letter to the Emperor Constantius, we see what Catholic Prelates thought of imperial interference in ecclesiastical matters, in that age; and in a letter of St. Ambrose, on a similar subject, what was thought in the next age; or rather in the close of the same: Constantine, says this celebrated writer, who, from his situation, as a Roman Judge, before he was, with reluctance, forced to fill the vacant See of Milan, must have known the Emperor's prerogatives, did not premise any law, but left the judgment free to the Bishops. Epist. 32. The Emperor's sentiments we learn from themselves: when the Council of Nice was closed, Constantine wrote a letter to all Churches, which is given entire by Eusebius, *de Vita Const.* In the conclusion, the Emperor says, "with willing minds, let us embrace this decree of the Council, as the gift of God, and a mandate truly sent from Heaven; for whatever is decreed in the holy Councils of Bishops, that must be entirely attributed to the divine will." Constantine therefore believed, that Councils must be composed of Bishops, and their decisions of infallible authority, or he would not ascribe them to the divine will.

Valentinian, the elder, being prayed to permit a Council

oil to assemble, as it could not be done without his permission, replied, "it is not lawful for me, who am in the rank of the people, *de sorte plebis*, curiously to investigate these things, let the Priests, to whom these cares belong, assemble where they please." Soz. Lib. Hist. Cap. 7.

Theodosius, the younger, in his letter to the Council of Ephesus, after saying that he had deputed the nobleman Candidien, to the Synod, with orders not to interfere with any subject in discussion, thus concludes, "for it is not lawful for him, who is not of the Order of the Holy Bishops, to meddle with ecclesiastical matters."

That the decisions of a General Council, was final in ecclesiastical causes, and its authority unerring, in doctrinal decrees, was so universally known, and believed in the then Catholic world, that we find it making part of the civil law. *L. Nemo. C. de summa Trinitate and fide Cath.* "He offers an injury to the most reverend Synod, who endeavours to revive, or dispute things once decided."

After filling 65 pages with desultory declamations, and wild conjectures, advanced with as much confidence as if they were intuitive truths, in the discussion of one principal tenet of Roman faith, as Mr. N. calls it, though he has not invalidated, nor even attempted to invalidate, any one, of the many reasons adduced by the writer in the preceding volume, and published long before this Candid Discussion appeared, with an air of triumph, he proceeds to discuss a second, that is, the article of transubstantiation. If his reasoning against this argument be conclusive, the Christian religion is but a fiction, and the Jews were perfectly justifiable in crucifying the Saviour: "so long," says he, p. 66. "as bread and wine are exhibited to our senses in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, sound reason will not allow us to believe that they have ceased to be what they appear to be, thus to introduce confusion and discord among the works of the

the Almighty." A similar argument is a perfect justification of the Pharisees: "we do not," said they, "stone you for any good work, but for blasphemy, because whilst you are a man, you make yourself God." John, X—33.

Mr. N. must admit, that if these Pharisees thought the testimony of their senses the voice of God declaring the nature of corporeal substances, as Mr. N. does, p. 66. they must have thought J. Christ simply a man, and his claims to an equality with the Father blasphemy, punishable by the law; Mr. N. will reply, if he be yet a christian, that the Saviour's miracles authorised his claims. True, but not on the testimony of their senses: for the same senses by which they knew his miracles attested that he was man. It was by consulting reason that the fallacy of the judgment founded on this testimony ought to have been detected, not by any of their senses: the Divinity is neither visible nor tangible; his miracles attested his divinity, but because they attested the truth of his words: "we know," said the blind man, John IX—31. "that God does not hear sinners." If he had been a blasphemer, God would not have wrought miracles to authorise his doctrine.

This is a judgment of reason, not founded on any of our senses. A judgment, which condemns the error of the Pharisees, as it does that of Mr. N. for the miracles of Christ did not attest the truth of his words, when he said that he was Son of the Eternal Father, equal in power and majesty, one with the Eternal Father, with more certainty, then when he said to his Apostles, *take and eat, this is my body*. Appearances were more strong then, and are now, against the former assertion, than against the latter: for it is infinitely more difficult to persuade ourselves that a man whom we see, who eats, who drinks, who sleeps like other men, who is publicly condemned and executed as a malefactor, should be God, one in essence, of equal power and majesty with the Eternal Father, than to persuade ourselves that he changes one substance into another

ther, when we acknowledge him to be our God ; hence it is that the belief of the divinity of Jesus Christ was so violently opposed, and the opposition continued down to the present day, whilst the belief of transubstantiation, or the real presence of Christ's body, in the sacrament of the altar, met no opposition at all.

St. Paul, speaking of the passion of J. Christ, says, " it was a stumbling block to the Jews, and a folly in the opinion of the Heathens." 1. Cor. I.—23. Of transubstantiation, or the mystery of the eucharist, he says no such thing. Why so ? because the mysteries of the incarnation and passion of J. Christ, were proposed to both Jews and Gentiles, opposed by both, and rejected by many : the mystery of the eucharist was proposed but to Christians, who, believing the divinity of J. Christ, in the unlimited power of his divine word, saw more than sufficient to effect the stupendous change which the real presence of his adorable body in the sacrament imports, and which we call transubstantiation.

Mr. N's idea of the discord and confusion which would be introduced into the works of God, if things were not always in reality, such as they appear to our senses, scarcely deserves notice. What ! was there any discord or confusion in the works of God, when the Saviour appeared on a cross, juridically condemned as a malefactor ? when the angels appeared as men, to Abraham, Jacob, &c. ? when the mountain appeared full of horses and fiery chariots, to Elisha's servant ? 4 Kings VI.—17, our modern Theologian seems to have borrowed his ideas from modern Deists, who dispute the possibility of miracles, from what they call the immutability of physical laws, as if the Creator, by whose absolute, independent, and unfettered will, the nature of all created beings, and the laws to which they are subject, are determined, could not, at the same instant, have ordered whatever deviations, in the course of events, his divine wisdom disposed for the execution of his general plan.

Mr. N. thinks, " that if the doctrine of transubstantiation

tiation had been proposed by Christ to his Apostles, they would have started at so incredible a thing, and traces would have remained of their amazement, but not the slightest hint is given by the Evangelists, that the Disciples were in the least degree offended, or that they were any ways shocked at their divine Master's calling, bread, his body, and wine, his blood." p. 70. He cites in the preceding pages, some passages from the 6th of John, without referring to it; as that chapter contains a direct contradiction to this surmise of modern ignorance, perhaps he did not think it fit for the inspection of his readers, who, instead of fishing a creed from the scriptures, as they are taught to believe they ought, rest satisfied with the conjectures of their teachers. In that chapter we learn, from the Evangelist, that the Saviour taking occasion from the admiration excited by the miracle of the reduplication of the loaves and little fishes, proposed to the Jews two great mysteries of faith, that of his divine incarnation, and of the eucharist, the latter manifestly founded on the former.

When the Jews had crossed the lake, arriving at Capernaum, they asked the Saviour when he had come thither: *pote ōde gegonas*, the Saviour answered, " verily, verily I say unto you, you seek me not because you see signs, but because you eat of the bread, and were filled. Do not labour for food, which is lost, but for food, which remains to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you, him has the father sealed God, *touton ō Patēr esphragisen, ō theos.*" The term "*esphragisen*" in its genuine signification, imports the impression of an image, as a figure is impressed on wax, which perfectly expresses the seal. In this one sentence the Saviour proposed the whole mystery of the incarnation: his humanity, calling himself *Son of Man*, his divinity, saying that he was the express image of the Father, the unity of his person, saying of the Son of Man, *he will give*, and *him* has God the Father sealed, or on him has the Father impressed his image, "*touton esphragisen.*" He thus expresses the

the hypostatical union of the divine and human nature in the same person.

Christ having proposed to the Jews to labour for eternal life, they asked what works were necessary to the attainment of this end, Christ answered, "this is the work of God, that you believe in him, whom he has sent," v. 20. The Jews replied: what sign do you produce that we may know, and believe in you. Our fathers eat manna in the wilderness, as it is written, he gave them bread from Heaven to eat, insinuating, that though he had fed them one day with bread, Moses had fed their ancestors forty years in the wilderness with manna, and yet they did not believe him to be impressed with the image of God. To this Christ replied, "Moses did not give you bread from Heaven, but my Father gives you true bread from Heaven, the bread of God is he, who descends from Heaven and gives life to the world—I am the bread of life, he, who comes to me, will not be hungry, and he, who believes in me, will not be thirsty at any time, v. 35. The Jews took offence at the proposal of this first mystery. Like Mr. N. they thought their senses infallible, "is not this," said they, "Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how then does this man say, I have descended from Heaven?" v. 42. The Saviour, regardless of their murmurs, after declaring the indispensable necessity of internal grace, to believe in him, saying, "do not murmur amongst yourselves, no one can come to me, if the Father, who sent me, do not attract him," v. 44. Continues to propose the mystery of his incarnation as a principal object of their faith: "verily, verily I say unto you, he, who believes in me, has life eternal. I am the bread of life, your fathers eat manna in the desert and they died; this is the bread which is descended from Heaven, that if any one eat of it he shall not die. I am the living bread which is descended from Heaven, if any one eat of this bread he shall live for ever." Having thus repeatedly confirmed, what he had at first proposed, that is, the in-

dispensable

dispensable necessity of believing the mystery of his incarnation, which he called the gift of his Father : “ my Father gives you true bread from Heaven,” v. 32. He immediately proposed a second, that is, the tremendous mystery of the eucharist, which he called his own gift, not yet given, but which he intended to give, and then solemnly promised to his Disciples : “ and,” said he, “ the bread which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world, *kai o artos de on ego doxo e sarx mou estin en ego doxo uper ten tou kosmou zoen,*” v. 51. The proposal of the first mystery had excited murmurs. The Jews complained that a man, whom they saw, whom they knew, whose mother they knew, and whose Father they thought they knew, should pretend that he, in person, had descended from Heaven. They took no offence at his saying he was the bread of life. The metaphor he had explained, saying : “ he who comes to me will not be hungry, and he who believes in me, will not be thirsty,” v. 34. The intended sense of the metaphor they could not mistake ; but when the Saviour promised that he would give them his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, they murmured in a tumultuous manner, *emachonto pros allelous,* v. 52. “ how,” said they, “ can this man give us his flesh to eat ? *pōs dunatai outos umin dounai ten sarka phagein.*”

If Christ had taken Mr. N. for instructor, he would have settled their disputes, and silenced their murmurs with one word ; he would have said your understanding must be dull and stupid indeed, if you mistake my meaning ; it is plain bread and wine, which I promise you as a figure of my flesh and blood. If the Jews had misapprehended his meaning, it is blasphemous to pretend that the Saviour instead of correcting the error would have confirmed it with an oath ; “ verily, verily I say unto you, if you do not eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you will not have life in you,” v. 53. This answer was calculated not to suppress but encrease their murmurs ; and if their had been an error in their apprehension

apprehension, words could not more effectually confirm it. The Saviour, after this solemn declaration, continued to explain the effects of this divine gift, which he promised, "he who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, will have life everlasting, and I will raise him on the last day; my flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink; he, who eats my flesh and drinks my blood, remains in me, and I in him. These things Jesus said in the Synagogue, teaching in Capernaum. Many of his Disciples having heard (him) said, "this is a hard speech, who can hear it?" Jesus knowing in himself that his Disciples murmured at this, said, "does this offend you? what then if you see the Son of Man ascending where he was formerly?" v. 62. If he intended to give his Disciples bread and wine as the symbols of his body and blood, why urge the miracle of his ascension to confirm a truth which ignorance itself can hardly misapprehend? why not prevent the apostacy of so many of his Disciples, who from that time followed him no more? v. 66. At their departure, Jesus said to the twelve: "will you also desert me." Simon Peter answered him, "Lord to whom should we go? you have the words of eternal life, we have believed, and we have known that you are Christ, the Son of the Living God," v. 69.

