



# REMARKS

ON A PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

## POPERY CONDEMNED

BY

*Scripture and the Fathers.*

---

*Ἐσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαίνουσῆς διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνεκονταί. Ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἰδίων, ἐαυτοῖς ἐπιβουλευσάμενοι διδασκαλοὺς κνῆθῶμεν τὴν ἀκοὴν,*<sup>29</sup>  
2nd. Tim. iv. 3.

For there will be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their sensual desires will heap to themselves teachers with itching ears.

---

HALIFAX:

PRINTED BY HOWE AND SON,

1809.



---

## INTRODUCTION.

IN excuse for the notice, which the writer has been induced to take of a compilation deserving of none, he offers the reasons assigned by St. Jerom, in his work against Helvidius: "I was pressed, says Jerom, by the brethren to make a reply to a Pamphlet by a certain Helvidius. I delayed for some time: not that it was difficult to refute, a meer country clown, who scarcely knows the first rudiments of literature, but I feared lest by making a reply that scribbler might appear deserving of notice. I also feared lest a turbulent fellow, who is in the whole world, alone both priest and layman, and who thinks clamour eloquence; and to calumniate all others proof of a good conscience, finding a subject of dispute would begin to blaspheme, and from his elevated place would pass sentence on the world: I had also to fear for myself from his scurrilous invectives; though these were just reasons of passing his pamphlet in silence, a more cogent reason has forced a reply, that is, to prevent the impressions which his frenzy may make:" these reasons which justified a reply to Helvidius will justify this work; in it there are some strictures intentionally severe in order to cure, if possible, that itch of abusing papists, with which the *author of Popery Condemned* is tormented, as physicians try the efficacy of a doubtful medicine on a worthless subject, or to speak their language *faciunt experimentum super pile caput*, if they have not the desired effect on him, they may on others.



---

**A** PAMPHLET of uncommon bulk, entitled, *Popery condemned by Scripture and the Fathers*, has been lately imported from Edinburgh, whether the offspring of fancy there, or the genuine fœtus of the supposed Author's imagination here, is useless to inquire : Men's opinions, not their names, are the proper subjects of discussion. The frontispiece is embellished with a quotation from Shakespear, a father of irresistible authority on the Stage, to him succeeds Hudibras, the Idol of independants, and in the course of the work d'Alembert, of atheistical memory. Popery is an universal theme : " the abuse of Popery, says a late Writer, is that happy incident, which illumines the evidences of the Historian, gives energy to the eloquence of the Rhetorician, adorns essays, travels, geographies, poems, pamphlets and romances ; it gives wit to dulness, sense to nonsense, truth to lies ; and, what is its main advantage, (such is the public taste) it ensures praise, credit, and, better far than either, . . . . money to the hero, who employs it most profusely." How many ranting enthusiasts, from John Bunyan, down to the author of *Popery Condemned*, would have descended to the shades unknown, and unlamented, if zeal for the destruction of Popery had not given celebrity to their names ? How many enlightened prophets, since Martin of paradoxical memory's days, have not only foretold, but precisely determined, the time of the downfall of Popery ? How many apostolical pedlars, pipers, cobblers, &c. have piously raised their pastoral voices against the abominations of Popery ? Yet, strange to tell, Popery subsists undiminished and unchanged. Why this insuperable obstinacy in Papists ? They reply, that all this abuse, which is lavished on Popery, all this noisy nonsense, all these wild declamations against its corruptions, are levelled against a phantom, which exists but in the artifices of deception and interest, or in the illusion of prejudice and

and simplicity. The enthusiast, whose restless mind is always in search of some new object, sees, within his disturbed imagination, a hideous figure, which he calls Popery, this figure his fancy clothes, and on it he vents his spleen. Interest pretends to believe, simplicity or prejudice believes him infallible. Though Papists have not employed him to compose their creed, nor do they take his fancy for a rule of faith, he whines most piteously if they refuse to acknowledge this popery, of his invention, to be the standard of their belief: these ridiculous efforts to persuade them that what they do not believe is a part of their creed, excite only a smile of contempt, or an emotion of pity. When they hear a teacher in one of the modern schools boldly assert that *fornication is authorised by the Church of Rome,\** and that *dispensations are granted to commit the basest of crimes.†* they conclude without hesitation that he is grossly deceived, or that he intentionally and maliciously deceives; if deceived, they lament his folly; if a deceiver they despise his malice: whether deceived or a deceiver he loses all credit, and racks his imagination in vain for reasons to justify what the most ignorant Papist knows to be a notorious falsehood.

This Reverend Pastor of some Church, its descriptive title he himself, perhaps, may know, as it is of the latest date, newest taste, and finest polish, it is rather unfortunate that it is not universally known, has, in the true spirit of new modelled charity, given some *wholesome castigation* to an anonymous writer, who published Remarks on Doctor Stanfer's Examination of the Reverend Edmund Burke's Letter of Instruction. This castigation consists of strictures incessantly made on the vanity and ignorance of that writer. To which he modestly replies: that an accusation of vanity is seldom brought against an anonymous writer. Other motives may be assigned; but vanity can have no share in an anonymous work. To this he adds that, if to a rhapsody composed

\* Popery Con. p. 206

† p. 240

composed of fragments collected from different authors, as judiciously assorted as the borrowed feathers on Æsop's crow, interspersed with coarse invectives, and thus swelled into a volume, he had set his name, and informed the world by an advertisement in a public gazette, his vanity would have been a fit subject of farcastic ridicule. As to his ignorance, he has been repeatedly told of it by all these Reverend Gentlemen, who have condescended to honor him with their animadversions; he knows it; he acknowledges it; it is his misfortune, not his fault. He naturally expected information from the extraordinary talents, and profound erudition of these Reverend Gentlemen; but has yet to lament a cruel disappointment; even the transcendental genius of the author of *Popery Condemned*, and the refulgence of his wit have not dispelled the clouds; from some unlucky defect in his understanding, or native dulness of apprehension, no doubt, he fancies that he sees in that wonderful performance, *Popery Condemned*, but a thick veil of artifice, concealing an unbounded fund of ignorance, some ridiculous attempts at wit, and vain efforts, not to invalidate close reasoning by argument, but to divert the attention of his readers from the subject under discussion to the immorality of Popes and Monks of whom he seems to know nothing; or to the excesses of the catholic clergy, of whom, perhaps, he does not know an individual. His powers of divination are astonishingly great: from them he has learnt, that the writer thinks the vilest calumnies laudable when they tend to support the Popish system.\* This spirit of divination at times deceives weak mortals: it has doubly deceived our pious castigator: it has induced him to act literally on the principle, which he falsely and injudiciously ascribes to the writer: as proof of his assertion the castigator quotes from Mr. Burke's Letter of Instruction this passage: "I pass in silence other party writers not less virulent than he, (Sir Richard Musgrave)

\* Pref. p. vi.



Musgrave) holding it unfair and inconsistent with the morality of the gospel to *traduce* before the public any man, much more so, any body of men, but in the case of self defence." To this passage the castigator pretends to affix a sense which was not intended by Mr. Burke, and which the passage cannot bear. The first and most genuine sense of the verb *traduce*, is to censure, if we believe Johnson, that, in that sense, and no other, it must be understood, is manifest from the subject matter, and context. Mr. Burke assigns the reason why he so severely censures Sir Richard Musgrave's compilation, not why he calumniates the man: the supposition is ridiculous, and the imputation as foul a calumny as any one of the many, which ornament *Popery Condemned*. That Mr. Burke's censure on Sir Richard's compilation was neither inconsiderate, nor undeserved, the writer has shewn to demonstration in his reply to Doctor Cochran's fifth letter: see Review, p. 113 . . . . . If the castigator had read that reply, which he pretends to refute, he would have seen the epithets, applied to his favourite Luther, justified by unquestionable facts. The writer presumes to advise him to read the work, which he may be tempted to refute in future, if the author be living, and not wholly to confide in his spirit of divination, both for the contents of the work, and the refutation of it. Our Castigator appeals to Erasmus, who says: "that Luther had two faults: he touched the Monks bellies, and the Pope's crown;" but he has forgotten to inform his readers that there were several stages in Luther's life: that he gradually ascended from the obscurity of the Augustinian convent to the resplendent throne of Patriarch, or Pope, of the new modelled church. His first essay, whilst yet a Monk in his frock and sandals, was against abuses, which did exist, if there be truth in history; and of the existence of which, the pretended reformation is itself the most decisive evidence. Against them abuses others declaimed as well as Luther, far more vehemently than Erasmus himself. If Luther had confined his stric-  
tures

tures to the existing abuses, however severe they might have appeared to dispassionate, and unprejudiced men, or even extraordinary in a simple Monk, whose duty it was to correct himself, and leave the correction of others to their lawful superiors, he would have retained a share in Erasmus's esteem.

This reforming Patriarch, knowing how great an acquisition a man so universally esteemed as Erasmus would have been to his party, if it were possible to seduce him, directed Melancton to write to him, on the subject. This letter produced no effect. Luther then wrote himself an epistle full of the most fulsome flattery. Erasmus politely replied in his letter, yet extant : he gave Luther some prudent and charitable admonition : never to speak in the pulpit against the persons or powers of Popes or Princes, but solely against those, who abuse their confidence ; to say nothing with arrogance, or the spirit of party ; not to permit himself to be swayed by anger, hatred, vain glory, or any other passion, though he might conceal it under the mask of piety, which would only make the matter worse.\* He knew the man though he had not seen him ; but when he saw Luther disregard all restraints, and transgress the bounds of public decency, he changed his opinion and his language. In a letter to Melancton, he says of Luther : " what shocks me is, that in every thing which he undertakes to support, he goes to extremities, even to excess ; if he be admonished, so far from moderating himself, he goes yet farther. He seems to have no design but to pass to yet greater excesses. I know his humour by his writings as well as if I lived with him. He is a fiery impetuous man. You see in him an Achilles, whose rage is invincible." Melancton himself, though Luther's greatest admirer, made heavy complaints of his disciples—in a letter to Erasmus he says : " there are some amongst them, who have forgotten humility and religion, who excite troubles by their seditious preaching, who observe none of the rules of civil life, who

who only endeavour to establish their own tyranny" . . . To this Erasmus replies: that Luther inverts all order, pretending to correct abuses he causes yet greater evils, by exciting commotions and sedition. "Is it", says he, "consistent with christian piety to preach to the people that the Pope is Anti-Christ; that Bishops and Priests are but shadows, that human constitutions are heresies; that confession is a pestilence; that to speak of good works, of merits or efforts, is to be an heretic, to assert that there is no free will, that all things happen by unavoidable necessity; that it is no matter of what nature our works be." Finally, concludes Erasmus, "the gospel formerly made men better, this new gospel only serves to corrupt them."\* Luther's doctrine, subversive of order and destructive of morality, Erasmus refutes in a Latin work, entitled, *Diatriba de libero arbitrio contra Lutherum* or a *dissertation on free will against Luther*. In this work Erasmus shews, in a masterly manner both from reason and revelation, that man is possessed of free will, however weakened by the sin of Adam; he replies to all Luther's objections, and demonstrates that all the passages in Scripture, which establish the necessity of divine grace, prove the existence of free will, because they suppose that grace strengthens the will, assists the will, and acts with the will, whence it follows of all necessity that the will itself must act. This work, though a peremptory refutation of Luther's new doctrines, was disregarded by him whilst it was confined to the Latin Edition, because the Germans whom he and his emissaries had seduced by flattering their passions did not understand that language, but when *Emser* and *Cochley* had translated it into the German Language, his indignation knew no bounds. The very name of Erasmus was terrible to him; and to support some ridiculous errors against a man so far his superior, writing in defence of truth, was a task which alarmed even Luther's effrontery. However, something must be done. He reluctantly

tantly undertakes it ; but in terms so unmeasured, and in a style so envenomed, that Melancton said: “ would to God Luther had been silent, I thought age would have made him moderate, but I see that he grows more violent every day.” Erasmus, piqued at the torrent of unexpected and undeserved abuse which was lavished on him, immediately replied in two books, which he entitled ‘*Hyperaspistes*’ the protector, or a defence of the dissertation. In his reply he reproaches Luther with having filled his pretended refutation with useless tales, common places, sophisms, coarse language, figures improperly applied and advanced without shame. It seems to have served as a model to our castigatour. “ I am surpris’d” says Erasmus to Luther, “ that you confine yourself to my treatise, which contains nothing but what is moderate, whilst you have so many enemies, who fall on you and spare you much less than I have done. Near you, is *Emser*, and far from you is *Cochley*, in England a bishop, who overwhelms you with volumes, in France *Clichtoveus*, and Langelius in Italy : there are some of your own sect, who give you exercise enough : a *Zuinglius* who combats your opinion on the Eucharist, a *Capiton*, on *Pecolompadius*, &c. is it not astonishing that you observe a profound silence with respect to them all, and fix on me :” to the *Defence of the Dissertation*, Luther made no reply. In his pretended refutation of the dissertation he had advanced the most horrid and disgusting blasphemy : that God is the author of all crimes ; that free will is a vain title ; that God effects in us evil as well as good ; that the great perfection of faith is to believe that God is just though he makes us damnable by his absolute will ; that he seems to take a pleasure in the torments of the unhappy ; God, said he, pleases you when he crowns the unworthy, he ought not to displease you when he damns the innocent : see Review, p. 130 . . . .

Erasmus’s aversion to Luther, and his gossellers, increased in proportion as he remarked the progress of the sect, and the devastation, which it caused : “ this new gospel,

gospel," said he, in a letter to a physician, "has produced a new sort of people, obstinate, impudent, hypocrites, calumniators, liars, deceivers, who do not agree amongst themselves, and are troublesome to others, seditious, furious, full of chicane, they displease me so that if I knew a town, in which there is not one of them, I would fix my dwelling there." Of the many able writers, who, at that unlucky period, opposed the intrusion of Luther's errors, and exposed the absurdity of his paradoxes, for opinions they cannot be called, few, if any, more effectually checked their progress than Erasmus, whom our castigator cites as one of the fathers for the condemnation of Popery. But Erasmus said that Luther had two faults: that he touched the Monks' bellies, and the Pope's crown. True, but Luther had only commenced his career. Erasmus was undeceived, and we have seen what he thought of that furious Monk's wild declamation against Popes and Princes. Let us now discuss his stricture on the Monks' bellies. It is strictly true, as Erasmus remarks, that Luther's first preaching did alarm the Monks; but our castigator, whose memory deceives him at times, as well as his spirit of divination, has forgotten to inform his readers that these Monks, who were alarmed at Luther's preaching, were yet Monks, or rather Epicureans under the cowl of Monks, subject to certain rules and restraints, which they ought to observe, but did not. The idea of a reformation to such men must be alarming, it was particularly so at that time as their disorders and excesses were public, offensive, and even disgusting, and a reformation of course was loudly called for; but a reformation of conduct and morals, a reformation of excesses and intemperance, a reformation of dissipation and sensuality, was the reformation expected by all pious christians; a reformation, which would have re-established order, and discipline, and would have enforced the observance of monastic rules and regulations. It is not surprising that the first rumour of such a reformation should

should alarm these epicurean Monks ; but when they found that Luther's reformation was as opposite to this as darkness is to light ; that it consisted in a release from all civil and religious restraints ; that it cancelled all vows, promises and obligations ; that it extinguished every idea of self-denial or mortification ; that it suppressed all fasts and abstinences, all rules and regulations, and consequently enabled its professors to gratify the cravings of the belly to their utmost extent, these Monks were amongst the first to embrace it ; they became not only his proselytes but his most zealous assistants in the glorious work of reforming. Hence in many parts of Germany, where the disorders were greatest, and ignorance most profound, we find convents and monasteries almost instantaneously depopulated, and these licentious Monks becoming the first Pastors of all the reformed churches in Germany.

If our castigator be a Pastor of any of these churches, whatever its descriptive title be, he must date from one of these Monks, whose bellies were alarmed by Luther's first preaching ; and, whatever reluctance he may feel, he must acknowledge him for his ancestor : Because the fact is incontrovertible : the first Pastors of the reformed churches did not fall from the clouds, nor grow like mushrooms, they were the Priests and Monks then in being, who abjured the faith, which they had professed until that unlucky period, and embraced the reformed faith. Of all historical facts there is not one more certain than this. It is known to every man who reads the history of our times. Burnet informs us, that, when the Commissioners, in 1559, made a report of the success of their visitation to Queen Elizabeth, the whole kingdom had received the orders of Parliament, and the Queen's *Pastoral Instructions*, with due submission ; that though there were 9,400 benefices in England, they all embraced the reformation, with the exception of 14 bishops, 6 deans, 12 arch-deacons, 15 principals of colleges, 50 canons, and 80 vicars. In the

space of about thirty years these men had changed their religion four several times, in obedience to the injunctions of their kings and queens. Such were the first Pastors of the reformed churches in the United Kingdom, and if they were guilty of the excesses and cruelties with which this castigator charges them, which, by the bye the writer does not believe, it is not dishonorable to catholics, who disclaim them, but to protestants, who must acknowledge them for their ancestors.

The writer, in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's Examination, had spoken irreverently of Cromwell, Henry the Eighth's vicar general; he had even presumed to censure that *worthy nobleman* severely. This has inflamed the castigator's bile beyond its usual pitch; but has he forgotten, or did he ever know, that the British parliament stigmatized that vile sycophant with the most opprobrious epithet in the English language: *a traitor to the State?* and as such condemned him to lose his head? He seems to know nothing of the man's history. The writer gives a sketch of it in a few words: he was born in Pulteney, bound apprentice to a sheerman, fled from his master, enlisted a private soldier, so ignorant that he never obtained the rank of corporal, was in the ranks when the Duke of Bourbon traitorously stormed Rome, in 1527, shared in the massacre and the barbarities committed on that memorable occasion, a recital of which chills the blood; they disgrace the annals of mankind; he returned to England, engaged as a menial servant in Woolsey's family; insinuated himself into the good graces of that intriguing prelate; was recommended to Henry VIII. served him in his pleasures; by the influence of Anne Boulen was raised to the dignity of Baron of Oakham, Earl of Oxford, prime minister in state affairs, and vicar-general in spirituals; in that quality he presided over the English clergy; subscribed, and pretended to believe, all the articles of Henry's creed, though he secretly professed the doctrines of Zuinglius; he advised the suppression of monasteries, and the sale of church lands at a  
low

low rate, to engage the nobility and gentry in the support of Henry's supremacy; in conjunction with Cranmer, who, like Cromwell, publicly professed, and swore to the truth of Henry's articles, which he probably disbelieved; he had views for the advancement of the reformation. It is true, Cranmer was more interested, because he was obliged not only to conceal his faith but his wife. Cromwell knowing that Henry refused nothing to a wife whilst she managed to command his affections, thought Anne of Cleves well qualified to advance his views; but, unfortunately for him, Henry transferred his affections to Catharine Howard; employed Cranmer, a ready instrument on such occasions, to annul his marriage with Anne of Cleves; turned his indignation against Cromwell, who advised the marriage; soon found means of disposing of that favourite: it was suspected that he secretly encouraged the new preachers against the six articles of Henry's fabrication; some indiscreet expressions against the King were reported, an order issued, parliament convened, condemned him as a traitor to the state. It was remarked that he was condemned unheard, in conformity with the advice which he had given to condemn the accused without a hearing. Thus perished our castigator's *worthy nobleman*.\* The writer begs leave to assure him, that to serve the intrigues of a Woolsey, a Cranmer or an Anne Boulen; to minister to the pleasures or the rapacity of an Henry the eighth, is a sort of merit of which he is not ambitious, that nature has not blessed him with the duplicity, the pliability of conscience, the cringing servility which so eminently distinguish this *worthy nobleman*. He neither expects applause, nor fears animadversion for such merit; he has the honor to date his pedigree from honest men, who sacrificed not only their possessions, but their hopes in this world, in defence of what they believed to be truth, the only inheritance which they have left him, for which he most sincerely thanks them.

The

\*Pre. p. viii.



The writer in his remarks on Dr. Stanfer's Exam. stated facts collected from Protestant writers, and related in their own words. See Rem. p. 8. . . . These our castigator modestly enough calls *calumnies*, without even an attempt to invalidate or elude the force of the authorities, which substantiate them. Immediately after he tells us, that there are "many Romish clergymen who deplore the general depravity of that church, and abominate the selfish spirit of their brethren." A material question presents itself: how does he know it? The man, in all appearance, does not know an individual of that immense body of men, consisting of some millions, spread over the christian world, whom he thus asperges in bulk. The Romish clergy do not say that the ministers of the reformed churches are depraved. Why so? Because they do not know it. They do not consult the spirit of divination, the castigator's instructor; they know it to be a spirit of illusion, a lying spirit, and disregard its suggestions. He even condescends to admit that there are "some of the Romish clergy who cherish a high esteem for the scriptures." Does he know any one of them who does not? Such a clergyman would be a phenomenon as rare as the Phoenix of the Ancients. Their respect and reverence for the scriptures is such, that they will not permit every pedant, who understands a few words of Greek and Hebrew, to translate them according to his own fancy; nor will they permit either enthusiasts, or impostors, to affix to them a sense of their own invention, as our castigator has done, more than once, in his pretended refutation: closing the work he gives a remarkable instance of his ingenuity in forcing the scriptures to speak his own language. "What agreement hath the temple of God with *images*," in the text, *with idols, meta eidōlon*. Again: "Little children keep yourselves *from images*;" in the text, *from idols. Apō tōn eidōlōn*. The Greek word *eikōn*, signifies an image from *eik* I am like, the term *eidolon*, signifies an *idol*, from *eidōs* a form. This every man knows who knows any thing

thing of that language : the inspired writers, speaking of images, invariably express them by the different inflexions of *eikon* : Thus Matt. xxii. 20, whose image is this? *tinós è eikôn autè . . .* 1st Cor. xi. 7—for the man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God. *Eikon kai doxa*. If, in complaisance to the castigatour, the apostle had substituted *eidōion* to *eikon*, he would have made man the *idol* of God. The writer does not remember to have seen so impudent a perversion of the scriptures, manifestly intended to mislead the ignorant. Catholics have a fixed standard : the scriptures deposited in the hands of the first pastors of the church, by the apostles, and from them descending in regular succession to the pastors of the present day, not the scriptures reformed, and refitted by every enthusiast, or impostor, to his own opinions, which he gives to his deluded followers as the pure Word of God.

From the title page of *Papery Condemned*, a refutation, or something like a refutation of the writer's *Remarks on Doctor Stanfer's Examination*, &c. might be expected, but the castigatour found it more convenient to overlook the *errors and falsehoods contained in them*, and direct the *attention of his readers to the leading points of debate between protestants and papists*.\* Why not tell his readers that these *errors and falsehoods* are harmless? Or, that a serious refutation of *errors and falsehoods* which have all the appearance of truth, and are supported by a train of conclusive reasoning, is an alarming task to any man, an insuperable difficulty to a man, who has not studied dialectics? That a few tales of Popes and Monks, resembling these of Robinson Crusoe, and as well authenticated, are more amusing, and as much to his purpose? It is true papists disregard these tales; they tell him, that such tales, so far from being leading points of debate between protestants and papists, are not points of debate at all; that their truth or falsehood is perfectly indifferent; that to amuse his readers with such tales

\**Præf. p. 4.*

tales is a pitiful subterfuge, which shews that he has no solid reason to offer, either in defence of his own opinions, or in opposition to the doctrine, which he pretends to refute.

After a preface of nine or ten pages, in which he profusely lavishes his modest animadversions on the *vanity*, the *ignorance*, the *calumnies*, the *errors* and *falsehoods* of the writer, this castigator proceeds at length to discuss the *extrordinary claims* of the See of Rome. It is rather ominous that his first line should contain a palpable mistake: they are not the *extraordinary* but the *ordinary* claims of that See, which form the subject of debate between protestants and papists. The castigator does not seem to understand the state of the question. The writer had said, in his remarks on Dr. Stapfer's Examination, that "there is as great a certainty of Peter's having been at Rome as that he wrote his first and second Epistle." This gives great offence to the castigator. The writer, without hesitation repeats the assertion, and subjoins a peremptory reason: that Peter was at Rome, and that he wrote his first and second epistle, are facts, the certainty of which rests on the same authority, the uninterrupted tradition of ages; the facts are therefore equally certain. The man has a weak head, or a bad heart, who denies it. Imagination perhaps may suggest some silly reasons to elude the force of this reasoning, but not one to disprove it. In the same paragraph the castigator either intentionally mistakes, or grossly blunders: "The certainty of this fact," he says, "does not, as the writer imagines, prove ruinous to the reformed system." The writer imagines no such thing. The certainty of Peter's having been at Rome, or Jerusalem, or Antioch, or elsewhere, is not the fact, which the writer stated as ruinous of the reformed system, but *the certainty of Peter's having founded his See at Rome, and transmitted his authority to feed Christ's flock to his successor.* See Remarks, p. 175. The reasons there adduced to authenticate the fact, are yet without a refutation. Idle tales do not invalidate  
positive

positive facts ; and this fact is confessedly ruinous of the reformed system : for if it be true, that Peter did transmit to his successor, his authority to feed Christ's flock, they are not his flock who disclaim this authority : under pretence of directing his reader's attention to the leading subject of debate, the castigator introduces a tale of Peter's going to Rome to resist the juggling tricks of Simon the magician, and of a chair being revered there on the 18th of January, on which the labours of Hercules were discovered in 1662. It is doubtful, whether ignorance or artifice be the more prominent feature of this ridiculous tale. The chair which is revered on the 18th of January, is a festival in commemoration of the foundation of the Apostolical See, in Latin called *Cathedra*, which has no reference to chairs or tables ; there is another festival in commemoration of St. Peter's chair at Antioch, on the 22d of Feb. See the Roman calendar. Thus ignorance and artifice combined sport with the credulity of a deluded people, whose pride is flattered in being taught to believe that they themselves are the only competent judges, of what they do not understand.

In every age of the church there have been, and there yet are christians, who celebrate the anniversary of their baptism, in gratitude to the divine goodness for their adoption, and if these new modelled christians do not, it is because they have wandered so far from the old path, and so deeply bewildered themselves in the labyrinth of fancy, that they have not only lost sight of the true path but of all the land marks which distinguish it. We know that a festival in commemoration of St. Peter's chair, or the exaltation of that apostle to the supreme government of the Christian church, was celebrated before St. Austin's days : we have yet extant a sermon preached by that prelate on the subject, in which he says : " the institution of this day's solemnity has received from the Ancients the name of *cathedra*, or *chair*, because Peter, first of the apostles, is said this day to have

have received the chair of the bishopric. Justly therefore the churches celebrate the anniversary (*natalem*) of that feat, which the apostle received for the salvation of churches, the Lord saying: "Thou art Peter, (*a rock*) and on this rock I will build my church." The Lord therefore called Peter the foundation of the church, and therefore the church rightly honors (*colit*) this foundation, on which the height of the ecclesiastical edifice rises.\* We have also a sermon of Leo the Great on the same subject, in which he says, that we ought to celebrate the festival of St Peter's chair, as joyfully as the festival of his martyrdom; for says he, "as by the one he was exalted to a throne of glory in the heavens, so by the other he was instituted head of the church on earth." We have yet extant four sermons preached on the anniversary of his accession, to the dignity of the apostolical see, by this pontiff, in whose days Antichrist had not yet made his appearance in Rome, if we believe protestant writers. Even the castigator fixes his coming after the death of Gregory the Great, who was the twentieth Pope in succession to Leo, a most unlucky mistake, which has involved reformed controvertists in difficulties from which there is no evasion. Why so? Because this pontiff, in his works, universally acknowledged genuine, teaches all these doctrines, which the reformed churches reject, and pretend to be the inventions of Antichrist: the real presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist, see Review, p. 231; the public sacrifice, and the benediction of the chrism. (1) In that letter he complains that the violence exercised by the Eutychians in Alexandria, had interrupted the offering of the sacrifice, and the benediction of the chrism. In his letter to the bishops of the province of Vieme, he states, in strong terms, the primacy of St. Peter and the authority of the Roman See (2); that authority he himself exercised over the christian world, as appears from his works. He frequently recommends himself to the saints reigning

\*Serm. 15. de Sanctis.

(1) Ep. 125, Edit. quer.

(2) Ep. 10.

reigning in Heaven, and exhorts others to place a confidence in their intercession (3); he honors their relics and festivals, *ibid.* He rebuilt the church of St. Paul, painted on the ceiling in Mosaic work the images of Christ and the twenty-four Elders (4). He placed at the sepulchres of the apostles, guardians, in Latin called *camerarii*, see Fleury, B. 21, cap. 16. He calls the fast of the lent an apostolical tradition, (5). In a letter addressed to Theodore, bishop of Frejus, on penance, he reprimands that prelate for not applying to his metropolitan for instruction in the first place; then he describes the order of administering that sacrament, confession, satisfaction, and reconciliation. Penance, he says, is by the ministry of the pastors; but by the power of Jesus Christ and the gift of the Holy Ghost. This remedy, he says, is for the living, not for the dead, who have neglected it: whilst life continues we are not to set bounds to the mercy of God: penance, therefore, must not be refused to sinners in the greatest extremity, who desire it, if their conversion be sincere. This letter is dated on the 10th of June, 452, (6). This sacrament is not of Antichrist's invention, as it was in use before Leo's days, the impostor who rejected it as useless in 1517, was, in all appearance, one of his advanced guard. In a letter addressed to the bishops of Campania, and the two neighbouring provinces of Samnium and Picenum in date the 6th of March, 469, Leo reprimands those prelates for obliging some penitents to make a public confession of their sins, lest others should be deterred by shame, or the fear of their enemies, who might institute a criminal action on their confession. It is enough, says he, that sins be confessed to God, and to a priest, in a secret manner, (7).

Bower, the reformed Jesuit, in his *Lives of Popes*, says of Leo: "he was without doubt a man of extraordinary parts, far superior to all who had governed that church before him, and scarce equalled by any since."

C

Though

(3) Serm. 4. and alibi pluries. (4) Lib. Pon. (5) Serm. de quadragesima.  
(6) Epis. de. 83. (7) Epis. 136.

Though Bowers's compilation, which serves as a repertory to modern declaimers against popery, be replete with the most gross blunders, and the most vile calumny, the writer knows no work better calculated to disabuse an unprejudiced reader: he sees in almost every line the most envenomed rancour contradicting known truth, and shamelessly advancing falsehood in the face of conviction.

To Bower's testimony the writer adds that of Fleury, who was not more remarkable for the severity of his strictures on popes, than for the inaccuracy of some of his conjectures. The writer would not be understood to accuse Fleury of advancing an intended falsehood. "His style," says he, speaking of the works of Leo, "is noble and elegant, shewing the solidity of his judgment, the beauty of his imagination, and the greatness of his courage.\*

The castigator, after having amused his readers with the tale of Hercules's chair, though he seems unwilling to dispute Peter's having been at Rome, thinks the fact has not been proved by the writer in his Remarks on Doctor Stanfer's Examination. The direct proof offered there, and now again repeated, is *universal, uninterrupted, and uncontradicted tradition*, the proof by which all such facts are known, a proof, which bears no reply; this the castigator prudently passes unnoticed, and pretends to correct a quotation from Eusebius, and a chronological mistake, as he imagines, with respect to Paphias. The writer begs leave to inform him, that the quotations there adduced are merely collateral evidence, in which either inadvertence or error does not in the least affect the direct proof. If Eusebius and Paphias had never existed, it would not be the less true that Peter was at Rome, nor could that universal tradition, which attests it, have been the less unquestionable. The fact was known and believed by millions before Eusebius was born; and on the faith of others he believed it: a Greek writer of the fourth century, who had never seen  
Peter

\* Hist. Ec. L. 29, N. 16.

Peter nor Rome, could not otherwise have known it. Thus, in Nova-Scotia, we know, that a Lewis XIV. reigned in France. In Eusebius's days writers had not yet learned to consult the spirit of divination for the truth of facts; they did not know that men, whom they never saw, with whom they had no intercourse, nor acquaintance, were *depraved* and *corrupt*. The writer is not disposed to waste time and paper in a grammatical discussion of a Greek phrase, nor dispute with dictionary-makers and schoolmasters, of whom Pope says "they may understand the sense of one word but no more." However the quotation, as corrected by the castigator, is of greater force than as stated by the writer: in *Papery Condemned* it stands thus: "moreover Peter mentions Mark in his first epistle, which, as they say, was written at Rome; Peter himself intimates as much, calling Rome, by a figure, Babylon, in these words: the church which is *at* Babylon, in the text, *in* Babylon, &c." The castigator excludes Paphias from the number of Eusebius's informers, and substitutes the pronoun *they*: This pronoun must imply more than one, consequently the force of the testimony is increased; Eusebius in that place does not cite Paphias or others to shew that Peter was at Rome, he supposes the fact known to the world; but he cites Paphias, or, as the castigator will have it, public opinion, that Peter wrote his first epistle from Rome, and he confirms this opinion expressly, saying: "Peter himself intimates as much, calling Rome Babylon." Is this castigator stupid enough to believe that Peter called the church of Rome Babylon, whilst he himself governed it? If he does, is there any man so destitute of common sense as to believe him? Peter and John called the city of Rome *Babylon*, and justly: it was the head of the Roman empire, immersed in idolatry and all sorts of uncleanness, persecuting the church with unrelenting fury, as Babylon of old did the Jews.

The castigator, who must fill a pamphlet with something, finds that Paphias was not a disciple of the apostles.

It



It is of little consequence whether Paphias was cotemporary with the apostles, when it is certain that he was instructed by their immediate successors, however it is not the less true that he was cotemporary with some of them : St. John the Evangelist died at Ephesus in the year 99 of our Æra, and Paphias was bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia, in 111, that is twelve years after the death of the evangelist. If we suppose him at the age of 50 years, when he was chosen bishop, he must have been near 40 when John died. Whether the commencement of our Æra be correct or not, the time elapsed between John's death, and his accession to the episcopal dignity is the same.\*

Paphias was a disciple of John the priest of Ephesus, an immediate disciple of Jesus Christ. It is conjectured that this John was not the evangelist, because Paphias, as cited by Eusebius, says, "I did not approve those, who said many things, but those, who taught the truth; nor those who related strange precepts, but those who related the precepts, which the Lord entrusted to us, and which proceed from truth itself. If any one came, who had followed the ancients, I asked him what they said; what said Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or some other of the disciples of our Lord, what Aristion said or John the old disciple of our Lord.† Whether this John be the evangelist or not, which is mere matter of conjecture, he is properly called an apostle, as he was a priest and immediate disciple of Jesus Christ. Thus St. Paul calls Andronicus and Junias apostles.‡ The spirit of contradiction as well as the spirit of divination deceives this castigator. We have from the history of Paphias, what he does not wish to know, that in the apostles days, their words as well as their writings were collected by their immediate disciples, and transmitted to their successors; hence that injunction of St. Paul, to his disciple Timothy: "the things, which you have heard from me

\* Fleur. Ec. Hist. Lib. 3, N. 15. † Euf. Lib. 3. Cap. ult. ‡ Rom. ult. 5.

me by many witnesses, these commit to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others."\* On the testimony of these men, we know the apostolical traditions.

The castigator, from his profound knowledge of antiquity and deep researches in the works of Lucan, of Philostratus and Pliny, finds that Seleucia on the Tigris, was called Babylon.† He might find a Babylon in Shropshire or Fifeshire, for what the writer knows; but he will find it difficult to find a Babylon either there or in Syria, which corresponds with St. John's description, that is, built on seven hills, and commanding the kings of the earth. Eusebius never dreamed of this Babylon fir-named Seleucia. But Dupin, a Popish Polemic of great candour, better versed in scripture and antiquity than all the Romish clergy on this side the atlantic,‡ contradicts Eusebius; "this interpretation," says Dupin, "is false, and it is more natural to say that he wrote this epistle from Babylon." It is the first time that the writer has seen Dupin numbered amongst Popish Polemics; he has seen him more than once ranked with Fra Paoli, amongst lurking hypocrites. Whatever opinion the castigator may have of his erudition, he has given a very bad specimen of his modesty: A Frenchman writing in 1686, before he had attained the age of thirty years contradicts Eusebius a Greek writer near the close of the third century, of whom it is said *that he knew all that was written before him*, and whose chronicle including events from the commencement of time to the 20th year of Constantine's reign, is the principal fund, which remains for the study of chronology.

Dupin did not confine his strictures to Eusebius: he censured, with such petulant severity, the style, the doctrine, and the qualities of ecclesiastical writers of antiquity that Bossuet, the celebrated bishop of Meaux, who knew something of antiquity too, denounced him to Harlay, then arch-bishop of Paris, who obliged Dupin publicly to retract his unfounded conjectures. He was obliged

\* 2. Tim. ii. 21

† p. 6.

‡ p. 10.

obliged to a second retraction on a more serious occasion in 1703, and dismissed from his professorship,—see his life, by his friends in the historical dictionary. His errors have been ascribed by some to the impetuosity of his disposition, by others, to reasons not very honorable, which the writer passes in silence; but whether we believe his friends or his enemies, there was more pliability in the man's conscience, than is consistent with a sincere regard to truth.

However reluctantly the castigator is forced to admit that Peter was at Rome, but, says he, it does not follow as a consequent that he was Bishop of that See.\* No: he was in many other cities as well as in Rome: Why these unwearied exertions to perplex a plain truth? The writer did not state it as a consequent: he stated a proposition, which gives this castigator great anxiety, and he states it again: that there is as great a certainty that Peter did establish his See at Rome, as that the scriptures are divinely inspired. This proposition he has proved more than once already; against the peremptory reasons which establish it, all suppositions are vain: for it is an intuitive truth that facts resting on the same authority are equally certain. Will he condescend to admit that these many millions of christians, whom he calls papists, do believe it? That it was believed by the christian world when Luther first opposed the Pope in 1517? That it was universally believed in 1215, when the fourth council of Lateran was celebrated? That in Charlemagne's time, that is in 814, it was believed by the then christian world? That at the celebration of the general council of Chalcedon in 451, it was believed? In that council we have on public record the names of three hundred and sixty bishops, Greeks, Asiatics and Africans, who believed it. Will this castigator, or any of his friends, tell us when or where it was not believed? The first act of the council of Chalcedon, which is acknowledged by the church of England as a lawful council,

\* p. 19.

cil, gives the most authentic evidence, that the bishop of Rome was then, and before, universally acknowledged head of the catholic church. The first assembly of this council was held in the church of Saint Euphemia on the eighth of the ides of October, under the consulship of Marcien, fourth indiction, that is, the eighth of October, 451. There were present, with the prelates, nineteen of the chief officers of the court: Anatolius, general of the troops, who had been consul of the year 440, Taticn, governor of Constantinople, Palladius, superintendant of the court, Sporatius, captain of the guards, &c. The bishops named in the acts are 360: at the head of these are, Paschasius, bishop of Lilibee in Sicily, Lucentius, bishop of Ascoli, and Boniface, priest of the Roman church, the pope's legates, then Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, Dioscorus of Alexandria, Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem; these are patriarchal Sees; the archbishops and bishops are named in their respective orders; the order of sitting is thus described: the magistrates and senators in the middle, before the balustrade of the altar, to the left, the place of honor in the church, were the pope's legates, then Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Thalassius of Cæsarea, Stephen of Ephesus, and the bishops of the dioceses of the East, of Pontus, of Asia, and Thrace, in their order; on the right was, Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Quintillus of Heraclea, in Macedonia, representing Anastasius of Thessalonica, Peter of Corinth, then the other bishops of Egypt; of Illyricum and Palestine in their order; the gospel in the middle; the bishop Paschasius, the pope's legate, spoke first, and addressing himself to the magistrates, he said: "We have the orders of the bishop of Rome, *head of all churches*, directing that Dioscorus should not sit in the council; therefore, if it please your lordships, let him retire, or we retire:" Paschasius spoke in Latin; his words were explained in Greek, by Beronicien, secretary of the emperor's consistory. The senators and magistrates

gistrates said: "what particular complaint is there against the most reverend bishop Dioscorus?" Lucentius, the other legate, replied: "he must give an account of his judgment. He has usurped the authority of a Judge, and presumed to hold a Council without the authority of the Holy See, what never was done nor allowed." Paschalinus added: we cannot disobey the orders of the pope, nor the canons of the church. Dioscorus, therefore, quitted his seat by order of the magistrates, and sat in the middle of the assembly,—see the first act of the council of Chalcedon.

Here we have the most authentic evidence upon record, of the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction over all churches, acknowledged and exercised in presence of the Greek Emperor's ministers of state, representing his Imperial Majesty, in presence of Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, of Maximus, patriarch of Antioch, of Juvenal, patriarch of Jerusalem; in presence of 350 prelates, subject to the jurisdiction of these patriarchs. If the pope's jurisdiction had been doubtful, if there had been a possibility of contesting it, would they all have thus tamely acquiesced? Would not Dioscorus and his party, at least, have resisted it? They had the most cogent reasons, and the strongest inclination to decline it, if they could discover any evasion.

In the second Act of that Council, on the sixth of the Ides, that is, the tenth of the month of October, when the Pope's Letter to the Council was read, the Prelates exclaimed: "That is the faith of our fathers; the faith of the apostles; we all believe so; Peter has spoken by Leo."

At this distance, both of time and place, we know the doctrine taught in Constantinople and Rome in the days of Leo the Great; we know the names of the Prelates who occupied all the Patriarchal Sees in the christian world; we know the districts over which they presided, the order of precedence in their assemblies. Did these  
men,

men, who were not inferior to us in point of science— their works are yet extant? Did these men, the writer asks once more, did they know nothing of their own predecessors? Did they know nothing of the doctrine taught in the dioceses, over which they presided, for two or three centuries before? All reasoning is lost on the man who pretends to believe such an absurdity; and the man who is duped by such nonsense is rather an object of contempt than pity.

Of the many authorities adduced by the writer in his remarks on Dr. Stanfer's Examination, the castigator says there are but two who wrote before the fourth century. The writer refers him to the prelates assembled in the council of Chalcedon: they had in their hands the writings of their predecessors; and, through them, we know them. If the writer has not cited many writers of the second century, it is because there are but few writers of the three first centuries, whose works have been transmitted to us. There were no printers in them days. The few, who ventured to write in defence of christianity, confined themselves to establish the divinity of Christ's mission, and to justify their faith against the false imputations of the heathen philosophers: for christianity was then, as it is now, grossly misrepresented. The heathen philosophers declaimed against the abominations and corruptions of christianity under the appellations of superstition and atheism, with as much virulence as new modelled ministers declaim against the same christianity, under the appellation of popery. But if the writer did not cite these very ancient writers, whose works are not in his hands, he has cited their immediate successors, in whose hands they were, the Eusebius's, the Jeromes', the Austins', the Optatus's, &c. To them he refers the castigator. Does he pretend to refute the testimony of men who occasionally relate, what the world knew, by the silence of others, who have not spoken on the subject at all? This is a new modelled sort of refutation.

Restless imagination, if not despair, suggests another

D

resource:

resource: it is hardly possible for a writer, not divinely assisted, to be so correct, and exact in the choice, and disposition of his terms, that no incorrect, or incautious expression shall escape him: the scriptures themselves are frequently distorted from their intended signification, and, either through malice or ignorance, forced to speak the language of error. If such an incautious expression be found in the works of an ancient writer, the spirit of imposture or illusion fastens on it; as the beetle on the fore, pretends to make an incorrect expression, which escapes the vigilance of the writer, a rule to determine the sense of all the passages, in which the writer clearly and expressly conveys his thoughts. Common sense prescribes a different rule, according to which the sense of all incorrect, or incautious, expressions must be determined by the subject matter, the scope of the writer, and the whole tenor of the work. From a total disregard of this rule of common sense, and an adoption of that, which imposture prescribes, opinions are lent to men, which never crossed their imagination, and which are expressly condemned in their works. At the commencement of the Reformation, whilst there was yet some respect for antiquity, this plan was adopted: incautious expressions, and insulated passages, were cited from ancient writers to justify the pretence of reviving primitive christianity; but as it was found impossible to make the Fathers speak a language, which they had not learned, without new modelling the whole of their works, and catholics then, as they are yet, the keepers of their own records, not being disposed to pass in silence such a diabolical deception, after a few ineffectual efforts to reform the Fathers, they were peaceably resigned to their old possessors, and an appeal made to the scriptures alone. The castigatour thinks he may revive the plan of his ancestors. The writer recommends to him a careful perusal of the works of Flaccus Illyricus and his associates, the century writers of Magdeburgh. In the lucubrations of these indefatigable reformers,

formers, he will find every incautious expression, and every obscure passage, which may with any appearance of truth be distorted in support of the Reformation ; but he must at the same time advise him not to open the works of these ancient writers, if he understands their language, he will find them incorrigible papists, as deeply immersed in popish superstitions, such as praying for departed souls, honoring saints and angels, invoking them, prescribing fasts and abstinences, recommending celibacy and good works, &c. as the writer of these remarks. The castigator, therefore, must confine himself to read the garbled passages extracted from their works, by Flaccus Illyricus, with his commentaries on them, and he will be satisfied that, they were all good protestants, one thousand years before there was a protestant in the world. He will also find, in the works of that celebrated reformer, a treatise, in which he demonstrates, in his usual way, that the papacy is an invention of the devil ; that the pope is the devil himself. It is not easy to reconcile this opinion with the received opinion of protestants, that the pope is Antichrist, for, after all, Antichrist, bad as he is, is not the devil. The reverend Mr. Parish, in a late publication, has reformed this opinion : he says that Bonaparte is Antichrist. It seems that he has superseded the pope ; perhaps in the course of time he may supersede the devil himself. The writer fears that old Davy will prove too hard for him. Future ages will scarcely believe that, in our days, human credulity is the sport of such nonsense, or that such gross imposture should find dupes.

The castigator, in imitation of his friend Illyricus, distorts the passage adduced from Ireneus : this father, if we believe him, appears to have been a stranger to Peter's particular relation to the Roman See.\* This he pretends to deduce from Ireneus's words : " The blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, having founded and built (edified) the church, delivered to Linus the episcopal office, him Paul  
mentioned

\* p. 20.



mentioned in his epistles to Timothy ; Anencletus succeeded him ; after whom, in the third place from the apostles, Clement had the bishopric." Does the castigator pretend that to found a church is not a particular relation to it ? But he thinks that Paul had an equal title. That Paul, by his words, his works and writings, did assist in founding and edifying the Roman church, is unquestionably true ; that the Roman church knew and professed the doctrine taught by Peter and Paul, is equally true. By this doctrine, preserved in the Roman church, and transmitted in regular succession from pastor to pastor, since the apostles' days, Ireneus confounds all heresies ; by the same rule, errors are condemned to this day : " we can," said he, " enumerate those, whom the apostles established bishops in the churches, and their successors down to us . . . but since it would be too long to enumerate the succession of all churches, we shall content ourselves with indicating the *tradition* of the greatest, and most ancient church, known to the whole world, founded and established at Rome by the glorious apostles Peter and Paul ; and by this *tradition*, which it has received from the apostles, and this faith announced to men, and preserved to our days by the succession of bishops, we confound all those who make unlawful assemblies, in any manner, whether through self-love, vain glory, blindness or malice."\* Ireneus shews, that the doctrine taught by Peter and Paul, was transmitted, in regular succession, through the pastors of the Roman church ; he did not inquire, whether Peter or Paul had first founded that church, it was a public fact, of which no man doubted in his days : the Romans tell this castigator, that the church of Rome was founded before Paul saw Italy ; and that it was then celebrated for the purity of its faith, we know from Paul himself in his epistle to the Romans, i. 8 : " your faith is celebrated in the whole world." These same Romans tell him, and they ought to know something of the founder of their

\* Lib. 3, cap. 3.

their own church, that Peter, with his disciple Mark, and others, had founded that church long before Paul had seen it, and on their testimony it was believed by the christian world. How are facts known, but by the testimony of witnesses? Thus Eusebius knew it, and states precisely the time in his chronicle of the lxxiv. year: "Peter, by nation a Galilean, the first *pontiff of christians*, when he had first founded the church of Antioch, goes to Rome, where, preaching the gospel twenty-five years, he remained bishop of that city." Thus all those writers, who have been cited in the Remarks on Doctor Stanfer's Examination, knew it—see Remarks, p. 177, and seq. They also tell him, that Paul was neither his predecessor nor successor in office, though he was his most zealous fellow labourer; and this they demonstrate beyond the possibility of contradiction: for Peter was entrusted with the care of Christ's flock before Paul was a christian: John, xxi.—"feed my lambs; feed my ewes;" and it does not appear that Paul was ordered to supersede him: that was reserved for the evangelist of Wirtemberg; nor was Paul Peter's successor; they died the same day.

"The church of Rome," says the castigator, "would never indeed acknowledge Pope, Paul the First. Epiphanius and Ireneus have been more complaisant"\* The passages which he endeavours to distort, in order to perplex the truth, tell against him: Epiphanius says, "Peter and Paul were the first at Rome, both bishops and apostles." Epiphanius does not say that Paul was prior to Peter or superior to him, on the contrary he gives Paul the second place. He says that, "Paul was at Rome a bishop and apostle." Who ever doubted it? But this castigator ought to know that Paul, though a bishop and apostle, was one of Peter's flock; and if he does not know it, Epiphanius, on whom he endeavours to impose his nonsense, will inform him. This father says, "Christ chose Peter to be the leader of his disciples."† And in the work called the *Anchor*, speaking of Peter, he says: "this

\* p. 23.

† Her. 51.

“this is he, who heard—‘feed my lambs’—to whom the fold was entrusted.” The passage which he cites from Ireneus tells pointedly against him: “Alexander was the fifth in succession from Peter and Paul.” Peter therefore must have been bishop of Rome, or Alexander could not have been the fifth in succession from him. Ireneus did not consider Paul as joint bishop of Rome with Peter, as this castigator imposes on him; he knew that there were not two bishops of the same See: and if he had considered Paul as bishop, with Peter, of the See of Rome the passage does not tell the less forcibly against the castigator, for he assigns the second place to Paul, and his apostolical authority should of course descend to the bishop of Rome as his successor: however, it is not as Paul’s successor that the bishop of Rome claims an universal spiritual jurisdiction over the christian church: for Paul could have no successor in an office, which he never possessed. The power of feeding Christ’s flock was vested in Peter before Paul was a christian.

The castigator, in his great zeal to refute the Remarks on Doctor Stanfer’s Examination, ruins the cause of that new modelled church, of which he is himself a minister. He tells us that Peter was a bishop. If so the episcopal order is of divine institution in the christian church. The church, therefore, in which this order is not found, is not the church of Christ. The man, who denies this consequence, is destitute of common sense, or perversely obstinate. Was the castigator aware of this consequence? Or did he honestly intend to undeceive these deluded mortals, who are taught to believe that all ecclesiastical authority is vested in themselves, and derived from them to ministers of their own institution?

In the same paragraph in which the castigator says, that Peter was a bishop and apostle, he tells us that, the offices of an apostle and a bishop are incompatible: in other words, that Peter was invested, at the same time, with two offices incompatible. This, to plain men, has

has all the appearance of nonsense. If Peter was a bishop, as he says, what would prevent him from governing the church of Rome or Antioch, or any other church as a bishop? His apostolical commission, if we believe the castigator. Common sense replies that his apostolical commission did not invalidate his Episcopal authority; it only strengthened and encreased it. He governed the church of Antioch for seven years as bishop, whilst he governed the universal church as supreme pastor of Christ's flock, if the christian world in former times be not deceived. Hence Antioch is called an apostolical See, and if he had continued to govern that church as bishop to his death, the bishop of that See, and not the bishop of Rome, would have been his successor in office.

The castigator asks if the people of Rome had appointed Peter Bishop of that See? To this the writer replies, that the time was not yet come, of which St. Paul says: "There will be a time, when they will not bear the doctrine of salvation; but according to their irregular desires (*Epithumias*) they will collect teachers for themselves, with itching ears."\* The time is now come—the castigator knows it. The flock in Peter's days had not yet learned to conduct the shepherd.

To the other queries, intended to embarrass the ignorant or mislead the unwary, by perplexing the known truth, the writer replies: that Peter's commission to rule his master's flock, includes the subordinate authority of bishop, priest and deacon, as the authority of the prince includes the subordinate authority of all officers under him. This authority Peter exercised when and where he thought it convenient, according to the directions of his divine master, in whom all spiritual authority to rule his church is vested, and from whom it must be derived, according to the order, which he was pleased to institute. This doctrine may not be so pleasing to the castigator, but it is not the less true, nor the less consonant with our ideas of order. Peter's authority, indispensably necessary  
for

\* 2. Tim. iv. 3.

for the good government of the flock, for the support of union, unanimity, peace and subordination, continued until death, and then passed to his successor in office. For Christ's paternal care of his flock did not cease when Peter ceased to conduct it; nor did that authority, vested in Peter for the welfare of the flock, expire with Peter: it yet subsists, and will continue to subsist, whilst Christ, the supreme pastor, has a flock on earth, that is, to the consummation. This is a plain statement. The man must be stupid who does not conceive it, and warped by interest, prejudice, passion, or something worse, who does not believe it.

The castigator finds a subterfuge, as he imagines, in the doubt expressed by some writers, whether Linus, Clement or Anacletus, was Peter's immediate successor; does he imagine that the Roman church, then in being, did not know their own bishop? If there be some, who, at this distance of time, doubt which of these three pontiffs was Peter's immediate successor, there are none who doubt that one of them did succeed him immediately, and the other two in succession. Their successors, down to the present day, we know. During a long interval of 1700 years. Would this castigator condescend to oblige us with the succession of pastors in his new modelled church? Or is he the first, and must his successors date from him? Does his ambition aspire to the honor of being the founder of so great a family.

In the next chapter the castigator pretends to refute the reasons urged in support of Peter's supremacy, his first attempt is rather awkward; in the course of the work he formally condemns it. The writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer, had said: "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 Christ to be by nature son of the living God." This, if we believe the castigator, was confessed by the prophets, before the apostle's days: "it has been," he gravely tells us, "a received opinion in the church,

church, that the christian religion, or the religion of Christ, was published in the world a few thousand years before the days of the apostles."\* That the divinity of the promised Messias was predicted by the prophets Christians demonstrate against Jews, Deists and Socinians; but that the christian religion was published before the days of Christ, or his apostles, is an extraordinary paradox; if it be a received opinion in the church, it must be in some church of the castigator's invention; the christian church does not know it. Lapse of time had effaced this opinion from the castigator's mind before he had arrived at the end of his work. "The angel," he says, "did not direct Cornelius to the scriptures; but the reason is obvious: it was the design of God to exhibit to him the Saviour already crucified, and exalted as a foundation of faith, for the remission of sins, to both Jews and Gentiles. The angel, therefore, could not direct him to the old testament scriptures, because they taught no such doctrine"† Is it that the belief of the crucifixion of Christ for the remission of sins is no part of the christian religion? This castigator finds truth variable, he bends it to his opinions, and fits it to his purpose. How unfortunate for the castigator that truth is in itself, so stubborn, so unmanageable? All his efforts to perplex it are vain. It is yet true that Peter was the first who did confess Christ, as man, to be Son of God, by nature. In the prophets' days Christ was not yet man, they therefore did not, nor could not, confess him to be, as man, true Son by nature, of the Living God. This first mistake he endeavours to enforce by another: Peter's confession, says he, was the testimony of his faith concerning what the prophets had written. If we believe the evangelist, Peter's confession was the testimony of his faith in Jesus Christ, to whom he spoke—whom he acknowledged true-Son of the Living God; and this he did not learn from the prophets, whose writings, in all appearance, he had not

E

read,

\* p. 26.

† p. 229.

read, but from the immediate revelation of God: "blessed art thou Simon, son of John, said the Saviour, because flesh and blood did not reveal to thee, but my Father, who is in Heaven."

It is doubtful whether his next effort to perplex the truth be the effect of ignorance or artifice. "If Peter's excellent confession produced this declaration, upon what authority," says he, "does the writer overlook his confession and fix on his person as the basis of the church?" Does this castigator think Peter's confession something really distinct from his person? If so, his ignorance is despicable, if not, why does he assign a mere quality which has no independent existence as the basis of Christ's church? Is it that he thinks the church of Christ an imaginary Being? The writer now tells him on what authority he fixes on Peter's person, and not on his confession: the unerring authority of Jesus Christ, who did not bless Peter's confession, but Peter himself, saying: "blessed art thou Simon, son of John," who did not speak to Peter's confession, but to his person, saying: "I say unto thee," who did not call Peter's confession a rock, but Peter himself, saying: "thou art a rock," and, finally, who did not say that he would build his church on Peter's confession, but on his person, saying, : "and on this rock will I build my church." To this the writer adds a second authority, that is, the authority of common sense: Peter's confession of faith was neither the foundation of the church, nor a member of the church, nor any part or parcel of the church. His confession of faith qualified Peter himself to be a member of the church, and the almighty power of Christ performing after his resurrection, what he then promised, gave him the strength and solidity necessary to support that mysterious building. As in a material building, it is not the figure nor the qualities of the stones, which compose the walls, but the stones themselves, shaped and fitted by the builders.

"The scriptures," he says, "declare confession to be the

the ground on which the church stands." The scriptures do not speak nonsense; St. Peter thus describes the church; Christ he calls *a living stone*, "*Lithon Zanta*," on whom the faithful are built as *living stones*, "*Lithoi Zantes*:"\* he does not say that the faith of the people was raised on the faith of Christ, to form a church of this castigator's invention: faith is one of these virtues which Christ did not possess: there is no other Christ in whom he believed.

Illyricus, and his associates, in the commencement of the Reformation, had collected from the Fathers, several passages, some entire, others garbled, all insulated and distorted, in order to persuade their deluded followers, that there was some similarity between their new doctrines and these of the primitive church; from this repertory the castigator transcribes some passages, with which he makes a display of erudition, which cost him the labour of transcribing and translating. If artful efforts to continue a deception, and lead the stray sheep to the precipice, could be a subject of amusement to a sober man, the vanity of this castigator, would amuse, and the folly of obtruding on the public passages, from the writings of men, who uniformly condemn the errors, in support of which they are adduced, would excite a smile of contempt.

The first passage he cites, is from St. Hilary, who says: "this, therefore, is the only immoveable foundation, this is the only blessed rock, which Peter confessed: thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." What christian does not know that Christ is the immoveable rock, the primary foundation on which the church is built? Does it follow that Christ did not call his disciple Simon, son of John, a rock? The Syriac term, *Kepha*, and the Greek term, *Petros*, signify nothing else but a rock. Because Christ was, and is, the primary foundation of the church, does it follow that he did not constitute Peter a secondary foundation? St. Hilary did

\* 1st Pet. ii. 4.



did not think so : in his commentary on this passage of St. Matthew, " thou art *Peter*, (*a rock*)" he says : " happy *foundation* of the church, in the solemn declaration of a new name, and *rock*, worthy of the building of it, which dissolves the bonds of hell ! blessed gate keeper of heaven !" this is one of the Fathers who condemns Popery ! *Risum teneatis Amici.*

He next adduces a passage from St. Austin, who says : " the church is at present assaulted by divers trials, as with floods and storms, but it is not destroyed : because it is founded on the rock, whence Peter received his name for the rock is not named from Peter, but he from the rock, as Christ is not named from the christian, but the christian from him ; on this account the Lord says : ' upon this rock I will build my church ; ' because Peter had said : ' thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God ; ' upon this rock, therefore,' says he, ' which thou hast confessed, I will build my church,' for Christ is the rock upon which Peter himself was built." In this passage Peter's prerogative is clearly expressed, and another truth totally subversive of new modelled churches. It is matter of surprise, that the castigator did not observe it. Austin says, that the rock was not named from Peter, but he from the rock ; that Christ is the rock on which Peter himself was built. All this is unquestionably true. Austin, therefore, thought that Peter partook of the stability of that rock, from which he was named, and on which he was built. Austin knew that a name imposed by God in the scriptures invariably expresses the prerogative of the person. Thus the name imposed on the Father of the Faithful, by his parents, *Abram*, which signifies *exalted father*, was changed into *Abraham*, which imports *father of a multitude*, and the reason assigned : " because, said the Lord, I have given thee father to a multitude of nations.\* *Cbi al hamon goim nathathika.* The name *Sarai*, which signifies *my Queen*, was changed into *Sarah*, which signifies a *Queen*

\* Gen. xvii. 5.

*Queen*, without restriction, and the reason also assigned, because she was to be the Mother of Nations and Kings.

A second truth, as yet more alarming, Austin demonstrates in that passage. "The church," says he, "is assaulted by divers trials as with floods and storms; but it is not destroyed, because it is founded on the rock." He thought, as catholics do now, that floods and storms, trials and persecutions, the united efforts of earth and hell, were ineffectual against the church built on the rock, that is founded by Christ, conducted by his Spirit, and protected by his Almighty Power. Some reformers, in his days, had said, that the church had perished: this bold assertion has been frequently repeated since his time; hear his reply: "that church, which was of all nations, is no more; it has perished." This, they say, who are not in it. The impudent assertion! Is it not, because you are not in it? See least, therefore, you be not, for it will be, though you be not. This assertion; abominable, detestable, full of presumption and falsehood, supported by no truth, enlightened by no wisdom, seasoned by no salt, vain rash, precipitate, pernicious—the Spirit of God foresaw, on account of those who say: it was, and it is not; for those, who say: the scriptures are fulfilled, all nations have believed, but the church of all nations has apostatized, it has perished. What is this? *Behold I am with you until the consummation of the age . . .* Why is it that you say: the church of all nations has perished, when for this the gospel is preached that it may be in all nations? Therefore, until the end of time, the church in all nations; sectaries may perish, let them cease to be what they are, that they may be what they are not.

In the passage adduced by the castigator, St. Austin says: that "the church is founded on Christ, the Rock which Peter confessed. In that he was perfectly correct. But that the demonstrative pronoun *tauté*, *this*, had a reference to *Petrà*, a *Rock*, implied in the proposition, because it did not correspond with *Petros*, is an unfounded conjecture:

jecture: the Greek terms *Petros* or *Petrà* are indifferently used to signify a *Rock*, the sense imported by the Syriac term *Kepha*, the name which the Saviour imposed on his disciple Simon, son of John—this we know from the Evangelist, St. John, i, 43: “Thou art Simon, son of John; thou shalt be called *Kephas*, which, interpreted, is Peter.” Hence the Greek translator of St. Matthew used the terms *Petros* and *Petrà*, of the same import, as if to explain the force of the name *Petros* by *Petrà*, which imports nothing but a *Rock*. This introduced a diversity in the Greek expression, which is not found in the Syriac, the language then in use amongst the Jews. This diversity in the expression, which St. Austin, not understanding the Syriac language, did not know, led him to conjecture that the article *tauté*, *this*, not being of the same gender with *Petros*, had a reference to some other *Rock*, and, as Christ is frequently called a *Rock* in the scriptures, St. Austin thought it referred to him. If he had known that this diversity did not exist in the language spoken by the Saviour, he must have seen that the article *tauté*, *this*, could have no reference but to the *Rock* of which Christ had spoken, and that was *Peter*, a *Rock*: no other *Rock* was mentioned before. Hence we find that Jerome, who was a perfect master of both languages, in his exposition of the passage in St. Matthew, refers the article to Peter: “According to the metaphor, *Petrà*, a *Rock*, it is rightly said—I will build my church on thee;” and, in his letter to Pope Damasus concerning the term ‘*Hypostasis*,’ then in dispute, he says, speaking of the Chair (the See) of Peter: “I know that the church is built on this *Rock*.”

That St. Austin’s exposition of the passage was a conjecture, founded on the diversity of expression introduced by the Greek translator, we know from himself: “I said, in some place, of the apostle Peter, that on him, as on a *Rock*, the church was founded, which sense is sung by the mouths of many, in the verses of the most blessed Ambrose; who, speaking of the *Cock*, says: ‘at the crowing of the *Cock* the *Rock* of the Church washes away

away his fault ;' I know also that very often after I explained it so, that *on this Rock* might be understood on him whom Peter confessed ; for it was not said to him ' thou art *Petrà* but *Petros*'—of these two expositions the reader may chuse that which he thinks the more probable."\*

From this passage we learn that though Austin, deceived by the diversity of expression, introduced into the Greek version, thought this exposition probable, he thought that of St. Ambrose equally probable, and more universally adopted. We know the motive of his conjecture was fallacious : for Jerome expressly says, that *Kepha* signifies a rock ; and in the Syriac version of the old Testament, the Hebrew term *Selah*, a rock, is invariably expressed by the Syriac term *Kepha*. Hence Ambrose's exposition of the passage is incontrovertibly correct ; it prevailed in his time, before his time, and after it. Since his time, there can be no doubt : because the verses of which St. Austin speaks, compose the hymn for lauds on the three Sundays before Lent, in the Roman breviary in general use. It is true these sons of pleasure, the reformed Monks, with the arch-reformer at their head, abjured and exploded the breviary with all other *unprofitable austerities*. See Review, p. 154.

In Ambrose's time we know it to prevail from his own and Austin's testimony. That it prevailed before his time, we have the testimony of Greeks and Latins.

Origen, who understood, if ever man did, the original scriptures, in his Homily on the 5th of Exodus, says : " see what was said by the Lord to that great foundation of the church, and that most firm rock, on which Christ founded his church : Man of little faith, why have you doubted ? It was Peter whom Christ thus reproached, when his confidence failed, and he began to sink."

Basil, in his second book against Eunomius, says : " Peter, for the excellence of his faith, received on himself the building of the church Epiphanius in Anchora : the Lord constituted Peter, the first of the apostles, a solid rock, on whom the church of God is built."

Chryostom

\* Lib. 1, Ret. Cap. 21.

Chrysoſtom in his 55th homily on St. Matthew : “ the Lord ſaid thou art Peter, (a rock) and on thee will I build my church.” The expoſition of the Latins coincides with that of the Greeks.

Tertullian : “ was any thing concealed from Peter, called the rock, on which the church was to be built ?”

Cyprian, in his letter to Quintus, ſays : “ the Lord choſe Peter firſt, and on him built his church,” in a word, this was univerſally believed. St. Auſtin himſelf, though he thought it probable that the terms *this rock*, might have a reference to Chriſt, did not preſume to contradict the contrary opinion, nor did he ever doubt of Peter and Peter’s ſucceſſors in the See of Rome, being the firſt paſtors of the chriſtian church : in his letter to Glorius Eleuſinus, ſpeaking of pope Melchiades, he ſays : “ the good man ! the child of chriſtian peace and father of the chriſtian people !”

The writer cites a paſſage from Auſtin’s works. The caſtigator may diſregard his authority, but he will find his reaſoning invincible. In a letter to Generoſus, yet extant, he ſays, N<sup>o</sup>. 1 : “ as you hold the chriſtianity not of one city only, nor of Africa only, nor of the Africans, but of the whole world, which was announced, and is announced to all nations. . . . It has been evangelized to you by the prophetical and apoſtolic writings, that promiſes were made to Abraham and to his ſeed, that is, to Chriſt, when God ſaid to him, Gen. xxii. 18 : ‘ in thy ſeed ſhall *all Nations* be bleſſed.’ As you have theſe promiſes, if an angel from heaven ſhould ſay to you, relinquish the chriſtianity of the world, and hold the party of Donatus, he ought to be accuſed, becauſe he would endeavour to cut you off from the whole, and thruſt you into a part ; and cut you off from the promiſes of God.”

What does the caſtigator think of this reaſoning? Is it true, as St. Auſtin ſays, and demonſtrates, by what has all the appearance of concluſive and irrefiſtible argument,

\* Ep. 43, *alias* 162.

ment, that a man, even an angel, who would form a party and separate it from the christianity then in the world, would be cut off from the promises of God? If so what is become of all celebrated reformers? The reforming castigator would do well to refute this first part of Austin's reasoning: it most seriously interests himself, and his flock.

Austin continues, N<sup>o</sup>. 2, if, says he, the order of bishops succeeding each other be to be considered, how much more certainly and safely may we enumerate from Peter himself, to whom, as he bore the figure of the whole church, the Lord said: on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it, Linus succeeded Peter, Clement succeeded Linus, Anacletus succeeded Clement, then Evaristus .. . . . . . Anastasius. In this order of bishops in succession there is no Donatist bishop to be found.

In the next number Austin solves the difficulties against catholics, urged from the immoral lives of some popes, without enquiring whether the accusations were well or ill-founded. Disobedience to existing authority, by which all factions, whether in Church or State, must commence, is masked by the pretence of correcting abuses. If no real abuse exist, the leaders of a faction must invent on the principle of self-defence. Hence, there never was a sect formed, who did not bring heavy accusations against the pontiff then in being, and the catholic prelates in communion with him. From these sources the century writers of Magdeburgh, and Bower, retail that collection of slander against popes and prelates, nineteen twentieths of which are bare-faced calumnies, contradicted by cotemporary writers. Hear Austin's reasoning on the subject, N<sup>o</sup>. 3: "if," says he, "in that order of bishops continued from Peter to Anastasius, who now holds the same See, some *trahitor* in the times should have crept, it would not prejudice the church nor the innocent christians, to whom the Lord, providing for it, had said of bad prelates, Matt. xxiii.

3, 'do what they say; but what they do, do not do: for they say and they do not do;' that the hope of the faithful, which is not placed in man, but in God, may not in the time of sacrilegious schism be confounded, as they are confounded, who read in the sacred scriptures, churches to which the apostles have not written, and in them have no bishop.'

Christians, who to elude the sanguinary penal laws enacted against christianity, and enforced with the utmost rigor by the Heathen magistrates in the first ages, had given up the scriptures, and the sacred vessels of the church, were called *traditors*, and considered as apostates.

Donatus, of Cosa Nigra, in 311, commenced his schism, which spread its baneful influence like a pestilence over the churches of Africa, on the pretence that Felix, of Aptong, one of the consecrators of Cæcilian, arch-bishop of Carthage, was a traditor; and as this frivolous pretence was rejected by the then pope Melchiades, and his successor Sylvester, the donatists accused the popes themselves of being traditors. Though this was an impudent, and atrocious calumny, Austin passed it unnoticed, and justified the catholic church on the general principle.

The castigatour next cites from Austin and Basil, of Seleucia, passages in which it is said that the church is founded on Peter's confession of faith. Did they exclude his person? We applaud a man's virtues, we censure his vices. Is it not the man himself whom we applaud for his virtues or censure for his vices? In common discourse we say: a man's prudence preserved him from impending danger, or his rashness exposed him to ruin. Whatever is said of Peter's confession of faith is manifestly understood of Peter himself, confessing his faith. This the castigatour, must know if he knows any thing of rhetoric, which the writer very much doubts, it is matter of surprize to hear him cite Modestus, a Monk, Abbot of the monastery of Saint Theodosia in Jerusalem,

Jerusalem, for the condemnation of popery. And, to increase our surprise, his words, as cited by the castigator, shew him to have been as arrant a papist as the writer : "the first fruits or chief of the apostles," says Modestus, "was called Peter (a rock), on account of the unshaken faith which he had in Christ the rock." In this passage we find that Peter was the *first fruits* of the apostles : a manifest allusion to that sentence of St. Paul, 1 cor. xv. 20, which, intimating that Christ is the head and chief of all the elect, and the author of the resurrection, calls him "the *first fruits* of those who rest in death) *aparche ton kokoimemenon* ;" we find also that Peter was *chief of the apostles* ; that he was called a *rock*, for the name *Peter* signifies nothing else, on account of his unshaken faith in Christ, the rock. That is, in other words that the Saviour, to reward the faith of his disciple, imposed on him a name which the scriptures elsewhere appropriate to Christ himself. What modern papist speaks of Peter's prerogative with greater energy ?

His next citation is from Pope Gregory, surnamed the Great. He forgot to inform his readers of Nova-Scotia, that this Pope Gregory, was the man, who sent Austin, a Benedictine Monk, with other Monks from the monastery of St. Andrew in Rome, to England ; that to these Monks England owes her conversion to christianity from the most blind, rather brutal, Idolatry ; that the same christianity, planted in England by the labours of these Monks, charged with all the pretended superstitions to which Papists now-a-days are addicted, was the only religion believed and taught in England from Pope Gregory's days, in the year 596, until the parliament in 1533, thought proper to transfer the pontifical authority, together with all other spiritual authority, on that new modelled pontiff Henry VIII. of reforming memory. This sketch of English history was not much to the castigator's purpose : it is an alarming reflection, that our christian ancestors, the memory and marks of whose piety are yet visible, were arrant Papists during a space of 937 years,



years, if Popery and Idolatry be synonymous, and doubly alarming to the castigator and his friends if they were in reality christians : from their graves they seem to call on their children : *redite ad cer prevaricatores.*

Gregory, as cited by the castigator, says, what no christian ever doubted, that Christ is the only rock on which the church is founded ; but Gregory does not say that Christ did not call his disciple Simon a rock ; nor does he say that the prophets and apostles, in a certain sense, are not the foundation of the church ; and St. Paul expressly says they are, Eph. ii. “ built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ himself being the great corner stone.” In the structure of the church, described by St. Paul, the faithful themselves, not their faith, nor the confession of their faith, compose the spiritual building : first Jesus Christ, then the apostles and prophets, then all their disciples united form that society, which the apostle calls the House of God: Gregory was so far from disputing Peter’s appointment, as a secondary foundation, that he asserts it in the most peremptory manner : “ to all,” says he, “ who know the gospel, it is manifest, that, by the voice of the Lord, the care of the whole church was committed to the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles : for to him is said, “ thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my church.”\*

That Gregory did himself exercise this spiritual jurisdiction, which was transmitted to him in succession, from St. Peter over the whole christian church, we have the most satisfactory evidence in his own writings, and in all the monuments of that age : in his letter to John, Bishop of Syracuse, he says : “ of the church of Constantinople who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolical See ? What our Lord the Most Pious Emperor, and our Brother Eusebius, Bishop of the same city, incessantly profess :”† in the next letter to the same Prelate : “ that” he says, “ he is subject to the Apostolical See,

if

\* Lib. 4, Epi. 37.