The Apostles knowing that Christ was Son of the Living God believed, without hesitation, the mysteries he proposed, however impenetrable to human understanding, they knew that Christ, the truth itself, could neither deceive, nor be deceived. And Christ having in this solemn manner promised to give his Disciples his precious body and blood without explaining either the manner in which he intended to give it, or the time when he intended to give it, must have been in daily expectation of receiving it, could not therefore be surprised when the promise was fulfilled. They did not hear, as Mr. N. artfully pretends, bread called a human body. They saw the Saviour take bread in his hands and bless it; they did not hear him say: this bread

Bread is my body, such a proposition is manifestly absurd ; but they heard him say : *take and eat, this is my body.* The demonstrative *this, touto*, can have no reference to bread, it is of the neuter gender, as grammarians say, and *bread, artos*, is of the masculine. *This, touto*, signified distinctly what he held in his hands, and that by the virtue of the almighty word, which created the Heavens and the Earth, was, as soon as he had spoken it, his adorable body. If *touto* be supposed to signify any thing distinctly, it must have been his body, *soma*, which is of the same gender, not bread, *artos*, which is of a different genus, Matt. XXVI—26. Mark XIV—22. Luke XXII—29. This Evangelist adds : *which is given for you* “ *to uper imon didomenon,*” and St. Paul, 1 Cor. XI—24, “ *which is broken for you,* “ *to uper imon, klomenon,*” in these two passages, the participles *given, didomenon*, and *broken, klomenon*, must of all necessity, be understood of the body, *soma*, not of bread, *artos* : it was therefore the body, which was broken for us, that Christ gave to his Apostles, and they must have been stupid indeed, to speak Mr. N’s language, if they did not understand it : it is not possible to substitute words more strongly expressive, or more intelligible ; and so well convinced were the Apostles, that J. Christ had literally fulfilled his promise, in giving them his real body and blood, under the symbols of bread and wine, that St. Paul makes a prophanation of this mystery a crime inductive of perdition : “ he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord,” 1. Cor. XI—29. The Apostle shews the enormity of this crime to result from confounding the body of the Lord with bread and wine, a crime, which he thinks more atrocious than murder : “ if any person eat this bread, or, drink the cup of the Lord, unworthily, he will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,” *ibid.* 27.

We say of a murderer, that he is guilty of blood ; the Apostle says of the prophaner that he is guilty, not only of the blood of Christ, but also of his body, which must be

understood of mangling the body, a ferocious act. A man would imagine that he was giving a lecture, and a terrible lecture it is, to reformers. To discern the body of the Lord where it is not, is impossible; and to profane the body of the Lord, where it is not, is equally so; to pretend that the profanation of any sign, symbol, image, or figure, is a crime equal to the murder, and the mangling of the body of the person thus figured, is an offence against common sense.

A strong specimen of that pure faith, which Mr. N. finds in the gospel, he has given us, page 69, "if then," says he, "we hear Jesus declaring, that bread is his body, and wine his blood." Though this modern divine may not think it criminal to distort Christ's words from their intended signification, and wrest them to support a fiction, why force the Saviour to speak nonsense? Why substitute the illusions of a disordered brain, to the plain words of the Saviour? If it be not criminal, it is not decent. Hear the conclusion: "the bread and wine are the appointed symbols of that flesh, and of that blood, of which we are assured, that except we eat and drink *by faith*, we can have no life in us."

If this be an article of Mr. N's faith, which he finds in the scripture, would he, or any of his admirers, have the condescension to inform us where we may find it? Even an evasive answer to this embarrassing question, requires more powers of sophistry than Mr. N. seems to possess. The terms *by faith*, he has liberally supplied from his own stock; the Evangelists forgot them. This is reforming to some purpose: the man reforms the gospel itself. The writer laments the infatuation of men, who are thus deluded. They pretend to take the scriptures for a sole rule of faith, whilst, in reality, they have no other rule, but the fictitious conjectures and wild speculations of their leaders; imagination is racked, and invention exhausted, to force the scriptures by tropes, and figures, and metaphors, to give some colour of truth to these fictions, though even by distant implication not one of them is there to be found.

The

The Saviour did not propose his flesh and blood as an object of faith to the Jews ; they never doubted the reality of his humanity. He proposed his divinity as the object of their faith : “ do you believe in the Son of God ? ” *Su pistueis eis ton uion tou theou*, John IX—35. This the Jews did not believe, because they did not see it ; and though his almighty power was visible in its effects to unprejudiced reason, they did not believe. Their senses they thought infallible, them they believed, not his words, and so does Mr. N. that flesh and blood which they saw, of which they had no doubt, he said he would give them to eat and to drink. This they did not believe, nor does Mr. N. Why so ? Because once more they believed their senses, not his words. This is equally true of Mr. N.

The Pharisees were therefore innocent, if Mr. N. reasons conclusively. Unfortunately for them, and him, Mr. N. does not reason at all : “ whilst bread and wine,” says he, “ are exhibited to our senses in the sacrament of the Lord’s supper,” p. 66. This is the proposition which he ought to have proved, or at least attempted to prove, and not suppose it certain. The man has forgotten his logic as well as his Breviary. Admire his sagacity : he has discovered that what Philosophers call sensible qualities, are not exhibited to sense, but the very substance, the component elements of the object, that is, he has discovered that colours are not the object of sight, nor sounds the object of hearing ; to this first discovery, he has added a second, that is, whilst bread is exhibited to our sight, it is bread : Philosophers will tell him that his first discovery is an illusion, to which many old women are subject, as well as Mr. N. and they will add, that no old wife ever doubted that bread is bread. Would Mr. N. have the goodness to inform us, in what book of the scripture he has discovered, that it was bread and wine which Christ exhibited to his Apostles, when he said : *take and eat this is my body* ? We are not disposed to take Mr. N’s conjectures for evangelical truths ; nor do we found our belief on

tropes

ropes and figures. The writer has shewn, and he does not fear a contradiction, that *this, touto*, in Christ's proposition, neither has, nor can have any reference to *bread, artes*, which is of a different genus. If Mr. N. will reply, that what was exhibited had the appearance of bread, it is admitted. We Catholics believe transubstantiation, not transfaccidentation; we believe that the substance of the bread is changed into the body of the Lord, whilst the impressions on our senses continue unchanged. To this we add, that the substance of the bread is not exhibited to our senses, either before or after consecration: the component elements of all bodies, whether animate or inanimate escape the eye, and baffle the researches of the Philosopher. If it be said, that the impressions on our senses must be changed, when the substance of the object is changed, we reply that this opinion is neither founded in truth, nor in fact; that it is inconsistent with the authority of the scriptures, and unphilosophical. Angels have appeared who had no human body, probably no body at all, yet, from the impressions on the senses of the beholders, it was concluded they were men; the testimony of sense is, therefore, not always infallible, if we believe the scriptures. Philosophers say, that external objects are not the efficient causes, that they are but the occasional causes of the impressions on sense; that God is the efficient cause, either immediately, or by laws dependant on his will. This principle, the truth of which is indisputable, pre-supposed, we say, that though the substance of the bread be changed by consecration into the body of the Lord, the impressions on sense continue the same, in virtue of such a law. If it be asked how we know this law, we reply, that we know it as we do the law of gravitation, the law of the communication of motion, or any other physical law, by invariable experience. For we who believe Jesus Christ to be God, and know it was not possible for him to aver a falsehood, on oath, believe that his adorable body is really present in the eucharist, by consecration, and we know, by invariable experience, that the impressions on sense are

the

the same, before and after consecration, hence we conclude, with unerring certainty, that this law does exist.

Mr. N. instead of finding in the scriptures, his pretended rule of faith, that bread and wine are in the eucharist, the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, finds it in the silence of the Apostles; they did not appear shocked, he says, at their divine master's calling bread his body, and wine his blood, p. 70. "This silence he conceives to be evidence, that the Apostles believed the wine and bread to be the instituted symbols of the blood, which was spilled for them, and the body which was offered for them. The writer humbly conceives, that the Apostles words are more expressive of their belief, than their silence; they were not accustomed to hear their master speak nonsense; in all appearance, if they had heard him call bread his body, and wine, his blood, they would have expressed their surprise. This is a language which Mr. N. has lent him, not that which their divine master spoke; it has been shewn already to demonstration, and from supine ignorance, or designing malice alone, it can receive a contradiction. Mr. N. has been unlucky in his surmise, and, yet more so, in his confirmation of it, "no effect," says he, "of divine agency, was visible in the substances, which were said to be changed into the body and blood of Christ, they still appeared to have retained the nature of bread and wine." P. 71. Does Mr. N. believe the efficacy of baptism? Does he believe that by the laver of water, and the word of life, we are cleansed from sin, as St Paul teaches, Eph. 1—26. or as he expresses it, Titus III—5, "by the laver of regeneration, and the renovation of the Holy Ghost?" We see the exterior rite, by which the body is washed, but the divine agency, by which the man is regenerated, and cleansed from sin, is perfectly invisible; it is not the less true, that this wonderful change is effected, and indispensable to salvation, if we believe Christ himself: Jesus said to him, "*(Nicodemus)* Amen, Amen, I say unto you, if a man be not born from above, he cannot see

see the kingdom of God," *ean mē, tis, gennēthe, anothen*, John III—3. Nicodemus not conceiving the possibility of this regeneration, replied, "how can a man, when old, be born? can he return into the womb of his mother a second time, and be born? The Saviour only confirmed the mystery, which he had proposed, telling him that this regeneration must be by water and the Holy Ghost: "verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man be not born of water and the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

The divine agency is therefore certain in the sacrament of baptism, or of regeneration, and that it is invisible, the Saviour assures us in the same place: "the wind blows where it lists, you hear the sound, but you do not know whence it comes or where it goes, so is every one born of the spirit," v. 8.

Mr. N. seems to have taken a lecture from the incredulous Apostle: if I do not see said Thomas, I will not believe, John XX—25. We Catholics have learned, not from the silence of the Apostles, but from the express words of Christ that: "blessed are they who believe, and have not seen," visible things are the objects of sense, not of faith, if St. Paul be not deceived, he says, that "faith is the demonstration of things which are not seen." Heb. XI.

Mr. N. continues to discover the faith of the Apostles, and consequently his own, from their silence: if, says he, p. 71. the Apostles believed the real presence, we should have heard them proposing it to the Jews and the Heathens, and advancing motives of credibility, to counterbalance the authority of their senses. This surmise surpasses absurdity itself. What! he would have the Apostles propose the mystery of the real presence to the Jews and Heathens, who did not believe the divinity, not even the sanctity of J. Christ, who thought him a malefactor juridically and justly condemned and executed; and, as if to shew the gross absurdity of the surmise in a stronger light, he adds "of all the dogmas of the Christian religion that of the real presence must have been the greatest stumbling

stumbling block to the Jews, and the most revolting foolishness to the Greeks, *ibid.*

A man who judges by the rules of common sense, would say, if this dogma be so revolting, the Apostles must have been stupid indeed, if they proposed it to either Jew or Gentile, until they had previously taught him to believe that J. Christ is God, infinite in power and majesty, incapable of deceiving, or being deceived, and had thus prepared his mind to believe the words of J. Christ infallibly true. This we find is the method, which the Apostles adopted : we hear them incessantly urging the miracle of the resurrection of J. Christ, the irresistible proof of his divinity. His divinity once admitted and believed, all the other mysteries proposed by him, and his Apostles, in his name, were believed, without hesitation or opposition : the man who believes J. Christ to be God, knows him to be incapable of deception ; and in that infinite power which gave existence to the universe, sees more than sufficient to convert one substance into another. Though to omnipotence, which knows no resistance, the creation of the world, the formation of a fly, or the conversion of any one substance into another, be equally easy, yet in our limited apprehension, the former appears infinitely more difficult than the latter, he must, therefore, be unaccountably stupid, or perversely obstinate, who, whilst he professes to believe the one, refuses to believe the other. Hence it is, that whilst we see the Apostles urging every motive from the prophecies of old, from the miracles of Christ himself, and accompanying their words by signs and prodigies, to enforce the belief of the divinity of J. Christ, the doctrine of the real presence, and other mysteries of religion, were proposed in their instructions to the faithful, and believed, without hesitation, on the authority of their word.

In the next page our modern Theologian simplifies religion ; he excludes from it all mysteries, and leaves the sanctuary open : “ no articles of faith,” says he, “ are tendered, which clash with reason, truth and wisdom made the entrance

trance into the Gospel Religion smooth and easy." If St. Paul had consulted Mr. N. he would not have been reduced to such straits; he would not have recourse to the unsearchable ways, and incomprehensible judgments of God, for a solution for some difficulties on the mystery of predestination. It must be admitted that nature has blessed Mr. N. with a most comprehensive understanding: he clearly and distinctly conceives the hitherto inconceivable mysteries of the Trinity of the incarnation, of the death and resurrection of J. Christ, of the transmission of original sin, of regeneration in baptism, &c. of these he has an adequate idea, a singular privilege, to which other men have no pretensions not even St. Paul. There are some tribes of enthusiasts, who think themselves absolutely certain of salvation: we know from the Apostle that Satan transforms himself into an Angel of Light, 2. Cor. XI—13, it is not therefore surprising, that ignorance and enthusiasm should mistake the suggestions and operations of the Spirit of Darkness, for divine inspirations, but to pretend to all the knowledge, which the beatific vision gives, is stretching enthusiasm beyond its usual pitch.