† Lib. 7, Ep. 63.

if any fault be found in Bishops, I do not know what Bishop is not subject to it.

The castigator did not think proper to cite from other writers on this subject : he has been extremely unlucky in his selection : perhaps those whom he suppressed would not have been so explicit in his condemnation.

The Romish church, he says, views these words as one of the principal proofs of Peter's supremacy. The writer begs leave to inform him, that if these words had been expunged from the gospel, the most unerring proof, and at the same time the most invincible proof, of Peter's supremacy would yet remain. The writer, he says, did not think proper to give them an extensive discussion in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer. True ; he did not think an extensive discussion necessary. He has now supplied he hopes to the castigator's satisfaction.

He has but to add, that the metaphorical expression *rock*, on which the church is founded, imports the unshaken stability of that mysterious edifice, and the pre-eminence of the person thus denominated : for it is the foundation which supports the weight of the building, and unites the different parts into one individual whole. The conversion of the world was effected by the joint labours of the apostles and their successors in office, each apostle was the first founder, or the foundation of the church formed by his ministry ; all these churches being integrant parts of that one great whole the catholic church, Peter was nominated, in presence of the other apostles, as that one foundation, which collects and cements all the integrant parts. Hence St. Jerom, in his first book against that apostate monk Jovinien, explaining in what sense the church is said to be built on Peter, says : the firmness of the church is solidated equally on all the apostles, yet for this, amongst the twelve, one is chosen, that the head being constituted, the occasion of schism should be removed.

After this first effort, not to refute, of that he felt the impossibility, but to perplex the truth by some garbled passages

passages from catholic writers, which in the intended sense, confounded his errors, as has been shewn, he passes to a second proof of Peter's supremacy. Suppressing in silence the peremptory reasons assigned by the writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's, p. 145. . . . to which the reader is referred, the castigator tells us that the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and loosing are synonymous: the saviour did not think so, or he would not have said to Peter, in presence of the other apostles, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and then immediately subjoin " whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. This latter sentence is not perfectly synonymous with the former: for Christ did not multiply words of the same import: it was inconsistent with his wisdom. The former sentence imports the supreme government of Christ's kingdom on earth, as the writer has shewn in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's, p. 145. . . . the latter the powers to be exercised by his ministers, of whom Peter was the first in this kingdom. That is the power of enacting laws for the good government of the different departments of his kingdom, and removing obstacles which impede its progress. A power which was vested in all the apostles after by the same words, and in this sense the keys were given not to Peter alone, nor to the apostles alone, but to them, and through them, to all bishops, their rightful successors in office, a power which they now exercise, and will continue to exercise to the end of time, though not one of them does, or ever did claim the supreme government but the rightful successor of Peter.

Thus in all well regulated kingdoms not only the supreme, but all subordinate Legislatures are vested with powers to enact laws, and enforce them within their respective jurisdictions; it is reserved to the supreme power to superintend them all. Thus, for instance, the Legislature of Halifax is vested with powers to enact laws

laws for this Province, and enforce them. It is not the less subject to the controul of the British Parliament. The power, therefore, of binding and loosing is not synonymous with the supreme government imported by the metaphor of the keys.

The writer says, the castigator was aware of this objection. True, and stated reasons which expose its vanity, he does not garble passages from others to perplex the truth : he solves difficulties by fair argument, a science, which the castigator, has yet to learn.

The reasons offered in support of Peter's supremacy are not convincing, if we believe this castigator, as a highwayman accused of robbery will not admit, that he is guilty of the offence with which he is charged, yet if the proofs be satisfactory to the court and jury, he is not the less ordered for execution. Reasons, therefore, may carry conviction, they may even impress it on the mind, but cannot force artful imposture or perverse obstinacy to acknowledge it. The man whose interest it is to perplex, not to elucidate truth, seizes with avidity on every shadow, which may serve as a subterfuge. The castigator has hitherto been unlucky, his next effort is not less so, he cites the following passage from St. Austin, in which there is not even a shadow to support his pretensions : " some things, says Austin, are spoken, which may seem properly to belong to the apostle Peter, and yet have not a clear sense but when they are referred to the church as that is, *I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*" Without a reference to the church, these words would convey no sense at all : for Christ did not promise to vest in Peter a power over that kingdom of Heaven, where he manifests himself to the angels of light, and to the departed saints : the power which he promised to give him must be exercised in his kingdom here on earth ; that is, in his church : What other kingdom had he on earth ? Nor were the keys given to Peter to be used by him exclusively : they were given to him as chief pastor of Christ's flock, and  
through

through him to all the subordinate pastors for the use of the flock, as a privilege granted by a sovereign prince to any province is given through the first magistrate, who represents the Province. This Austin intimates in the same passage as cited by the castigator, p. 44: "as some things are spoken which may seem properly to belong to Peter, and yet have not a clear sense, but when referred to the church (of which he is acknowledged to have represented the person in a figure because of the primacy, which he had among the apostles):" this parenthesis, in which St. Austin determines the genuine sense of the former sentence, not being much to the castigator's purpose, he prudently suppressed. *Peter's primacy among the apostles* has a harsh, disagreeable sound. What folly to cite it at all! Austin did not confine this primacy to Peter alone, if we believe him: "the primacy of the Apostolical See, always flourished in the Roman church.\*"

His next citation is from St. Jerome, a garbled passage, of which the most material part is suppressed, not by the castigator, for the writer does not suspect him to have read a line in the voluminous works of that celebrated writer of antiquity, but by Francowiz, surnamed Flaccus Illyricus, in his *catalogue of witnesses*. The repertory from which the castigator has filled a volume, "the church, says Jerome, is founded on all the apostles, and all have received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the firmness of the church rests upon them equally. Thus far the castigator Jerome adds: "yet for this amongst the twelve one is chosen that the head being constituted, the occasion of schism might be removed. In this we have a good specimen of Illyricus's candour in citing his witnesses.

But it surpasses effrontery to cite for the condemnation of popery a work professedly written in vindication of what new modelled ministers call popish superstitions and unprofitable austerities. Jovinian, against whom  
Jerom

\* Ep. 164.

Jerom wrote, was a monk, passed some years of his life in an austere monastery at Milan, subject to monastic rules; impatient of restraint, and desirous of indulging his appetites, he retired from Milan to Rome; to justify his apostacy, and retain some share of public confidence, he pretended that fasts and abstinence were unprofitable austerities, and as he did not confine his amusements to the pleasures of the table alone, he added that celibacy was not preferable to the married state; that the Virgin Mary did not continue a virgin after the birth of Christ, with some other extravagancies, for error knows no bounds. Against these errors St. Jerom wrote the work which the castigator, on the credit of Illyricus, cites for the condemnation of popery! *Obstupescite Cæli super hoc!*

The writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer had said: "to which of the other apostles did Christ 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?" The castigator, to shew, as he pretends, that Christ's words imports no privilege or prerogative, gives what he calls a plain statement of transactions. He introduces Satan preparing to take advantage of Christ's sufferings, and make an attack on all the apostles, "but his principal force was to be directed against Peter." Satan, therefore, thought Peter a prime leader amongst the apostles, or his principal force would not be directed against him. "Satan," he says, "might imagine that presumption and cowardice are pretty near a-kin, and might hope to depress Peter's spirits, as he had excited his arrogance." Satan, therefore, knew the critical situation of the apostles; he knew the dispositions of their minds; he was capable, by his suggestions, of exciting their arrogance and depressing their spirits. In another part of his work we find this castigator rack his imagination to shew that the angels of light know nothing of our situation in life; that they can afford us neither relief nor assistance in our necessities. Thus he

G

ascribes.

ascribes to the evil spirit a knowledge and power, which he refuses to the angels of light. Into what monstrous absurdities does the spirit of illusion lead men in support of any opinion, however ridiculous, which they once adopt ! The writer passes unnoticed the indecency of calling the indiscretion and weakness of the apostle, by which it is acknowledged that he sinned gravously, by the harsh epithets of *presumption*, *cowardice*, and *arrogance*. The enmity expressed against the apostle, in this place, and in other parts of the castigator's work, against the saints who stand before the Throne of God, is a perfect image, if not an emanation of that rancour, which the apostate angels conceived, and yet retain, against the angels of light, who persevered in truth and humble obedience to their Creator. Yet after all Christ's words were not empty sounds : they convey some idea, and if they import neither prerogative nor privilege, they convey no idea at all. The castigator does not even attempt to affix any sense to them. He endeavours to divert the minds of his readers to Satan's wiles and Peter's presumption, from which he pretends to conclude " that Christ only intended to shew the sovereignty of his grace to back-sliders by assuring Peter, that though the exercise of his faith might terminate, still as a principle it would remain in his heart." In this new-fangled comment there are as many errors as lines. Men's intentions are deduced from their words. Christ did not speak a word of the sovereignty of his grace ; nor of the exercise of Peter's faith ; but of his faith, of this he said : it will not fail : nor could it be his intention to console Peter under his misfortune, for Peter did not then foresee it : it was not yet foretold. The genuine sense of the passage is to be collected from Christ's own words : he speaks to Peter : " Simon, Simon, Satan has asked for ye, that he might sift ye as wheat." From this first sentence it appears, that Satan can exercise no cruelties, either by himself, or his emissaries, on the people of God, without a permission ; it appears also, that Satan

was

was desirous of tempting not only Peter, but all the apostles, and the whole church of God, not only then, but in all future ages. The Saviour's words, though directed to Peter, were general, and must be understood of the whole church, which Peter as its first pastor in the divine preference represented: for this is one of those expressions, which, though said of Peter, cannot convey a clear sense but when referred to the church. In the next sentence the Saviour confines his words to Peter, saying: "but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith should not fail, or be eclipsed," as it is in the original text *ekleipé*. This prayer cannot be understood of Peter's final perseverance in justice: for Christ did not pray a second time for the same thing, and he prayed for the final perseverance of all the elect of whom Peter was one—John xvii. "Holy Father preserve those in my name, whom you have given to me;" nor did he pray for Peter, as representing the whole church, because he ordered him in virtue of this privilege conferred on him to confirm his brethren, the church has no brethren, all christians are its children, the prayer of Jesus Christ must be understood of a prerogative conferred on the first pastor of his church, whose official duty it is to confirm his brethren in the faith, or as the text has it, *to fix them firmly*—*Sterixon*. And as this prerogative imports an official duty for the welfare of the church, it will continue in Peter's successors whilst christ's care of his church continues, and that will be until the end of time.

The castigator comes at length to discuss these words of the Saviour to Peter: "feed my sheep, feed my lambs." Passing in silence the invincible reasons by which the writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer, p. 144. . . . has demonstratively shewn, that these words cannot be understood in any other sense, but as constituting Peter Supreme Pastor of Christ's flock on earth, he attempts some silly evasions, which the writer now examines: "It will not be denied," says he, p. 33, "that the Greek word, which signifies to feed, denotes also to govern," but he thinks



thinks the most natural idea is to feed the sheep, not to rule them. To this the writer replies, and he is supported by the sense of mankind, that the one imports the other: that the shepherd has the power of leading the sheep to wholesome pasture; to fence their pastures against the incursions of the wolf or the bear; to confine the sheep within their own pastures, and that the sheep are obliged to obey him, are truths which no man who has any remains of reason will deny. Hence the term Pastor is used, both in sacred and profane history, to signify a Sovereign Ruler. Homer, in the second book of the Iliad, frequently calls Agamemnon the pastor of the people: Thus for instance

248.—*ōs phato neikeiōn Agamemnona poimena Laōn.—*  
Thersites.

Thus spoke, reproaching Agamemnon the pastor of nations.—Thersites.

The Lord speaking by the prophet Isaias calls that celebrated conqueror Cyrus his pastor, “who says to Cyrus my pastor, *haqmer le chores robbi*. x. L. iv, 28. The verbs to feed and to rule are promiscuously used by the sacred penmen. Thus Ps. ii. “thou shalt *rule* them with a rod of iron,” in the original; “thou shalt *feed* them.” *Theropham be Shebet barzel*. Hence the evangelist St. Matthew ii. in this passage cited from Micah 8th, “from thee shall come forth for me, a leader who will feed my people Israel,” expresses the Hebrew term *Mosheh*, which signifies a *sovereign* by the Greek terms “*Egoumenos estis poimanei*.” That is, a leader who feeds.

Though the castigator admits that the Greek term “*poimanei*” signifies to rule as well as to feed. He pretends that the Council of Trent will not admit this acceptation: “The Council,” says he, “has decreed that no person shall dare or presume to reject the Vulgate on any pretence whatsoever in disputations.” But the Council does not forbid any person to understand the Vulgate in the sense intended by the inspired writers, which the terms in

in the Vulgate express with great correctness and propriety; nor does the council forbid a recourse to the languages, in which the scriptures were originally written, to fix precisely the sense where it may not appear so clear in the Vulgate version. The council, in that decree, does not speak of the Hebrew, Syriac or Greek editions of the scriptures at all. That venerable assembly, composed of the chief pastors of Christ's church, with its first pastor at their head, directed by the spirit of wisdom, as an antidote against the contagion of error, which, like lightening, blasted so many infatuated mortals in their unhappy days, of the many latin versions then dispersed, declared one only authentic. The prelates saw, with astonishment, that, under pretence of enlightening the people, the sources of life, that is, the divine scriptures, were poisoned by an immense variety of versions agreeing in nothing but their disagreement; each new teacher, instead of correcting his opinions by the scriptures, fitting the scriptures to his preconceived opinions, and obtruding the ravings of his imagination on his deluded followers as the pure word of God. Hence the Council, after specifying the books of the old and new testament, which the catholic church holds to be canonical, and for which she answers to her children, says: "moreover, the same holy Synod, considering that it will be of no small advantage to the church of God if, of the many editions of the scriptures dispersed, that, which is authentic may be known, decrees and declares that, *that old and common edition (vulgata editio)* approved in the church by the long use of so many ages . . . . be held for authentic . . . ." Sess. 4<sup>o</sup>. This vulgate edition had been exclusively in use, in the Latin church, for many ages; in it there were no errors against faith or morality; the text was not corrupted by artifice or hypocrisy, which, under pretence of reducing religion to primitive simplicity, corrupted both the faith and morals of the incautious victims of its delusion: To prevent typographical errors, and correct these, which,

which, through the neglect of printers and transcribers, before the art of printing was known, had unavoidably crept into many copies, the council took the most wise and effectual measures. The same precautions are taken by their successors: if two copies be found different in the version, a recourse to the original shews where the error lies: thus, for instance, in some copies of the vulgate we find this passage, Jos. 5th, in the affirmative: "to whom he swore that he would shew them a land flowing with milk and honey:" in other copies, it is in the contrary sense: "to whom he swore that he would not shew them the land flowing with milk and honey;" this is the true reading: for in all the Hebrew copies the negative particle, *lebilthi*, is found.

If all the copies of the Vulgate agree, and that a material difference in sense appear between them and the present Hebrew text, it is manifest that some typographical error, or inadvertent fault of transcribers, has altered the Hebrew text. In the edition now before the writer there are sometimes forty, sometimes fifty or more, different readings marked in the same page.

Though the castigatour may not think the united wisdom of the Romish church and of all her pastors in council assembled, equal to his own, will he permit us credulous catholics to think it equal to that of the servant maid, or even of his better half, if he has not endowed her with all his mind as well as his body and worldly substance? We have even the simplicity to think the united wisdom of some hundreds of catholic prelates, assisted in their deliberations by the ablest Divines in Europe, to pass unnoticed the promised assistance of the spirit of truth, equal to that of an apostate monk in an obscure corner of Germany, or to that of any new modelled teacher in Nova-Scotia. And we cannot help admiring the extravagant vanity of the man who prefers his own private opinion to their united wisdom; and we equally admire the blind infatuation of those, who believe him, and permit themselves to be duped by such nonsense! The wisdom of the  
decree

decree, by which the council declared that version exclusively authentic, which had been approved by the test of ages, is manifest on the principles of common sense. Luther felt it, though pride would not permit him to acknowledge it: in his book against Zuinglius, of the truth of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, he said: "If the world continue longer on account of the different interpretations of the scriptures, which now are, to preserve the unity of the faith, it will be necessary that we receive the decrees of councils, and that we fly to them." In the version with which this new evangelist had enriched the world, numberless passages were disfigured to fit them to his new opinions. His additions, corrections, comments, and other corruptions of the new testament, are almost incredibly numerous: they are stated by Cochley at near one thousand. How monstrously corrupt these versions must be, of which he so bitterly complains! Yet, from these depraved versions, dignified by the name of divine scriptures, the deluded victims of the hypocrisy and profligacy of these apostate monks were to fish their faith.

Passing the Council of Trent, the castigatour finds that "Peter, in his apostolic directions to teachers in the church, makes use of the same term: 'rule the flock of God, which is among you;' from which he concludes that Christ's words to Peter afford no proof of his supremacy."\* Men who understand language in the obvious sense, draw an opposite conclusion: for what is it to *give apostolical directions to teachers in the church of God, to rule the flock which is among them*, but to extend the cares of the chief pastor to the subordinate pastors, and through them to the respective portions of the flock committed to their care. Peter did not direct them to feed the whole flock of Jesus Christ, of which they themselves composed a part, but the flock which was among them.

It is irksome to reason with a man who offers nothing like argument; who fills a pamphlet with desultory quotations, and every silly evasion, which imagination suggests

suggests : "Christ," if we believe him, "when he said to Peter, 'feed my sheep, feed my lambs, feed my sheep,' intended indirectly to reprove him for having thrice denied him ; and gave him a test for proving the sincerity of his love." On this conjecture, founded in prejudice, the flock of this new modelled pastor must rest their *faith*, or, to speak more correctly, their *no faith* ; and this is what he calls making scripture a sole and sufficient rule of faith : that the conjecture is vain, is not difficult to shew : Christ had already sufficiently reprov'd Peter by that look of mercy which brought the tears from his eyes ; and which he continued to shed occasionally to the end of his career, if ancient history tell truth ; nor was it necessary for him, who knew all things, to give a test to try the sincerity of Peter's love ; he knew it. If he had said, that he gave Peter an opportunity of shewing his humility in not presuming to prefer himself to the other apostles ; and that by exacting this profession of love, he shewed that he would not entrust the care of his flock but to the man who loved him, his comment would have been founded in truth. It was in consequence of Peter's confession of faith, that Christ promised to found his church on him, as on a solid rock ; to constitute a centre of union which cements all the different parts of that spiritual building, and unites them into one individual whole. Preparing to fulfil the promise, he exacts a profession of love, to shew, that charity is not less necessary to fit the materials for the building, than faith, whatever the spirit of illusion may pretend to the contrary.

But the words of Christ are independent on comments or conjectures : in the natural and obvious sense, the only sense in which they convey any idea at all, they vest in Peter a power of feeding the sheep and lambs, the whole of Christ's flock without restriction or reserve. The castigator, with unusual sagacity has discovered that the rams were not included, that is, he has discovered that a ram is not a sheep. Hitherto it was thought that the  
 generical

generical term *sheep*, as its correspondent to the Greek term *probaton*, signified indifferently male or female. It would appear that Christ himself thought so : twelve or thirteen several times he repeated the same term *probaton* in its different inflexions, describing his flock. John xth, and thus at length concludes, 16, “ *there will be made one flock, one shepherd* ” — “ *kai genēsetai mia poimnē eis poiēm.* ” This *one flock*, therefore was not yet formed; nor was this *one shepherd* yet appointed to conduct it. This *one promised shepherd* must of all necessity be distinct from Jesus Christ; for Jesus Christ was born a shepherd, he was then the good shepherd as he called himself repeatedly in the same chapter, or as St. Paul calls him “ *the great shepherd of the sheep* ” — “ *poimena tōn probatōn megan.* ” Heb. xiii. 20. The apostle also forgot to include the rams. It is ominous for the castigator, that this *one shepherd* promised, John xth, we find actually appointed, John xxi. and ordered to feed the flock. The castigator did not exercise his sagacity to its full extent, or he would have discovered that neither the goats nor the hogs were included. These, together with the rams, and other salacious animals, were reserved for the pastoral cares of the Wirtemberg evangelist and his associates, in whose gospel are found the indispensable precepts of propagating the human species, and indulging the pleasures of the table, as the narrow path which leads to paradise.

He cites some passages from the fathers who say that Peter by his threefold confession expunged his triple denial. What then? Does any of these fathers say that Christ did not order him to feed his flock? Many passages more, he says, might be adduced. Yes, but passages from the Alcoran or the Hanscrit would be as much to his purpose, that is, to fill a pamphlet, and persuade a credulous uninformed people that he refutes a work which is not to be refuted by argument. In his quotation from Austin he makes that venerable prelate speak nonsense intentionally to mislead: “ when Christ said to Peter, he said to all : feed my sheep.” If all are shepherds where

are the sheep? If all are to feed, who is to be fed? Thus an illiterate peasant is taught to believe that he himself is vested with the same authority to feed the flock of Christ, which the apostle received from his divine master, hence this inundation of preaching coblers, tinkers, &c. When Austin says, that Christ said to all: feed my sheep, he does not speak of all men and women indiscriminately, but of all the pastors of the church, whose official duty it is to feed their respective portions of Christ's one flock entrusted to their care. Who doubts that the power vested in Peter, and the attendant indispensable duty of exercising that power for the welfare of the flock, descends in a proportionate manner to all subordinate pastors? What power is vested in the lowest magistrate in the state but that, which is derived from the highest? If Peter was vested with powers to feed the whole flock of Jesus Christ, it was not intended that he himself should exercise these powers exclusively, but that through him they should descend to all pastors legally instituted; not to self constituted teachers, nor to teachers and pastors nominated and instituted by a cabal of farmers, of weavers and tailors, or a gossiping party of old women. There is some thing farcically ridiculous in the idea, as in a state the first magistrate is vested with full powers to govern the state, but these powers are not exercised by himself in person, they descend in proportionate shares to all subordinate officers. Austin therefore and Ambrose, whom he cites also, were justified in saying that when Christ said to Peter: *feed my sheep*, he spoke to them also; by what other authority did Ambrose govern the diocese of Milan; or Austin the diocese of Hippo, but that, which was derived from Jesus Christ through Peter and his successors? Why was it that these ancient prelates were so exact in enumerating Peter's successors in the See of Rome, whilst they passed in silence all their own predecessors in their different Sees but to shew the source of their episcopal authority? There is not a catholic bishop in the christian world,

world, who does not speak the same language with Austin and Ambrose, and point out the source of his episcopal authority in the same manner. They do now, as they did then, acknowledge the plenitude of ecclesiastical authority vested in Peter's successor of feeding not only the laity, intimated by the lambs, but also their immediate pastors, signified by the sheep, which feed their own lambs. Thus St. Ambrose, in his comment on the third chapter of the first epistle to Timothy, says: "though the whole world belong to God, yet the church is called his house, of which Damasus (the then Roman Pontiff) is this day the ruler."

And in his funeral oration on his brother Satyrus he says of him: "he asked the bishop if he agreed with catholic bishops, that is, with the Roman church."

To the many testimonies adduced from Austin, the writer adds one more, to shew not the vanity but the effrontery of the scribbler who cites him for the condemnation of popery. "The primacy of the apostolical See always flourished in the Roman church.\*"

See the testimonies of ancient writers with the writer's reasoning on the subject in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's, p. 176 . . . . . 206, which the castigator very prudently passes unnoticed.

After remarking the *novelty* of the writer's doctrine, a doctrine which protestants acknowledge to have been universal at least one thousand years before Luther was born, and which the writer has shewn to be coeval with christianity, the castigator passes to the council of Jerusalem. From Peter's words, in the council, he pretends that no conclusion in favour of his supremacy can be drawn. It is not from Peter's words, in that council, or from the acts of the council, that catholics shew Peter's supremacy, but from the words of Christ, John xxi. which constitute him supreme pastor of Christ's flock; however, from Peter's words, in the council, combined with

\* Aug. Ep. 162:



with other circumstances, such strong presumptive evidence is drawn as baffle all efforts at evasion : for if it be true, as Peter says, that God chose him among the apostles, that from his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word and believe, Acts xv, it is therefore true that he was the first pastor of the Gentiles ; and if it be true, as St. Paul says, Gal. i. 7, that the gospel of the circumcision, that is of the Jews, was entrusted to him, he was therefore first pastor of the Jews. Hence it manifestly follows, that he was that one shepherd appointed to conduct that one flock composed of Jews and Gentiles, as Christ had promised, John xth. When after speaking of his sheep then in the Jewish fold, he said : “ I have other sheep, which are not of this fold, and these I must bring home, and these will be made one flock and one shepherd.” The castigator in his next essay will recollect that conclusive reasoning is not invalidated by tales of St. Anthony’s preaching to fishes. He has enriched the world with a new comment on the acts of the council. The writer had said, in his remarks on Doctor Stanser, that the council adopted the decision of Peter, to which the castigator replies : “ it happened to be the decision of James which the council followed,” p. 40. This spirit of divination, which he invariably consults, has most grossly imposed on the innocent man’s credulity, it sports with his imagination, suggests a contradiction in a few lines : “ Peter had,” he says, “ declared his opinion that it was wrong to subject these converts to the ceremonial law.” What ! Peter had already decided the question before James had spoken at all, and it was not his decision that was followed ! What nonsense ! “ However,” continues the castigator, “ James thought.” Did James think that Peter was in error, and that the Gentile converts were obliged to observe the ceremonial law ? In St. Luke’s relation, we find no contradiction : Peter did not offer an opinion. This castigator does not know the force of the term *opinion*. That apostle had shewn, by unquestionable authority, that converts

from

from the heathen superstition, were not obliged to observe the ceremonial law. Thus St. Luke relates the transaction, Acts xv, "After a great discussion had been made, Peter rose *and* said to them: men, brethren, you know that, from former days, God chose among you, that by my mouth, the nations should hear the word of the Gospel and believe; and God, the searcher of hearts, testified to them, giving to them the Holy Ghost, as to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore, why do you tempt God to impose a yoke on the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we could bear, but by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we believe to be saved in the same manner as they." If this be not the decision which the council followed, the christian world has been hitherto deceived. James was so far from contradicting Peter, that after hearing Paul and Barnaby relate the signs and prodigies, which God wrought by them amongst the Gentiles, he proceeds to shew that Peter's decision was authorised by the prophets: "after they ceased to speak, James answered, saying: men, brethren, hear me: Simon has shewn how God first visited; to take from the nations a people to his name, the words of the prophets agree with him" . . . after citing some passages from the prophetic writings, he concludes by saying, as Peter did before: "wherefore I judge that they who are converted from the Gentiles be not disturbed:" here ends the decision of the question proposed, that is, whether converts from the heathen rites were obliged to observe the Jewish ceremonial law, or not. James then proposed to enact a law, which this castigat<sup>or</sup> ignorantly confounds with the decision of the question of faith, and most injudiciously mentions: it strikes at the vitals of the pretended reformation: it is well known that the authority of any one of the apostles was more than sufficient to decide the question: doctrines of greater moment and more difficult discussion are believed on the authority.

rity of an apostle. If therefore the apostles assembled in council for the decision of this question, it was to authorize by their example an authentic form, and infallible rule, for the decision of such questions in future ages. A form which is yet observed, a rule by which the innovations of pharisaical Reformists have been suppressed; a rule so indispensably necessary to preserve the unity of faith, that modern Reformists, in opposition to their fundamental principle, have adopted it. When Arminius thought proper to reform the doctrine of Calvin, on the absolute decree of perdition, at which reason revolts, and human nature shudders; and Gomar, professor of theology at Leyden, strictly a Calvinist, had published a thesis against him, in which Calvin's doctrine is stated in these terms: "it is ordered by an eternal decree of God that amongst men some should be saved and others damned," the preachers on both sides inflamed the minds of the people; from words the people came to blows, a civil war was threatened. The English Ambassador represented to the States General that such a division might endanger the safety of the Republic; that the decision of such a question did not belong to the magistrates, who had already interposed their authority without effect; but to a National Council, who would decide which of these opinions was consistent with the word of God. A Synod was assembled at Dordrecht, composed of deputies from all the churches in Europe, reformed according to Calvin's plan, these of France excepted. In 1618, 1619, Calvin's doctrine of the absolute decree of perdition was confirmed, to the no small astonishment of Europe, and terror of all good men, an excommunication was issued, of a most malignant nature, against the Arminians, of which the celebrated Barneveldt, and many other Arminians of note, were the unhappy victims. It is remarkable in this Synod that, to silence the Arminians, or Remonstrants, as they were called, who appealed to the fundamental principle of the Reformation, in opposition to the authority of the Synod,

the

the pastors composing the Synod claimed to themselves that infallibility of decision, which they refused to the catholic church, and on the very same principle by which it was claimed, that is, on the promise of Christ to his church, they say: "that Christ, who had promised to his apostles the spirit of truth, had also promised to his church to be always with her," hence they conclude, "that when pastors from many countries are assembled to decide according to the word of God, it is necessary to teach in the churches that it must be believed with a firm confidence that Jesus Christ would be with them according to his promise." This doctrine was borrowed from the Synod of Delpht, and confirmed in that of Dordrecht.\*

From the authentic doctrine of the reformed churches we may learn, not only the necessity, but the infallibility, of this rule prescribed by the apostles for the decision of questions of faith; but the rule is not confined merely to controverted doctrines: for as the apostles assembled, acting as the pastors of Christ's church, did by their ecclesiastical authority enact a law prudentially necessary, considering the circumstances of time and place, and oblige all the faithful to observe it; it follows, without a contradiction, that their successors in office are vested with the same powers of enacting laws prudentially necessary: another consequence more terrible to all Reformists. This law, enacted by the apostles, was strictly a law of abstinence: the Council ordered the faithful to abstain from the flesh of animals suffocated; from blood, and from meats offered to idols. The apostles therefore thought that it was lawful to abstain from meats, which are good in themselves: for all God's creatures are good; they not only thought it lawful, but by a positive law ordered it to be done. This doctrine sounds harshly in the ears of a new-modelled teacher. What! Deprive the saints of the enjoyments of the table! Oblige them to abstain from the good things

\* Act. Dor. p. 66.

things of this world ! They will all turn papists, for the source and fundamental principle of all reformati-  
 ons, whether in Church or State, is *Liberty*, that is, eman-  
 cipation from restraints. However, in this mortifying  
 decree, the castigator found something to his purpose :  
 “ that they abstain from the pollutions of images.” It is  
 rather unfortunate that these *pollutions of images* are only  
 found in his own polluted imagination. There is  
 no such thing in the decree ; “ *τὴν ἀπέχου τῶν ἀπο τῶν  
 εἰδωλῶν τῶν εἰδωλῶν, to abstain from the defilements of idols*,  
 which can signify nothing else but to abstain from things  
 defiled by being offered or consecrated to idols. Where  
 has this castigator found that idol and image are syno-  
 nimous ? How has he discovered what no lexicogra-  
 pher ever knew before, that *Eidolon* and *Eikon* are of the  
 same import ? Was Cæsar’s image on the piece of money  
 shewn to Christ, an idol ? The Jews did not think so. Is  
 the King’s picture on our current coin an idol ? Thus  
 the man sports with the credulity of his readers : under  
 pretence of giving them the pure word of God, which  
 he unblushingly falsifies, he gives them his own idle  
 conceit.

Doctor Stanfer, in his Examination, had cited a pas-  
 sage from Peter’s first epistle, to shew that the apostle  
 did not pretend to any jurisdiction ; the writer, in re-  
 ply, had said : “ that it was, perhaps, the first time the  
 actual exercise of a man’s official duty was adduced, as an  
 authority against his jurisdiction, shewing at the same  
 time, that the passage did not bear the sense affixed to  
 it by Doctor Stanfer.” It is difficult to determine whe-  
 ther supine ignorance or perverse obstinacy be the lead-  
 ing feature of the castigator’s pretended refutation : the  
 apostle’s letter was not, he says, addressed to the episco-  
 pal pastors, as this writer had said, but to the church.  
 He has not told us whether it was to the walls, the sex-  
 ton’s wife, or the parson’s wife ; but the letter was ad-  
 dressed to some thing, or some body, which he calls a  
 church. If he had consulted common sense, it would  
 have

have told him that a letter, containing instructions for any society, is addressed to the president of that society, by whom its contents are communicated to all the members; that a circular letter from any bishop to his diocesis is addressed to the parsons, not to the parsons' wives, or the sextons; but common sense and this castigatory spirit of divination are irreconcilable enemies. If the apostle's letter was not addressed to the episcopal pastors, who are these "*Presbyteroi Episcopountes*" whom the apostle exhorts to feed the flock, which was amongst them? Were they the parsons' wives.

The writer had translated "*katakurieuontes tōn kleron,*" *domineering over the clergy*, this version the castigator thinks incorrect; to justify his opinion he adduces some passages in which the Greek term "*kleros,*" *a lot*, is taken in its proper signification; his knowledge of the language must be confined indeed, who does not know that "*kleros,*" in its common acceptation, signifies *a lot*; but he must be ignorant as the castigator, who does not know that it is sometimes used in scripture to signify a *portion of inheritance*, because an inheritance was frequently parcelled out by lot. Thus, Col. i. 12, giving thanks to God and the Father, who has made us worthy of a share of the inheritance of the saints in light, "*tou klerou tōn āgion,*" and hence it has been used both by Greeks and Latins, since the apostles days, to signify the clergy, as that portion of Christ's inheritance more immediately consecrated to his service: ignorance itself can hardly mistake that from the Greek term *kleros*, we have the Latin *clerus* and *clericus*, and the English *clergy* and *clerk*. That *cleros* cannot be understood to signify a lot in the passage adduced, is manifest, for no man can be said to domineer over a lot: a bishop may domineer over his clergy, or even over the laity, but not over an inanimate being.

The writer translates the Greek term "*kleron,*" *clergy*; this, says the castigator, is an extraneous meaning, for which the writer's only authority is the vulgate, and

that version puts in the mouth of the apostle, a language which he never expressed, p. 48. To pass unnoticed the vanity of presuming to write on ecclesiastical matters without knowing the terms in use amongst ecclesiastical writers, and the extravagance of an ignorant individual, who boldly censures a version consecrated by the use and approbation of all the pastors of the Latin church during a space of at least one thousand years before the Reformation was thought of; admire the man's folly: the vulgate in this place, so far from putting language in the apostle's mouth, which he did not speak, uses the original term *kléron*, giving it a Latin termination *cleris*."

He desires the writer to produce a parallel in the septuagint, the new-testament, or any hellenistic writing. The writer knows no hellenistic writing in plain English: it would be a curious phenomenon; but that the Greek term *kléros*, the Latin *clerus*, and the English *clergy*, have been in common use to contradistinguish the ministers of the church from the Greek *laos*, the Latin *laicus*, and the English *laity*, is what every school boy knows; and if the castigator does not know it, it is because he knows nothing of the matter; he ought therefore to remember the old adage *ne sutor ultra crepidinem*. Though he may not find *clericus* to signify a clergyman in the writings of Pindar, Anacreon, Sappho, or any other heathen poet, there is nothing more common in the writings of the Greek fathers: there is now before the writer a profession of faith, sent by Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, to St. Basil; he says that he subscribed it in presence of the brethren Phorton and the the rural dean Seurod, and other clergymen.

*Ego Eustathius Episcopus sibi Basileo anagnous egnōrīsa kai sunēnesa tois progegrammenois de sumparontōn moi tōn adelphōn ēmeterou phortonos kai tou Chorepiscopou deourou kai tonon allin Clericōn, inter Op. Bas.*

Calvin, the most imperious of ministers, severely censured the distinction between the clergy and the laity; but he did not presume to say that it was not of ancient date;

date ; in his comment on the vth of Peter's first epistle, in which this offensive term *Klerōn* is found : " I wish" he says, " that it never came into the fathers' heads to use this word ;" however, we find this distinction in use, and the ministers of the church signified by *klēros* and *clerus* in the primitive church, and our fathers called them in plain English, clerks or clergy.

Origen, one of the first christian writers after the apostles, whose works are extant, says, in his 7th homily on the xii. of Jeremiah : " We, who are thought to be something, that is, who in the order of clergy preside over you, so that some from a lower rank desire to ascend to this place ; you ought to know, that we are not immediately to be saved because we are clergymen, (Clerici) for many priests perish, and many laymen are most blessed : " and Tertullien, Lib. demono. says : " When we are elated and puffed up against the clergy," *adversus clerum*, " then we are all one, then we are all priests." It was pride, in this very early writer's opinion, which levelled the distinction between the clergy and the laity.

That most ancient and venerable Council of Nice, in the twenty canons, yet extant and authentic, speak of the ministers of the church, by the name clergy : i. if any clerk, iii. if any clerk or layman be suspended from the communion,—xv. If any priest or deacon, or any one of the number of the clerks "*Clericorum* ;" at that time there were bishops, the council was composed of them ; there were priests and deacons, and clerks in minor orders, it was then the christian church ; is it a christian church in which they are not ? Finally by *klērōn* in the text must be understood *clergy* or *clerks*, for it bears no other signification : it cannot be *lots* we have shewn it already ; it cannot be understood of all christians or the whole inheritance of Christ, as Calvin pretends : for the inheritance of Christ is one, and *klērōn* signifies many. Peter had already recommended to their care that portion of the inheritance of Christ, "*the flock*," over which they presided,



“to en *úmin* *potimnion* ;” lest they should be tempted to domineer over the clerks, or clergy, as being more immediately subject to their authority, he strictly forbids it.

The distinction between the clergy and the laity in the Jewish dispensation was well ascertained, see the terrific punishment inflicted on the usurpers of the priesthood, Core, Dathan, and Abiram, with their partisans, Numbers, xvi. 33. Has this castigator ever bestowed a serious thought on it? Or does he think the Christian priesthood less venerable than the Jewish?

St. Paul has given similar instructions to the pastors, Acts xx. From these the castigator says, no argument can be drawn in favor of Paul’s supremacy. No. Nor against it; it argues his apostolical authority. It is not from Peter’s epistles that the writer concludes with unerring certainty, but from the words of Christ, related by John xxi, Simon, son of John, . . . feed my lambs, feed my sheep. . . . His reasoning on Peter’s epistle exposed the absurdity of drawing an argument from that epistle against his supremacy. The argument simplified might be conceived in these terms; Peter directed the pastors of some Asiatic churches to feed the flock of Christ among them; therefore he was not the chief pastor of Christ’s church. *Risum teneatis*. Such are the invincible arguments, by which these profound dialecticians refute Peter’s claim to supremacy! As this is an article of their faith, and scripture their sole rule, would they condescend to point out some passage in the old or new testament, which says that Peter was not chief pastor? That Christ did not entrust the care of his flock to him?

The castigator, in translating St. Paul’s instruction, forgot to translate the Greek term “*episcopous*,” *overseers*, in the true canting dialect, and inadvertently informed his congregation, to whom the word *bishop* is offensive, that there were bishops in Paul’s time, whom the Holy Ghost had appointed to feed the church of God. As the

the sun at times appears through the thickest cloud, so truth forces its way through all the artifices which are used to conceal it.

Closing this chapter, the castigator says that Peter was represented as active in the management of the church, yet Paul did not suppose him possessed of any supremacy. He classes him with James and John. If the castigator had read the work which he pretends to refute, he would have seen that Paul says of Peter, that the ministry of the circumcision, of which Christ himself had been on earth the minister, was entrusted to him; he does not say so of James or John, they, Paul himself, and all his fellow apostles, were of the circumcision, and consequently of Peter's flock—see Remarks, p. 169. . . . He also condescends to admit that Peter was called *chief or prince* of the apostles by some of the fathers; but it is evident, if we believe him, that they did not intend to ascribe to him any supremacy, they meant these titles as tokens of respect which they imagined due to his character, p. 44. They therefore thought him possessed of the character of *prince or chief* of the apostles; but possessed of no superior authority or supremacy! The writer is not disposed to refute rank nonsense, he cites a passage from St. Austin, in which, by the bye, Peter is neither called chief of the apostles nor prince of the apostles, but is said to possess the primacy among the apostles. "As some things, says Austin, are spoken which may seem properly to belong to the apostle Peter, and yet have not a clear sense but when referred to the church (of which he is acknowledged to have represented the person because of the primacy, which he had among the apostles) as that is: I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven and if there be any like, so Judas sustains after a certain manner the person of the Jews the enemies of Christ."\* Who could imagine that Austin did not intend to say that Peter possessed the *primacy* among the apostles,

poetles, if this castigator had not discovered it? How did he make this wonderful discovery? Why Austin says that Judas after a certain manner represented the Jews. Yes, but he did not say that Judas represented the Jews *because of the primacy of which he had among them*: he knew of no such primacy vested in Judas, nor does the writer, if you except the primacy of his apostacy. He represented the Jews as a wicked man represents others equally wicked. We say of a traitor, he is a Judas, of a tyrant, he is a Nero; of an epicurean monk, he is a Luther. Peter Damien calls Judas: "the head of apostates," if the castigator thinks proper to acknowledge him, the writer has no objection.

Austin was neither ignorant nor impious: he never denied nor doubted the literal and historical truth of these passages, in which, he says that many things are said of Peter; but, supposing, as a principle universally known, that Peter was under Christ, head of the visible church, or as he terms it, in one place, possessed of the *primacy among the apostles*; and in another, possessing the *primacy of the apostleship*,\* he thought these things were more clearly understood of him as representing the ministers of the church, whom he calls the church at times, as we do this day, than without any reference to the church, thus, he says, speaking of the keys, or the power of binding and loosing promised to Peter: "*if this was said to Peter only, the church does not do it; if this be done in the church Peter when he received the keys signified the holy church.*"† He thus demonstrates that the powers vested in Peter as first minister of the church are derived from him to the subordinate ministers. In like manner he thought that some things in the cviii. psalm, from which Peter had cited a passage to shew that Judas's episcopal dignity must be given to another, Acts ii. Though they may seem to be literally said of Judas, are more clearly understood of the Jews, the enemies of Christ, whom he in some manner represented.

The

\* Tract. ult. in Joan. † Tract. 50, in Joan.

The castigator's third chapter opens with unusual confidence. "I have shewn," says he, "that the apostle Peter possessed no such authority in the church, therefore the Pope's claims must be without foundation." Facts are proved by witnesses; rights by immemorial possession or authentic instruments. *No facts* admit no proofs; *no rights* are incapable of proof. This castigator, in opposition to an axiom of law and logic, has proved a negative. This pretended proof consists in transcribing some passages, which Illyricus had garbled from the writings of the fathers, and endeavoured to distort to his purpose. These passages, in the intended sense, the writer has shewn irrelative, or condemning the castigator, and cited, from the authentic writings of the same fathers, passages, in which they speak of Peter's supremacy, and that of his successors, in terms as precise, and as clear, as language furnishes.

Illyricus's artifice was immediately detected by catholic writers, and many well meaning men, who had been duped by the imposture, were undeceived and instantly withdrew that confidence, which they had unwarily and almost implicitly given to men, who had recourse to every art and artifice, which the spirit of darkness suggests, to substitute their new opinions to the settled truths of religion, in order to form a party devoted to themselves; a measure indispensibly necessary, not only to gratify their predominant passions: ambition, interest, and sensuality; but also to efface, or at least extenuate the shame of their apostacy in the public opinion, and justify that voluptuous licentiousness to which they abandoned themselves.

This castigator seems to know nothing of them profligate Monks, the first pretended reformers, and the turbulent times in which they lived, but what he has learnt from themselves or their echos, Illyricus, Bower, Jortin and Mosheim. What he gleans from these sources of error, he advances with unblushing confidence, not knowing that the artifices of these men have been detected;

ted; and their errors refuted in all the known languages in Europe, many years before his birth.

The Roman Pontiff's claims to supremacy are justified not only by immemorial possession; that invincible proof of right, but also by the most authentic instrument on record. Before the reformers withdrew their obedience they ought to have shewn, by positive proofs, that this possession was commenced in fraud or force, and the title defective. Instead of proof they have offered some wild conjectures, but conjectures are not proofs, they are not admissible in opposition to any existing right in possession, whether the right be originally well or ill founded. Hence it manifestly follows that the first Reformers were guilty of unjustifiable schism, which no lapse of time can authorise or efface. To prove that the Pontiffs jurisdiction had commenced in fraud or violence, the commencement must be assigned, the time, place and person; on all these circumstances, indispensably necessary to support any thing like proof, even conjecture fails.

Some think this jurisdiction was conferred by the apostles. In support of this conjecture they cite from the epistles of Anacletus and Julius; the former says: "the other apostles received honor and power by a like fellowship with him (Peter) and willed him to be their chief," Ep. 2. The other, speaking of the apostles, says: "they willed the holy Roman church to have the primacy of all churches," Ep. 3. But these pontiffs only speak of the apostles approbation of the primacy, not of its institution, that is of Divine appointment. The apostles did not order Peter to feed Christ's flock, that order was from Christ himself. It is true the primacy of the Roman See, or rather the indisputable proof of that primacy rests on the fact of Peter's governing that See in person, and finishing his mortal career there: "it was he who elevated this See, in which he deigned to rest, and finish the present life."\*

Nilus

\* Græc. Lib. 6, Epi. 37, ad Eulogiam.

Nilus, a Greek writer of the fourteenth century, whose opinion Illyricus, and his echo, this castigator, adopt, pretends that the pope's jurisdiction over the universal church was derived from some General Council. In support of this conjecture he cites the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon, in which it is said: "the Fathers justly attributed to the throne of old Rome privileges, because it was the reigning city, and for the same reason the 150 bishops, (i. Const.) judged that new Rome, (Constantinople) which is honored by the Empire and the Senate, should have like privileges in the ecclesiastical order, and be the second after it." It is remarkable of this canon that it was introduced in the absence of the presiding legates and the officers of the empire, by a cabal, and was severely censured, and a protest entered against it, by the legates on their return. It was also condemned by Leo himself in his letters to Anatolius, to the emperor Martianus, the empress Pulcheria, and to Maxima and Juvenal, Epis. 51 . . . . The canon is self-condemned: for there is no General Council, which establishes the primacy or jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff: the Council of Nice, canon 6, says "let the old custom continue, which is in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria have power over them, because this is customary with the bishop of Rome; in like manner for Antioch, and the other Provinces, let their honor be preserved to each." This canon gives no precedence nor jurisdiction to any prelate: it declares the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to be already in possession of an extensive jurisdiction, and assigns the reason why the patriarch of Alexandria exercised a jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis: because that was customary with the bishop of Rome—see Remarks, p. 192. Antiquity knew no patriarch of Constantinople. His first claim was founded on a canon of the Council of Constantinople in the year 381. As this Council was celebrated by some Eastern prelates, without the concurrence of the Western bishops, though

afterwards accepted by them as to the decision of faith, the canon, if it be genuine, which is doubtful, because it was never presented to Damasus, the then Roman pontiff, nor to his successor, Siricius, nor known to the Western prelates, could have no force. This Anatolius must have known. To give the canon of Constantinople effect, he, with Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, after the dissolution of the Council of Chalcedon, headed a party of some prelates, and continued some sessions. In the last of these, the 16th session this 28th canon was formed, in the absence of the pope's legates and the officers of the empire. On their return the legates pressed the party to suppress the canon, but could not prevail on them to do it: they have, said Lucenius, one of the legates, passed in silence the canons of the 318 Fathers (in Nice) and mentioned but those of the 150 (in Const.) which are not amongst the canons of the church, and which were made as they say about eighty years ago. To this Anatolius, and his party, made no reply. It is, therefore, true that he himself thought that canon of no force: "If, during that time," continued Lucenius, "they enjoyed these privileges, why do they ask them now? And if they never enjoyed them, why do they ask them?" To this reasoning no reply was made; the truth is, no reply could be made.

Aetius, arch-deacon of the church of Constantinople, desired to know if the legates had any orders from the Pope on that subject: the Priest Boniface read this order from Leo: "Do not suffer the ordinance of the fathers to be infringed or diminished . . ." The magistrates said let the canons be produced . . . Paschasius read the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, beginning with these words: "The Roman Church had always the primacy. Let the old custom continue," &c. In the copy produced by Aetius, these words—"the Roman Church had always the primacy"—did not appear: they would have ruined his cause before the magistrates, from whose influence over the bishops he expected a favorable decision; but he did not presume to say

say that Pachasinus's copy was incorrect, nor did any of his party. The same words are found in many manuscripts, and in some the title of the canon : *Of the primacy of the Roman Church, and of the Bishops of other Cities*—see Pouget. Constantine, the Emperor's Secretary, read from the copy produced by Aetius the sixth of Nice, and also the canon of the Council of Constantinople, on which Anatolius founded his claim. After some altercation the magistrates said : “ from what has been said and done we see first that the primacy and prerogative of honor must be preserved according to the canons, to the archbishop of old Rome, and that the bishop of Constantinople is to have like privileges, that he may have a right to ordain metropolitans in the districts of Asia, of Pontus and of Thrace.” This judgment of the magistrates damns their memory : for there was no canon produced which gave the primacy or prerogative of honor to the Roman Pontiff. This therefore was a flagrant falsehood : in the canon of Nice, as read from the copy produced by Aetius, there was nothing adjudged to the Roman See ; but its provincial jurisdiction was made a rule for the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and in the Council of Sardica, to which they seem to allude, though its canons were not produced, it was only determined that appeals in what is called *chief causes* should be carried to Rome in reverence to Peter's monument. This was not giving a primacy, but, on account of primacy, acknowledging a tribunal in the last resort. Again the Council of Nice had declared that the jurisdiction and rank of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch should be continued, and as this was confessedly a General Council, and its canons universally known and approved, the canon of the subsequent Council of Constantinople, neither known nor approved, could not deprive them of their rank and jurisdiction, this, therefore, was a manifest injustice. Hence, these conscientious magistrates, under pretence of judging according to the law, pronounced a sentence in direct opposition to the law.

We



We know, from writers on the subject, that the General Council of Chalcedon was closed at the 6th session, when the prelates had subscribed the definition of faith, and then prayed the Emperor to dismiss them. They were delayed for some few days by the Emperor's orders, and a party formed by Anatolius, who, courtier like, made the Emperor's power and influence the instrument of his ambition. Some sessions were held on different subjects, in the last of these, the 16th action, which was exclusively composed of Anatolius's partisans, as appears from the subscribers being but 145 in number, though the Council consisted of 520, as they themselves attest, this 28th canon was enacted. That this was done through the influence of the Court, is manifest from their letter to Leo, in which, after acknowledging him to be their head, and the guardian of the vineyard appointed by Christ, see Remarks, p. 194, praying him to confirm this decree, they shift the scene, they talk of imperial solicitations, that they adjudge no right, that they only confirm an established custom: "we make known to you," say they, "that we have regulated some other things for the establishment of good order and the firmness of the laws, persuaded that your Holiness, when informed, will approve and confirm them. We have authorised, by a sentence of this Synod, the old custom of the holy church of Constantinople, to ordain the metropolitans of the districts of Asia, of Pontus, and of Thrace: not so much for the advantage of the See of Constantinople, as for the peace of those metropolitanical Sees, where tumults frequently happen after the death of bishops; the clergy and the people having no head, which your Holiness must know, as having been often importuned, principally on account of the church of Ephesus.

"We have also confirmed the canon of the 150 fathers, assembled at Constantinople by the great Theodosius, which orders, that the bishop of Constantinople *shall have the prerogative after your See*; persuaded that you, who

who generously enrich others with your own, will continue your cares of the See of Constantinople, and extend to it the splendour of your apostolical power. It is true your legates have strenuously resisted this decree; but they intended, no doubt, to leave you the honor of it; that the preservation of peace, as well as of the faith, might be ascribed to you. We have done this in compliance to the emperor, the senate, and the imperial city; we pray you therefore to honor our judgment with your suffrage, and to accomplish the just desires of your children . . . . you will do nothing more pleasing to the Emperor, who has established your judgment as a law; and the See of Constantinople will, upon every occasion, shew its gratitude by its union and zeal."

The Emperor Martianus, or Marcien, the Empress Pulcherica, and Anatolius himself, wrote to the Pope, praying him to authorise the decree in favor of the See of Constantinople. Though the primacy of the Roman See was acknowledged, and no encroachment made on its jurisdiction, yet Leo, whose conscience was not influenced by political views, could not be prevailed upon to sacrifice the rights of Alexandria and Antioch, to the ambitious intrigues of Constantinople. He replied as became the common father of the Christian world: "Anatolius," said he, "ought to rest satisfied that I listened to mercy rather than to justice, in approving his irregular ordination." This intriguing prelate had been ordained bishop of Constantinople, by Dioscorus, of infamous memory, after the pretended deposition of Flavien, a most pious and orthodox prelate, and he himself had ordained Maximus bishop of Antioch, in place of Domnus, unjustly deposed; through love of peace Leo had dissembled the irregularity of these ordinations, "this indulgence," continued the pontiff, "ought to make Anatolius modest rather than ambitious; he ought to imitate the humility of Flavien, his predecessor, and not found a claim on the consent, which he extorted from some of his brethren, which can be of no force against

gainst the canons, principally against those of Nice, the authority of which is everlasting and inviolable, and cannot be abrogated by any other Council, however so numerous. The city of Constantinople has its privileges but they are temporal; it is the royal city, but it cannot become an Apostolical See; the privileges of the churches, established by the canons, cannot be annulled, nor the authority of so many metropolitans cancelled, to satisfy the ambition of one man. Alexandria ought not to lose the second rank on account of the personal crime of Dioscorus, nor Antioch the third. About sixty years this violence has been suffered, but the bishops of Constantinople have never sent this pretended canon, which they alledge, to the Holy See.\*

The reason assigned in this pretended canon of Constantinople is sufficient to condemn it: for if, as that canon says, privileges had been conferred on Rome because it was the imperial city; they ought to have been transferred to Constantinople, which was then, and long before, the seat of empire; or as Gelasius, in his letter to the bishops of Dardania, said Milan, and Treves, and Nicomedia, had been imperial cities, yet no primacy was conferred on them, and what is conclusive against Nilus and his associates, these very prelates who give the second rank to the See of Constantinople because it is the imperial city, acknowledge Leo to be the successor and representative, not of the Roman emperor, but of the Roman pontiff Peter, who never pretended to any imperial power or dignity. Nor could the intrigues of the bishops of Constantinople, supported by the wealth and power of the emperors, obtain for them, from any Council, but the second place. No patriarch ever pretended to be superior to the Roman pontiff, until the Reformation gave us popes in every village. So true it is, as Gelasius that venerable and learned pontiff says in his Council of seventy bishops, so well known to antiquity, that “the Holy Roman Church was not made superior

to

\* Leo. Ep. 78, *alias* 54, 79, a. 55, 80.

to other churches by synodical constitutions, but by the evangelical voice of our Lord and Saviour it obtained the primacy."

It is, notwithstanding, true that the Roman church may be said in a certain sense to have obtained authority from Councils, because they have declared her authority and privileges, as we say that the Council of Nice declared the Son to be equal to the Father, in opposition to the Arian pretension. Thus Nicolas I. in his letter to the Emperor Michael, says: "these privileges were given to this church by Christ; they were not given by Synods; but they were celebrated and honored by them." . . . .

Calvin, Illyricus, and the century writers, discover another source of the pontifical jurisdiction over the Greeks, in a law of the emperor Phocas, in the beginning of the 7th century; and over the French and Germans in the concession of Pepin, king of France: but we have seen the Council of Chalcedon acknowledge this jurisdiction in the year 452, more than a century before Phocas was born; and we found it inserted as an imperial law by Justinian, to whom Phocas was fourth in succession—see Novella 100, *alias*, 131: we found it acknowledged in the Councils of Nice, of Ephesus, of Constantinople; and exercised before and after these Councils were assembled—see Remarks, p. 191 . . . 206. It is true that Phocas published a law, by which he declared the Roman church head of all churches, but it was to suppress, by the civil power, the ambition of the bishops of Constantinople, who, at that time, had assumed the stile of *universal bishop*. *Bede. de 6.*

When Calvin says that, Pepin and pope Zachary, had combined to rob Childeric of his kingdom, and then, like two thieves, to divide the spoils, the one to have the temporal, and the other the spiritual, jurisdiction over the French, he contradicts all writers on the subject, and advances falsehoods as inconsistent with each other as they are with truth: for if it be true, as he says, that

that Zachary did authorise the French to transfer their allegiance from Childeric to Pépin, it is therefore true that he did then exercise a spiritual jurisdiction over the French, and consequently false that he received it after from Pépin. The fact, as related by all historians of the time, is, that the Nobles, desirous of conferring the name of King on Pepin, who exercised the regal power under that idiot Childeric III, consulted the pope on the subject, who replied: "that order required that he who possessed the power should have also the name of King," and Pepin was crowned by Boniface, archbishop of Mayance, whom we know to have been then and long before the pope's legate in France. His letters to pope Zachary, consulting him on many points of doctrine and discipline, together with that pontiff's answers, are yet in being. The venerable Bede, an English writer who lived a century before Pepin, says of Gregory the Great, that he exercised the pontifical power in the whole world;\* and Gregory himself, who lived a century before Bede, in his letter appointing Virgil, bishop of Arles, his legate to preside over all the bishops of France, orders him to refer the judgment in chief causes to the Apostolical See.†

Leo, who preceded Gregory a century and an half, in his letter to the French bishops, says: "you will acknowledge with us that the Apostolical See has been consulted in innumerable instances by the priests of your Province, and, according to appeals in different causes, judgments have been quashed or confirmed."‡

Cyprian, who preceded Leo a century and an half, in his letter to the Roman pontiff Stephen, prayed him to have Marcien, bishop of Arles, deposed, and a successor elected to fill that See. The pope therefore exercised his spiritual jurisdiction in France, in Cyprian's days, that is, in the year of Christ 254, when this letter was written. Seventy years before the Council of Nice, the first General Council, was assembled, it was not there-  
fore

\* Hist. An. Lib. 2, cap. 1. † Lib. 4, Epi. 52. ‡ Leo. Ep. 89, ad. Ep. Gal.

fore, from general Councils that the pope received this power. Marcien had adopted the opinion of Novatien, a celebrated reformist of the time, and refused to admit to penance those, who intimidated in persecution, had either sacrificed to idols, or purchased certificates. This unwarranted rigour produced nothing but despair; Faustin, bishop of Lyons, wrote to Stephen on the subject; he wrote also to Cyprian, arch-bishop of Carthage, who was consulted as an oracle, and in point of science superior to Stephen, but having no jurisdiction in France, Cyprian wrote to Stephen and prayed him instantly to send strong letters to the French bishops and to the people of Arles, that Marcien might be deposed, and a successor elected, whom you will make known to us, said he, that we may know to whom we may write and address our brethren.\* *Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelatæ consistertem a te litteræ quibus absente Marciano alius in locum ejus substituat. Calvin,* whose imagination always discovered, even in truth, something to countenance his errors, concludes from Cyprian's letter that Stephen exercised no jurisdiction in France. "If," says he, "Cyprian thought that Stephen presided over Gaul, would he not say: restrain them, they are your's; but he speaks far otherwise, this, he says, the fraternal society by which we are bound requires that we should mutually admonish each other." To Cyprian's words, which are found in all the copies of his works, Calvin substitutes his own. If an admonition without any jurisdiction had been sufficient to remove Marcien, Cyprian's advice was of greater weight than Stephen's.

Some time after his accession to the episcopal dignity, Cyprian assembled a Council at Carthage, on the 15th of May, 252, to examine the cause of those, who fell in the persecution. Privatus, who had been bishop of Lambelia, in Numedia, but deposed for his crimes, appeared before the Council in hopes of being reinstated. In

L

the

\* Epis. 68.

the bitterness of disappointment, he consecrated a pretended bishop of Carthage, as if Cyprian had been deposed. This miscreant, named Fortunatus, sent a deputation to Rome, desiring letters of communion from the then pope Cornelius. Felieiffimus, a schismatic bishop, was at the head of the deputation. In the letters which he brought from Carthage, it was stated that Fortunatus had been elected by 25 bishops, with other falsehoods and misrepresentations of Cyprian's conduct. The pontiff rejected their application, wrote to Cyprian on the subject. They renewed their application, with menaces if the pope did not take cognizance of their cause that they would read their letters publicly. The pontiff alarmed, wrote a second letter to Cyprian, whose messenger had not yet arrived at Rome. In his answer to this letter, he expresses his dissatisfaction of the pope's indulgence to his enemies; justifies his conduct and appointment: "there are," says he, "bishops who are not made by God, but they are bishops without the pale of the church. The Lord himself suffered many to desert him, and said to the apostles: will you also go away? But *Peter, on whom he built his church*, replied: Lord to whom shall we go? Shewing that they who forsake Jesus Christ perish through their own fault, but the church, which, believes in him does not forsake him, and they are the church who remain in the house of the Lord." He then assigns the reasons why these appellants had been retrenched from the catholic communion, and adds: "after all this they dared to cross the sea and carry letters from schismatics to the *Chair of Peter*, and to the principal Church, which is the source of sacerdotal unity, not considering that, they, to whom they apply, are Romans, whose faith was praised by the apostle, to whom infidelity can have no access."\* In this letter we see Cyprian, archbishop of Carthage, primate of Numidia, acknowledge the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman See, which he calls the chair of Peter, to which infidelity

\* Epis. 55. ad. Corn.

ty can have no access, and call that church, not simply the mother and mistress of all churches, but the *very source* from which all ecclesiastical authority must flow ; though in the same letter he complains of the irregularity of appeals from the ordinary tribunals : “ it is,” says he, “ established amongst us, and justly, that every criminal should be examined in the place where the crime has been committed.”—*ibid.*

The universal jurisdiction in spirituals of the Roman pontiff is shewn with irresistible evidence by the installment and deposition of prelates in the districts immediately subject to the patriarchal Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople. That prelates deposed by Councils within these districts, have been reinstated on appeal to the Roman See ; and that some patriarchs have been deposed for misconduct, are facts of incontrovertible notoriety ; of both we have decisive evidence in this Council of Chalcedon, which Misopapist thinks the writer ought not to name. The truth is, the man appears never to have read a line in the acts of that Council, except some garbled fragments in Illyricus, of lying memory.

Theodoret, the historian, a prelate whose works have survived the ravages of time, had been deposed by the false Council of Ephesus, at which Dioscorus presided ; he had appealed from the sentence to the Roman pontiff,—see his Appeal, Remarks, p. 199, and was reinstated by the authority of the then pope Leo, and received by the Council of Chalcedon. In the first session, or action as it is called, the magistrates said : “ let the most reverend bishop Theodoret come in and assist in the Council, because the most holy archbishop Leo has reinstated him in the episcopal dignity.” Some Egyptian prelates of Dioscorus’ party objected to his admission, saying that he was infected with the Nestorian heresy. They did not pretend that Leo exercised an unwarranted authority, in quashing the judgment of a numerous Council, over which the patriarch of Alexandria, who then



then held the second rank in the church, presided, which should have been their first objection to Theodoret's admission, and would have been peremptory, if the pope's jurisdiction had not been universally acknowledged. In the 8th session, when Theodoret had satisfied the Council that his faith was pure, the magistrates said: "there is no more difficulty on Theodoret: he has anathematized Nestorius before you; he has been acknowledged by the archbishop Leo; he has voluntarily received your decision of faith; finally, he has subscribed Leo's letter; no more remains but that you order him to resume his church as Leo has judged." All the bishops replied: "Theodoret is worthy of his See . . . Long live the archbishop Leo." In this cause we have public, authentic, satisfactory and indisputable evidence of the Roman pontiff's jurisdiction. His judgment in appeal from the sentence of a Council, at which the patriarch of the second See, authorized by the emperor's letters, presided, is admitted with acclamation in a General Council, composed of Greeks and Asiatics, at which were present Anatolius, of Constantinople; Maximus, of Antioch; Juvenal, of Jerusalem, &c.

In the same Council Maximus was acknowledged patriarch of Antioch though his entrance had been irregular, because it was authorized by the Roman pontiff: in the 10th session, held on the 6th of the calends of November, in which the cause of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, which had been examined in the preceding session, was terminated, after reading the acts of the judgment in Beritus, on the 1st of September, 448, in which Ibas had been acquitted of the charges against him, the magistrates desired that the proceedings against him in the false Council of Ephesus should be read. To this the pope's legates objected, saying that no regard was to be paid to any thing done in that Assembly, excepting, notwithstanding the ordination of Maximus, bishop of Antioch. Anatolius, of Constantinople, joined in opinion with them, made the same exception in favor of Maximus,

mus, justified the exception by saying : that the holy archbishop Leo had received him to his communion, and judged that he ought to govern the church of Antioch. Though Maximus had not been ordained in that Council, his ordination was consequent to the unjust deposition of Domnus in it, and manifestly irregular.

The deposition of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, in the Council of Chalcedon, is a striking instance of the Roman pontiff's jurisdiction. In the third session, on the 13th October, 451, Dioscorus having refused to appear, though cited juridically three several times, Paschasinus asked : what was to be done? If the Council thought proper to judge him according to the rigour of the canons! The Council declared their consent. Then the three legates, Paschasinus, Lucensius and Boniface, pronounced the sentence in these words : " The excesses committed by Dioscorus, heretofore bishop of Alexandria, are made manifest, as well in the preceding sitting as in the present ; he has received to his communion Eutyches condemned by his own bishop ; he persists in supporting what has been done at Ephesus, for which he ought to beg pardon as others have done ; he did not permit the letter of pope Leo to Flavian to be read ; he even excommunicated the pope ; many complaints have been presented against him before the Council ; he has been cited three several times and refused to obey, wherefore the holy archbishop of Rome, Leo, *by us, and by this Council*, with the apostle St. Peter, who is the rock and the foundation of the catholic church, and of the catholic faith, has divested him of the episcopal dignity and of the sacerdotal ministry, let the Council dispose of him according to the canons. Anatolius, of Constantinople ; Maximus, of Antioch ; Stephen, of Ephesus, and all the other bishops present, individually gave their assent to this judgment. Their words though differing in sound have all the same tendency in sense,—see the Acts of this Council in Labbe's collection,

collection, or Nicoleti's, or abridged in Fleury's Ecclesiastical History, Book xxi.

In the annals of the world there is not a more authentic act of universal spiritual jurisdiction: the Roman pontiff deposes the patriarch of the second See by his legates in the Council, and by the Council, exercising his jurisdiction at the same time by the prelates there assembled and over them. To this act we have on record the names of 191 subscribing witnesses, not one dissentient voice, nor have we heard of any reclamation.

Nicolas I, in his letter to Michael III, Emperor of Constantinople, enumerates eight patriarchs of that See, who had been deposed for errors in faith, and misconduct, by different Roman pontiffs; of those Anthimus was deposed in Constantinople by pope Agapetus in the year 536, notwithstanding the entreaties of the emperor, and the threats and promises of the empress, and Menas consecrated in his place. This Liberatus, a writer of the same age, relates in Brevario, cap. 21, and Zonares, in the life of Justinian—so far was the people of Constantinople from thinking the bishop of that city exempt from the jurisdiction of the Holy See by the 28th canon of Chalcedon.

And Gelasius, in the year 495, in his celebrated letter in answer to the bishops of Dardania on the subject of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed by Felix II. for heresy, on the complaint of John, patriarch of Alexandria, but yet continued to officiate under the protection of the emperor Zeno, refutes the deposition of Acacius, made by some schismatics, on the ground of its not having been done in Council, as he was bishop of the imperial city. As this learned and pious pontiff discusses the question in a masterly manner the writer begs leave to insert a part of his letter: "reflect," says he, "on every thing, which has happened since the apostles, and you will see, that our Fathers the catholic bishops having once condemned each heresy in Council,

Council, resolved that what they had decided should remain inviolable, not permitting the question to be again discussed, wisely foreseeing that otherwise there would be nothing solid in the judgments of the church, for however manifest the truth may be, error will never cease to make objections, being supported by obstinacy in default of reason. They have therefore thought it sufficient to condemn heresy with its author, and declare, that whoever in future should adopt the same error, would be included in the first condemnation. Thus Sabellius has been condemned in a Council; thus the Arians in the Council of Nice; thus Eunomius, Macedonius, Nestorius. These things pre-supposed, we are well assured that there is no true Christian, who does not know that it is principally the duty of the first See to execute the decrees of Councils approved by the consent of the universal church; as it is this See which confirms Councils by its authority, and enforces their observance in virtue of its primacy.

The Holy See having certain proofs that Acacius did swerve from the catholic communion, had been a long time without believing it, because he himself had often been the executor of its judgments against sectaries; he was warned by letter frequently during a space of nearly three years; a deputation by a bishop with letters was sent to exhort him not to separate himself from the catholic unity; and either to come or send to justify himself against the weighty accusations of John, bishop of Alexandria: for, though a new Council could not be held, there is no bishop, who could decline the judgment of the first See, to which the bishop of the second See, having no other Judge, had applied. Acacius instead of making satisfaction had corrupted the legates, endeavouring to draw this See into communion with heretics, and by his letters declared that he did communicate with Peter (an Eutychian intruder) praising him, and making bitter reproaches against John (the catholic patriarch) of Alexandria, without daring to come or  
send

send to justify what he advanced. Acacius, therefore, has been condemned in virtue of the Council of Chalcedon, and the Holy See has retrenched him from her communion, lest she should fall into communion with Peter, of Alexandria, with whom Acacius did join in communion. Thus Timothy, Elurus, and Peter, of Alexandria, who passed for bishops of the second See, have been condemned without a new Council by the Holy See on the complaint of Acacius himself. Let them shew how Peter has been justified. The whole church knows that the chair of St. Peter has the right of absolving from the judgments of other bishops, and of judging the church, so that no other can judge its judgments; since the canons direct that appeals may be brought to it from all parts of the world, and it is not allowed to appeal from it. Acacius therefore had no power to absolve Peter, of Alexandria, without the participation of the Holy See, who condemned him. Let them say by what Council he has done it, he who was but simply a bishop, dependant on the metropolis of Heraclea . . . . . We have smiled, said he, at the prerogative, which they desire to give Acacius, as bishop of the imperial city. Has not the emperor resided at Ravenna, at Milan, at Sirmium, and at Treves? The bishops of these cities, have they ever transgressed the bounds, which antiquity prescribed to them. If attention be paid to the dignity of cities, the bishops of the second and third Sees, have more dignity than the bishop of a city which has not even the right of a metropolis. The temporal power of the empire and the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities are different. However small the city it does not diminish the grandeur of the prince there resident, nor does the presence of the emperor change the order of religion, the city ought rather to make such advantage subservient to the liberty of religion, remaining quietly within its bounds. Let them hear the emperor Marcien, who unable to obtain any thing for the exaltation of the bishop of Constantinople,

nople, from pope Leo, of holy memory, gave him great applause for supporting the canons ; let them hear the bishop Anatolius himself, who said that the enterprize was rather from the clergy and people of Constantinople than from himself, and that Leo was master of it. Leo himself, who confirmed the Council of Chalcedon, quashed all that was done there anew, contrary to the canons of Nice, besides the power which he had given to his legates."

The writer has been thus explicit on the Council of Chalcedon, for the information of these readers who may not have recourse to ecclesiastical history. This castigator seems incapable of either giving or receiving information. His object is to involve truth in obscurity, hence these wretched sophisms, by which he endeavours to embarrass the unlearned. P. 48, he says, that this writer in his remarks ought to have proved that the See of Rome was Peter's successor as well as the pope. Is the man so contemptibly ignorant as not to know that a writer, speaking of the power of the Crown, is understood of the powers vested in the King, in virtue of his kingly office ? In the next page he transcribes from Raynold, a protestant writer of the other day, as vehement in his invectives against the pretended idolatry of the church of Rome as this castigator himself, and from Froissard, a French writer of the thirteenth century, of whom the author of his life says : *il aimoit la chasse, la musique, les fetes la prarure, la bonne chere, le vin, et les femmes. Ces goûts fortifiés par l'habitude ne moururent qu'avec lui.* This reverend writer would have made a conspicuous figure amongst the Reformists, if he had not come a century or more too soon. These are the Fathers who condemn Popery ! In their works this castigator finds that popes Martin and Clement called themselves Gods ; to these he adds, from the repository of his own brain, this remarkable passage : " to these a multitude of testimonies might be added, in which the pope is called : the Lord our God the pope, another God upon earth, the King of

M

Kings,

Kings, and Lord of Lords ; and in which it is said that he is more than God, and that his power is greater than all created authority, and reaches to things in heaven, earth, and hell, p. 50." This passage will be cited from *Papery Condemned* by other fanatical scribblers, as the castigatōr cites from Raynold and Froiffard, they are of equal authority, and of similar veracity. The writer recommends a serious meditation on this passage, by which St. John closes his revelation : " without are dogs and poisoners, fornicators and homicidēs, and idolators, and every man *who loves and makes a lie*—Rev. xxii. 15."

His quotation from Bellarmine only shews that he knows nothing of dialectics ; or that he does not understand the language of that famed controvertist. In the chapter which the castigatōr cites, Bellarmine undertakes to prove that the pope by a decision addressed to the whole church as first pastor cannot order any thing contrary to faith or good morals ; that he can neither prohibit virtue nor commend vice. This position he founds on the promise of Christ to his church, John xvi. : " when the spirit of truth will come he will teach you all things," which in the most limited sense must be understood of all things necessary to salvation. He founds a second argument on the impiety of supposing that God commands the faithful to obey their pastors, and permits these pastors to teach that virtue is vice, or that vice is virtue ; which is a manifest heresy, or something worse. The writer has yet to learn how the supposition may be justified from blasphemy.

In the next page, he either mistakes or misstates the argument deduced from Ignatius's letter : it was founded on the manner, in which he addresses that church, different from his salutation to the other churches, and manifestly expressing its pre-eminence. No protestant ever denied, says the castigatōr, that the Roman church presided in the country of the Romans. That the Roman church is in the country of the Romans no man of common understanding ever denied ; but that the

the Roman church presided over other churches this castigator denies ; he has learned from his spirit of divination how a church may preside over itself, or preside over no church : Ignatius does not confine the presidency of the Roman church to the country of the Romans, he salutes her as a presiding church existing in the country of the Romans, and says that she presides in charity, which this castigator, better informed no doubt, contradicts.

He next attempts to distort a passage from Ireneus, and affix to it a sense as far remote from that prelate's words and ideas, as the most flagrant falsehood is from the most manifest truth. The writer does not remember to have seen a more bare-faced imposition on public credulity. To give some colour of truth to this newly-invented sense he gives a version of the passage, which favours more of fraud than ignorance. Though, says he, p. 55, *cum hac convenire Ecclesiam*, may signify *to agree with this church*, *ad hanc convenire Ecclesiam*, the phrase used by Ireneus, can never be taken in that acceptation. However the acceptation in which he takes it, only increases the force of the argument which he endeavours to elude : for if it be true, as he says, that the phrase signifies : *the surrounding faithful are under a necessity of resorting to this church*, it must be to know its doctrine, or receive its orders : for the faithful are not under the necessity of resorting to any church for their temporal affairs. Moreover Ireneus says that every church must resort to *this church*, on account of *its more powerful principality*, and explains what he calls every church, that is, says he, *the faithful, who are every where*, without distinction of country or restriction of place, *eos qui sunt undique fideles*, he sets no bounds or limits. In the face of truth and common sense, this castigator pretends that *more powerful principality* must be understood of the state of Rome, of which Ireneus does not speak at all, not of the Roman church, of which, in the version, which he himself gives, it must be understood, as it can bear no other sense. The phrase, *eos qui sunt undique fideles* he artfully



fully translates : *the surrounding faithful*, which his comment reduces, to the people near the suburbs of Rome, or, as he terms it : *the suburbicary regions*. He has not told us how Lyons, an inland city in France, of which Ireneus was bishop, was metaphorised into a suburbicary of Rome, nor has he told us with what propriety Ireneus said : that *every church* must resort to the Roman church on account of its more powerful principality, if he only intended to say : that the people of the adjacent country were obliged to go to Rome to transact their private business : if this castigator prevails on himself to believe that Ireneus, speaking of the Roman church, founded by the apostles Peter and Paul, is to be understood of the Roman State, which they did not found ; and when he says : that every church must resort to this church on account of its more powerful principality, he is to be understood of the people going to transact their private business in the city. The writer laments his folly, and if he does not believe it, he more sincerely laments the credulity of his dupes. Let him consult his spirit of divination to know why Christian churches should resort to a Heathen senate, or a Heathen emperor. If ever the church was distinct from the State it was in Ireneus's days, when the State persecuted the church with relentless virulence and unremitting ardour. As the castigator seems determined to force Ireneus to condemn popery, however reluctant, the writer begs leave to furnish some materials for the exercise of his talent. That venerable prelate wrote a treatise against heresy, in the time of pope Eleutherius, about the year 180. This treatise, yet extant, in an old Latin version, with some fragments of the original, is divided into five books. In the first he accurately explains the system of Valentinus, who pretended to engraft all the extravagancies of the Platonic philosophy on the doctrines of christianity ; he then enumerates all the Heresiarchs, who had appeared, from Simon, the magician, in the apostles days, to Tatien, his own cotemporary. In the second book he re-

futes

futes their different errors with great strength of reasoning and perspicuity. In the third he establishes the catholic doctrine on the authority of the scriptures and tradition; exposes the artifice of sectaries, who, pressed by the authority of the scriptures, had recourse to tradition, and to decline the force of tradition, had recourse to the scriptures. The tradition of the church he proves authentic by the succession of bishops. "To look back," says he, "on the tradition of the apostles, made manifest in the whole world, is easy in every church, for all, who desire to see: we can enumerate those, who have been instituted bishops in the churches by the apostles, and their successors, down to us, who taught no such thing, knew no such thing as these (Her.) have raved, if the apostles had known concealed mysteries, which they had taught to the perfect, unknown to others, they would have delivered them principally to those, to whom they committed the churches: for they required that, they, whom they themselves had left their successors, and to whom they had committed their authority to teach, '*Locum Magisterii tradentes*', should be truly perfect and irreproachable in all things; but as it would be very tedious to enumerate the successions of all churches, 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 is from them, and is come to us by the succession of bishops, with this church every church must agree, or \* "to this church every church must resort," on account of its more powerful principality, that is, the faithful, who are every where, in which, that tradition, which is from the apostles, has been maintained by those, who are every where. The blessed apostles therefore having founded and instructed the church, gave the episcopal charge of administering

\* Castigator's version.

ministering the church to Linus, of this Linus Paul speaks in his epistles to Timothy ; to him succeeded Anacletus ; after him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement obtained the bishopric, who saw the apostles themselves and conferred with them, whilst he had yet the preaching of the apostles sounding, and their tradition before his eyes, and not alone, for as yet many remained, who had been taught by the apostles, under this Clement, a great division was made amongst the brethren at Corinth, the Roman church wrote a powerful letter to the Corinthians to restore them to peace, and to renew in them that faith and tradition, which they had received from the apostles. To this Clement Evaristus succeeded, and Alexander to Evaristus ; the sixth from the apostles Sixtus was appointed, and after him Telephorus, who suffered martyrdom most gloriously ; then Hyginus, and after him Pius, after whom Anicetus, when Soter succeeded Anicetus. Now in the twelfth place from the apostles Eleutherius has the episcopal charge, by this ordination and succession, that tradition, which is from the apostles, in the church, and the preaching of truth, descended to us . . . . . If, continues Ireneus, the least question be under discussion is it not necessary to resort to the most ancient churches, where the apostles lived ? What if the apostles had left us no writings ? Should we not follow the tradition, which they left to those, to whom they entrusted the churches ? This is what many barbarous nations observe, who believe in Jesus Christ, without paper or ink, having the doctrine of salvation written in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and faithfully keeping the old tradition, concerning one God and Creator, and of his Son Jesus Christ. They, who have received this faith without writings, are barbarous, as to their language, with respect to us ; but as to their sentiments, and their conduct, they are truly wise and pleasing to God ; they observe justice and chastity ; and if any one should preach in their language what these sectaries have invented, they

they would stop their ears and run far away; they would not listen to such blasphemy, the old tradition of the apostles does not suffer such monstrous doctrines to come into their minds, because there are as yet no assemblies of sectaries amongst them: for before Valentinus there were no Valentinians; before Marcion there were no Marcionites, nor any of these sectaries before their authors."

In his next essay, the castigator will inform us how Lyons, in France, Corinth, in Greece, and these barbarous nations, who knew nothing of the Greek or Roman languages, were transported into the neighbourhood of Rome, as history is silent on the subject, his familiar spirit will tell him, how the inhabitants of these countries, going to transact their private business, learned from a Heathen senate, the tradition, which descended from the apostles by the succession of bishops.

This comment on Ireneus, extracted from the feculence of a disordered brain, he pretends to strengthen, by distorting the sixth canon of Nice from the intended sense, and the only sense which it conveys. The writer once more inserts the canon as cited by Aetius, and after him by the castigator, "let the ancient custom continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria have the power over all these, because this is the custom or manner of the bishop of Rome," *oti kai to en te Romé touto sunethes esti*. He must be as acute as the instructing spirit of the castigator who can discover in this canon any jurisdiction given to the bishop of Rome. If words be understood in their common acceptation, the canon says, that it was the custom with the bishop of Rome, that the bishop of Alexandria should preside over Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, for *touto, this*, must have a reference to the former sentence. If the canon had said: the bishop of Rome presides over the suburbicary cities in Italy, therefore let the bishop of Alexandria preside over Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, the reason would have been insufficient and ridiculous. This comment, therefore, converts sound reasoning into nonsense. This wild

wild conjecture of Rufinus, the calligrapher transcribes from Illyricus, which he, modestly enough, gives for the sense of the Fathers. The writer begs leave to assure him, that Rufinus is indebted to the calligrapher for his place amongst that venerable body of men; and he laments sincerely that this wild and unfounded conjecture is not the only one which affects his memory, though he shall never rank him with sectaries of any denomination. St. Jerom, in his apology against Rufinus, now before the writer, treats him with great severity, he accuses him of ascribing a book, written by an Arian, to the martyr Pamphilus; and of insidiously endeavouring to introduce the errors of Origenes, whose works Rufinus had translated into Latin, as if authorised by himself. Rufinus, in his invectives against Jerom, did not justify himself of these charges.

The calligrapher, who disdains to consult history, having his familiar spirit, like Socrates' genius, to direct him, tells us that the bishop of Rome by residing at the seat of government had acquired a considerable influence. Writers of the time, tell us that his influence was founded on his apostolical authority, which descended to him in due succession from his predecessor Peter. At the distance of seventeen centuries this calligrapher knows better: his surmise stands in opposition to the positive assurance of cotemporary writers. On account of this influence, continues the calligrapher, a certain respect was paid to him by the surrounding bishops, in course of time this respect began to be viewed as an acknowledgment of superiority, but he met with a formidable opponent in the bishop of Constantinople. If, disregarding the suggestions of his familiar spirit, he had consulted history, he would have found the bishop of Rome peaceably exercising his spiritual jurisdiction, long before Constantine, the founder of Constantinople, was born. He has forgotten, that he himself has told us in the same page, that Anatolius, depending on the influence of the Court, was the first opponent. This happened in the  
year

year 451, and his opposition was not to the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction, for that he acknowledged; but to obtain a priority of rank over the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and a jurisdiction over some metropolitans, if the Roman pontiff would consent, which consent, though refused by Leo, was at length extorted by obstinate importunity. Common sense informs us that if the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome had been instituted by any Council, or any human authority, this intriguing prelate might, through the influence of the Court and Senate, in so great a Council, composed of Greeks, Asiatics, and Africans, have obtained a jurisdiction over the bishop of Rome, as well as over the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and so many metropolitans, who were forced to submit to his authority. The castigator himself has told us that the jurisdiction of Alexandria and Antioch had been authorized by the great Council of Nice; if then the jurisdiction of Rome rested on the same authority, it might have been cancelled in the same manner by the Council of Chalcedon, against this truth there is no reasoning, the castigator states facts which invalidate his conjectures. In the next page, 59, he transcribes the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon as fashioned by some other scribbler: for the writer does not suspect him ever to have seen it in the original, or to understand it if he did. Erasmus would have said: *Sentias Rabulam aut Babulum effluentem non proloquentem et quicquid in Buccam venerit ebullerentem*, "whereas the See of old Rome hath been not undeservedly distinguished by the Fathers with some privileges, because that city was the seat of empire, the Fathers of Constantinople were prompted by the same motive to distinguish the most Holy See of new Rome with equal privileges, thinking it fit that the city, which they saw honoured with the empire and the senate, and equal in every civil privilege to old Rome, should be equalled to her also in ecclesiastical matters," here the castigator stops, his copy was moth eaten, or mouldered with age: the canon stands thus in

all copies which have escaped the moths: "the Fathers by right attributed to the throne of old Rome privileges because it was the reigning city; through the same motive the 150 Fathers have judged that new Rome, which is honored with the empire and the senate, should have like privileges in the ecclesiastical order *and be the second after it.*" Some malignant moth had fixed on these last words and effaced them from the castigator's copy. The canon continues to enumerate the privileges granted to the See of Constantinople: so that the metropolitans of the districts of Pontus, of Thrace and Asia only; and the bishops of these dioceses, which are in the countries of the Barbarians, may be ordained by the See of Constantinople, on report of their canonical elections. These are the privileges granted to the See of Constantinople, on condition that the Roman pontiff Leo would agree to it, which neither the persuasions of the emperor, the intrigues of Anatolius, nor the entreaties of his friends in the church, in the senate, and in the city, could prevail on him to do, not because the prerogatives of the Roman See were diminished: for the canon left them entire and untouched; but because the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch were deprived of the rank, which they held in the church from the earliest ages, and which was confirmed to them by the Council of Nice.

The castigator, in what he calls a refutation, passes unnoticed the testimonies of Epiphanius, of Athanasius, of Basil, the Great, of Chrysofom, of Cyril, of Alexandria; &c., which the writer had adduced in his Remarks, p. 197, . . . to shew, that the bishop of Rome did exercise his jurisdiction over the Greeks and Asiatics, before and after the Council of Nice; and cavils on a passage of Theodoret which he thinks he may distort.

The writer had said in his Remarks, p. 193, that the Oriental prelates assembled in Constantinople in the year 382, who had been present at the general Council in 381, in a letter to the Western prelates then at Rome, say,

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 Aqueleia." The castigator pretends that the language of the prelates has been reversed in that citation. He ought to have consulted Theodoret's own work to support his assertion, and not offer a garbled fragment from Binus, who, though a zealous papist, as the castigator says, is not the most exact compiler. As the letter is now before the writer, in Theodoret's work, not in Binus's compilation, he gives a part of it, from which the reader may judge with certainty, whether, in the citation, he had reversed the prelates language or not. The letter is addressed to Damasus, the then Roman pontiff, to Ambrose, Britton, Valerian, Ascholius, Aremus, Basil, and the other bishops assembled in Rome. After describing the horrors of the persecution, and the sufferings of catholics in the East, under the Arian emperor Valens, they say, : " seeing, therefore, that you, to declare your brotherly love towards us, having by the permission of God assembled a Council at Rome, did call us thither as members of your own body by the letters of the Most Holy Emperor, Left, whereas we only, have in times past endured the misery, now that the emperor hath consented to the faith, you should reign without us, but rather, as the apostle says, we may reign with you, it is our only desire, if it were possible, to leave our churches all at once to fulfil your desire, or rather to serve the necessity of the church. ' Who will give us wings as the dove that we may fly and alight with you ;' but because the churches lately restored would be left destitute by that measure, and moreover some of us cannot possibly do it, because we prepared ourselves to travel not farther than Constantinople, as we were commanded by letters which your reverence sent to the most holy emperor Theodosius the last year after the Council of Aqueleia ;



leia ; and for this Council only we brought with us the consent of the bishops, who remained at home in their Provinces. We did not think that we should have to travel farther ; nor did we hear of any such matter before we met at Constantinople ; moreover the term fixed was so short that we had not time to make so long a journey, nor to call the bishops of every Province together, who communicate with us, nor yet to obtain their consent. These and other causes prevented the greater part of the bishops from going to you.”—L. v. Cap. 9.

From this extract it is manifest that Damasus did not summon the Asiatic bishops in virtue of the emperor's letters ; but that the emperor did summon them to meet in Constantinople, in virtue of the pope's letters after the Council of Aqueleia, and when they arrived in Constantinople, they found the pope's letters in the emperor Theodosius's hands, directing them to repair to Rome, which they declined for the reasons assigned in their letter. This is expressly stated by Theodoret : in the preceding chapter, after giving a brief account of the Council of Constantinople, held in the year 381, he says : “ the ensuing summer several of them (the bishops) returning to the same city (Con.) for the necessary business of the church called them thither, they received letters from a Council of bishops in the West, inviting them to Rome, where many bishops were assembled, but they declined making so long a journey, thinking it to no purpose . . . . their own letter will more clearly shew their fortitude and wisdom,” L. v. C. 8. He then gives a copy of their letter as cited. It is therefore true, if there be truth in history, that it was not the pope who signified the emperor's orders ; but it was the emperor who intimated the pope's orders. Socrates Scholasticus, a layman, as ignorant of ecclesiastical matters as the caltigator himself ; and Sozomen, a lawyer, who copied him, speak of the Emperor's orders to the prelates to meet in Constantinople, which being a public fact they must have known, they are silent as to the pope's orders, of which perhaps they knew nothing.

nothing. They deserve no credit in opposition to Theodoret the most learned prelate of the age, who gives a copy from the record. Does this castigator pretend that these prelates did not know by whose orders they were summoned to meet? We know from the seventh general Council, celebrated by Greeks and Asiatics, and admitted by Nilus, that the pope's circular letter was indispensibly necessary to authorise a general Synod, refusing the pretensions of an Assembly, collected by Copronymus, of infamous memory, which had assumed the title of oecumenical, the prelates say: "how is it an oecumenical Synod, which was neither received nor approved, but anathematized by the bishops of the other churches? Which had not the concurrence of the pope of Rome nor of the bishops, who are with him, neither by his legates, *nor by a circular letter, according to the usage of Councils?*" Sess. 6. These prelates, who had before them the original records of all the general Councils held before their time, declare it to be the usage to have the pope's circular letter. This circular letter must have been communicated to the emperor of Constantinople, for without his consent it could not be obeyed by the prelates of the empire, who travelled at the public expense, and drew their subsistence from the imperial treasury.

The pope's concurrence and approbation to render a Council oecumenical was so well known to be indispensable, that Stephen, of Morant; Auxentius, a Constantinopolitan born, eminently conspicuous amongst the Greeks, both for science and sanctity, objected that defect to the commissioners of Copronymus without a reply. Five of these infatuated prelates, who, in complaisance to the Court, had renounced the faith of their ancestors, that is, Theodosius, of Ephesus; Constantine, of Nicomidia; Constantine, of Natolia; Sifinnius, Partilus and Basil, Tricacabe, with the patrician Callistus, and the prime secretary Comboconon, were sent by the emperor to engage Stephen to subscribe the articles of  
faith,

faith, newly invented and authorized by Copronymus's courtly bishops, in what they called an oecumenical Synod. When they pressed Stephen to subscribe this new faith, and proposed the alternative, death, in case of non-compliance, read, said he, that I may see if there be any thing reasonable in it. Constantine, bishop of Nacolia, having read the title: Definition of faith, by the Holy Council seventh oecumenical; Stephen replied that the Council was neither holy nor oecumenical, on the first member of the disjunctive the writer omits Stephen's reasoning, thus that venerable sage reasoned on the second: how is that Council oecumenical, which was not approved by the pope of Rome, though there be a canon which forbids to regulate ecclesiastical affairs without him? It has not been approved, continued Stephen, by the patriarch of Alexandria, nor by the patriarchs of Antioch or Jerusalem. Where are their letters? How can that be called the seventh Council, which is in opposition to the six preceding Councils? In what, replied Basil, do we disagree with the six preceding Councils? To this Stephen instantly replied: were they not assembled in the churches?—and in these churches were there not images received and revered by our fathers? Basil, though a strenuous iconoclast, admitted it. Will the castigatour deny, what his ancestors, on the evidence of the fact, were forced to admit? that there were images adorning the churches, and there revered by all the prelates, who composed the six first General Councils, that is, by the whole christian world? He may deny it: for there is no truth which perverse obstinacy may not deny; but his ancestors, the iconoclasts, could not, because the churches were then in being, and the very images revered by their ancestors were there to be seen. On this subject we shall reason more at large in the course of this work. The writer only remarks at present, that the pope's concurrence and approbation of the Council to render it oecumenical was then as publicly known, and as universally believed by the Greeks, as that the images,

images, which they saw with their eyes, were in their churches,—see Stephen's life, by Stephen of Constantinople, by Theophanes, or Cederenus. The commissioners, reduced to silence, made their report to the emperor, that Stephen was powerful in argument, and fearless of death, which, however, that remorseless tyrant ordered to be inflicted, and it was done, with circumstances of barbarity, at which humanity shudders.

The castigator has recourse to the authority of Richer, whom he calls a learned papist. If there be an incorrect writer, who through ignorance, or vanity, hazards an uncommon opinion, which error may drag to its support, he is a man of science in the castigator's opinion, though the writer very much doubts if ever he read a line in Richer's works. However the writer begs leave to assure him that Richer's opinions are of no weight; that they have been refuted more than once, and were by himself three several times retracted. His treatise on ecclesiastical and political power would have been well received in Copronymus's Court, but would have been anathematized by the university of Paris, whose doctrine Richer pretended to elucidate, if the Parliament had not interfered. It was anathematized by the celebrated cardinal du Perron, in a Council of eight bishops, in Paris, in 1612; in this history of the Councils Richer garbled and distorted, in order to give some colour of truth to his new opinions, as all innovators do.

Christianus Lupus is a writer of great weight; if he has undertaken to prove that Theodosius called this Assembly alone, as the castigator asserts, which the writer very much doubts, but cannot contradict as Lupus's works are not in his hands, it only shews that Lupus did not read Theodoret on the subject, and took for granted what Socrates and Sozomen had said, without farther discussion.

Eusebius says that Constantine the Great assembled the Council of Nice. True, and Theodoret says that Theodosius assembled the Council of Constantinople; but

but they do not say that this was done without the Roman pontiff's consent. If Theodoret had not given a copy of the Asiatic prelates letter to Damasus, we should not have known from his history that Theodosius intimated the pope's consent, at the same time that he ordered the prelates to assemble. In the same sense it may be said that all general Councils were summoned by the emperors of the times then in being : for without the emperor's orders and assistance no general Council could be assembled, nor other assembly formed : it was the standing law of the empire, yet to be seen in the civil law, 1. *ff. de Coll. illicitis & Li. de Conven.* But Constantine did not pretend to any spiritual authority, nor did he at all interfere in the proceedings of the Council, over which Osius, bishop of Cordova, Vitus and Vincentius, priests of the city of Rome, as legates of the Holy See, presided,—see Review, p. 176. The castigator, who seems to know nothing of the matter, but what he conjectures from some garbled fragments in Illyricus, is advised to read the work which he pretends to refute, in it he will find truth attested by authentic history, not unfounded conjecture, drawn from materials, fashioned by arch impostors, to mislead the unwary. The members of the Council, if we believe the castigator, assert that they were summoned to meet by Constantine, in their letter to the Egyptian bishops, p. 64. To this the writer replies that they might have asserted it with truth and propriety for the reasons already assigned, but yet they did not. Their letter is given by Theodoret, L. i. Cap. 9. the writer transcribes the passage alluded to, it is thus expressed :

To the holy and famed Church, by the grace of God, the church of Alexandria, and to our loving brethren inhabiting Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, the bishops assembled in the holy and great Council of Nice, send greeting in our Lord. Whereas by the grace of God, and the help of the most holy emperor Constantine, this great and holy Council is assembled from several Provinces

vinces and cities at Nice . . . . The prelates say that it was by the assistance of the emperor they were assembled, and truly: for without it they could not assemble, but they neither include himself nor any of his officers in the number of the members, who composed the Council. That venerable assemble was composed exclusively of bishops, successors in office to the apostles, and the first pastors constituted by apostolical authority, each to feed his respective portion of the one great flock entrusted to Peter's care. It was not a motley crew of self-taught and self-constituted leaders. Hence they say: *the bishops assembled in the Holy and Great Council of Nice.*

We have already seen what the Greeks thought of a Council assembled by an emperor without the consent of the Roman pontiff, lest the castigator should think that their sentiments had been changed in the course of three or four centuries, the writer transcribes from Theodoret the answer of Eulogius, chief priest of Edeffa, with his companions, the priests and deacons of that church, to Modestus, the imperial prefect, about the year 371. Valens, the Arian emperor, having banished Barses, the bishop of Edeffa, ordered the prefect to arrest the priests and deacons of the church, and send them into exile also, if they did not communicate with the Arians. Modestus, endeavouring to prevail on them to obey the imperial edict, said: "it is an act of desperate madness, that so few as you are, should resist the emperor, who governs so many and such mighty nations: As no one replied the prefect spoke to Eulogius, the chief priest, a man worthy of everlasting praise? What? Dost thou not answer to what I have said to thee? Verily, replied Eulogius, I did not think it my duty to answer when I was not asked the question. I have bestowed many words, said the prefect, to advise you for your good. Your speech, replied Eulogius, was addressed to us all, I did not think it right to prevent my companions, and answer alone, but if it be your will to

ask me any thing, I shall tell you my mind. Then, said the prefect, communicate with the emperor. To this Eulogius pleasantly replied: What? Is my lord the emperor, besides the empire, become a priest? That is, with the imperial dignity has he received the priesthood also?" That this their opinion was universally believed by catholics we know, because it was never censured; because it was approved and applauded. Theodoret continues: the prefect apprehended eighty of them, and sent them away into Thrace. As they were led into exile great honor was done them on the way: cities and towns came in procession to meet them. . . . L. iv, C. 16.

The writer begs leave to insert the preceding chapter by way of digression. In it the reader will see how deeply the then Christian world was immersed in what are now called popish superstitions.

As to Barfes, (B) whose glory still continues not only in Edeffa, which city he governed, and in the neighbouring cities, but also in Phenicia, Egypt and Thebais, for the fame of his virtues had been heard in all these countries. Valens first assigned him Aradus, an island, for his dwelling place; but when he understood that an immense number of people flocked about him there, for he was endued with apostolical grace, and cured diseases by his word only, the emperor removed him thence to Oxyrinus, a city in Egypt. Again when his fame attracted multitudes he sent him to a castle called Phenas, situate in the utmost boundary of that country, bordering on the savage people who dwell there. Thither Valens transported this aged father, who, God knows, was more fit to be a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. *It is said that his bed remains yet in Aradus to this present day, and is greatly honored by the people. For many vexed with diseases after having lain upon it, are by faith restored to their perfect health,*—L. iv, C. 15. This is one of these Fathers whom the castigatour cites for the condemnation of popery!

From the Council of Nice, in 325, the castigatour descends

ends to the Council of Constance, in 1414. He forgot to inform his readers of Nova-Scotia, that in the intermediate space of 1089 years there were fourteen general Councils assembled, all composed of popish bishops, whose acts are yet on record, so many subscribing witnesses that this popery, which he hates, was during that space of time the religion of the Christian world. If he had read the history of the Council of Constance, he would have found that Martin V. who approved the doctrinal decrees of that Council, severely censured the unwarranted assumption of some prelates, who qualified their private regulations, as the genuine acts of a general Council. It is rather strange that this castigatour should seek protection from the Council of Constance. The reader must admire the accuracy of his historian; he gives the exact number of barbers, of musicians, of trumpets and jugglers, who were present at the Council. With these his author seems to be well acquainted. He has not told us how many burghers, or anti-burghers were there. Were they classed with the jugglers or non-descripts? He laments the fate of *John Hufs*, and *Jerome of Prague*, who taught the way to heaven according to the scriptures; so did *Jack Straw*, and *Wat Tyler*, *John Ball*, *George Gordon*, and many other military divines, who received from the gratitude of an English jury, the reward of their pious labours. See the history of John Hufs and the Council of Constance, *Review*, p. 55 . . . . 70.

He next attempts to elude the authority of Epiphanius, who says that Ursacius, bishop of Singidon, and Valens, bishop of Murcia, went with supplicatory libels to Julius, bishop of Rome, to give an account of their error and their crimes. His ridiculous effort to elude the force of this testimony only strengthens it. For if it be true, as he says, p. 68, that they had already been absolved by the Council of Milan, and then went to repeat their recantation before pope Julius, thinking if they could obtain his countenance it would efface every suspicion



picion against them, it is therefore true that they thought the pope's authority superior to that of the Council. This, however, he does not think any acknowledgment of supremacy. Men who judge by the rules of common sense think otherwise; Athanasius, Theodoret, and Chrysostom, Greek prelates of venerable memory, who had appealed from the judgments of Councils to the Holy See, thought so too—See their appeals, *Remarks*, p. 197. The Council of *Sardica*, composed of bishops assembled from all parts of the then Christian world, were of the same opinion.

From the following extract of their Synodical Letter, given by Theodoret, *Lib. ii. Cap. 8*, the reader will see what was the received doctrine of the Christian world, on the Roman pontiff's supremacy, in their early days, whilst the apostles instructions were yet fresh in the memory of their disciples :

EXTRACT—

“ The Holy Council held at *Sardica*, through the grace of God, by the bishops of *Rome*, of *Spain*, of *France*, of *Italy*, of *Campania*, of *Calabria*, of *Africa*, of *Sardinia*, of *Pannonia*, of *Mysia*, of *Dacia*, of *Dardania*, of lower *Dacia*, of *Macedonia*, of *Thessaly*, of *Achaia*, of *Epirus*, of *Thracia*, of *Rhodes*, of *Asia*, of *Caria*, of *Bithynia*, of *Hellepont*, of *Phrygia*, of *Pisidia*, of *Cappadocia*, of *Pontus*, of *Phrygia* the less, of *Celica*, of *Pamphylia*, of *Lydia*, of the Islands of the *Cyclades*, of *Egypt*, of *Thebais*, of *Libia*, of *Galatia*, of *Palestine*, of *Arabia*, to all bishops . . . greeting . . . . . *Eusebius*, *Maris*, *Theodorus*, *Theogius*, *Ursacius*, *Valens*, *Menaphantus*, and *Stephen*, have written to our fellow in office, *Julius*, bishop of the Church of *Rome*, against our fellow bishops *Athanasius*, *Marcellus*, and *Asclephas*, so also the bishops of the opposite party have written to him, both to attest the justice and innocence of our fellow bishop *Athanasius*, and to declare that the report of the Eusebians contained nothing but falsehood and slander, their accusations are known to the world to be manifestly false, as well because they would not appear  
when

when they were cited by our most dear brother and fellow bishop *Julius*, as by the letters which *Julius* wrote; for they would undoubtedly have appeared, if they had been able to justify before *Julius* the crimes which they had committed against these bishops." . . . .

Here we have the testimony, not of an individual, but of the civilized world, that accusations and appeals were brought before the Roman pontiff before the Council of Sardica was assembled; that Council, therefore, only declared the existing law when they said, *Canon 7, Let. 5, Gr.* "when a bishop, deposed by a provincial Council, shall have appealed, and recur to the bishop of Rome, if he thinks proper that the affair should be examined anew, he will write to the bishops of the neighbouring Province, that they may be judges of the matter; and if the deposed bishop, engage the bishop of Rome to send a priest from near his person, he may do it, and send commissioners, to judge, by his authority, with the bishops, but if he thinks the bishops sufficient to terminate the matter, he will do what his wisdom will suggest."

This Council of Sardica does not meet the castigator's approbation, that is not surprising: for in their Synodical Letter, to Pope *Julius*, they say: "it is meet that Bishops should bring from all sides, matters to the head of the church," that is, to the See of *St. Peter*.

In the simplicity of the times it was thought, that the Pope was head of the Church, and the See of Rome, the See of *St. Peter*. *Fleury*, who was not remarkably prejudiced in favor of the Roman See, cites this letter, *B. xii. s. 3, 6*. Though the castigator may refuse his approbation, the Council has been approved by *Theodoret*, a Greek writer of venerable memory; by *Athanasius*, patriarch of Alexandria, a writer universally admired by Greeks and Latins: he says, in his second Apology, that the Council was subscribed by more than three hundred Bishops, so does *Hilary*, *Lib. de Synodis*, *B. ii. Va. His.* says it was a Convocation of the whole world, and *Socrates Scholasticus*, *B. ii. cap. 16*, calls it a General Council;

Council ; in a word, its doctrine and discipline had the approbation of the then catholic world, was disapproved by none but professed Arians ; and it has been of such venerable authority, that the century writers of Magdeburg, of reformed memory, have described it as a lawful Synod, Cent. 4, cap. 9. Even the castigator himself, if he had read their Synodical Letter, would have found some passages more to his purpose than many of these garbled quotations, which swell his pamphlet to an immoderate size : for they say : “ the most holy Emperors have called us from different provinces and cities, and have appointed this holy Council to meet at Sardica,” . . . . . and they call the Roman pontiff Julius “ their beloved brother and fellow bishop ” which the castigator thinks sufficient to shew that they acknowledged no primacy or supremacy in him. Thus he pretends to elude the argument drawn from the Councils of Ephesus, and ii. of Nice. Because these Councils called the Roman pontiff their fellow bishop, he thinks they did not acknowledge him as their head. By the same reasoning he would have found that St. Paul did not acknowledge the supremacy of Jesus Christ, for he calls him “ *Minister of the circumcision,*” Rom. xv, 8. and “ *Apostle,*” Heb. iii. 1. It is rather unfortunate that the acts of these Councils are yet in being ; and that we are not left to conjecture their thoughts from garbled and distorted passages, or take for genuine the sense which imposture affixes to them ; we see that the Council of Sardica, whilst it calls Julius fellow bishop, says that he cited so many prelates to justify their charges against the patriarch of Alexandria ; and severely censures them for not appearing.

He next has recourse to his friend Dupin, who knows, as the castigator pretends, that a letter from Athanasius to the anti-pope Felix, whom Athanasius at the time of writing thought duly elected, is not genuine : it has been already remarked that Dupin retracted his errors and his impertinent conjectures. His impudent strictures

on the primitive Fathers, and other ecclesiastical writers, were founded on weighty reasons, if there be weight in gold: for when he was arrested on suspicion of carrying on a treasonable correspondence with a most reverend prelate of a neighbouring State, on the 10th of February, 1719, and his papers examined at the Palais Royal, it appeared that he was not guilty of treason against the State, for which he would have paid the forfeit of his life; but against the Church, of which, Cranmer like, he professed himself a member, and from which he drew an honorable and comfortable subsistence. Lassitau, bishop of Sisteron, who was present at the examination of his papers, gives a catalogue of errors, little inferior to Luther's dreams, which that lurking hypocrite insidiously endeavoured to disseminate. However, whether on conviction of conscience, or through fear of losing his appointments, all these he retracted and anathematized, died in the communion of the church. Peace to his manes. It is not from him that the castigator learned that this pope Felix, whom Athanasius, hearing the irregularity of his election, called a wolf, is revered by Catholics as a saint and martyr. Felix, the saint and martyr, governed the church from the year 269 to 275, and suffered under the Heathen emperor Aurelian. Felix, the anti-pope, as Fleury calls him, was intruded into the See of Liberius, then in exile, by the artifices of the Arian emperor Constantius, in the year 355, near a century after the martyr's death. This castigator speaks of saints and popes as a blind man does of colours.

He finds that Athanasius had great reasons to acknowledge the pope's supremacy, because Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus say that Julius, bishop of Rome, had restored him to the See of Alexandria, p. 71. However, he thinks, they were both mistaken, he was, says he, restored by the Council of Sardica, many years after, *ibid.* As the *ignis fatuus* leads the benighted traveler to the precipice, so his spirit of divination leads this castigator

castigator to his ruin: from his statement we have that Athanasius, patriarch of the second See, a Greek prelate, universally acknowledged orthodox, and Sozomen, with Socrates Scholasticus, Greek lawyers, not much prejudiced in favor of the Roman See, as is manifest from their works, believed the bishop of Rome possessed of powers to reinstate a bishop deposed by a Council, before the Council of Sardica was assembled: the right, therefore, of judging on appeals was vested in the Roman pontiff before the Council of Sardica declared it. Thus the castigator refutes himself. The writer begs leave to vindicate Socrates and Sozomen in the present instance. For their private conjectures and opinions he has no respect; but facts of public notoriety they must have known: when, therefore they say that pope Julius reinstated Athanasius in his See of Alexandria, they are to be understood of his spiritual authority and jurisdiction over that patriarchal See, and the many episcopal Sees dependant on it. In this they were not mistaken. They did not pretend that Julius reinstated him in possession of the cathedral of Alexandria, or the temporalities belonging to it: the Arian emperor Constantius would not permit him. To this first error the castigator adds a second: The Council of Sardica did not, as he pretends, restore Athanasius to the possession of his See in Alexandria. The Council had no more jurisdiction over the city of Alexandria than the pope. They declared Athanasius innocent of the crimes, with which he was charged by the Arians, and rightful bishop of that patriarchal See, as the pope had done before. For the possession of his See, Athanasius was not indebted to the Pope or the Council, but to the protection of Constantius, Emperor of the West, and the fears of Constantius, his brother in the East. Theodoret says, Lib. ii, Cap. 8, that after the Council of Sardica, Constantius sent a menacing letter by two of the bishops, in company with General Salionus, to his brother, desiring "that he would send Athanasius home to his flock."

in

in consequence, Constantius wrote the following letter to that prelate :

LETTER—

Constantius, the victorious emperor, to Athanasius, greeting :

Though we informed you by a former letter that you might come to our Court with full confidence, as it was our pleasure to send you home to your See, we have, notwithstanding, directed this letter also to your reverence, willing you to take a public carriage and come hither to us hastily without fear or distrust, to the end that you may enjoy what you desire, *ibid.* Cap. 11<sup>o</sup>.

If Athanasius had been a temporising bishop of the modern school, he had great reasons to acknowledge, not the pope's supremacy, as the castigator pretends, but the emperor's : for from the pope, who neither possessed nor claimed any temporal jurisdiction, even in Rome, he could not expect to be reinstated in his cathedral of Alexandria: that was dependant on the emperor's mandate.

Thus the castigator, making a display of erudition, with some scraps of garbled history, transcribed from Illyricus, injudiciously informs his admirers, that in primitive times Christian churches were governed by bishops in regular succession. Is that a Christian church in which there is neither bishop, nor succession of bishops? In what does it resemble the churches in Asia and Europe, founded and governed by the apostles and their immediate successors? Is it not an intuitive truth, independant on discussion, that if they taught christianity in its purity, the castigator does not. That highly polished church, of which he professes himself a minister, by reforming reformation, has reformed christianity to a non-entity.

From the facts already stated authentic, if there be truth in man, we learn that in the early times Christian princes neither exercised nor claimed, neither possessed, nor were thought to possess, any spiritual jurisdiction or

authority whatsoever ; that the supreme spiritual authority was universally believed to reside in the Roman pontiff, Peter's successor ; that he neither exercised nor claimed, neither possessed, nor was thought to possess, any civil authority or temporal jurisdiction whatever.

The reader must admire the castigator's sagacity : in a fact simply and truly stated he detects proofs of *the most contemptible ignorance*. The writer, in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's examination, had said that the Roman pontiff Victor, in the year 192, had threatened to excommunicate some Asiatics, for celebrating the festival of Easter on the 14th day of the March moon. The fact the castigator admits ; he cites a long passage from Socrates the historian, in which it is expressly said, that Victor did send an excommunication libel against them ; but he discovers the writer's ignorance in trying to persuade his readers that to celebrate the festival of Easter on the 14th day of the March moon, whatever day it happened was an innovation in religion. If the writer had called it an error in faith, or innovation in religion, a man of less sagacity than the castigator would have qualified it artifice or imposture, the latent ignorance would have escaped his notice. With equal sagacity, he has discovered that this writer is not better informed about the nature of excommunication, as it was frequently used in primitive ages, p. 74 : a subject which the writer had not discussed at all. If the castigator will discard that lying spirit of divination, which deceives him so invariably, he will find that in the statement there is neither ignorance, artifice nor imposture. The Council of Nice, that venerable assembly of catholic bishops, of tried faith, unshaken by the tempest of persecution, against whom the last efforts of the powers of darkness were ineffectual, condemned that usage, not as an error in faith, or innovation in religion, but as an erroneous and unwarranted deviation from general discipline ; and what the castigator, with modesty surpassing his sagacity, calls a *non-sensical rite*, was one of the principal causes

causes of assembling that great Council. The prelates in their Synodical Letter say : “ as to our consent for the celebration of the most holy festival of Easter, we give you to understand, that the controversy raised on that subject, was, through your good prayers, well and discreetly settled, so that all the brethren, who dwell in the East, and in times past, followed the observation of the *Jews* in keeping the feast of Easter, are now determined in future, to follow the *Romans*, who *always from the beginning* have kept it as we have done,” Theo. B. i, C. 9. In the next chapter the historian gives the letter of Constantine the Great, to the bishops in his empire, who were not present at the Council. As many readers have not a familiar spirit to consult, and few understand the language of a Greek historian, the writer begs leave to give that prince’s letter in plain English; in it his reader will see how deeply immersed in the popish superstitions of observing the *nonsensical rites* of feasts and fasts, the whole Christian world was in the days of that first and greatest of Christian Emperors :

#### LETTER—

“ Constantine Emperor, to the churches greeting :  
Whereas the flourishing and prosperous state of the common wealth, is to us manifest proof of the special grace and favour of God, it has been always our chief care to have *one faith*, unfeigned charity, and general agreement in religion and worship of God preserved amongst all people of the Catholic church; but as this could not be well accomplished, unless all the bishops, or a great majority of them were assembled, that each might severally give his judgment in the causes of religion, hence after as many as possibly might, were met together, I myself, as one of your number, was present also, for I did not refuse to unite myself with you in that service, of which I am exceedingly glad; so long every question was exactly discussed, until such sentence was pronounced, as God, the beholder of all things, by the union and consent of minds, was pleased to permit ;

so



so that nothing was left which concerns disagreement of mind or controversy of religion.

When the question was moved concerning the most holy feast of Easter, it was agreed by common consent that all Christians should observe it on the same day. For what is more laudable or honorable than that his feast, by which the hope of immortal life is offered to us, should be observed by all in the same manner? It seemed shameful and dishonorable to us to follow the custom of the Jews in keeping that sacred festival, who, for that great and horrible crime of shedding our Saviour's blood, are justly blinded with error and ignorance; we are left free to reject their custom, and to transmit to posterity a more true manner of observing the feast *which we have retained from the day of our Saviour's passion to this present time*, therefore, let us have no fellowship nor communion with the accursed Jews. Our Saviour has taught us to walk in a different path from theirs, and that course which is pursued by the professors of our religion is both lawful and becoming. Let us therefore all unite and unanimously adhere to it, most venerable brethren, and separate ourselves from the detestable opinion of the Jews. It is absurd that they should boast that without the help of their religion we cannot rightly observe this festival. How can they believe any thing rightly, who, having slain our Lord, are fallen into a kind of phrenzy, are not guided by reason, but hurried by violent passion wherever their natural madness drives them; hence it is that on this subject they cannot conceive the truth. They have strayed so far, that instead of correcting former errors, they now celebrate the feast of Easter twice a year. What reason is there to induce us to imitate men whom we see engaged in such gross and manifest errors? We cannot permit that the same feast may be solemnized twice in the year. Though I should not propose these things to you, yet it is incumbent on your wisdom diligently to pray to God that he will not suffer your devout and well meaning

meaning minds to be defiled by the corrupt manners of such malicious men.

Moreover you may easily perceive how great an enormity it is that any dissention should subsist amongst us in so great and solemn a festival of our religion, *for our Saviour has given us one festival day* of our liberty, that is, the day of his most holy passion, and his will is that there be but *one Catholic Church*, the members of which, though dispersed in divers places, are united in one spirit, that is, in the will and pleasure of God. Let your wisdom therefore diligently consider how lamentable and shameful a thing it is, that on the same day some should give themselves *to fasting*, and others to feasting, and again when the Easter is over, some should indulge themselves with amusements, whilst others afflict themselves with *fasting and abstinence*. This matter required correction, and the same order observed in all places, for such is the good will of Divine Providence, as is well known to you all, and as it was our business to settle this question, so that we have nothing to do with the custom of the Jews; who were accessory to the death of their Lord and Master, and also to continue that laudable and decent custom, which all the churches in the world observe, whether in the West, or the South, or the North, and several also in the East observe it, and thus it has been decreed with the unanimous consent of us all. I have also engaged for you that you will easily consent to, and joyfully approve whatever is uniformly practised in the city of *Rome*, in *Italy*, in *all Africa*, in *Egypt*, in *Spain*, in *France* and *Britanny*, in *Lybia* and in *all Greece*, in the jurisdiction of *Asia* and *Pontus*, and in *Cilicia*; that you will carefully consider that in all these places there are a greater number of churches, and that their manner, ratified by common consent, is most agreeable to reason, and more remote from the false opinions of the perjured Jews.

To conclude, it was unanimously agreed that the most holy feast of *Easter* should be always celebrated on the same day;

day; for in so holy and solemn a thing, there ought to be no disunion: to follow this opinion, in which there is no error of faith, nor stain of sin, is highly commendable. The question thus stated, it is your duty to reverence and embrace this decree with willing minds, as *a special Gift of God, a Commandment sent down from Heaven, for whatever is decreed in the Holy Council of Bishops is to be attributed to the will of God himself*, wherefore, after you have informed our beloved brethren of such things as are decreed in this Council, of the doctrine here established, and the manner of observing the holy feast of Easter; you ought first approve it yourselves, and then take order that things may be settled in that good state, which I have long desired, that you and I may celebrate that *sacred festival* on the same day; and that I may rejoice for your sake, as I certainly will when I hear that, by your pious endeavours and the grace of God, the tyranny of the Devil is utterly suppressed; and our faith, (unity and peace established,) doth flourish and increase in the world. God keep you, my dear brethren, in prosperous health."

This letter is replete with popish errors: it says, expressly, that controversies on religious subjects are decided by the authority of Councils composed exclusively of bishops; that their decision is final and infallible under the direction of God himself; that the feast of Easter, that *nonsensical rite*, was solemnized by all christians from the very first establishment of christianity; that it was preceded by fasting and abstinence, *an intolerable rite*. The castigator, in his own opinion, better informed than the emperor, and all the prelates of his empire, tells us, that the celebration of Easter on any particular day, had no foundation either in scripture or apostolical tradition—p. 72; he therefore admits, contrary to his principles, that apostolical tradition would have sufficiently authorized this *nonsensical rite*. Why not other rites also? Some men, who have the simplicity of judging by the rules of common sense, without the

The assistance of Socrates' Demon, or the Castigator's familiar spirit, think that the celebration of Easter has some foundation in scripture. It is presumed that every reader knows this great festival of Easter to be solemnized in commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is known from the scriptures to have happened on the first day of the week, which we call Sunday. St. John, says, xix, 31 : " the Jews, therefore, lest the bodies should remain on the cross on the Sabbath (Saturday) as it was the day of preparation (" *epei paraſkeuē en,*" ) and that was the great day of the sabbath, asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and they taken off," Christ therefore suffered on Friday, the eve of Saturday, and St. Paul, 1st Cor. xv, 3, 4, says : " that he rose from the dead on the third day," which is of all necessity Sunday. The four evangelists say that the women came to the sepulchre very early on the first day of the week. He was then risen, the precise time is not marked, nor is it known. To celebrate the festival of Easter on Sunday has, therefore, some foundation in scripture.

The Jews, as ordered, xii. of Exodus, sacrificed the Paschal Lamb on the evening of the 14th day of the lunar month Abib, or Nisan, as it was called, after the captivity ; on that day the Saviour having strictly complied with the Jewish ordinance, instituted the venerable sacrifice of the new law, of which all the sacrifices of the old law, then abolished, were figurative, and the day following was himself offered in sacrifice on the cross. We learn from the Council of Cæsarea assembled in the year 196 of our Æra, at which presided Theophilus, bishop of that city, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, that the 15th of the month Nisan fell that year on Friday the 23d of March, Christ, therefore, rose from the dead on Monday the 25th of the same month. Does the castigator think the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, facts of sufficient importance to engage the attention of his immediate disciples ? Does he imagine that in little more than a century these facts were effaced from  
the

the memory of the people of Palestine, that even the church of Jerusalem had so soon forgotten them? If he believes it, the man who believes him, must be credulous indeed. At the distance of three centuries we yet remember that the reforming patriarch Luther was born on the 10th of November, 1483; that after two years previous instructions, he made the charming Miss Boree his assistant in the reforming trade; on the 11th of June, 1525; that he ceased from his apostolical labours and matrimonial cares on the 18th of February, 1546. His prayer penned by himself, in one of his pious fits, is yet extant in the original manuscript, it is the quintessence of his new modelled gospel. For the edification of his admiring disciples, the writer inserts it: "My God through your goodness provide us with clothes, with hats, with riding coats and cloaks, with good fat calves with kids, with beef and mutton, with many wives and few children, to drink well and eat well is the true way to pass through life without irksomeness." Reverend Christian Junker, a zealous Lutheran member of the Royal Society of Berlin, and rector of Altenbourg, in his life of Luther, p. 225, admits this prayer to have been penned by that Reformer? Does this castigator think these facts of greater consequence to his reformed brethren than the birth, death and resurrection, of Jesus Christ to his disciples? If not, the prelates assembled at Cæsarea, in Palestine, might have known the day of the month on which the Saviour suffered without consulting an astronomer; to deny it is stretching reformed modesty.

It appears from their Synodical Letter that these prelates thought it an error to celebrate the Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, as some Asiatics did at that time. After declaring that the festival ought to be solemnized on Sunday, they say: "copies of this letter are sent to all churches, lest the fault of those, who rashly engage in error, be imputed to us. We wish you also to know that the church of Alexandria celebrates the festival the same day with us."

A Council, assembled at Pontus, at which presided Palmas, bishop of Amastris, one in Gaul, at which St. Ireneus presided; another composed of the prelates of Orfonia and the adjacent countries, at which Bachelus, bishop of Corinth presided, all unanimously decided, on apostolical tradition, that the Easter ought to be celebrated on Sunday.—See Euf. B. 5, Cap. 23. In a word, all the churches in the Christian world, if you except these of Asia minor, and some few others, solemnized the festival on the same day, and continued the fast of the Lent until Sunday. These *nonsensical rites* were universally observed by the immediate disciples and successors of the apostles. Will the castigator permit us Christians to believe that these men, who had eyes and ears as we have, knew the rites established and practised by the apostles themselves? Or will he allow us to think that this rite, so universally observed, and considered of so much importance in religion, had some other foundation besides *will worship*, as he calls it? Was it the pope who introduced, and imposed on the Christian world this worse than *nonsensical rite*, the fast of the Lent, more hateful to modern epicures than the pope himself? If so, the papal authority was universally obeyed; to admit this proposition is ruinous to all anti-papal systems of religion, to deny it is not less ruinous to modern reformation. For if the fast of the Lent and the solemnity of Easter have not been instituted by Popes or Councils, as they most certainly were not, since they were universally observed, they must have been instituted by the apostles themselves, according to St. Austin's rule "all rites which are universally observed in the church, and are not found instituted in any Council of the church, must descend from apostolical tradition, Epis. 118: *ad Januarium*. St. Austin thought that no other authority would be universally obeyed. The castigator, better informed than Austin, does not find the obligation of fasting the Lent, or celebrating the Easter, expressly enjoined in the scriptures, and wisely concludes that no such observance was

instituted by the apostles. He has given so many specimens of the newest modelled modesty, that the writer is not surpris'd to hear an ignorant scribbler, at the distance of sixteen or seventeen centuries, pretend to know the doctrine taught by the apostles, and the rites and ceremonies authorized by their example, better than the prelates who immediately succeeded them in the care of the churches which they founded and governed. Of the twelve apostles sent to instruct the world seven never wrote a line, that we know. Does the castigatour pretend that these men taught nothing? Or that the churches founded by them did not know the rites and ceremonies, which they themselves observed? Their example, without any written precept, was more than sufficient to establish them.

He quotes from Socrates, as if from an authentic historian a long passage, in which that writer says: that the feast of Easter and other festivals were not imposed by the gospel or instituted by the apostles. Aeriſius' authority is of equal force on the subject: Socrates, a layman, ignorant of ecclesiastical discipline, had adopted the errors of that reforming monk of the fourth century, who, in opposition to his bishop, Eustathius, of Constantinople, condemned all the ceremonies of the church, particularly the celebration of festivals, because, in these great solemnities, the bishop, whom he hated, appeared in a conspicuous manner at the head of the clergy and the people--See Epiphanius, Her. 76. It is not surpris'ing that Socrates, who adopted the error, should attempt to justify it. Religious restraints were not more pleasing to that epicurean courtier than they are to his admirers of the present day. However, we learn from him that the festival of Easter was universally observed, and preceded by the fast of the Lent.

That the churches in Asia minor did celebrate the festival on the fourteenth day of the lunar month Nisan, as Socrates says, is true, and though a deviation from general discipline, it was tolerated by Victor's predecessors;

predecessors ; but when Blastus insidiously endeavoured to introduce Judaism, founding a pretence on the coincidence of the Christian festival in Asia, with the Jewish passover, Victor thought it necessary to correct that variety, and establish uniformity in that district, with the other churches, in which the festival was observed on the Sunday ; with that view, he directed Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, to assemble the bishops of the district ; the prelates knowing that the custom of celebrating the festival on the 14th day, as observed in their churches, had been tolerated by Victor's predecessors, persisted in it. Victor finding persuasions ineffectual, threatened to issue an excommunication, Euf. L. 5, C. 24.

Eusebius, on whose authority Socrates seems to have rested his opinion, says that Victor did actually excommunicate the Asiatics. This severity did not meet the approbation of other prelates, who, though they themselves celebrated the Easter on the same day with the Roman Church, did not think the diversity in the Asiatic manner, a sufficient reason to justify so harsh a sentence. St. Ireneus complained of it in his letter to Victor : " the priests," said he, " before Soter, who governed the church in which you this day preside, that is, Anicetus, Pius, Hygins, Telephorus, and Sixtus did not observe the festival in that manner (that is on the 14th day of the lunar month Nisan) nor did they permit those, who were with them to observe it in that manner ; but they remained in peace with those who did . . . . no one was ever expelled the church for that custom." In the same letter he says, that though the pontiff Anicetus could not prevail on Polycarp to change that custom, he did not threaten to censure him ; he also observes : that there was as great a diversity in observing the fast in the holy week, as there was in the celebration of the festival, some fasting three whole days without any nourishment, others two days, some forty hours, and others but one day ; " this diversity," says he, " has not commenced in our time, but a long time ago, under our predecessors, who do not seem to have taken



taken sufficient precautions." This diversity in the manner of observing the fast of the Lent, as well as in the celebration of the Easter, whilst both were invariably held sacred by all churches in the Christian world, shew them to have been of apostolical institution, but that some churches were not exact in observing the institution in all its circumstances. Socrates, speaking of this diversity, says that the Greeks fasted six weeks before Easter, and the Romans but three, which is a mistake, for we know from Leo the Great, who was bishop of Rome in Socrates' time, that the Romans fasted the whole Lent, which from its very name implies forty days, "*quadagesima*." Socrates says that the Romans did not fast on Saturdays in Lent, a mistake which shews that he knew nothing of the discipline of that church but by vague report; for the Romans fasted all Saturdays; and were censured by the Council of Trull, Can. 55, for fasting on Saturdays in the Lent. Gregory, therefore, was justified in saying of that historian *multum mentitur*. This is one of the castigator's admired Fathers.

Though many prelates in Victor's time, unacquainted perhaps with his motives, did not approve his conduct with regard to the Asiatics, the event shewed that Victor was better informed, and his apparent severity justifiable; for as Christ neither died, nor rose from the dead on the fourteenth day of Nisan, a commemoration either of his death or resurrection, could not with strict propriety be solemnized on that day. Hence the festival of the Easter, as celebrated by the Asiatics, had a strong appearance of the Jewish Passover, from which *Blastus*, and his adherents, pretended to conclude, that this being the principal ceremony of the old law, the other ceremonies of that law ought to be observed also. To remove the occasion, and efface every shadow of discordance, the celebrated Council of Nice, exercising that power, which, in the simplicity of ancient times, was thought to have been vested by Jesus Christ in the pastors of his church assembled in his name, ordered all Christians

Christians to celebrate the festival of Easter on the Sunday immediately succeeding the fourteenth day of the lunar month Nisan; that month, the fourteenth day of which fell on the vernal equinox, or immediately after it, was called Nisan by the Jews, and was the first month of their year; disobedience to this order of the Council was considered as something worse than error, and the Quartodecimans were in consequence numbered amongst sectaries. What would these venerable pastors have thought of an obscure individual, in a remote corner of the world, who some 1400 hundred years after their death, pretends to know the origin of the discipline observed in the churches, which they, and their predecessors in office, since the apostles days, had governed, better than they did themselves, and scoffingly calls their most solemn ceremonies *nonsensical rites*? The writer pities the simplicity, and laments the infatuation of so many inconsiderate victims, who listen to the tales of assuming arrogance, as the Heathens did to their oracles, and place the same confidence in them.

From the decree of the Council of Nice we learn that the prelates there assembled thought themselves vested with a power of ordering a festival to be solemnized on a certain day; the observance of the festival for so many ages on the day determined by the Council, shews that all Christian churches believed it. The castigator says they were all mistaken; he very modestly sets his private opinion in opposition to the united authority of the Christian world. This, to a dispassionate enquirer, has all the appearance of downright imposture or manifest illusion; whether imposture or illusion, it argues the folly of appealing to the authority of the Fathers, in support of a doctrine, as opposite to that which is believed and taught by them, as the most glaring falsehood is to an intuitive truth.

The castigator tells us, p. 76, that popes have been more than once excommunicated for condemning the doctrines of the gospel. He has not specified the doctrines

trines which they condemned, nor cited any authority to support the assertion. It is true in a marginal note he instances two popes, *Liberius* and *Vigilius*, of whose history he seems to know nothing: neither the one nor the other was excommunicated for condemning the doctrines of the gospel, nor were they excommunicated at all. Though there were many impudent monks at that time, there was not one so lost to shame as to presume to denounce a sentence against the chief pastors of the church: this was reserved for the self-created evangelist of Wirtemberg, who, to the no small astonishment of the world, excommunicated Leo X. *Liberius* and *Vigilius* were blamed and justly, the former, not for teaching the Arian heresy, for he condemned it; but for condemning *Athanasius*, whom he knew to be unjustly accused, and persecuted for his defence of truth; and for communicating with *Ursatius* and *Valens*, whom he ought to have known, and in all appearance did know, to be Arians in principle, though they subscribed a Catholic formula at *Sirmium*, where they made their peace with *Liberius*. However as the term *Omoussious Consubstantial* was suppressed in that formula, it was wrested by the Arians to support their heresy, and *Liberius* justly blamed for subscribing it.

*Vigilius* was not less deservedly blamed for promising the Empress *Theodora* to reinstate her favourite *Anthymus*, the Eutychian patriarch of *Constantinople*, who had been deposed by pope *Agapitus*, if she would procure him the pontificate; and for writing to *Anthymus*, *Theodosius*, of *Alexandria*, and *Severus*, of *Antioch*, that he was of their opinion and communion, when the General *Bellifarius*, by order of the Empress, had banished the true Pope *Sylverius*, and substituted *Vigilius* by his own authority, but *Vigilius* was not then pope: the rightful pope *Sylverius* was yet living in a state of exile and persecution: when, on the demise of *Sylverius*, by the consent and appropriation of the Roman clergy and people, *Vigilius* became the rightful possessor of the then vacant

vacant See, the empress insisting on his promise of reinstating her favourite Anthymus, he replied that he had rashly promised, and sinned grievously in so doing, that he would not add one crime to another by fulfilling an unjust and unlawful engagement, refused positively to reinstate Anthymus, approved the 5th general Council which condemned the Eutychian heresy; was himself sent into exile, and persecuted with great severity—See Paul the deacon, in his life of Justinian.

The promise of Christ to Peter saying, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith should not fail," is manifestly verified in the history of this pontiff: before he obtained the pontificate we see in him a court politician, an artful intriguer, an unprincipled schemer, solely intent on the gratification of his ambition, regardless of the means. The instant he became the rightful successor of the apostle we find him totally changed; religiously attentive to the duties of his state; unshaken as a rock: neither threats nor promises, persecutions, nor death could induce him to deviate from truth or give countenance to error. During a space of eighteen years he governed the church in turbulent times, and steered the fisherman's boat with a steady hand. The history of this pontiff, which the castigatour will hardly venture to dispute, as it is given by cotemporary writers, furnishes the most unquestionable proofs of the authority, which the Roman pontiffs exercised, and were thought to possess over all the Greek and Asiatic churches. For the information of those readers, who have no familiar spirit to consult, the writer gives a short sketch of it:

The Emperor Justinian having taken Africa from the Vandals, in the year 536, made vast preparations to recover Italy from the Goths, which they had possessed since the year 476, when Odoacer took it from Romulus Augustulus, then emperor of the West, and declared himself king of Italy. Theodatus, the then Gothic king, terrified by the threats and preparations of the emperor, wrote to Agapitus, the Roman pontiff, and the senators

tors, that if they did not avert the impending storm from Italy, he would put the senators, their wives and children to death. The senators alarmed, sent the pope to Constantinople to intercede with the emperor, and endeavour to prevail on him to desist. His remonstrances were ineffectual: the emperor was resolved to indemnify himself for the heavy expenses incurred in the expedition; he left the senators, their wives and children to their fate. Theodatus' intended vengeance was prevented by his death. His soldiers, seeing the progress of the imperial General *Bellisarius* in Italy, revolted, and declared *Vitiges* their king. This traitor sacrificed the tyrant to the hatred of the Romans, and saved the senators from impending death, *Proc. de Bel. Goth.*

The pope on his arrival at Constantinople found *Epiphanius*, the Catholic patriarch of Constantinople dead, and *Anthymus*, an Eutychian, bishop of Trebifonde, translated to the patriarchal See, through the credit and influence of the empress *Theodora*. Notwithstanding the entreaties of the emperor, the solicitations and secret threats of the empress, *Agapitus* deposed him, and, in the church of Saint Mary, consecrated *Mennas*, with the approbation of the emperor and the people, to fill that vacant See, *Lib. C. 21<sup>o</sup>*. *Agapitus* died soon after in Constantinople, and *Sylverius* was chosen in Rome to succeed him. The empress *Theodora*, desirous of reinstating her favourite *Anthymus*, signified to *Vigilius*, deacon of the Roman church, then in Constantinople, that she would ensure his election for the Roman See, on his promise of suppressing the Council of Chalcedon, and approving the faith of *Anthymus*, of *Theodorus*, of Alexandria, and *Severus*, of Antioch, that is, the Eutychian heresy. This promise *Vigilius* made, received from the empress seven hundred pounds of gold, with an order to the Roman general *Bellisarius*, to put him in possession of the See; on his arrival at Rome he found *Sylverius* acknowledged, went to Ravenna, shewed the General the empress's order, and promised him two hundred pounds

pounds of gold if he would dispose of Sylverius. Bellisarius took Rome from the Goths, on the 10th of December, 536, and under pretence that Sylverius had given some intelligence to the Goths, sent him an exile to Pataras in Lycia, and placed *Vigilius* in the pontifical chair, *Lib. in Br. Ca. 22°*.

From this short sketch it appears, that the pope's authority was as unlimited over the patriarch of Constantinople after the Council of Chalcedon as before it; the sequel of *Vigilius's* history shews it not less forcibly: when, after the taking and sacking of Rome by *Totila*, on the 17th of December, 546, *Vigilius* was called to Constantinople by the emperor, though a prisoner, and treated with great cruelty, he published a sentence of condemnation against the empress *Theodora*, and the *acephali*, or *independents* of the day; by his unshaken firmness in support of the Council of Chalcedon he disappointed the views, and rendered ineffectual all the efforts of *Theodorus* of Cappadocia; and of the other partisans of the Eutychian heresy, who, though all-powerful at Court, and the pope in the church of Saint Euphemia of Chalcedon, as a place of refuge, could not otherwise make their peace with him, than by offering to him a profession of faith, in which they declare, that to preserve ecclesiastical unity they receive the four general Councils of Nice, of Constantinople, of Ephesus, and of Chalcedon, promising to observe inviolably, all that was in them decided with the consent of the legates and vicars of the Holy See, by whom the popes have presided over these Councils, *each in his time*; a profession of the same form was given by *Mennas* patriarch of Constantinople, by *Theodore* of Casarea, by *Andrew* of Ephesus, by *Theodorus* of Antioch, in Pisidia, *Peter* of Tarus, and many others—See Fleury, B. xxxiii. p. 431.

It cannot be said or thought that a man, who, in defence of his life had taken refuge in the sanctuary, used any undue influence, to engage these prelates to make such a public and authentic acknowledgment of the su-

periority of his See. The fear of giving offence to the clergy of their several dioceses, and to the faithful in general, to whom the fact was as well known then, as it is to us now, and who would no more acknowledge a bishop disclaiming the authority of the Roman See then, than we would now, is the only motive which can justify their submission.

If the castigator had consulted ecclesiastical history he would have found one pope, who, though not excommunicated whilst living, was severely censured after his death, on the supposition of his having countenanced the Eutychian heresy at least by silence; whether the censure was well or ill founded a question of difficult discussion, it is certain that the 8th general Council, in which he was censured, did not think a pope infallible, the Catholics of the United Kingdom, with great propriety, therefore, declare that the pope's infallibility is no article of catholic doctrine, nor term of communion.

To fill his pamphlet with something the castigator gives us the history of *Afriarius*, an African, who, excommunicated by his own bishop *Urb. nus*, had appealed to pope *Zozimus*. This affords him an opportunity of discharging a certain portion of his bile in the abuse, which he lavishes on that venerable pontiff and his successor *Cœlestine*. Their arrogance and imposture he must have learned from his spirit of divination: historians are silent on the subject. He concludes a long tale, some parts of which are founded on fact, others of his own invention, by saying, that this priest of *Sicca*, in Africa, who had been absolved on appeal by the pope, acknowledged, in presence of an African Council, the crimes with which he was charged. The reader will be surprised to hear a man cite against the pope's authority a fact, which from his own statement tends to establish it: for he says, p. 84, "by the protection of the bishop of Rome he might have escaped had he been able to withstand the stings of his own conscience, but upon the fourth day, to the great confusion of the legate and the  
supremacy

supremacy, he confessed every crime." From this statement it is manifest that the pope's authority was acknowledged by these African prelates, otherwise his authority would not have saved the man, whom they had before condemned. How the crimes of that African priest could turn to the confusion of the Roman pontiff or his legate is not easily conceived. A Judge in appeal must pronounce on the proceedings already had in the Court from which the appeal comes. If the man had been legally convicted no protection could have saved him. A man, who consults common sense, would say that this African was a hypocrite, who had imposed on the pope; whose crimes, though known to the African prelates on public report, had not been juridically proved; it was therefore neither arrogance nor imposture in the pope to absolve him: it was his official duty, and this castigator, whilst he vents his spleen on these popes, exposes his own ignorance to contempt. To detect the crimes of persons not known is a privilege to which popes pretend no title, this, with all such, they resign to Bower, Francowitz, and other retailers of slanders, who, in the malignity of their own hearts, at the distance of some centuries, discover the motives which they lend to innocence and integrity; in order to give these virtues the colour of their opposite vices.

It is true the African prelates did at that time prohibit appeals in personal causes to Rome, and in their Synodical Letter to the Pope assigned a sufficient and satisfactory reason for so doing: "how," said they, "can a judgment beyond the seas be certain, since the necessary witnesses cannot be sent, either on account of the weakness of their sex, or their advanced age, or some other impediment." Long before that time St. Cyprian complained of the irregularity of such appeals; and since that time, France, Spain, Germany and England, before the Reformation, loudly and justly complained of them. What then? This only proves that such appeals were always made, and often abusively, to the great detri-  
ment



ment of ecclesiastical discipline ; that power is frequently abused no man doubts, but the abuse of power shews that power to be real : for if fictitious, it could not be abused.

There are some men, who having borrowed an opinion, however false or absurd, seize with avidity every shadow, which seems to countenance the deception ; there are others, who artfully wrest, in support of the opinions, which it is their interest to lend, the very reasons, which detect the fallacy. It is not easy to determine to which of these classes our castigator belongs : the facts which he has selected in support of error, uniformly, and unequivocally, condemn it. He is not less unlucky in his choice of witnesses. A Jerom, a monk remarkably austere, a mirror of penance, as inimical to epicurism, the idol of modern reformists, as the Baptist himself ; in whose works all the errors borrowed from Jovinien, Vigilantius, &c. now taught in the reformed churches, are refuted with inexpressible force and perspicuity, a man who informs us that he was himself secretary to the Roman pontiff Damafus, and assisted him in answering the Synodical consultations of the East and the West, that is, of the then Christian world : in his letter to *Gerontia*, advising that lady to continue unmarried, he relates an anecdote which he heard at Rome, “ many years ago,” says he, “ when I assisted Damafus, bishop of the Roman city, in ecclesiastical writings, and answered the Synodical consultations of the East and the West.” It was, therefore, the custom of the East and the West to consult the Roman See on difficult questions ; hence we find Jerom himself, confessedly the most learned man of his time, consulting the same pontiff, and resting the expression of his faith, in a difficult question, on the authority of the Holy See. The Greek term “ *hypostasis*” is of doubtful signification ; it may express a *subsisting person*, or a *substance*, in the former sense it was commonly used by Catholic writers, in the latter by Heathen philosophers. The Arians, and other sectaries in the East, wrested

wrested this ambiguous expression from the sense intended by Catholic writers, to that sense which seemed to give countenance to their errors. St. Jerom, pressed by contending parties to declare his faith, dared not use the expression to signify either *person* or *substance* without the pope's approbation. He wrote two letters to Damafus on the subject; in the first he says, that in the distracted state of the church in Asia he found it necessary to consult the See of Peter: "though," says he, "your greatness terrifies, your humanity invites, as a sheep I desire the victim of salvation from the priest, and claim protection from the shepherd. Let envy recede, and the ostentation of the Roman dignity cease. I speak to the successor of the fisherman, to a disciple of the cross, following no chief but Christ, I am united in communion with your beatitude, that is, with the chair of St. Peter, on that rock I know the church to be built, whosoever eats the lamb without this house is a profaner." There were three bishops then contending for the patriarchal See of Antioch, of which church Jerom was himself a clergyman: of these, in his letter to Damafus, he says: "I do not know, *Vitalus*, *Meletius*, I reject, nor do I know *Paulinus*, whosoever does not collect with you scatters, . . . if we ask what they think may be understood by three *hypostases*; they say three subsisting persons; we answer; thus we believe, the sense does not satisfy them: they exact the word because I know not what poison is concealed in the syllables: we exclaim if any one does not confess three *hypostases* or three *enypostata*, that is, three subsisting persons, let him be an *anatheme* . . . but if any man, by *hypostasen*, understanding *ousian essence*, or *substance*, does not say that in three persons there is one *hypostasen*, he is alienated from Christ, and in this confession, also, with you we are impressed with the stamp of union. Decide if you please, I beseech you. I will not fear to say three *hypostases* if you command." He warns the pope at the same time against the artifices of these sectaries who urged him to use a  
term

term which they might wrest in support of their errors, and then concludes, "wherefore, I conjure you by the *Crucified*, by the *Salvation* of the world, by the *Consubstantial Trinity*, that by your letters I be authorized to say three *hypostases*, or not to say it, and, lest the obscurity of the place in which I dwell should deceive you, deign to transmit the writings by the carriers of letters to Evagrius the priest, whom you well know, and signify to me at the same time with whom at Antioch I ought to communicate, because the Campanes, united with the sectaries of Tharsis, desire nothing else but that they may, supported by the authority of your communion, preach three *hypostases*, with the old sense."

As this letter remained unanswered, St. Jerom wrote a second in a pressing style, in which, after exposing his embarrassment, he says: "in the mean time I exclaim if any one be united to the chair of Peter he is mine. *Meletius*, *Vitalus*, and *Paulinus*, (the contending bishops) say they are united to you. If one only said it I could believe it; but now two assert a falsehood, if not all three, wherefore, I conjure your beatitude, by the cross of our Lord, to signify to me by letter, with whom in Syria I may communicate."

From these letters we learn, that to wrest words from the intended sense of the writer, in order to countenance new opinions, is not of modern invention. We see the embarrassment, into which the artifices of sectaries, wresting his words, and garbling his works, threw this most accurate and intelligent writer, whilst yet living; we are the less surpris'd that many centuries after his death, other sectaries, equally artful, should attempt to make him, and other writers not more cautious, speak a language, which they never intended. The writer makes no illusion to the castigatour, he does not suspect him to have read a line of Jerom's works—the few garbled passages which he gives are transcribed from *Illyricus*.

We also learn from Jerom's letters that in Asia, not only

only catholics acknowledged the authority of the Roman See ; but that even different sectaries, in order to impose on the credulity of the Public, founded their pretensions on a supposed communion with that See. So universally and so publicly was it known, and so deeply was it impressed in the minds of all Christians, that the See of Peter is the centre of union, the bond of Catholic communion.

To enable readers not versed in the works of these early writers, whom by reason of high antiquity and great authority we call Fathers of the Church, to judge of the folly of this castigator, who refers to Jerom for a condemnation of popery, the writer transcribes a few passages from that Father so justly celebrated, not only for his profound knowledge of the scriptures, but also for his extensive acquaintance with every branch of polite literature ; of whom Erasmus, an acknowledged judge, says, that his works are an opulent treasure, diversified with the beautiful and the sublime of all languages and sciences.

In his first book against Jovinien, Jerom states the errors of that reformist :

1st. That a state of perpetual celibacy is not more meritorious than the matrimonial state.

2d. That they, who are regenerated by baptism, cannot fall, or, as he terms it, be subverted by the Devil.