After finding his own faith in the silence of the Apostles, Mr. N. proceeds to shew, that the belief of Catholics is not to be found in their words: "not the faintest gleam of the doctrine of the real presence can be perceived by an impartial eye, in primitive Christianity." This primitive Christianity, of Mr. N's invention, must have been prior to that established by Christ and his Apostles; for in that Christianity, if the four Evangelists and St. Paul tell truth, there are not gleams, nor insinuations, but incontrovertible evidence of the doctrine of the real presence. Mr. N. continues, "if this doctrine had been delivered to the Apostles, many expressions would have been used, which would plainly intimate what was their belief on the point." *ibid.* Would he condescend to inform us, what expressions more simple, more clear, or more intelligible, are found in any language, to convey a correct idea of the real presence of Christ's body,
 than

than those which the Apostles have left on record, “ *this is my body, which is given for you,*” “ *touto esti to soma, mou to úper umon dideminon ?*” If Christ intended to fulfil the promise he had made, John VI—could he have declared it more intelligibly ? Perhaps, if Christ had said, *this is not my body*, by the friendly assistance of some *trope, metaphor*, or some other rhetorical figure, Mr. N. would have discovered, that Christ intended to say, *this is my body*. Plain men know nothing of tropes and metaphors, they are satisfied with plain truth, in plain language, hence it is, that this doctrine of the real presence, delivered by Christ, in plain language, to his Apostles, and in the same language transmitted by them to their successors, was believed by them and their successors, and by the whole Christian world for ages. These expressions, in which Mr. N. cannot discover the faintest gleam of the real presence, were so universally understood to import neither less nor more than the real presence, that the patriarch of the Reformation; Luther, however well disposed to mortify the Pope, saw no possibility of eluding the force of them : “ I well knew,” said he, “ that in this matter I could greatly incommode the Papacy, but I see myself taken, no way of escaping left : the text of the Gospel is too clear, too strong.” *Epist. ad. Argentinenfes, tom. 7. Wirtemb. fol. 502.* Zuinglius himself, in his dispute with the Secretary of Zurich, pressed by the words of institution, *this is my body*, found no evasion, until a spirit, whether black or white, he did not know, suggested to him, that *is, esti*, in the words of institution, is of the same import with *signifies*, and asked him, why he did not instance that passage in Exod. XII—11. in which it is said, “ the Lamb is the passover,” that is, the Lamb signifies the passover. But whether this instructor of Zuinglius was a black or a white spirit, it was a lying spirit : for in that passage the Lamb does not signify the passover, literally, or figuratively, or in any other sense. It was the sacrifice of the Passover, and figurative of the sacrifice of the Cross. Hebrew writers frequently suppress

the term *sacrifice*, it being sufficiently understood from the subject matter. Thus, “the Priests will eat the sins of the people.” Osee IV—8, that is, the victims offered for the sins of the people. St. Paul says of Christ, that God *made him sin for us*, 2. Cor. V—21, that is, the victim of sin; in the same chapter, Moses ordered the people to *immolate the Passover*, v. 21, *shachatou pshfach*, and after directing that this rite should be continued in succeeding generations, said: “when your children will say to you, what religious rite is this?” “*mah haabodah hazoth lachem*,” you will say to them: *it is the sacrifice of the Passover*, “*zabach pshfach hou le Jehovah*,” because the Lord passed over the houses of the Children of Israel, destroying the Egyptians.”

The idea suggested by this black or white spirit was seized with avidity, and other passages of similar import discovered, thus, Gen. XLI—26. The seven good cows, are seven years, and Daniel II—38, thou (*Nebuchadonoser*) art the golden head; and 1. Cor. X—4, the rock was Christ; but Zuinglius, and his partisans, were told that the intended sense of these passages was not collected from imaginary tropes and figures, but fixed with the utmost precision in the scripture: Joseph told Pharaoh, that seven plentiful years would come, which was intimated to him by the seven fat kine, which he saw in his dream; Daniel informed Nebuchadonoser, that his empire was signified by the golden head in the statue which he had seen; and St. Paul explains himself: he says, the Jews drank water from the rock, but that it was the spiritual rock, which accompanied them, that furnished the water, and this rock, he says, was Christ, intimating at the same time the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the unity of his person, asserting that the same Christ, who was born, and suffered in Judea, in their days, according to his humanity, had conducted their ancestors through the wilderness according to his divinity. Neither Zuinglius, nor any other Reformer, nor reformed writer, has yet informed us in what part of the scripture, the figurative sense
which

which they pretend to affix to Christ's words : *this is my body, which is broken for you ; and this is my blood, which is spilled for you,* is fixed with precision, and accurately determined : they say, there must be some *trope*, some *metaphor*, some *figure* : we reply, that this *trope*, this *metaphor*, this *figure*, is a fiction of their imagination, in the greatest latitude, but a conjecture, of course, their faith is founded, not on the scriptures, but on conjecture, a crumbling foundation.

To convince his readers that the doctrine of the real presence was not known in primitive Christianity, Mr. N. cites a few passages from the works of Austin, Cyprian, Theodoret, and Tertullian, whom he calls venerable writers, of these, the three first named were as arrant Papists as any age or country has produced, and the last named a Montanist, whose authority, though of no weight, is against Mr. N. The reader will be surpris'd, perhaps, that Austin should be called a venerable and learned writer by Mr. N. when he hears that this same Austin said mass as other Popish Prelates do ; that he instituted a religious community, and, with his Clergy, observed a monastic rule ; that he religiously observed the fasts and abstinences, and other *vain observances, and unprofitable austerities* ; that he thought, and taught, a breach of vows inductive of perdition ; that he venerated the relics of the Saints, relates a miracle wrought at the discovery of the bodies of St. Protase and Gervaise, in Milan, at which he says, that he was himself present, with an immense concourse of people. Lib. 22. de Civ. Dei. Cap. 8. N. 2. In the same book, N. 6, he says, that a man, high in rank, by name Hesperius, who thought his house infested by an evil spirit, had, in his absence, applied to his Clergy ; that one of them went, and *offered there the sacrifice of the body of Christ*, praying that the infestation might cease, and he adds, *that, through the mercy of God, it immediately ceased* ; that this same Austin prayed for the souls of the faithful departed Mr. N. will not dispute ; in a word, that he was to all intents and purposes,

pöses, what, in modern phraefology, is called a bigotted Papist.

In his works, yet extant, this venerable and learned Prelate speaks of the real presence of Christ's body in the eucharist, with that precision which excludes all evasion. The writer has just cited his relation of one of his Clergy's celebrating mass, or, as he more correctly terms it, *offering the sacrifice of the body of Christ*, in a Nobleman's house, infested by an evil spirit. The writer knows no words, in any language, more expressive of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist; and in his exposition of the XCVIII. H. XCIX Ps. he is equally explicit: explaining this passage of the Psalm, "adore his footstool," *bishtbaca-vou le chadom raglajo*, and enquiring how this could be done without impiety, Austin says: "I turn myself to Christ, because him I seek here, and find how, without impiety, the Earth may be adored: he took Earth from Earth, because flesh is of Earth, and from the flesh of Mary he took flesh, and, because he walked in that flesh, and gave us that flesh to eat, for salvation; no one eats it until he has previously adored it; it has been discovered how such footstool of the Lord may be adored, so, that not only we do not sin by adoring it, but we should sin by not adoring it." In Mr. N's words, this passage is of such perspicuity, that the meaning cannot be mistaken, any attempt to wrest the words from the intended signification, would only make a bad cause worse. In his exposition of the XXI. XXII. H. Ps. on that passage, "*all the rich of the people eat and adored.*" Austin says, "they also eat the body of the humility of the Lord, not like the poor, who are nourished to imitation; but yet they have adored him;" and in his 120. Epis. on the same subject, he says: "they also are brought to the table of the Lord, and receive of his body and of his blood; but they only adore, they are not nourished, because they do not imitate him; in his second book against the adversary of the Law and the Prophets, he says: "with believing heart and *mouth*, we receive the man, J. Christ
the

the mediator of God and men, giving us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink ; though it seems more horrible to eat human flesh, than to kill, and to drink human blood than to spill it." The writer has seen no attempt to elude the force of this passage, nor does his imagination suggest any mode of doing it. Another passage may serve to shew Austin's popery in a stronger light. In the 9th Book of his Confessions, chap. 13. he says, speaking of the death of his mother, " she only desired that she might be remembered at the altar, from which she knew that the holy victim was dispensed, by which the bond against us was cancelled." In the same book he prays God to inspire all who read his book, to remember his father Patricius, and his mother Monica at the altar : " I pray," says he, " for the sins of my mother ; hear me by the remedy of our wounds, you who hung on the cross, and sitting on the right hand intercedes for us ; I know she shewed mercy, and forgave from her heart, all debtors, forgive her also her debts."

It was therefore a settled rule, in primitive Christianity, to offer up prayers at the altar, for departed spirits, and it was believed, that the victim of our salvation was dispensed from the altar. In what does this differ from Popish doctrine of the present day ? The passages from which Mr. N. pretends to conclude that Austin did not believe the real presence, are here transcribed from his pamphlet, p. 75. " If the sacraments had not some resemblance of those things whereof they are sacraments, they would be no sacraments at all, but from the resemblance they bear, they generally receive the names of the very things. As, therefore, the sacrament of the body of Christ, is, in some sense, Christ's body, and the sacrament of the blood, is the blood of Christ ; so the sacrament of faith, is faith. As of baptism, itself, the Apostle says, we have been buried with Christ by baptism into death : he does not say we signify a burial, but plainly says we have been buried. The sacrament therefore of so great a thing he calls by no other name but that of the thing itself." As Mr.

N. is not very accurate in his version, the writer begs leave to correct an error : what St. Austin calls *according to some mode, secundum, quemdam, modum*, Mr. N. translates, “ *in some sense.*” Whether it be the effect of ignorance, inadvertence, or design, it disfigures the sense of the passage. His next passage is composed of half a sentence, which conveys no sense. “ And having tasted the sacrament of his body and blood, he signified what he purposed.”

The next passage serves to fill the page : the writer transcribes it entire : “ Whoever *celebrates*, or venerates, any useful sign instituted by divine authority, whose force and signification he understands, does not venerate that which is seen and passeth away ; but rather the object to which all such things are to be referred. Such a man is spiritual and free, but a few institutions, instead of many *and such as are very easy to be performed*, and are most august in their *signification*, and whose observance is most chaste, the Lord himself, and Apostolical discipline, has transmitted : *such* is the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of our Lord, which every one that is informed on seeing them, knows what they refer to, so that he venerates them not with a carnal servitude, but rather with a spiritual freedom. As to follow the letter, and to take the signs for the things that are signified by them, is a servile weakness. Whatever, in the word of God, cannot be strictly referred either to the purity of morals, or to the truth of faith, one may know that it is spoken figuratively. Purity of morals regards the love of God and our neighbour ; the truth of faith concerns the knowledge of God and of our neighbour.”

The writer begs leave to inform Mr. N. and his readers, that these passages, as cited in the original, not precisely as in Mr. N's version, were in Austin's works some six hundred years before Berenger, who first cited them in support of his new-fangled opinion, was born ; that Catholics who were then, as they are yet, the keepers of
their

their own records, saw nothing in them but Catholic doctrine. They told Berenger, that Austin, in these passages, speaks of the *species*, that is, *the appearance to sense*, of the bread and wine, which is, with strict propriety, called the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, that is, the sensible signs representing the body and blood of Christ present; and of these it is truly said, that the sacrament of the body of Christ, is according to some mode, the body of Christ; because the species or appearance to sense of bread and wine is not the body and blood of Christ, but representatively, to make use of a school term. In the same sense St. Austin says that baptism, which he calls the sacrament of faith, is called faith, because by it the habit of divine faith is infused.

The second passage which Mr. N. cites, a half sentence without any reference to antecedents or consequents, is of such wonderful perspicuity that it conveys no sense at all: "Having tasted the sacrament of his body and blood he signified what he purposed." However, this broken sentence contains nothing but pure Catholic doctrine: Catholics distinguish the sacrament, that is the *species, or appearance to sense*, from the body and blood of Christ, in other words, they distinguish the *sign*, or species of bread and wine, from the *thing* signified, the body and blood of Christ. St. Austin has done so too.

The last passage, though it almost fills a page, is nothing to the purpose: St. Austin says, that it is not the exterior rite, which we venerate in any sacrament, but the divine authority in the institution, and the divine agency in the operation. The exterior rite of washing, in baptism, abstracting from the divine institution, and the divine agency, is no object of veneration, nor is *the species*, or appearance to sense of bread and wine, abstracting from the divine institution and agency a venerable object: it is the body and blood of Christ in virtue of the divine institution and agency present, to which these appearances, properly called the sacrament, refer, which we venerate and adore.

Though,

Though, in Mr. N's version of this last passage there is nothing inconsistent with the doctrine of the real presence, the writer is forced to correct some inaccuracies, which have a tendency to authorise other errors: thus he pretends to give the sense of the Latin term *operatur*, which signifies *operates*, by the English word *celebrates*. To celebrate, is to praise or commend, to operate, is to produce an effect. Mr. N. who thinks the sacraments mere commemorative signs, entirely dependent on the institution, could not, consistently, with this his opinion, admit any effect produced by the Minister, as the instrument of Christ. To support the deception, he affixes his own ideas to Austin's words. A second inaccuracy of the same tendency with the former, is found in these words, *such as are very easy to be performed*: in the original which he cites, "*the same, most easy to be done, factu, facillima.*" Though the words "*to be performed,*" may imply the agency of the Minister, they are not of the same force and perspicuity with Austin's term, *factu*, to be done or effected, which manifestly imports an effect produced by an active cause. In the adjacent sentence, "*intellectu augustissima, most august, to be understood.*" St. Austin gives to understand, that though the exterior rite be the object of sense in the sacraments, the divine agency is the object of faith, which is in the understanding. We see the exterior rite of washing in baptism, for instance, but it is by faith we know the divine agency, by which the Soul is cleansed from sin. In a word, the exterior rite is seen, the divine agency is understood: It is this divine agency, and its effect, which St. Austin calls *most august*. Mr. N. not finding the sense, intended by St. Austin to his purpose, substitutes a sense of his own invention. *They are most august in their signification.* Thus he excludes the divine agency, and reduces the sacraments to mere signs.

From these passages, in which there is not a shadow of opposition to the doctrine of the real presence, Mr. N. pretends to conclude, and avers with confidence, that St. Austin did not believe it, though to the man, who reads the
works

works of that venerable Prelate, it is evident as the Sun at mid-day, that it was the settled doctrine of the Christian world in his time.

By some extraordinary power of divination he has discovered that all the writers of antiquity, though they invariably call the eucharist the body and blood of Christ, did not believe it ; and by a stretch of the same power, he finds that the faithful understood all these strong expressions of their teachers in a spiritual sense : “ the first believers,” says he, p. 76, “ were spiritual men : they did not misapprehend their venerable teachers ; they were not misled by similarity of expression.” Consistency is not an ingredient in the composition of this modern Theologian : he had told us, p. 73, that in primitive Christianity there was not the faintest gleam of the doctrine of the real presence, no expressions which intimate it. He now admits that the expressions were so strong that the believers must have been spiritual men, not to misapprehend their venerable teachers. Thus, when Chrysostome, in a public discourse to the people of Antioch, said : “ let us believe God, and not resist him, though what he says may appear absurd to our senses, and to our thoughts ; let his word, I pray you, overcome our thoughts, and our senses ; let us do this in all things, but more especially in the mysteries, not merely considering the things which are before us, but also holding his words ; by his words we cannot be deceived, our senses are very easily deceived, since he said : *this is my body*, let us not be held by any dubitation, but believe.” The people of Antioch must have been spiritualized beyond measure, or rather they must have had a double portion of Mr. N’s spirit of divination, to discover that Chrysostome intended to tell them, that in the tremendous mysteries there was nothing but plain bread and wine.

From Ephrem the most correct and intelligent writer of the Syrian Church, where Christianity commenced, we may learn the settled doctrine of the Christian Church,

long before Austin or Chrysoſtome were born : in his book *de non ſcrutand à Natura Dei*, chap. 5th, he ſays : “ why do you ſcrutinize things inſcrutable ? If you curiouſly examine theſe things, you will be called, not a believer, but a curious enquirer : be a believer and innocent ; partake of the immaculate body of thy Lord with full faith, certain that you eat the Lamb entire. The myſteries of Chriſt are immortal fire, do not raſhly ſcrutinize them, left in the ſcrutiny you be conſumed. This certainly exceeds all admiration, all our thoughts and words, what the only begotten Son, Chriſt our Saviour, has done for us : he has given us fire and ſpirit to eat and drink, that is, his body and his blood.” No attempt was made by any Reformer, as yet, to elude the force of this paſſage, nor was its authenticity called in queſtion. So great was the authority of Ephrem, the author, that his works were publicly read in the Churches immediately after the ſcriptures. See Jerom, *in Cat. Scrip.* The difficulty of believing, the inſcrutability of the myſteries, the miracle ſurpaſſing imagination, which he remarks in this ſacrament, exclude the poſſibility of eſaſion. Add to this, that Ephrem makes an antitheſe : he ſays, it is wonderful, that Angels, pure ſpirits, in an aſſumed body, eat corporeal food, but more wonderful, that we, who are corporeal, ſhould eat ſpirit and fire, that is, the body and blood of Chriſt. He alludes to that paſſage in Deut. IV—24, “ thy God is a conſuming fire.” There is nothing difficult to conceive, nothing ſurpaſſing imagination, nothing miraculous or wonderful, in eating plain bread and wine in commemoration of Chriſt’s body and blood. The real preſence, therefore, was the ſettled doctrine of the Syrian Church in primitive Chriſtianity. The writer has given the teſtimony of the diſciples of St. Andrew, and of 318 Prelates aſſembled in the Council of Nice, in the preceding volume, p. 79, 80, 81. In theſe Mr. N. may ſee, not a faint gleam, but a blaze of evidence, that in primitive Chriſtianity, the doctrine of the real preſence was believed and profeſſed by the whole Chriſtian Church.

The

The writer adds a testimony from Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem, a man of some authority in his day, and whose testimony is at least admissible evidence of the doctrine taught by himself and his fellow-patriarchs. Cate. 4. Mys. he says : " Christ formerly changed water into wine, which is near to blood, in Cana of Galilee by his will alone, and will he not deserve that we should believe him that he changed wine into blood ? Wherefore with all certainty let us receive the body and blood of Christ : for under the appearance of bread is given there his body, and under the appearance of wine, his blood." There is no modern Papist, who speaks of transubstantiation with more precision than this venerable patriarch of primitive times. Would Mr. N. permit us to believe, that Cyril knew the settled doctrine of the Church in his own time.

This, our modern Theologian, is extremely unlucky in his citations : after citing these passages from St. Austin, which, in the sense intended by that celebrated writer, are subversive of his cause, he cites a passage from St. Cyprian, destructive of the whole Reformation, and in which the doctrine of the real presence is clearly stated. " I wish you to know that we are admonished to keep the tradition of our Lord, in offering the cup, and not do otherwise than our Lord first did for us ; to offer the cup that is offered in commemoration of him mixed with wine. For as Christ says : I am the true vine, the blood of Christ is certainly not water, but wine, nor can the blood of Christ, with which we are redeemed, and vivified, seem to be in the cup when there is no wine, by which the blood of Christ is *represented*. I am astonished how the custom should prevail, that, contrary to the Evangelical and Apostolical doctrine, water should, in some places, be offered in the Lord's cup, which, alone, cannot express the blood of Christ. We see that by the water, the people is understood, by the wine, the blood of Christ is shewn." In these passages, which Mr. N. gives without comment, Cyprian teaches his people to observe the *tradition* of our Lord,

Lord, in offering the cup, and not do otherwise than our Lord first did for us, to offer the cup, that is offered in commemoration of him, mixed with water. It was not from the scriptures that Cyprian learned that wine mixed with water was in the cup, which Christ offered for us. Cyprian therefore taught his people, that *tradition* is a rule of faith. This is destructive of the Reformation. Again, he told them, that Christ offered the cup for us; it was therefore a true and proper sacrifice, and St. Cyprian could not express it more intelligibly. It was not wine which Christ offered for us, it was his precious blood, this therefore he gave his Disciples to drink, after he had offered it to his Eternal Father, and thus consummated the sacrifice. Cyprian continues, as Christ says, "I am the true vine," the blood of Christ is certainly not water, but wine. Ignorance alone can mistake the import of these words. Christ is called a vine by similitude, and in like manner, his blood is called wine. As the branches of the vine receive life and nourishment from the stock, so all his elect are justified by the redemption which is in Jesus Christ, and sanctified by his grace, and, as the body is nourished by wine, so is the soul by the blood of Christ. The blood of Christ, is therefore, with great propriety, called wine, and with equal propriety, his body is called bread. This proposition, *the blood of Christ is wine*, and the inverse, *wine is the blood of Christ*, are of different import: the former signifies, that that which is blood in *reality*, is wine in *similitude*; and the latter signifies, that that which is wine in *reality*, is blood in *similitude*, either in its effect, or in its appearance; or in its signification. If this proposition be found in Cyprian, or any other writer, it is neither for nor against the real presence: the proposition *wine in the eucharist is the blood of Christ by signification*, only imports that there must be wine in the cup, as to that which signifies the blood, or is the sign of the blood, and that, as all Philosophers know, is the *species* or appearance to sense; but whether the substance of wine be there, or not, that proposition does not import: because the sub-

stance

stance is not the sign, it is the thing signified. That proposition, therefore, is neither for nor against the real presence. However, that proposition is not found in St. Cyprian : his words, as cited by Mr. N. though not correctly, are strongly expressive of the real presence, in the whole of the passage : he says, that the cup was offered for us ; it was therefore a proper sacrifice ; he says, that the blood of Christ is certainly not water, but wine. The blood of Christ is therefore, in *reality*, in the cup, and it is not water *in appearance or effect*, but wine ; and he concludes that the blood of Christ cannot be shewn by the *species* of water, but by that of wine, which perfectly coincides with the former assertion, that the blood of Christ is wine, in similitude, and not water. The writer only remarks, that if the blood of Christ, by which we are redeemed, be not in the cup, it cannot be shewn there, either by the appearance of water, or wine. Mr. N. not finding Cyprian's expression, *is shewn, ostenditur*, properly applied, has lent him an expression of his own invention, *is represented*. He takes these trifling liberties with every author he cites, and this he calls a candid discussion.

The other passages from Cyprian are of similar import, all equally destructive of the fundamental principle of the Reformation : his object was to shew that wine, mixed with water, was in the cup, which Christ took in his hands, and blessed, not wine alone, nor water alone ; this he calls *Evangelical and Apostolical doctrine* ; this doctrine, he must have known by oral tradition ; the scriptures are silent on the subject ; the Evangelists say, that Christ took the cup in his hands and blessed it, but they do not say what was in the cup, whether wine or water, both, or neither, by what rule of faith will Mr. N. discover it ?

In the last passage, Cyprian says, that by the water in the cup, the people are *understood*, by the wine the blood of Christ is *shewn*. These expressions are remarkably different. He does not say of the people, that they are shewn in the cup, because they are not there ; their union

with

with Christ is signified by mixing water, with the wine in the cup, before consecration ; but of the blood of Christ, he says, *it is shewn*, because it is there in reality, and seen, under the appearance of wine, the sacramental sign, which signifies and shews the blood of Christ in the cup.

It then appears that these passages, of such perspicuity, that their meaning cannot be mistaken, have been totally mistaken by Mr. N. that he has most injudiciously appealed to Judges, who condemn him without mercy ; perhaps he may not so easily mistake the sense of other passages, in which that venerable Prelate speaks with more perspicuity : in his fifth sermon, which is on those who fell in the persecution, he reprobates in strong terms the presumption of those, who, after denying Christ, dared to receive the sacrament of the eucharist before they had fulfilled the penitential works then prescribed by the ecclesiastical laws : he too, thought penitential works were not *unprofitable austerities*. “ Violence,” says he, “ is offered to the body and blood, and now they sin more against the Lord, by their hands and their mouths, than when they denied him.” Does Mr. N. think that violence was offered to the body of the Lord where it was not ? Or, does he imagine, that the prophanation of any sign, image or figure, is a greater crime than to deny Christ ? There is a sermon on the Lord’s Supper in the works of Cyprian, thought by some to be by another writer of the same name, not inferior to the Primate of Numidia, in science or eloquence : “ the doctrine of this sacrament,” says he, “ is new ; the Evangelical schools first produced this office of teaching (*Magisterium*) ; by the teacher Christ this discipline was first made known to the world, that Christians should drink blood, the eating of which, the authority of the old law had so strictly forbidden. The law forbids the eating of blood, the gospel commands it to be drank.” Does this venerable writer of primitive antiquity speak with sufficient perspicuity ? Is there a faint gleam of the real presence in his words ?