3d. That abstinence from meats is useless.

The 4th, and last, that all who keep their baptism will obtain one and the same reward in the Kingdom of Heaven.

These, says Jerom, are the hissings of the old serpent, "*hæc sunt sibilæ serpentis antiqui.*" By these counsels the dragon expelled man from paradise, "*draco his cæ consuleis de Paradiso hominem expulit.*" Thus Jerom qualifies the doctrines which the castigator must teach. He then, by a train of irresistible reasoning, shews not simply the falsehood, but the impiety of these doctrines, refutes the silly reasons offered by Jovinien in justification of these errors,

errors, and which modern reformists continue to repeat, *ad nauseum usque*.

Jovinien, to justify his first error, had cited the example of the patriarchs in the old law, and descending to the new law, insisted on the prerogative of Supreme Head of the Church, conferred on Peter, a married man, in preference to John, in a state of celibacy. To this Jerom replied, that though celibacy was not so seriously recommended in the old law, it was yet practised by their greatest prophets, Elias, Elifha, Daniel, Jeremias, &c. To the prerogative conferred on Peter, he replied that it was conferred on age. The writer transcribes the whole passage in the original—" Si autem obnixè contenderit Joannem Virginem non fuisse & nos Amoris præcipui Causam Virginitatem diximus, exponat ille: si Virgo non fuit, cur præ Cæteris Apostolis plus amatus sit? Et dicis super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti Claves regni cælorum accipiant, & ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur, tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut Capite Constituto Schismatis tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Joannes electus est Virgo? Ætati delatum est quia Petrus senior erat: ne adhuc adolescens, ac penè puer progressæ ætatis hominibus preferretur."

"But if he earnestly contend that John was not a virgin, and we have said that virginity was the cause of singular love, let him explain, if he was not a virgin, why he was more beloved by Jesus Christ, than the other apostles? But you say the church was founded on Peter, though the same thing in another place be done on all the apostles, and all receive the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the strength of the Church be equally solidated on them; yet for this amongst the twelve, one is chosen, that a head being constituted the occasion of schism should be taken away. But why was not John, a virgin, chosen? A preference was given to age because Peter was older, and that a youth, as yet almost a  
boy,

boy, should not be preferred to men of advanced age."

From this passage the castigator has selected these words, p. 31, "the church is founded on all the apostles; and all have received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the firmness of the church rests on them equally," and this he thinks conclusive evidence that Jerom did not think Peter superior to any of the apostles. The writer does not remember to have seen such unblushing imposture; even doating stupidity cannot justify it. It is a lamentable truth that many well disposed but uninformed christians are duped by such impostures.

In his writings against Vigilantius, Jerom is not less unfriendly to modern reformists, in whose defence it must be admitted, that not one of their errors is of late invention; they have been all severally taught at different times, and in different places, but were never united into one pretended rule of faith, until Luther, of reforming memory, composed his monstrous code.

Jerom begins the work by enumerating many monsters of which we read in sacred and prophane history; amongst these he ranks Vigilantius, "who," says he, "actuated by the unclean spirit, resists the spirit of Christ; says that the tombs of the martyrs are not to be venerated; that vigils are to be condemned; that alleluia is not to be sung but on Easter day; that continence is heresy, and chastity the source of licentiousness, and as Euphorbus is said to be re-born in Pythagoras, so the perverse mind of Jovinien is risen in him, hence both in the one and the other we are forced to reply to the insidious arts of the demon. Jovinien condemned by the authority of the Roman church with the pleasures of the table gave up the ghost; Vigilantius, now an inn-keeper, mixes water with wine, and by his accustomed art endeavours to unite the poison of perfidy with the Catholic faith: he condemns virginity, he hates chastity, at the banquets of worldlings he rails

against the facts of the saints." A man would imagine that he was describing a modern reformist. To the charge of idolatry, which was then made, and now, after a lapse of many centuries, revived, he replies: "mad head! Who ever adored a martyr? Who ever thought a man a God? When Paul and Barnaby were thought by the people of Lycaonia to be Jupiter and Mercury, and victims were prepared to be offered to them, they rent their garments and said they were men; not but they were better than the dead men Jupiter and Mercury, but by an Heathen superstition the honor due to God was offered to them." Thus Jerom distinguishes the honor due to God from the respect and reverence which is due to some of his creatures. It grieves him, continues Jerom, speaking of Vigilantius that the relicks of the martyrs are covered with a precious veil. . . . Are we then sacrilegious when we enter the churches of the apostles? Was Constantine (the emperor) sacrilegious, who translated the holy relicks of Andrew, Luke and Timothy, to Constantinople? Before these the demons cry, and they who dwell in Vigilantius confess they feel their presence. Is the emperor Arcadius to be called sacrilegious, who after so long a time translated the bones of Samuel from Judea to Thrace? Are all the bishops to be judged not only sacrilegious but insane, who carried *that silent thing crumbling ashes*,\* in silk and golden vessels? Were all the people of all churches insane, who met the holy relicks and received them as joyfully as if they had seen the prophet present and alive, so that from Palestine to Chalcedon the crouds of people were joined, and their voices resounded in praise of Christ? Was it Samuel they adored, not Christ of whom Samuel was the levite, the prophet? You suspect him to be dead, therefore you blaspheme, read the gospel: the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, he is not the God of the dead but of the living . . . . you say in your pamphlet that whilst

we

\* Vigilantius's words.

we live we may pray one for the other; but after death the prayer of one is not to be heard for another;" to this Jerom replies: "the apostles and martyrs in the body, whilst yet solicitous for themselves, prayed for others, how much more fervently after the attainment of their crowns, their victories, their triumphs? One man, Moses, obtained from God pardon for six hundred thousand armed men; Stephen, the imitator of his Lord, the first martyr of Christ, sued for pardon for his persecutors; now they are with Christ will they have less credit? Paul the apostle says that two hundred and seventy six souls were given to him in the ship; now that he is freed and with Christ will he shut his mouth? For all, who in the world have believed in his gospel will he not have the power to speak?"

He confounds Vigilantius by the unanimous consent and invariable usage of all Christian churches: "does the Roman bishop sin, who offers sacrifice to the Lord over the bones of the dead men Peter and Paul, in our opinion venerable, in yours, but vile dust? And he thinks their tombs the altars of Christ; not only the bishop of one city, but all the bishops of the world, do they err when despising the inn-keeper Vigilantius, they enter the churches of the dead, in which, *this vile dust, and I know not what ashes*, are wrapt up in linen?"

From this passage we learn that the relicks of the saints were under the altars of the churches in Jerom's days; that on these altars all the bishops of the Christian world offered the sacrifice of the mass, as they do yet in our churches.

In Jerom's defence of celibacy some severe strictures on second or third marriages escaped his pen, which were garbled, and distorted by the disciples of Vigilantius, who pretended that he condemned matrimony in common with Montanus; in a letter to Marcella on the subject, he states the difference between the doctrines of the church and the errors of Montanus even where they seem to agree. In this epistle he expressly says that  
Christ



Christ founded his church on Peter : “ *if the apostle Peter, on whom the Lord founded the church . . . . we disagree (with the Montanists) in the rule of faith. We place the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, each in his own person, though we unite them in substance. They, following the doctrines of Sabellius, confine the Trinity within the limits of one person; we do not so much desire second marriages, as we allow them. They think them so criminal, that he, who contracts a second marriage is thought an adulterer; we fast one Lent in the whole year according to the tradition of the apostles at a congruous time; they make three Lents in the year as if three Saviours had suffered; not but it is lawful to fast through the whole year, Pentecost excepted; but it is one thing to offer a gift voluntarily, another thing to do it of necessity; with us bishops hold the place of the apostles; with them bishops are the third order: they have patriarchs from Pepusa, in Phrygia, in the first place; on the second order they place canons, and thus the bishops are thrown into the third place, almost the last; as if their religion was more brilliant because what is first with us is last with them; they for almost every fault shut the doors of the church; we daily read, ‘I desire the sinner’s repentance more than his death; and this man, who falls will he not rise again, saith the Lord, and turn to me you returning sons and I will heal your conversion.’ They are rigid, not but they commit greater sins, but there is this difference between us and them, that they are ashamed to confess sins, as if they were guiltless; whilst we do penance we more easily obtain pardon, I omit . . . .”*

From this letter we learn that in Jerom’s days it was believed that Christ had founded his church on Peter; that bishops were the successors of the apostles; that the fast of the Lent was of apostolical institution; that sins were confessed and penitential austerities in use; in a word, we learn that the Christian world was in peaceable possession of observing all these popish superstitions and

and nonsensical rites so hateful to the castigat<sup>or</sup>. How stupidly ignorant he must have been to appeal to Jerom for a condemnation of popery !

We are now to discuss the passage which he cites from Jerom's letter to Evagrius, p. 85, in it Jerom says that a bishop at Rome, or Eugubium, Constantinople or Rhegium, are of the same worth and the same priesthood, the advantage of wealth and the disadvantage of poverty neither make a bishop lower nor higher, for they are all successors of the apostles. Who ever doubted it? In that letter Jerom severely censures the presumption of some arch-deacons, who, charged with the administration of the ecclesiastical funds, thought themselves superior to the priests who received their subsistence from them. He shews that the deacon is inferior to the priest because the deacon is promoted to the order of priesthood ; that the priest is next in order to the bishop, and not much inferior to him in dignity : " what does the bishop," says he, " ordination only excepted, which the priest does not ?" That the possession of wealth makes no distinction amongst the clergy, which is literally true, all bishops are equally bishops, and superior to priests and deacons, whether in great cities or villages. The commencement of that letter, " we read in Isaias that fools will speak foolish things," is strictly applicable to this reverend pastor of a church, in which there is neither bishop, priest nor deacon, and who confidently cites, in support of such extravagance, a letter in which these orders are distinctly specified and said to form an hierarchy similar to that of the old law, that is, that bishops, priests and deacons, are in the Christian church what Aaron, his sons and the levites, were in the temple.

His talent for contradiction is confessedly great, it is rather unfortunate that in the distribution of logical powers Nature has not been liberal : he fills four or five pages with citations from St. Cyprian, to which he pretends to affix a sense of which Cyprian never dreamed. The writer in his remarks had cited Cyprian's letter to  
the

the Roman pontiff Cornelius, in which, speaking of the schism caused by the anti-pope Novatian, Cyprian 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 obeyed, no one would disturb the college of priests." If we believe the castigator the Roman pontiff was not that one priest of whom St. Cyprian spoke. This he wittily remarks did not occur to the writer. It did not occur to the writer that Cyprian spoke nonsense, it occurred to him, and must to the castigator, if his spirit of divination has not infatuated him, that Cyprian spoke of some *one priest* to whom all other priests were subordinate: for *the whole fraternity* can signify nothing else; and the obligation of obedience, of all necessity, imports subordination; and if the Roman pontiff, to whom Cyprian's letter is addressed, and whose See he calls the *See of Peter*, and the *principal church* from which the unity of the priesthood arises, be not that one priest to whom all others owe obedience, who was that one priest, to whom even the Roman pontiff was subject? And to whose See the *See of St. Peter, the principal See*, was subordinate?

His spirit of divination has not enabled him to affix any sense to Cyprian's words, but he says the meaning of them must be found elsewhere, that is, because the words are so clearly expressive in this passage that they cannot be misunderstood, some ambiguous expression, many of which are found in all voluminous works, must be adduced to divert the reader's attention. With this view he seizes on a passage in Cyprian's letter to Antonianus, which he new models, as he imagines, to the entire satisfaction of his readers, "the episcopal government ought to be but one, spread abroad among many bishops and agreeing heartily together." In this passage he finds that Cyprian said *episcopal government is founded*

founded in unity, and from his own words, which he obligingly lends to Cyprian, concludes that Cyprian means unity of counsel, not of supreme government. He has not told us what sort of government that is which is founded in the unity of counsel without any authority vested in the person at the head of it. We are indebted to the creative imagination of the castigator for the idea of a government without authority. Unfortunately Cyprian does not say that episcopal government is founded in unity: he says that *episcopal government*, or, rather, *episcopal order is one*, "*episcopatus unus est*," of which a part is held by each bishop in *solidum*, a legal term which the writer cannot express in English.

In Cyprian's works there is not a letter, in which the Roman pontiff's supremacy is expressed with more strength and perspicuity than that to Antonianus, from which our castigator garbles a passage for his purpose. Novatien, an anti-pope, the first of these miscreants, whose ambition, under the mask of zeal for reformation, had disturbed the peace of the whole church, had written to Antonianus, then bishop of Numidia, informing him of his pretended election to the pontificate, in place of Cornelius who had fallen into heresy, as Novatien asserted, by communicating with Trophymus and others, who had sacrificed to idols. Antonianus wrote to Cyprian on the subject, desiring to know how Cornelius had admitted Trophymus to his communion, or what heresy Novatien had introduced; Cyprian, in reply, shews that Cornelius was duly elected, innocent of the crimes with which Novatien charged him, that he was the true successor of Peter, and his calumniator retrenched from the communion of the church: "Cornelius," says he, "was made bishop when the place of Fabien, that is, the place of Peter, and the rank, 'gradus,' of the sacerdotal chair was vacant. . . . . As to what you have been told that Cornelius communicates indifferently with all those, who have sacrificed, it is a false report invented by  
apostates

apostates . . . . You ask what heresy Novatian has introduced. Know, in the first place, that we ought not enquire what he teaches, because he teaches without the pale of the church, 'extra Ecclesiam.' There is but one church which Jesus Christ has divided into many members throughout the world, and one episcopal order, 'episcopatus unus,' which is extended in the multitude of bishops whom unanimity unites. Novatian, after the Divine institution, endeavours to form a *human church*: he sends new apostles into many cities to lay new foundations, and though there be of a long time past bishops ordained in each Province, venerable for their age, for the integrity of their faith, and their constancy in persecution, he dares to create other false bishops."

Cyprian contrasts this human church of Novatian's invention, with the one church of Jesus Christ entrusted to the care of Cornelius. Moreover this anti-pope pretended to depose all the bishops in the different provinces who refused to acknowledge him, and to create bishops in their stead. It was therefore the acknowledged right of the true Pope to depose bishops for disobedience and contumacy, and substitute others, or that artful intriguer would not attempt it.

In what that unity of the episcopal government consists Cyprian explains, with accurate precision, in his treatise on the unity of the church. He begins by shewing the source of schism and heresy: "this happens," says he, "because recourse is not had to the *source of truth*, because the *Head* is not sought, because the doctrine of the Heavenly Master is not observed." He then assigns this *source of truth*, this *Head*: "Christ said to Peter, 'thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my church.' He built his church *on one*, and though after his resurrection he gave to all his apostles equal power, yet to shew *the unity*, he established *one chair*, and posed the source of unity by making it descend from one, without doubt all the apostles were what Peter was: they

they partook of the same power, the same honour ; but the beginning is from unity : *the primacy* was given to Peter, to shew that there is but one church of Jesus Christ, and *one chair*. All are shepherds, there is but one flock, which all the apostles ought to feed with one accord . . . . The episcopal order *is one*, of which each bishop holds a portion in solidum."

To give his readers a correct idea of the unity of the church, to which the unity of the episcopal order is indispensable, Cyprian compares it to a tree, the branches of which are united in the root ; to light, all the rays of which are united in the sun, the source of light ; to many streams of water flowing from the same spring ; hence it follows that all spiritual powers, in the episcopal order, are radically in the chair of Peter ; that from it all the powers of that order flow as the waters from the source ; that in it all other episcopal chairs are united, as the branches of the tree are united in the root, from which they receive the nutritious juices. If a branch be separated from the root, it must from all the other branches : for it is in the root and not elsewhere that all the branches of the tree unite ; hence it follows that if an episcopal See be separated from the See of Peter, it is from all other Sees in the church, and is no part nor portion of the one church of Jesus Christ founded on Peter, and though the See of Peter be but a part of the church, it is it which gives life and energy to the whole, as the root, though but part of the tree, supports the whole tree, and conveys nutritious juices to all the branches.

" It will be granted," says the castigatour, p. 88, " that Cyprian calls the church of Rome the See of Peter, and the principal church from which the unity of the priesthood arises." He then fills a page with a passage in which Cyprian complains of an appeal to Rome, and says that every person's cause should be examined where the crime is committed, then concludes that Cyprian calling the church of Rome the principal church, and

the spring of sacerdotal unity, did not intend to ascribe any supremacy to the Pope or his See. To this extraordinary assertion the writer makes no reply : he thinks hellebore or sea-bathing may be useful : there is something of madness in it. After the castigator has taken a few doses of hellebore to purge his brain, let him consult some school-boy, who will tell him that principal and subordinate are correlatives ; that when one is principal all others must be subordinate ; he will also tell him that the stream is dependent on the spring, not the spring on the stream.

In the next page he gives the passage which the writer has cited from Cyprian's treatise on the unity of the church, omitting some sentences, which the author of his repertory chose to forget, and then with unblushing confidence tells this writer, that if he thinks Cyprian calls the church of Rome the principal church, in exclusion of all others, he is a stranger to the doctrine taught in the primitive church. If he will dismiss that spirit of divination, which dupes him so incessantly, and consult Cyprian's works, he will find that venerable prelate, of the primitive times, professedly demonstrating, that the unity of Christ's church rests on the episcopal chair of Peter ; that in it all other churches, the integrant parts of that one whole, are united, as the branches of the tree in the root. Cyprian knew but one church, but one principal See, the root, from which all subordinate Sees derive their spiritual powers, as the branches draw their subsistence from the root, or as the streams of water flow from the fountain, and this *principal See, this See of Peter*, he calls the Church of Rome, and what may appear extraordinary, the castigator admits it : " it will be granted," he says, p. 88, " that Cyprian calls the church of Rome the See of Peter, the principal church from which the unity of the priesthood arises."

Cyprian's dispute with pope Stephen on the rebaptisation of sectaries, invalidates all that he has written on the primacy of the Roman church, if we believe the  
 castigator

castigator. His reasoning is as newly modelled as his religion, that is, Cyprian did not acquiesce in the pope's opinion, therefore he did not believe him successor to St. Peter, nor his See, the principal See. Before the art of reasoning had been new modelled, it was thought that Cyprian did not believe the pope infallible, nor think himself obliged to adopt, what he thought, an opinion, before the question had been solemnly decided, thus St. Austin explains Cyprian's words in the Council—see remarks, p. 204. It may not be amiss to inform the reader that in that celebrated controversy Stephen's doctrine was apostolical, and his authority enforced it; Cyprian's opinion was new, introduced by his predecessor Agrippinus, as such was condemned.

A defence of Stephen's doctrine, written at that time and yet extant, is of irresistible force against all reformists; "there would be," says that writer, "no dispute if each of us would rest satisfied with the authority of all churches; and observing the maxims of humility make no attempt to innovate: for whatever is doubtful, if it be judged contrary to the ancient usage of all our holy predecessors, ought to be rejected. There is nothing obtained from novelty, but that some individual is vaunted by ignorant, and inconsiderate people, as having corrected the errors of all churches. In this all sectaries agree, their consolation is to shew that they are not the only persons who are in fault, and their whole study is to load the church with calumnies." In his next edition the castigator will shew the defects in the colouring of this picture. His invectives against popes, beginning with Peter; and the abuse which he so liberally bestows on monks and other ecclesiastics, of whom he knows nothing, are the ebullitions of his zeal, they are not to be classed with the calumnious misrepresentations of which that ancient writer spoke.

From Cyprian the castigator passes to Gregory the Great. The citations from the works of that most venerable pontiff answers several purposes; they fill some pages to  
 swell



swell the volume ; they make a display of uncommon erudition ; they introduce anti-christ, an old and favorite theme. His spirit of divination forgot to remind him that these passages are strongly tinged with papal supremacy. In the first passage, p. 90, Gregory says : “ though there were several apostles there is but *one apostolic See*, the See of the prince of the apostles.” Of this he gives incontestible evidence in a few words, saying : “ this See is in three places—in Rome, where he died ; in Alexandria, where it was founded by his disciple Mark ; and in Antioch, where he resided himself seven years :” these were the only patriarchal Sees which antiquity knew, and Gregory knew no other ; he, as well as Cyprian, thought the See of Peter the source of sacerdotal unity ; and as Peter had founded the See of Antioch immediately by himself, and the See of Alexandria by his disciple Mark, these Sees he considered exclusively as apostolical ; but as Peter did not transfer to Evodius, whom on his departure from Antioch, he appointed to govern that See, nor to Mark, who by his appointment governed the See of Alexandria, whilst he himself governed the Roman See, his own commission of feeding Christ’s flock, in which these prelates, and the people they governed, were included, neither the See of Alexandria nor of Antioch was ever called the *principal See, the source of the priesthood*, this title was reserved for the Roman See, in which Peter closed his mortal career. Official authority descends to the successor.

We are next favored with a long quotation, in which Gregory severely censures John, patriarch of Constantinople, for assuming the title of *universal bishop*, followed by an extract from the pontiff’s letter to Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, in which he refuses that title offered by the patriarch, and calls him his brother. If assuming ignorance could excite any emotion but contempt, the writer would express his surprize at seeing so many quotations, in which the exercise of the pontifical

cal authority is as manifest as the sun at mid-day, offered as arguments against it. Gregory censured the patriarch of Constantinople in strong terms for assuming a title, which did not belong to him in any sense; a title which he himself, and his predecessors, when offered in the Council of Chalcedon, and in one sense, well founded, did not take, because it might be understood in the sense intended by this haughty prelate, to confine the priesthood to one bishop in exclusion of all others, a sense in which the title did not belong to the patriarch, nor to the pontiff, nor to any other prelate on earth. Thus Gregory begins his letter to that patriarch: "you know what peace you found in the churches, and I do not know on what motive you pretend to assume a new name capable of offending all your brethren; what astonishes me is, that you desired to avoid the episcopal dignity, and now you intend to employ it, as if you had sought it through ambition. You declared yourself unworthy the name of bishop, and now you desire to bear the name alone. My predecessor Pelagius wrote you a strong letter on the subject; he quashed the acts of the Council, which you held in the cause of our brother the bishop Gregory, and forbid the arch-deacon, his nuncio, near the emperor, to assist at mass with you. Since I have been called to the government of the church, I have directed my nuncios to speak to you, and I now order the deacon Sabinien. Yet because fores must be lightly touched by the hand before the iron be applied, I pray you, I conjure you, I request with all possible mildness, that you will resist these flatterers, who give you a name full of extravagance and pride. Do not you know that the Council of Chalcedon offered that honor to the bishops of Rome, calling them universal? Yet not one of them would receive it, lest he should seem to attribute to himself alone the episcopal dignity, and take it from all his brethren." . . . Lib. iv. Epis. 38.

In his letter to Sabinien, the nuncio, he informs him, that

that the patriarch had artfully engaged the emperor to write to himself to countenance that prelate's pretension: "he hopes," says he, "to authorise his vain pretension if I listen to the emperor, and if I do not to irritate the emperor against me, but I walk in the strait path and fear but God alone," Lib. iv. Ep. 39. In his answer to the emperor he says: "the conduct and primacy of the whole church was given to Peter, yet he is not called *universal apostle*. Europe is given up to barbarians, the cities are destroyed, fortresses ruined, provinces are ravaged, the lands are waste, idolators are masters of the lives of the faithful and bishops, who ought to lament prostrate in ashes; seek new titles to content their vanity. Is it my particular cause which I defend? Is it not the cause of God and of the universal church? We know that many bishops of Constantinople have been not only heretics but herefiarchs, as Nestorius and Macedonius, if therefore he, who fills that See, were *universal bishop* the whole church would fall with him. For me, I am the servant of all bishops, whilst they live as bishops . . . to obey your orders I have written to him with mildness and humility, if he hears me, he shall have in me a brother entirely devoted, if not he will have for adversary him, who resists the proud," iv. Ep. 32.

This title which Gregory's predecessors did not assume, though offered in the Council of Chalcedon, he himself rejected, when offered by Eulogius, the then patriarch of Alexandria, the most learned and pious prelate of the day. From the extract of a letter quoted by the castigator, p. 93, it appears that Eulogius thought Gregory had given him an order in a former letter. It must have been a request, which coming from his superior, Eulogius considered as an order. He therefore acknowledged Gregory's spiritual jurisdiction over the See of Alexandria, the second See, a patriarchal See of the most extensive jurisdiction, whilst Constantinople was yet subject to the metropolitan See of Heraclea.

"But Gregory says that he did not command him, calls him

him in rank his brother, in manners his father." What then? The modesty which he recommended to others, he practised. But will this castigator pretend that Eulogius did not think Gregory his superior? That he did not think him superior to all other prelates when he called him *universal pope*? Or will he pretend that the passage, as cited by himself, does not contain conclusive evidence of Gregory's universal jurisdiction? He says to Eulogius: "*nothing can redound to my honour, which conduces to the dishonour of my brethren. I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs.*" Is not this the language of a man vested with authority to support all bishops in their respective ranks? Is this castigator so perversely obstinate or so crazy as to deny it.

In imitation of other prophets in these reforming times, who run without being sent, the castigator pronounces the immediate destruction of popery. A true disciple of John Knox, he exultingly desires the writer to cast his eyes on what is called the Christian world, and observe if the protestant interest or papal authority be in the most declining condition, p. 94. The writer has to lament the destruction of the human species, in many Catholic States, effected by the late revolution in Europe, confessedly the work of our latest reformists; he has also to lament that this destruction was not confined to Catholic States exclusively, some Protestant States on the Continent shared the same fate. This is no subject of exultation, if not to the emissaries of Abaddon, the enemy of man. If by the protestant interest, the castigator understands the established Church of England, the writer begs leave to inform him, that the Catholics of the United Kingdom look with horror and dismay on the breaches, which are daily making in that national structure by the castigator's friends, enthusiasts and fanatics of different descriptions, from whose ascendancy, if once established, catholics have every thing to fear and nothing to expect. He has also to remark to him, that this spirit of divination, which the castigator has foolishly

foolishly mistaken for a spirit of prophecy, is a lying spirit : for the papal authority in spirituals, the only authority which the pope of Divine right and institution possesses, was never more extensive, more universally acknowledged, nor more firmly established, than on the present day. If the castigator does not know it, it is because he knows nothing of the present state of the Christian world. If he looks to the East and West, to the North and South, he will see to his great astonishment, and no small mortification, the kingdom of Jesus Christ, that is the catholic church, composed of pastors in regular succession since the apostles days, and their respective portions of the flock, in some countries in splendour, in others depressed, but in all nations visible, as it was from the commencement, literally verifying the promise of Jesus Christ, that he himself would be with the pastors of his church, teaching all nations to the extremities of the earth, and to the end of time, Matt. xxvii. 19. 20, whilst ephemeral sects, suddenly emerging as if from the regions of darkness, pass like a meteor and then disappear, or like flies, which buzz in the sun-shine, fall, and are heard of no more. Some hundreds have already passed into oblivion, and if we may judge by analogy the same fate awaits them all.

From his spirit of divination, no doubt, he has learned that St. John called the church of Rome, founded by the apostles Peter and Paul, and then governed by pastors of their immediate institution, Babylon. Men who judge by the rules of common sense think that the evangelist spoke of the Roman empire, of which that city was then the capital, and mistress of the civilized world. Against this idolatrous city the apostle denounced the Divine vengeance, and his prediction has been literally verified. Near the close of the fourth century, the Huns, the Vandals, the Goths, and other barbarians, had successively ravaged the different provinces of the empire, Germany, Gaul, Spain, Italy and Africa. The Lombards had established themselves in Italy, and the  
Goths

Goths in Spain. The soldiers of this last nation, who had served in the Roman armies, suspected of being secretly in the interest of Stilicon, after his death were harshly treated : in some towns their wives and children were put to death, and their possessions confiscated contrary to the public faith which had been pledged. Enraged at this infraction of a solemn treaty, they united under Alaric, the most powerful and warlike of their chiefs. He conducted them to the gates of Rome. It is said of him by Socrates and Sozomen, that on his way he had said, that it was not of his own movement, but that something pressed him and tormented him saying : go and pillage Rome. He besieged the city so closely that both famine and pestilence began their ravages. In that extremity the Heathen senators thought it necessary to sacrifice on the capitol and in the other temples. The Tuscan soothsayers promised to chase the barbarians with thunder and lightning, but Vulcan had ceased to forge the bolts, and Jupiter's thunder was heard no more. His golden goblets proved more effectual. Alaric agreed to raise the siege on condition that the city would furnish five thousand pounds of gold, thirty thousand pounds of silver, four thousand tunicks of silk, three thousand hides, of a scarlet die, and three thousand pounds of pepper. As the money was not in the treasury, the citizens were taxed ; the ornaments of the temples, and the idols of gold and silver were melted down to supply the deficiency. Zozimus, the heathen historian, laments the destruction of the idols ; he complains that since the idol of the goddess of virtue was melted down, virtue itself was extinguished in the breasts of the Romans. The intelligent reader need not be told that, the Heathens deified virtues as well as vices. This was but the commencement of that punishment, which Divine justice had prepared for that idolatrous city, in which temples were erected to pretended Gods, more vicious than the infatuated mortals who adored them.

Alaric according to agreement drew off his troops ; but soon after, taking offence at some imprudent expressions of Jovius, prefect of Italy, in a conference with him, he resumed the siege, obliged the Romans to declare Attalus, one of his creatures, emperor, and in the course of the same year deposed him. Not long after, whilst treating with the emperor Honorius, Sarus, a barbarian chieftain, allied to the Romans, surprised some of his foldiers, and cut them to pieces. Alaric, full of indignation, broke off the treaty, returned to Rome, recommenced the siege, took the city by treachery on the 24th of August, 410, in the 1164th year of its foundation ; gave it up to pillage, yet, in respect to the apostle Peter, he ordered the church called the Vatican to be a place of refuge. St. Jerom describes this tragical event in his letter to Principia : “ a terrible report,” says he, “ is come from the West that Rome was besieged ; that the safety of the citizens was purchased with gold ; that spoiled, they were again besieged, and that after having lost their all, they lost their lives. Voice fails ! Sighs interrupt words ! The city is taken, which took the world, it perished with hunger before it perished with the sword ; few were found to be taken ; the rage of hunger seized on food, which is not to be named ; the mother did not spare the infant at her breast . . . . who can describe the ravages, the massacres of that night ? Who can equal his sorrows with his tears ? The ancient city falls ; the city which had reigned so many years ! Lifeless bodies are scattered without number on the ways, and the image of death in the houses.” This tremendous punishment, which St. John denounced against idolators, who had tinged the whole earth with the blood of Christians ; who had made the most strenuous and persevering exertions, during four succeeding ages, to exterminate christianity, and which, when the measure of their iniquity was full, the Divine justice did inflict in the most terrible manner. The castigator, in his new modelled zeal, exults in the hope of seeing it renewed on Christians

tians. The writer ventures to assure him that, however alarming this punishment may appear, a punishment infinitely greater, and of greater duration, is reserved for these, who under the mask of religious zeal, fill the minds of the uninformed with rancorous prejudices against their brethren. "Six things God hates, the seventh is the abomination of his soul," that is, they who sow discord amongst the brethren, Pro. vi. 16. He may exult with certainty in the hope of seeing this punishment inflicted in due time, and console himself for his former disappointment.

This anti-christ of modern invention, which exists but in the imagination of fools and fanatics, has been a necessary instrument in forming that elaborate structure, which our first reformists raised, and he is equally necessary to their successors for the support of its tottering remains: Vossius, a learned and unprejudiced protestant, who was in error but through the accident of his birth, and who in all his writings had truth in view, disgusted at the violent declamations which incessantly assaulted his ears, from the different pulpits in Holland, in which nothing was heard but invectives against the *pope*, the *anti-christ*, the *son of perdition*, &c. and the Romish church, the *Babylon*, the *great whore*, as the castigator modestly translates, asked one of the ministers, why he did not chuse some other subject for the instruction of the people, to which the minister replied, that if the people were not taught to believe that the pope is anti-christ, they would all turn papists again. The minister's opinion was better founded than Vossius thought it: for if it be true, that the pope is not anti-christ, it is therefore true, that Luther and all his brother reformists were impostors, and their disciples and successors are dupes, that their new-fangled system is founded on manifest imposture, in support of which no dispassionate and disinterested man of common sense would risk his reputation, much less his salvation. The reader is referred to Pastorini's history of the christian church,



church : in it he will find the true character of the anti-christ described by the apostles, as opposite to the fancied anti-christ of the epicurean monk, and his associates, as the licentiousness of their pretended gospel is to the severity of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Closing his pretended proofs against the supremacy, adduced from Gregory's works, the castigator, whose memory plays the truant at times, calls this pontiff : *learned and judicious*, and almost in the same sentence adds, that like many other *ignorant and well meaning persons* he happened to stumble on truth. Thus this scribbling castigator, who never stumbles on truth, with one stroke of his pen, converts a *learned and judicious man*, into an *ignorant and well meaning man*, who happens to stumble on truth.

In his next chapter, p. 96, he introduces the temporal authority claimed by some popes. This part of the supremacy he says is *indirectly denied by the writer*, then quotes from his *Remarks*, p. 72, a long passage; in which it is asserted : " that Mr. Burke has shewn in his *Letter of Instruction* that the pope does not possess an atom of civil authority, or temporal jurisdiction, beyond the territories which he governs as a temporal prince." This he calls *attempting to deny it indirectly !* and in this *indirect denial*, his spirit of divination discovers an *insinuation* that popes formerly made no such claim. If he had not been infatuated by his lying spirit, he might like other *ignorant and well meaning men, sometimes stumble on truth* ; he might have seen in the writer's words, not an insinuation that some popes did not claim a temporal jurisdiction, but the contrary insinuation, that they did. If he had read the work which he pretends to refute, he would have found not an insinuation, but a positive assertion that some popes did claim a temporal jurisdiction, "*so true it is that this power which some popes pretended to assume was never believed to exist but in their ambition,*"—Review, p. 71, and a direct denial of any temporal jurisdiction whatever being vested in the pope as  
first

first pastor of the church, a truth which he might have seen established in Mr. B's Letter of Instruction, p. 22 . . . . 34, not by coarse invectives, but by conclusive reasoning. His extract of history shewing that popes established some kings, and dethroned others, only proves that popes were always thought superior to all other prelates, and that at times extending this jurisdiction, which they were known and universally acknowledged to possess, beyond its due limits, they made encroachments, on the temporal jurisdiction of princes, which they never did of divine right possess; but which they might at any time obtain from the common consent of princes and people, in whom all temporal jurisdiction and civil authority is originally vested by the author of society, and by whom it may be conferred on any pope, prince or potentate.

In his great zeal to excite a horror of this bug-bear popery, which haunts his disturbed imagination on these tedious hours from which curtain lectures banish rest, he informs us that Alphonfus was raised to the dignity of King in Portugal, in 1179, by the Roman Pontiff Alexander III. the same regal dignity was conferred on Primisslaus, Duke of Bohemia, by Innocent III. in 1204, and Johannius, duke of Bulgaria and Wallachia, was made king by the same pontiff in 1220, he says, that Stephen grand jucan of Servia, was crowned by the authority of Honorius III. that Boleslaus of Poland was deprived of his regal dignity by the then pope, and Roger, count of Sicily, was made king of Sicily. If he had been diligent in his researches he might have found that Leo III. made Charlemain emperor in 801, and Zachary made Pepin his father king of the Franks in 752,—See Review, p. 52. It is true he tells us that he can present a list of one hundred princes, who have been excommunicated and deposed by popes, and double the number might be collected with very little labour, p. 109, he thus injudiciously informs his readers that the pope's spiritual authority was well and universally established

blished in the christian world, some centuries before Luther and his brother reformists were born, for this temporal authority, which they unwarrantably assumed, could have no other foundation or pretext but the spiritual authority with which they were in reality invested: they abused this power. Some did it is true, that only proves the power to exist: for if it did not it could not be abused. There have been some writers who maintained the deposing power. Yes, as a matter of opinion, which no catholic ever was obliged to believe, which the whole school of French divines, truly catholic, reprobate—See Review, p. 2, and which was considered as an usurpation. In the first instance that of the Emperor Henry IV. *Otho Frisingensis*, a catholic prelate, well affected to the See of Rome, says: the empire was indignant at this novelty, as no such sentence had ever been published against an emperor of Rome," vi. Epr. C. 35.

To give his readers an idea of a popish excommunication he fills three pages with a scurrilous fiction, in which the coarsest and most offensive terms in the English language are introduced. He then repeats, with additional virulence, the hackneyed tales of Raymond, of Thoulouse; of the Albigenses, &c. of the Councils of Constance and Latran, all which the writer has already discussed in his different replies to the Rev. Mr. Cochran—See them in the Review.

From his spirit of divination he has learned, and confidently asserts, that these wicked popes and papists for whom he has the newest modelled charity, have massacred fifty millions of people. What a pity that this venerable teacher of the newest school, inflamed with pious zeal against these wicked papists, had not lived in the famed John Knox's reforming days; to the warlike blasts of John's trumpet, he would have added the deep, the shrill, and terrific sound of *Alecco's horn*, and he would have brought *Jezabel*, as that ruffian called the queen, to the block in her own capital. Even George  
Gordon's

Gordon's days are past! The writer has already discussed these pretended massacres, the Gun Powder Plot, &c. in his Review, which this castigator pretends to refute, though it appears that he has not read a line of it. A refutation of all the calumnies which fill the century writers' massive volumes, and Bower's leaden lives of popes, would be an endless and an useless work, which the writer will not undertake. He whispers in the castigator's ear that there have been many bad popes, bad bishops, and priests, in the christian church, and some good ones; and he adds, for this castigator's consolation, that any conventicle in which there is neither pope nor bishop is not a christian church. Not to know this plain simple truth is intolerable ignorance, to know it and conceal it from an uninformed well meaning people, is something worse than ignorance.

“It can be shewn, by most authentic documents,” he says, p. 111, “that the assassinations of princes, the bloody massacres, and the cruel persecutions, which grace the annals of modern Europe, either have been the devices of popes, or received their approbation.” He has not produced one of these authentic instruments: it would be a curious state paper. Will he deign to tell us, what pope sent Charles I. to the block? What pope devised the death of Mary, queen of Scots, of Lewis XVI. of the duke d'Enghien? Who advised the cool dispassionate murder of Beton, archbishop of St. Andrew's, primate of Scotland? Some pious reformists, enflamed with holy zeal, kindled by one of *Knox's* memorable *blasts*, entered the episcopal palace, and, having prevailed on that prelate, by entreaties and promises, to open the chamber door, in which he had barricaded himself, they rushed in—the scene is thus described by one of themselves: “they found him sitting in his chair, he said to them: I am a priest, I am a priest, do not kill me, John Lesley according to ancient vows, (it seems he had sworn to do it) struck him first, and gave him one or two strokes, as did Peter Carmichael, but James Melvin,

vin, a man of a mild disposition, and very modest, thinking they were both angry, stopped them saying: this work and the judgment of God ought to be done with great gravity, then presenting the point of his sword to the cardinal, he said to him: repent of your past wicked life. . . . . we are sent by God for the punishment of it: for I protest here in presence of my God, that neither hatred of your person, nor love of your riches, nor fear of any evil, which you can do me in particular, have engaged me, or engage me now to strike you, but only because you have been, and you are yet, an obstinate enemy to Jesus Christ and his gospel, (that is Knox's new gospel) then he thrust his sword two or three times through his body"—See Hist. of Scot. Ref. London, 1644, p. 72, supposed to be written by John Knox himself. Never was repentance preached in this form before; nor murder committed with such meekness and modesty. Such were the disciples of John Knox, whose spirit seems revived in this Edinburgh castigator.

In one of these sanctified *blasts* which that noted reformist filed an *Admonition to the Nobles and People of Scotland*, speaking of the neighbouring country, he says: "I will boldly assure it, that the Gentlemen, the Governors, the Judges and the People of England, ought not only to resist Mary their Queen, *that new Jezabel*, as soon as she began to extinguish the gospel, but also to put her to death, with all her priests, *and all those who enter into her views.*" Thus this new modelled apostle, of true Mahometan breed, consigns to the shades, in bulk, both princes and people, indiscriminately, all, who oppose, what he calls, the gospel. These are authentic documents which shew how truly Erasmus said: "this new gospel makes men surpass themselves in wickedness."

However, the castigator's invectives against popes are derived from a higher source: Luther, the great patriarch of reforming memory, in one of these *Theses*, published

published in 1540, says : the pope is a forcerer (*loup garou*) possessed by an evil spirit. All towns and cities ought to collect in troops against him, it is not necessary to wait the authority of Judges or Council against him, nor to pay any attention to the Judge, who would forbid him to be killed. If the Judge or the peasants are themselves killed in the tumult by the people, who pursue this monster, it is what they deserve, there is no injury done them. We are not to enquire if the pope is supported by princes, by kings, or by emperors themselves : he who fights under a robber *is fallen from military command*, as well as from salvation." If there be truth in history these documents are authentic, it is therefore true, that the apostles of the reformation in Germany and Scotland, taught rebellion, authorised murders, massacres, assassinations of princes, &c. with which, this castigator, with true pharasaical confidence charges popes ; nor does he confine the charge to popes alone ; he charitably extends it to all popish magistrates : " what else," says he, " are magistrates under the influence of the Romish religion but the creatures of the pope ?"—p. 111. The Pharisees in their accusation against Paul, Acts xxiv, 5, say : " we found this man pestilential, moving sedition amongst all the Jews" . . . . .

Were the Lords and Commons in Edward III. days, who passed the famous statutes of *premunire* and *provisors*, creatures of the pope ? They were papists as well as their fellow subjects. Were the Lords and Commons, who deposed Richard II. creatures of the pope ? They also were papists, yet one of the articles of impeachment against Richard, shews to conviction that they were not creatures of the pope. The article is thus conceived : " though the Crown of England, and all the rights of the Crown, and the Kingdom itself, hath been in all past time so free that the supreme pontiff (*Dominus summus Pontifex*) or any other person without the kingdom, ought not to interfere with the same (*se intro mittere de eisdom*).

*èisdem*) the said king, for the strengthening of his erroneous statutes, did supplicate the pope to confirm the acts passed in the last Parliament," so true it is that England, whilst a Catholic State, never believed the pope to possess any temporal jurisdiction within the realm. These Lords and Commons so hostile to the pope's pretensions were the men, who a few years after the deposition of Richard, in the days of Henry V. passed the sanguinary laws which condemned the Lollards to the stake.

The writer is willing to admit that some popes have been as sanguinary as John Knox himself, even as Calvin, his master, who religiously roasted Michael Servetus for presuming to take the scriptures alone for his rule of faith, a doctrine which he had learned from Calvin. He is also willing to admit that some papists have been as meek and modest assassins as James Melvin. Does it follow that murder, rebellion or assassination, is authorised by any tenet of catholic doctrine, or any maxim of its morality? The contrary has been shewn to conviction in Mr. B's. reply to Palæologus's third letter, to which the reader is referred—See Review, p. 55.

Some popes have been suspected, perhaps not without strong reasons, of being addicted to avarice, to ambition, sensuality and intemperance. What then? Are these vices authorised or converted into virtues? No. It is the glory of the catholic doctrine, to condemn every possible vice, and enforce every possible virtue; it knows no distinction of persons in the severity of its morality: it condemns vice in the prince as in the peasant; in the pope and bishop as in the soldier or the sailor. The man who does not know this, does not know it. The man who knows it, and unblushingly affirms the contrary, does not know the truth. It is not in the catholic church that we learn to believe that vice divests the civil magistrate or the spiritual superior of that authority with which he is legally invested. This is one of these new fangled doctrines invented by Wiclef, taught by John Hus and by Luther, taught and reduced to practice by  
John

John Knox and his reforming colleagues, a doctrine anathematized by the Council of Constance, and by all catholics; condemned by the apostolical writings, subversive of order and subordination, and destructive of society.—See Review, p. 55.

After filling some pages with garbled extracts from the Councils of Lateran and Constance, which have been already adduced by Pæulogus in his letters, and discussed by Mr. B. in his replies—See Review. The castigatour concludes that there is no dependance to be placed on popish oaths of allegiance, p. 120. This modest assertion he pretends to shew by a passage from Paschenius, of whom this writer knows nothing. Whether the passage be genuine or fictitious, it is useless to enquire. It contains the opinion of an ignorant individual, which from the obscurity of the author, or the turbulence of the times, has perhaps escaped censure. Does this castigatour know that catholics do not permit loquacious demagogues to substitute the ravings of their imagination to the settled doctrines of the church? This is a privilege which they have long since resigned to enthusiastic rambles in the regions of fancy, which they now confirm to the castigatour, to Sandiman, to salvation Murray, Jemima Wilkinson, and Co.

He tells us that Paschenius said the papists were not obliged to pay allegiance to king James I. because the pope had declared the oath unjust. If he had told us that papists in England did not observe their oath of allegiance to their prince, we should conclude, not that the oath was unjust, but that they were guilty of perjury, who transgressed it; however, King James, who thought himself happy in escaping the plots of reformists in Scotland, brought no such accusation against his catholic subjects in England. After the pretended Gun Powder Plot, the machiavelian artifice of which was soon discovered by the king, and is now well known to every man of information in England, in his proclamation of the 7th of November, 1605, James says: “we are by good experience



rience so well persuaded of the loyalty of divers subjects of the Romish religion, that they do abhor this detestable conspiracy as ourself . . . .”—See Review, p. 78.

Will this Edinburgh castigator condescend to tell us what pope declared null and void the oath of allegiance, which his ancestors had sworn to Mary their queen, whose title to the Scottish throne was never doubted? Were they papists, who dethroned her? Were they papists, who persecuted her with relentless fury, until she died on the scaffold? Were they papists, who regardless of their oath of allegiance, and of every other tie, even of common decency, brought her grand-son, the unfortunate Charles, to the block? Was it not pope Knox, from whom this castigator dates his pedigree, who taught the holy duty of perjury and insurrection in defence of his new gospel, though Jesus Christ, the author of the gospel, had strictly enjoined obedience to a heathen emperor, and his apostles had as strictly enjoined the same obedience to the most ferocious of all heathen princes, and the most furious persecutor of the gospel, *Nero*? Is the man so crazy as to deny what the world knows? With what unblushing effrontery then does he impute to us a doctrine, which we detest, and which it is known to the world that his ancestors taught and acted on?

In the next page, after having composed a creed for us, of such materials as could have been gleaned, garbled and fashioned by Illyricus and his associates, the castigator, modestly enough, says that: “by this view of Romish principles he would not be thought to charge the papists of Nova-Scotia with disloyalty.” They thank him; but hold! They must not be profuse in their gratitude: his conscience is tender, his charity excessive, he corrects the excess by a certain restriction: “but until the church of Rome come forward collectively, and abjure her former opinions [this will not happen] their loyalty is at war with the principles of their religion [with the religion which the castigator lends them] and the  
Legislature

Legislature can only consider them as Samson at the mill-stones." [this castigator hates persecution]. The writer begs leave to inform him that the opinions of individuals compose no part of the doctrines of the church of Rome; that the doctrine of that church is settled and invariably independent on opinions. As he has already given the answer of six foreign catholic universities, in which the creed composed for our use by the castigator, and his friends, and these pretended Romish principles which they have gleaned, are unequivocally condemned, the writer does not think it necessary to repeat what he has already said on the subject, however, there is a part of the answer of Alcalá so strictly applicable to this Edinburgh castigator, that the writer begs leave to insert it.

*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 the 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 their tongues to utter such falsehoods, has never desisted from perverting others in like manner :”

What if the university had heard this Edinburgh castigator inflated with pious zeal, emitting from his halloved throat this oracle : “*the Romish church opens the gates of Heaven to thieves, robbers, murderers, and sinners of all descriptions, who would only embroe their hands in the blood of a heretic,*” p. 114 ? They would have said that

the

the maniac had superseded the *Pythonissa*\* of Delphos, and was agitated by the same spirit. The writer however dissents: he does not even think him a fortune-teller, though he acknowledges his great powers of divination; thanks to that spirit, which assists him, whether it be the spirit of the delphic Pythonissa, of the witch of Endor, or of Saul, he leaves that to the university to decide.

In Catholic States, thieves, robbers and murderers are dismissed from their labours in this life, as in England, by the finisher of the law.

He would advise the castigator to read some treatise on morality, though it were but a paraphrase on the alcoran. He may perchance learn a truth of which he seems extremely ignorant, that is, atrocious facts are not proved by bold assertions, with their usual accompaniments, petulance and effrontery. These only expose the weakness of the head, or the malignity of the heart, which are not unfrequently combined.

This castigator expresses great indignation at Mr. B's want of candour, in refusing to acknowledge that to break faith with heretics has been a long time a maxim believed and practised by the church of Rome. It seems Mr. B. instructing the catholic missionaries of Nova-Scotia, did not think proper to adopt this new modelled doctrine, composed by the castigator and co. for their use. He even condemned it expressly, as a doctrine which no man of common sense, or common honesty, ever believed. It was cruel in him to deprive the castigator of a favorite topic, on which he might exercise his talent of railing against the perfidy of papists. He complains that the phrase which Mr. B. ignorantly or cunningly produces does not exhibit the doctrine of the church of Rome in its true colours. He must, he says,  
be

NOTE OF THE EDITOR.

\* The Pythonissa was the priestess of Apollo, who prophesied in the temple at Delphos: to deliver her oracles, she placed herself on a stool, covered with the skin of the serpent Pythos, worked herself into a sort of frenzy, spoke in shrill and broken sounds, with horrible convulsions.

be an ignorant priest, who does not know that the phrase used by the church is not : "non est habenda fides," but "non est servanda fides hereticis." It seems Mr. B. did not know it. He had not the good fortune to consult the castigator's repertory, or his spirit of divination. He may think Mr. B's. ignorance excusable, when he finds that not one catholic university in Europe knew it, the writer most certainly does not know it, and after the solemn declaration of the universities of *Paris*, of *Doway*, of *Louvain*, of *Alcala*, *Salamanca* and *Valladolid*, which this castigator might have seen in the work which he pretends to refute, that no such doctrine is or ever was taught in the church, he must say that to impute such a doctrine to the church is not the effect of sheer ignorance, but impudent imposture.

He cites an epistle of Martin V. to the duke of Lithuania, saying : that he sins mortally if he keeps faith with heretics. The original perhaps may be found in Edinburgh, it is not amongst that pontiff's authentic papers. If it had been authentic, of which there is no appearance, it would only shew that the pope in a private letter, like other politicians, observed a maxim, which in his official capacity, as Head of the Church, he had solemnly condemned. In his Bull, approved by the Council of Constance, we find this question proposed to persons suspected of heresy : "whether he does not think that all *willful perjury* committed upon any occasion whatsoever, for the preservation of one's life, or another man's, or even *for the sake of faith*, be a mortal sin."—See Review, p. 69.

If the passages, which he cites from two or three obscure authors, be genuine, which this writer doubts very much, he has only to remark that such works if known to the proper judges would be condemned, and the authors obliged to retract, or be retrenched from the catholic communion. If he be diligent in his researches he may find amongst propositions extracted from the  
works

works of catholic writers, and juridically condemned, materials to form as great a variety of creeds as are to be found amongst all the discordant religious societies of the United Kingdom, Quesnel alone will furnish him with one hundred, in which there is just as much truth as in this castigator's invectives.

In vindication of these authors, whom the writer does not know, and of whom in all appearance this Edinburgh castigator knows as little, it must be said that a man, who with unblushing confidence and a steeled conscience, falsifies the scriptures, substituting *eidōlon* to *eikōn*, that is, *idol* to *image*, a man, who notoriously garbles the works of the Fathers which are to be found in all libraries, has not been scrupulously sparing of works of such obscurity, as to make it doubtful if they exist at all.

The reader is informed that the answers of the universities were given at the desire of that great Statesman Mr. Pitt, and are cited in the History of the Penal Laws, by Henry Parnell, Esq. p. 148 . . . . and in the appendix to Sir J. C. Hippisley's Observations, p. 76, both Members of the Imperial Parliament.

To the declaration of the universities the writer subjoins a declaration of greater weight if possible, that is, the declaration of Pius VI. of venerable memory, in a Letter to the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland.—The Letter Hip. p. 77.

“The Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, at their meeting in Dublin, in 1791, addressed a letter to the Pope, wherein they described the misrepresentations that had been recently published of their consecration oath, and the great injury to the Catholic body, arising from them . . . . .

“After due deliberation at Rome, the Congregation of Cardinals appointed to superintend the ecclesiastical affairs of these kingdoms, returned an answer (of which the following is an extract) by the authority and command of his Holiness :

“*Most*

“ *Most Illustrious and most Reverend Lords, and  
“ Brothers\**,

“ We perceive from your late letter, the great uneasiness you labour under since the publication of a pamphlet, entitled, *The present state of the Church of Ireland*,—from which our detractors have taken occasion to renew the old calumny against the Catholic Religion with increased acrimony; namely, *that this religion is by no means compatible with the safety of kings and republics; because, as they say, the Roman Pontiff being the father and master of all Catholics, and invested with such great authority, that he can free the subjects of other kingdoms from their fidelity and oaths of allegiance to kings and princes; he has it in his power, they contend, to cause disturbances and injure the public tranquility of kingdoms, with ease. We wonder that you could be uneasy at these complaints, especially after your most excellent brother and apostolical fellow-labourer, the Archbishop of Cashel †, and other strenuous defenders of the rights of the Holy See, had evidently refuted, and explained away these slanderous reproaches, in their celebrated writings.*—In this controversy a most accurate discrimination should be made between the genuine rights of the Apostolical See, and those that are imputed to it by innovators of this age for the purpose of calumniating. *The See of Rome never taught, that faith is not to be kept with the heterodox:—that an oath to kings separated from the Catholic Communion, can be violated:—that it is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions. We too consider an attempt or design against the life of Kings and Princes even under the pretext of religion, as an HORRID and DETESTABLE CRIME.*”

“ His Holiness, Pius VI. has not, however, disregarded your  
your

\* The original Latin will be found in opposite columns in Dr. Troy's Pastoral Instruction, 1793.—(Coghlan, Duke-street)

† Dr. James Butler.

your requests; and therefore, in order to effectually remove every occasion of cavil and calumny, which, as you write, some borrow from the words in the form of oath of obedience to the Apostolical See, that Bishops are required to take at their consecration.—*I will persecute\* and oppose heretics, &c. to the utmost of my power*; which words are maliciously interpreted as the signal of war against heretics, authorising persecution and assault against them, as enemies; whereas the pursuit and opposition to heretics, which the Bishops undertake, are to be understood as referring to their solicitude and efforts in convincing heretics of their errors, and procuring their reconciliation with the Catholic Church: his Holiness has graciously condescended to substitute in place of the ancient form of oath, that one which was publicly repeated by the Archbishop of *Mobilow*, to the great satisfaction of all the Court of Petersburg, in presence of the Emperess; and which we transmit to you in this letter.

“ In reality, who is there that does not know what the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all others, preaches, teaches, and commands, on the duty of obedience from subjects to earthly powers ?

“ At the very commencement of the yet infant Church, blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, instructing the faithful, exhorted them in these words:—*Be ye subject to every human creature for God's sake, whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of the good; for so is the will of God, that by doing well you may silence the ignorance of foolish men.* The Catholic Church being directed by these precepts, the most renowned champions

\* No one word in the English language corresponds exactly with **PERSECUTAR**, as used here. Abstractedly it certainly cannot be considered as signifying PERSECUTION. To make it bear this construction, it must be united with some word of hostile meaning, as *Persequi bello, gladio, &c.*—one may even say *persequi beneficio*:—at any rate it is just to admit that construction which the See of Rome itself now gives it—it matters not whether it were ever differently construed. (Vide *Ainsworth's Dictionary*.)

of the Christian name replied to the Gentiles when raging against them, as enemies of the empire, with furious hatred ; *we are constantly praying*, (Tertullian in Apologet. chap. xxx.) *that all the emperors may enjoy long life, quiet government, a loyal household, a brave army, a faithful senate, an honest people and general tranquillity.* The Bishops of Rome, successors of Peter, have not ceased to inculcate this doctrine, especially to missionaries, lest any ill-will should be excited against the professors of the catholic faith, in the minds of those who are enemies of the Christian name. We pass over the illustrious proofs of this fact preserved in the records of ancient Roman Pontiffs ; of which yourselves are not ignorant. We think proper, notwithstanding, to remind you of a late admonition of the most wise Pope Benedict XIV. who in his regulations for the English missions, which are likewise applicable to you, speaks thus :—*The Vicars Apostolic are to take diligent care that the missionaries behave on all occasions with integrity and decorum, and thus become good models to others ; and particularly that they be always ready to celebrate the sacred offices, to communicate, proper instructions to the people, and to comfort the sick with their assistance ; that they by all means avoid public assemblies of idle men, and taverns. . . . The Vicars themselves are particularly charged to punish in such manner as they can, but severely all those who do not speak of the public government with respect.*”

“ England herself can witness the deep-rooted impressions such admonitions have made on the minds of Catholics. It is well known, that in the late war, which had extended to the greater part of America, when most flourishing provinces, inhabited almost by persons separated from the Catholic Church, had renounced the government of the King of Great-Britain ; the province of Canada alone, filled as it is almost with innumerable Catholics, although artfully tempted, and not yet forgetful of the old French government, remained most faithful in its allegiance to England. Do you, most excellent Prelates, converse frequently on these principles :  
often.



often remind your suffragan Prelates of them : when preaching to your people, exhort them again and again *to honour all men, to love the brotherhood, to fear God, to honour the king.*

“ Those duties of a Christian are to be cherished in every kingdom and state, but particularly in your own of Great-Britain and Ireland, where, from the benevolence of a most wise King, and other most excellent rulers of those kingdoms towards Catholics, no cruel and grievous burden is imposed : and Catholics themselves experience a mild and gentle government. If you pursue this line of conduct unanimously ; if you act in the spirit of charity ; if, while you direct the people of the Lord you have nothing in view but the salvation of souls, adversaries will be ashamed (we repeat it) to calumniate, and will freely acknowledge that the Catholic Faith is of heavenly descent, and calculated not only to procure a blessed life, but likewise, as St. Augustin observes in his 138th letter, addressed to Marcellinus, to promote the most lasting peace of this earthly city, inasmuch as it is the safest prop and shield of kingdoms. *Let those who say (the words are those of the holy Doctor) that the doctrine of Christ is hostile to the Republic, produce an army of such soldiers as the doctrine of Christ has required ; let them furnish such inhabitants of provinces, such husbands, such wives, such parents, such children, such masters, such servants, such kings, such judges, finally such payers of debts and collectors of the revenue, as the doctrine of Christ enjoins ; and then they may dare to assert that it is inimical to the republic : rather let them not hesitate to acknowledge, that it is, when practised, of great advantage to the republic.* The same holy Doctor, and all the other Fathers of the Church, with one voice, most clearly demonstrate by invincible arguments, that the whole of this salutary doctrine cannot exist with permanent consistency and stability ; or flourish except in the catholic society ; which is spread and preserved all over the world by communion with the See of Rome as a sacred bond of union, divinely connecting both. From our very high esteem  
and

and affection for you, we earnestly wish that the great God may very long preserve you safe. Farewell.

Rome, 23 June, 1791.

As your Lordship's most affectionate brother,

L. CARDINAL ANTONELLI, Prefect.

A. ARCHBISHOP OF ADEN, Secretary."

*Sir J. C. HIPPISEY's Remark.*

"I have here recited an extract of considerable length, from this document, because the Honourable Member has himself alluded to a part of it, where he observes an alteration of the Pontifical Oath made at the instance of the Empress of Russia. I could wish a reference may be made to the original Latin, which will be found in Dr. Troy's work; from which this translation is also selected — The Pontifical Rescript for the alteration of the Pontifical Oath to be taken by the Irish Catholic Prelates is as follows:—

"FROM AN AUDIENCE HAD OF HIS HOLINESS ON THE  
9TH DAY OF JUNE, 1791.\*

"The Archbishops metropolitans of the kingdom of Ireland represented to his Holiness, that from the ignorance or malice of some persons, certain expressions in the form of the Oath, prescribed by the Roman Ritual to be taken by Bishops at their consecration, and by Archbishops on receiving the *Pall*, have been misrepresented; which has added new perplexities to those which they daily experience in a kingdom where the catholic faith is not the religion of the state: wherefore they humbly requested, if it should appear expedient to his Holiness, that he would vouchsafe to apply a remedy by some act of his apostolical vigilance. His Holiness, on this report being made to him by me the underwritten, all circumstances

\* Vide Dr. Troy's Pastoral Address, 1793.

cumstances of the case maturely considered, was graciously pleased to grant, that the Bishops of the kingdom of Ireland, at their consecration, and the Archbishops on receiving the *Pall*, may use the same form of oath, which was taken by the Archbishop of *Mohilow*\*, in the empire of the Muscovites, by permission of his said Holiness, and which is as follows :

I N. N. &c. (as in the Roman Pontifical to the clause—*All Heretics, Schismatics, and Rebels, against our said Lord, and his successors aforesaid, I will to the utmost of my power, prosecute and oppose*—which is entirely omitted:) after wards the words —*the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for propagating the Faith*, are substituted instead of *the Cardinal Proponent in the Congregation of the Sacred Council*. The form concludes with these words : *I will observe all and everyone of these things the more inviolably, as I am firmly convinced that there is nothing contained in them, which can be contrary to the fidelity I owe to the most serene King of Great-Britain and Ireland, and to his successors to the throne. So help me God and these holy Gospels of God. Thus I promise, and engage.*

Dated at Rome, in the house of the said Sacred Congregation the 23d Day of June, 1791.

L. CARDINAL ANTONELLI, Prefect.

A. ARCHBISHOP ADANEN, Secretary."

*Sir J. C. HIPPISEY's Remark.*

The learned Member will observe that his construction of the words "*Hæreticos persequar et impugnabo*," is very widely at variance with that which is inculcated by Rome herself.—I should not have been satisfied that the popular sense imputed to those words, was disclaimed by the Catholics of this kingdom, if the See of Rome had held the contrary; but I must own that I am, in this

\* Mohilow was erected into an archbishopric, with a chapter, by the Pope Pius VI. The first Archbishop *Stanislaus Siefrencewex*, was appointed in a consistory at Rome, 21st December, 1783, and is still living.

† Bishop of Cloyne's translation.

this instance, perfectly satisfied with the declaration of Rome itself, as I read it, thus solemnly made, and as I know from the most authentic collateral authorities, that notwithstanding the persecuting spirit avowed by some individual writers, and manifested also by some individual Pontiffs, that such a spirit is not consistent with the recognised doctrines of the See of Rome."

Though all suppositions against the declarations of the Roman Pontiff and the catholic universities are vain, the writer offers an argument of more imposing authority, capable of reducing to silence, a man steeled against conviction, if deep rooted prejudice, combined with interest, could be silent, that is, the Catholics of the United Kingdom, rather than take an oath, inconsistent with the principles which they profess, have during the space of one hundred years submitted to all the penalties and disabilities of a system of penal laws, the most insulting and oppressive that human imagination has yet suggested; laws, which that celebrated Statesman Edmund Burke called *ferocious*; laws of which the Catholics of Ireland in their petition to Parliament for a mitigation say: "for near one hundred years we, our fathers and grandfathers have groaned under a code of laws (in some parts already purged from the statutes) the like of which, no age, no nation, no climate ever saw."—See Parnell, P. 134.

In the same petition they say: "with regard to our civil principles, we are unalterably, deeply and zealously, attached to his Majesty's person and government . . . with regard to the constitution of the Church, we are, indeed, inviolably attached to our own, first, because we believe it to be true; and next because, beyond belief, we know that its principles are calculated to make us, and have made us, good men and good citizens"—*ibidem*.

Never was testimony more public, more authentic, more honourable! The testimony of four millions! The testimony of men incapable of compromising with conscience!

science! The testimony of men, who knew the principles of their religion, who believed them true, and who beyond belief, knew them to be sound and good! If they had been as condescending as Charas, whose complaisance in professing a faith, which he did not believe true, in compliance with the injunctions of the Inquisition, this castigator laments, they would, like him, have silenced conscience, and by an oath have freed themselves from all disabilities. It is therefore manifest as the sun at mid-day that what they disclaim they do not believe.

Before the writer proceeds to discuss the Edinburgh castigator's efforts to perplex the truth of the perpetual visibility of Christ's church, and his artful endeavours to involve in obscurity a truth, which extorts the assent of the unbiassed understanding, he finds it necessary to inform the unprejudiced reader that there is no article of doctrine, so universally misunderstood by dissenters of different descriptions as the pope's primacy or supremacy as it is called. It is almost invariably misrepresented, some through ignorance, others through artifice, many through a deeply rooted prejudice, which assumes the appearance, if not the reality of the most virulent rancour, state it entirely different from what it is in reality, they persuade themselves that this hideous form, which it takes in their cancered imagination, is something real; hence these furious declamations and senseless invectives against all popes indiscriminately. If in the annals of ages it appears, that at any time, or in any country, the pope's injunctions were not implicitly obeyed, though in a thousand instances it appears that his primacy was universally acknowledged, this solitary instance of non compliance is seized with avidity, as if sufficient to confound a truth, which the history of all Churches, and the unanimous consent of Christians attest. If these men would silence prejudice, and on a subject so interesting to the peace of the Christian Church, taking reason for their guide, consult history with

with a view to truth, they would find this non-compliance with the pope's injunctions, did not proceed from any opposition to his primacy, of which there was not the shadow of a doubt, but from an idea of his interference on that particular occasion being an infringement of the rights of patriarchs, of metropolitans, or national synods, which were secured to them by ecclesiastical rules and canons, these rights the popes themselves possessed and exercised within certain limits; but if on any occasion they extended these rights beyond their limits they were sure of meeting opposition; hence we find that Cyprian considering the question of rebaptisation as a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, over which the African prelates in their national synods exercised an uncontroled jurisdiction, refused to accede to Stephen's decision, and resisted even his threats, because he thought it an encroachment on the rights of the national church of Africa, though no man had a more profound respect for the Apostolical See of Rome, as every man must see who reads his works. He calls it the *See of Peter, the principal Church, the source of sacerdotal unity, &c.* In like manner the Asiatic bishops, with *Polycrates*, of Ephesus, at their head, considering the celebration of Easter on any particular day, as a matter of mere ecclesiastical discipline, within the jurisdiction of their national synod, notwithstanding the remonstrances of pope Victor, and his threats of excommunication for disobedience, persisted in celebrating the Easter on the 14th day of the moon with the Jews, yet that these prelates never doubted the primacy of the pope is clear from the letter written by Polycrates in their name and addressed to that pontiff. "We celebrate the Easter inviolably," says Polycrates. "without adding or diminishing;" he then enumerates many holy bishops and martyrs who celebrated the Easter in the same manner, amongst them he names St. John, the evangelist, and St. Philip, an apostle, with his two daughters *nuns*, or, as he calls them, *virgins*, [it seems this non-sensical institution, which the castigator hates, was authorised by the apostles]

apostles] following their example he was not alarmed at the pope's menace: "for me," says he, "who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord, who have communicated with all the brethren in the world, who have read the whole scripture, I am not troubled at what is proposed to terrify us: I know that they, who were greater than I, said it is more necessary to obey God than men." "I might," continues Polycrates, "name the bishops who are present, whom I assembled at your request, if I named them you would see their great multitude, and knowing my littleness they have all notwithstanding approved my letter,"—Euf. L. v, cap. 24. Is not this the language of a man, who writes to his superior? Who assigns the reasons why he does not comply with his injunctions? It is remarkable that, in these disputes, Stephen and Victor were correct, and their decisions were founded; Cyprian and Polycrates were deceived, and their opposition productive of bad consequences, as is invariably the case when lawful authority is resisted.

The declaration of the French Clergy affords irresistible evidence that opposition to the pope's interference on certain occasions may be without prejudice of his supremacy. In the third article of that declaration they say: "*the exercise of the Ecclesiastical Power is to be regulated by the canons.*" These articles have been strenuously supported by Bossuet in his *defence of the declaration* of the French Clergy; yet no man ever suspected Bossuet of being disaffected to the papal supremacy in its true sense: few men have demonstrated with more force or efficacy the divine original of this supremacy, and its indispensable necessity for the support of order, unanimity and union in the Christian church. It is almost an intuitive truth that without one superintending power there can be no union or unanimity: if bishops were all independent we should have as many sects and schisms as there are bishops of discordant views; and the Christian church would resemble those jarring sects, which are divided and subdivided into as many separate societies as there

there are leaders, who lend their opinions, and form parties, there being no general superintendant, in whom the authority of the whole is concentrated, and who in the exercise of that authority, to silence clamours, to prevent dissensions and disputes, and to confine the restless and turbulent within due bounds, is supported by the whole. This is a truth so irresistible that the most learned protestants admit it. Melancthon, who first assumed the name, in his answer to Billicanus says : “ we agree that the government of bishops in different churches and the *Presidency of the Bishop of Rome* over them is a legal form : for the pope’s supremacy would tend much to preserve amongst different nations the unity of doctrine, so that were other points agreed on the popes supremacy might be easily allowed.” And, Grotius, a man celebrated in the republic of letters, in his discussion of Rivett’s Apology, gives it as his opinion, that Protestants will never be united with each other, until they are so with those, who adhere to the See of Rome, without which he says no common agreement or government can be expected.

The ancients had a just notion both of the papal and patriarchal authority, the patriarchal as well as the metropolitan jurisdiction they knew to be of ecclesiastical right, established either by immemorial custom, as was that of Alexandria and Antioch, or by decrees of General Councils as was that of Constantinople. That they thought the patriarchal jurisdiction variable, the history of this latter See affords ample proof : it was originally suffragan to Heraclea ; in complaisance to the emperor, who had fixed his chief residence in that city, it was elevated to the rank of metropolitan ; in the second Council of Constantinople, at which none of the Western prelates assisted, the bishop of that city obtained the prerogative of honour after the bishop of Rome, because, said the prelates, Constantinople is *a New Rome*—Canon iii. He thus obtained a precedence over the ancient patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch ; and, finally in the Council  
of



of Chalcedon, Anatolius, the then bishop, an artful and intriguing prelate, by the influence of the Court, obtained a confirmation of this rank of precedence after the bishop of Rome, together with an extensive jurisdiction, and similar privileges within his new jurisdiction to these which the Roman pontiff exercised within the patriarchate of Rome. The twenty-eighth canon is thus conceived: "the Fathers had reason to grant to the See of old Rome its privileges, because it was the ruling city, and through the same motive the 150 Fathers have judged that the new Rome (Con.) which is honored with the empire and the senate should have the same advantages in the ecclesiastical order, and be the second after it." The Fathers then specify the privileges which they confer on the See of Constantinople: "so that," continues the canon, "the metropolitans of the districts of Pontus, of Thrace, and of Asia only, and the bishops of these dioceses, which are amongst the Barbarians be ordained by the See of Constantinople. It is well understood that each metropolitan of these districts will ordain the bishops of his Province with his comprovincial bishops according to the canons." Though this canon did not abridge in any sense the pope's sovereign jurisdiction, nor interfere at all with his authority as chief pastor of the church, yet Leo the Great quashed the canon for two reasons: first, because it falsely asserted that privileges were granted by the Fathers to the Roman See because it was the imperial city, which was a manifest falsehood: for the authority of the Roman pontiff as chief pastor of the church was derived from St. Peter, and was of divine institution; and the privileges, which he exercised as Patriarch of the West were founded on immemorial custom, as were those of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; and secondly, because it authorized an usurpation of the ancient rights of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, which had been confirmed to them by the Council of Nice, in the 4th canon, of which this canon of Chalcedon

don was a notorious infraction. If the jurisdiction of the See of Rome had been of ecclesiastical right or institution, nothing could prevent Anatolius, supported by the whole weight of the Imperial Court, from obtaining for his See of Constantinople, a rank of precedence before that See, as he did before the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch. The jurisdiction which Anatolius obtained in the districts specified in the canon did not abridge the pope's patriarchal jurisdiction: it never extended to them districts; nor did he at any time interfere with the rights of the Eastern patriarchs in superintending the elections, and canonical institutions of the prelates subject to their Sees; or in other points of church discipline, over which they exercised their patriarchal jurisdiction controlled by the canons alone, the observance of which was enforced by the pope's authority as successor to Peter, and chief pastor of Christ's flock. Hence Gregory the Great, in the letter to Eulogius, injudiciously cited by the castigator, says: "nothing can redound to my honour, which conduces to the dishonour of my brethren: I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs." And, in a letter to John, bishop of Syracuse, speaking of the bishop of Constantinople, who had assumed the title of *universal bishop*, as if he were the only bishop, and all other prelates his vicars, Gregory says: "as to his saying that he is subject to the Apostolical See, if any fault be found in bishops, I do not know what bishop is not subject to it; but if no fault require its interference, they are all equal according to the rule of humility."—L. vii. Ep. 65. Fleury, who never missed an opportunity of depressing papal authority, remarks on this passage: "these words of St. Gregory indicate in a precise manner, the limits of the power of the Head of the Church: as long as bishops do their duty, he treats them as his equals, but he is the superior of them all when there is a question of correction."—L. xxxv.