His audience must have been all spirit to understand his words of plain bread and wine. In what book of the law is the eating of bread and wine forbidden ?

The works of Tertullian, from which Mr. N. cites some passages, were written after the apostacy of that great but unfortunate man ; they are full of ridiculous errors, the productions of a restless mind ; the passages are, notwithstanding, in the sense intended by the author, free from error, though immersed in obscurity. His appeal to the senses is just, whilst they are confined to their proper object, that is, appearances and sensible qualities. Tertullian did not think with Mr. N. that the substance, or component elements of matter, is the proper object of sense. He says, that Christ was not deceived when he tasted the wine, which he consecrated in remembrance of his blood. He does not say, that it was wine after the consecration, and if he had, it might yet be understood in an orthodox sense : for it was wine in appearance and effect, though not in substance. Nor does Tertullian say that he consecrated wine as a figure or a sign of his blood : a figure or a sign requires no consecration : the institution is sufficient, but the permutation of wine into the blood of Christ, to give us a perennial memorial that the same blood was spilled for us on the cross, requires of necessity, the divine agency, and consecration.

The next passage is curtailed, and the sense intended by Tertullian concealed from the reader ; the writer begs leave to restore it. After Tertullian had said, the bread which he had taken and distributed to his Disciples he made his body, saying *this is my body, that is, not that is to say*, as Mr. N. pretends, *the figure of my body*, and immediately subjoins, it would not have been a figure, if it had not been a true body. In the first proposition of this passage, the doctrine of the real presence is clearly stated, and the second, in the genuine sense of the author, only serves to confirm it : these words, *the figure of my body*, do not import that the eucharist is a figure of the body of Christ ; but that the bread which he took in his hands to consecrate,

consecrate, had been a figure of his body in the old law. The words have a reference to the demonstrative *this*, as if Christ had said, this bread, which I now take in my hands, had been in the old law, a figure of my body, it is now my true body. That this was the sense intended by Tertullian is certain from what he immediately adds, that *it would not have had been, non fuisset, a figure, if the body had not been true*, or, as he terms it of *truth*, by which nothing else can be understood, but that the bread in the old law would not have had been a figure of Christ's body, if his body had not been the true bread of life in the eucharist, otherwise bread in the old law, would have had been a figure of bread in the new. Tertullian shews that in the old law bread was not the figure of bread in the new, but of the true body of Christ. "Why," says he, "did Christ call his body bread, and not a pumpkin, which Marcien has in place of a heart, not understanding it to have been an ancient figure of the body of Christ, saying, by the Prophet Jeremy, 'come let us cast wood into his bread,' that is, the cross into his body. Therefore the illuminator of antiquities, sufficiently declared what he then intended to signify by bread, calling his body bread." Thus we see, that by taking the intended sense of the author from his own words, and his subject matter, which Mr. N's garbled quotation conceals, the doctrine of the real presence is fully stated by Tertullian.

A passage is cited from the same writer, capable of imposing on the uninformed. "He did not reject bread with which he *represented* his body." *Con. Mar.* This passage, in its English dress, sounds ill, in the original it is perfectly orthodox, for the Latin verb, *representare*, is of ambiguous signification, it imports, *to shew a thing present*, either *in itself*, or *in its image*. Thus, for instance, an object however distant in itself, is present to the mind by its image, and is said to be represented. As bread, is in no sense, the image of the body of Christ, though it may be a sign or a figure, Tertullian's words must be understood

stood in the former sense, of shewing Christ present in *reality*, not in *image*, and in this sense Tertullian frequently uses the verb *representare*. Thus, he says, Lib 4. Cont. Mar. "that God the Father, who had formerly promised his Son, represented him on Mount Thabor, that is, shewed him present on Mount Thabor : *representing him, he says, this is my Son.*

In the last passage, as in the first, cited from Tertullian, our modern Theologian artfully conceals the subject on which that writer reasons, and insidiously distorts the man's words in order to mislead. The writer gives the whole passage : "this wood, (the wood of the cross) Jeremy insinuates to you preaching to the Jews, who were to say : come let us cast wood into his bread, that is, his body ; for thus in your gospel God has revealed, calling his body bread, that hence you may learn that he gave the figure of *his body, of bread*, whose body the Prophet formerly figured by bread." Tertullian does not say, as Mr. N's garbled quotation seems to intimate, that Christ gave bread in the eucharist as a figure of his body ; but he says that Christ explained that passage of Jeremy, in which the Jews are introduced, saying, "let us cast wood into his bread," by calling his body bread, and hence concludes Tertullian, "you may understand that he gave a figure of *his body, of bread*, that is, of his true body, the bread of life." If Tertullian intended to say that Christ gave bread in the eucharist, a figure of his body, he would have said *panem*, not *pasce*. The man understood his own language. There is an antithese observable : as Jeremy, in the old law, called bread the body of Christ, so Christ himself called his body bread, and thus explained the prophecy of Jeremy. From the nice discrimination, and minute discussion, necessary to fix the genuine sense of this obscure writer, the reader will be enabled to judge of the extravagance of that fundamental maxim of the Reformation, which, flattering the vanity of every artisan, and illiterate peasant, teaches him to believe, that he is, himself, the most competent judge of

controverted truths, on which his salvation confessedly depends.

In his quotation from Theodoret, though that writer speaks covertly, the doctrine of the real presence is fully established: Theodoret says, that Christ changed the names, giving to his body the name of the symbol, and to the symbol the name of his body, that by the change of the names, *they who were imitated and partakers of the mysteries*, might not attend to the nature of those things, which are seen, but by the change of the names, believe the change, which is wrought by grace. What Catholic, on the present day, speaks otherwise? But Theodoret says, that nature is not changed, but grace added to nature. True, and in that he is perfectly correct, though an illiterate peasant may not understand him: for he does not speak of the substance, or the component elements of bread, and wine, but of the nature of the symbols, that is of the species, or appearance to sense, what Philosophers call the *metaphysical essence*, or, these attributes, by which Logicians distinguish accidents from substance; and in these symbols there is no change. That it is of these he speaks we know from the proof of his assertion: because, says he, after the consecration we see the same colour, figure and form as before. The component elements or prime substance we see neither before nor after consecration, it is not, therefore, of any change in them that Theodoret speaks.

From the tenor, and scope, of these dialogues which Mr. N. cites, the doctrine of the real presence, and of transubstantiation, is manifestly deduced. Theodoret introduces a Catholic disputing with an Eutychian, who believed that in Jesus Christ there is but one nature, as there is but one person, and to shew that the human nature in Jesus Christ was converted into the divine nature, by the mystery of the incarnation, the Eutychian argues from the settled doctrine of the Church, that in the eucharist, the substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ. This is perfectly the doctrine

doctrine of transubstantiation. If this had not been the doctrine universally professed, Theodoret would have denied this conversion of the substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and in one word, refuted the Eutychian's argument; but, as this was an undeniable truth, Theodoret has recourse to the symbols, or the appearance to sense, of bread and wine, and shews, that the two things, which remain in the eucharist after consecration, that is, the substance of the body and blood of Christ, and the nature of the species, or appearance to sense, of bread and wine, are not converted one into the other, the body and blood of Christ, is not the species of bread and wine, nor is the species of bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. Hence Theodoret, in the second dialogue, says: "the mystical signs after sanctification do not recede from their nature, they remain in their former nature, figure and form, and may be seen and touched as before." Thus he shews, that all the objects of sense, that is, the species, which he properly calls *mystical signs*, remain the same after consecration as before; he then immediately subjoins, what is not the object of sense, but of faith, "they are understood to be what they are made, and believed, and *adored*, as they are these things which they are believed to be." Why did he not say in plain terms, *the body and blood of Christ*? He assigns the reason, "it is not fit," says he, to speak openly, because probably there are some not initiated present." He had said, elsewhere, "to those who are initiated, the reason must appear evident:" to them, as to us his words are perfectly intelligible: they knew, that in the adorable eucharist, under the symbols of bread and wine, the body of Jesus Christ is understood, believed and *adored*, not bread and wine, which are adored by none but Atheists and Epicureans.

From the clouded manner, in which Theodoret conveys his thoughts, we learn with what reserve the tremendous mystery of the altar was proposed in the public assemblies.

whilst

whilst the Heathens were present. From the celebration of the divine mysteries, not only the Heathens and Jews, but the Catechumens, that is, Christians under instruction for Baptism, were excluded. "Let the doors be guarded, let no Infidel or person not yet initiated by Baptism, enter." Lib. 2. Cont. Apos. Cap. 57. People were not so far advanced in folly, as Mr. N. would have the Apostles, to propose the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, to men who did not believe his divinity; but to pretend, that this doctrine was not proposed to the faithful by their Pastors, betrays the most consummate, the most contemptible ignorance of primitive Christianity.

St. Ignatius, who had learned his doctrine from St. Peter and St. John, and was, by the Apostles, constituted Bishop of Antioch, on his way from Syria to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom, this venerable Patriarch, in his letter to the Christians of Smyrna, says, speaking of certain sectaries: "they do not admit the eucharist, and oblation, because they do not confess the eucharist to be the flesh of the Saviour, which suffered for us, and which the Father, by his benignity, raised." These sectaries thought that Christ had but an apparent or fantastical body; hence they rejected the eucharist, in which it was believed that the real body of Christ was present. The authenticity of Ignatius' epistles to the Smyrneans, to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, and to the Romans, was never disputed. They are cited by Eusebius, by Theodoret, and other early writers, and to pretend, that the Patriarch of Antioch did not know the doctrine which he had learnt from the Apostles, Peter, Paul and John, and which he taught in his own Church, is offensive to common sense.

; The writer omits a testimony equally strong, found in the works of Dennis, the celebrated Areopagite Judge, converted at Athens, by St. Paul, because some modern critics, under pretence that the style and manner of that
 writer

writer, is different from that of writers of the first and second age, think the works are of the fifth age; yet Gregory the great, equal, at least, to any modern critic in taste and science, in the sixth age, cited them works from an ancient and venerable father. Gregory, therefore, thought him a writer of the first or second age, however, to avoid altercation, the writer passes his works unnoticed, and cites from writers against whom no suspicion lies. Justin the martyr, in his second apology to the Emperor Antoninus, says, “*ou gar ōs koinon arton au de ōs koinon pōma tauta lambanomen alla ōn trophon dia logou theou. Sarkopoiētheis Jēsous Christos ō sōtēr émōn kai sarka kai áima úper jōterias émōn esken outō kai tēn di'euchēs logou tou theou par' autou eucharistētheisen trophēn ex'ēs aima kai sarkes kata metabolēn trephontai émōn ekeinou tou sarkopoiēthentos Jēsou kai sarka kai aima edidachthémén einai*” We do not receive these as common bread, nor as common wine, but in the same manner as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, was made flesh, by the word of God, and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught, that the food, from which our blood and flesh, by conversion, are nourished, blessed by the prayer of the word of God, from him, (which we have from him) is the flesh and blood of the same incarnate Jesus. He had previously said, vindicating Christians, from the imputation of eating human flesh in the celebration of their religious rites. “This food is called with us eucharist, of which none are permitted to partake, who do not believe what we say to be true; and who are not expiated by the laver, which is given for the remission of sins and regeneration, and live as Christ commanded.”

We know from Tertullian, in his Apologeticum, from Minutius Felix, in *oclavio*, and from Athenageras, in his apology addressed to the same Emperor Antoninus, that Christians were accused of eating human flesh in their Assemblies. Justin admits the fact, but explains the manner, and shews that there is nothing criminal in it; that it was the flesh and blood of J. Christ which they eat under the symbols

symbols of bread and wine, and however incredible this might appear to the Emperor, or his Court, Justin shewed that it was not in itself incredible, nor rashly believed by Christians: for they, who believed that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, co-equal, co-eternal, one in essence with the Father, was made flesh by the word of God, and had flesh and blood for their salvation, believed in the same manner, that the bread and wine, were, by his word, converted into his flesh and blood; they had the same motives for believing these two mysteries, that is, the word of Christ, warranted by his miracles, announced by his Apostles, whose mission was warranted in the same manner. Thus are all difficulties against the real presence of Christ's body in the eucharist solved: for he must be stupid as an ass, who, of two mysteries attested by the same authority, believes the more incredible, and rejects the other.

To give the uninformed reader some idea of these Prelates Cyprian and Austin, whom Mr. N. calls venerable and learned writers, and shew, at the same time, how desperate his cause must be, if left to their decision, a passage or two from their works may suffice, in them the reader will see that these venerable writers of primitive Christianity, were as deeply infected with what is now called Popery, as the present Pope himself, or any other modern Papist. Cyprian, *Epist. ad Clerum et plebem Furnit.* 1. alias 66, says: "we were greatly moved my dearest brethren, I and my colleagues, who were present, and our Fellow-Priests who sat with us, when we were informed that Geminius Victor, our brother, dying, had, by his will, appointed Geminius Faustinus, the Priest, a guardian, though it had long since been decreed in the Council of the Bishops, that no person should by will nominate to a guardianship or Curatorship from amongst the Clergy and the Ministers of God; since they who are honoured with the divine priesthood, and constituted in the clerical ministry, ought not to serve but the altar, and the sacrifices, and attend but to prayer and orations. Which the Bishops, our predecessors,

predecessors, religiously considering, and, by a salutary measure (*salubriter*) providing, ordered, that no brother, at his death, should nominate a Clergyman to a guardianship or Curatorship, and if any man did it, that there should be no offering for him, nor the sacrifice (mass) be celebrated for his repose; for he does not deserve to be named at the altar of God, in the prayer of the Priests, who wished to withdraw the Priests and Ministers from the altar; since therefore Victor, contrary to the form prescribed by the Council to the Priests, has dared to constitute Geminus Faustinus, guardian, it is not fit that any oblation be made amongst you for his repose, nor any prayer in his name, be frequented in the Church. Cyprian was beheaded at Carthage, in 259, by order of the Pro-Consul Galerius Maximus, in the eighth general persecution raised by the Emperor Valerian, to whom Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, was the eighteenth in succession.

That this letter is genuine and authentic is incontrovertibly true; from it we learn, that Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage, and Primate of Numidia, did exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, before Constantine was born, that his predecessors in that See did exercise the same jurisdiction before he himself was born; that it was then a settled doctrine that Christians were obliged to obey, and observe the canons, or rules, established by the Bishops in Council; and because this *Victor* disobeyed, and by his last will did constitute Geminus Faustinus, a Priest, guardian, contrary to the tenor of an established rule, Cyprian ordered that the sacrifice of the Mass should not be offered for the repose of his soul, nor any other prayer in the Church. They had altars, and Priests who served at these altars, and offered the unbloody sacrifice on these altars, and offered the sacrifice for the repose of departed spirits on these altars; and this, in primitive Christianity, when, Mr. N. says, p. 18, "the gospel doctrine was displayed in its purity."

The writer has already adduced some passages from St. Austin's

Austin's works, which shew him to have taught the very same doctrine, which Cyprian had taught near 200 years before ; so true it is, that Catholic doctrine is at all times invariably the same ; he now adds one more, which proves this Austin to have been totally immersed, in what the reformed Mr. N. must call Popish superstition. In his 22d Book of the City of God, Chapter 8th. N. 22. after relating some miracles wrought by God at the intercession of St. Stephen, and also at the discovery of the relics of St. Gervaise and Protase in Milan, whilst he was himself in that city, in the former numbers, he adds a miraculous fact, which happened in his own Cathedral Church at Hippo, before his eyes, in presence of his people : " there is," says he, " one fact, not greater than those which I have related, but a miracle so evident, so conspicuous, that I believe there is not one of the citizens of Hippo, who has not seen it, or learned it ; not one who can forget it. Ten children, seven brothers and three sisters, of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, not of the lower classes of citizens, cursed by their mother, who had been left desolate by the late decease of their father, and felt most bitterly some injury, which she had received from them, were divinely punished by a horrible tremour in all their limbs. In this offensive state, to avoid the eyes of their fellow citizens, they wandered, as each thought fit, almost over the Roman world. Two of them came to us, a brother and sister, Paul and Palladia, already well known in many other places, from their misery. They arrived about fifteen days before Easter, frequented the Church daily, and in it the memorial of the most glorious Stephen, praying that God might be appeased and restore their former health ; there, and wherever they went they drew the eyes of the people on themselves ; some who had seen them elsewhere, and had known the cause of the tremor, signified it to others as they could. Easter came, and on Sunday morning, when the people were crowded in the Church, the young man praying, held the lattice of the holy place, where the shrine of the martyr was, he suddenly

denly fell prostrate, and lay as if asleep, but not trembling, as was usual, in his sleep; the people present were amazed, some fearing, others lamenting, some desired to raise him, others forbid it, saying, it was better wait the event. Behold he rose, and did not tremble, because he was healed, and stood safe, looking on those who eyed him. The man dined with us, and carefully related his mother's and brothers' calamity. The day after this narration, I promised, that it should be recited to the people, on the morrow. Whilst the information was read, on the third day of Easter, I made them both stand on the steps of the pulpit, from which I spoke. All the people, men and women, saw them, the one, without any deformed motion, the other trembling in all her members. They who had not seen him, saw what was done for him, by the divine mercy, in his sister; they saw for what thanksgiving was due in him, and for what they had to pray in his sister. When the narration was ended, I ordered them to withdraw from the sight of the people, and began to expatiate more minutely on the whole subject; whilst I was yet speaking, other voices of gratulation were heard from the shrine of the martyr. The people, who listened to me, turned to it; they ran to the place. As soon as the woman had descended from the steps of the pulpit, on which she had stood, she went *to pray to the Holy Martyr*, and, as soon as she touched the lattice, fell in a slumber, and arose in health." What does Mr. N. think of this circumstantial relation? If it be true, the boasted fabric of the Reformation crumbles; if it be false, St. Austin, though revered by the Christian world, was not a venerable and learned writer, but a lying impostor. Plain men do not easily conceive how he could have imposed on the citizens of Hippo, if he had attempted it. Men are not easily taught to believe that they have seen what they never saw, and Austin, however great his authority, had some able adversaries, who would have gloried in finding such an opportunity of undeceiving the world. The writer is willing to admit that there have been impostors and

dupes ; that some impostors have, intentionally to deceive, supposed miracles ; but that of all these men, eminent for science and sanctity, who attest the truth of miracles, there has not been one honest man, is a supposition which surpasses extravagance, it is impudent in the extreme, there is no man who has any remains of modesty would dare to avow it.

Mr. N. after this appeal to the venerable writers of antiquity, in which he has been rather unlucky, enquires how, or when, the belief of the real presence gained credit in the world, p. 81. The question is important, it has been discussed, without success, by Aubertin, Jurieu, and Claude, men, on whom nature had bestowed some qualifications for such a discussion, which Mr. N. does not possess, if we may judge from the specimen before us : after a long winded tale, as much to the purpose as any in Gulliver's travels, he tells us, p. 88, that in the beginning of the 8th century the worship of images had made great progress. A man, whose ideas are not confused, confines himself to the question proposed, or to others immediately connected with it. The writer has shewn in the close of the preceding volume, that the religious respect and reverence which we Catholics pay to angels, to saints, to their relics, and images, is authorised in the scriptures, and he has just now shewn that the same practice was universal in primitive Christianity. We find it in the Confession of Faith, which Basil the great sent to Julian, the apostate, of infamous memory : " I believe in one God, Father Almighty, God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost ; these three I adore and glorify. I confess also the dispensation of the Incarnate Son, and the Mother of God, who begot him according to the flesh, Holy Mary. I receive the true and Holy Apostles, Prophets and Martyrs, and the prayer to God, which by them, makes the most merciful God propitious to me, for which I honour and adore the figures of their images, this has been in a special manner, a tradition from the Holy Apostles, and not forbidden, but in all our Churches their

their histories are designated." Here are no figurative expressions, no metaphors : it is a Confession of Faith drawn up by that celebrated and venerable Prelate Basil, fir-named the great, and offered to the reigning Emperor. This is the faith, for which the martyrs died—the faith which was taught by the Apostles. It was the settled doctrine in Austin's days, as we have seen. It was the same in Basil's days, who preceded Austin ; it was the same in Cyprian's days long before : in his 39th *alias* 34th Epistle, he says : " his (Celerinus') grand mother has been long since crowned with martyrdom, also his uncles, by the father's and the mother's side, Laurentinus, and Ignatius, the true and spiritual soldiers of God, who overcome the demon in the battle of Christ, merit palms and crowns ; as you remember, we always offer sacrifices for them, as often as we celebrate their sufferings, and their days, by an annual commemoration." It was the same in the time of Irenæus, who preceded Cyprian : in his fifth book against heresies, he says : " as Eve was seduced to desert God, so Mary was persuaded to obey God ; so that the virgin Mary is become the advocate of the virgin Eve." And before Irenæus, it was the doctrine in Dennis's time, who was converted and instructed by St. Paul : " as if," says he, " whilst the Sun gives light but to sound eyes, a man should pluck out his own, and desire to be partaker of its light, so the man is duped by the vain hopes of impossibilities, who implores the prayers of the Saints, whilst he disregards works agreeable to their nature." Eccl. Hier. Cap. 7. This disciple of the Apostle requires, that they who expect any assistance from the prayers of the Saints, should endeavour to imitate them. Finally, this reverence was due, and paid to the Apostles as the chosen Ministers of Christ, whilst yet living. Acts V—13, " none of the others dared to join themselves to them, but the people magnified them," and Acts XIX—11, 12, " God wrought not common miracles by the hands of Paul, so that handkerchiefs were taken from his body to the sick, and the sickness left them."

This

This progress of the worship of images, which Mr. N. pretends to discover in the 8th century, is an absurd fiction; Images were not adored, as Gods, then, before, or since; the same relative honor was paid to them then, as in the primitive ages, and referred in the same manner to the prototypes: this we know, from that very Council, the 2d of Nice, which condemned the Iconoclasts, or Image Breakers, and Mr. N. by anticipation. "Believing in *one God*, to be praised in the Trinity we salute the honorable images. We follow the ancient legislation of the Catholic Church. To these, who transfer to the venerable images the sayings of the holy scripture against idols, Anathema; to these who do not salute the holy and venerable images, Anathema. *To these who say that Christians approach the images, as Gods*, Anathema. Action 4. Tom. 7. Labbe p. 318, and Act. 7. p. 555." The Fathers thus conclude the more frequently they (Christ, the Saints and Angels) are seen by their images, the more they, who contemplate them, are excited to their memory, to their desire, to their salutation, and to give them an *honorary adoration*, but not that true worship, *Latreia*, which is according to faith, and which becomes the divine nature alone to be given. The honor of the image passes to the prototype, and he who adores the image, adores the person represented in it.

Four hundred years before this Council was assembled, there were some Reformers, who undertook to compose a creed for Catholics, as Mr. N. does for us; they accused them of paying idolatrous worship to Saints and Angels; to these St. Austin replied, and in his words, the writer replies to Mr. N. "the Christian people celebrate the memory of the martyrs by a *religious solemnity* to excite imitation, and to partake of their merits, and to be assisted by their prayers; yet so that to none of the martyrs, but to the God of the martyrs, though on the tombs of the martyrs, we erect altars. What Prelate standing at the altar, in the places of the holy bodies, has at any time said: I offer to thee, Peter, or to thee Paul, or to thee Cyprian?

Cyprian ? What is offered, is offered to God, who crowned the martyrs at the tombs of those, whom he crowned ; that, admonished by the place, greater love may be excited, and charity may be inflamed to them, whom we imitate, and to him, by whose assistance we are enabled to imitate. We worship the martyrs with that worship of love and fellowship, with which, in the present life, holy men of God are worshipped, whose hearts we know are prepared to suffer in the same manner for the truth of the gospel ; but we worship the martyrs more devoutly and more securely because their battles are past ; we praise the victors in a happy life, with much more confidence, than those, who are yet fighting in the present life ; but with that worship, which, in the Greek tongue, is called *Latreia*, and which cannot be expressed by one word in Latin, because it is a certain homage properly due to the Divinity, we neither worship, nor teach to be worshipped, but God alone, and as the offering of sacrifice belongs to this worship, (*Latreia*,) whence idolatry is said of those, who offer it to idols, we by no means offer any such homage, or order it to be offered, to any martyr, or to any Holy Soul, or to any Angel, and, if any one falls into such an error, he is reprov'd by sound doctrine that he may be corrected, or avoided." *Contra Faust. Lib. 20. Cap. 21.*

Of the 377 Bishops assembled at Nice, in 787, not one was a schoolman, yet we find this distinction of absolute and relative worship, clearly stated by them ; and with equal precision by Austin, in 430, that is, 700 years before Peter Lombard, the father of the schoolmen, was born. The term *Latreia*, so offensive to the reformed Mr. N. was not of their invention. Ignorance, however contemptible, may be pardonable, but the confidence, with which the great and venerable writers of antiquity, are censured by every modern scribbler, excites disgust. "No distinction of relative and absolute worship, of adoration, of honor, and, what schoolmen call, *Latreia*, should be heeded." P. 91, N's pamphlet.