After discharging a certain portion of foetid bile, with which this Edinburgh castigator seems to be greatly over-

over-charged, in denouncing maledictions against the *Beast of Babylon*, and foretelling the *eternal dissolution* of the Romish Church immediately impending, whether to fill his pamphlet, or to surprize the good wives with his great erudition, he gives us all the notes of the catholic church, as taken from Bellarmine. Quere—Has he ever read a line in the works of that controvertist? Does he rightly understand the language in which they are written! Would he condescend to oblige us with a refutation of Bellarmine's reasoning on the subject? *Hic Labor, hoc opus.* He has done it in a summary way—by saying nothing. Passing from Bellarmine, he recites this passage from the writer's remarks: "He, the writer, 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 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 cessation visible." To this he replies, that no protestant church, which proceeds on scriptural principles, acknowledges a commencement at a later date than the days of the apostles," p. 151. His spirit of divination forgot to remind him that the first Protestant Church, of which the world knows any thing, acknowledged it, if we may believe Luther himself and his panegyrists. This patriarch of reforming memory says that in his first essay, and to do him justice, it was a master-piece, "he was all alone," "*primo solus eram.*" "I alone," says he, "rolled the stone.—Tom. ii. Fol. 63. I was alone in danger, forsaken by all, *assisted by none.*" This first protestant church commenced in him, and not before him; for he had not one assistant. His testimony,

ny, however strong, is confirmed by his ablest panegyrists. Doctor Tillotson, in his 49th sermon, says: "in the beginning of the reformation, when popery had overrun these western parts, and subdued her enemies *on every side*, and Antichrist (the Pope) sat securely in the quiet possession of his Kingdom, Luther arose, a bold, rough man, but a fit wedge to cleave asunder so hard and knotty a block, appearing stoutly against the gross errors of the Church of Rome, *and for a long time stood alone.*" And Jewell assures us, that "The truth was unknown at the time, *and unheard of*, when Martin Luther first came to the knowledge of the gospel."—Ap. B. iv. Ch. 4. And Perkins, the celebrated Professor of Cambridge goes further, he says: that "Before Luther, for many hundreds of years such an universal apostacy overspread the whole world, that the *Protestant Church was not visible any where,*" Per. on the Creed, p. 400. As a church of any kind, whether true or false, is, and must of all necessity be, composed of men, women and children, by whatever bond they are united; at least in this sublunary world of ours there is no invisible church: for there are no invisible men, women or children to compose it. The man who resists this truth is not sound in head, or he is horribly depraved in heart. It is therefore irresistibly true that the first protestant church commenced in Luther, and, if we believe his greatest admirers and most zealous disciples, on whom a double portion of his spirit descended, the century writers of Magdeburgh, to whose researches our Edinburgh castigator is indebted for all these garbled extracts with which he has filled a volume, it ended with him: for they say in their preface to the second century: "the greatest variations in doctrine and changes seem to impend; thus the sins of men deserve, which are growing every day more atrocious, (Erasmus thought so too) the times of the Germanic prophet Martin Luther, by whose voice and ministry the light of the gospel *was recalled*, as if from the Egyptian darkness, almost corresponded with the age of the Apostles;

tles ; but now since his death, we have entered as it were into another age of the gospel, in which so many religious frenzies, *fanaticisme*, begin to spring up and gradually to reign :” and in their preface to the 5th Cen. after lamenting that many of Luther’s doctrines were already forgotten, they say : “ the truth that was brought to view has *already perished*, and that suddenly : philosophy, popery, and other sects, far and wide, occupy the first chair in the temple of God.” We have it then from Luther and his friends, that the first protestant church commenced in him ; he was the foundation stone on which the edifice was raised, *and he stood a long time alone* ; and we have it from his disciples that it ended with him : the foundation was rotten, and the superstructure tumbled into ruins, *and that suddenly they say, “ et id repente.”* Calvin, the boasted father of another grand division of the reformed churches, says, that his division began with himself : “ we have been forced,” says he, Ep. 14 “ to renounce the communion of the whole world.” This has been invariably and universally acknowledged by protestants of every description. Chillingworth assigns the reason, “ because,” says he, “ *Safe Way*,” Ch. v. “ they were convinced by all manner of evidence, as scripture, reason, and antiquity, that all the *visible churches in the world* had degenerated from the purity of the gospel.” We must, then, conclude that these first protestant churches did not act on scriptural principles ; does this last church, fashioned by our Edinburgh castigator ? We maintain, says he, that we have only re-assumed our original form, after having been *transformed into the image of the Beast*. This his new Church, therefore, had been, during a lapse of centuries, *in the image of the beast*, and then resumed its original form. To this the writer replies, that if this fancied existence of a Church in the image of the Beast had been real, it was not the church of Christ, nor any portion or integrant part of the church of Christ : for Christ is head of his Church ; he teaches his church by the ministry of his apostles,

apostles, and their successors, and it is animated by his Spirit : to pretend that Christ is head of a church in the image of the beast is the most atrocious blasphemy. Hence it follows that besides this church in the image of the beast, on which this castigator's disordered brain has bestowed an imaginary existence, there must have been some other church, of which Christ is, and was the head, if it be true that his church was perpetually visible. He has not deigned to tell us in what form the protestant churches existed in the apostles' days ; or when they ceased to exist in that form and were transformed into the image of the beast. These are abstruse questions. The truth is, we do not know in what form they exist on this present day : we know they are numerous, unconnected, discordant in their principles of faith, and church discipline, agreeing in nothing but their disagreement and opposition to what they call popery ; we know from better authority than this castigator, that in the apostles days there was but one church professing the same faith "*una fides,*" one faith, participating the same sacraments : "*unum baptisma*" one baptism. — Eph. iv. United under the same chief pastor *Peter*, who was commissioned by Christ to feed his flock. — John xxi. We know that this one church was a visible society composed not of souls or angels, or other invisible beings, but of mortals like ourselves, so perfectly united in the profession of the same faith, participation of the same sacraments, and obedience to the same chief pastor, that the apostle Paul, says : it was *one body* "*unum corpus*" animated with one and the same spirit — "*unus spiritus.*" Eph. iv. Does this castigator pretend that the numerous, or rather innumerable churches, which call themselves protestant, are so perfectly united as to form one compact body, animated by one and the same spirit ? If so, why these disputes, dissensions and variations in doctrine, which commenced with the reformation and are every day increasing ? If not, the protestant churches have not re-assumed the form of the church in the apostles days.

But perhaps the castigator, confines the re-assumption of the form of the apostolical church to that particular protestant church, of which he is himself chief pastor. There are many, who pretend an equal right, and with equal justice, all these he must exclude on the principle of self defence, and at the same time he excludes himself from the promises of Abraham, and from the inheritance promised to that patriarch, who is, if we believe St. Paul, the father of all, who believe in Jesus Christ, Rom. iv. 16. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," Gen. xxvi, 4. St. Paul says, that this promise was made to Jesus Christ, that in him and by him all nations of the earth should be blessed.—Gal. iii, 16. The church of Jesus Christ is therefore, the church of all nations and of all ages, for no reason can be assigned why it should be confined to one age in preference to others, more particularly as the angel Gabriel, announcing his incarnation said, "Of his kingdom there will be no end."—Luke i, 33. The church of this reverend and castigating pastor, is so far from being the church of all nations, that it is not the church of any nation at all, and it is so very far from being the church of all ages, that he himself says, it was the image of the Beast for many ages. The most idle conceit, and ridiculous subterfuge which the writer remembers to have seen. In its present form, it is as opposite to the church founded by the apostles as darkness is to light: for in the apostolical church the pastors were constituted by Jesus Christ himself, the great shepherd, as St. Paul called him.—Heb. xiii, 20. Immediately, as the apostle Peter and his fellow apostles, or mediately by their ministry as Paul and Barnaby.—Acts xiii, 2. . . . . As they were ministering to the Lord and *fasting* "*nēsteuontēn.*" The Holy Ghost said: segregate for me Barnaby and Paul, for the work, to which I have called them; then *fasting* and praying, and imposing hands on them, they dismissed them " (this *nonsensical rite fasting*, which the castigator hates, was in use in the apostolical church,) and so on in succession as  
Timothy

Timothy and Titus ordained by Paul.—1 Tim. iv, 14. “Do not neglect the grace which is in you, which was given to you by prophesy with the *imposition* of hands of the priesthood,” and 2d Tim. i. 6. “For which reason I remind you to rekindle the grace of God which is in you, by the imposition of my hands.” This imposition of hands, which we catholics call the sacrament of orders, conferred a permanent grace: for the apostle says: “It was in him from the time that he had conferred the priesthood on him, by the imposition of his hands, and this same grace was conferred on others by the apostles’ disciples”—Titus i, v. “For this reason I left you in Crete, that you might correct defects, and constitute Priests in each city, according to the orders which I have given you.” In this new modelled Church over which this castigator presides, Christ does not constitute pastors, either immediately by himself, or mediately by the ministry of his apostles, or their successors in office; but the people elect, constitute and appoint their pastors according to their own views, literally verifying that prophecy of St. Paul, 2d Tim. iv, 3: “There will be a time when they will not bear sound doctrine, but, according to their sensual desires, they will collect teachers for themselves, with itching ears.” This is the first, and a striking difference it is, between this new modelled church, and the Church of Christ in the apostles’ days; the second is not less remarkable: in the apostolical church there was but one faith—“*una fides*”—Eph. iv, and that one faith delivered to the faithful by their pastors: “The faith once delivered to the saints”—Jude 3. “Have the form of sound words, *which you heard from me* in faith and charity, which is in Christ Jesus”—2d Tim. i, 13. In the next chapter the apostle says to Timothy: “These things which you have heard from me, with many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others”—ii, 2. In this new-modelled church there are as many faiths as faces, or fancies—to speak correctly there is no faith at all, but as many opinions as there



there are individuals capable of forming an opinion. This is a direct and inevitable consequence of that fundamental principle, that every man must take the scriptures for a sole rule of faith; he must therefore on principle fish his faith from the scriptures by his own industry, in other words, he must form his opinions, independently, on that sense of the scripture, which presents itself to his view. This is neither less nor more than his private opinion, the man is destitute of common sense who denies it. To pass unnoticed an intuitive truth, that a great majority of protestants are incapable of deducing any opinion at all from the scriptures, and must, contrary to principle, borrow from their teachers, or from others who chuse to lend them; of these, it is true that they have neither faith nor opinion; it is, therefore, manifestly true, that this new modelled Church has not re-assumed the form of the apostolical church; and if it be true, as the castigator says, and this the writer is willing to admit, that it was in the image of the Beast, it yet continues in the image of the Beast.

The form, say philosophers, is that which limits the matter, and distinguishes the subject of which it is the form: hence the form of the apostolical church consists in these characteristics, which limit that society called the church, and distinguish it from every other society. These have been defined by the inspired writers with great precision: they professed one and the same faith received from pastors instituted by Christ himself, either immediately, or mediately by their ministry; they participated in the same sacraments; they were united as one body, animated with the same spirit under the same visible head, Eph. iv. nourished by one and the same spiritual food: "*ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος ἐν ἑνὴ ἰσμία πολλοὶ ἐσμεν ὅτι γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.*" So there is one bread, (*the eucharist*) we who are many, *one body*: for we all partake of this one bread."—1st Cor. x, 17. Of these characteristics not one is to be found in this newest modelled church of the Edinburgh castigator, as the writer has already shewn.

After

After having, with unusual confidence, asserted that this his newest modelled church had re-assumed its original *form*, an expression, which he does not understand, without offering a syllable in justification of the assertion, "but as *we maintain*," the castigator says, "the church of Rome is an anti-christian church, because it has not subsisted in its present form since the apostles' days." This he pretends to prove, not by argument, but by a rhapsodical enumeration of popes, cardinals, archbishops, and monks of different orders, which enable him to fill a page. If the man knew the force of the term *form*, or if he knew any thing of the characteristics, which constitute the form of a church, he would not be tempted even by vanity, to expose his ignorance to such contempt: is it not astonishing that a man, who knows nothing of the art of reasoning, should presume to write on a subject of deep research, with which he is totally unacquainted. He might with equal propriety, rather with not less absurdity, pretend that the form of a kingdom is changed by the establishment of different corporations, which have bye laws for the regulation of their own societies; but he is told that these societies of civil institution, however different their relative duties, have nothing to do with the form of the kingdom; in like manner he is told, that these different ranks and orders of ecclesiastical institution, have nothing to do with the form of the church. They all profess the same faith; they participate the same sacraments, and are united under the same visible head, Peter's successor, as the primitive christians were under Peter himself. His invectives reach the apostles themselves: for they had renounced every thing in this world to follow Christ, if we believe Peter.—Matt. xix. *Ecce nos reliquimus omnia*, and their immediate disciples followed the example.—Acts' iv. That the voluntary poverty, obedience, and chastity, promised by all the religious orders, have been recommended, though not strictly enjoined, by Christ himself has been shewn to demonstration—see Review,

p. 156- . . . . . The observance of these virtues, if we believe the castigator, has depopulated the earth. The Saviour has therefore injudiciously recommended them. The castigator's invectives are not confined to the apostles; the Saviour comes in for a share. What a strange antipathy he repeatedly expresses against that antiquated virtue called chastity. There are, if common fame tell truth, as many daughters of dissipation in London and Edinburgh, as there are nuns in Vienna, Rome, Paris, Madrid, Naples, and the other capitals of all the catholic states in Europe. In these capitals there are daughters of dissipation too, yes, and many; but they do not alarm this castigating pastor's humanity; his invectives do not extend to them: they do not depopulate the world; they are piously engaged in what he calls the pastor's first great duty, that is, the propagation of the human species. Raynal thought so too, and so does that foul fiend who wanders in the unwatered places seeking rest and finding none.—Matt. xii. 43.

In his next chapter, he pretends to examine the indefectibility of the church, that is the perpetual and uninterrupted existence which it has always enjoyed, and will continue to possess till the end of time. Of this doctrine, he says, p. 130, protestants are as strenuous supporters as the Romish church, but they will not admit the consequence which the writer has deduced. The castigator, is not the first whom irresistible evidence has forced to shift his ground; but his evil genius has led him to a position the most unlucky, that ever entered man's imagination, that is, to *the image of the beast*, this is his last refuge, in it he makes a stand. The consequence which the writer deduced, and which he now repeats, is--that if it be true, and true it is, if the scriptures be not false, that the church has always existed, and will continue to exist, until the end of time, it must always exist in the same *form*: for it is the form which limits, which defines, which constitutes and distinguishes; if then the form ceases to exist, the church must of all necessity

necessity cease to exist : for no body can exist, whether natural or moral, without its constituent attributes ; thus, for instance, if the materials which compose a ship be employed in the construction of a house, the materials continue to exist, but not the ship ; or if a State changes its form of Government, and from a monarchy becomes a republic, it is not the monarchy which continues to exist under a republican form : for the one form excludes the other, but the monarchy has ceased to exist, and the republic has succeeded it ; in like manner if the church should change its original form, and assume the form of the Beast ; it is not the church which would continue to exist under the form of the Beast ; but the church would have absolutely ceased to exist, and the synagogue of Satan would have succeeded, in which this Edinburgh castigator has, with great truth and propriety, found his new modelled church.

Admitting that the many passages adduced by the writer in his remarks, p. 110 . . . . . in support of the uninterrupted existence of the church, are of irresistible authority, the castigator selects one, which by the bye was incidental, though not less mortifying, to the spirit of innovation ; on it he declaims with great vehemence : It is thus conceived and expressed by the prophet Isaiah : “ every weapon which is formed against thee (the church) shall miss, and every tongue, which rises in judgment against thee, thou shalt condemn.”—liv. 17. The writer’s reasoning on the passage, the castigator transcribes, and however irksome to himself, and unpleasant to this castigator, he again repeats it : “ 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 examinant 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." To this the castigatour replies: "though the church of Rome has condemned and laid her murderous fangs as often as she could upon those who differ with her in sentiment, it is no evidence that she is the church of the Prince of Peace," p. 134. This is railing not reasoning: for whether the church of Rome be the church of the Prince of Peace or not, it is not the less true, that Jesus Christ had then on earth a church, which did not consist of Luther alone, he therefore was incontrovertibly one of these men, who rose up in judgment against it, and it condemned him, according to the promise. The ridiculous subterfuge of an invisible church is no evasion; for Luther was not a member of an invisible church, if such a phantom could exist; he was visible and tangible like other men. The castigatour as a substitute for argument, fills two pages with invectives against papists; their doctrines and unmeaning ceremonies inflame his bile beyond its usual pitch, his indignation against the Romish church knows no bounds, by it millions of his ancestors have been persecuted to death. Full of the delphic spirit he prophesies: "We view the operations of God as hastening the approach of that period, when the friends of Christ shall join in halleluiahs, on beholding the smoke of her torment ascending up for ever and ever," p. 135. But as these invectives and oracles have no more reference to the writer's argument, than to the ebbing and flowing of the tide, they leave it insoluble, as they found it, in full force against the first reformer, and of equal force against this castigatour, and if he pretends to shelter himself in an invisible church, the writer will appeal to his *cara sposa* the partner of his pastoral cares and she will attest that the castigatour is visible and tangible like his neighbours.

In his next edition will he condescend to inform us  
 where

where these millions of his ancestors who were persecuted to death concealed themselves : it must have been in the regions of the moon, or the Island of *Utopia* : in Scotland there was scarcely one million, and they were all papists, when James V. in 1540, ordered four epicurean monks, who, to gratify the cravings of the belly, had renounced their frocks and vows, to be arrested, and, without consulting the Pope or any other prelate, ordered them for execution as disturbers of the public tranquility ; some other apostate Monks of the same stamp were disposed of in the same way ; when John Knox began to found the horn of discord there was some blood spilled on both sides, that was not an uncommon thing in Scotland if their historians tell truth ; however the Monks, who had renounced their frocks, being the more numerous, and the more clamorous, and having inflamed the minds of the people with virulent invectives, and calumnious misrepresentations, of the faith and morality of their brethren, who persisted in the observance of their vows, soon formed a strong and infuriate party, and with their assistance pulled down both church and state, destroyed all religious houses, and pious institutions, expelled the queen and her most faithful subjects, persecuted, and yet continue to persecute with unrelenting fury, all who refuse to adopt their new opinions. This Edinburgh castigator, so conversant in the history of the primitive church, ought to know something of the history of his own country.

He is at a loss, he says, p. 136, to know what the writer calls *the first reformers*. By the first reformers, the writer means " the first inventors, the first founders, the first authors of what they call a Reformation, or what this castigator calls *re-assuming an original form* : for to re-assume an original form, is neither less nor more than to effect a Reformation ; and where there is a reformation, there must be a reformer : for there is no relation without a subject, in which the relation is founded, as there can be no child without a father. The first in-

ventor, the first founder, the first author of the protestant reformation was Martin Luther, a Saxon monk, if we believe himself, though Zuinglius had the presumption to claim that honour"—see Remarks. "There have been," he says, "at all times men who testified against papal usurpations, and other pollutions of the church of Rome," p. 136. True, there have been men, who abused the Pope, from Nicolas, of infamous memory, who abused St. Peter, down to this castigator, who abuses all his successors: but these men were not protestants: for Luther did not find one protestant in the world when he commenced the reformation; he himself was an arrant papist, and said mass religiously for many a year, and all his disciples were papists, who renounced the faith in which they were baptised, and in which they lived until that unlucky period to embrace his reformation, nor did these traitors again form a visible society, perpetually existing, professing the same faith, and united under the same head: on the contrary, their terms of communion were contradictory: what one sect believed was anathematised by another: thus, for instance, the Nestorians believed that in Jesus Christ there are two persons as well as two natures, the Eutychians believed but one nature and one person; the Pelagians believed man, by his free will, unassisted by Divine grace, capable of fulfilling the whole law, the Calvinists, on the contrary, assert that free will is extinct, and ascribe the whole of man's salvation to grace alone. The Pelagians make the soldier fight without arms, and the Calvinists make the arms fight without the soldier; they all unite in abusing the pope, and that church, which is now visible, was at all times visible, and will continue visible, that church, of which all the members, though dispersed over the world, profess the same faith, participate the same sacraments, and are united under the same head, whilst hundreds of these jarring sects have disappeared, and are succeeded by others, which after making a little noise in the world, disappear in turn, to make way for others,

others, who, to the end of time, will verify that prediction of St. Paul, 1st Cor. xi, 19: "there must be sects amongst you, that they who are approved may be publicly known," as in a rebellion, faithful subjects adhere to their prince, and thus attest their loyalty, whilst the disaffected unite with the leader or leaders of the rebellion; so in all these commotions, which heresy has caused at different times, true christians have persevered with unshaken constancy in the faith of their ancestors, whilst restless spirits, attracted by novelty, and deceived by the spirit of illusion, formed sects under their different leaders. Our ancestors, says the castigat'or, always declared their doctrine founded upon the scriptures. True, so did all the different sects, who have disfigured the face of christianity; they have always endeavoured to distort some passage of scripture to countenance their absurd fables; but catholics have uniformly shewn that these fables have no foundation in scripture at all; that the sense which they pretend to affix to the scriptures, in order to countenance their opinions, is not the genuine sense, the sense intended by the inspired writers.

To justify the separation of the reformed churches from the church of Rome, he cites some passages from St. Bernard, and other catholic writers, who declaimed vehemently against the immorality of many of the clergy. That there were many of the clergy corrupt and immoral, no man doubts; but these writers did not say that the faith of the church was corrupt, or that its discipline had any tendency to encourage immorality, on the contrary, these clergymen were impious because they did not believe the doctrines of christianity then taught, and they were corrupt and immoral, because they did not observe the discipline of the church. However, of all these impious, corrupt, and immoral clergymen, Luther's reformation purged the church: they were the first to embrace it; the most zealous to support it; of their old concubines they made new wives; picked up all the daughters of dissipation, who dishonoured some  
convents,



convents, made them the partners of their pastoral cares ; for these were the first pastors of all the reformed churches. These are the men who the castigator calls his ancestors.

The image of the beast, and this invisible church, composed not of fairies, or other imaginary phantoms, but of mortals, with their flesh and bones about them, are not quite satisfactory to our castigator : he speaks of Hussites, of Wiclefites, of Waldenses, &c. but the Hussites were not his ancestors in any sense : they were a Bohemian banditti, not protestants, and if they had been protestants they were not before John Huss, who began to reform in 1409, the same is true of the Wiclefites : they were not protestants, nor had they any existence before John Wiclef began to dogmatize in or near the year 1365. The Waldenses were nothing less than protestants, and they commenced with Peter Waldo about the year 1136. The evangelical poverty, on which they rested all hopes of salvation, and from which they obtained the appellation of *poor men of Lyons*, was not of Luther's taste, though he had promised it in his early days he did not the less renounce it, together with the antiquated virtues of obedience and chastity, and the unprofitable austerities of fasting, praying, &c. This castigator therefore must find his ancestors elsewhere ; however strange it may appear, he finds some of them amongst us papists. If by ancestors he means the persons, from whom he is lineally descended, they, as well as the ancestors of all his countrymen, were indisputably papists from the year 565, when the Picts in the north of Scotland were converted to christianity, by the ministry of Colemkill and his assistants, monks of the old school. The southern Picts had been converted by the labours of St. Ninian in or about the year 426.—Bede L. iii, cap. 4. During a space of nine hundred and seventy-five years, until the year 1540, when the four apostate friars, whom James Vth ordered to be arrested, began to justify their apostacy by declaiming against monastic vows, and their

their profligate sensuality, by crying down all austerities as useless and unprofitable; but if by his ancestors he mean protestants, the writer says, No. In the whole range of the christian world, there was not one protestant when Luther began to preach. Of this truth Luther is himself the voucher, and if he did not attest it, the truth is not the less manifest; for though there have been at all times many corrupt and immoral men, and many good and pious men, who inveighed most bitterly against corruption and immorality; yet there never was, and there is not yet, a man within the pale of the christian church who does not profess the faith, which is taught in it, and submit his private opinions to its solemn decisions, such a man is not, nor can he be, a protestant.

To justify these his protestant ancestors, whom his spirit of divination discovers where no protestant did ever exist, he says, p. 141, "even allowing the Romish church to be the church of Christ, which has holiness as a characteristic, protestants may still have good reason to charge her with superstition and idolatry." Be it so! We papists, though rank idolators, may yet be holy! Holy idolatry is a new combination of ideas: it resembles a geometrical figure called a *square circle*, the only property of which, as yet known to geometers, is, the impossibility of conceiving or describing it. Our Edinburgh castigator, in imitation of the Valentinians, the Manicheans, the Arians, Eunomians, &c. who found passages in scripture to authorise all the extravagant fables with which they pestered the world, finds a passage to reconcile holiness with idolatry. "Israel," says he, p. 142, "appears to have been guilty of some superstitious idolatry; and yet God acknowledged their relation to him as a church." My people, says he, ask counsel of their stocks . . . they sacrifice upon the tops of mountains and burn incense upon the hills.—Hos. iv, 12. He did not think proper to insert the whole passage: the intermediate words, to which he has substituted points, were

were not to his purpose: they shew that, if God acknowledged them for his people, they did not acknowledge him for their God, the intermediate words are: "the spirit of fornication has deceived them, and they have fornicated from their God." What, does the idiot pretend that God acknowledged professed idolators for his church? God, he says, called them *his people*. True, what then? Does he know any people, who are not God's creatures? when did he cease to be the God of the whole earth? But God did not call them a holy people; nor did God say that they had any relation to him as members of his church. This is the castigator's wild conjecture, which he modestly enough gives for authentic scripture. This is not a bad specimen of the proofs adduced from scripture in support of every fable, which is obtruded on the credulity of the uninformed multitude. These men, of whom the prophet speaks, were so far from being holy, that they were a most un-sanctified people: for the prophet charges them not only with idolatry, but with almost every other atrocity which degrades human nature; they were of the Jewish race it is true, but not of the Jewish church; they had renounced it, and were then of the synagoue of Satan, whose chief residence was in Bethel, or, as the prophet called it in derision, Bethaven, that is, the house of iniquity. There were many members of the true church dispersed amongst the ten tribes, which from the time of schism effected by Jeroboam's impious policy, were called Israel or Ephraim; but they did not communicate with the idolators in their idolatrous worship, either in Bethel, where they sacrificed to Jeroboam's calves, or on the tops of the mountains, where they sacrificed to other idols: they communicated with the true church in Jerusalem, where victims were offered, and incense burned, to the true God in the temple, according to the law of Moses, by the high priest, the descendant of Aaron, whose spiritual authority was acknowledged by all the members of the true church. It is said of Tobias,

" when

“ when all went to the golden calves, which Jeroboam, king of Israel, had made, he alone avoided the communion of them all ; but he went to Jerusalem to the temple of the Lord, and there he adored the Lord God of Israel, offering faithfully his first fruits and tithes,”—Tob. i. 5. In the chapter cited by the castigator, Juda, in which tribe the true faith, as well as all the rites and ceremonies, by which all the members of the true church were united, under the representative of Aaron, continued after the schism is clearly distinguished from Israel the idolatrous Conventicle : “ if thou Israel be guilty of fornication (idolatry) let not Juda sin. do not go into Gilgal, and do not ascend to Bethhaven.”—16.

To this embarrassing question : “ if the church be the assembly of saints, why do you separate yourselves from it,” the castigator replies : “ Let him (this writer) bethink himself whether protestants separated themselves, or were unjustly cast out by the Romish church. When our ancestors discovered the abominations, that were practised under the mask of religion ought they to have quieted their consciences with the consideration that it was the church who did them.” p. 142.

This inconsiderate reply convicts them of unwarrantable schism, for it admits that the Romish church, as he calls it, was at that point of time the assembly of saints ; it was therefore the church to which the promises were made, so clearly expressive of its perpetual and uninterrupted continuation until the end of time, that the castigator himself says, “ protestants are as strenuous supporters of this doctrine, as the Romish church ;” it was the church, of which Christ was the head, which he teaches by his ministers ; which he preserves as the apple of his eye, says the castigator, p. 133. In a word, it was that one church of Christ promised by the prophets, founded by the apostles, governed by their successors, of which the angel Gabriel said : “ of it there will be no end.”—Luke i. Either it ceased to exist at that point of time, or it continues to exist. If it ceased to exist, the promises

promises were false, and christianity an illusion. If it continues to exist, it must continue in the same form. This truth has been already shewn to conviction, and is a self-evident truth : for the same church can no more exist under a different form, than a man can exist under the form of an ass, or a monarchy under the form of a republic. This is a direct proof, which requires more sophistical powers than this Edinburgh castigat<sup>r</sup>, assisted by his spirit of divination, possesses to elude. To separate from the church, to which the promises were made, and which in virtue of these promises must enjoy an uninterrupted existence until the consummation of time, is so manifestly a schism that the man is divested of common sense, who denies it.

Whether these his ancestors were unjustly cast out of the Romish church, as the castigat<sup>r</sup> says, or separated themselves from it, as the christian world knows, he admits that they were in it : for if they were not in it the instant before the separation, they could neither be cast out of it, nor separate themselves from it. He thus acknowledges that these ancestors, whom he sought amongst the Hussites, Wiclefites, &c. were imaginary : not one of them was in the Romish church at that time. And whether the abominations with which he charges the Romish church, be real or pretended, he admits that she was the church of Christ : “ ought they (his ancestors) to have quieted their consciences with the consideration that it was the church who did them ? ” It is therefore true, that they were separated from the church of Christ, and consequently from Christ himself, who is head of his church, and teaches his church, by the ministry of its pastors in regular succession from the apostles, according to his promise.—Matt. ult. And it is equally true, that the church of Christ did not begin with them : it was in existence fifteen centuries before, nor was it continued in them, for they had no predecessors, and without a predecessor there is no succession or continuation. These are intuitive truths which bear

no reply. However numerous the partisans or disciples of these his ancestors, who were unjustly, as he says, cast out of the Romish church, may be on the present day, it is not difficult to assign the time when they consisted of number *one*. Luther positively asserts it: "*at first I was alone,*" "*primo solus eram.*" His panegyrist Tillotson assures it: "*he stood a long time alone.*" The day, the hour, even the instant before he began to dogmatise, the church existing without interruption was in being. All evasions are vain, subterfuges ridiculous: wild and extravagant declamations against real or imaginary abuses, virulent invectives against fictitious or existing abominations may divert the uninformed from the true state of the question, or enflame the enthusiastic; but they cannot convert truth into falsehood, nor can they transform an impostor into an apostle. Though many well-meaning men have been misled, seduced by the idle tales of reformation, it is not the less true that their teachers have been of the number of these men, whom the apostle Jude graphically describes: "but you my beloved remember the words, which were spoken by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: for they have said to you that in the latter time there will be impostors, who will follow their sensual desires full of impiety; *these are they who separate themselves,*" Jude v, 18, 19. This apostle, appealing to the authority of his fellow apostles, designates with the most accurate precision the characteristic of all impostors: "*they are,*" says he "*the persons who separate themselves.*" For as all the apostles had heard Jesus Christ declare that he would be with them until the end of time, Matt. ult. they rightly concluded that the succession of pastors and teachers, commenced in them, must continue until the end of time, hence a separation from that succession, they taught the faithful to consider as convincing evidence of imposture, and it is, in truth, the most plain and simple remedy against schism and heresy, that wisdom can prescribe. On the same principle St. Paul, speaking of the

the leader of a party, whom he emphatically calls a *heretic*: for his disciples, though deceived by him, are not, properly speaking, distinguished by that epithet, says, that he is condemned by his own judgment "*autokatakritos*:" why so? Because as he appears at the head of a party, and cannot name his predecessor, he publicly declares himself an innovator, ranks himself amongst those, who separate themselves, *οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιωριζόντες εαυτούς*, *these are they who separate themselves*, Jude 19. His appeal to the scriptures is vain; his pretence of re-assuming the primitive form of the church, or of reinstating the church in its primitive purity is an illusion: if he cannot name his predecessor, he unequivocally separates himself from the church then in being. St. Jude calls him an impostor, St. Paul calls him a *heretic self-condemned*. His appeal to the scriptures is his condemnation: all impostors have appealed to the scriptures: it is the last resource of imposture: in the scripture there are many passages of ambiguous signification; imposture easily finds one or more to countenance the opinion, which it intends to disseminate in order to form a party, then gives its deluded followers the sense which it lends to the inspired writers for authentic scriptures. This artifice of imposture was in full force in the apostles' days, and has continued down to the present day: St. Peter says that the writings of St. Paul, in which there are some things not easily understood, "*δυσνόητα*," were distorted by the unlearned and the unsettled to their own perdition, whilst St. Paul was yet living, and these infatuated men did not confine themselves to distort and pervert the writings of St. Paul: for Peter says that they distorted the other scriptures also, Pet. 2. iii. 16. The precaution, which the apostles prescribed against this artifice of imposture was simple and effectual: "but you my beloved remember the words which were spoken by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: for they have said to you, that in the latter time there will be impostors, who will follow their sensual desires, "*Ἐπιθυμίας*," full of impiety:

*these are they, who separate themselves.*—*Jude 19.* By this simple rule, all impostors have been detected and confounded from Nicolas, one of the deacons, and Simon, the magician, who separated themselves from the church in the apostles days, down to John Knox, of trumpeting memory. However a sect might have increased in the course of time, or whatever length of time it might have continued, there was a time, and this time was not forgotten, when it consisted of the leader, and the few, who adopted his opinions: thus for instance, though the Arians had rapidly spread their opinions over many provinces in the East and the West, and had numbered many princes and prelates in their communion, yet there was a time when the sect consisted of Arius himself, the founder, and the few who adopted his opinions; when Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria, told Eusebius, of Nicomedia, that he thought the whole church confined within his own person, and two or three more of his faction—Epi. 1 & 2, ant. Con. Nic.; when the few seduced by that arch-impostor were known by their names; seven or eight deacons, and three or four bishops, who were immediately anathematized by their patriarch at the head of one hundred bishops of Lybia, and again more solemnly by the council of Nice. What the patriarch said at that time the catholic church repeats: “we know but one catholic and apostolical church, which cannot be destroyed by the united efforts of the world combined against it, and before it all heresies must fall.”—Epi. 2. ad om. Epi. The same is true of the Nestorians; though their opinions spread like wild fire through the east, and a vast extent of country is yet infected with their errors, yet there was a time, when the sect was composed of Nestorius himself, and one man, whom he engaged to preach in his cathedral of Constantinople where the people heard him with horror; a time when Dalmatius said to the emperor: “will you listen to one impious man rather than to six thousand bishops?”—Ap. Dal. ad.



ad. Theo. Thus without farther discussion all impostures are detected, the founder of the sect ceases to believe the faith, which he himself professed to believe, the faith in which he was baptised, separates himself, and by the very fact condemns himself. See Tertullian's reasoning on the subject.—*Remarks*, p. 141.

The Castigator, whose conscience seems to be of an accommodating texture, if we may judge from the specimen before us: it permits him to falsify the scriptures; to garble the fathers; to asperse the memory of the dead, of whom he knows nothing, in order to bring an odium on the living, to whom he insidiously imputes doctrines which they detest; thinks that his ancestors ought not to quiet their consciences seeing the abominations which the church did, p. 142. If they themselves were not guilty of these abominations, the writer sees no reason for that pretended anxiety of conscience: monstrous crimes are daily committed for which the guilty are personally accountable, not the innocent; the crimes and excesses of many ministers of the Jewish church were public and atrocious in Jeremiah's days; he inveighed most bitterly against the crimes of the princes, the priests and the people; but he did not separate himself from the communion of the church: he communicated with them very priests, whom he censured in the temple, assisted at their sacrifices and public offices, endeavoured to reclaim them, but did not presume to reform the faith of their church or withdraw himself from the temporal jurisdiction of the prince, or the spiritual authority of the high priest. The prophet Samuel did not separate himself from the communion of Heli's two sons, who ministered in the temple under their father, though their conduct in the ministry was notoriously scandalous; nor did he presume to change the order of the priesthood on that account: for we find Achias brother to Achitob, son to Phineas one of these wicked priests, high priest in Saul's days.—1st Sam. xiv. 3. The ministers of the temple were corrupt in Herod's days,

days, yet the Baptist's father did not separate himself from their communion, on the contrary he ministered with them; nor did the venerable Simeon withdraw himself from the temple; he was there when the virgin came to present her son according to the law, and the prophetess Anna daughter to Phanuel did not depart from the temple, serving God night and day, with fasting and prayer in a state of widowhood from her early days, Luke ii, 36, that is, serving God by all these *unprofitable austerities, and nonsensical rites* which Luther and his associates renounced, and which this castigator hates, as do all the sons of Epicurus.

Finally, the Saviour himself, though he severely censured the doctors of the law, the Scribes and Pharisees, continued to communicate with them in the temple, until the close of his mortal life. He acknowledged that the source of true religion was in Jerusalem; that the true faith was there, not elsewhere; though the schism of Samaria had commenced immediately after the death of Solomon, and had continued under different princes during a space of one thousand years, the Saviour did not the less condemn it: in his answer to the Samaritan woman he said: "you (the Samaritans) adore what you do not know; we (the Jews) adore what we know, *because salvation is from the Jews,*" John iv, 22. "And when he healed the lepers he sent the Samaritan to the priests in Jerusalem, as well as the Jews," Luke xvii, 14.

This delicacy of conscience, which would not permit the castigator's ancestors to continue in the church of Rome, though confessedly the true church at the time, seems to be of a fading nature: it was discoloured when Luther, offended at the opposition of the Zuinglians to his doctrine of the real presence, bestowed on them with a liberality bordering on profusion these favourite epithets which he had in reserve for the pope, such as *damned fellows who dragged others to hell; senseless fellows, worthless damned miscreants for whom it was not lawful to pray*; encircling the Zuinglians with devils within

within and without, above and below, behind and before, to the right and the left, T. 2. f. 305. The Zuinglians in return called him *new Pope, new Antichrist*, they published a work yet extant which they entitled: *Against the vain and scandalous calumnies of Luther*. In it they say: that people must be as senseless as he, to bear his extravagance, that he dishonoured his old age, made himself contemptible by his violence; that he ought to be ashamed to fill his book with so many offensive expressions, and so many devils. In truth he has left us some anecdotes which intimate that he was extremely familiar with the spirit of darkness: he says: "believe me I know the devil well, yea very well," Tom. 2. Ed. Jena fol. 77. In an epistle to the Elector of Saxony he says: "the devil sometimes dances through my brain so that I can neither write nor read," Tom. 5. p. 485. In another place he says: "sometimes he walks with me in the bed chamber, when I am with men he does not hurt me, but when he finds me alone he teaches me manners," Col. men. f. 275. "I have," says he, "elsewhere, a couple of wonderful devils by whom I am diligently and attentively watched: they are not vulgar, but great demons, yea amongst the devils they are great doctors in theology," *ibid.* f. 231. If we believe him this spirit of darkness slept with him more closely and more frequently than his wife Catharine Borèe, "*Diabolus multo frequentius et proprius mihi accubare solet quam mea Catharina*," *ibid.* f. 219. The disciples of Zuinglius were therefore justified in saying that he ought to be ashamed of filling his works with so many devils. Luther's delicacy of conscience must have been something more than faded when he and his friends and fellow reformers Philip Melancton, Martin Bucer, Anthony Corvin, Adam John Leningue, Justus Winserte and Denis Melanter, authorised the Landgrave of Hesse to cohabit with his two wives at the same time—See Review p. 131.

We cannot but admire the tenderness of these men's conscience, which would not permit them to continue

in the Romish church seeing the abominations, which they saw ; of these, however, the greatest would have escaped Luther's notice, if that spirit of darkness, with whom he was so well acquainted, had not informed him.

—See his conference with the fiend, Review, p. 130.

Zuinglius too suffered great anguish of mind whilst he continued parish priest of Notre Dame des Hermites, in the canton of Zurich ; but the Reformation having relieved him from *unprofitable austerities, nonsensical rites,* and all religious restraints, which the simplicity of the apostles, and their immediate successors, thought necessary for the sanctification of the ministers of the church ; and the rich young widow having cheered his spirits, depressed by these abominations, his anxiety subsided ; his conscience was dilated ; he could then join in communion with Hercules, Theseus, Numa, and all the gods and heroes of fable.—See Review, p. 132. The writer is left to conjecture, whether this Edinburgh castigator dates his pedigree from Luther or Zuinglius ; but as he calls himself a protestant, and says that his ancestors were cast out of the Romish church, he must of all necessity date from either the one or the other : for it is incontrovertibly true, that they have been the first founders of the two grand divisions of the Reformation ; and, however numerous or discordant the sub-divisions, they must all date from this fixed point.

This boasted tenderness of conscience, is well described by Erasmus, a cotemporary writer, who was in the confidence of the party, though he did not think proper to unite with them. “ What sort of an evangelical race is this ?” said he, “ never was any thing seen more licentious, more seditious, or less evangelical than these pretended Gospellers, they retrench vigils and offices of night and day ; because they are, say they, Pharisaical superstitions ; but they ought to replace them with something better. They ought not to become Epicurians to avoid Judaism, they eradicate instead of weeding ; they set fire to the house instead of sweeping it. Luxury, debauchery,

debauchery, adultery are multiplied more than ever; there is no rule, no discipline, the people indocile, disobedient, having rejected the yoke of their superiors, will believe no body; in this confused licentiousness Luther will soon have to regret what he called the tyranny of bishops."

He reproached them with the malice of *Capiton*, the malignant slander of *Farel* and *Oecolampadius*, at whose table he lived, and whose arrogance he neither could bear nor suppress, he reproached them with the violence of *Zuinglius* and *Luther*, who sometimes affected the air of an apostle, and immediately after descended to the lowest buffoonery; the others, whom he knew were not better, L. xxxi. These men so conscientious ought not to quiet their consciences seeing the abominations of the Romish church, so they dismissed her from their communion! Half a dozen profligate and perjured monks dismissed from their communion more than one hundred millions of Christians, who acknowledged the spiritual jurisdiction of the See of Rome! Yes, just as the ship dismisses the shore, or as the bucket of water dismisses the river.

His ancestors, the castigator says, only imitated the conduct of the first disciples of Christ, who were cast out of the Jewish synagogue. Is it not strange that his spirit of divination should pass unnoticed some hundreds of sects, which have shared the same fate, and fix on one which has nothing in common with his ancestors? The first disciples of Christ did not pretend to reform the Jewish Church; they did not charge the Priests with teaching errors in faith: on the contrary from the faith of that church, founded on the prophecies, for the authenticity of which that Church answered, they shewed that the rites and ceremonies of the mosaic law, were temporary, and must have an end. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, vii and viii, invincibly demonstrates that the Jewish Priesthood must be transferred, and consequently that the Jewish Law must cease

cease: because all its sacraments, sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, of which the Priests were the ministers, must cease with their ministry. Did his ancestors shew by any document whatsoever that the Priesthood of the new Law was to be transferred? That all its rites and ceremonies were to cease with its ministry? Does the Prophecy of Jeremiah, on which St. Paul rested an irresistible proof that a new covenant would succeed the old, say that this new covenant would itself be succeeded by another? What Prophet or Apostle has predicted a cessation of the Law of Grace? A translation of the Priesthood? A suppression of its rites and ceremonies? His ancestors, therefore, did not imitate the disciples of Christ: for if they withdrew their obedience from the Jewish priesthood, it was because its authority was transferred and their obedience with it; but his ancestors withdrew their obedience from a priesthood, which was not then, nor ever will be transferred. This may be a subject of meditation for this Edinburgh castigator in his serious moments.

This, though an essential difference between his ancestors and the disciples of Christ, is not the only one: the first pastors of the Christian church were not priests of the Jewish church, they derived no spiritual powers or authority whatever from it; nor were they sent by their Divine Master to reform the synagogue: they were sent by him, not to reform a church which no longer existed, but to form a church, in the formation of which he himself promised to assist, against which he said that the powers of darkness would never prevail; a church which has enjoyed and will continue to enjoy an uninterrupted existence until the end of time, so says the castigator. To form this church he ordered them to teach and baptise; their authority therefore to teach and baptise was not derived from the Jewish priesthood, nor from the Jewish people, nor from any other civil or ecclesiastical power on earth, it was conferred by him in whom all spiritual authority resides, as

in its source ; by Jesus Christ the *Higb Priest*, who was instituted by an oath, as St. Paul says, Heb. vii, viii, the *Great Shepherd* of the flock, and through them it descends to their successors in office, and will continue without interruption until the end of time—Another subject of meditation for this castigating pastor. His ancestors were priests of the Christian church, ordained in it according to the rites of primitive institution, were baptised in it, had promised obedience to it, derived from it all authority to teach and baptise ; they withdrew their promised obedience ; separated themselves from it ; literally verified the prediction of St. Jude and his fellow apostles, saying : “ in the latter time there will be impostors : these are they who separate themselves.” This is a second and striking difference between his ancestors and the disciples of Jesus Christ.

There is another difference, which may have escaped the notice of this pastor, whose chief care is the propagation of the human species : the first disciples renounced all things to follow Jesus Christ : “ behold, said Peter, we have forsaken all things,” Matt. xix. They literally reduced to practise that advice, which the Saviour gave the young man, *ibid.* “ 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.” It does not appear that the Saviour directed him to go and take a wife ; or to retain a certain portion of his possessions for the support of a wife and family ; he was therefore clearly of opinion, that perfection was attainable, without the practice of that new modelled virtue, which consists in propagating the human species.

The castigator's venerable ancestors instructed by that spirit, of which this venerable pastor inherits a double portion, discovered that the apostles were dupes ; that the Saviour himself was either deceived, or a deceiver ; that to have forsaken all things to follow Christ was an abomination ;

nation; and that perfection was not attainable without the practise of that virtue, for which antiquity knew no name. Thus enlightened they publicly resumed all these good things, which they had solemnly renounced.

Finally, the disciples, did not enrich themselves by the plunder of the Jewish synagogues; they did not appropriate to themselves, to their wives or their daughters, the ornaments of idols; they did not tempt the avarice of princes by the pillage of temples; nor encourage their sensuality by authorising polygamy contrary to the injunction of their Divine Master; that the ancestors of this castigator have plundered convents, monasteries, and churches, that they and their disciples have enriched themselves with the funds, which the piety of our ancestors had devoted to the support of religious communities is a fact, which the world knows; a fact attested by the truly venerable ruins of these ancient monuments of true piety. The writer is at a loss to discover any one trait of resemblance between the boasted ancestors of this castigator and the immediate disciples of Jesus Christ.

In his next page he reasons with Bellarmine, who says, that the true church only subsists where there is an union of the members with the head: he concludes from this that the church is annihilated by the demise of the pope, Bellarmine would reply that without some bond of union there is no society at all; that a moral body possessed of inherent powers to constitute a president is not affected by the death or physical destruction of such president; but if the body itself be destitute of such a power then it ceases to be a moral body, it ceases to exist: for a moral body can no more exist without a moral head, or an inherent power of constituting such head, than a natural body can exist without a natural head. Bellarmine would tell him that there is this difference between a natural and a moral body; that in the natural body the physical destruction of the head, destroys the individual, because there is no inherent power in the natural body to  
reinstat



reinstate the head, whereas the physical destruction of any member, does not destroy the moral body whilst its inherent power of reinstating that member continues entire, and hence he would conclude, that in the new modelled system of this castigator, there can be nothing like a christian church ; why so ? Because there is no bond of union, there is no *one faith*, each man forms his own opinion; there is no president vested with spiritual authority nor any inherent power of constituting him, for they neither individually, nor collectively possess any spiritual authority ; that must of all necessity descend from Jesus Christ, through his apostles and their successors in office ; for though all civil power be originally vested in society by its author as indispensably necessary for its support, and may of course be conferred by the people on their first magistrate, and his ministers, because in that quality they are the creatures of the people, yet the people can confer no authority whatsoever on Jesus Christ, or his ministers : for they are not the creatures of the people. Jesus Christ is in himself, and by himself Sovereign of his Kingdom ; the people who compose his Kingdom are chosen by him ; he is not appointed or constituted King by them ; they confer no powers on him ; all powers necessary for the government of his kingdom, that is, his church, are vested in him, and must be derived from him, the people neither appoint nor constitute his ministers : for they are not the creatures of the people, as he himself is not the creature of the people ; his ministers therefore must be appointed by himself, must receive all powers of teaching and feeding his flock, from himself ; and this power, originally conferred by him on the first pastors of his flock, must be continued in their successors appointed according to his institution, whilst his flock continues to exist in this sublunary world, that is, until time shall be no more, hence it follows that all teachers and pastors, self-constituted, though admitted by the people, or elected and constituted by the people, may be the ministers of the people, but they are not, nor

can

can they be, the ministers of Jesus Christ, they have not, nor can they have, any spiritual powers or authority whatsoever in the Spiritual Kingdom of Jesus Christ, for this simple but irresistible reason, which the writer once more repeats, because the people have conferred no powers on Jesus Christ, nor can they on his ministers; Jesus Christ receives no laws from his people; they must receive laws from him, and these laws must be taught and enforced not by their ministers, but by his. Against this reasoning all declamation is vain: it precludes evasion, the understanding must be horribly perverted which refuses its assent. This is the reply which Bellarmine would make, and though it may not be satisfactory to preaching weavers, and tailors, and tinkers, &c. who obtrude their nonsense on a credulous populace, it is not the less solid, the less founded in truth, and common sense.

In the next paragraph he asks where was the church before the council of Trent? To which the writer replies it was then where it is now, the church of all nations, it is not circumscribed by geographical dimensions, nor limited by ages. It does not resemble those ephemeral sects, which occasionally appear, and are confined to certain districts, of which the world never hears. Is the man so unaccountably ignorant as not to know, what every protestant school boy knows, that the Council of Trent so far from making any alteration in the ancient faith or form of the Church confirmed them by its decisions: and anathematized the errors and paradoxes of Luther and his reforming associates, as their ancestors in the Council of Nice condemned the errors of Arius, as in the Council of Ephesus they condemned the errors of Nestorius, and in the Council of Chalcedon the dreams of Eutyches, thus have the ravings of all Reformists been condemned by the pastors of Christ's Church, literally verifying the prophecy of Isaiah: "every tongue which rises in judgment against thee thou shalt condemn."

To

To his query, if Leo the Great was for receiving the eucharist only in one kind? The writer replies: that in Leo's days, and before them, the eucharist was received indifferently under one, or both kinds by the faithful; that then as well as now the eucharist was received under both kinds by the officiating minister. Of this truth the passage, which Illyricus garbled from Leo's fourth sermon on the Lent, (to which this castigator seems to allude, though he does not cite it, unwilling perhaps to inform his disciples that this *unprofitable austerity* was observed in the primitive church) is sufficient evidence: in it that venerable pontiff directs the people to observe those, who never received the cup. The Manicheans, who had fled from Carthage, when taken by the Vandals in 439, took refuge in Rome; to evade the severity of the imperial laws, they concealed their impiety, feigned themselves Catholics, with them received the communion in the churches, but never under the species of wine: because they thought wine the gall of the dragon, created by the devil; if it had not been customary to make the communion under the species of bread alone, the pope's direction would have been useless: they would have been detected on their first appearance at the holy table, many of them were by this precaution detected and confessed in presence of the most illustrious senators, some horrible impieties and abominations.—*Leo. Ep. 15, ad Tur.* The same order was renewed by Geladius in 496 for the same reason; but when the Manicheans ceased to infest the churches, these orders became useless and ceased by disuse, generally all laws occasioned by circumstances cease to oblige, when the circumstances, on which they are founded, cease to exist.

An irresistible proof of this truth, is taken from the ancient practice of the Greek church: in that church during the whole Lent, the sacrifice was offered but on Saturdays and Sundays, on these days the eucharist was reserved under the species of bread alone, and received under that species solely the other days of the week.

This

This they called *præsanctified*. The same custom was always observed, and continues yet in the Latin Church, on Good Friday. The custom of the Greeks is mentioned in the Council of Laodicea, can. 49, and by the Council of Trull, can. 52. The custom of the Latin church is mentioned by Innocent 1st, Epis. 1. cap. 4. The writer adds one proof more, which bears no reply: the eucharist in the primitive church was given to the faithful, that when through the violence of persecution they could not meet in their oratories, they might make the communion at home; but under the species of wine it was never given but from the chalice by the priest or his deacon, this is attested by all ecclesiastical history, even Kemnitz admits it, but ridiculously endeavours to elude the force of truth, by saying that they who received the communion under the species of bread at home, received it under the species of wine in the church. This attempt at evasion, if true, would only prove that the communion was made indifferently under the species of wine, as under the species of bread: for it could not be the same communion that was made one day in the church and some days after at home.

Our castigator continues his queries: would Gregory the Great support the worship of images? Never was man so unlucky in his selection of Fathers for the condemnation of popery: there are no monuments more authentic than these which attest Gregory's veneration, for the saints, their relics, and their images; when he sent Austin, the monk, to England to attempt the conversion of our idolatrous ancestors, he gave him many rich vestments, vessels and relics. The original inventory made by Thomas of Elenham in the reign of Henry V. is said to be preserved in the Harleian library,—see Butler in the life of Gregory; he sent to Theodolinda, queen of the Lombards, a particle of the holy cross to be worn about the neck of her infant son. In his letter to that princess, dated in January, 604, Seventh Indiction, he says: “I send to the prince Adeodalde, your son, a  
cross

cross, with some of the wood of the true cross, and a gospel in a Persian box; he sent to the empress Constantina a veil, in Latin called *brandeum*, which had touched the bodies of the apostles, saying, that miracles had been wrought by such relicks—L. iv, Epif. 30. At Cagliari, a wealthy Jew had embraced the christian religion, but retaining something of the Jew he seized the synagogue, placed in it an image of the Virgin Mary and a Cross. On complaint of the Jews, Gregory ordered the synagogue to be restored, having previously removed the image and cross *with due veneration*: “*sublatâ exinde, quâ par est veneratione imagine et cruce.*”—L. 9, Epi. 6. Secundus, a man of remarkable piety, god-father to the young prince Adeodalde, prayed Gregory to send him some devout pictures; in his answer Gregory says: “we have sent you two cloths containing the picture of God our Saviour, and of Mary the holy mother of God, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and one cross, and for a benediction a key which has been applied to the most holy body of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, that you may remain defended from the enemy.” These words are cited by Paul, the deacon, and by Adrian I. in his letter to Charlemagne. When Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, had broken certain sacred images, which persons lately converted from idolatry, in his diocess, adored as they did their idols, Gregory commended the zeal of the bishop in suppressing that monstrous abuse; but reprimanded him for breaking the images.—Lib. xi, Epif. 13. He frequently censured the impiety of paying an idolatrous worship to images; an impiety, which catholics have always condemned; hence in his letter to Secundinus he says: “I know that you do not ask the image of the Saviour to worship it as a God; but that, in remembrance of the Son of God, you may be inflamed with his love.—Lib. 7, Ep. 53.

From these passages, in which Gregory censured the idolatrous worship of images, this castigator pretends to conclude that he condemned that religious respect and veneration,

eneration, which he himself paid to the images of the Saviour, and of his elect. Thus, in imitation of his ancestors, who, in the face of truth and conviction, taught their infatuated followers to believe that there is no difference, or distinction, between that reverence and veneration, which the Catholic church pays to the angels and saints, and the divine honour, and sovereign homage, which is due to the Almighty God alone, whose creatures they are, this castigator artfully endeavours to continue the delusion.

His next query is, if pope Gelasius was a defender of transubstantiation? To which the writer replies that, that venerable pontiff believed and professed the doctrine taught in, and by the catholic church, which was that of transubstantiation in his time, before his time, and after it, as he cites no passage from this pope, the writer presumes that he alludes to a passage garbled by Kemnitz from a writer of the same name, whom he ignorantly confounds with that pontiff. This Gelasius, let him be who he will is perfectly orthodox: in his book of the two natures in Christ, he reasons on the eucharist as Theodoret did, whose reasoning on the subject has been discussed, Review p. 210.

His last query were Cyprian, Austin, the council of Chalcedon, and the African bishops for appeals to Rome and submission to the pope's jurisdiction? Has been already discussed in all its parts, they have been all shewn to be perfectly submissive to the pope's spiritual jurisdiction; whatever they might have thought of appeals in personal causes, which were frequently abusive, they never doubted the supremacy of Peter and his successors in office. From these his queries, in support of which he has not offered even the shadow of proof, the castigator asks: What right we have to appropriate indefectibility to the Romish church? To which the writer replies: Because the Romish church, as he calls her, that is, the church in communion with the See of Rome, acknowledging the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff,

is now, what she always was, and ever will be, that *one, holy, catholic and apostolical* church, to which the promises were made so clearly expressive of her indefectibility, that this castigator says, p. 133, "protestants are as strenuous supporters of this doctrine as the Romish church," and from this doctrine he concludes as he did before, that any church, the commencement of which is fixed at any time since the apostles' days, is not the Church of Christ: because it manifestly is not that church, to which the promise of indefectibility was made.

In his next chapter, p. 144, the castigator says, the doctrine of perpetual visibility proves at least as much for protestants as for the Romish Church. If his spirit of divination can discover, and will condescend to inform us, in what country there was a society of protestants perpetually visible since the apostles days; in what See there has been a succession of protestant bishops, in what city, town, village or hamlet, there has been a succession of protestant ministers of any description or denomination perpetually visible since the apostles time, this assertion however wild and paradoxical will be admitted. The Romish Church shews a society perpetually visible, an uninterrupted succession of bishops in the same See since the apostles days; she shews that these her bishops in regular succession were in communion with the bishops of other Sees; that the bishops of other Sees from their communion with the See of Rome, shewed that they themselves were rightful pastors, true members of the Catholic church, professing the true faith, as Irenæus of Lyons, Austin of Hippo, Optatus of Milevium, &c. This they shew with such irresistible evidence that Protestants are forced to admit it: Doctor Reynolds, in his Conference with Hufs, p. 442, says: "that the succession of the Roman bishops was a proof of the true faith in the time of Austin, Optatus, Tertullian, &c." Dr. Thorn-dyke, speaking of the Councils in the East, says: "of these Councils how many can be called general by number

ber of the present votes? Their authority then, must arise from their admission by the Western Churches; and this admission what else can it be ascribed to, but the authority of the Church of Rome eminently involved above all the Churches of the West in the summoning of them and by consequence of their decrees? And in the troubles between the East and the West, though the Western Churches have acted by their representatives in great Councils; yet on other occasions, they seem to have referred themselves to that church, resolving to regulate themselves by it; *whereby it appears that the Western Churches went always with that of Rome*, which necessarily argues a singular pre-eminence in it."—See Epilogue Book iii, ch. 20, p. 179. Whether this union of all the Western Churches with the church of Rome, argues a pre-eminence or not, it proves beyond a contradiction that the Church of Rome was always visible; that all the churches in the West were of its communion, consequently that before the Reformation there was no Protestant Church in the West: perhaps the castigatōr's spirit of divination may discover some latent Protestant Church in the East, which has hitherto escaped the world's observation.

Of the many passages in scripture promising the uninterrupted existence of Christ's church adduced by this writer, in his remarks, p. 110, the Castigator makes an awkward attempt to wrest one to his purpose. It is from Isaiah ii. "And it shall come to pass 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." These words, if we believe him, are not applicable to every state of the church. The church, in his opinion, has different states, from his words we must conclude that one state of the church is visible, to which the promises apply; the other state is invisible, to which the promises are not applicable; common sense would tell him that one state is real, which the prophet announces; the other imaginary, of  
which



which the prophet knew nothing: he asks if the doctrine of visibility applies to the days of Elijah? To this the writer replies that the doctrine of visibility does apply to the days of Elijah, and to every stage of the Jewish church from its first establishment to its final cessation, but the passage which the castigator awkwardly endeavours to fit to his purpose, does not apply to the days of Elijah, or to any other stage of the Jewish church at all. The passage is so clearly understood of the christian church that ignorance itself can hardly mistake it, and in it the prophet announces not only the visibility, but the catholicity of the church, he thus continues: "*and all nations shall flow unto it.*" See remarks p. 110. . . . his spirit of divination finding some difficulty in applying this sentence to the Jewish church wisely suppressed it. Doctor Southwell, whose memory was never aspersed with a distant suspicion of popery, says, in his expository note on this chapter: "by the last days is meant the time of the gospel dispensation," though this passage be not applicable to the Jewish church, it is not the less true that; that church was from its first establishment to its final cessation visible without interruption, and under the immediate protection and unremitting vigilance of divine providence. This the inspired writers attest in language which is not to be misunderstood: Jeremiah, one of their latest and greatest prophets, says: xi, 6, 7. "and Jehovah, said to me: proclaim all these words in the cities of Juda, and in the streets of Jerusalem, saying: hear ye the words of this covenant, and do them for protesting, I have protested to your fathers *on the day when I brought them up from the land of Egypt and to the present day, rising early and protesting, saying hear my voice;*" the voice of instruction by God's ministers was therefore incessantly heard by the Jews, and this instruction was not given by invisible ministers or to an invisible people. The Jewish church was instructed by the prophets and the priests with unremitting attention: "from the thirteenth year of Josiah, son of Amon,

Amon, king of Juda, and to this day, this the twenty third year, the word of Jehovah was on me, and I have spoken to you rising early and speaking, and ye have not hearkened; and Jehovah sent to you all his servants, the prophets, rising early and sending, and you did not hearken nor did you incline your ear to hear."—Jer. xxv, 3, 4. This prophet pathetically describes the vigilance of Divine Providence, and the unwearied attention of himself, and all the prophets, his predecessors, to the instruction of the Jews. Though the mission of the prophets may appear extraordinary, yet it continued without intermission, until after the return from the Babylonian captivity: the scripture speaks of them as forming a corps, a society, it speaks of their habitations, of their children: "and the sons of the prophets, who were at Jericho, came to Elisha, and said to him, knowest thou that Jehovah, will take away thy Lord from thy head this day."—2d Kings, ii, 5. This Lord, of whom the sons of the prophets at Jericho spoke, was Elijah, in whose days, if we believe the castigator, the Jewish church was invisible: an invisible church, in which that great prophet prophesied, and instructed the people! An invisible church, in which the scriptures and the law of Moses were explained in the public schools even in Jericho! For by the sons of the prophets are understood, says Dr. Southwell, the young men who studied under the aged ones, the church was therefore perfectly visible, even in Israel, amongst the schismatical tribes, and notwithstanding the number of prophets massacred by Jezabel, even the impious idolator Achab knew where a prophet of the true God was to be found: when Jehosaphat, king of Juda, desired that a prophet of the true God might be consulted on the war with Syria, Achab replied: "there is yet one man, Michaiah the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire from Jehovah, but I hate him; for he prophesies no good for me, but evil."—1st Kings, xxii, 8. Though the church should have been absolutely extinct; and the extraordinary ministry of the prophets with

with the ordinary ministry of the priests and Levites, abolished, which did not happen, in the ten tribes distinguished by the name of Israel, the church was never more visible than it was at that time in Jerusalem, and in the whole kingdom of Judah, under the good king Jehosaphat.

In times of the greatest affliction under Achaz, Isaias preached and prophesied; in that time of deepest distress before the captivity, Jeremiah preached, nor did he cease to instruct after the destruction of the city, until he ceased to live; during the captivity Ezekiel and Daniel instructed the people, and after it Nehemias, Esdras, &c. Independent on the extraordinary ministry of the prophets the ordinary ministry of the priesthood, commenced in Aaron, never ceased until the final cessation of the Jewish church; of this truth the scripture affords the most convincing evidence. The prophet Ezekiel clearly distinguishes priests, who had swerved from their duty, from the venerable pastors, who had been at all times faithful to their ministry: "but the Levites, who went far from me, when Israel strayed, when they strayed from me after their idols, they shall bear their iniquity. . . . they shall not approach me to do the office of priest for me. . . . but the priests, the Levites, the sons of Sadoc, who preserved the ministry '*asber shomrou eth mishmaretb mikadshi*,' of my sanctuary when the sons of Israel strayed from me, they shall approach to me to minister to me; they shall stand before me to offer to me the fat and the blood, saith the Lord Jehovah. They shall come into my sanctuary, they shall approach to my table to minister to me, and they shall preserve my ministry," Ezekiel, xliv, 10. We know that Sadoc was high priest in Solomon's days, and God attests by his prophet that his descendants did not stray nor swerve from their duty, and that they should continue in their ministry to serve him. The covenant of the priesthood with Phineas son to Eleazar, son to Aaron, was not discontinued until the priesthood was transferred: "the Lord

Lord said to Moses, Phineas son of Eleazar, son to Aaron the priest, has averted my wrath from the Children of Israel . . . . wherefore, say : behold I give him my covenant of peace and it shall be *to him and to his seed after him the covenant of an everlasting priesthood*, because that he was zealous for his God and made an atonement for the Children of Israel,"—Num. xxv, 12, 13. That this priesthood, in virtue of the covenant, did continue without interruption until the final cessation of the Mosaic dispensation we know from St. Paul : in his epistle to the Hebrews the apostle shews the total cessation of the Mosaic law from the change of the priesthood ; the priesthood therefore must have continued until the final cessation of the Jewish church : for if it had ceased at any time before, the law would have ceased with it. The initiating ceremony of circumcision, and the other Mosaic ceremonies are not said to have ceased at any time : the pious Jew could always find a minister of the Jewish church to perform all the rites and ceremonies, which the law required of him. Even during the captivity their prophets and priests instructed ; and so religiously attentive were they to the Divine institution, which confined the priesthood to the family of Aaron, that the priests, the sons Habalah, who had assumed the name of Barzallai, from their mother, unable to prove their genealogy from the authentic register, were excluded from the ministry, Nehemiah, vii, 63. The passage which he cites from 2d Chronicles, xv, 3, applies not to the Jewish church, which was never without a teaching priest of the descendants of Aaron, but to the Jewish people in their present state, who have been since the cessation of the Mosaic dispensation without prophet or priest, and will continue in the same state until the *fulfillment of the Gentiles be come in*, Rom. xi. 25.

The castigator's spirit of divination, like that spirit of illusion, which blinds the Jews, discovers in the prophet's words, not the prediction of a future event, but the relation of a past calamity ; he fits the passage to his purpose

purpose by substituting his own words to these of the prophet: "Israel were without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without the law," so says the castigator. The prophet says: "*vejomim rabim leifrael 'lelo Elabei emeth velelo Coben moreh oulelo iborab,*" "many days to Israel, to no God of truth, to no teaching priest, to no law." That this is a prediction of a future event is manifest from what the prophet adds: "in them times no peace to the man going out, or to the man coming in, but many terrors over all the inhabitants of the whole earth." These words have a clear reference to the consummation. It is thus described by all the prophets who speak of that event.

It is therefore unquestionably true that the Jewish church in its deepest affliction and greatest obscurity was perfectly visible, and its ministry without interruption; if this be true of the Mosaic dispensation, which was from its constitution, terminable, the cessation of which had been so repeatedly announced by the prophets, how much more certain is it of the Christian church, which is from its constitution interminable? The castigator asks: if the Romish church was as visible during the ten persecutions as at the Council of Constance? - He thus inadvertently informs his readers, that the Romish church, as he calls it, is that church which was founded by the apostles, which was persecuted by the Neros, the Domitians, &c. in the faith of which all the martyrs spilled their blood. It is therefore the church to which the promises were made; that church against which the gates of hell will not prevail: he did not advert to these consequences. To his query, the writer replies Yes. The persecutions prove it: they were not exercised on an invisible church: the persecutors knew where to find the most distinguished pastors; they were the first objects of persecuting rage, and it was not confined to them. The church was never more conspicuous than when its faith was professed by its ministers and their disciples in the face of the world, in the presence of persecuting emperors,

emperors their officers and executioners. What could induce the man to think the church invisible at such a time? It was this same Romish church invisible, as he dreams, during the ten persecutions, which was perfectly visible in the council of Constance in 1414. He admits therefore that it had enjoyed until that period an uninterrupted existence; but it was not more visible in the council of Constance in 1414, than it was in the Council of Trent, 1545; nor was it more visible then, than it is now in 1809. It is therefore, and castigatōr injudiciously acknowledges it, the only church, which has enjoyed an uninterrupted existence since the apostles' days; if it be not the church of Christ, the redeemer never had a church on earth, and christianity is but an illusion.

Both Protestants and catholics he believes, maintain that the appearance of antichrist is connected with a general apostacy. The writer does not inquire what protestants maintain, but catholics maintain no such doctrine, catholics do not confound doctrines and opinions, the terms are not synonymous in their language: it is the opinion of some catholics that immediately previous to, or on the appearance of antichrist, there will be a great apostacy, that all the wicked will publicly disclaim the faith of Jesus Christ, and unite with that impostor. They found their opinion on the words of St. Paul, 2 Thef. ii. He says that the day of the Lord will not come until there be a revolt, and the son of perdition be revealed; others with equal, if not greater reason, think the defection, foretold by the apostle, a revolt of the dependant provinces against the Roman empire, of which St. Paul, speaks covertly to avoid giving offence to the then masters of the world, who believed their empire eternal; and many think that St. Paul, used the abstract term *apostacy* to signify antichrist the great *apostate*, a mode of speaking in common use with sacred and prophane writers. Thus Roboam is called not a fool, but the folly of the nation, Eccl. xlvii. 27; but whatever their opinions may be with respect to this prediction,

tion, no catholic ever believed that this last apostacy could in any sense affect the visibility or the stability of the church : is it an invisible church that antichrist will persecute with such relentless fury? Was it an invisible church that Paul himself persecuted? Is it an invisible church to which the Jews will be converted by the preaching of the two witnesses? If the church of Jesus Christ be extinct on the last day in what church will the angels find his elect, whom they will collect from the four winds at the sound of the trumpet?—Matt. xxiv, 31. In what church will they be found who overcome the beast, and his image, and the number of his name? Apo. xv, 2. Is it in an invisible church, by invisible ministers that the faith will be announced, baptism and the eucharist administered? These rites will continue until the consummation, or Christ and his apostle have deceived us: The saviour said to his apostles: going make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father; and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to keep all things whatsoever, which I have commanded you; and *behold I am with you all days until the consummation of the world.*—Matt. xxiv. With this express promise of the Saviour to be with his ministers teaching and baptising until time shall be no more, the evangelist closes his history: and St. Paul, in terms equally expressive, says that by the eucharist the death of the Lord will be announced until he comes at the end of time to judge the world; the faith cannot be announced, nor these rites administered by invisible ministers, in an invisible church. The supposition is so extravagant, so offensive to common sense, that it is matter of surprise that any man, however infatuated by error or blinded by prejudice, can prevail on himself to believe it.

This castigator, whose liberality knows no bounds, lends his words to the inspired writers, and his opinion to the Redeemer. Christ, to enforce the necessity of incessant prayer, one of these unprofitable austerities, from which the reformation relieved its ministers, says of a wicked

wicked judge, that though he neither feared God, nor regarded man, yet to free himself from the importunity of a widow, he resolved to avenge her of her adversary. — Luke xviii. He then asks : “ Will not God avenge his elect, who cry unto him night and day, though he bear long with them ? ” To this question he himself replies : “ I say unto you that he will avenge them speedily. ” He then asks another question : “ Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh will he find faith on earth ? ” He asks the opinion of his disciples, who made no reply ; nor did he himself : he did not say there will, or there will not. Who could imagine, if the castigat-  
 or’s spirit of divination had not discovered it, that the Saviour intended to reply : there will be no faith on earth, but forgot it, or the evangelist forgot to insert it ? However, without consulting this spirit of divination, we find a sufficient reply to this question in more passages than one. The elect, whom the angels will collect at the sound of the trumpet from the four winds, that is, from all parts of the earth, will they have no faith ? These myriads, who will overcome the beast, his image, and the number of his name, will they have no faith ? Is it not of his last coming the Saviour speaks— Luke xxi, 27 : “ then will they see the Son of Man coming on a cloud with power and great glory ? ” To whom does he say : “ when you see these things beginning to come to pass, then rise up, lift up your heads, for your redemption is near ? ” Will these have no faith ? The mystery of the eucharist, by which the death of the Lord will be announced until he comes— 2 Cor. will it cease before he comes ? Or will it be administered by invisible ministers to an invisible people in an invisible church ? It is irksome to be obliged to refute such nonsense. However, in vindication of this castigat-  
 or, it must be admitted, that he has faithfully transcribed all the reasons, which his ancestors, the prime reformers, and their panegyrist, have offered to justify their separation ; he has only forgotten to inform his readers that they have  
 been



been refuted an hundred times before he was born. This incessant repetition of the same hackneyed arguments argues an insuperable obstinacy accompanied by a barrenness of invention, which excites both contempt and disgust. He garbles an extract from Ockham and Panormiton, which serve to fill his pamphlet, the extracts only shew that the writers were ignorant or inaccurate; as their authority is of no weight, the writer does not inquire whether the passages adduced be genuine or not; he is not disposed to justify the mistakes or inaccuracies of all catholic writers, they have the modesty, to submit their opinions to the judgment of their superiors. If this castigator wishes to oblige the public with propositions extracted from the writings of catholics and condemned, he may find wherewith to fill a folio volume.

In his next chapter he admits that the church of Christ is catholic or universal; but he thinks this characteristic does not belong to the Romish church. He does not seem inclined to dispute the universality of time. The fact is indisputable: that the Romish church did commence in the apostle's days, and continues yet, is a fact of such unquestionable notoriety, that the man would be thought fit for bedlam, who would venture to dispute it. He has not told us when this last and best reformed church, of which he is himself either the founder, or the minister, commenced; nor has he told us in what part of the world it lay concealed, either visible or invisible, even since Luther's reformation; before that period, if he pretends that it had an existence at all, not one protestant of common information will believe him. If the church of Christ be catholic, the church of which he is minister is not the church of Christ. The antecedent he has admitted; to deny the consequent argues something worse than ignorance. Though he does not dispute the universality of time, he thinks the universality of place may afford a subterfuge: "Have," says he, p. 148, "her tenets been propagated in every nation on earth?" Perhaps the authority of St. Paul may satisfy him: "First then,

then, says the apostle, writing to this Romish Church, I thank my God for you all; because *your faith, é pistis úmón,* is announced in the whole world.—Rom. i. 8. The Romish church was therefore catholic in the apostle's days, will the castigator inform us when it ceased to be catholic? What nation is there, in which her tenets have not been preached? If there be any such, which the writer very much doubts, her faith will yet be propagated there: the consummation of the world is the limit prescribed by the saviour to the propagation of the faith of his church, see remarks p. 135 . . . . . the writer's reasoning on the subject is refuted by silence, it seems that this castigator's spirit of divination could discover no evasion. It is true he says, because the man must say something, that a little reflection would have shewn this writer that many of the passages by which he attempts, to illustrate this point are applicable only to these days when "the whole earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord." There are days therefore in his opinion in which the earth is not filled with the glory of the Lord, how sadly the angels were deceived whom Isaias heard crying out incessantly "the whole earth is full of the glory of the Lord."—Isaias vi. 3. And David was not less mistaken when he said: "the Heavens announce the glory of the Lord, and the firmament declares the work of his hands.—Ps. xix. 1.

Our castigator begins this chapter by saying "protestants, as well as papists, are persuaded that the church of Christ is catholic or universal;" and ends it by saying "that this universality can be no characteristic of the church of Christ in her present situation." From these two propositions, contradicting each the other, and advanced almost in the same breath, we conclude with unerring certainty that consistency is no characteristic of this castigator. A man reduced to such straits is an object of pity, he felt the impossibility of applying this universality to his new modelled church, and wisely concluded that though protestants do believe the church universal,

universal, universality is not a characteristic of the church of Christ. Thus, though he calls himself a protestant, he new models the protestant creed, and fits it to his own conventicle. He will scarcely venture to deny that the church of Christ was believed to be catholic or universal in the first ages of christianity, that catholicity or universality was then thought to be a characteristic of Christ's church; this is one of these notes of Christ's church, which is expressly marked in all the professions of faith, which we have upon record. Will he then condescend to inform us if the Romish church be not catholic or universal, what other church is, or ever was? When was it that the Romish church arrogated to herself the title of catholic, and protestants began to distinguish Romanists from others by calling them catholics? Can his spirit of divination discover the time when we who call ourselves catholics were called protestants, or were distinguished by any other name? And they who call themselves now protestants, were called catholics and were distinguished from us by that appellation? In what time, by what means, by what magic has this change been effected? Though these embarrassing questions admit no solution, the writer proposes one extremely simple: Has this castigator ever in his serious moments prevailed on himself to believe that, that little conventicle, of which he is a pastor, whether by the election of the people nominated, or instituted by some ceremony, of which the writer knows nothing, is the church of Jesus Christ, founded by the apostles, to which the promises were made? Has it crossed his imagination even in his dreams, that all the elect of Jesus Christ have been sanctified within the pale of his little conventicle? Has this immense crowd, of whom St. John speaks, Rev. vii, 9, been sanctified in the communion of his new little church? Does it embrace all nations, tribes, peoples and tongues? Thus the apostle describes the elect: "I saw and behold a great crowd whom no one could number, of all nations and tribes,

tribes, and peoples, and tongues, standing before the Lamb." What does the castigator think of this passage? Is it in the church of Jesus Christ that all these millions of millions are sanctified or is it not? If it be, which even presumption will not venture to deny, the church of Jesus Christ is therefore the church of all nations, of all tribes and tongues, it is consequently universal. The Castigator may not believe it; and as it is absolutely impossible that this multitude without number should be sanctified and perfected in any church, which is not universal both in time and place, hence follows another consequence of the most serious import to this castigator, and his deluded friends, that is, that his new modelled church, in which all nations and tongues are not found, is not the Church of Jesus Christ.

From the catholicity of the church, which the castigator admits in one page and denies in the next, he passes to the doctrine of infallibility. This doctrine the writer had shewn to be a necessary consequence of the churches' indefectibility, of which protestants are as strenuous supporters as the Romish church, says our castigator p. 133, for if it be true that the existence of the church cannot be interrupted, it is therefore true that she cannot teach false doctrine, for if she be supposed to teach false doctrine at any time, she at that time is not the House of God, the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, as St. Paul says, 2d. Tim. iii. 15, but the pillar and ground of falsehood, she therefore at that time is not the church of Jesus Christ, but the synagogue of Satan, her existence is interrupted, and instead of being indefectible, she has failed, and the gates of Hell have prevailed against her, notwithstanding the promise of Jesus Christ. Hence it is manifest to the meanest capacity that her indefectibility once established, her infallibility follows indisputably. The castigator does not even attempt to invalidate the writer's reasoning on this subject; of that he felt the impossibility, but to divert the attention of his readers, and fill his pamphlet with something, he transcribes  
some

some fragments from the Councils of Constance and Basil, in which the authority of the Council is declared superior to that of the Pope, and their decisions of infallible authority; and in opposition to these he cites some garbled passages from Catholic writers, who think the pontifical authority superior to that of any Council not authorized by the pope; fragments from the Alcoran would have been as much to the purpose: for whether the decision of a Council assembled by the papal authority and continued in opposition to his injunctions, be of infallible authority, as the prelates in Basil pretended, or not, as many believe; and whether the pontifical approbation be necessary to authorize the decrees of Councils or not, it is not the less certain, nor the less universally and invariably believed by all Catholics, that the doctrinal decisions of the pastors of the church, united with their head, is of infallible authority, and on this truth there is not, nor ever was, a shadow of diversity of opinion amongst Catholics, as the writer had asserted in his Remarks. For if it be true, as some pretend, that the decision of a Council of Bishops, whether authorized by the pope or not, be of infallible authority, it is not the less true that their decision authorized by the pontiff's judgment is infallible; and if it be true, as others say, that a doctrinal decision of the pope accompanied by the conditions, which they require, be infallible, it is at least equally true, and more certain, that this decision authorized by the judgment of the Council is infallible. On this doctrine there is no disagreement, no variation. This then is the term of communion; that doctrine which is believed by all Catholics, in all places, and at all times; a doctrine so consistent with the plan of Christianity, that Protestants have admitted it: the learned Doctor Bull, in his defence of the faith of the Council of Nice, says: "in that council a principal article of the christian religion was in dispute, if in a question of that importance it be imagined that all the pastors of the church could fall into error, and deceive  
all

all the faithful, how can the word of Jesus Christ be defended, who promised to his apostles, and to their successors, to be always with them? The promise would not be true: because the apostles were not to live a long time, were it not that their successors were comprised in the persons of the apostles themselves. Bull. *Def. fid. præm.* N. 2, p. 2. To prove that this was the doctrine then taught in the church, this learned protestant cites a passage from the historian<sup>4</sup> Socrates, L. vi, C. 9, “ though the fathers of that council were simple and not very learned, they could not fall into error because they were enlightened by the light of the Holy Ghost,” this is the doctrine of Doctor Bull, the doctrine which is naturally impressed on the mind by the promise of Jesus Christ, to be always with the pastors of his church, teaching and baptising, and also to send the Holy Ghost to teach them all truth.—John xvi, 13. This in the most limited sense must be understood of all truth necessary to salvation.

Our castigator after having filled a couple of pages with these extracts, which whether genuine or not the writer believes him to have faithfully transcribed from his repertory, because he has seen them more than once before, inquires, with that politeness which is peculiar to himself, how the simple faithful may know whether Popes or Councils are the greatest liars, p. 151. To this the writer replies, that his better half and his favourite maid, may learn from him, with as much ease and certainty, as he himself has learned from his familiar spirit, which exhibits a strong resemblance to that of the delphic Pythonessa. The writer inserts a supposed dialogue between the mistress and the maid consequent to one of the castigator's lectures.

J. Lord mistress! What a wonderful man is master? To be sure these wicked popes and popish bishops, are all liars. Master says so.

M. Ay! ay! Jane! My good man knows that: my good man reads the bible.

J. The bible, mistress! Does the bible say that all these wicked popes and bishops are liars?

M. Ay! ay! Jane! The bible says that the Pharisees were liars, to be sure the popes and bishops are the Pharisees. Do not you know that?

J. To be sure mistress! They are the Pharisees: master says so. Bless the man of God! He says that I know every thing in the bible, to be sure mistress knows every thing that master knows; but I did not think that I knew every thing in the bible myself until master told me so.

M. Ay! ay! Jane! you must believe nothing but what is in the bible.

J. To be sure mistress, I must believe nothing but what master tells me. Does not the bible say that? Blessings on the good book, which tells master that I know every thing in it; that I understand it better than all these wicked popes, and popish bishops, who pretend that I do not understand it. Is it not that great book with the fine pictures? How edifying to see that fine young man and that pretty young woman naked under the tree? But mistress, are not images idols? Master says so.

This dialogue, which, though supposed, is not the less natural, sensibly exposes the artifice of this castigatour and his fellow reformists, who under pretence of recalling the people from supposed errors taught by their lawful pastors, to the authority of the scriptures, give their infatuated followers their own opinions regardless of the scriptures. There is now before the writer a version of the old and new testament by Doctor Southwell, swelled to an enormous bulk, by his notes and comments; in these notes and comments, some of which are not only false, but extravagant even to folly, a deluded multitude think they find the genuine sense of the scriptures, whilst they find in reality but the ravings of this fanatic, which he has substituted to the sense intended by the inspired writers. Thus for instance in his note on the vii. to the Hebrews, he says: "it is allowed that Abraham

was called from among idolators at a time when none were left to keep up the worship of the true God in its purity;” this is a wild conjecture which has no foundation in scripture : it argues the ignorance of this voluminous commentator : the patriarch Sem, who was never suspected of idolatry was yet living : for he lived 500 years after the flood.—Gen. xi, ii. And Abraham tenth, in succession to that patriarch, was born about 382 years after the flood, his son Isaac 99 years after, so that Isaac was 19 years old at the death of Sem. This ignorant commentator gravely tells his readers that during the life time of this venerable patriarch, the founder of so great a portion of the human race, there were none to keep the worship of the true God in its purity ! But if this be a wild conjecture the sequel of the note contains a blasphemous assertion, that is, “ that Melchisedeck was no other than the redeemer of mankind,” thus, with one dash of his pen, he annihilates the divinity of Jesus Christ, reducing him to the rank of priest before his incarnation, for Moses says, that Melchisedeck “ was priest to the most high God”—*Ve hou eohen le el hoion*.—Gen. xiv, 18.

If the partner of his pastoral cares and her maid may learn with so much ease to determine whether popes or councils be the greatest liars, the writer transcribes a simple rule of great antiquity and respectable authority, by which others not so well informed as his *cara sposa* may determine with equal ease and infallible certainty whether this castigator himself be a child of truth, or its opposite : St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, x, says, “ for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed ? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard ? And how shall they hear without a preacher ? And how shall they preach except they be sent ?” By what authority was this castigator, pastor of a nameless church, sent to preach ? This question is extremely simple, however embarrassing it may appear. The apostle



apostle says, the preacher must be sent; that is an infallible truth if the scriptures be infallible. No man sends himself; that is an intuitive truth, which bears no contradiction, the man, who sends the preacher must himself possess the authority to preach: for no man can communicate to another the authority which he himself has not. It is an axiom that no man can give what he has not, hence it follows of all necessity that this authority to preach must descend from Jesus Christ, through his apostles, whom he sent to preach, in a regular and uninterrupted succession—against this reasoning it is madness to contend. This rule of the apostle, infallibly true and extremely simple in its application, shews with the most exact precision and unerring certainty whether this our Edinburgh castigator be a child of truth, or one of these emissaries of whom the Lord said by his prophet, Jeremiah, xiv. 14: “They prophecy falsely in my name: I did not send them nor command them, nor did I speak to them; it is a lying vision, and divination, the fraud and seduction of their hearts, which they prophecy;” and xxiii. 21: “I did not send these prophets, and they ran; I did not speak to them, and they prophesied.” That these emissaries, who ran without being sent were not exclusively confined to the mosaic dispensation we know, from St. Paul, 1st, to Tim. i. He says: that some had swerved from charity and faith, “desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm,” and in his 2d to Tim. iv. He foretells an abuse of which antiquity knew nothing, that is, the usurpation of the ministry, by the people: “for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears”—this may serve as a corrective to the exuberance of the castigator’s bile. The writer now adds, that whether these popes and bishops be *great liars* or not, they are the rightful successors of the apostles, that to them, through their predecessors, the authority of preaching and teaching, vested in his apostles

apostles by Jesus Christ himself, is regularly descended in due succession ; that of them not one sends himself ; not one presumes to usurp the ministry as KNOX, that arch-impostor did, and as many others do ; not one receives his mission but from those, who have themselves been instituted according to the Divine ordination ; this is a fact of such unquestionable notoriety that no protestant of common sense ever denied it ; of such impressive evidence that the church of England, the only protestant church, which has retained an appearance of the ancient church, proves, or at least endeavours to prove, her mission from these popes and popish bishops. Hence the writer concludes that these popes and bishops, though they may not obtain the approbation of the castigator, are notwithstanding the pastors, whom Jesus Christ now gives to his church, for the perfection of his elect. As this conclusion directly excludes the pretensions of this Edinburgh castigator, and reduces him to that level, from which, by his private authority, or by some pretended authority of the same nature, and consequently not greater than his own, he has raised himself, he may not perhaps so willingly admit it, but whether he admits or disputes it, it is not the less certain. St. Paul, whose authority is of some weight, expressly authorizes it : in his epistle to the Ephesians, iv, the apostle says : “ and he, (Jesus Christ) gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some *pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the nature of the fulness of Christ, that we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the craft (in the original *kubeia*, that is, dice play) of men, by the shuffling to the *methodism* of error.” The writer translates *methodeian’ methodism*, because he thinks the terms convey the same idea. In its common acceptation, it signifies *circumvention, or imposture*. Either then the apostle has  
 deceived*

deceived us, or Christ gives, and will continue to give *pastors and teachers* for the perfecting of the saints, and the work of the ministry and the edifying of the body of Christ, until all the members of his mystical body are perfected, that is until time shall be no more: for the Saviour expressly says—Matt. xiii, 30; “Let both grow together until the harvest, and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers: gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn;” and in the same chapter he himself explains the parable, v, 37. . . . “He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy, that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels.” In words as clearly expressive as language affords, the Saviour tells us that his elect, the children of his kingdom, until the end of time will be in the world intermixed with the children of the prince of darkness; until that period therefore he will continue to give *pastors and teachers* for the perfecting of his elect, for the work of the ministry. St. Paul attests it; reason attests, and nothing but perverse obstinacy can deny it, that these *pastors and teachers*, whom Christ gives for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, are they only, to whom the authority of feeding and teaching his flock vested by Jesus Christ in his apostles descends in regular and uninterrupted succession; what does the castigator think of this reasoning? Scurrilous invectives against popes and councils will not invalidate conclusive argument, these invectives justify the necessity of a regular succession of *pastors* of Christ’s appointment, to ensure his disciples against the artifice of impostors who intrude themselves; to be led astray by their opinions and inventions the apostle with great energy calls being tossed to and fro, and whirled about with every wind of doctrine. To set this truth in a stronger

stronger light if possible, the writer contrasts the injunctions of Jesus Christ and his apostle to the faithful with the advice which this Edinburgh castigator gives. Christ says, Matt. xviii, 17 : "if any man will not hear the church let him be to you as a heathen or a publican." The church speaks by its pastors, as the state by its officers. The castigator, in direct opposition to the injunction of Jesus Christ, says to the simple faithful : "believe them not." St. Paul says, Hebrews xiii, 17 : "obey your guides and be subject to them for they watch over your souls, as obliged to account *for them*." The castigator says : "follow your own direction, and believe them not." After this short digression, which the indecent invectives or rather scurrilous abuse lavished on popes and bishops by an obscure individual, who has yet to study the first elements of science, extorted, the writer proceeds to discuss the hackneyed subterfuges, which the castigator has transcribed from his repertory, to elude or rather to embarrass a truth which cannot be eluded. Despair alone suggests the first. "Is it not reasoning in a circle to say that infallibility proves the inspiration of the scriptures and then the scriptures prove the infallibility?" p. 152. Does this castigator believe the scriptures divinely inspired? Or does he not? If he does, they may be assumed as principles admitted on both sides. If he does not believe them divinely inspired, catholics are not embarrassed to prove the christian religion true, and the scriptures divinely inspired, against atheists and deists—see a Treatise on the first principles of Christianity, in which that question is discussed, and the sophisms of atheists and deists examined. This castigator does not seem to know, what logicians understand by a vicious circle in argument. When of two things equally uncertain the one is assumed as a certain principle to prove the other. This is a vicious circle. Does this castigator pretend that a principle, admitted by both parties as certain and infallibly true, is an uncertain principle? Against such nonsense there is no reasoning.

After

After his first awkward attempt to throw a shade over a truth, which blinds him, this indefatigable transcriber fills a page with a citation from *the Remarks*, in which the words of Christ, enjoining obedience to his church are cited, and the conduct of the framers of the thirty-nine articles of Elizabeth's creed is stated as inconsistent with this injunction. To this the castigator replies: "that the framers of the thirty-nine articles were ignorant of any precept, which obliged them to follow the direction of the church implicitly." If so they were ignorant of the scriptures, as is this castigator: for there is not a precept in the decalogue more expressly announced than that of Jesus Christ, Matt. xviii. 17: "if any man will not hear the Church let him be to you as a Heathen or a publican." Though the framers of the thirty-nine articles knew no precept, which obliged themselves to obey the church of Christ's institution, they seemed to know something of a precept, which obliges Englishmen to obey the church of Elizabeth's institution. Are not the ministers of the church of England obliged to subscribe the thirty-nine articles? Are not the students in the universities obliged to subscribe them before they have learned to examine them? Is this order consistent with that fundamental principle: the scriptures are a sole and sufficient rule of faith? In what book of the scriptures did they find that Elizabeth was head of the church? Where is it said that a woman is a minister of the church at all? The power of Parliament is great, that is admitted; it can do every thing that is naturally possible; so says Blackstone; but it cannot make a woman a man; and consequently could not make the queen a minister of Christ's church, much less could they make her the chief minister of it. "They had read somewhere," says the castigator, "to the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isaiah viii. 20. Is it contrary to the law for the people to obey their pastors? If this castigator's spirit of divination had

had not discovered it, who would imagine, that obedience to the pastors of the church, so strictly and repeatedly enjoined, both in the old and new law, is contrary to the law? We read somewhere that a doubtful question in controversy was to be referred to the Priests, the Levites, and the Judge, whose decision was final; and that simple man, Moses, who had not an Edinburgh castigator in his Council, instead of directing the contending parties to examine the decision of the Priests, to determine if it was founded in the law, says, without any restriction: "And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they shall pronounce from the place which the Lord shall choose; thou shalt not decline from the sentence, which they will pronounce to thee, to the right hand nor to the left; and that man who will act in pride, and will not hearken to the Priest, who will then stand to minister there, to the Lord thy God, and to the Judge, that man shall die, and thou shall remove that evil from Israel, and all the people shall hear, and fear, and not act in pride in future," Deut. xvii, 11, 12. Has his spirit of divination discovered in what stage, of the Mosaic dispensation, this injunction of that legislator ceased to oblige? When was it that individuals were authorized to examine the decision of the high Priest and his Council? The prophet Isaias called the people to the observance of the law, of which obedience to their pastors was an indispensable precept; he warned them against the insidious artifices of impostors—"When they say unto you: enquire of familiar spirits (*oboth*) and of soothsayers, who peep and who mutter. Should not the people enquire of their God? Shall they enquire of the living from the dead? To the law and the testimony; if they do not speak according to this word the morning light is not for them—*ein lebem Blachar*—II viii, 20. The prophet forbids the people to consult familiar spirits (the original term *oboth* may signify *Ventriloquists*) or soothsayers, who peep—" *hajidebonim bamet'saft'sepim*"—that is, who inspect the entrails of beasts or birds which

was forbidden under penalty of death by the law, he shews the folly of consulting carcases or inanimate idols on future events, of which they know nothing, directs the people to observe the law, and on future events to have recourse to the ark of the testimony, which was placed under the mercy seat from which the Divine oracles were given."—Exod. xxxv, 21. He then concludes with a terrible menace, that if they did not observe this injunction, the morning light, by which prosperity is signified in the prophetic style, is not for them. In this passage the castigator's *oboth* has discovered that Isaiah directed the Jews to examine the doctrine of their pastors, and if their pastors did not teach according to the law, to disrepute them. He forgot to tell us by what authority these ventriloquists and soothsayers were appointed pastors of the Jewish church, or teachers of that people; men who are duped by such imposture are scarcely deserving of pity.

In the next paragraph, p. 154, the castigator cites these words from the writer's Remarks: "our Saviour said without reserve or restriction: if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a Heathen." To this he replies: "the apostle Paul also says with as little reserve or restriction: 'put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates,' yet both the primitive Christians and protestant heretics, whom they have murdered in myriads, can attest their want of infallibility." To extract something like argument from this jumble of words, and ideas it must be: as the Heathen magistrates to whom Paul enjoined obedience were not infallible, so the pastors of Christ's church, to whom Christ in the same manner enjoined obedience, are not infallible. The writer was yet to learn that the obedience to the magistrates and the ministers of the state, which the apostle ordered, was of the same nature with the obedience to the pastors and teachers of his church enjoined by Christ. He like other simple men, who have no familiar spirit to consult,

consult, thought the obedience of which the apostle speaks confined to civil duties, and the obedience enjoined by the Saviour to be of a religious nature; he had not yet learned to believe that Christ had constituted the ministers and magistrates of the state, pastors and teachers of his church; or that he had made the pastors and teachers of his church ministers and magistrates of the state. The world is indebted to this Edinburgh castigator's *ob.* for two great discoveries: that the ventriloquists and soothsayers were the pastors of the Jewish church, and that the Heathen magistrates were the first pastors of the Christian church.

He fills a few pages with invectives against the Pharisees and popes, whom he classes together and piously consigns to the spirit of darkness, with whom he seems to have almost as great an intimacy as his ancestor Martin; he tells us, what we know, that the Saviour warned his disciples against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, from whence his readers must conclude, that Christ warned the faithful against the hypocrisy of popes and popish bishops. If he had not informed us, we should not have known that Christ had warned his disciples against the hypocrisy of the pastors of his own institution: for after all, these popes and popish bishops, were the first pastors, and the sole pastors of Christ's church, many centuries before the new modelled church of this castigating pastor was known. As he has been so complaisant to us, he must not be surpris'd at a piece of information, which we give him, that is, that Christ did warn the faithful against the hypocrisy not of the pastors of *his own choice*, but of the pastors of *their own choice*, or of the choice of others not authorised by him. These he, with great propriety, calls wolves in sheep's clothing: "beware," said he, "of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing; but inwardly they are ravening wolves."—Matt. vii, 15. Has this castigator, in his serious moments, ever bestowed a serious thought on this warning? In all these invectives the writer can find nothing like argument:



argument : he has not cited one unfounded decision of the pastors of the Jewish Church, before their decision against Christ himself, which was clearly predicted, and by which it ceased to be a Church.

From his repertory he transcribes a few lines from a passage in Jerom's works, to which, as usual, he affixes a sense as opposite to the sense intended by that father, as falsehood is to truth : the writer transcribes the whole passage, not from Illyricus's *Catalogue of Witnesses*, this castigator's repertory, but from Jerom's work now open before him : "Then Jesus said to the multitudes and to the disciples : the scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of Moses, therefore all things whatsoever they say unto you to keep ; keep and do them, but according to their works do not do,"—Matt. xxiii, 1. On this passage Jerom says : "What more mild, what more gentle than the Lord ? He is tempted by the Pharisees ; their artifices are confounded, and their toils, according to the psalmist, are the arrows of children, nevertheless, for the dignity of the priesthood, and of the name, he exhorts the people to be subject to them, *considering not their works but their doctrine*, for that he says the chair of Moses, by the chair he shews the doctrine of the law."—*Per Calhedram ostendit doctrinam legis*. In words as clearly expressive as language can make them, Jerom says : that notwithstanding the enmity of the Pharisees, their artifices, and hypocrisy, the Saviour in respect to the dignity of the priesthood, "*propter sacerdotii dignitatem*," enjoined obedience to them who sat on Moses' chair ; and that this obedience consisted in observing their doctrine, Jerom proves from Christ's mentioning the chair of Moses. From this passage the castigator garbles these few words : "by the chair of Moses, Christ means the doctrine of the Law," intimating that Christ did not enjoin obedience to the priests but to the law, of which in his new modelled doctrine every cobbler was the sole competent judge. Even these few words which he garbles from the passage, are falsified to fit them some way

way or other to his purpose : it is insupportably irksome to be obliged to correct so many impostures. To this he adds a passage from St. Austin, which in the genuine sense is a full condemnation of himself : “ God therefore,” says St. Austin, “ teaches by them, (the pastors of his own church) but if they teach doctrine of their own, do not hear them.” If it be true as St. Austin says, that God teaches by the pastors of his own church, it is therefore true that he does not teach by self constituted pastors, or by pastors appointed by others not authorised by him. But, continues Austin, if they teach doctrines of their own do not hear them. He could not more expressly, or with greater precision condemn all innovators : for if a prelate regularly instituted, and consequently a true pastor of Christ’s church at the time of his institution, presumes to suppress the doctrine taught in his See, at the time of his accession, and substitute his own opinions, the succession ceases in him ; the people are not to believe him ; if this be true of a regularly instituted pastor, when he presumes to innovate, how much more manifestly true is it of a man, who, not being a pastor of Christ’s church at all, obtrudes his opinions on the people. But how may the people know that the pastor, regularly instituted, changes the ancient doctrine. The intelligent part of the community know it by the testimony of their senses : they know the doctrine, which they had learnt in their infancy, and they hear the innovator teach a doctrine inconsistent with it. That this new doctrine, is not the doctrine of the catholic church, they may know with unerring certainty from the decision of the pastors assembled in union with their head, who proscribe the error, and oblige the innovator to retract, or dismiss him from his charge. St. Austin, did not dream of sending the faithful to examine the doctrine of innovators, by the rule of the scriptures, which not one of a thousand in his time, could read, and of which not one of ten thousand could procure a copy. This venerable prelate says : “ the truth  
of

of the scriptures is observed by us, when we do that which is determined by the universal church, which the authority of the scriptures themselves commends: that, as the holy scripture cannot deceive, whoever fears to be deceived by the obscurity of this question, may consult on it, that church, which the holy scripture without any ambiguity demonstrates,"—Cont. Cref. Cap. 33, N. 39. St. Austin, who knew the art of reasoning as well as any writer, whose works have escaped the ravages of time, did not think this reasoning in a vicious circle; he had not our Edinburgh castigator's *ob.* to direct him.

This writer in his Remarks p. 64. shewing the necessity of a living Judge, to determine the true construction of the law, in doubtful cases, and exclude the fictitious constructions of ignorant or interested individuals, had said that such a Judge, was expressly constituted by Moses, in the old law—Deut. xvii, and refuting an assertion of Doctor Stanler, importing that the people were referred in doubtful cases to the scriptures, not to their pastors, he had said that the prophet Malachi thought the people should seek the law from the mouth of the priest, p. 104; and p. 87 he had said, that when Christ spoke of the lawful pastors of the Jewish church, he had enjoined obedience and submission to their orders. We must admire the sagacity of our Edinburgh castigator, who discovers in this an inconsistency. He admits that the passages are truly stated. If there be an inconsistency it must be either in his imagination or in the scriptures. He replies to the passage in Deut. xvii, that if infallibility be proved by it, it must apply to civil transactions as well as ecclesiastical discussions, and a share be allowed to the Judge as well as to the high priest. If he had consulted the scriptures, not his *ob.* he would have known that many of these transactions, which we call civil, were determined by the Jewish law, of which the Priests and Levites were the sole judges, and though Jehoshaphat nominated some civil magistrates from other tribes to sit in the Supreme Council, with the priests and Levites,

Levites, and judge with them in civil actions, yet all ecclesiastical discussions were reserved to the judgment of the priests: "and also in Jerusalem, Jehosaphat appointed of the Levites, and of the priests and of the heads of the fathers, in Israel for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversy for the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he commanded them, saying, thus you shall act in the fear of the Lord, in fidelity and with a peaceable heart; and every controversy, which comes to you from your brethren dwelling in their cities, between blood and blood, between law and commandment, for ceremonies and customs, you shall shew them, and they will not sin against the Lord, and wrath will not be on your brethren, thus you will do and you will not sin. *And behold Amariah, the high priest, over you in every thing which regards the Lord, and Zebadiah, son of Ismael, prince in the house of Judah, over every thing which regards the king, and the Levites teachers before you.*"—2d Chro. xix, 10, 11. Dr. Southwell on this passage says, that the civil magistrates would not have been admitted to sit in the Supreme Council, if many of the priests and Levites, had not neglected their duty. Whether the seventy elders chosen by Moses, Num. xi. 16, to compose the Supreme Council, were taken indiscriminately from all the tribes, or exclusively from the tribe of Levi as Southwell, must have thought, and his opinion is rendered probable by the original text: for Moses was ordered to collect them, whom he knew to be chiefs of the people and teachers: "*asher jaditba ebi bem Ziknei haam ve shoteraio.*" We know that the public instruction was committed to the Levites, it is unquestionably true, that all religious controversies were reserved to the judgment of the priests, over whom the high priest presided; and that their decision was of infallible authority is equally certain: for two reasons, which bear no reply: the first, because God by his prophet says: "they will announce to you the word of judgment," *ve bigiden leka diber hamisphat,* which

which cannot, without blasphemy, be understood of an unjust sentence. To this first reason, the writer adds a second of equal force : God orders disobedience to their decision to be punished by death ; and God would not, nor could not consistently with his justice and sanctity, enjoin obedience to an iniquitous sentence under so heavy a penalty. It is not jumbling unmeaning words together to introduce confusion, and calling writers *great liars*, that will invalidate close reasoning.

After a vain effort to elude the force of the passage of Deut. xvii, by sharing the infallibility between the high priest and the Judge, the castigator cites, from the writer's Remarks, these words of Malachi : " 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." To this he replies, as if this writer had claimed an unerring authority for the individuals of the Aaronic priesthood ; an old artifice, by which many well meaning people have been deluded. Let him only consult the following verse, and he will see what infallibility the priests of these days discovered : " but ye are departed out of the way." What then ? Though it be true that many of the priests did swerve from their duty, it is not the less true that it was their official duty to teach the law ; and equally the duty of the faithful to seek the law from their mouth, as the prophet declared, and this writer asserted, authorized by him, in opposition to that insult on common sense, which sends the illiterate mechanic to fish for the law in the scriptures.

Having amused his readers with some garbled extracts, and a few unmeaning words, which he calls discussing the Jewish infallibility, this castigator tells us that the Jewish church, like the Romish, generally found the prophets rank heretics, persecuted and put them to death. Some impious princes did persecute the prophets it is true, but that the Jewish church did judge them rank heretics, is rank nonsense. What other scriptures were read in their synagogues but the writings of the prophets ?

We

We are to understand that the Reformists, whom the Romish church judged heretics, were prophets. What a catalogue of new prophets his spirit of divination has discovered? One of them we know assumed the title of Evangelist of Wirtemberg, and was called the Germanic Prophet by his panegyrists. This castigator no doubt will tell us when we may expect this new Messias, whose prophets have been rejected by the Romish church, or shall we believe the apostle, that this imaginary Christ, as yet expected by the Jews, is the real Antichrist, and these pretended prophets his precursors?

The pastors of the Romish church, so called in modern cant, then and yet the Christian church, not knowing that the Christian priesthood was to be transferred, and the covenant of the new law to be succeeded by another covenant, of which the prophets and apostles knew nothing, very naturally concluded that these new prophets were the men described by Jesus Christ, when he said: "beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but within they are ravening wolves," —Mat. vii, 15. They thought their teeth and claws uncommon, and their whining did not even in sound resemble the bleating of the sheep. Be that as it will, the prophets, whether persecuted by the Jewish church or not, never presumed to reform the faith, the rites or ceremonies of that church; they never relinquished the communion of that church. However severely they censured the conduct of the priests, they communicated with them in the temple, and in their synagogues, assisted at their sacrifices and other rites and ceremonies. In what did these new prophets resemble them? And Christ himself though rejected by them as was foretold, did not relinquish the communion of the Jewish church; until, by the iniquitous sentence which condemned him to death, it ceased to be a church. He continued to honour the priesthood, until the very instant of its final cessation: when the Council was assembled in which it was determined that

Christ should die, John xi. 49 : one of them, Caiphas, being the high priest of that year, said unto them : " you know nothing at all, nor do you consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish : " this, continues the Evangelist, " he did not say from himself, but being high priest of that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that also he should collect in one the children of God, who were dispersed abroad." Christ himself though silent on the heavy accusations brought against him, yet when adjured by the high priest to declare if he were the Messias, observing that lesson which he himself had taught, to respect the chair of Moses, he admitted it. Let any man contrast the meekness of Christ and his apostles with the unmanageable impetuosity of these new-modelled prophets ; the modesty of the replies of the former to the ministers of the Jewish church, with that torrent of scurrilous abuse, which the latter have poured out on the ministers of the Christian church, and which this castigator, in imitation of his ancestors, continues to bestow on their successors, and he must be either unaccountably stupid, or insuperably obstinate, if he does not conclude that these pretended prophets have nothing in common with Christ or his apostles.

Having thus, as he imagines, suppressed every claim to infallibility in doctrine in the Jewish church, and shewn that the God of Truth and Sanctity had for so many ages on earth, either no church at all, or a church which taught error and authorised vice, the castigator, whose imagination is fruitful in wild conjectures and ridiculous subterfuges, pretends to discuss the writer's proofs of the infallibility of the Romish Church : they are he says, p. 160, founded on the supposition that the Romish Church, is the Church of Christ to which the promises were made. True, and he now tells the castigator that the promises were made to some church ;  
if

if it be not to the church of Rome, or, to speak more correctly, to the church in communion with the See of Rome, this castigator no doubt, or his spirit of divination, or some other familiar spirit of the same species, will assign the church to which the promises were made, and shew its title more ancient than that of the church of Rome; until this happens the writer must persist in his belief, that the church in communion with the See of Rome, is the church of Christ to which the promises were made.

In the next page the castigator cites from the writer's Remarks, this passage of Isaiah ii. 3, "he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths;" and also these words of the writer: "God, whether he teaches by himself, as when visible on earth, or by his ministers, as since his ascension, teaches no errors at all." This truth he has the condescension to admit, but finds a fancied evasion in a reflection which only serves to confirm the truth: "if," says he, "these words prove infallibility at all, they teach as much freedom from error in obedience as in doctrine," which is true: for the church is not less faithful in her obedience to Jesus Christ than in teaching his doctrine. If there be unsound members who disobey Jesus Christ, it is because they disobey his church, which strictly enjoins and incessantly teaches her children to observe his law. If it be asked, as it frequently is, why did not Christ exclude vice from his church, as well as error? The reply is simple: we must confine ourselves to what he has deigned to promise, not distort his words nor extend them beyond their limits. To ask why Christ has not done this, or that, betrays either ignorance or impudence or both, in all his words and actions he was directed by his wisdom: he has promised to be with the pastors of his church teaching and baptizing until time shall be no more, it is blasphemy to assert that the God of truth teaches falsehood; he has not promised to exclude vice or imperfection, on the contrary he has told us that the tares would be intermixed with the



the wheat, until the harvest, that is, that the children of darkness will be found indiscriminately with the children of light until the consummation, in the same sense he has said that the kingdom of Heaven is like a net cast into the sea, which takes fish of all kinds, but when full, it is brought to land, the good fish is preserved for use, and the bad thrown away.—Matt. xiii. This must be understood of Christ's Kingdom in this world, for in the heavens there are none bad to be thrown out. The first object of the church, and its indispensable duty, is to correct vice and reclaim sinners, for this end Christ has given pastors and teachers to his church, or, as St. Paul expresses it,—Eph. iv, to perfect the saints by the work of the ministry, for what is it to perfect the saints, by the work of the ministry, if it be not by preaching the word of God to reclaim sinners, to convert infidels to the faith of Christ; to cleanse them from sin by administering the sacrament of baptism; by other rites and ceremonies of Christ's institution to strengthen them; by administering the eucharist to sanctify them; by unremitting attention to prepare them for their place in the celestial kingdom, what St. Paul calls for the replacing the dislocated members *pros katartismou*, to intimate the unity of the church, the mystical body of Jesus Christ, of which all his elect are members.

In his next subterfuge he adds a striking instance of that total ignorance of the art of reasoning, of which we have seen so many specimens already. Infallibility in doctrine is useless, he says, if all the teachers be not infallible, and all the people who are to be taught be not also infallible. If he had not discarded common sense from his councils, he would have known that the assent of the most illiterate peasant to an infallible truth, is equally infallible, with that of the most acute philosopher. The unerring certainty of any doctrine depends on its connexion with an infallible motive, not on the infallibility of the teacher, or the disciple. Thus in geometry the assent of the school boy to this proposition,

proposition, "the three angles of any right lined triangle are equal to two right angles," is as infallible, as that of a Newton or a Descartes, though neither the teacher nor the school boy, have any pretensions to infallibility, because the truth of this proposition rests on mathematical demonstration, a motive which founds an infallible assent. Thus again, the assent of the most illiterate peasant in Nova-Scotia to this proposition: "London is the chief city of England," is as infallibly certain, as that of the most intelligent man in the Province: why so? Because this truth rests on a motive as infallibly true, as mathematical demonstration, that is, the testimony of man universal and uncontradicted, in like manner the assent of the most ignorant catholic to this catholic truth, "Christ is true God and true man," is as infallible as that of the most learned divine; why so? Because this truth rests on the testimony of God, who cannot deceive. An embarrassing question presents itself, to which the man who recedes from the unity of the church, and disclaims her infallible authority as a witness, can make no reply: "How is it known that God attests this catholic truth?" This question shews the essential difference between the unerring faith of the catholic, and the uncertain opinion of the sectary: the instant a man recedes from the unity of the church, he can no longer reclaim her testimony to authorise his faith. To the faith authorised by her testimony he substitutes an opinion, authorised by no other testimony but his own, which is manifestly, and even confessedly, fallible as he is himself: In vain he pretends to find his new opinion in the scriptures: he is told that the scriptures, together with the sense in which they are understood, were deposited by the inspired writers in the hands of that church, which he disclaims; that these scriptures were committed as a deposit by the apostles to the pastors to whom they entrusted the flock, and transmitted by right of inheritance to their lawful successors in office; he is told, moreover, that in these scriptures others, not inferior to  
him

him in point of science, find, or pretend to find, an opinion directly opposite to his ; that his testimony, in support of his own opinion is not of greater weight than the testimony of others equally intelligent in support of the contradictory : Thus, for instance ; Arius found in the scriptures that Christ was true Man, but not true God ; Eutyches found in the same scriptures that Christ was true God, but not true Man ; Nestorius found that there were two Christs, one true God, and the other true Man. These opinions were equally false, and equally authorized : for the testimony of Arius, in support of his own opinion was of as great weight as that of Eutyches in support of the opposite, or that of Nestorius in opposition to both. To descend to our own times ; the opposite opinions of Arminius and Gomar, which divided the protestant churches and schools in Holland, and set that country in a flame, were equally authorized. Gomar, a rigid Calvinist imagined he found in the scriptures, what he really found in Calvin's Institution, " that Adam could not avoid his fall, and yet that he was not the less criminal because he fell voluntarily." This doctrine, which makes God more hateful than the Devil, Calvin deduced from two supposed principles, equally false : the first : that God imposes on all things, *and even on our will*, an irresistible necessity ; to this he adds a second ; that this necessity does not excuse from sin.—Lib. de ater. dei præ. Arminius, a benevolent man, who had nothing of that phlegmatic malignity, which characterized Calvin and his disciple Gomar, in his composition, alarmed at this horrible doctrine, which proposes to our belief, a God, who creates a man without his concurrence or consent, makes him wicked by his irresistible will, and damns him for crimes, which he could not avoid, in opposition to Gomar, found that in God there is a general will to save all men, and in Jesus Christ a sincere intention, to redeem them, and means sufficient offered to all. These truths are found in the scriptures, but Arminius added that human nature was not corrupted

corrupted by sin, and that supernatural assistance was not necessary for the exercise of virtue. Hence Gomar's horrible paradox, and Arminius's beneyolent opinion, though both false, are equally authorised; for the testimony of Gomar, or of his master, Calvin, in support of his opinion, is not of greater weight, than the testimony of Arminius in defence of his own. It is therefore unquestionably true of all sectaries, that their opinions are all equally uncertain, and consequently that divine faith, which is an infallible assent to infallible truth, is not to be found but in that one church founded by the apostles, and governed by their successors.

The catholic believes the truths of religion which transcend his reason on the infallible testimony of God, what we call divine revelation; that God has revealed these truths he believes on the unerring testimony of these pastors, whom Christ sent to teach these truths, which testimony is yet continued in their successors. Against the Atheist and the Deist the Catholic shews that the testimony of many witnesses neither deceived, nor deceivers attesting a fact, is of unerring certainty; that the certainty of this testimony continued in succeeding generations without interruption or intermission is invariably the same. Though the impression on the senses of the witnesses may be stronger, the conviction on the understanding is not diminished by time, we are as firmly convinced this day that Cæsar was murdered in the Senate, as the men who saw the body in the streets of Rome; the horror of that atrocious act we scarcely feel: in like manner we are as well assured that Christ died on the cross, rose from the dead, and ascended into Heaven, as the disciples, who saw him nailed to the cross, conversed with him after his resurrection, and saw him ascend on the mountain. The impressions made on the senses of the disciples by these affecting scenes, we may represent to ourselves, but cannot feel: the conviction, however, on our understanding, is not the less irresistible. From this testimony, indispensably necessary

ry to ascertain these facts, the infatuated, and ill-fated man, who recedes from the unity of the church, or, as St. Jude expresses it, "*separates himself*," is precluded. Why so? Because he disclaims her testimony in support of one truth, he cannot therefore claim it in support of another; hence it necessarily follows, that he can have no certainty of any one of these great truths of religion, which are known but by testimony; such are the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension of Jesus Christ, the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, &c. for these are facts, and facts are not known by metaphysical reasoning, but by the testimony of witnesses: from this testimony he is precluded; and in the range of imagination he cannot find a substitute: his appeal to the scriptures argues both ignorance and obstinacy, and instead of an evasion he finds in it his condemnation. For that the scriptures were written by authors divinely inspired, and deposited in the hands of the first pastors of the church, is itself a fact, which cannot be known but by the testimony of the church;—by his appeal therefore to the scriptures, he claims this very testimony, which he disclaims, contradicts, and condemns himself. Hence St. Paul says that the sectary is self-condemned, "*autokatakritos*,"—Ti. iii, 11. What, therefore, he calls his faith, is not that Divine faith *which is from hearing*,—Rom. x, and without which *it is impossible to please God*,—Heb. xi, 6, but a meer human opinion, which he has himself imagined, or taken on trust from some other visionary, or impostor, who whilst he deceives others, is himself most cruelly deceived by that great impostor, whom the scripture emphatically calls *the father of lies*,—John viii, 44.

After a childish tale of a Romish pastor, who preached to a congregation of rooks, this castigating pastor, of a congregation more easily deluded than the rooks, if they be duped by such nonsense, transcribes from the writer's Remarks these words of Isaiah lix, "there shall come a Redeemer to Sion and to those who return from iniquity

iniquity in Jacob"—see Remarks, p. 116. To this he replies: "These words of Isaiah respect only the restoration of the Jews, so that though they actually taught infallibility, the Church of Rome could have no claim to it; but did they even extend to the *Gentile Church* it is not of that kind for which the R. contends: it is something in which the whole Church is equally interested."—p. 164. What a jumble of unmeaning sounds he huddles together! The covenant of the Redeemer only respects the restoration of the Jews! The Romish Church has no claim to the infallibility promised by the prophet, though it may extend to the *Gentile Church*! The world had heard of a Christian church, composed of Jews and Gentiles; but a *Gentile church*, that is a church, which does not know the true God, is a church of the castigator's invention. This promise the castigator thinks confined to the Jewish church, it may extend to the *Gentile church*, it is something in which the whole church is interested. But if the whole church be interested in it, why exclude the Romish church from her share? Is it because it is neither a Jewish church nor a Heathen church? Hitherto the untaught world thought the covenant of the Redeemer was made with the redeemed; the covenant of Christ with the Christian church; this Edinburgh castigator has undeceived us. The covenant of the Redeemer, he says, respects only the restoration of the Jews, it may perhaps extend to the Heathens, the Christian church he excludes: for it is neither a society of Jews, nor of Heathens, it is that very Romish church, which excites his indignation. That the whole church is interested in the promise is strictly true; and serves to confirm this Catholic truth, that to the end of time errors in doctrine are by this promise excluded from it: for as the whole church is equally interested in the promise, the faithful are not less interested than their pastors and teachers; by *their* ministry the saints are perfected,—Eph. iv. It is not by false doctrine the saints are perfected, it is therefore the most important interest of the faithful to bear

found doctrine from their pastors and teachers; if then contrary to the promise the spirit of God be withdrawn from the pastors, and the word of God cease to be in their mouths, the people cannot be perfected by their ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ is interrupted, the promise is broken, the covenant is annulled, and the Christian religion an illusion.

The promise of Christ to send the Holy Ghost to the apostles, to teach them all truth and remain *with them for ever*, the castigator confines to the apostles themselves: *for ever*, if we believe him, signifies *uninterrupted continuance*, not *perpetuity of duration*; other men, as intelligent as our castigator, think the term *for ever* strictly expressive of both *uninterrupted continuance* and *perpetual duration*, and the common sense of mankind, authorises their opinion in opposition to his fanciful conjecture: if a lease be made to a man for ever, his son would not be dispossessed, under pretence that *for ever* in the contract implies no more than *uninterrupted continuance*, during the lessee's life. The man, who would advance such a plea in a court of law, would be dismissed as a knave, or despised as a fool; that *for ever* in the promise of the Saviour implies both *uninterrupted continuance* and *perpetual duration*, is a truth, which imposture may contest, and pertinacity resist, but which reason unprejudiced is forced to admit: for the vigilance of Christ, the great shepherd, as St. Paul calls him *meγas ποιμην*, who watches incessantly over his flock, is not diminished by time: he his God immutable in his nature; his vigilance is not less necessary now, than it was in the apostle's days; nor is the assistance of the Holy Ghost less wanted for the conduct of his flock: that he continues to give, and will continue to give, pastors and teachers to perfect the faints, his elect, until the consummation of time, St. Paul attests without any ambiguity.—Eph. iv. The apostle's words are so clearly expressive, that the ingenuity of imposture cannot distort them from the intended sense.

That

That the apostles did themselves receive the holy Ghost, the castigatoꝛ admits, because they wrought miracles; if these only, who wrought miracles, received the holy Ghost, the elect are few indeed; this castigatoꝛ inadvertently excludes himself and all his reforming ancestors from the number. Catholics tell him that this promise did not include the gift of miracles: it is confined to the *gift of teaching all the truths*, which Christ had taught them, the official duty of the pastors of Christ's church now, as it was then, a gift of uninterrupted continuance and perpetual duration, that is *for ever*, as Christ himself expressed it, for this simple reason, that it is at all times indispensibly necessary, and if at any time it ceased, Christ would at that time cease to watch over his flock, and annul his covenant, which is blasphemy to assert.

St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, xii, compares the church of Christ to the human body; the component members of this mystical and moral body, the church, are correspondent to the component parts of the natural body, of which each has its appropriate function, to which its natural powers are adequate and exclusively confined, thus each member contributes to the symmetry and perfection of the whole; in like manner, if the apostle has not deceived us, in the church every member composing that mystical body has its appropriate place, determined by that one spirit, which animates the whole, and receives from that same spirit gifts appropriate, and adequate to its functions, 4. "There are diversities of gifts but the same spirit, . . . . . if the foot shall say, because I am not the hand I am not of the body, is it, therefore, not of the body? . . . . . But now hath God set the members every one of them, in the body, as it hath pleased him . . . . . 28, and these, therefore, God has placed in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly *teachers* . . . . . are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? . . . The gift of teaching is manifestly appropriate to the function of the ordinary teacher; the gift of miracles, is appropriate



priate to the function of the extraordinary teacher, because it is necessary that he should authenticate his immediate mission from God : by this exercise of his almighty power, God attests the mission of these, whom he immediately sends to teach in his name—the apostles were possessed of both these gifts ; of the gift of teaching in virtue of the promise, John xvi, 13, “ When he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth,” and xiv, 26, “ But the comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and remind you of all things, which I have said to you,” and of the gift of miracles to authenticate their mission in virtue of the power vested in them by Jesus Christ, when he sent them to preach.—Matt. x, 1. “ And having called his twelve disciples to him, he gave them power over unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal every sickness and every disease” . . . . . these twelve Jesus sent and commanded them . . . . . as ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is near, heal the sick, cleanse lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons . . . . . the apostles therefore were possessed of the gift of miracles long before the saviour promised to send the Holy Ghost to teach them all truth, and remain with them for ever, these gifts, so different in themselves, and appropriate to such different functions, this castigator ignorantly confounds. The gift of miracles necessary to authenticate the mission of the apostles and appropriate to that apostolical function, he requires in their successors, whose mission is unquestionable, and to whose function the gift of teaching is perfectly adequate and appropriate.

From the apostle's doctrine, 1st Cor. xii, conclusions are deduced, which this Edinburgh castigator may find difficult to contest, and ruinous to admit ; if it be true, as the apostle says, that God places every member in the body as it pleases himself, and distributes to each member gifts appropriate to its determined place, as the powers of each member of the human body are appropriate

to its function, on what principle does this castigator pretend that the gift of teaching, one of these expressly noted by the apostle, is appropriate to the place assigned to him? If God gives teachers to his church, as the apostle repeatedly inculcates, it must be either in the ordinary manner, by uninterrupted succession from the apostles, or, in an extraordinary manner, by immediate appointment: between these extremes imagination can reach no mean. Is this castigating pastor a teacher in the ordinary manner, by uninterrupted succession from the apostles? If not, the gift of teaching is no more appropriate to his place in the body, than the power of seeing is appropriate to the ear. Is he a teacher in an extraordinary manner, by immediate appointment as the apostles were? If so the gift of miracles is appropriate to his place, and as indispensibly necessary to authenticate his mission, as it was to authenticate the mission of the apostles. Does he possess this gift? If not, he is not a teacher given by God either in the ordinary way or by an extraordinary appointment. And as the gift of teaching is exclusively appropriate and confined to these teachers, whom God gives to his church, this gift is not appropriate to his place in the body at all. The assumption, therefore, of the office of teacher, without the gift of teaching, is productive of the same confusion in the mystical body, as if the ear should assume the office of the eye, to personify the members of the human body as the apostle has done: "To the impious man God says why dost thou announce my statutes and take my covenant in thy mouth? Thou hatest discipline, and dost throw my words behind thee,"—Ps. I. This may serve as a lesson to cobblers, who ought to mend shoes, instead of cobbling the souls of a deluded populace.

In place of the gift of miracles appropriate to teachers of immediate appointment, by which this castigator's ancestors ought, but did not, authenticate their mission, pastors of the catholic church assign that proof, which unequivocally shews that the gift of teaching is appropriate

appropriate to their place in the mystical body of Jesus Christ, as that is the function assigned to them, in like manner as the powers of the eye are appropriate to the organ of sight, not to the ear, the organ of hearing, the function of which being different from that of the organ of sight, requires powers of a different character: to the pastors and teachers Christ said: "go teach all nations . . . . I am with you until the consummation of time."—Matt. ult. To them he had said, where two or three are assembled in my name, there am I in the midst of them.—Matt. xviii, 20. These teachers, and these only, assemble in the name of Jesus Christ, who are vested with that power of teaching, which is derived from Jesus Christ through his apostles, as these magistrates, and these only, assemble in the name of the King, who are vested with the civil authority derived from the King, through his immediate officers; others may assemble in their own name, but not in the name of the King, thus the pastors of Christ's church assemble in the name of Jesus Christ, and he himself according to his promise assists, all others assemble in their own name. When we hear of crowded assemblies of self-appointed itinerant preachers convened, as gregarious animals of the same species meet in the fields, though we may be tempted to smile at such an instance of public folly, yet we are forced to lament the infatuation of our brethren, who are the deluded victims of the artifices of that spirit of illusion, which presides over these assemblies. When we open their evangelical magazines, these records of insanity, our astonishment is increased; we feel the degradation of human nature; if church history had not given many instances of such a blind infatuation, or, to call it by a more appropriate name, of such a degrading fatuity, we could hardly think it possible; it is not to be accounted for on any principle of reason; it indicates, therefore, a mysterious exercise of Divine Justice, which, for reasons known to Sovereign Wisdom, effaces not only the light of religion, but the light of reason as far as it is connected with religion. These

These artful efforts to elude the force of the promises of Christ to his church, which our Edinburgh castigator has borrowed from his ancestors, have induced the writer to explain them with more precision than he had done in his remarks on Dr. Stanfer, and deduce conclusions, which, however unpleasant to a groupe of self-constituted teachers, are not the less infallibly true. The next subterfuge deserves no notice : This writer had said that God dwells in his church as in his temple authorized by St. Paul, 2d Cor. vi, and concluded that his presence excludes every shade of error, as light expels darkness, and as faith effaces infidelity. To this the castigator replies, that the apostle speaks of christians individually. Of what else would the apostle speak ? Is the man's ignorance so gross as to think that a collective body has any existence separate from the individuals which compose it ? If God dwells in his Church it must be in the individuals who compose it, and if he excludes error it must be from the minds of individuals who without his presence are subject to it, not from a Being which has no existence but that which reason bestows on it : it is, therefore, true, or St. Paul mistakes, that God dwells in the individuals who compose his Church, these he animates with his divine presence as the spirit animates the united members of the body ; not these members, which are by any accident separated from it. In the same page, 168, passing in silence that irresistible mass of evidence, collected by this writer from the inspired writings in defence of this truth, that errors are excluded from the Church of Christ by the vigilance of that supreme pastor, and the unremitting attention of his divine spirit. The castigator says it is not necessary to examine them, because this writer, if we believe him, supposes the whole visible church to be Christ's spiritual seed to which the promises were made, and then draws the conclusion that these will be preserved from the least shade of error. This subterfuge favours more of imposture than ignorance, despair alone suggests it.

it. If by Christ's spiritual seed the elect be understood, as it must, the writer supposes no such thing, draws no such conclusion: he knows that on the threshing floor the wheat is mixed with the chaff; that in Peter's net the good and bad fish were taken: that the clean and unclean animals were in Noah's Ark; he knows that though there are many within the pale of the church who are not of the number of the elect, yet all the elect are in it; that in it the saints are perfected by the ministry of the pastors and teachers, he knows also that to this visible church, in which the saints are perfected, the promises were made, and if this castigator does not know it, his ignorance is both criminal and inexcusable: for the promises were made to some church; and an invisible church composed of men, women and children is a chimera, the ridiculous invention of imposture to mislead the unwary and the ignorant. And as the promises were made to this visible church he concludes that errors in faith are excluded from it, not from every individual, who may at any time be in it; an army is not the less victorious because some desert and others are killed. It is so with the church, some are over-powered by the enemy of man, others desert and range themselves under different leaders, and assume different names; but the great body remains entire, impenetrable to the shafts of the enemy, unmoved by the artifices of imposture, and unshaken by the terrors of persecution. This writer knows that in the visible church the faith of Jesus Christ is found, and his doctrine taught in its purity, though some individuals may fall into error and heresy; because it is not by these seducers that the church teaches, but by her lawful pastors in communion with their head; he knows from St. Jude i. that there are murmurers, complainers, scoffers, who separate themselves; and he knows from reason that if these men be not in the visible church it is not possible for them to separate themselves: for no man can separate himself from a society, of which he is not a member; he knows from St. Paul, Acts xx,

30 : that of Christians, for they were Christians to whom the apostle spoke, some arise, and teach false doctrine to draw disciples after themselves ; finally, he knows from church history that all apostates and heresiarchs from Judas the traitor, and Simon the magician, down to Voltaire, Diderot and d'Alembert, the apostles of Atheism, and Weisshaupt, the patriarch of the Illuminati, have been members of the Church, from which they separated themselves, and by the act of separation condemned themselves. Our castigator, who would embarrass truth if nature had blessed him with talents equal to that arduous task, or even correspondent to his desires, having ascribed to this writer a false supposition, which he did not make, and a conclusion equally false, which he did not draw, to refute this error of his own invention, falsely ascribes to the Churches in Asia errors which were not taught in them ! The man's understanding is so impervious to truth, or his native disposition so inimical to conviction, that even by accident discoloured truth cannot escape his pen : from the foetid exhalations of his disordered brain, he draws some cloud to envelope it. If we believe him, *gross errors* were taught in the Asiatic churches, yet Christ acknowledged their relation to himself, p. 169. St. John says, that Christ did reprimand some of the bishops, or angels, as he calls them, of the Seven Churches ; but not one of them for teaching false doctrine. This castigator calumniates Christ himself, if he says that he accused them Bishops of teaching false doctrine, and he calumniates the Bishops if he pretends that they taught a doctrine, for which Christ did not reprimand them. The Bishop of Pergamos was reprimanded, because there were amongst his people some seducers, whom he ought either to have corrected or retrenched from his communion, but did not, for if he had he would not have been reprimanded ; he was therefore censured for a neglect of duty, not for teaching false doctrine, on the contrary Christ approved his faith : " Thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith"—Rev. ii, 13.

The Bishop of Thyatira was reprimanded also for permitting, or, to speak more correctly, for not preventing the pretended prophets to seduce some of his people. Does the castigator think that this woman was one of the Ministers of the Church of Thyatira, or that she was authorised by the Bishop to teach false doctrine? He must be stupid indeed, who believes it. It is not on a bishop, who teaches false doctrine, or authorises it, that Christ himself bestows such encomiums: "I know thy works, and thy charity, and thy faith, and thy patience, and thy works, and the last more full than the first." iii, 19. Yet for a neglect of duty he reprimanded him: "because," said the Saviour, "thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants",—iii, 20. It is therefore true, that a man may be a servant of Jesus Christ, and by the artifices of some impostor may be seduced, and renounce him.

The bishop of Sardis was reprimanded, not for teaching or believing error, nor even for any neglect of duty, but for some hidden fault, which deprived his works of all merit: "I know thy works," said the Saviour, "because thou hast the name that thou livest, and thou art dead . . . . I have not found thy works full in presence of God"—iii, 1-2. In the simplicity of them early times, before the hemisphere of religion had been enlightened by the lucubrations of the Germanic Prophet and his reforming associates, good works were thought as necessary to salvation as faith. Christ himself appears to have been of that opinion. Of all these Bishops, whom he reprimanded, and some of them severely, not one was accused of having falsified, renounced or forgotten the faith, or of any defect whatever in faith: they were all reprimanded for other reasons: the Bishop of Ephesus for a diminution in charity—"thou hast left thy first love;" ii. 4. The bishop of Pergamos, for a neglect of duty: "Because thou hast there them, who hold the doctrine of Balaam" . . . —ii, 13. The bishop of Thyatira, for the same reason: "because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel,

bel," . . . ii, 20. The bishop of Sardis, for some capital, but hidden offence, which deprived him of sanctifying grace, the life of the Soul : . . . . "thou hast a name that thou livest, but thou art dead," iii, 1. The bishop of Laodicea, because he was lukewarm, because his charity, though not absolutely dead, was on the point of being extinguished : "because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot" . . . . iii, 15.

This indefatigable transcriber fills a page, with an extract from the remarks on Dr. Stanfer, in which the writer had stated some of the promises made to the church, and from them concluded that, if at any time gross errors were taught by the pastors, and believed by the people, the gates of hell would prevail, and the promises prove ineffectual; this truth intuitive and extorting the assent, where prejudice does not blind, nor interest deprave the mind, the castigator denies ; he thinks that the promises to preserve the church entire, do not extend to the exclusion of gross errors, so that, in his new modelled opinion, Christ may be head of a church which teaches heresy, idolatry, atheism or epicureism : for if one gross error be taught in the church no reason can be assigned why any other may not : as all errors are equally opposite to truth : thus, for instance, it is not less false that a triangle is composed of four sides and four angles, than that it is composed of fifty sides and five hundred angles. It is scarcely credible that a man, who calls himself a christian, would presume to assert that Christ does not teach his church by the ministry of the pastors, though he expressly promised it, or that by their ministry the God of Truth and Sanctity would teach false doctrine, heresy or idolatry—there is something so horribly blasphemous in the assertion, that it is irksome to discuss it : however, this opinion the castigator endeavours to support, in his usual way, by a bold assertion, and one or two passages which condemn it. "It is," says he, "repugnant to the experience of the church"—p. 170 : that, in other words, it is repugnant to the experience of the church, that Christ should preserve



preserve it from error : but it is not repugnant to the experience of the church that Christ promised to give pastors to his church, and teach the faithful by their ministry ; and it is repugnant to common sense that he would teach error by their ministry, and repugnant to common decency to assert it. He does not seem to be aware of the tendency of the passages, which he adduces, not to support an opinion, the falshood and absurdity of which he must have felt, but to amuse readers of a certain description for whom he writes. “ The Apostle Paul informs us, that some in the Corinthian Church denied the Resurrection ; that Hymeneus and Philetus erred in doctrine, and were believed by the people ”—p. 170. He calumniates the apostle ! For Paul does not say *that they were believed by the people*, but, as he himself cites it : “ that they overthrew the faith of some.” But Paul does not inform us that Hymeneus and Philetus were the sole pastors of the church, nor does he say that they were pastors of the church at all ; he does not tell us that the few, whose faith was subverted by these impostors, composed the Church of Corinth, much less the Church of Christ dispersed in different nations, but he gives us a piece of information terrible in the extreme to this Edinburgh castigator, a piece of information that must fill his soul with anguish, if his aversion to popery has not steeled his conscience against fear and remorse, as well as his understanding against truth and conviction : for the apostle informs us, that he himself, one of these pastors legally instituted, delivered these and such like seducers over to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme : “ This charge I commit to thee, Son Timothy, according to preceding prophecies concerning thee, that thou mayest fight a good battle, having faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith, have suffered shipwreck, of these are Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered over to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme ”—1st Tim. i, 18. In the passage cited by the castigator to shew that Christ’s promise

promise of preserving his church did not extend to exclude gross errors, we have a signal instance of the contrary, in the attention of the Great Shepherd to the welfare of his Flock is manifest: the error, which was insidiously introduced, and which, creeping like a cancer, began to infect the incautious part of the flock, was immediately detected, the progress stopped, the proper remedy applied to eradicate the disease: that is, the warning voice of the legally authorized pastor, and the seducers by his ministry delivered over to Satan.—A terrible warning to all reformists and inventors of novelty. From the same passage we learn another truth, which this castigatōr did not perceive: that is, that error in faith when imputable, or, in other words, when not excused by invincible ignorance or inevitable necessity, excludes from salvation: for the apostle says that they who erred in faith suffered shipwreck; it is hardly necessary to remark that the man who falls into the sea can find no safety but in a return to the vessel. The error of these early reformists, Hymeneus, Philetus and Alexander, the apostle corrected in his first epistle to the Cor. xv, the people he reclaimed, as we find no vestige of that error after amongst them; the Seducers, incorrigible it is presumed, he delivered over to Satan; thus established a precedent in the church, which has been religiously observed. The writer would not be understood to extend the strictures, which he occasionally makes on reformists and innovators, to any of the people seduced by their artifices, nor to their successors, whether they teach the errors of their predecessors, or add to them their own conjectures; his strictures apply exclusively to these, who, originally members of the catholic church, separated themselves and formed sects in opposition to it; their successors are perfectly innocent of their apostacy, and not having been originally in the communion of the catholic church, they could not separate themselves from it. Whether a persuasion, arising from motives unfounded, but by them thought solid, may excuse or extenuate a perseverance in error,

is a question which this writer does not think proper to discuss. Our castigator, who is profuse in his citations, adds a passage from St. Peter's second epistle, ii : "there shall be false teachers among you, who shall bring in privily damnable heresies . . . . and many shall follow their pernicious ways." As the castigator only gives these few words, which are as much to his purpose as the first verse of Genesis, the writer adds the omission : "but there were also false prophets among the people, as there will be false teachers among you, who will introduce sects of perdition, and, denying the Lord, who brought them, will bring on themselves swift destruction, 2d Pet. ii, 12, and many will follow their destructive ways, 'apoleias,' by whom the way of truth will be blasphemed." Peter says that there were false prophets amongst the Jews, but he does not say that these false prophets were the pastors of the Jewish church, nor does he say that the Jewish people were deceived by them, though many were as we know from the inspired writings ; he says also that there will be false teachers amongst us Christians, and that many will follow their destructive ways, and woful experience has verified this prediction ; but he does not say that these false teachers are or will be the pastors of the Christian church, or that all Christians will be seduced by them ; he says : "they will introduce sects of perdition," *oitenēs paraisaxousin aïrescis apoleias*, this phrase the castigator translates, "who shall privily bring in damnable heresies." The substantive *apōleia*, which signifies *perdition* or *destruction*, he converts into the adjective *damnable*, and by his apostolical authority he adds the adverb *privily*, which Peter forgot, and Paul was so far from thinking that they would introduce their destructive opinions *privily*, that speaking of false teachers, who resist the truth, as Jannes and Jambres, the Egyptian magicians, resisted Moses, the apostle says : "their folly will be manifest to all"—2. Tim. iii. 9.

Our castigator is invariably unlucky in his selection of passages

passages from his repertory. Imagination is racked in vain to discover something to give a colour of truth to subterfuges, which despair only can suggest. To distort truth in support of error is a task, for which Nature has not qualified him; but to force a truth to countenance an error, which it expressly condemns, surpasses folly: in the inspired writings there is not perhaps a passage, in which all sects and sectaries are more explicitly condemned, and their distinctive characteristic marked with greater precision, than that which he has cited from St. Peter's epistle: the apostle says: "there will be false teachers, who will introduce *sects* or *heresies* of perdition." Where will they introduce them if not amongst christians pre-existing? And what doctrine will they endeavour to corrupt if not the doctrine taught in the church when they begin to dogmatise? All sects, therefore, are originally formed of catholics seduced by false teachers: they commence amongst catholics, and by their false doctrine begin to corrupt the doctrine then taught by the pastors, and believed by the people. This characteristic distinguishes false teachers so plainly that even ignorance cannot mistake them: thus, for instance, when Arius began to dogmatise, some few catholics were seduced by him, and formed a sect, which in a short time swelled to an immense multitude, but yet the distinctive characteristic assigned by St. Peter was perfectly applicable to the sect: for Arius did not pretend that all the bishops of the then catholic world were false teachers, who introduced a sect of perdition amongst the Arians then in possession of all christian churches; of catholics seduced by his artifices he formed a sect amongst catholics, the catholic prelates did not form a sect of seduced Arians amongst Arians, he therefore was one of these false teachers foretold by St. Peter, and his followers composed one of those sects of perdition introduced by false teachers; to come nearer home, when Luther began to dogmatise in Saxony, he did not pretend that the bishops, then pastors in lawful succession, introduced any sect

sect or heresy amongst Lutherans pre-existing and possessing all Christian churches; the bishops did not then begin to corrupt the doctrine taught in all churches; Luther, therefore, was one of these false teachers, his sect was formed of catholics seduced by him amongst catholics, the catholic bishops did not form a sect of Lutherans seduced amongst Lutherans. This reasoning is applicable to all sects, and bears no reply: "for it was never pretended by any sect that they themselves were in possession of all churches, and their pastors, in regular succession from the apostles, possessed of all right of preaching and teaching, when some one or other began to form a sect amongst them. The man, who weighs dispassionately the force of this reasoning and resists it, is not within the reach of conviction: either incurable stupidity, or invincible obstinacy has so depraved his understanding, that even intuitive truth can make no impression on it.

The ensuing pages are filled with an extract from this writer's remarks, in which the obedience enjoined by St. Paul to the pastors of the church is stated, and the rule prescribed by St. John to distinguish false teachers. To this the castigatō replies: that obedience to magistrates, parents and masters, is also enjoined by the apostle—this seems to be his favourite evasion, it has been already discussed. The writer now adds that this precept of obedience to the civil magistrate, which the castigatō seems to disregard, strictly obliges in all civil causes which are of his jurisdiction; that it is his official duty to understand the civil law, and explain it to contending parties; that it is intolerable presumption in a cobbler or coal porter to pretend to direct him, or refuse to acquiesce in the sentence, which he has juridically pronounced, until they have examined it, and found it consistent with the laws, of which they know nothing, but what they learn from him; in like manner this precept of obedience to the pastors of the church obliges, under penalty of perdition, in all religious disputes, which are of their jurisdiction;

it

it is their official duty to understand, and explain the laws of the gospel to the cobbler and the coal porter, and to all the illiterate and uninformed, who compose an incalculable majority of Christians, and who neither know, nor can know any thing of the gospel, but what they learn from their teachers; and from this reasoning, which may be denied, because there is no truth which may not be denied, but cannot be invalidated or eluded, he concludes that the rule prescribed by St. John, to distinguish false teachers, is the most simple and the most infallible that can be devised: this is a reflexion of which the most illiterate man or woman is capable: Arius says that all the pastors of the church are deceived, that he alone understands the scriptures, and they do not; he disobeys them; he is one of these false teachers. This reasoning is strictly applicable to every Reformist; it is the dictate of common sense, independent on logical or metaphysical discussion. "It did not occur to this writer," says the castigator, p. 173, "that this very rule of St. John is a rule of the scriptures, which the unlearned he says do not understand." His spirit of divination deceives him: it did occur to this writer that St. John's rule, is a rule of the scriptures, infallible as the scriptures; but which the unlearned did not learn from the scriptures, which one of a thousand at that time could not read, but from their pastors, from whom they learned all, that they knew, and all that they were obliged to know of the scriptures, as the castigator's servant maid learns from him the opinions of Calvin or Gomar, or his own discoveries in the hitherto unexplored regions of religious fancy, not in the scriptures, of which she may admire the fine pictures. In the same page he tells us, that "St. John, instead of referring the members of the church to their teachers, implicitly turns their attention to the doctrine of the scriptures, and tells them to exercise their judgment by bringing the instructions of the Clergy to this test." This paradox his spirit of divination discovers in these words of the  
K k
apostle,

apostle, "beloved believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know you the spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."—1 John, iv, 1-3. We admire the unexampled sagacity of his spirit; he has discovered that these false prophets and lying spirits were neither less nor more than the pastors of the christian church, or, as he calls them, the clergy; and he detects, in St. John's words, a latent order to the people, which had hitherto escaped the notice of the world, to bring the instructions of these false prophets, and lying spirits, their clergy, to the test of the scriptures: a simple man, judging by the rules of common sense, would have thought that St. John intended to instruct the clergy, and through them to warn the people against the artifices of false teachers. What renders this conjecture probable is, that many of the people could not read, that they were not all prophets, and could not know the contents of the apostle's letter by inspiration, in a word, that they had no possible mean of knowing the apostle's instructions but from their teachers. The world is greatly indebted to the castigator's instructing spirit, though some simpletons, from the striking resemblance, may mistake it for one of these spirits, of which the apostle spoke. In the next page we find another discovery, which had also escaped the notice of an undiscerning world, for many ages: implicit obedience to the church is repugnant to the spirit of the gospel; disobedience, therefore, is an evangelical virtue. This he finds in these words of St. John: "we are of God, he, that knoweth God heareth us; he, that is, not of God heareth us not." A man, not enlightened by the castigator's instructing spirit, would very naturally conclude from these words, that the apostle knew nothing of that new modelled virtue "disobedience:" in terms as intelligible as ever were penned, the apostle assigns obedience

obedience as the distinctive characteristic of the children of God. It is the knowledge of God that produces submission to the faithful ministers, says the castigator ; who ever doubted it ? But where this knowledge, says he, is wanted, there may be submission and credulity, but no faith ; there may be, and is, too often unfortunately, submission and credulity to other ministers, but not to the ministers of Christ, for it is not possible for the man, who does not know Jesus Christ, to have any respect, or pay any submission to himself or his ministers, and this is precisely what the apostle says : “ he who knoweth God, heareth us ; and he, who is not of God, heareth us not.”