The writer begs leave to correct another conceit of this modern Theologian. He says, p. 89, " eminent men amongst the Gentiles, considered the numerous tribe of Pagan Divinities, as so many attributes of the one Sovereign Deity, that ruled the world." Theodoret, whom Mr. N. calls a venerable writer, well versed in Heathen mythology, in his *Thérapeutique*, or remedy against the false opinions of the Heathens, published in the beginning of the 5th century, when idolatry was shaken to its foundation, says, " I think you, (the Heathens) will reply to me : but you also say there are some invisible Powers, which you call Angels, and Archangels, Principalities and Powers, Dominations and Thrones, and others also, which you by Hebrew names, call Cherubim and Seraphim ; why then are you angry with us, if after the God who always is, and is always the same, we think there are secondary Gods, much inferior to him, and venerate them." The Heathens, therefore, did not think that Neptune was the Sovereign God holding the empire of the seas, or Mars, the same God, disposing of the fate of war : they thought that Neptune and Mars were secondary Gods, inferior to the one God, who always is, and continues, the same." Theodoret replies : " I confess that the divine scripture teaches that there are some invisible Powers praising the Creator, and always obedient to his will, but we do not call them Gods, nor do we give them *divine worship*, we do not divide *the divine adoration* between the true God and them. We think them superior to men, but yet, our fellow-servants." He too knew the distinction between the divine worship, the sovereign homage, *Latreia*, due to God alone, and the veneration due to Angels.

Mr. N. has forgotten to give his readers a sketch of the history of the pious Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, who corrected the abuses which had crept into the worship of Images. For the great edification of his readers, he might have given an extract from Fleury. We may judge of the measure, from the character of the man. He was son

to a shoemaker in Isauria, ignorant as his father, science in them days was not within the reach of artificers. Enrolled a private soldier in the army of Justinian II. by him promoted, on account of personal strength and undaunted courage, to a place in the guards; was named General of the Army of the East, by Anastasius II. whom he afterwards dismissed from his labours in this world, and in 717 was saluted Emperor, by the Eastern Army, no uncommon thing amongst the Greeks, where soldiers of fortune frequently reigned. At the solicitation of some Jews, to whose superstition he was from his infancy addicted, he, without consulting either Patriarch, Prelate, or other Ecclesiastic, ordered the sacred images to be removed from the Churches; finding it impossible to prevail on Germanus the Patriarch, one of the most venerable and learned Prelates in the then Christian world, to authorise the measure, he, by his Imperial power, and newly assumed Pontifical power, banished the Patriarch, and substituted Anastasius, a creature of his own, who felt no reluctance in acknowledging a power, from which he held his place, and was upon all occasions the Emperor's humble servant; finding his efforts to pervert the twelve Sages, so celebrated in the history of the Greeks, equally ineffectual, he ordered themselves and their Prebend to be shut up in the public library, composed of 30,000 manuscripts, and consumed the whole by fire, men and books indiscriminately. Theophanes, a cotemporary writer, and Zonares, who wrote soon after, paint him as a remorseless tyrant, the scourge of humanity.

Mr. N. admits that in Leo's time the images of Christ, of his blessed Mother, and of other Saints, were objects of veneration in all the Churches of the then Christian world, we know from better authority than Mr. N. that they were so in Constantine's days 400 years before, and not only in the Churches, but in the public squares, and on the high-ways, as they are yet, in Catholic countries. Eusebius, a cotemporary writer of unquestionable authority,

city, in his third book of the life of Constantine, Chap. 49th, says: "you would see on the fountains, which are in the great square, the images of the Good Shepherd; and in the most magnificent hall of the palace, on a large frame, in the middle of the gilded ceiling, the sign of the Lord's passion, in pure gold, with precious stones inlaid, the most *pious* Emperor seems to me to have placed it as a guard for the defence of the Empire." Images were therefore objects of veneration in Constantine's days, and his historian, a more intelligent man than himself, did not think it impious, or idolatrous to revere them. Hear another writer of the same age, and of equal authority, Asterius of Amasea, whose works, yet extant, are models of eloquence: "I retired into the Temple of God to pray at leisure. In one of the galleries I saw a picture, the appearance of which instantly seized me—a spotless virgin who had devoted her chastity to God; they call her Euphemia. The citizens where she suffered, admiring her fortitude and sanctity; having raised a tomb, not far from the Temple, and placed the coffin in it, pay her public honors. The annual day of her victory is joyfully celebrated by all the people." Asterius accurately describes the painting; he admires the Painter's art in expressing these affections of the mind, which seem of a contrary nature, modesty and fortitude. See Asterius in *Sanctam Euphemiam Martyren*.

From this elegant writer of the 4th century, we learn that in the Cathedral of Chalcedon, the image of Euphemia, the patroness of the Church, was exposed to public veneration; that the same veneration was paid to her remains in the tomb; and that her festival was annually celebrated. In 451 the fourth General Council, acknowledged orthodox by the thirty-nine Articles, was assembled in that Church; the Prelates ascribed to the intercession of this glorious virgin, in a great measure, the happy issue of their meeting. See *Con. t. 4. p. 325*. And Evagrius, a Greek historian, of undoubted veracity, says, *Lib. 2. Cap. 3*, that the Church of Chalcedon was visited by
Emperors,

Emperors, Patriarchs, and all ranks of people, imploring the patronage of this Holy Virgin.

We know from Tertullian that in primitive antiquity, the image of Christ, as the Good Shepherd, with the stray Sheep on his shoulders, was engraved on the chalice. *De Pudi. Cap. 10.* From this very image Catholics reasoned conclusively against Tertullian, and shewed that repenting sinners were to be re-admitted and reconciled, which Tertullian denied. We know from a most authentic source, that the images of Angels, in scripture called Cherubs, were placed over the Ark of the Covenant in Solomon's temple, by God's express order, and from the same source we know the religious respect and reverence, that was paid to these images, and to the Ark itself, which was but a mere inanimate monument, not even a figurative representation, yet from its relation to God, as containing the tables of the Law, the most profound veneration was due to it, and a gross neglect punished in the most exemplary manner. This the Bethsamites and Uzah learnt from lamentable experience. 1st. Sam.—6, 2d. Sam.—6. Finally, we know, from the common sense of mankind, that if the prototype, or person represented by any image, be an object of veneration, there is a certain respect and veneration due to the image itself, which is referred to the prototype. Who would dare to kick our Sovereign's picture in the streets?

Mr. N. informs us that his reforming Emperor, Leo, met some opposition: "the people in the East revolted, and were going to dethrone him, all the West were exasperated against him," p. 92. It is therefore true, and admitted by Mr. N. that the images of Christ, and his Saints, were then revered in all the Christian Churches of the world. This was not impious: for Mr. N. assures us, p. 21, that, "it is decreed in the Council of the Eternal God, that the faith of his Christ shall triumph over impiety and iniquity." If it was not impious then, it is not impious now. How will Mr. N. reconcile this truth with his reformed creed? An ignorant soldier of fortune, ad-

dicted to the Jewish superstition is his avowed ancestor. "Many Bishops in the East," he says, p. 89, "approved the Emperor's sentiments, and applauded his zeal." Contemporary writers have forgotten to name them. We know that Anastasius, the new Patriarch of Leo's creation, and his creatures, were subservient to the Emperor's views, and in the course of time, armed with his power, they formed a party; but we know also that the impious intruder, and his partizans, together, with their self-created Pope, were retrenched from the communion of the faithful by Peter's successor, Gregory II. and by all the Patriarchs and Prelates of the Catholic Church.

Constantine Copronymus, so called from his having fouled the Baptismal font, succeeded his father, and surpassed him in every vice: his savage ferocity knew no bounds, it was equalled but by his fiery zeal and unrelenting cruelty. He put to death Prelates, Priests and Monks, without number; he tinged all the cities of the Empire with blood. Michael III. one of his successors, ordered the bones of this monster to be taken up and burned, and the tomb destroyed. He was ranked amongst the Neros and Caligulas; hated by his subjects, and despised by his enemies. See *L'Histoire des Grand hommes*.

Under him, and by his creatures, was celebrated Mr. N's favorite Council, at which no Patriarch, if you except the intruder of Constantinople, assisted, either in person or by his legates. This conventicle, and that of Leo's collection, have been so totally disregarded, that they are not even numbered amongst Councils, yet even these conventicles condemn the present reformed creed: by the 15th canon, they anathematise those who do not invoke the blessed Virgin Mary: by the 17th canon, those who do not honorably worship and invoke the other Saints, and, by the 18th canon, they anathematise all those who do not believe that God will give eternal life to the just, according to the merit of their works. A modern writer admires the stupidity of the century writers of Magdeburg, who cite this Council as of unquestionable authority,
and

and these very canons, in which some leading principles of the Reformation, are so explicitly condemned.

It is true they condemned the relative veneration, which was paid to the images of Christ and his Saints, and ordered them to be removed from the Churches; the images were therefore in the Churches, and Catholics, who know that the creatures of arbitrary power, disclaiming the authority of the Apostles, in their lawful successors, and acting in direct opposition to their commands, have no jurisdiction in Spirituals, disregarded the Conventicle and its orders. The writer presumes to think them perfectly justifiable. He is not disposed to adopt the opinion, which timid, or venal men, subservient to his nod, borrow from a merciless tyrant, and retract as soon as their fear subsides. Mr. N. laments that many of the Bishops, who had opposed the images, repented of what they had done, they had not that energy and vigor of mind, necessary to resist popular error; this, he says, falls to the lot only of a chosen few, p. 96. He has not told us by what strange fatality this energy, and vigor of mind, capable of resisting the torrent, was found, not in the chosen few, but in the chosen many, these myriads, the victims of Copronymus's unrelenting fury. The writer whispers in his ear, that vile sycophants, and venal souls, will applaud error and impiety, when combined with interest, and desert them when the opposite interest invites; that honest men will sacrifice interest to truth.

Mr. N. finds two Councils in opposition, the one approving, the other condemning, the worship of images. To this the writer replies, that Mr. N. deceives, or is deceived: the one was a Conventicle, composed of Copronymus's creatures, possessed of no legal authority, reprobated then, and since, by the Christian world, and its decrees rescinded shortly after, by the very men who composed them. The other was a Council of the Catholic world, assembled by the proper authority, at which St. Peter's successor presided, by his legates, and at which were present, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, of Antioch,

of Constantinople, and of Jerusalem, either in person, or by their legates; its decrees were received, and revered by the Catholic world; were not rescinded either by the Prelates themselves, or by their successors. Mr. N. does not think it presumption to set his private opinion in opposition to their united authority; a strong specimen of modern modesty. As usual, he garbles the decree of the Council. Where the Prelates say, “we honorably adore them,” (the images and relics) *honoranter adoramus*, which imports, that we pay them that respect of honor which is due to them, not that *divine homage*, which is due to God alone. Mr. N. in his version, makes the Prelates say, *we honor and worship them*. Of the adverb *honoranter*, which qualifies the respect paid to them, he makes a distinct verb, destroys the intended sense, and substitutes his own conceit.

Provoked at the audacity of the Council, for ordering that religious respect, which their ancestors had paid to the images of Christ, and his Saints, to be continued, Mr. N. asks if the Apostles, who indignantly refused the *religious homage*, which the people of Lystra were going to pay them, could enjoin the adoration of images? He forgot to inform his readers, that *that religious homage*, was neither less nor more than an idolatrous sacrifice. The citizens of Lystra did not think with Mr. N’s new modelled Heathens, that the numerous tribe of Pagan Divinities, were only attributes of the one Sovereign Deity, that rules the world: “they called Barnaby, Jupiter, and Paul, Mercury,” Acts XIV—12, “and the Priest of Jupiter, who was before the city, brought bulls and crowns to the gates, with crouds, and intended to sacrifice.” *ibid*. It would have been surprising, indeed, if the Apostles had accepted a sacrifice offered to Jupiter and Mercury: they were not commissioned to oust the Heathen Gods, and possess themselves of their honors.

A passage cited by Mr. N. from the proceedings of the Conventicle under Copronymus, manifestly exposes the impiety of them time-serving Prelates and with equal force,

force, the ignorance of the man who cites it in support of an opinion which it condemns. "The only true image," say they, "of J. Christ, is that which he made himself, when on the eve of his passion he took bread and blessed it." From this proposition we have that the bread, which was not the image of J. Christ, was, by his words, changed into his *true image*. It therefore ceased to be bread : for a true image, must be a true likeness of the prototype, and bread is not a true likeness, nor any likeness at all of a human body. After a rhapsody, in which the heresy of Eutyches is latent, as a great majority of Copronymus's favourites were of that sect, they say, "the bread of the eucharist becomes a divine body, being sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the mediation of the Priest, who makes the offering, and renders the bread that was common, holy." Here again we have, that the bread, which was common before the consecration, is by the consecration sanctified, and becomes a divine body. It therefore ceases to be bread : for bread is neither a divine body, nor a human body." Mr. N. continues to cite : "it is then proved," says the Council, "that it is the true image of the incarnation of J. Christ, which he has taught us to make." "In this passage," says Mr. N. p. 94. "we find that the substance of bread is called *the image* of the natural body of Jesus Christ." Nature not having blessed the writer with that acute sense, which discovers, what does not exist, he finds no such thing : he finds, that some Eutychian Prelates institute a comparison between the mystery of the incarnation, and that of the eucharist : they say, "for this is what Christ has done, that as he deified the flesh, which he took by a sanctification, that is peculiar and natural to it, in virtue of the union, so the bread of the eucharist, being the true image of his natural flesh, becomes a divine body, being sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the mediation of the Priest, who makes the offering, and renders the bread, that was common, holy. The Eutychians pretended that the
humanity

humanity of Jesus Christ was converted into the divinity, by the hypostatical union : in support of this opinion, they instanced the mystery of the eucharist : they said that the bread of which the eucharist is made, being by nature, bread, before the consecration, and, in that, a true image of the flesh of Jesus Christ, which was, by nature, flesh before the hypostatical union, is by consecration, a divine body, in like manner that the flesh of Jesus Christ is deified by the hypostatical union. They conclude, “ it is then proved, that it is the *true image of the incarnation* of Jesus Christ, which he has taught us to make.”

If transubstantiation had not been an indisputable principle, the Eutychian's argument would have been null and impertinent. Catholics would have replied, that, however the bread might have been sanctified by the consecration, it did not cease to be bread, and, consequently, that though the flesh of J. Christ had been sanctified by the hypostatical union, it did not cease to be flesh. We have already seen the reply which Theodoret made to the argument drawn from the mystery of the eucharist. To the Eutychian's argument, the writer replies : that in the eucharist, it is one created substance, which is converted into another, which implies neither impossibility nor difficulty, but in the Eutychian's opinion, of the conversion of the humanity of Jesus Christ into the divinity, it is a substance, in itself, finite, created in time, which is supposed to be converted into a substance, infinite, increased and eternal : a supposition offensively absurd, and evidently impossible.

We are indebted to Mr. N's researches, for this incontrovertible proof, that transubstantiation was the settled doctrine, not only of Catholics, but of the Eutychian sectaries, who composed a majority of that Council, which he says, cannot be supposed to misrepresent the doctrine of the Church, with respect to the eucharist.

He tells us that the Council of Nice, in answer to the Council of Constantinople, who had asserted that the eucharist

eucharist was the only image allowed by the Christian religion, declared, that the eucharist is not the image of the body, but the very *body and blood of Christ*, p. 100, and in this declaration he finds the doctrine of the real presence, in embryo, p. 101. Other men, not possessed of that spirit of divination, which enables Mr. N. to discover that when writers say one thing, they intended to say another, find the doctrine of the real presence stated in this declaration with the utmost precision.

The article of the real presence was not discussed by that, or any of the preceding Councils, it was supposed as an incontestible principle, of which no man doubted, from it, conclusions were drawn by Catholics and sectaries, these conclusions were subject to discussion, but the principle was unquestionable. Leo the Great, in his 23d Epistle to the Clergy, proves against the Eutychians, that Christ's body and blood are real, not apparent, because we receive them in the eucharist, and this he says was known to the children. "The truth," says he, "of the body and blood of Christ, amongst the sacraments of the common faith, is so uniformly avowed by the mouth of all, that even the tongues of children are not silent on it."

Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who presided at the Council of Ephesus, as legate to Coelestine I. supposing the doctrine of the real presence indisputable, reasoned from it against Nestorius: in his 8th epistle to that impious reformer of the time, Cyril says: "thus also we approach the mystical benedictions, and are sanctified, being made partakers of the holy body, and the precious blood of Christ, the redeemer of us all, not receiving it as common flesh, forbid it (*absit*), nor as the flesh of a sanctified man, but as the proper flesh of the *word*," (the Son of God.) Cyril demonstrates, that the flesh of Christ, which we receive in the eucharist, though it be not God, is the flesh of a God, part of a whole, which is God, because by it we are sanctified, which could not happen, if Jesus Christ, as Nestorius pretended, were but man: because
the

the flesh of one man, however sanctified, could not sanctify others. This epistle was approved by the Council of Ephesus in 431, by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and by the Council of Constantinople in 553. Thus we have, on record, the testimony of some hundreds of Prelates, composing three succeeding general Councils, whose decisions were received as oracles by the Catholic world, that in the eucharist we are partakers of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and sanctified by them. These Prelates were crumbling in their graves, some centuries, before Mr. N. could discover the doctrine of the real presence in embryo. There are none so blind as they who will not see.

In the 104th p. he tells us, seriously, "that Paschasius was the first to expound what was *supposed* to be believed, by asserting that the elements of the sacrament were not the image of the body, but the very body of our Lord." That is, in other words, that though the Council of Nice had declared, that the eucharist was not the *image* of the body of Christ, but the *very body* of Jesus Christ, they did not believe it, but were *supposed* to believe it; and though the Christian world was united in the same doctrine, Christians did not believe it, but were *supposed* to believe it. The writer is not disposed to refute such nonsense: Paschasius himself, if we believe Mr. N. informs us, that many in *their minds* rejected his doctrine, though they did not oppose it in writing. That spirit of divination, by which he has himself discovered the thoughts of the writers of antiquity, he has lent to his friend Paschasius, "*in their minds,*" they rejected his doctrine. The writer does not believe Paschasius a forcerer. He was a plain, honest, Benedictine Monk, who, in his convent of Corbie, wrote an instruction, in the nature of a catechism, for the Novices, or young Monks, of New Corbie, in Saxony, in which he expounded to them the doctrine of the eucharist, as believed, taught and professed in all the Churches of the Christian world. He says, it is true, "that though there were some who moved some questions on the truth of
Christ's

Christ's body in the sacrament, there was no man who publicly denied it." He did not say that *in their minds* they rejected it. The man neither knew, nor pretended to know, other men's thoughts, he was neither a fool nor a conjuror.

Ratramne, a Monk of the same convent, who wrote in opposition to Paschasius, was injudiciously supposed by Claude, and some others, to have denied the real presence; but Doctor Boileau, in a preface to Ratramne's work, which he published in 1636, shews to conviction, that Ratramne denied neither the real presence nor transubstantiation. Ratramne had undertaken to prove two propositions, the first that the body and blood of Christ, as received by the mouth of the faithful, are figures, if they be considered simply according to the visible and external appearance of bread and wine, though they be truly the body and blood of Jesus Christ, by the power of the divine word. This proposition, though not true, is not heretical. There is nothing in it contrary to transubstantiation. His second proposition is perfectly orthodox, the body of Jesus Christ, in the eucharist, is different not in itself, and as to the substance, but as to the manner of being from the body of Jesus Christ, such as it was on Earth, and such as it is now in Heaven. This he advanced, in opposition to Paschasius, who had said, that the body of Jesus Christ in the eucharist, is the same that was born of the Virgin, and hung on the cross, which is true: for the body of the child, in embryo, is identically the same with that of the man at age, though not the same in appearance: accidental changes do not destroy the identity of the body.

If Rabanus Maurus wrote the passage cited by Mr. N. he seems to be of the same opinion with Ratramne in opposition to Paschasius. In the catalogue of his works now before the writer, he finds no such letter, nor does he know any intelligent writer, who accused Rabanus of a deviation from the common faith. The writer closes this work, with setting Mr. N. in opposition to Mr. N. he

says, p. 110, the Christian religion was, in course of time, so loaded with human doctrines and ordinances, that mankind was again *in bondage under the elements of the world*. He had said, p. 21, it is decreed in the Council of the Eternal God, that the faith of his Christ shall triumph over impiety and iniquity. Will he have the goodness to reconcile these passages?

E. B. v. c,

E R R A T A.

VOLUME I.

| Page | Line | | Page | Line | |
|------|------|-------------------------------|------|------|------------------------------------|
| 11 | 19 | Statute | 113 | 3 | himself <i>in person</i> |
| 12 | 16 | order <i>in</i> the | 115 | 2 | gates, <i>that is,</i> |
| 20 | 21 | face <i>of</i> truth | 116 | 13 | <i>Ego úmas</i> |
| 21 | 10 | Excommunicamus | 127 | 21 | account |
| | 23 | Superius | 133 | 32 | lives |
| | 25 | conveniunt | 136 | 35 | kurios |
| 25 | 2 | Exterminare | 138 | 12 | god's pro . . . |
| | 23 | Similitudinem | 36 | 36 | them as |
| 26 | 25 | no <i>such</i> dispensations | 139 | 35 | did <i>not</i> move |
| 27 | 30 | <i>is</i> made | 150 | 36 | <i>first</i> protos |
| 30 | 18 | transmigration | 154 | 35 | <i>Compulsion</i> |
| 32 | 21 | attingens | 156 | 31 | poimanein |
| 35 | 6 | ally, <i>to invalidate</i> | 168 | 26 | alluded <i>to</i> did |
| | 33 | <i>as well</i> | 27 | 27 | or <i>of</i> the |
| | 34 | <i>is an</i> | 193 | 12 | timiatatoi |
| 36 | 16 | <i>with</i> these | 197 | 32 | admonith |
| 39 | 14 | <i>in hac</i> | 38 | 38 | power <i>of</i> rescinding |
| | 17 | Consecrationem | 208 | 23 | Kemnitius |
| 43 | 5 | but <i>on</i> the | | | VOLUME II. |
| | 38 | proposed | 5 | 12 | Nobleman |
| 47 | 1 | characterises | 6 | 6 | pol. |
| 49 | 5 | indescribable | 19 | 6 | ghosts and Spectres |
| 51 | 20 | inutilities | 11 | 11 | a comment |
| 53 | 13 | expresses it , that | 20 | 8 | <i>settled</i> |
| | 36 | Apostles , Catholic | 26 | 11 | meaning . the |
| 54 | 14 | <i>parakalountos di'émon</i> | 30 | 30 | obtuse |
| 55 | 27 | men <i>so that</i> fools | 42 | 6 | thoughts |
| | 28 | <i>stray</i> therein | 47 | 24 | three more four are equal |
| 58 | 7 | sacrifice for the living | | | <i>to seven therefore six more</i> |
| 60 | 12 | force , or the | | | <i>nine are equal to eleven</i> |
| 65 | 30 | <i>fraternal</i> | 48 | 5 | insuperable |
| | 31 | case <i>of</i> disappointment | 11 | 11 | Melchior . . . locis |
| 71 | | phulassein . The | 50 | 36 | Pope's |
| 78 | 9 | penmen | 51 | 37 | Empire <i>was</i> seized by |
| 93 | 2 | Christ in the year 325 ; | 62 | 14 | works . . . there <i>is</i> no |
| | 20 | Lanfranc , who | 64 | 14 | Lollard's , Wicief's |
| 94 | 3 | <i>Ratramne</i> | 75 | 32 | <i>in his</i> time |
| 96 | 21 | known ; finding | 76 | 34 | that the |
| | 38 | <i>poimanein</i> | 109 | 18 | <i>knew</i> |
| 87 | 12 | <i>lagon</i> | 119 | 19 | publicly |
| | 18 | Jew's <i>tradition</i> | 31 | 31 | , says that Prelate p. 4, |
| 88 | 26 | <i>Simon</i> | | | <i>Constructions</i> |
| 97 | 1 | <i>diverted</i> | 139 | 5 | spoken the |
| 98 | 31 | Men | 152 | 20 | <i>lechem</i> |
| 102 | 22 | 39 | 157 | 23 | <i>fikera</i> |
| 105 | 10 | <i>Innēmoneuete tōn</i> | 28 | 28 | Lord , it is |
| 106 | 21 | choice | 167 | 32 | Silas |
| 107 | 17 | believe , to | 171 | 1 | preserved |
| 108 | 28 | <i>f' agit</i> | 175 | 8 | <i>initiated</i> |
| 110 | 30 | Church ; <i>it's</i> | 210 | 8 | Euplemian. Manpre's |
| 113 | 1 | Consummation ; the | 224 | 26 | |