In the same page, 174, he tells us that the unlearned are capable of trying strange doctrines by the rule of the scriptures ; he has not told us how the unlearned, who neither read, nor can read the scriptures, know their contents, to compare strange doctrines with them. Can they try them by a rule of which they know nothing ? The writer presumes to inform him, that the unlearned, who have never read a line in the scriptures, may, with great facility, and unerring certainty, detect false teachers, by that simple rule, prescribed by St. John, which they learn from their pastors ; and having detected the false teacher, they must conclude, that his doctrine is false. Thus the Redeemer, in his paternal cares of his flock, provides for the most illiterate as well as for the most intelligent, an effectual preservative against error ; but minutely to discuss the opinions of false teachers, and compare them with the doctrines of the scriptures, is what the unlearned cannot do ; the pretence is offensive to reason ; the most gross artifice of imposture : the man, who tells the illiterate mechanic, that he understands the scriptures, which he cannot read, flatters him with the idea that he is himself a competent judge of true or false doctrine ; that he is capable of comparing obscure doctrines, of which the man has no idea at all, with the scriptures of which



which he knows nothing, intentionally imposes on his credulity. The unlearned, says the castigator, may possess a very accurate knowledge of the doctrines of religion : yes ; no man doubts it ; but this knowledge they must obtain from the instruction of their pastors and teachers, not from the scriptures, the contents of which they cannot know but from their teachers. Hence it is that the most illiterate catholic, who has learned his catechism by rote, and heard it explained by his pastor, has a more accurate knowledge of religion than this castigating pastor, and all his associates ; hence it is also, that the most illiterate Calvinist, who has learned his catechism by rote, and heard his pastor explain it, has a more accurate knowledge of the wild conjectures of Calvin, than any catholic not versed in controversy. Why so ? Because these are the doctrines impressed on his mind by his minister, whilst in the face of truth and experience, he himself is told, and the world is taught to believe, that he finds these doctrines in the scriptures, of which perhaps he never could read a line.

Upon mature consideration our castigator thinks that obedience and submission may be due to the ministers of Christ ; to himself, we must presume, and his brethren of the new school, and last appointment, but the Romish church has no claim to it—*veteres migrate Coloni*—old fashioned fellows pack up your alls and begone. Why so ? Because the Romish church forbids marriage and commands an abstinence from meats. Yet, strange to tell, this Romish church, that forbids marriage, calls matrimony a sacrament of divine institution, and Romanists, in presence of her ministers, contract marriages with great solemnity. She orders also an abstinence from meats at certain times, but never as if they were unclean, hence her children eat all sorts of meat with thanksgiving ; they think with the apostle that every creature of God is good ; and have nothing in common with the Manicheans, the ancestors of this castigator, who believed that the evil principle created this visible world ;

world ; they think with the Saviour that chastity is a virtue lawful and laudable, of which he himself and his precursor John Baptist set the example ; the man who does not believe it, is not a Christian, but a hog of Epicurus' sty, whatever the castigator may think of the matter ; they also think with the Baptist, who abstained from all sorts of meat, and with Daniel, who abstained from meat, from wine, and even from desirable bread, for three whole weeks, Dan. x, 3, that it is lawful at times, or even at all times to abstain from certain meats, the man who does not think it, is one of those, of whom the apostle says, " whose end is perdition, whose God is their belly," Phil. iii. 19 ; they think that the apostles were justified in ordering all Christians to abstain from blood and animals suffocated, or things offered to idols, though all these things are God's creatures, and good in themselves, and finally, they think the Lent, so terrible to all the sons and daughters of Epicurus, wisely instituted by the apostles, and religiously observed by their successors, a measure well calculated to crucify the flesh with its passions and lusts, Gal. v. 25.

To the proof deduced from St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy, iii. 14-15, stated in the writer's Remarks, which the castigator, who fills a volume with extracts, interspersed with incoherent reflexions, and coarse invectives, transcribes, replies that the Church of Rome cannot know whether these words, " the pillar and ground of truth," be applied to Timothy himself, or to the church. Artifice suggests this silly evasion : for even the ignorance of the castigator cannot mistake the apostle's meaning, nor can the efforts of his artifice distort them from the intended sense. St. Paul says to his disciple Timothy : " that you may know how to conduct yourself in the House of God, which is *etis est*, the Church of God, the pillar and ground of truth." This phrase bears no other sense, but that the Church of God is the pillar and ground of truth. To divert the attention of his readers, and perplex a truth, which he cannot deny, he pretends that the Fa-  
thers

thers refer it sometimes to Timothy, and sometimes to the church : Gregory, of Nyssene, says, that " St. Paul fashioned Timothy to be a goodly pillar, making him the pillar and ground of the church and of truth; and Basil said of the deceased bishop of Neocesarea that he was the ornament of the churches, the pillar and ground of truth, a strong and firm establishment of faith in Christ ;" and in another epistle, lamenting the state of the church, on account of the dispersion of the bishops by the persecution, Basil says : " The pillars and ground of truth are dispersed"—Ep. 78. Who would think that a pastor of a new church, in which there are no bishops, would presume to inform his readers that the pastors and teachers of the primitive church were bishops? And, what argues the most blind infatuation, he cites from their writings, in opposition to truth, passages which expressly confirm it : Basil calls the bishops " the pillars and ground of truth ;" in like manner Gregory calls Timothy an arch-bishop, a pillar of the church and of truth ; and the castigator informs us also, that ancient writers were accustomed to call any person eminent in the church by this name, he might have added modern catholic writers to the ancients, their ancestors : there is nothing more common than to call a prelate, eminent for science and sanctity a pillar of the church, or a pillar of truth : because the sanctity of his life justifies the sanctity of that faith, which forms him ; and his doctrine condemns the artifices and errors of false teachers ; his writings vindicate the truths of religion from misrepresentation and false interpretations, but he cannot prevent them from being distorted : against artful imposture no precaution is proof—the inspired writings are themselves horribly abused. The extracts, which the castigator has injudiciously cited, are manifest allusions to that passage in which St. Paul calls the church the pillar and ground of truth, and shew us that at all times, as well in the primitive as in succeeding ages, the pastors of Christ's Church were thought to be the pillar and ground of truth, and of necessary consequence

quence all teachers in opposition to them are the pillar and ground of falshood.

After this fruitless effort, which must be ascribed to the vanity of appearing conversant in the writings of the Fathers, by transcribing some garbled scraps from his repertory, the castigator condescends to think that Paul's words may be applicable to the church, but they by no means, if we believe him, support infallibility. A plain man would naturally think that the pillar of truth supports nothing else but truth, for this plain reason, that between truth and falshood there is no mean. If, therefore, the church teaches true doctrine, she supports the truth, and is the pillar of truth, if she teaches false doctrine, she supports falshood, and is the pillar of falshood, not of truth. This simple reasoning precludes evasion, the man is wilfully blind, who does not see it, and lost without redemption if he resists it. The castigator asks on what the church rests? To which the writer replies, with the apostle, it rests on Jesus Christ, whose almighty power preserves it according to his promise: "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" the truths of his gospel he teaches by these pastors whom he gives to his church for the work of the ministry; by them he detects and confounds the impostures of these emissaries, whom the enemy sends to sow tares in his field. "We protestants," says the castigator, p. 177, "believe the truth to be founded on the testimony of God." He seems to insinuate that catholics do not believe the truths of religion on the testimony of God. The writer begs leave to undeceive his readers: we catholics believe the truths of religion in reality on the testimony of God, whilst protestants think they do, but in reality do not: there is this remarkable and essential difference between our faith and their opinion, that we have an unerring and absolute certainty that God has attested the truths of religion, and they have none but what they borrow from us. This article has been already discussed in this work, our castigator inadvertently confesses it: "the church,"

church," says he, p. 178, "we conceive to be a pillar and ground of truth merely on account of that record, which it bears to the divine testimony." Catholics believe no more: that truth, and that only, is of Catholic faith which is attested by the church to have been revealed by God: it is a gross imposition on the credulity of the public to pretend that the church either supposes, or conceals, or alters any revealed truth; her decisions are solemn declarations that such or such truths are revealed by God, and as truth is not opposite to truth, the contradictory of a revealed truth must be an error. "But," continues the castigator, "though the church may be the pillar and ground of truth, it does not follow that it cannot err, or by erring that it is no longer a church of Christ, but a pillar of falsehood." This jumble of incoherencies he pretends to prove by something more incoherent, or to speak correctly, more blasphemously impious: "*a person*, says he, "*may be a Saint of God, though considerably involved in the pollutions of Sin.*" As *Sin* is a generical term, applicable to all sorts of crimes, and the pollutions of sin unlimited, this Edinburgh castigator assumes, not simply as a truth, but as an unquestionable truth, that is, as a principle of proof, that abominable doctrine, which authorises all sorts of wickedness and crimes in our modern saints: a person may be a saint of God and considerably involved in the pollutions of sin! That is, in other words: a person may be a saint of God and at the same time guilty of perjury, of adultery, of theft, of treason, &c. Husbands take care of your wives, they may be saints of God though considerably involved in the pollutions of sin! It is rather unfortunate that St. Paul did not think these new modelled saints entitled to a share in the inheritance of the kingdom of God,—Eph. v, 5.

The next pages are filled with vague assertions, totally unconnected, without a shadow of proof. The inquisition haunts his affrighted imagination, the thought alarms him, he stares, as a highwayman trembles at the sight

light of a rope, or as a fox pursued by a lame or toothless hound, though perfectly secure, through fear, becomes doubly offensive; it is true that a preacher who tells his people: that an assassin, a traitor, a blasphemer, in a word—"a person considerably involved in the pollutions of sin, may be a saint of God"—would have something to fear from that tribunal, if within its grasp; but as the inquisition is no article of catholic doctrine, and neither admired or approved by the writer, he resigns it to the castigator's vengeance—he may vent his rage on it with impunity. From the inquisition he flies to Epiphanius, the great enemy of images. Why not to Copronymus, of foul memory, he was a greater enemy to images? If the accusation against Epiphanius had been founded in truth, it would prove him an Iconoclast, or image breaker, and he would have been anathematized by the church as the Iconoclasts were: other men, more intelligent than he, did not escape censure when they swerved from truth, as Origenes, Tertullian, &c. but it would not prove that images were not in the churches objects of respect and veneration before his days, in his days, and after them. However, the accusation is a calumny, though the castigator be not the author. St. John of Damascus, a celebrated Greek writer, vindicates him from that injurious aspersion: in his defence of the catholic doctrine against the image breakers, this venerable Ascetic, whom the Greeks consider as their greatest writer, states, as a principal universally admitted, *that the church cannot err*—precisely what the castigator denies. John Damascen then explains, with great precision and perspicuity, the genuine sense of the passages in scripture, distorted by the image breakers in support of their error, justifies the church from the imputation of idolatry, with which, calumnious misrepresentation then, as now aspersed it; he replies to a passage cited by these sectaries from St. Epiphanius' Letter to John of Jerusalem; they too knew how to garble and interpolate. In this passage Epiphanius is made to say: that he tore a curtain on which an image was painted; to this John

Damascen replies : if the passage be genuine, which he did not seem to believe though he did not think proper to contest it, Epiphanius must have done it to suppress some local abuse, as Athanasius ordered the relics of the Saints to be buried, to induce the Egyptians to abolish the custom of keeping the dead bodies of their friends on beds in their houses ; but that Epiphanius did not pretend to abolish images is manifest, says he, because they yet embellish his own church. A more convincing argument he could not offer. St. Epiphanius' cathedral of Salamine, in the Isle of Cyprus, was yet in being when John Damascen wrote, and the images were there to be seen, as they are yet to be seen in St. Stephen's Chapel, where the Imperial Parliament meets, if a part of the wainscot be removed. Damascen then cites many passages from the earliest writers to justify the veneration of the images of Christ and his Saints ; from Denis, the Areopagite ; from Basil ; from Gregory of Nyssa, who says that he was affected even to tears at the picture of the sacrifice of Abraham ; from Chrysofom, from Leontius, Bishop of Naples in the Island of Cyprus ; on this last passage Damascen says : " Who is the best interpreter of Epiphanius ? This holy Bishop, who preached in the same island with him ? Or they who speak now according to their own opinions ?" In the Seventh General Council, 4th Ac. a long passage was read, from Leontius' apology for christians, against the jews, in which that prelate had shewn, with demonstrative evidence, the essential difference between the veneration, which christians pay the images of Jesus Christ and his Saints, and the idolatrous worship of the Heathens. In his reply Damascen says : if Epiphanius had been of the same opinion with the Iconoclasts, his authority could not be of any force against the general practice of the church. Damascen, so celebrated amongst the Greeks and Latins, thought so lightly of the authority of Epiphanius in opposition to the established usage of the church, that, though he justified him from the imputation of heresy, he did not think it necessary to contest

contest a manifest interpolation in his works; what would he have thought of an apostate monk in Saxony, buristing from his monastery, disregarding vows and oaths, and setting his wild conjectures in opposition to the sealed doctrines of the christian world? The passage in which Epiphanius is made to say that he tore the curtain on which the image was painted, is an addition to a letter already finished, and has no reference to the subject of that letter, in which the errors of Origenes are stated, of which John, then Bishop of Jerusalem, was strongly suspected—This, and other interpolations in the works of Epiphanius were detected by Epiphanius the Deacon, in the Seventh General Council, Act 6: in that Council, composed entirely of Greek Prelates, with the exception of the Roman Pontiff's Legates, the artifices of the image breakers were exposed, and by themselves acknowledged; the records of the Church of Constantinople were produced, in them the erasures were visible; some passages not well effaced were with difficulty rendered intelligible, whole leaves were cut out, all which remained entire in some authentic copies, which were also produced. Thus it is that error at all times has endeavoured to raise itself on the ruins of religion, by artifice and imposture.

As this Edinburgh calligrapher seems to place an implicit confidence in St. Epiphanius, he must be highly pleased at an extract from that Father's works, which are universally acknowledged authentic.

At the request of Acacius and Paul, priests and archimandrites, that is, superiors of the monasteries of Carchedonia, and Berea in Syria, whose letter is dated in the 92d year of Dioclesian, the 12th of Valentinian and Valens, the 8th of Gratien, that is, the year 375 of our æra, Epiphanius wrote his great work against heresies, which he entitled *Panarian*, or, as he explains it, *Chest of Medicines against different Poisons*. In this work are eighty different heresies specified, and solidly refuted. The work is closed with an exposition of the Catholic faith, and a minute description of church discipline, which the writer transcribes:

“Perpetual



“ Perpetual continency is by many inviolably observed, and honoured ; then celibacy ; continence in widowhood ; the next is a married state principally when not reiterated, though it be allowed to marry after the death of a husband or a wife. The source of all these goods is the priesthood, which is given for the greater part to men of undefiled and perpetual chastity, or to them, who live in a state of celibacy, or who abstain from their wives, or to widowers, who have been once only married ; but he, who marries a second time cannot be received into the priesthood, either in the order of bishop, of priest, of deacon or sub-deacon. After the priesthood, is the order of readers, who are admitted indiscriminately from all States, of perpetual chastity, of celibacy, of continence, of widowhood, or marriage, and in case of necessity from amongst those, who have contracted a second marriage. There are also deaconesses appointed for the service of women solely ; as decency requires on account of baptism, and other similar occasions, they ought also to live in a state of continency after one only marriage, or in a state of perpetual virginity ; after these are the exorcists, and the interpreters, who translate from one language into another the lessons or the sermons ; remain yet the *copeats*, sextons, who bury the dead, and the porters, and all that concerns good order within the church.

“ The assemblies ordered by the apostles are held on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday ; on Wednesday and Friday the Fast continues until *none*, that is until the third hour after mid-day is ended, because on Wednesday the Lord was betrayed and on Friday he suffered. Our Fast is an acknowledgement that he has suffered for us, and a satisfaction for our sins. This Fast on Wednesday and until *none*, is observed in the Catholic church the whole year, the fifty days in the Easter, during which it is forbidden to kneel or fast, excepted ; during that time the assembly on Wednesday and Friday is held in the morning, not at *none*, (three in the evening) as during the rest of the year ; on the day of the Epiphany,

phany, which is the birth of the Saviour, it is not allowed to fast, though it fall on Wednesday or Friday. The Asceticks voluntarily observe a fast the whole year, except Sundays and the Easter time, and always observe the vigils; the Catholic church reckons all Sundays days of joy, assembles on them in the morning and does not fast; she also observes the forty days before the seven days of Easter in a continued fast; but she does not fast on Sundays even in Lent; as to the six days before Easter-Day, all the people live on dry food, (“*xerophagia*”) that is, taking but bread, and salt and water, in the evening; the most fervent pass sometimes two days, sometimes three or four without eating, and some the whole week until Sunday morning at cock-crow; vigils are observed these six days, and there is an assembly every day; during the Lent also the assembly is held from *none* to evening. In some places the vigil is kept on the night of Thursday until Friday, or of Sunday only. In some places the sacrifice is offered on Holy Thursday, continuing the “*xerophagia*,” dry food; in other places the sacrifice is celebrated but on the night of Sunday, so that the office finishes at cock-crow on Easter Day. Baptism and the other mysteries are celebrated according to the tradition of the gospel and of the apostles.

“ A commemoration of the dead is made, naming them by their names, celebrating the prayer and the sacrifice; morning prayers in the church are always with canticles and praises, and evening prayers with psalms. There are monks who dwell in cities, and some who dwell in monasteries, far distant from cities; some, who wear long hair through devotion, but that practice is not conformable to the precept of St. Paul; there are many other particular devotions observed in the church, as to abstain from the flesh of all sorts of animals, from eggs, and from cheese; some abstain from four-footed animals, others retrench fowl also, and some retrench even fish, others eggs and some cheese, and there are some, who  
abstain

abstain from bread and fruits, and every thing dressed at the fire; many sleep on the bare ground, many go bare-foot, some wear a hair cloth concealed, it is indecent to expose it to view, or to carry a chain on the neck as some do. A great number abstain from the bath, and some, having renounced the world, invent simple and easy mechanical arts to banish idleness, and live without being expensive to others. A great number are continually employed in psalmody, in prayer, in reading or reciting the scriptures.

“The catholic church teaches to all the fruits of hospitality, of alms, and all works of charity towards others; she abstains from the communion of all sectaries, banishes fornication, adultery, uncleanness, idolatry, murder, and all sorts of crimes, magic, astrology, divinations, poisonings, enchantments, &c. she forbids the theatres, horse races, the combats of beasts, musical shows, all sorts of slander, quarrels and disputes, injustices, avarice, usury; it does not approve traders, places them in the last rank of all, and does not receive the offerings but of those, who live according to justice.”

What does the Edinburgh calligrapher think of this picture of the primitive church, of which he says protestants have re-assumed the form? Can he discover his new modelled church in the picture? Is there any one feature of resemblance? The epicurean devotion, of eating all sorts of meat indiscriminately on all days, was not yet known in the church; nor was that new modelled virtue, of propagating the human species, a necessary accomplishment in its ministers. What a catalogue of popish superstitions, and unprofitable austerities Epiphanius gives!

In the same page, 170, the calligrapher cites a long passage from Paul's epistle to the Romans, xi, the conclusion of which, “thou also shall be cut off,” he applies to the Roman Church, he only omits to inform his readers that the apostle did not address these words to the Roman church, or to any other church; but to the  
Gentile

Gentile converts, who preferred themselves to the Jews ; in the preceding chapter the apostle had corrected a prevailing error amongst the Jews, who preferred themselves to the Gentiles, and thought the promised Salvation confined to themselves ; he had shewn them from the prophets, that the vocation of the Gentiles had been predicted ; that the Jew and the Greek are equally justified by faith in Jesus Christ, not by the works of the Jewish law ; in the 11th chapter he corrects the presumption of the Gentiles, who thought that the Jews had been reprobated, and they themselves substituted. “ Has God,” says the apostle, “ cast away his people ? God forbid : for I am myself an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin . . . . . I speak to you Gentiles . . . . . if some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive wert grafted in amongst them, and with them partakest of the root, and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches ; but if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then : the branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Well, because of incredulity they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded but fear : for if God spared not the natural branches, perhaps he would not spare thee : behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God ; severity on them who fell, but goodness towards thee, if thou continue in goodness, *if not thou also wilt be cut off*, and they also if they do not persist in incredulity will be grafted in : for God is able to graft them in again.” Who would imagine that the menace, “ *thou also wilt be cut off*,” was addressed to the Church of Rome or to any other Church, if this castigator’s familiar spirit had not discovered it ? A plain man would apply the menace to himself, and from it conclude the necessity of working his salvation with fear and trembling, a doctrine which the apostle teaches with great precision in his epistle to the Philippians, ii, 12—“ Wherefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed me, not only when present, but much more now when

when absent, *with fear and trembling work your salvation—  
meta phobou kai tromou ten èauton soterian katergazesthe.*

In the passage garbled by the castigator, and the context, which determines the sense, artfully omitted, the apostle, so far from menacing the church with ruin, expressly teaches its perpetual stability: though many branches are occasionally broken off, and others engrafted amongst the remaining branches, the stock remains entire; and will continue entire until the consummation: the apostle continues speaking to the converts from the heathen nations: "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is by nature wild, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall they, who are according to nature, be engrafted in their own olive tree? For I would not, brethren, have you not know this mystery, (that you be not wise in yourselves) that blindness in part is effected in Israel until the plenitude of nations come in, and so all Israel shall be saved"—xi, 24-25. The stock, therefore, if we believe the apostle, will continue entire until the Jews are engrafted, after the plenitude of nations become in. Quere: does this Edinburgh Castigator think, that the plenitude of nations are, have been, or ever will be, within the pale of his little church? If not, it is not that stock of which the apostle speaks.

He then proceeds to transcribe, from his repertory, extracts, garbled from the works of incorrect or fanatical writers, which have been censured by the church, amongst these we find Occam, a fanatical admirer of Lewis of Bavaria, censured for his extravagant opinions, which, however, he retracted, and was, in consequence, absolved from censures—see his life, *Hist. de Gran.* And Wesselus, Luther's precursor, whose works were burned. Of this last writer, the castigator says, with his accustomed veracity: "*a man highly esteemed in the Church of Rome*"—p. 182. So highly esteemed that his works were burned by the common hangman—see his history, *ibid.* The ravings of these men, similar to his own, the castigator gives  
his

his readers, as doctrines taught in the church of Rome. As their errors were refuted long before the castigator was born the writer passes them unnoticed. He then gives, what he calls, specimens of morality taught in the church of Rome. It is amusing to hear a man speak of morality who tells his readers that *they may be Saints of God though considerably involved in the pollutions of Sin*. However, these specimens, which he gives, are doctrines condemned by the church of Rome, which he impudently calumniates, the author of his repertory found them not in the works of these voluminous writers, which, in all appearance, he never read, but in the censure which is always passed on the extravagant opinions of catholic writers by the church of Rome, as modern sceptics find the objections, which they propose against different passages of scripture, not in the scriptures, of which they know nothing, but in the works of christian writers, who accurately discuss all seeming difficulties in order to elucidate the truth: our castigator, not so cautious as his brethren, modern sceptics, inadvertently refutes himself: that many individuals of the Romish Communion, have exalted notions of the precepts of religion, p. 186. If he could dismiss that lying spirit which misleads him, and consult common sense, he would have known that all the individuals, who compose that immense body the catholic church, or, as he calls it, the Romish church, learn, the maxims of morality as well as the doctrines of faith from their pastors, whose official duty it is to explain them, as this castigator's congregation learn Calvin's opinions from his instructions. If therefore they have pure and exalted views of the precepts of religion, it is because the maxims of morality taught in the church are pure and exalted. The man who asserts the contrary does not know the morality of the church, or he does not know the truth.

Page 187, contains a greater number of groundless assertions than the writer remembers to have seen crowded into the same space, some are impudently ca-

lumnious, as that Liberius declared himself an Arian; and cursed the doctrine of the scriptures, with some others, which have been already refuted. As they are all mere vague assertions, without a shadow of proof, they are passed unnoticed.

This Edinburgh castigator seems to think, confidence in assertion, a substitute to truth. The infallibility of decision, which he denies to the church of Jesus Christ, he assumes, modesty is not in the catalogue of new modelled virtues: it is the accompaniment of real science, the irreconcilable enemy of assuming ignorance; hence we find truth diminish in the castigator's assertions, in proportion as his confidence swells, as if it fled from arrogance: "the fathers," he says, p. 188, "were utter strangers to the pretensions of the Romish church, and knew of no infallibility beyond the testimony of God in the scriptures." The fathers, it is true, believed no revealed truths but on the testimony of God, as we catholics do now. This is an invariable rule, but that these truths were attested by God, they believed on the testimony of his church, as we do, this rule is equally invariable: for the fathers were not all immediately inspired, nor had they our castigator's spirit of divination to instruct them. If by the pretensions of the Romish church, the doctrine of infallibility, of indefectibility, and perpetual visibility, be understood, the fathers were not strangers to these pretensions; they knew them, and if the castigator does not know this, it is because he knows nothing of the works of these venerable writers but the few garbled extracts, which are found in Illyricus' *Catalogue of Witnesses*. Assuming the visibility, the veracity and the universality, of the church as a principle of proof, St. Austin demonstrates the truth of the christian religion. Does the castigator think this father was an utter stranger to a doctrine on which he founds a proof of christianity? "If we say to a heathen, believe Jesus Christ because he is God, and he replies: why believe him? when we produce the authority of the prophets; and he says that he

he does not believe them, because they are Hebrews and he a Heathen. From the future events, which they foretold, and are now seen to have happened, we shew the veracity of the prophets. I believe he would be moved when he would hear many things from the prophets . . . when he would see the kings of the earth advantageously subject to Christ's dominion, and all nations serving him; when what has been so long ago foretold, is read to him from Ps. lxxi. ii, all the kings of the earth shall adore him, *all nations shall serve him . . .* When he considers what things are there foretold of Christ, *and what of his church*, and sees fulfilled in the whole world, what he there read foretold,"—Lib. 13. Cont. Faus. Ca. 7. But if this Heathen be moved that they who are called Christians are divided into many different sects; we shew that even this has not been omitted by the prophets,—Cap. 12.

If he should say, and enquire as one, whom we catechise, by what manifest sign, shall I, as yet a child, and unable to distinguish clear truth from so many errors; by what manifest sign shall I hold the Church of Christ? The prophet teaches him that, *that is the Church of Christ predicted, which shows itself above all others and appears . . .* as it is the city built on the mountain, what mountain if not that, which according to the prophecy of Daniel ii, 35, from a little stone increased, and is become a great mountain so that it fills the whole earth, Cap. 13, and, in his book on the belief of things which are not seen, Austin says: "they are greatly deceived who think that we believe in Christ without assurances: for what assurances can be more evident than these, which we see foretold and fulfilled, you, then, who think there are not assurances why you ought to believe of Christ things which you have not seen, *attend to what you see. Behold in Christ, that is, in the seed of Abraham, all nations are blessed*, you see it and are amazed," cap. 3. n. 5. He adds, cap. 4. n. 7, attend to me, the church says to you (the Heathens), attend to me, whom you see, though you be unwilling



ling to see : the faithful who were in the land of Judea, then present, learned the facts which then happened, the wonderful Nativity, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension of Christ; all his divine words and actions. These things you have not seen, and therefore you refuse to believe. But look on this; reflect on what you see, not on what you are told is past, or on what you are forewarned is to come, but on what is now shewn present. . . . You have not seen what is predicted, (Isaiah vii. 14) ‘*Behold a Virgin will conceive and bring forth a Son;*’ but you see what was predicted to Abraham, (Gen. xxii. 18) the word of God, and fulfilled “*in thy seed all nations shall be blessed* ; you have not seen what was predicted of the wonderful works of Christ,—Ps. xlv, 9, “*Come and see the works of the Lord, the prodigies which he has placed on the earth,* but you see what was predicted, (Ps. ii, 7–8) “*The Lord said to me, thou art my Son. . . . . ask thou of me, and I will give thee nations an inheritance, and the bounds of the earth a possession.*” All the mysteries of religion, as well the past, that is, the Birth, the Death, the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, as the future, that is, the last Judgment, the Resurrection of the Dead, the Pains of the Damned, and the Glory of the Just, St. Austin demonstrates to the Heathens on this one principle, that these mysteries are predicted in the same scriptures, in which the church is predicted, catholic, visible, and perpetually existing, and as these predictions of the church, are undeniably verified, he concludes that the other mysteries are equally true. Thus he proceeds in his demonstration, Ch. 5, n. 8 : “*As the intentions of friends which cannot be seen are believed on the signs which indicate them, so the church, which is now seen, of all those things, which are not seen, but are shewn predicted in the same writings in which the church is itself predicted, is the index of the past, and fore-teller of the future.*” St. Austin’s argument is now, as it was then, of irresistible force. If we believe this Edinburgh Castigator, he, and all the Fathers

thers were utter strangers to these pretensions of the church. How miserably his spirit of divination deceives this castigating pastor! St. Austin was no stranger to the pretensions even of his new-modelled church: there were many of them in his days, and he knew how to distinguish them from the Church of Christ, on the stability and universality of which he founded his demonstration of christianity against the heathens. His discourse on pastors is now before the writer, from it he makes a few extracts for the satisfaction of this castigating pastor—the venerable prelate cites these words from Ezekiel xxxiv: “My sheep stray on every mountain, and on every elevated hill, and on the face of the whole earth my sheep are scattered.” From these he concludes: “the sheep are straying on the whole face of the earth, not that *all sectaries* are on the whole face of the earth, but yet there are *sectaries* on the whole face of the earth: *some here, some there*, from no place are they excluded, they do not know each the other. There is one sect in Africa, another in the East, one in Egypt, another in Mesopotamia, for instance—in different places, they are different, but it is the same mother Pride, which brought forth them all, as it is our one Catholic mother, which gives birth to all Christians dispersed in the whole world: it is not surprising that pride should give birth to dissention, and charity to union, yet the Catholic mother, and the great pastor, by her ministry, every where seeks the wandering sheep; strengthens the weak; cures the languid; binds up the broken, some from these, some from those, who do not know each the other, but the catholic mother knows them all, because she is diffused with them all. Thus, for instance: the sect of Donatus is in Africa, the Eunomians are not in Africa, but the catholic mother is here; the Eunomians are in the East, the sect of Donatus is not there, but the catholic church is there with the Eunomians, the catholic church, is like the vine encreasing, in all places diffused, they, are like the useless branches lopped off by the cultivator’s pruning knife,  
on

on account of their barrenness, that the vine may be cleared, not that it might be cut down. Where these branches are lopped there they remain, but the vine knows its own branches, which remain in it, and the branches lopped off, which remain by it, from thence she recalls the wandering; because, of these broken branches, says the apostle, God is able to engraft them again; whether you say sheep straying from the flock, or branches lopped from the vine: for God is not less capable of recalling the straying sheep, than of engrafting again the lopped branches, because he is the chief shepherd and the sovereign cultivator."

After some severe strictures on these pastors, through whose neglect the sheep stray from the fold, and on these, who neglect to recall the stray sheep, Austin says: "if a bishop, constituted in the Catholic church, does not give a good account of the sheep, when he does not recall one, that strays from the flock of God, what account will the A Catholic give, who not only does not recall from error, but forces the sheep into it?"

As the Donatists, against whom St. Austin reasoned more particularly, pretended that the sacraments were not validly administered but by pastors exempt from sin, he proves both from the old and new testament that it is Christ himself, who feeds his flock by the ministry of their pastors, of course that the validity of the sacraments is totally independent on the good or bad qualities, the virtues or the vices of the ministers. The Lord says by the prophet Ezekiel, xxxiv, 10: "*Behold I to the pastors, and I will seek my sheep from their hands, and I will make them to cease from feeding the sheep.*" Austin remarks, that when God said he would dismiss the pastors of the Jewish church from the care of his flock, reproaching them with their neglect, he did not say: "I will constitute other good shepherds, who will attend to these duties, which you have omitted; but he says: I myself will feed my sheep: I will commit them to no other: you my brethren, you the sheep are safe, we  
(the

(the shepherds) may have some reason to fear." From the old testament Austin descends to the new; he cites these words from John.x. 27. "The sheep, which are mine, hear my voice, and follow me." Here, continues Austin, I find all good pastors in one pastor, not that good pastors are wanted, but they are in one, they who are divided are many, but here one is announced because unity is recommended. The pastors are not unnoticed, and one pastor only mentioned, because the Lord does not find a person, to whom he would entrust his sheep, and then entrusted them, because he found Peter, in Peter himself he recommends unity: there were many apostles, to one only is said: feed my sheep. Far be it from us to think that there are no good pastors now; far be it from us; far be it from the mercy of him who begets and constitutes them. If there be good sheep there are also good shepherds, for of the good sheep, the good shepherds are made; but all good shepherds are in one, are one *unum sunt*, they feed, Christ feeds, the friends of the bridegroom, do not speak their own word: they rejoice because of the voice of the bridegroom. He himself then feeds when they feed. He says: *I feed*, because in them is his word, in them is his charity, and Peter himself, to whom he entrusted his sheep, as one to another "*quasi alter alteri*" he willed to make one with himself, that he might thus entrust his sheep to him; that he might be the *head*, that he might bear the figure of the church, and that, as the bridegroom and the spouse, they might be two in one flesh . . . . . Let them (the Donatists) speak their own word; let us see if it be the word of Christ; if it be the voice of the shepherd, whom the sheep follow; whether the word be spoken by a good man, or a bad man, is it the word of Christ? The stray sheep seeks the fold. You say the church is of the party of Donatus, I want the word of the shepherd. Read me this from the prophet, from the psalm, from the law, from the gospel, from the apostle: from all these I read *the church diffused all over*  
*the*

the world, and the Lord saying, *the sheep, which are mine, hear my voice, and follow me.* What is the voice of the shepherd? "*There will be preached in his name repentance and remission of sins through all nations, beginning from Jerusalem,* Luke xxiv. This is the voice of the shepherd; attend to it, and follow it, if you be a sheep."

The Donatists affected to justify their schism on the pretence, that the ordination of Cecilian, bishop of Carthage, was null, because he had been ordained by Felix, bishop of Aptung, who had, as they pretended, given up the scriptures in the persecution; and as the Roman pontiff Melchiades, or, as he is sometimes called, Miltiades, had, in a council at Rome, declared the ordination of Cecilian valid, without inquiring whether Felix had, or had not given up the scriptures, a question of fact, difficult, if not impossible to determine; the Donatists separated themselves from the communion of the pope, and of the catholic church, which he then governed; to shew the folly of this pretence, St. Austin continues: "But these men gave up the books; and those again offered incense to idols; this man, and that man; what do you tell me of this man and that man? If they done so, they are not pastors; but let me hear the voice of the shepherd, you do not speak the word of the shepherd of these men: you neither produce the gospel, nor the prophet, nor the apostle, who speaks of this, or that man, these I believe of him; others I do not believe. You produce acts, (the depositions of witnesses against Cecilian) so do I, (depositions in his favour) let us believe yours, do you believe mine; I do not believe yours; do not you believe mine; let these papers be removed; let us hear the Divine words, produce me one word of scripture for the party of Donatus; hear innumerable for the whole world. Who can enumerate them? However, let us enumerate a few: the first covenant of God: "*in thy seed shall all nations be blessed*—(Gen. xxii, 18); in the Psalm (ii. 8) *ask thou of me and I will give thee nations thy inheritance, and thy possession*  
the

*the boundaries of the earth; all the extremities of the earth will remember and will be converted to the Lord (Ps. xxi, 28;) and all the kindreds of nations will adore in his presence; for the kingdom is the Lord's, and he will reign over nations—(ibid;) sing to the Lord a new song, let the whole earth sing to the Lord—(Ps. xcv, 1;) and all kings shall adore him; all nations shall serve him—(Ps. lxxi, 11.)* Who is able to enumerate them all? Almost every page sounds nothing else but Christ and his church diffused in the whole world. Let me now have one word produced for the party of Donatus. Is it a great thing, which I ask? They say the church diffused in the world is to perish. Is it to perish by so many testimonies predicted to continue? That word is not from the law, nor from the prophets, nor from the canticles of the shepherd: hear the voice of the word (Jesus Christ) from the mouth of the word (of Jesus Christ,) admiring the faith of the Centurion, he said: “*I say unto you I have not found so great faith in Israel; wherefore I say unto you that many will come from the East, and from the West, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven*” (Luke xiii, 29.) From the East *many*, and from the West *many*: behold the church of Christ! Behold the flock of Christ! See if you be a sheep, the flock, which is every where, cannot be concealed from you; you will have no reply to make to your Judge, whom you do not desire to be your Shepherd, you will, I say, have nothing to reply, I did not know, I did not see, I did not hear. Why is it that you did not know? There is no one, who concealshimself from his heat. Why is it that you did not see? All the boundaries of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. Why is it that you did not hear? Their sound is gone out into the whole earth; and their words to the extremities of the earth” . . . . .

What does our Edinburgh castigator think of this reasoning? Is it conclusive? Or is it not? If it be, what a melancholy prospect before him! If it be not, there is no truth in man: for never was reasoning of more ir-

resistible force, more impressive evidence, or more universally applicable. The castigator says this pope was a wicked man; that other pope cursed the doctrine of the scriptures; the popish clergy are corrupt; papists disregard oaths, &c. To all these accusations Austin replies: is that the voice of the shepherd, whom the sheep follow? In what book of the scriptures do you read it? This is the voice of the shepherd: "*obey your guides and be subject to them, for they watch over your souls as being to give an account,*"—Heb. xiii, 17. These virulent invectives with which the castigator feeds his flock, are not found in the scriptures; they are his own words, not the voice of the shepherd, who says: "*the sheep, which are mine, hear my voice, and follow me,*"—John x.—See St. Austin's reply to the accusations against the popes Marcellinus, Marcellus, Sylvester, Melchiades, &c.—Review, p. 74.

In passages which he cites from Athanasius, Austin, and Jerom, or rather which he transcribes from his repository, the castigator's spirit of divination discovers that these Fathers knew nothing of the infallibility of the church. Athanasius says, what no Catholic ever denied or doubted, "that we ought to pray for the spirit of discretion, that every one may know what to receive and what to reject: a faithful disciple of the gospel is able to distinguish between truth and pretence, because he has the spirit of discerning, but the simple is carried away by every colour." What then? Is it not the spirit of discretion, which enables the illiterate mechanic to distinguish between the true pastor of the church, from whom he learns the truth, and who feeds him with the word of Christ, from the false teacher, from whom he hears nothing but pretence, and who feeds him with his own words, as this castigator and his associates feed their disciples with the tales of wicked popes, and wicked bishops, &c. of which there is not a word in the scriptures. Is it not to prevent the simple from being carried away by every colour, or, as St. Paul expresses it, by every

every *wind* of doctrine, that Christ gives pastors and teachers to his church? Eph. iv. Athanasius believed the church infallible in her doctrinal decisions, as did Austin and Jerom, as all Catholics do, and always did; in his letter to Epictetus, cited by Epiphanius, Her. 77, he expressed his surprise that they would move any question on matters decided in the Council of Nice, the decrees of which could not be changed without error; and in his treatise on Synods, having shewn that the Synods of Selucia and Rimini had been assembled by the intrigues of the Arians, under pretence of establishing the faith of Jesus Christ, but in reality in order to subvert the definition of the Council of Nice, after which there is nothing more to be examined. He therefore thought the decision of Nice final, of infallible authority, otherwise it would have been subject to examination; and Austin says, Ep. 162, that the last judgment of the church is a general council. The castigator finds in his repertory a garbled passage from Austin's works, which in the sense intended by that prelate is strictly true, but no more to the castigator's purpose than the former, "the church," says Austin, "ought not to set herself above Christ, [who ever doubted it?] for he always judges according to truth; but ecclesiastical Judges, being men, are frequently mistaken." The castigator's familiar spirit forgot to inform him, that St. Austin did not speak of doctrinal decisions, but of personal crimes, which are proved by the deposition of witnesses, the truth or falshood of which is not, nor cannot be known to the ecclesiastical Judge; "from this censure," continues the castigator, p. 189, "Austin does not even exclude general councils," nor does this writer: for in personal crimes, such as the fact then in dispute, whether Felix of Aptung, or Cecilian of Carthage, or even the pope Melchiades had given up the scriptures or not, the church claims no infallibility of decision, for the reason already assigned, such facts are no parts of the deposit of faith; no part of that doctrine, with which Christ feeds



feeds his sheep by the ministry of his church : no Catholic is obliged to know that ever such men existed ; but when St. Austin speaks of doctrinal decisions, he says the judgment of a general council is the last, it is subject to no change. Thus, in his 3d. B. against Maximinus, cap. 14, he says : “ this is that ‘ *homoousion*,’ ( ‘ *consubstantiality* ’ ) which, in the council of Nice, against the Arian heretics, was, by the catholic fathers, confirmed by *the truth of authority, and the authority of truth.*” So universally was it believed that the decision of a general council, on any doctrinal question, was final and of infallible authority, that it was inserted amongst the laws of the empire by the emperor Martianus. *L. Nemo. C. de summatrinitate & fide catholica.* The castigator inadvertently informs his disciples that in the primitive christian church there were ecclesiastical Judges ; these ecclesiastics were vested with some spiritual authority, they exercised some spiritual jurisdiction : for a Judge without authority or jurisdiction is an exotick ; it may perhaps be found in the regions of new modelled fancy. Is it a christian church in which there is no ecclesiastical Judge ? no spiritual authority or jurisdiction ? The castigator, who is never weary of transcribing, adds another passage from St. Austin, in which that Father says, “ that he learned to pay that deference to the canonical scriptures of believing their authors to have erred in nothing ; but others, though ever so learned or holy, he read so as not to take any thing to be true, because they were of that opinion, but because they proved it by reason or scripture.” What is this to the purpose ? Who ever thought any writer, not divinely inspired, infallible ? Though we, catholics, pay the greatest deference to Austin’s authority, we do not believe himself infallible ; some of his opinions we reject. In matters of opinion, of which St. Austin spoke, a wise man will adopt that which seems to him most consonant to scripture and to reason ; doctrines of faith, which this castigator ignorantly confounds with opinion, the catholic believes on the authority of revelation,

tion, and that such doctrines have been revealed; he knows by the testimony of the pastors of Christ's church, by whose ministry that great shepherd feeds his flock; the sheep which are his, hear his voice, not the idle tales of ranting enthusiasts, of preaching cobblers and tailors, &c. St. Austin, never thought of confounding the doctrines of the church with the opinions of individuals, the latter he says he believed, if proved by scripture or reason; of the former he says: "since, therefore, we see so great protection from God, such progress, such fruit, shall we hesitate to repose ourselves in the bosom of his church, which, even to the confession of mankind, has obtained the summit of authority by the succession of bishops from the apostolical see? Sectaries condemned, partly by the judgment of the people themselves, partly by the weight of councils, partly by the majesty of miracles, in vain bark around; to refuse a pre-eminence to this church, '*cui nolle primas dare,*' is of the most consummate impiety, or precipitous arrogance: for if there be no certain path for souls to wisdom and salvation, but when faith forms them rather than reason, what is it to be ungrateful to the divine assistance and protection, if not to resist with obstinacy the authority predicted? And if every art, however mean or easy, requires a teacher or a master to be understood, what more full of pride than to be unwilling to understand the books of the divine mysteries from their interpreters, or to condemn them not understood?" *Lib. de uti cre. cap. 17, n. 35.* Is it this Father who sends the inexperienced youth to fish for tenets of religion in the scriptures? Even the cobbler must have a teacher or a master to understand his art, however simple it may appear, to send him to sound the depths of scripture, in which Austin and Jerom too found great if not insuperable difficulties! The thought is extravagant, it surpasses absurdity: there is something of madness in it.

To shew the profound respect which Austin had for the authority of the church the writer repeats a passage, which

which he has already cited : “ the truth of the scriptures is observed by us when we do that which has pleased the whole church, which church the authority of the scriptures themselves commends ; and since the holy scripture cannot deceive, let whosoever fears to be deceived, by the obscurity of this question, consult the same church on it, which the holy scripture shews without any ambiguity.”—*Lib. Con. Cresc. c. 33, n. 39.* Austin was, therefore, of opinion, that obscure and difficult questions were to be decided by the authority of the church without fear of deception. Is that authority fallible which decides obscure questions without fear of deception ? Was Austin an utter stranger to the infallible authority of the church ? Thus an infatuated populace are duped by imposture : with unblushing confidence they are told that the Fathers are utter strangers to the doctrines, which are found in almost every page of their works. Have not all general councils retrenched from the communion of the church the refractory, who refused to acquiesce in their decisions ? Why so ? Because it was the settled, the established, the universally believed doctrine of the Catholic church, that the decision of a general council, at which Christ assists according to his promise, *where two or three are assembled in my name*, is on every question of faith infallibly certain : for if ever men are assembled in the name, that is, by the authority of Jesus Christ, it is when the pastors of his church are assembled to decide on questions of faith ; to resist the impetuous fury of ravening wolves, and chase the wily foxes from the fold ; and if ever Christ feeds his flock by the ministry of the pastors, which he gives to his church, it is when all these pastors unite, and with one voice declare that, such is the doctrine revealed by Christ to their predecessors, the doctrine transmitted to them in regular succession, the doctrine they found established on their accession to the episcopal chair : this therefore is the voice of the great shepherd ; they who are of his flock hear it and follow him. The castigator  
does

does not hear it. Why so? Because he is not of the flock: "*you do not hear me, said the Saviour to the Jews, because you are not of my sheep,*"—John x, 26. The castigatōr—a son without a father, a successor without a predecessor—teaches a doctrine, not that which he found on his accession to a vacant chair, for there was no chair vacant for him, but that, which he invented or borrowed from some other, a Luther, or a Calvin, a Brown, or a Whiston, God knows from whom. Is it the voice of the great shepherd? He tells his disciples that the pope is anti-christ, that popish bishops are impostors, that papists are corrupt and bad men, that the church is invisible, that it is subject to error, that it has fallen into ruins, &c. In what book of the scriptures does he read all this? In what scriptures is there one word of it to be found? Is this the voice of the great shepherd? Is it not manifestly the whining of the wolf in sheep's clothing, inveigling the sheep from the cares of the shepherd? For supposing all these tales of popes and friars as true as many of them are notoriously false, they are not the word of God; it is not the voice of the great shepherd; it is not with such tales that Christ feeds his flock. This is the voice of the shepherd; this is the word from his mouth: "*if he does not hear the church let him be to thee as a heathen.*"—Matt. xviii, 17. If ever the church speaks distinctly, so that her voice cannot be mistaken or misunderstood, it is by the unanimous and united voice of her pastors in council assembled. This also is the voice of the shepherd: "*obey your guides and be subject to them: for they watch over your souls, as being to give an account,*"—Heb. xiii, 17. This also is the word of God: "*the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law from his mouth.*"—Malachi, ii, 7-8. The castigatōr corrects this version: "*the lips of the priest,*" he says, "*should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth.*" He is doubly unfortunate: the correction encreases the force of the passage: for *should* or *ought* implies a greater obligation than *shall*  
or

or will, and attempting to display his erudition, he exposes his ignorance: the terms *jishmerou* and *jibaksbou* in the original are translated by Jerom "*custodient*" and "*requirent*;" "*mepibou*" is not *at his mouth*, but *from his mouth*. The prophet assigns the reason why the priest ought to possess knowledge, and why the people ought to learn the law from him: "*because he is the messenger of the Lord*;" "but," says the castigator, "the Jewish priests were wicked men. Some were, it is true, not all: Jeremias and Ezekiel were priests, they were not bad men; but whether wicked or not, it is not the less true that it is the official duty of the priest to teach the people the law, and their indispensable duty to learn the law from him: because, says the prophet, "*he is the messenger of the Lord.*" because it is by him that God speaks to his people, not by every enthusiast, who is his own messenger, who runs without being sent, who speaks the ravings of his own disordered brain; as this castigating pastor, who tells his disciples that all papists, of whom he does not perhaps, know an individual, are bad men; let us now suppose these papists, whom he so piously hates and so religiously calumniates, as wicked as he finds it convenient to represent them; who will ensure me that he himself is not as wicked as any one of them? He says, no doubt, that he is a Saint, and perhaps believes it, so did the Pharisee in the gospel: "*I am not like other men*;" he asserts his honesty and veracity; so do thieves before conviction, and some even at Tyburn, but let him say or believe what he will, this is irresistibly true, that he is not the messenger of the Lord, from whom the people are obliged to learn the law; that he is not one of these pastors, by whom Christ the great shepherd feeds his flock.

When Bossuet, the celebrated bishop of Meaux, had collected all the confessions of faith published at different times by the two grand divisions of the reformed churches, the first, in time, under Luther and his associate Melancton, though the precedence had been disputed by

by Zuinglius, who, with Calvin, presided over the second, with all their subdivisions, which were numerous in their own time, and since that time are become innumerable, and had compared these confessions of faith one with another, and had also compared the confession of faith published on one year with the confession published by the same division on the ensuing year; and had with that precision and strength of reasoning peculiar to himself, pointed out all the contradictions, inconsistencies and absurdities, of these new-fangled confessions of faith, the pastors of the reformed churches were seriously alarmed; as he had produced none but the most authentic documents, their synodical decisions subscribed by their ministers, and their catechisms approved and taught in their churches, all evasions and subterfuges were precluded: the whole of the Reformation became defenceless. The immediate consequence was, that men of information, unprejudiced and disinterested, were undeceived, wherever the work got into circulation, and the language in which it was written understood. Where interest and prejudice unite to warp the understanding, truth finds no access; the miracles of Christ only served to exasperate the Pharisees and increase their aversion to his person; it is not therefore matter of surprise that the ministers of the reformed churches were inaccessible to the truth, though enforced by the persuasive eloquence and irresistible reasoning of a *Bossuet*. In that alarming crisis they racked imagination to continue the deception, which had formed the party, over which they presided, with a more absolute authority, than ever was exercised by any one of these popes against whom they railed incessantly. They collected from incorrect writers incoherent opinions, some well and some ill founded, not one of which was a doctrine of faith; and some opinions from moral writers, which had been censured and retracted, or the authors condemned; these they artfully confounded with doctrines of faith, to shew, as they pretended, that the Catholic church itself had varied in its faith; Jurieu went some-  
 O O thing

thing further : he pretended that the primitive Fathers, whose writings have escaped the ravages of time, had varied in their doctrine of the Trinity. The illusion was immediately detected by Bossuet himself, the doctrine of the church justified from misrepresentation, and shewn to have been at all times invariably the same. The artifices of Jurieu, Claude and some others, produced that inimitable work, *The perpetuity of the Faith*, by Arnaud and Nicole, which was refuted, as usual, by the most scurrilous invectives and a torrent of abuse. From this repertory our Edinburgh castigator transcribes, and, what they artfully contrived to continue a deception, which had placed them at the head of a party, he obtrudes on the credulity of his admirers, as the fruits of his researches in antiquity.

To enable the reader to form a correct idea of an opinion, which Christians are free to adopt or reject, and thereby place the artifice of these innovators in a proper light, the writer gives a signal instance : whether the last chapter of Deuteronomy, in which Moses' death and burial are described, was written by Moses himself, or added by Josue, or some other writer, is meer matter of opinion, which any man may adopt or reject without the suspicion of heresy ; but if he were to deny that the chapter is divinely inspired, he would cease to be a Christian. Why so ? Because it is declared by the authority of the Catholic church to be a part of the scriptures divinely inspired, and entrusted to her care, as is the gospel of St. John : the certainty of the revelation of both rests on the same authority, the man, therefore, who rejects the one, may also reject the other.

The writer gives a second instance of an opinion, which, though authorised by Austin and Jerom and others, no man is obliged to adopt. In the Homily on Pastors, from which some extracts have been already cited, Austin says : "in the prophet Jeremias, some one cries out : *the partridge collects what she did not produce* . . . . . This partridge, by some of our ancestors, treating

treating on the scriptures before us, is understood to be the Devil collecting what he has not produced ; for he is not the creator but the deceiver, he collects his riches without distinction ; he does not inquire whether a person errs in this or that manner, he desires that all may be deceived, and by all sorts of errors : how many different sects there are ! how many different errors ! He does not say : they are Donatists, not Arians : for whether they be Donatists or Arians they are his, who collects without distinction : let him adore idols, says he, he is mine ; let him persist in the superstition of the Jews, he is mine, let him, having broken the unity, fall into this or that sect, he is mine, he collects, therefore, without distinction, and makes his riches." Whether by that partridge, which collects the eggs she did not lay, the Demon be understood or not, is meer matter of opinion, which notwithstanding the authority of Austin and Jerom, and these more early writers of whom Austin speaks, no Catholic is obliged to adopt ; but that a Heathen, a Jew, or a Sectary is not in the catholic communion, is a doctrine of faith. Austin does not extend this severe censure to all Sectaries : he confines it expressly to persons, who, having been catholics, renounce that communion and unite with some sect : "*desertã unitate,*" he says, elsewhere, that they, who support a false opinion, without animosity, disposed to submit to the truth when clearly exposed, and more particularly if it be an opinion which they receive from their parents, are not to be numbered amongst Sectaries : of such a person Austin says. B. 4, of Bap. against the Don. ch. 16, p. 23 : " this man I do not yet call heretic, unless after the doctrine is made manifest to him he had rather resist the catholic faith, and chuse to adhere to what he held . . . . in him there is only a false opinion to be corrected."

The catholic reader is informed that he is not obliged to adopt the opinion of any writer, however great his authority, as a doctrine of faith, if many writers of great



great authority coincide in the same opinion, it is rashness, but not hereby, to contradict it, and argues a fund of pride in the individual, who sets his own private opinion, or the opinion which he borrows from some other not better informed than himself, in opposition to the united opinion of so many superior to him, and his teacher, in point of information. If all these writers, whom we call Fathers of the Church, or, indeed, all the writers of any age, unanimously teach a doctrine, we must conclude, that it is the doctrine of the church, which is at all times invariably the same: because their united and uncontradicted testimony is incontestible evidence of the fact, that such was the doctrine then taught; the discipline of the church is, and has been in some of its parts variable, and adapted to circumstances, times, places and persons: thus in the primitive times, the fast of the Lent was continued until three o'clock in the evening every day, and no collation allowed; now the meal is taken at twelve, or some short time before, with a light collation in the evening. If at any time the opinion of an individual be found to deviate from the doctrine universally taught, it is a false opinion; if obstinately persisted in, and publicly taught, in opposition to the settled doctrine, it is an heretical opinion; if the author forms a party he becomes the leader of a sect, is one of these false teachers, who separates themselves, whom St. Paul calls heretics.

After citing these passages from Athanasius and Austin, which serve to swell the volume, our castigator makes an attempt to reason. If the church of Christ be not deprived of his Divine cares and assistance, it is not his fault: he most anxiously desires it; so does that spirit of illusion, which he consults: "infallibility is claimed," says he, p. 190, "by the body of pastors united with their head." From this principle he concludes, that to preserve this prerogative in the church, the pope and his clergy ought to be always in Council, *ibid.* The writer gives him credit for this argument: it must be  
of

of his own invention. How unfortunate it is, that in the only attempt to reason, which is found in a number of pages of such profound erudition, the conclusion which he draws is not found even by implication in the principle. For the body of catholic pastors are not more united with their head in council than out of council; they are at all times equally united with him and with each other, by the profession of the same faith, participation of the same sacraments, the same hope: that society which we call the Catholic Church is, if St. Paul does not mistake, *one body*—Eph. iv; animated with one and the same spirit: “*I will ask the Father and he will give you another Comforter, that he may remain with you for ever*”—John xiv, 16; in it there is “*one faith*”—Eph. iv; “*one hope*”—ibid; “*one baptism*,” ibid; it is “*one flock and one Shepherd*”—John x, 16, who does not entrust his sheep to the cares of others, but feeds them himself: “*I will feed my sheep*,”—Ezekiel xxxiv, 15. By the ministry of these pastors whom he sends: “*who hears you hears me, and who despises you despises me*,”—Luke x, 16, “*behold I am with you all days until the consummation of the age*,”—Matt. ult. by these pastors, thus united amongst themselves, and with their head, the supreme pastor feeds his flock according to his promise; hence it follows that if any prelate or pastor teaches a doctrine of his own invention, or borrowed from the inventor, a doctrine, which he did not find taught in the church, when he became a pastor, he breaks the unity of faith, the chain of succession, is no longer of the number of those pastors, by whom Christ feeds his flock; the instant a pastor substitutes his own conjectures, or the opinions which he borrows from others, to the settled doctrines of the church, in which he was baptised, he is a branch lopped from the tree, which cannot produce fruit: there is but the word of God efficacious, he substitutes his own, which is but an empty sound.

This union of all the members of Christ's church, which has escaped the notice of our Edinburgh castigator,

was

was known in these turbulent times between the apostle's days and the first general council, when, if we believe this castigator, Christ did not attend to the care of his flock; in those days lived Cyprian, from whose works we find some garbled extracts in the castigator's volume. His testimony, now before the writer, will, no doubt, be highly gratifying to him, he is one of these Popish Fathers, whom he has forced to condemn Popery. In his book on the unity of the church this venerable prelate says: "does he believe that he holds the faith who does not hold this unity? He, who resists the church, who withstands the church, does he think himself in the church? This same truth is taught by the holy apostle Paul: he shews the mystery of unity, saying (Eph iv) *one body and one spirit, one hope of your vocation, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God*, which unity we ought firmly to hold and vindicate, more especially we bishops, *who preside in the church*, [it seems that bishops did preside in the church in them primitive times, at least Cyprian thought so] that we may prove the episcopal order, '*episcopatus*,' one and undivided. Let no man deceive the fraternity by falsehood; let no man corrupt the faith by perfidious prevarication. The episcopal order is one and undivided, of which a part is held by each in its integrity, '*in solidum*.' *The church also is one*, which by the increase of its fecundity is more widely extended into a multitude; as the rays of the sun are many, and but one light; as the branches of a tree are many, and but one trunk founded in the tenacious root; when from one fountain many streams flow, though from the abundance of the flowing waters numerousness may appear; yet unity is preserved in the source. Separate a ray from the sun, unity does not bear the division of light; break a branch from the tree, it cannot bear fruit; cut off a stream from the spring, it will dry up. Thus the church of the Lord, perfused with light, emits its rays through the whole world, but the light is one, which is in all places diffused; nor is the unity of the body separated; it extends its branches

over

over the whole earth by the abundance of its fruitfulness ; it plentifully expands its flowing streams all around, but yet there is but one head, one source, one mother, abounding in the offspring of its fecundity, by its fruits we are nourished, by its milk we are fed, by its spirit we are animated." Why does this Edinburgh castigator express such anxiety to remove the Great Shepherd's pastoral cares from his flock ? Is it that he intends to substitute his own ?

In the next page he tells us " that the pope and his clergy may be very wicked men, and therefore, in a moral point of view, very unlikely to enjoy the presence of Christ and his Spirit." He has given so many specimens of new-modelled modesty already, that we must cease to admire it. The pope and his clergy, that is, in other words, the whole body of catholic pastors, a body composed of many thousands, amongst whom are found the most enlightened men on earth, men the most eminent for science and piety, may be very wicked men, and very unlikely to enjoy the spirit of Christ, and this our Edinburgh castigator, whose knowledge is correspondent to his modesty, is the only good man, the only pastor likely to enjoy the presence of Christ and his divine spirit ! Are there men so infatuated as to be duped by such monstrous presumption ? The writer replies, that as it is unquestionably true that Christ, the Great Shepherd, feeds his flock by the ministry of these pastors, whom he gives to the church for the work of the ministry, for the perfection of the saints, not by the ministry of these pastors who send themselves, or are sent by others not better qualified than themselves, and equally true that, though there may be a bad man amongst the pastors of his institution, as there was a Judas amongst his apostles, the whole body is not the less under his divine protection, consequently not the less sound and good. The man who believes, or pretends to believe, that Christ gives to his church a wicked body of pastors for the work of the ministry, for the perfection of the saints,

saints, (Eph. iv.) either does not believe the truth of his promises, or his power of performing them, and consequently is not a Christian. This supposition of our Edinburgh castigator, only exposes the weakness of his head, or the malignity of his heart, it can neither disqualify the pastors of Christ's institution from feeding his flock, nor justify the intrusion of self-appointed pastors whom he does not send.

In the next page there are assertions which the ignorance of this scribbler may excuse, if advanced by a man of real science they have a most dangerous tendency, being equally subversive of civil and ecclesiastical authority: "it will be granted," says he, "that God, who opened the mouth of Balaam's ass, may at times use the agency of very wicked men, and also that authority may be connected with many ill qualities." Authority, therefore, may be vested in a man, who has some bad qualities; John Ball, Watt Tyler's chaplain, was of the same opinion: he did not think natural qualities, whether good or bad, inconsistent with authority, but as sanctity, in his idea, was the foundation of all authority, he thought, or pretended to think, that sin was absolutely incompatible with it, and Watt Tyler, with his army of saints, did, in a most saint-like manner, enforce this doctrine: they divested all these sinful magistrates and prelates, who fell into their sanctified hands, of that authority, which of divine right belonged to the saints exclusively. Is this Edinburgh castigator one of these new-modelled saints? Is he one of the children of the promise, who, yet in the wilderness, are destined to expel the Canaanites from the land? He admits, it is true, that a wicked man may be a passive instrument as was Balaam's ass. Is it that this braying animal from Edinburgh does not know that, between a passive instrument and a rational agent vested with active authority there is an essential difference? His next assertion is more clearly expressive of that monstrous doctrine, which in Tyler's days deluged England with blood, and made

Bohemia

Bohemia a slaughter-house for more than twenty years — See Review : “ this writer,” he says, p. 192, “ ought to recollect that good qualities and authority ought to be *inseparably* connected in a Christian bishop.” This is worse than Bull’s doctrine : for Bull did not exact good qualities as the foundation of authority, he thought sanctity, whatever might have been the natural qualities of the mind or the body, sufficient, nor did he think bad qualities sufficient to cancel authority : he thought sin necessary for that : thus, for instance, irascibility is a bad quality, but anger is a sin. Irascibility, in Bull’s opinion, did not divest either the magistratè or the prelate of rightful authority, but anger did. That this castigat<sup>r</sup> exacts good qualities as indispensably necessary to authority is manifest from what he adds by way of proof : “ the bishop,” he says, “ must be blameless as well as the husband of one wife.” He cannot be understood to speak of the bishop’s duty as a Christian : for it is the indispensable duty of every Christian to be blameless ; this quality therefore he exacts as being indispensable to his episcopal authority. Amongst these good qualities, which he exacts, there is one of late invention ; that is, “ the bishop must be husband of one wife.” It is perhaps the first time that a wife has been numbered amongst qualities. The writer knows that, in the catalogue of modern virtues, from which modesty, obedience and chastity, have been expunged, as obsolete ; and the propagation of the human species substituted, to have one wife, at least, is a virtue ; but, not having this castigat<sup>r</sup>’s familiar spirit to consult, he did not know that a wife is a good quality : a quality, say philosophers, is that property, either absolute or relative, which makes the subject such or such : thus whiteness makes a man white, and blackness makes a man black, and a wife makes a man wived ; be it so. The bishop, therefore, must be a wived man ; so thought a right reverend prelate in former times, if that busy tattler common fame tell truth : having lost a first and second loving quality,

knowing that he must be a wived man, he applied for a third; but the lady, perhaps not disposed to become one of the castigator's qualities, in the common acceptance of terms called wives, or not clearly conceiving the indispensable necessity of an old prelate's being wived; or perhaps thinking that a bundle of dry bones, wrapt up in a parchment skin, shrivelled by the piercing cold of seventy hoary winters, could be neither useful nor ornamental in her bed chamber, alarmed too at the appearance of a skeleton, which, if we may believe a certain writer of no small authority, she mistook for the ghost of her grand-father, modestly but peremptorily refused to wive him. It is presumed that the lady, who in point of understanding was inferior to few, if any of her cotemporaries, reasoned in this manner: though it be true that this right reverend prelate must be wived, as the precept strictly obliges him, yet there is no precept which obliges me to be his wife, he may therefore be wived by some other. The reader will pardon this sarcastical stricture when he considers that there is something offensive to common sense, and common decency, in this canting on the necessity of propagating the human species, on the impossibility of perpetual chastity, &c. with which every paltry scribbler stuns our ears, that it is irksome seriously to refute such a nonsensical jargon.

The apostle Paul, in his 1st epistle to Timothy, iii. enumerates the qualifications of a man, whom that arch-bishop might with safety institute bishop of any city, under his jurisdiction, he must, says the apostle, be free from reproach, the husband of one wife, that is a man who after the death of his wife, or other legal dissolution of his marriage, did not contract a second marriage. That this is the intended sense of the passage is manifest, because it was never lawful for a christian to be the husband of two wives at the same time, he might in succession, because death dissolves the matrimonial bond, and the apostle did not direct his disciple to institute a Jew or Heathen bishop of any city. St. Paul sufficiently explains

explains himself: for he adds immediately after "*having children*" *tekna echonta*, he does not say "*begetting children*", for that was never allowed in the christian church. The apostles, of whom one or two were married, forsook all things to follow Christ. Behold, said Peter, we have left all things, and followed thee.—Matt. xix, 27. To follow Christ, in the inspired writings, imports neither less nor more than to imitate his virtues, of which chastity was unquestionably one, though, in the opinion of this castigatour, it may be antiquated; the apostles therefore did not retain their wives: for wives were not then qualities; they were something more substantial. The apostle Paul was not married, nor were his disciples Timothy, archbishop of Ephesus, and Titus, archbishop of Crete. Of the apostle there can be no doubt: for he himself expressly says it: 1st Cor. vii, after giving some directions for the conduct of married persons, the apostle says: "I say to the unmarried and widows, it is good for *them*, if they continue as I do; but if they *do not contain* themselves let them marry.—8. Southwell, in that monstrous compilation, which, with unparalleled effrontery, he calls the bible, translates *ei de ouk egkrateuontai* "if they cannot contain themselves," substituting his own words to these of the apostle in order to deceive the ignorant, as if there were persons who cannot contain themselves. The original phrase is so simple, so clearly expressed by the apostle, that the most ignorant school-boy, who knows any thing of Greek, cannot mistake it: that Timothy and Titus were not married is attested by a cotemporary writer, of great authority, Ignatius of Antioch, in his epistle to the Philadelphians.

There is, perhaps, no part of Catholic discipline so offensive to all Reformists as this continency, which the church proposes to her ministers on their admission to holy orders. The discipline itself is not of divine institution: for no such precept is found in the scriptures, nor does tradition attest that any such injunction was given by Christ himself to his ministers; that he approved



proved the discipline is certain from his reply to Peter—Matt. xx, 29: “every one, who has forsaken houses, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or lands, for sake of my name, shall receive an hundred fold, and inherit eternal life.” The wife is found amongst other things which may be meritoriously forsaken to follow Christ; but to approve a discipline is not to enjoin it; there are many things approved which are not strictly enjoined: this, therefore, cannot be taken as a precept, consequently the continency of the ministers of the church is of human, not of divine right. It is of course dispensable as all human laws may be modified or cancelled by the same power which enacts them.

St. Thomas says that a vow of continency is annexed to holy orders by a decree of the church in 2, 2, q. 88, art. 11. Bellarmine thinks that, though this discipline be not of divine right, it is of apostolical institution. The reasons which he offers in support of his opinion, if not absolutely irresistible, are not easily eluded. St. Paul, in his epistle to Titus, whom he had left at Crete to institute priests in the cities of that jurisdiction, enumerating the qualifications pre-requisite, says, of the Bishop, “he must be *sopbróna*,” an ambiguous term, which imports *sobriety*, *prudence*, or *chastity*, as the subject matter may require. In this place St. Jerom says it implies “*chastity*,” but as *chastity* is itself an ambiguous term, because there is conjugal chastity, as well as, virginal chastity, the apostle corrects the ambiguity by adding the term “*egkrate*,” which imports “*contingency*,” an uncontroled power over the mind and body. In that phrase it cannot be understood in any other sense; for though it may signify “*temperance*” that sense is sufficiently implied in the term ‘*sopbróna*,’ and would render the term ‘*egkrate*,’ redundant, a defect which is seldom if ever found in that apostle’s writings: he therefore exacts continency in the ministers of the church.

In his first epistle to the Corinthians vii, giving instructions for the conduct of married persons, the apostle directs

directs them not to defraud each other of their conjugal rights, but requires that they would at certain times restrain themselves, and devote these times to fasting and prayer; but the whole time of the ministers of the church is, or at least ought to be, devoted to fasting and prayer, they are, therefore, by the apostle's directions, at all times excluded from these rights, which are at certain times allowed to others not engaged in the ministry.

In his second epistle to Timothy ii, the apostle says to that prelate: "thou, therefore, endure evil as a good soldier of Jesus Christ: no man, who warreth, entangleth himself in the affairs of life," that is, in temporal concerns: it is needless to say that the man who has a wife and family to provide for, must entangle himself in the concerns of life. This, therefore, is prohibited by the apostle.

Independently on these passages, found in the apostle's writings, which sufficiently explain St. Paul's mind, on the subject, there is a testimony of great weight in support of Bellarmine's opinion. In the Council of Carthage, assembled under the consulship of Valentinian and Neoterius on the 16th of the calends of July, that is, on the 16th of June, 390, at which Genethlius, the archbishop of Carthage, presided, and many bishops from different provinces assisted. The continency of the ministers of the church was said to be of apostolical institution. The second canon of the Council is thus expressed: "*omnibus placet ut Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel qui contrectant Sacramenta, pudicitiae Custodes etiam ab uxoribus se abstineant, ut quod Apostoli docuerunt et ipsa servavit antiquitas nos quoque custodiamus,*" that is, "it is agreed by all, that bishops, priests, and deacons, or they who meddle with the sacraments, the keepers of chastity, abstain even from wives, that *what the apostles taught*, and antiquity itself observed, we also may observe." It was believed by all these venerable prelates assembled from different provinces, that the continency of bishops, priests and deacons, was of apostolical institution. If any thing could add to the force

force of this testimony, it is the approbation of the y of Carthage, in 398, composed of 214 Prelates, at which St. Austin assisted, the 3d C. is thus conceived: "It is decreed that bishops, priests and deacons, *according to former statutes, abstain from wives*; if not, let them be removed from the ecclesiastical office;" add to this, that the discipline, which they say antiquity observed, is found to have been universally observed before the Council of Nice; it must, therefore, descend from the apostles according to St. Austin's rule: "it is understood that these things, which though not written we observe on tradition, and which are observed by the whole world, are ordered by the apostles themselves, or by plenary councils, the authority of which is most salutary in the church—ad. Jan. Epif. 118, c. 1. At the council of Elvira in Spain, which was assembled near the close of the Persecution, under that remorseless tyrant Maximinus, at which Osius of Cordova, Sabinus of Seville, Flavius of Elvira, Liberius of Merida, Valerius of Saragossa, a celebrated confessor, with other venerable prelates assisted, it was ordered, Can. 33, that bishops, priests and deacons, and all other clerks engaged in the ministry should abstain from wives.

In the Council of Neocesarea in Cappadocia, at which Vital, patriarch of Antioch, presided in the year 314, it was ordered, that if a priest presumed to marry he should be deposed.—*Can. 1.*

These Councils were celebrated before the Council of Nice, the discipline therefore, was not introduced by a General Council. In the Council of Nice the question was not discussed, but there is a canon which supposes it to be universally observed: "the holy synod absolutely forbids the bishop, priest, or deacon to have any woman in his house, if it be not a mother, a sister, or an aunt, or such persons as banish every suspicion, *ē à mona profopa pasan úpopsian diápepheugen.*"—*Can. 3.* This canon manifestly supposes the ministers of the church in a state of continency: for if they were married, the prohibition would

would have been not only useless but ridiculous, a wife is neither a mother, a sister nor an aunt. To tell a married man that he must not have his wife in his house surpasses absurdity; and where there is a wife, her sisters, her maids, her gossips and visitants must have access.

Hence it appears that Sozomen was misinformed, when in his history, written about 236 years after the council of Nice, he said that Paphnutius engaged the prelates there assembled, to permit bishops and priests to cohabit with their wives. Such a permission is irreconcilable with their decree. Innocent I. better informed than Sozomen, knew no such permission: In his decretal letter to Victricius, bishop of Rouen, dated the 15th of the calends of March, under the consulship of Honorius and Aristeret, that is, the 15th of February, 404, one hundred years before Sozomen was born, and but 69 years after the council of Nice, the pontiff says: "the church must in all things observe that priests and levites (deacons) be not carnally united with their wives because they are occupied in the necessary works of the daily ministry; and it is written 'be you holy because I am holy,'—(Lev. 11) for if in old times the priests did not depart from the temple of God during the year of their ministry, as we read of Zacharias, (Luke i.) nor did they return at all to their house, though, on account of the succession, they were permitted to marry, because it was ordered that none should be admitted to the priesthood but of the descendants of Aaron, how much more strictly should these priests and levites observe chastity from the day of their ordination, whose ministry is without succession, and no day passes on which they are not obliged to attend to the divine sacrifices or the office of baptism." It will be admitted that this pontiff, one of the most learned and pious prelates of ancient times, knew the decrees of the council of Nice better than a court-lawyer, who gives conjectures founded on vague report. Innocent I. not only attests the discipline but assigns

assigns the motive, and justifies it, by the example of the Jewish priests, who abstained from their wives during the time of their ministry, and the authority of the apostle. He thus continues: "for as Paul, writing to the Corinthians, and saying, '*abstain for a time that you may attend to prayer,*' gives this precept to the laity; priests, whose unremitting duty is to pray, and sacrifices ought much more strictly for ever abstain from such connexion," and Jerom, better informed than Innocent, or, perhaps, than any man of that age, or any other, assigns the same reason, founded on the same authority: "if, says he, in his book against Jovinian, "a lay-man, or any Christian, cannot pray without abstaining from the conjugal office, the priest, who is obliged at all times to offer sacrifices for the people, must always pray, therefore he must always abstain from marriage."

Leo the Great, in his letter to Anastatius, bishop of Thessalonica, in the year 445, says: "so excellent is the destination of priests, that these things, which, in other members of the church, are free from fault, in them are held to be unlawful: for though it be lawful for those, who are not of the clerical order, to engage in marriage and attend to the procreation of children, yet, to shew the purity of more perfect chastity, the matrimonial connexion is not allowed even to sub-deacons; that they, who have (*wives*) may be as not having (*them*), and they who have not, may continue single; but if in this order, the fourth from the head, it be just that this be observed, how much more strictly should it be observed in the first, or in the second, or in the third, that no man may be esteemed worthy of the levitical ministry, or the priestly honour, or the episcopal excellency, who is not known to restrain himself from the matrimonial enjoyments."

It is therefore true, that before the Council of Nice and after it, bishops, priests and deacons were obliged to perpetual continency. Some did not observe the law. True: there are many who transgress the laws of God and their country,

country, the laws are not the less strict, the less wife, nor are they the less obliged to observe them.

To that passage of St. Paul, in which it is said "the bishop ought to be the husband of one wife," St. Jerom replied to Jovinian "the episcopal election is with one: the apostle does not say, let a bishop be chosen, who will marry one wife, and beget children, but let him be chosen, who has had one wife, *mias gunaikos andra*, and who has children subject in all discipline. Surely you confess that he cannot be a bishop, who begets children from the time of his ordination 'in *Episcopatu*,' if he be detected he will not be considered as a husband, but condemned as an adulterer . . . . Husbands are chosen for the priesthood, I do not deny, because more priests are necessary than there are virgins;" that is, men of virginal chastity qualified for the priesthood. In the early ages it was hardly possible to find amongst the converts from the Jewish church, or from the heathen superstition, a sufficient number of men qualified for the ministry, who had lived in a state of continency to the age of thirty, at which the priesthood was conferred; hence it was not an effect of choice but of indispensable necessity, in many places, to assume for the ministry married men; but the injunction of the apostle was strictly observed, that they, who were chosen for the ministry, had been married but once, and then to a virgin: for he, who, either before or after baptism, had been married a second time, or had contracted with a widow, or with a woman known to be corrupted, was excluded from the ministry by the apostle's rule, as understood by the churches, which he himself had formed and taught; when a man was chosen, whose wife was yet living, both he and she were obliged to promise perpetual continency, and strictly to observe their promise. The husband from the apostolical rule: "The Bishop must be continent—*egkrate*," Tit. i, 8; and the wife by a necessary consequence of the rule; because the husband could not be admitted to the ministry without her consent; hence if even after the death of her husband she

presumed to break her vow, she, and the man with whom she contracted a second engagement, were separated or retrenched from the communion of the faithful: in the 1st Council of Orleans, about the year 314, chap. 15, it is ordered: "If a woman, the relict of a priest or deacon, unite in marriage with any other person, let them be separated, and if they persist encreasing the crime let them be excommunicated." And, in the Council of Pope Martin, in the year 572, it is said: If the widow of a bishop, priest or deacon, accept a husband, let her not communicate; when dying the sacraments may be administered to her.

The epicurean doctrine of modern reformists, who think the propagation of the human species a necessary accompaniment of the episcopal dignity, was not yet known to the christian world: the doctrine of St. Paul, who prefers a state of continency to the matrimonial state, in words as clearly expressive as language affords, was thought divinely inspired, and observed with great simplicity—see Review, 158 . . . where this question is discussed. Vigilantius, a profligate priest of Barcelona, in the beginning of the v. Age; and Jovinian, a more profligate monk, about the same time, undertook to undeceive the world; of the latter Jerom says: "Since he boasts to have been a monk, and from the fable monastic cowl, and sandals, from the measure of bread and water, he has returned to the fashionable dress, all white; to the most excellent wines and best cooked dishes; to the soups of <sup>1</sup>Apitius and <sup>2</sup>Paximus; to the bath; to the pastry cook's shops, and the taverns; is it not manifest that he prefers earth to heaven, vice to virtue, and his belly to Christ?" What, if he had heard the German Apostle preaching to his disciples: "As it is not in my power not to be a man, so it is not in my power to live without a wife, and that is more necessary for me than to eat or to drink, or to satisfy the other necessities of the body

1. A celebrated cook mentioned by Juvenal.

2. A Greek, of great renown amongst Epicureans, mentioned by Suidas.

dy . . . if wives be obstinate, it is fit that the husbands tell them ; if you will not, another will ; if the mistress will not, the maid will come?"—Luther's sermon, cited by Pluquet. What would Jerom have said, if he had heard the whining cant, for declamation it cannot be called, of modern reformists against all *unprofitable austerities*.

That a state of continency in preference to the matrimonial state is recommended, though not enjoined in the gospel and the apostolical writings, is denied by none, if not by those, whose ignorance is not only contemptible, but degrading: learned protestants admit it, Grotius, in his commentary on the 1st epistle to the Corinthians, vii ; Forbes, in his first book of moral Theology ; and Dodwell, in his second dissertation on the chronology of popes, amongst Pearson's posthumous works, acknowledges, that, in consequence of St. Paul's advice, virginity was esteemed, and many virgins instituted in the time of pope Clement, of whom St. Paul speaks in one of his epistles. We know from better authority than Dodwell that perpetual continency was in high repute ; and strictly observed by many in the apostle's days, and ever since down to this present day: it has been already shewn that Philip the evangelist's four daughters lived in a state of perpetual continency ; this is attested by St. Luke, Acts xxi, 8, and by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who calls Philip an apostle ; he was one of the seven deacons. Justin, the philosopher, who suffered martyrdom about the year 167, in his apology addressed to the emperors Titus Elius, Antoninus, and Lucius, the philosopher, to the Senate and Romans, in order to disabuse the Heathens, and vindicate the morality of Christians from misrepresentation, after citing these passages from the gospel which recommend chastity, and condemn even impure thoughts, says : " there are many men and women, who preserve their virginal purity to the age of sixty or seventy, having followed the doctrine of Christ from their infancy."

Athenagoras, a Christian philosopher, also, in his apology offered to the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius



us Verus, in justification of Christian morality, says : “ you will find amongst us many persons of both sexes who grow old in a state of perpetual continency, hoping in that state to be more perfectly united to God.”

Origenes, in cap. 15. ad. Rom. “ what we do beyond what is due, we do not do from precepts, for instance virginity is not paid from a debt, for it is not exacted by a precept, but it is offered beyond all debt ;” and in his 23d homily on the book of Numbers he says : it is certain that the perpetual sacrifice is impeded by those who are subservient to conjugal necessities, whence it appears to me that, to offer the sacrifice is his duty exclusively, who devotes himself to unceasing and perpetual chastity,” Eusebius of Cæsarea thought so too, in his first book of evangelical demonstration, ch. 8, he says : “ it becometh those, who are consecrated, and occupied in the ministry, and in the divine worship, to contain themselves from any commerce with their wives.” The Germanic apostle, that venerable patriarch of reforming memory, had not yet thundered out this new-modelled doctrine : “ *if the wife will not, the maid will come.*”

St. Jerom, in defence of his books against Jovianian, in which some expressions were thought to reflect on the matrimonial state, writes thus to Pamphilius : “ read, I pray you, and diligently consider the words of the apostle (1. Cor. vii.) and you will see that to avoid calumny, I have been much more indulgent to married persons than the apostle desired. Origenes, Dennis, Pierius, Eusebius, of Cæsarea, Didymus and Apollinaris have most copiously (*latissime*) explained this epistle, of whom *Picrius*, discussing the sense of the apostle, and proposing to elucidate this passage : ‘ *I would have all men as I am,*’ adds : ‘ *tauta legōn ò Paulos antikrus agamiam kerusseï*’ Paul saying this, publicly preaches *perpetual continency* “ *agamiam*” “ What then,” continues Jerom, pray is my fault? What severity? All that I have written compared to this one sentence are insignificant, *levissima.*”

In his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, St. Jerom says  
of

of Pierius, that from his great eloquence and perfect knowledge of dialectics and rhetoric, he was called the younger Origenes. But Jerom was a monk. True: and Pierius, of whom he writes, was fond of an ascetic life, "*miræ askestos appetitorem.*" They were monks of the old school, not hogs from the sty of Epicurus. The works of Jerom, yet extant, shew him to have been the most intelligent, and best informed man of his age; the writer adds, without fearing a contradiction, that his equal has not, since his time, been seen. The works of Pierius are unfortunately lost. They were extant in the fourth century when Jerom wrote; but the works of a man of greater authority, whom Jerom cites as his master, and to whom he says no Latin writer was equal, that is, Gregory of Nizianzen, are yet extant: he wrote a poem in hexameter verse, in which the virginal and matrimonial states are introduced disputing thus concluding: "*Suzugion potheontes omōs ge stephousi karēnon partheniēs Christos de didous gras amphoterōsi tēn men dexterē parestētai eggūthi cheiri tēn d'eteren laē kudās dete kai to megiston.* Even they who desire marriage crown the head of virginity: Christ, who gives a reward to both, will make the one (virginity) stand to the right near his hand, and the other (the matrimonial state) to the left, and that also is a very great honour,"

Let the reader dispassionately compare the doctrine of these ancients, confessedly the most correct, the most intelligent, the most accurate, and the most eloquent of ecclesiastical writers, whether Greek or Latin, with the canting dialect of modern reformists, and then judge, if it be true, as they pretend, that they have reassumed the form of the primitive church. Let him seriously reflect on a fact, which the world knows, that is, that Luther, Oecolampadius, with all their associates, were monks or priests of the church of Rome, baptised in that church, had made their solemn vows, and promises of perpetual continency according to the discipline of that church, which commenced with it, and continued without variation

tion until the time of their apostacy; that these men, in the face of the world, broke their vows and promises, regardless of a discipline authorized by the apostles, so venerable for its antiquity, and if he can then prevail on himself to believe, that the God of Truth and Sanctity, sent such un sanctified miscreants to reform his church, the writer is at a loss to conjecture, whom he would call emissaries of the Demon.

The facts stated are incontrovertible, the only question that can come under discussion is, whether these monks were obliged to perform their vows, or not; this question might, with some propriety, be discussed in the School of Epicurus: he is not a christian who doubts it; it is an axiom in morality, that a man, who, free from constraint, promises what is good in itself, lawful and possible, is obliged to perform his promise; that continency is good, lawful, possible, and even laudable, is true, or St. Paul was a false teacher: in his first epistle to Corinthians, vii, 1, the apostle says: "*it is good for a man not to approach a wife.*" *"Kalon anthropō gunaikos mē aptēsthai,"* and he adds, v. 27: *art. thou not bound to a wife? le-lusa apo gunaikos; do not seek a wife?" mē zētēi gunaika.* If the apostle called that which is *bad, unlawful or impossible, good*; or if he exhorted Christians to practise that which is *bad, unlawful or impossible*, he was a false teacher; *continency*, therefore, which he called *good*, to which he exhorted the faithful, is neither bad in itself, unlawful nor impossible; hence it manifestly follows, that these reforming monks, and priests, and all these nuns, whom they seduced from their convents, were perjured apostates: this is not an abstruse question; the man must be unaccountably stupid, who does not conceive it.

In this epistle we find the apostle's solution of some difficulties proposed to him by the Christians of Corinth: "of these things, concerning which you wrote to me: it is good for a man not to approach a wife. (or woman) *gunaikos*; but on account of fornication, let each man have his own wife, and each woman her own husband,"

Vii. 1-2. It is hardly possible to recommend continency with greater force; Pierius was justified when he said that Paul publicly preached perpetual continency: for the apostle recommends continency even in the married state, it is true, he requires the mutual consent of both parties, for without it that virtue is not regularly practicable in the married state. "It is good," says he, "for a man not to approach a wife." As there is nothing opposite to good but evil, and the conjugal rights exempt from evil, the apostle may be understood by the term *kalon. good*, to express the idea of *useful* or *expedient*, this is the greatest latitude that can be admitted; hence we must conclude that though conjugal access be allowed to prevent a very great evil, that is, fornication, it is not expedient for the salvation of the parties; could the apostle more expressly recommend continency? The apprehension of evil does not render that which is good or expedient, in itself, bad or inexpedient; but it authorises that, which is inexpedient, to prevent what is criminal; however great the impediments in the true path, it is better to persevere in it, than deviate from it; but if the apprehension of evil be removed, a wise man in his choice of means will give the preference to that which is good, and expedient: the step is more steady even in the true path when all impediments are removed. The apostle continues: "Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence, and in like manner the wife to the husband." Benevolence is of indispensable necessity, whether they live in a state of continency or not, hence the apostle strictly enjoins it, and immediately adds: "the wife has not the power of her own body, but the husband, in like manner the husband has not the power of his own body, but the wife." This truth presupposed, he says: "do not you defraud one the other, if it be not by mutual consent for a time for the exercise of fasting and prayer." This observation justifies the truth of his first assertion, that it is not expedient for a man to approach a wife; and gives weight to the advice, which he gives to the  
 unmarried

unmarried, to persevere in that state : for what can be more inexpedient than to depend on the will of another person for the exercise of fasting and prayer, which, however despised and neglected by the disciples of Epicurus, was thought expedient and useful by Paul, his fellow apostles, and their disciples ? Yet, however inexpedient conjugal access, it is lawful, and may prevent a great evil, hence the apostle permits them to resume the exercise of their marriage rights after they have spent some time in fasting and prayer, “lest,” says he, “Satan tempt you on account of your incontinency.” To convince them that their return to these rights, from which they had abstained by mutual consent, was not a duty, the apostle declares it to be simply a permission and indulgence : “this I say according to permission, not according to precept : “*touto de lego kata Sugnomien ou kat' epita-gên.*” The apostle exhorts to what is good and expedient, and he permits what is inexpedient but to prevent a great evil : in the ensuing words the apostle explains his thoughts without reserve : “I would have all men to be as I am myself.” The apostle was not dependant on the will of another : he was sole master of his will, as he was of his body, which he chastised with stripes and reduced to servitude, lest whilst he preached to others he should himself be reprobated. *Alla upōpiazō to sōma mou kai doulagagō mēpōs allois keruxas autos adokimos genētai.* The apostle, if we believe himself, thought these austerities, which chastise the body and keep it in a state of subjection, indispensably necessary to avoid perdition ; our modern reformists think *them unprofitable*. Southwell, who could not think of informing his readers that the apostle used stripes to punish himself, it has such an appearance of popish superstition, translates *upopiazō, I keep under*. Let his reader consult Schrevelius' lexicon, he will find “*upōpiazō,*” *plagis contundo, domo, validis ietibus subjecio reluctantem.* The reader will pardon this short digression, as St. Paul was well aware that it is better to continue in the true path, though rendered difficult by number-  
less

less impediments than to stray from it entirely, he permits married persons to enjoy the privileges of their state, warns them of their danger, and intimates his wish, that, to remove all impediments, they would by mutual consent live in a state of continency, "*that they, who have wives, may be as not having them.*"

After giving his instructions to persons engaged in the married state, the apostle instructs those who are free from such an engagement: "but I say to the unmarried and to widows: it is good for them if they persevere as I do; but if they do not contain themselves let them marry; for it is better to marry than burn." As in his instruction to married persons he permits the use of marriage not as good or expedient, but through the apprehension of danger, as a part of the cargo is sometimes thrown into the sea to save the vessel from sinking, so, in his instruction to the unmarried, he permits the contract for the same reason, "if they do not contain themselves let them marry; for it is better to marry than burn" (be burned). Southwell's version of this passage, besides being horribly impious, insults mankind: he makes the apostle say: "*if they cannot contain themselves.*" What! Is it that there are Christians who cannot contain themselves? A young woman who cannot be married in early life, or according to her rank in society, must she prostitute herself? There is no mean: she must contain herself, or prostitute herself. A wife in the absence of her husband, or a husband in the absence of his wife, must they break their promise of fidelity? What impudence to assert it? If the apostle had said it, his epistle would never have found a place amongst canonical writings. Southwell calumniates the apostle: he gives his deluded readers the suggestions of the Demon of uncleanness for the doctrine of the God of Truth and Sanctity. These are the scriptures to which our modern Reformists invite their readers! In these they must find the faith without which it is impossible to please God! The words of the apostle are so clearly intelligible that

they cannot be misunderstood, this impious version is, therefore, an intended fallhood: *ei de ouk egkrateuoniat gamefatofan*, "if they do not contain themselves, let them marry." The apostle permits marriage to prevent crimes; he does not prescribe it as a preservative against temptations: for a temptation however great does not burn, it is the consent of the will, which constitutes the crime, it is the crime which burns, not the temptation, which may be repelled. The alternatives shew how strongly prepossessed the apostle was against the matrimonial state, considered as an impediment in the way of salvation, though he admitted it to be lawful and honorable. After giving some instructions to Christians, who were engaged in marriage to Heathens before their conversion to the faith, St. Paul resumes the comparison between the married and the unmarried states, and most persuasively recommends the latter: "concerning virgins," says he, "a commandment of the Lord I have not; but a counsel I give as having received mercy from the Lord to be faithful, I think therefore this to be good on account of instant necessity; because it is good for a man to be so. *Art thou bound to a wife? Seek not to be loosed. Art thou not bound to a wife? Do not seek a wife.*" What could the apostle say more? Could he direct married men to dismiss their wives? It would have been impious. Could he order unmarried men to desist from engaging in the matrimonial state: no, he had no such precept from the Lord. It is a maxim that what is not forbidden is lawful, however inconvenient or inexpedient it may be, the apostle therefore permits what is lawful though inexpedient, and advises that which is also lawful, and expedient: "if," continues he, "thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry she hath not sinned; but such will have tribulation in the flesh; and I spare you." The apostle had already urged one motive to engage the unmarried to persevere in a state of continency: because it is expedient for salvation to be absolutely independent on  
the

the will of another. To this motive, which is a strong inducement to embrace a state of continency, he adds another, which deters a judicious man from the matrimonial state—the married will have tribulation in the flesh; and I spare you. There are crosses in the married state, and mortifications unavoidable, which the apostle expresses with great energy, calling them “*tribulation in the flesh*”, *thlipsin de tē sarki*. Of these he warned his disciples, expressing his wish that they should avoid them, “*I spare you.*” In his reply to the first question he advised continency by mutual consent, because it is expedient for salvation. After giving directions to the unmarried, he presses the same advice on this general motive: “because the time is contracted,” “*ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς συνεστῆλμενος,*” it therefore remains that they who have wives be as not having them.” . . . “The figure of this world passes, I would have you free from solicitude, the unmarried man is solicitous about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is solicitous about the things of the world, how to please the wife.”

The apostle did not think the benediction conferred on our first parents to people the world, (a benediction not confined to mankind exclusively; for it was given in the same terms to the beasts of the field) a precept which obliged their descendants now that the world is full of people; he thought it full time to think of peopling that world, for which we were originally intended, hence with all his powers of persuasion he advised his disciples to begin here on earth that state of perfect continency which will continue for ever hereafter: “when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels who are in Heaven,” —Mark xii, 25. If the state of the Elect after the Resurrection be a state of perfection, which no Christian will presume to deny, perpetual continency is therefore a perfection. Hence follow two consequences, the first that the apostle was justified in recommending it, the

second



second that he who condemns it is not a Christian. What will be the fate of these sacrilegious monks who renounced it? Or what the fate of their successors, who so strenuously endeavour to continue the delusion?

There are ecclesiastics in the Greek church in communion with the See of Rome, engaged in the matrimonial state. Yes, but they are engaged before their admission to orders, and are never allowed to contract a second engagement, nor are they permitted to ascend to the episcopal order in the enjoyment of that privilege, which the persevering importunity of the Greeks, after repeated refusals, at length extorted on some unlucky day. In the year 691, about eleven years after the sixth General Council, some prelates assembled at Constantinople, in the hall of the palace called Trullus, and, assuming the name of a Council, though not called by proper authority, nor acknowledged, they pretended to make canons of discipline, which the fifth and sixth General Councils had not done, hence that Assembly was called by the Greeks *Penthektè*, and by the Latins *Quinisextum*. In their third canon they say: "the Romans are attached to the exactness of rule; they who depend on the See of Constantinople have more condescension, we combine both in order to avoid excess, wherefore they who have been twice married before the 15th of January of the last fourth indiction of the year \*6199, shall be deposed; they whose marriages have been dissolved before that day, shall be continued in their rank, but interdicted from all functions; in future we renew the canon, which prohibits the ordination of bishop, priest or deacon, or of any person in whatever rank in the Clergy, who shall have been twice married, or who shall have had a concubine after baptism, or who shall have married a widow, or a divorced woman, or a courtesan, a slave, or a comedian." This is a renewal of the 16th and 17th of the apostolical canons which are thus expressed; 16th: he,  
who

\* The fourth indiction of the year 6199 of the world, corresponds with the year 691.

who after baptism has been engaged in two marriages, or has had a concubine, cannot be a bishop, priest or deacon, or finally of the sacerdotal catalogue, "*ex Consortio sacerdotali,*"—17th : he, who has married a widow, or a woman separated from her husband by a divorce, or a prostitute, or a slave, or any of these women engaged in the public shews, cannot be a bishop, priest, or deacon, or of the sacerdotal community."

The Assembly continues : "as it is found in the canons, that readers and choiristers only are allowed to marry after their first admission, we forbid all sub-deacons, deacons, and priests to marry under the penalty of deposition ; if therefore any of them desire to marry let them do it before they enter into any of these orders." The canon to which they allude is the 26th of the apostolical canons : it is thus conceived : "of these who unmarried are entered amongst the clergy, '*qui Cœlibes in Cleram pervenerunt,*' we order that readers only and choiristers may marry if they will."

The assembly of Trullus say in their 11th can. because we know that in the church of the Romans it is tradition in the order of the canon : "*επειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν ταύτῃ Κανονί παραδεδοσθῆναι διεγνόμεν,*" that they, who are to be ordained bishops, priests or deacons, must confess that they will not cohabit with their wives ; but we, following the perfection of the ancient apostolical canon, desire that the marriages of these, who are in holy orders, subsist without depriving them of the company of their wives but in the proper times ; so that if any one be thought worthy to be ordained sub-deacon, deacon or priest, he shall not be excluded on account of being engaged in lawful marriage, and at the time of his ordination he shall not be required to abstain from the company of his wife, not to dishonour marriage, which God has instituted and blessed with his company ; we know also that the Fathers of the Council of Carthage have ordered, that sub-deacons, deacons and priests, should abstain from their wives, according to proper terms, that

that following the apostolical tradition we may observe the time of every thing, principally of fasting and prayer : for it is necessary that they, who approach the altar, should be perfectly continent at the time when they touch holy things, that their prayers may be heard." The canons which they cite, is the fifth of the apostolical and the 3d canon of the Council of Carthage, already cited, both misunderstood or mistated, and manifestly distorted from the intended sense : the apostolical canon says : "let not the bishop, priest or deacon, reject his wife under the pretext of religion ; if he rejects her, let him be secluded from the communion, and if he perseveres let him be deposed." The canon was understood at all times, and by all churches, before this assembly awkwardly attempted to distort it, to prohibit bishops, priests and deacons, assumed to the ministry on their promise of continency, from dismissing their wives from their care ; they were strictly obliged to provide them with all the necessaries of life.

The canon of the Council of Carthage is mistated perhaps through the ignorance of their interpreter : it is thus conceived : " it is decreed that bishops, priests and deacons, according to former statutes, '*secundum priora statuta,*' abstain from wives ; if not, let them be removed from the ecclesiastical office." The interpreter to the assembly, whether through ignorance or malice is doubtful, translates the Latin terms *priora statuta* former statutes by the Greek terms *idios orous* which signify *proper terms*, and the assembly concludes that the obligation of continency was confined to certain times, that is, as they explain it, to the times of their ministry in the church, which is not continual in the Greek church as it is in the Latin church.

In all attempts at innovation, inconsistencies are unavoidable : the Assembly of Trullus gives a striking instance of this truth : the canons, which they cite, speak in the same manner of the bishop, priest and deacon ; and in that sense they were always understood. Leo I. in his  
epistle

epistle to Rusticus, bishop of Norborne, written in the year 443, that is 248 years before this Synod of Trullus was assembled, says : " the law of continency is the same for the ministers of the altar, as it is for the bishops and priests, who whilst laymen or readers might lawfully marry, but when they entered into these orders, what before was lawful, began to be unlawful, wherefore that a carnal marriage may be converted into a spiritual marriage, they must not dismiss their wives, but have them as if they had them not, so that charity may continue, and the use of marriage rights may cease." —Epi. 99, cap. 3. The Assembly of Trullus acknowledges that these canons forbid the bishop to cohabit with his wife. Why not the priest and deacon? The canons make no distinction : they say, can. 11th, " Having learned that in Africa and other places there are bishops, who make no difficulty of cohabiting with their wives after their ordination, *to the great scandal of the people,* (by the bye they did not think that a bishop must be a wived man) we forbid them to do so in future, under penalty of deposition ;" and in the 48th can. they say : " that the wife of him, who is to be admitted into the episcopal order, being separated from him by mutual consent, after his ordination shall enter into a monastery distant from the place of the bishop's residence, who shall, notwithstanding, provide for her subsistence : " a provision for her subsistence was at all times indispensable, when the husband was assumed to the ministry with the wife's consent, without her consent he could not be admitted. Humbert, in his reply to Nicetas, a petulant Greek, says : " we confess that it is not lawful for a bishop, priest, or deacon, on pretext of religion, to dismiss his wife from his care, that is, that he must supply her with food and raiment, but he must not cohabit with her in the usual manner. Thus we read the apostles to have done. The apostle Paul says, 1st Cor. ix, have we not the power of conducting about a sister woman *adelphēn gunaika* as the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord

Lord, and Cephas, see, you fool, continues Humbert, the apostle does not say: "have we not the power of *cohabiting* with a sister woman, but of conducting her about that she might be supported at their expence, not that the use of marriage might subsist between them." Our reformists translate the terms—*adelphēn. gunaika*—a sister, a wife, to induce a belief that the apostle was married, though he himself attests the contrary; so untenable is error, that every attempt to support it is fruitless: the version, supposed true, condemns them: for the terms *sister* and *wife* cannot be understood of the same woman in any other sense but this, that she who is a wife is become as a sister. That, however, is not the genuine sense: the term *adelphēn, sister*, is assumed as an adjective, and signifies a *christian, adelphēn gunaika, a christian woman*.

The reader, accustomed to the railing of every scribbler against that popish superstition *continency*, will be surpris'd to find that this virtue of late invention, the propagation of the human species, so indispensably necessary, and so piously observed by all the ministers of the new school was not known to the primitive church; that the Assembly of Trullus, in all their researches, could find nothing in antiquity to countenance their innovation but these two canons which they could not fit to their purpose; nor was the innovation so very great in appearance: it only extended to permit priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, to cohabit with the wives, which they had married before their ordination, and obliged them to abstain during the terms of their ministering. However, from them we learn that continency in the Clergy was the invariable rule of the Roman church; "we have known," say they, "that it is delivered in the order of the canon *en taxi kanonis*, that they who are to be ordained deacons or priests must profess that they will not cohabit with their wives; this, therefore, was the invariable rule until the year 691, when the Synod of Trullus was assembled, since that time the fact is indisputable: this innovation in universal discipline made  
by

by the Synod of Trullus, was severely censured by the Latin church. Humbert, legate to Leo IX. in his refutation of Nicetas' libel against the Latins, says: "I am not surpris'd that you impute to Pope Agatho, and the venerable Fathers of the sixth Synod, your own ravings, and the canons, which you have corrupted or forged, since you impute fictions to our Lord Jesus himself and to his apostles. Knowing that the sixth Synod was assembled to suppress the heresy of Greek monothelites, not to give new constitutions to the Romans, we entirely refute these chapters, which you obtrude under its authority, because the first and the Apostolical See has not at any time received them, nor hitherto observed them."

Anastafius, the librarian, in his preface to the seventh Synod, says: "of the regulations, which the Greeks pretend to have been made in the sixth Synod, these only are received in this, which are found not to be contrary to former canons, or decrees of the venerable pontiffs of this Holy See, or to good morals. Though hitherto they have remained totally unknown to the Latins, because they have not been translated, nor are they found in the archives of the other patriarchal Sees, though they use the Greek language; because when they were passed none of these was found promulgating, consenting or even present, though the Greeks say that the same Fathers who composed the sixth Synod published them, but this they cannot prove by any authentic document."

Independently on this testimony of Anastafius, who first translated the acts of that Assembly, we have their own acknowledgement: they say in their address to Justinian Rhinotmetus, then emperor: "whereas the most holy and universal Synods, the fifth under Justinian Augustus, and the sixth under Constantine Augustus, your Father, after declaring the mystery of faith from the Fathers, *Patrokas*, did not make canons as the other four universal Synods did."

The pretence of the Greeks that the same prelates

who composed the sixth Synod were present at the Assembly of Trullus, is totally unfounded: Tharassius of Constantinople, and Peter of Nicomedia, in the fourth session of the seventh Synod, admitted, that four or five years intervened between the dissolution of the sixth Synod and the commencement of the Assembly of Trullus. Fleury says eleven years intervened, Anastasius better informed than Fleury, says that twenty seven years had past, and his testimony is supported by Theophanes, who was present at the seventh Synod, in the year 787.

Whatever modern Greeks may think of the authority of that Assembly over the district immediately subject to the patriarchal See of Constantinople, its dispositions could have no force in the other patriarchates. From the innovation then introduced by the authority of that Synod we conclude, with unerring certainty, that it was invariably the rule, with Greeks as well as Latins, that a profession of continency was exacted from all these, who, in a married state, were admitted to holy orders. Of the Latins there can be no doubt: the Assembly acknowledges it. Of the Greeks it is equally certain: for if the privilege of cohabiting with their wives had been enjoyed by their priests and deacons before, they would not then have granted it.

The writer has been induced to discuss this article accurately, in order to undeceive, not this Edinburgh castigatour, for men who endeavour to embarrass truth in order to deceive are not to be undeceived, but some Catholics who seem to think the promise of continency, which the church exacts of her ministers, a severe restraint, and express an opinion that to effect a reconciliation it might, perhaps ought, to be removed in favour of certain nations. The writer has no opinion on the subject: he confines himself to shew that, this discipline, however severe it may appear, is of primeval institution, authorized by the example, and, he believes with Bellarmine, by the precept of the apostles, strictly observed by all these lights of the church, whom we call Fathers.

Our

Our castigator, whose sagacity is not confined to these things, on which his turbid imagination bestows an existence, discovers that papists are the only people, who claim infallibility as distinctive of the true church: "if infallibility be the distinguishing characteristic of the true church, how then," says he, p. 193, "was it never claimed by any but papists since the apostles' days, though heretics in all ages have declared themselves to be the true church of Christ?" It is therefore the characteristic of an heretical conventicle to declare itself the true church of Christ without claiming the prerogative of infallibility. So says the castigator. Does the man understand himself? He admits that papists, since the apostles' days, did claim infallibility of decision as distinctive of the true church, and that this claim was not made by any heretical conventicle; papists, therefore, are not to be numbered amongst sects: they make the claim, which no sect has made, and they have continued to make this claim since the apostles' days; it is therefore of apostolical original. Thus he inadvertently and injudiciously informs his readers, that this doctrine of infallibility has been invariably taught in the true church of Jesus Christ, and denied by all sectaries; to gratify his curiosity, the writer assigns a very simple reason why infallibility of doctrine is claimed by papists, as he calls us catholics, and disclaimed by all sectaries. We believe the truth of Christ's words; and we know that he promised to be with these pastors and teachers, whom he gives to his church for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, until the consummation; and we know also that it is not by false doctrine that the saints are perfected: "they, who worship God must worship him in *spirit and truth*,"—John iv, 24. Sectaries make no such claim, for reasons equally simple: the first, because Christ has promised them nothing, if not punishment for disobedience; and the second, which bears no reply: because the leaders of all sects must pretend to correct errors; they must therefore in self-defence



defence deny the infallibility of Christ's church ; if they acknowledged it infallible there could be no errors to correct ; and to claim for a sect or conventicle of their own invention, a prerogative, which they are forced to refuse to the church of Christ's institution would expose them to the contempt of their followers. From this principle, which all sectaries must adopt, two truths are manifestly deduced, which render heresy inexcusable, the first that since the teachers of any sect whatever are so far from pretending to infallible doctrine, that they professedly disclaim it, the doctrine, which they teach is meer conjecture ; which may or may not be true, as is the nature of all conjectures, this truth is not to be eluded ; and the second is irresistible, that it is not the doctrine of Jesus Christ : for his doctrine is infallibly true, in it there is no conjecture.

Our castigator, who knows no other principle of proof but unblushing confidence in assertion, resting on the authority of his spirit of divination, "*thus saith ob.*" or of some garbled extract, fitted to his purpose, tells us, that the practise of papists is contrary to the laws of nature and of Christ, p. 193. Papists reply that calumny is contrary to the first law of nature, which heathens expressed in these few words : "do not to another what you would not wish him to do to you ;" they add that the father of lies is emphatically called a *Calumniator*. Is the epithet applicable to his *ob*? In the same page he says that the Church of Rome rejected parts of the canon of scripture which the Council of Trent recognised, and adds that the Council of Trent admitted into the canon books which were declared to be no part of the word of God. These assertions are simply false, his *ob.* has deceived him. When he shall think it convenient to specify these books rejected by the church of Rome, and recognised by the Council of Trent, and assign some reasons besides the authority of his *ob.* the writer will discuss them. The apostle Paul he says, prohibited the use of an unknown tongue in the church, unless accom-

panied

nied by an interpreter. He calumniates the apostle as he does the papists: St. Paul directs the man, who speaks in the church for the instruction or edification of others, to speak the language which they understand, or employ an interpreter; if there be no interpreter he very judiciously orders the man to be silent as to the people, to speak to himself and to God *éautō laleitō kai tō theō*, 1st Cor. xiv, 28—he does not prohibit the use of an unknown tongue; but he confines it to its proper use. His spirit of divination discovers an inconsistency between this pretended prohibition and a declaration of the Council of Trent: “the Council,” says he, “declared every person accursed, who should say that Mass ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue.” He calumniates the Council, as he does the apostle: they only were anathematized who say that it is contrary to the institution of Christ to celebrate the mass in any other but the vulgar tongue—see can. 9, Sess. xxii. He seems to know as much of the mass, or of the Council of Trent, as an indian does of the calculation of an eclipse. Does he know that the public instruction at the celebration of mass is according to St. Paul’s injunction, in the language understood by the people? That all the prayers of the Liturgy are addressed to God, who understands all languages? That even these are translated in catholic prayer books, so that instead of one there are many interpreters in the Church at the same time? To pass unnoticed the absurdity of calling the Latin tongue, an unknown language; is that an unknown language, of which a gentleman in any country would blush to acknowledge his ignorance? It is the language of all men of science, of all nations, though this castigator and his *ob.* may not understand it.

“The sixth General Council,” he says, “declared that marriage is dissolved by heresy.” The assertion is false, the Council made no such declaration. The contrary was declared by the Council of Trent. True, and justly, though this castigator may not believe it; this Council

Council, continues the castigator, decreed that the mystical benedictions, lights, incense, garments and other frippery, used in the Mass were apostolical traditions. Why not cite the decree? General assertions without any reference indicate imposture. There is no decree of the Council on the subject. In the fifth chapter of the 22d session, which is not a decree but a simple exposition of facts, the prelates say: "such is the nature of man that, without external aids it cannot easily be elevated to the contemplation of divine things, hence our pious mother, the church, has instituted some rites, as that some things in the Mass be pronounced with a low voice, and other things with a more elevated voice. She has also employed ceremonies, as mystical benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and many other things of that kind, from apostolical discipline and tradition, whereby the majesty of so great a sacrifice is commended, and the minds of the faithful by these visible signs of religion may be excited to the contemplation of the most high things, which are latent in this sacrifice." The prelates say that in the Mass the church employs many things from apostolical tradition, but does not specify what these things are, and, in their decree, they say: "if any man shall say that the ceremonies, vestments, and external signs which the Catholic church uses in the celebration of Masses, are rather incentives of impiety, than offices of piety, let him be anathematized,"—can. 7, sess. 22.

In opposition to the authority of the Council, the castigator cites a speech from Antoninus of Valetilina, which fills a page, and, whilst it swells his volume, exposes both his ignorance and his folly: Antoninus says: "It is plain, from all history, that every church antiently had her particular rite of the mass introduced by custom; that, to gratify the Pope, the Roman Rite had been introduced into a number of Provinces, though the Rites of many Churches are still very different from it; that the Roman Rite has also undergone great alterations, as is evident

dent from the book called *Ordo Romanus* . . . . That the vestments, vessels, and other ornaments of priests and altars, appear, from books, statues and pictures, to have been so much altered, that were the ancients to return into the world, they would not know them" . . . . Supposing the whole of Antoninus' discourse true, there is nothing in it inconsistent with the declaration of the Council : for the Council did not say that the Roman rite was the only rite in use in all churches, nor did it say that the Roman rite itself underwent no change, on the contrary it ordered that the ancient rite of every church should be strictly observed in that church : "*Retento ubique cujusque Ecclesie antiquo ritu,*" —chap. 8. sects 22, so that a Greek priest or an Armenian, though in communion with the See of Rome, is not allowed to celebrate Mass according to the Roman rite, nor in the Latin tongue. So much for the ignorance of this castigator ; hear now his folly : he cites a testimony to shew that Mass was celebrated in all churches in ancient times, but that each church had a rite peculiar to itself, and different from the Roman rite. It was not therefore from the Roman church that these churches borrowed this Mass, which was celebrated in all churches with rites differing from the Roman rite, and in many in a language which the Romans did not understand. This universal agreement in essentials, and difference in accidental rites, shew, with irresistible evidence, that this Mass, which the castigator so piously hates, is of divine institution in all its essential parts, and the accidental rites variable according to circumstances. Another consequence is deduced from this speech of the castigator's friend Antoninus, who does not seem to have more respect for the pope than he ought to have : he says that : "to gratify the pope the Roman rite had been introduced into a number of provinces." The pontiff's influence therefore was great, and widely extended, since, to gratify his holiness, a number of provinces substituted the Roman rite of celebrating the  
 Mass,

Mafs, to the rites of ancient ufe, in their own churches.

Something like the abortion of an argument had ef-  
 caped the writer's notice, he refumes it : " if," fays the  
 caftigator, p. 192, " a Council regularly held be infalli-  
 ble, why do they pretend to found their decisions upon  
 the authority of the Fathers ? None of thefe were in-  
 fallibly directed in their judgment." A Council, regu-  
 larly afsembled, founds its decisions in doctrines of faith  
 on revelation, on the authority of which all doctrines  
 of faith are believed, that fuch or fuch a doctrine has  
 been revealed is a fact, which is known by testimony, as  
 all facts are, not by metaphyfical difquifition, hence fol-  
 lows the indifpenfable neceffity of appealing to the testi-  
 mony of the pastors appointed by the apoftles, and con-  
 tinued in their lawful fucceffors, not to fhew that a  
 doctrine revealed is true : for the truth of the doctrine  
 refts on the authority of God, but to fhew that the doc-  
 trine was revealed : for this is a fact, the truth of which  
 refts on the testimony of thefe pastors, who received  
 thefe doctrines from the apoftles, a testimony from  
 which all fefts exclude themfelves. A Council cites the  
 Fathers to fhew, by their unanimous testimony, that  
 fuch was the doctrine transmitted to them by their pre-  
 deceffors in office, and whether any of the witneffes be  
 infallible or not, the united testimony of many intelli-  
 gent witneffes is infallibly true, though the caftigator,  
 or his *ob.* may not believe it. On the testimony of wit-  
 neffes, not more infallible than the caftigator himfelf,  
 a highwayman is fent to Tyburn.

He asks on what authority this writer explains  
 the doctrines of religion, as he has no infallibility to  
 direct his judgment or regulate his language,—p. 195 :  
 if this writer be a felf-constituted teacher, who fubsti-  
 tutes the ravings of his own imagination, or the fug-  
 gitions of his familiar fpirit, to the fettled doctrines of  
 his church, the queftion is propofed with great propriety ;  
 but if he confines himfelf to teach fettled doctrines, com-  
 mon

mon sense is sufficient to direct him ; if he deviates from the settled doctrines of his church, he has superiors, who know how to correct his errors ; that slender portion of Christ's flock entrusted to his care is not exposed to be the victims of his imposture, his malignity, or his ignorance : this unhappy fate is reserved for others, who having deserted the fold, are dismissed from the protecting cares of the Great Shepherd, and become the prey of ravening wolves and wily foxes.

Our castigator closes his fifth chapter with a passage of Isaias, in which the destruction of Babylon is foretold, and his *ob* has informed him that the prophecy was not fulfilled by the destruction of Babylon, Rome also must be destroyed in the same manner, or Isaias was a false prophet. As the writer has no confidence in the veracity of the castigator's *ob* and from the many specimens which he has already seen, believes him to be, what the prophet Michahou calls, *rouach sheker*, in plain English, a *lying spirit*, he will wait the event without anxiety.

The sixth chapter begins with a preamble, in which nonsense is rendered doubly disgusting by the air of gravity which it assumes : " the existence of a church," says the castigator, p. 197, " pre-supposes the appointment of certain principles for regulating the faith and practice of its members. For this purpose he to whom the church belongs has given a revelation of his will in the scriptures." What a jumble of incoherencies ! *The appointment of certain principles for regulating the faith.* He has forgotten to inform us to whom he gave this revelation in the scriptures before the church existed. Fixed principles of faith, and sound maxims of morality, must co-exist with the church and continue to exist in it whilst the church exists, that is, until time shall be no more ; but that the existence of the church pre-supposes these principles revealed in the scriptures before a line of the New Testament was written is rank nonsense. The apostles learned these principles of faith and maxims of morality from Christ himself, not from the scriptures, and

their disciples learned from them, not from the scriptures, hence St. Paul says "faith is from hearing,"—Rom. x, 17. In the same manner this Edinburgh castigat<sup>r</sup>'s disciples learn his opinions from himself. He tells them no doubt, that all his opinions are pure scripture, so did Arius, so did Eunomius, and that monster of impiety, Manicheas. Even the demon himself is said by the evangelist to have cited the scriptures, Matt. iv, 6.

If this castigat<sup>r</sup> knows any thing of the formation of Christ's church, he must know that the church was founded, formed and instructed, before a line of the New Testament was written; that when written it was deposited in her hands, and entrusted to her care; that on her testimony we know that the books, which we now call scriptures, are of divine original. We Catholics do not consult the Spirit of divination to learn facts which must be known by the testimony of witnesses.

After this preamble, in which the castigat<sup>r</sup> has surpassed himself, he returns to that hackneyed tale which has been a thousand times repeated in the face not only of truth, and conviction, but even of common sense; that papists detract, to use his own words, from the value of the scriptures. This writer, in his Remarks on Doctor Stanfer's Examination, p. 48, had said: "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 Rév. 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 axe 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

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 scriptures 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 itself 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 indescribable. 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 scriptures, take the scriptures for their sole rule of faith ? All reasoning is lost on the man, who would advance so great an absurdity.” The writer now subjoins the castigator’s observation on this reasoning : “ every little art,” he says, p. 198, “ and the meanest sophistry, has been employed,

to



to diminish the affection of men for the scriptures, and to excite their esteem for what has been maintained to be the oral tradition of the church, to promote these laudable purposes the R. (*this writer*) has expatiated in a very lengthy manner, and entered keenly into the spirit of these quirks and quibbles, which have been often found to be the principal support of popery. I cannot however join with him in these shouts of triumph, which on reviewing his labours, he raises over the protestant interests. A few observations will shew him that though his sophistry may confuse the minds of wavering papists, they will not affect protestants who have been taught to render a reason." What a nonsensical jargon is here: he calls fair logical reasoning *quirks and quibbles*. If there be a fallacy why not detect it? The writer thus publicly calls for a direct reply, or, an avowal that his reasoning is not to be evaded. Let this castigator consult, not his own spirit of divination, but some protestant university, in which there are men of science, versed in dialectics, for if the reasoning, which he advanced in his remarks, and here again repeats, be without a reply, the whole Reformation is defenceless, the attack is direct, it subverts the fundamental principle, the superstructure must fall of course. If protestants be taught to render a reason, as the castigator tells them, this writer calls again, not on the ignorant protestant, whose vanity is flattered, whilst his simplicity is duped by imposture, but on this castigator or some of his associates, and he asks: *Why the castigator believes the gospel of St. John divinely inspired?* Of this part of his faith the ignorant protestant can give no reason, and the writer asserts, without hesitation, that the most learned protestant is reduced to the same straits.

To divert the attention of his readers from a train of reasoning of such immediate and irresistible force that it extorts the assent of the understanding not blinded by prejudice, nor warped by interest; our castigator makes, what he calls observations to shew that protestants have

no reason to think the scriptures an insufficient rule of faith ; he begins by citing from this writers's remarks, the following passage, in which the advantages of the scriptures are clearly exposed, as stated by St. Paul : " What advantage results from the possession of the scriptures ? The greatest possible : it is 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." *Remarks*, p. 52. On this passage the castigator observes : " overlooking," says he, p. 199, " entirely his mistranslation of this apostle's language, I will merely contrast his own views with the conduct of the Romish Church : " if there be a mistranslation, in which the sense of the apostle is perverted why overlook it ? Is it a mistranslation because it does not coincide with the protestant version, in which the apostle is made to speak nonsense, or assert a flagrant falsehood ? The passage is thus translated in the version now before the writer : "*all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for proof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.*" Let the solecism "*all scripture*" pass for the true sense of the apostle, every writing "*pasa graphē,*" but the addition "*is given by inspiration of God,*" for "*Theopneustos*" is intolerable : for we must understand the apostle to say that *every divine writing is divinely inspired,* which is nonsense : whoever doubted it ? Or that *every writing indiscriminately is divinely inspired,* which is a manifest falsehood : there are many writings in which there is nothing of divine inspiration, and very little truth ; and there are writings, by some called divine, in which the suggestions of the father of lies are artfully or ignorantly blended with the revelations of the spirit of truth, such is that monstrous compilation which is with  
great

great propriety called Southwell's bible. In the modern edition of the Greek testament, there is a *kai* substituted by some careless transcriber or printer, to an *esti* which the English translator might correct from the Latin version, without forcing the apostle to speak nonsense.

To shew that the views of this writer are opposite to the conduct of the Romish church, this indefatigable transcriber fills a page with a rule of the Council of Trent, prohibiting the reading of the scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without the approbation of the bishop, and thereby depriving the faithful of all the advantages of the scripture as he pretends : his *ob* has deceived him as usual. This writer did not say, that these scriptures, divinely inspired, useful *for doctrine, for argument, for correction, and for instruction*, should be indiscriminately put into the hands of every illiterate man and woman ; he did not think it the duty of every man, who scarcely understands a line of a book, which he with great difficulty reads, to teach, to argue, to correct, or instruct ; this he thought, and continues to think, the exclusive duty of the pastors of the church, from them the ignorant and illiterate learn with ease the truths of religion, which even the most intelligent men cannot find in the scriptures. The apostle Paul thought so : Timothy, to whom he wrote and explained the use of the scriptures, was an archbishop, constituted by the apostle himself, not an ignorant peasant, who could not read the apostle's letter. From him the faithful learned the contents of the apostle's letter, hence St. Paul said to him in the preceding chapter : "*these things, which you have heard from me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others.*" He did not direct Timothy to give the scriptures to an immense multitude of people, of whom not one of a thousand could read a line. This order, so offensive to common sense, was reserved for the Wirtemberg evangelist and our Edinburg castigator. The Council of Trent coincides in opinion with

with the apostle : the prelates composing that Assembly thought it the indispensable duty of the pastors to instruct the faithful, to explain to them the genuine sense of the scriptures, this duty they enjoined under the severest penalty, ch. i, ii, secs. v. They had read somewhere that the *unlearned and the unsettled wrest the scriptures to their own perdition*—2 Pet. iii. 16. Has the castigatour found this passage in his copy? Or have the moths effaced it? Is it for depriving the unlearned and the unsettled of the inestimable advantage of wresting the scriptures to their own perdition, that the Council of Trent has incurred his displeasure? To these, and to these exclusively, the prohibition is confined. The Council saw the scriptures disfigured in numberless versions, and these sources of christianity poisoned by artifice and imposture. The author of each new version resolving to impress on the minds of the people, his own pre-conceived opinions fitted his version for the purpose, hence the universal discordance of all these new versions; for as their opinions were different, and each author fitting his version to his own opinions, their versions were as discordant as their opinions were different. In one English version the *Holy Ghost* was excluded and the *Holy Wind* substituted. Of all these versions Luther's was the most corrupt, and Chatellon's the most profane: this fanatic, who with Bernard Ochinus thought to re-establish polygamy, translated the scriptures in the style of romance, regardless of decency, as well as truth. Our castigatour inveighs most bitterly against the prohibition of these versions; the keeper of a billiard table rails more loudly against the law, which prohibits gaming; the law is not the less wise nor the prohibition less necessary. The Council did not prohibit the reading of the scriptures in the original, to any person whatsoever, who understands the languages in which they are written, nor in the vulgar tongue, to any person capable of receiving edification from them. The permission is granted by every pastor when asked. As the reason

reason of the law has ceased amongst Catholics, the law itself is going into disuse. If this disposition of the Council of Trent had been strictly observed, the world would not have been pestered, nor christianity disgraced, by such a group of illiterate mechanics and untaught peasants converted into preachers; we should not have seen the cobbler lay down his lap-stone, his last and his awls, and arm himself with a bible and hymn book to cobble the souls of his neighbours; nor should we have seen these camp-meetings resembling the orgies of Bacchus, and other nocturnal scenes, in which the rites of Ceres seem to be renewed. Be that as it will, in the cares of that venerable assembly, composed of the pastors of Christ's church, we admire the vigilant attention of the Great Shepherd "*meγas Poimén*" to the welfare of his flock. No sooner were the waters of life infected by these poisoners, of whom St. John says: *Foris Canes et venefici*, but his warning voice was heard from his pastors, of whom he said: "he who hears you, hears me:" *ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει*—Luke x, 16. In them sources, said he, the waters are not pure: do not taste them; in them pastures the poisonous herbs grow promiscuously with the sound, avoid them. The writer appeals to the common sense of mankind, is that an attentive shepherd, who permits his flock to drink waters issuing from a poisoned spring? Or to range at large in pastures where poisonous herbs abound? If not, the Council of Trent was justified in prohibiting all corrupt versions of the scriptures.

This writer had said that many books of the scriptures had been lost, in which assertion the castigator's *ob* discovers something to authorise Deists in rejecting the scriptures, that is, because some books were lost, those which remain, are not authentic, because some facts are forgotten, these which are remembered are not true. If the deep sagacity of his *ob* had not discovered this newest mode of reasoning, common sense could never suspect it. The writer passes unnoticed, a long dissertation,

tion filled with extracts as usual, to shew that the scriptures are not mutilated, in which the only thing worthy of remark is, an attempt to prove on the authority of primitive writers and others, a truth, which no man denies, that the scriptures are neither so far mutilated, nor corrupted, as to contain any thing contrary to faith or morals. He does not feel the inconsistency of appealing to an authority, which he disclaims, and his modesty, which is unrivalled, permits him to say that many of the Fathers were under the influence of prejudice and ignorance. Amongst these are numbered Justin, the philosopher, and Chrysostom, whose works are admired by the world. In this dissertation there is scarcely one observation founded in truth, but as it is totally irrelevant, and only serves to swell a volume with a display of borrowed literature, the writer does not think it necessary to consume time and paper in a refutation.

He gives some extracts from Austin and Chrysostom, who say, if we believe him, that all things which Christians are obliged to know are found in the scriptures. In Austin's words a moth had effaced the adverb *sere*, *almost*, and he totally forgot to inform his readers, that these Fathers when they recommended the reading of the scriptures to the most intelligent men amongst their people, directed them on doubtful or difficult passages to apply to the pastors of the church for the genuine sense of the inspired writer—See Austin's words, supra. And in his second book of the Christian Doctrine, cap. 6, he says: "they, who rashly read are deceived by many and manifold obscurities and ambiguities, taking one thing for another; and in some places they cannot find any thing to found even a false suspicion: Some things are so obscurely spoken that they induce the strictest cloud; this has been divinely provided, I doubt not, to tame pride by labour, and prevent that fastidious disesteem, which things easily investigated produce in the understanding." These are the scriptures

which Austin recommends to the ignorant peasant as a rule of faith and morality, if we believe this Edinburgh castigator! Chryostom's sentiments are not different from Austin's: in his 40th Homily on St. John, explaining this passage, *scrutinize the Scriptures*: "Christ," says he, "did not refer the Jews to a simple or a naked reading of the scriptures but to a diligent investigation: he did not say: read the scriptures; but scrutinize them. The divine words require the greatest diligence; it was not without reason that he spoke to these ancients in the shadow, hence he orders them to dig more deeply that we may find the things, which are deeply concealed; we do not dig up these things which are on the surface placed at hand, but these, which as a treasure are deeply buried, he who seeks such things, if he does not apply the greatest diligence and labour, will never find what he seeks." In his third Homily on Lazarus, exhorting men of science, of whom there were many in Constantinople, to read the scriptures, he replies to a silent objection: "what then if we do not understand these things, which are contained in the books? though you do not understand the things there concealed, yet great sanctity arises from the reading." He spoke of the historical events related in the scriptures, and these he said were easily understood in part, for the obscure parts he referred them to their teachers: "take the book in your hands," said he, "read the whole history, the things which are known retain in memory; and read many times the things which are obscure and not known, but if you cannot, by assiduous reading, find what is said, consult a more intelligent man, go to the teacher."

Who would imagine that our castigator would have recourse to the testimony of the church? It is not more strange than true, p. 232, he says, "in proving the canonical books genuine: we are far from rejecting the testimony of the church." The reader must admire the fertility of his imagination, when he finds that, though he admits the testimony of the church, it is not as the  
 testimony

testimony of the church but as the *evidence of faithful witnesses*. It is unlucky that such an effort of imagination, in which all his inventive powers have been strained beyond the usual pitch, should leave this writer's argument insoluble as it found it, and totally unhinge the Reformation, for the church is a society, a moral body, which speaks by its pastors, as the State by its magistrates; the evidence, therefore, of *these faithful witnesses*, is neither less nor more than the testimony of the church; the man is ripe for Bedlam, who denies it; he admits the testimony of the church as the *evidence of faithful witnesses*; but they are the same witnesses, who attest that all the doctrines taught in the catholic church are of divine original; the castigator says *they are faithful witnesses*, therefore these doctrines are true, and there is an end of the Reformation. He will not presume to call that man a faithful witness, who attests indiscriminately both truth and falsehood. His *ob* suggests another evasion, in absurdity surpassing the former, if possible: it is not, he says, on the ground of infallibility that he believes this testimony of the Church, but because it is the testimony of *faithful witnesses*, who could not be deceived. Plain men, who have not *ob* for their director, believe this testimony on the ground of its infallibility. Such a testimony, say they, is infallibly true. For it is not possible that the testimony of *faithful witnesses*, who could not be deceived, should be false—the supposition involves a contradiction: for if they be not deceived, and advance a falsehood, they are not *faithful witnesses*. Thus, on the testimony of the Church, or, as the castigator calls it, on the evidence of faithful witnesses, catholics demonstrate against atheists and deists, that these scriptures, which they call divine, are divinely inspired; and, on the same evidence of faithful witnesses, they demonstrate against the castigator, and his associates, that all these scriptures, and only these, which they call divine, are divinely inspired. They proceed further on this evidence of faithful witnesses, they shew the genuine and intended sense of ambiguous passages, which imposture distorts,



distorts, in support of error ; and, what will surprize the castigatoꝝ's admirers, this tradition, which he hates, is neither less nor more than what he calls *the evidence of faithful witnesses*. On this evidence the new fangled opinions of all reformists down from Simon the magician, to this Edinburgh castigatoꝝ, have been condemned, this maxim repeatedly inculcated in the scriptures, has been invariably observed : " in the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established," 2 Cor. xiii. i. A maxim known to the heathens, *testimonium pro se nec Catoni creditum*. Even Cato's testimony for himself is not believed. A maxim which without further discussion condemns every reformist : he gives testimony for himself, he deserves no credit. Has this Edinburgh castigatoꝝ ever bestowed a serious thought on this maxim ?

After admitting the testimony of the church, not as the testimony of the church, but as *the evidence of faithful witnesses*, to prove the canonical books authentic ; our castigatoꝝ proceeds on other grounds to prove the inspiration of the scriptures, that is, he does not believe these books divinely inspired because they were written or approved by the sacred penmen, and as such delivered into the hands of the pastors whom the apostles constituted in the different churches, which they founded, whose testimony is continued in their successors, these faithful witnesses, who attest the fact, but he believes them divinely inspired from the internal evidence of the books. His *ob* discovers the divine inspiration of these books, whether they were written by *Peter* or *John*, *Ezop* or *Homer*. On the same ground, the Mahometan finds decisive confirmation, as the castigatoꝝ calls it, of the divine inspiration of the *alcoran*, the Hindoo proves the *hanscrit* divine, and every enthusiast believes what pleases his fancy. The writer has known some well meaning Protestants of the established church, who believed the martyrdom of King Charles as divinely inspired as the gospel of St. John : why so ? Because they found it in the book, which they called their bible. He is weary of refuting such nonsense. Our

Our castigator, the fertility of whose imagination is inexhaustible, detects a mistake of this writer. He had said that "in no book of the scripture do we find that these books, which we call canonical were divinely inspired." His *ob* deceives him, and he deceives his readers: this writer did not mistake: for there is no book in the scriptures, nor is there a line in any book of the scriptures which says that these books, which we call canonical are divinely inspired: for admitting that St. Paul spoke the nonsense, which Southwell imposes on him, and instead of saying, as he did, that every writing divinely inspired *pasa graphē theopneustos* is useful, he had said: "all scripture is given by inspiration of God," he did not say that any one of these books, which we call canonical is given by divine inspiration. Southwell makes him say, that all divine scriptures are given by inspiration of God, a heathen would not doubt it. In this fruitless attempt to fit a passage by a false version, the reader sees a specimen of the fidelity of modern translators.

In the same page he says: "this writer cannot deny that the books of the Old Testament were received by our Lord and his apostles, as dictated by the Spirit of God." To this insidious insinuation, the writer replies, that imposture subsists on the supposition of public credulity: if there was not simplicity there would be neither hypocrisy nor imposture—*ad populos Phaleras, ego te novi intus et in cute*. This castigator has recourse to every little subterfuge to evade the truth; and every artifice, which his *ob* suggests, to perplex it. As that fatal delusion, which disfigured christianity, commenced in misrepresentation, he tries the same stratagem to continue it; it is an effort of agony, which forebodes an approaching dissolution. Where did he read that this writer, or any other catholic, ever denied that the books of the old testament were received by our Lord and his apostles as dictated by the spirit of God? Why endeavour to obtrude on the credulity of his disciples such a flagrant falsehood? That the books of the New and Old Testament

Testament are divinely inspired, is an article of catholic faith, a term of catholic communion, this castigator, however ignorant, must know, the imposture is therefore, intended; it ought to awake the victims of delusion from their lethargy. But that these books are divinely inspired, catholics do not know from the books themselves, but from the testimony of these witnesses, in whose hands the books were deposited; and these the castigator injudiciously calls *faithful witnesses, who could not be deceived*; yet however faithful they may be, their testimony would not found an act of faith, if it had not been guaranteed by Christ himself: "*he, who hears you, hears me*—Luke x, 16"; "*Behold I am with you all days until the consummation of the age*"—Matt. ult. The voice of the Great Shepherd they hear from the mouth of his ministers, and on his authority they found their faith; whilst infatuated sectaries hear from the mouth of their own ministers, not his, the wild conjectures of every enthusiast, and on these they found these jarring opinions, which by a monstrous abuse of language they call *faith*.

After citing some passages of scripture to shew, what no Christian doubts, that the prophets were divinely inspired, he says, in order to prove the inspiration of the New Testament: "there is nothing more plainly revealed in scripture, than that those persons by whom it was written had received the Holy Ghost to qualify them to be witnesses to Christ." What a nonsensical jargon is here! Is it because it is asserted in any writing that the author was inspired we are to believe it? Was there ever an impostor who did not pretend a commission from God? Did not the prophets of Baal, say to Achab and Jehosaphat *thus saith the Lord, chob amar Jehovab*, 2d. Chr. xviii, 9. If this Edinburgh castigator, inflated by his *ob*, should take a fancy to give us a new gospel, or a gospel new-modelled, as Ethan Allen has done, we should see in it that he was qualified by the spirit to be a witness to Christ, and would, no doubt, find

find dupes to believe him, as Allen did, and as Jemima Wilkinson, who calls herself the *Lord* in person, now does. It is a public fact that this woman has collected a number of people in the Janifsee country, who pay her homage as to Christ himself in person. She pretends to have died, and after the departure of her soul, Christ she says took possession of her body, and it is he himself who animates her body now. Human nature is so far degraded by fanatical enthusiasm that this woman finds credit. It is not from any writing that we conclude the author inspired, he must have given other proofs of his mission from God, and these proofs must be sensible facts, that the witnesses may be enabled to attest them on the testimony of their senses. A writing of any kind is not a witness: it has neither eyes to see nor ears to hear, it can by no possibility authenticate itself or prove its author to have been inspired. The tale of Jemima Wilkinson, is not more absurd than the assertion; nor is it more irksome to refute the one than the other.

Our castigator has yet one resource as a substitute to external evidence, from a multiplicity of words to which the reader must endeavour to fix some sense, it appears to be the spirit of criticism, and to this he adds, the spirit of prophecy: "The history of kingdoms which are now no more;" the fishermen and farmers are well acquainted with the history of kingdoms now no more, and every illiterate mechanic is an able critic: he will distinguish revealed truth from artful imposture by the modes of expression and concurring circumstances—*admissi Risum tenentis amici*, but after all, this spirit of criticism is not scripture, and if protestants found an article of faith on it, that article of their faith is not founded on scripture; and many parts of the scripture relate past events, mysterious truths, maxims of morality, these we know to be divinely inspired, because we know by external evidence, that is by the testimony of faithful witnesses, that their authors were divinely inspired, in the same manner we know that the prophecies themselves were fulfilled. Of

Of many prophecies our castigatour selects two from St. Paul; in the first the apostle foretells a great apostacy before the consummation and the appearance of antichrist or as St. Paul calls him *the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition*; in the second the apostle foretells, that in the latter days some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits . . . forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats. Who would imagine if the wonderful sagacity of his *ob* had not discovered it, that this *Man of Sin, this Son of Perdition*, is neither less nor more than the *seducing spirits*, and *these seducing spirits*, a succession of Popes? But as Paul unluckily had said that this *Man of Sin, this Son of Perdition*, whom the apostle thought to be a man not a spirit, “opposeth and exalteth himself above every thing called God, or which is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.”—2 Thes. ii. Finding it difficult to fit this part of the prophecy to the Pope, who, with some appearance of humility, acknowledges himself to be a sinner in the temple where he comes to adore God, and humbly confesses his sins to his confessor in hopes of pardon, he fits the Pope to the prophecy, and, with that unblushing impudence, which characterises imposture, tells his readers that this is the language of the church of Rome, “*the Lord our God the Pope another God upon earth*, says one, *the Pope*, says another, *is more than God*,” the description of antichrist, given by St. Paul, fits the Pope just as well as Job’s description of the war-horse fits this Edinburgh Ass. To give the reader a specimen of the arrogance of this Edinburgh scribbler, and justify some strictures which may appear severe, the writer cites, from page 233, the following passage “many from mistaken views of religion bequeathed their wealth to the church; not for the advancement of virtue and piety, but for supporting a clergy, *whose wallowings discovered more of the nature of the hog, than of the christian pastor*. That there were many individuals as well amongst the clergy

as amongst the laity, corrupt in their morals; when Luther commenced his reformation is true, of these, however, the Reformation purged the church: they became the first pastors of all the reformed churches; and since that time such men have always found a refuge from the severity of catholic discipline, amongst the pastors of the reformed churches. Is this Edinburgh castigator one of the number? From several awkward attempts to wrest, in support of a defenceless opinion, the arguments, by which Catholics demonstrate the scriptures authentic and divinely inspired, the writer, is tempted to suspect that, to satisfy the cravings of the belly, he, as well as the author of his repertory, has abjured the Catholic faith, of which some impressions yet remain; but as truth is stubborn and will not bend to countenance error, these awkward attempts to warp it, only remind us of the fable of the ass in the lion's skin, the long ears and the braying, shewed the stupid animal under the terrific form.

His next attempt to fashion the pope and metamorphose him into an antichrist is amusing enough, he teaches, he says, the doctrine of devils, prohibits marriage, and orders the people to abstain from certain meats, Yet this same pope calls marriage a sacrament, and papists contract marriages every day in the face of the church, and they eat all sorts of meat with thanksgiving; and the better it is the more they like it. We have here another specimen of that imposture, which wrests the scriptures from their intended sense to countenance error; but as our castigator has been always unlucky in his citations, he is doubly unfortunate in the present instance: for if there be a passage in scripture, which damns him without redemption, or without the possibility of evasion, it is that which he cites: the apostle says to his disciple: "the spirit expressly says that in the latter times *some will apostatise from the faith*, attending to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared; forbidding to marry (*command-*

ing) to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by them who believe and know the truth; for every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving."—1st Tim. iv, 1 . . . . The apostle warns Timothy, and through him the church in Asia, that many would apostatise from the faith; he at the same time describes the most prominent doctrines of the Marcionites, who of all the sects called '*Gnostics*,' *enlightened*, were the most corrupt; Marcion taught his disciples to believe that there are two causes self-existent, eternal, of equal power, the one infinitely good, and the other infinitely and essentially bad; to the good cause, or God, he ascribed the production of souls, which were all created, enlightened and happy; to the malignant cause he ascribed the creation of bodies, of all the elements, and of all that is visible, tangible or material in the universe; organized bodies were formed, if we believe Marcion, by this malignant cause to entangle the souls, which had been created happy, and to make them unhappy; to this artifice of the malignant principle he ascribes all the calamities of man; but the malignant spirit, unable to destroy the activity of souls created by the good spirit, has endeavoured to fix them under his own dominion, by attaching them to this earth: to this end he has given them laws, promised rewards and threatened punishments, in case of disobedience to himself, all this Marcion proves from the Old Testament, the work of the malignant cause, in it the rewards and punishments proposed only tend to attach men to this visible world; to dissipate the illusion, the good principle, God, assumed the appearance of humanity, proposed rewards and punishments in the New Testament, his work, in order to break every attachment to this visible world, and disengage the souls, which he had created from the dominion and power of the malignant spirit. From these principles Marcion concluded that it is the indispensable duty of all men to resist every inclination which

which attaches them to the world, and destroy all the works of the malignant spirit, who created it. Marriage was most strictly prohibited in order to prevent the procreation of organized bodies, in which the malignant spirit entangles souls, and makes them subject to his dominion; nameless crimes, excesses the most abominable, were authorized to prevent the procreation of human bodies, lest the malignant spirit should entangle happy souls in them. The Marcionites had the greatest contempt for life, and the most deeply rooted aversion to that malignant God, whom they called the creator of this visible world. Theodoret says, that he saw a Marcionite, aged 90 years, who felt the most sensible affliction when necessity compelled him to nourish his body with any of the productions of the earth. To eat any of the fruits, produced by the malignant spirit, was a humiliation to which he submitted through meer necessity. See *Ter. con. Mar.* These doctrines St. Paul condemns in a few words: he says, that marriage is not only lawful but honorable; that every creature of God is good. What catholic ever doubted it? He did not condemn or censure the virtues of perpetual chastity, and continency, which Christ himself practised and recommended, nor did he condemn these voluntary mortifications, which he himself practised to reduce his body to subjection; that ~~fasting~~ fasting and prayer, by which alone the unclean spirit is cast out. Have the moths effaced from the castigator's copy of the testament that passage in which Christ says, that the dumb and deaf spirit cannot be expelled but by *fasting and prayer*—*“ touto to genos en oudeni dunatai exelthein ei me en Proseuche kai Nefteia.”*—Mark ix, 29. The writer shrewdly suspects that the Edinburgh castigator's *ob* is one of that class. His aversion to chastity shews him to be an unclean spirit; and his deeply rooted hatred to fasting and prayer proves him to be of that very class of unclean spirits, which, as the Saviour says, are expelled but by fasting and prayer.

After a display of wit on the the celibacy of the clergy,



clergy, and these unprofitable austerities of fasting, abstinence and prayer, so hateful to the disciples of Epicurus, the castigatör observes the great use of prophecy, since from it he is "enabled to conclude that the pope is antichrist, and the scriptures are the word of God,"—p. 242. The writer acknowledges the great use of prophecy, more particularly this prophecy of St. Paul, which the castigatör has cited: from it he concludes that the castigatör's *ob* is one of them seducing spirits, of which the apostle spoke. This conclusion is not founded on that nonsensical jargon, which converts one man into many spirits, and many spirits into a succession of popes, it is founded on the apostles' words, understood in the plain literal sense, in which every man must understand them: the apostle says: "*some will apostatize from the faith,*" "*apostesontai tines tes pisteos.*" If some will depart from the faith, others will persevere in it: otherwise the apostle would not have said *some*, "*tines*," but *all*, "*pantes*," and it would not have been a departure of some from the faith, but the total destruction of the faith. Did the catholic pastors and people at any time depart from the church of this castigatör, its descriptive title the writer does not know? Was it at any time the church of all nations, from which all other sects originally departed? No, our castigatör informs us, that his ancestors were expelled from the communion of the Romish church—p. 142. He adds, that it was for their adherence to the truths of religion they were expelled from the Romish church: there never was a sect, which did not assign the same reason, but it is not the less true, that they were in it, or they could not be expelled from it. They therefore are not that church from which the apostle said some would depart: they departed from it, the faith continued in it, and this castigatör's *ob* is one of these seducing spirits, which makes its last exertions to continue a delusion, originally founded on imposture. Against this reasoning wild declamation is vain: tales of popes and friars, whether true or false, may amuse idleness

idleness or gratify malignity, but they cannot falsify the apostle's words : *some will depart from the faith*. Some, not all : they who form new conventicles depart : it is the ship which departs from the shore : he must be stupid indeed, who cannot make the reflection, and his insensibility must be great if he does not feel it.

This spirit of criticism, which discovers the divine inspiration of the scriptures in the mode of expression, and this prophecy which enables him to conclude that every pope is antichrist, though the apostle knew but one, do not entirely satisfy him, they produce a rational persuasion, but not divine faith : " there may be," he says, p. 242, " a rational persuasion of the divine inspiration of the scriptures, where divine faith is wanting." The cause is desperate ; after many struggles he gives it up : it is not an article of his faith that the scriptures are divinely inspired, it is but a *rational persuasion*.

If it be not an article of faith that the scriptures are divinely inspired, it is not a sin against faith to deny it. The proposition is evident ; if it be not a sin against faith to deny that the scriptures are divinely inspired, it is not a sin against faith to deny that any article contained in them is divinely inspired. This proposition is not less manifest than the former : for it surpasses absurdity to say, that the articles contained in the scriptures are divinely inspired, and the scriptures themselves are not. Hence it follows that in the doctrine expressly taught by this new-modelled Edinburgh preacher, a man may be a Christian, who does not believe a word of the gospel ; he had already told us that a man may be a Saint of God though considerably involved in the pollutions of sin. Impiety cannot go further.

After filling four or five pages with passages of scripture, which have no reference whatever to the subject under discussion, interspersed with stupid observations, loose and unconnected, to which, if any determinate sense can be affixed, it is that faith is a gift of God. What Christian ever denied, or even doubted it ? These observations

observations, he says, shew how a man, who never read the scriptures, may know the truths contained in them to be the word of God—p. 246; he ought to have told us how the protestant, who takes the scriptures for a sole and sufficient rule of faith, knows that these truths, which he believes to be the word of God, are contained in the scriptures. This is the embarrassing question, from which, by a multiplicity of unmeaning words, he endeavours to divert the attention of his readers. The writer tells him once more that, if the protestant, who does not read the scriptures, knows the truths, which he believes to be the word of God, to be contained in them, he must know it either on the testimony of those, who read them, or by divine inspiration. There is no mean, and, in either case, the scriptures are not his rule of faith.

Our castigator continues his observations on the powerful influence of the scriptures over the minds of men, as if Catholics doubted it; but they tell him, that the scriptures have no influence over the minds of men, who know nothing of their contents, the man who believes it must be as stupid as this castigator. He cites passages from Austin and Justin. The former says that his conversion was effected by reading an epistle of St. Paul, and the latter says: that the Christian doctrine possesses a certain innate majesty both to terrify and allure the sinner. These extracts are as much to the purpose as extracts from the alcoran. Was Austin an illiterate man? Was Justin a man who could not read? Does he intend to persuade us that Christ spilled his blood but for the very few, who are capable of understanding the scriptures? The writer is weary of refuting these little arts by which this castigator deludes the uninformed.

After these observations, our castigator, who knows no end of transcribing, fills two pages with an extract from the writer's *Remarks*, in which St. Austin's reasoning against the Manicheans is stated, to which, after some coarse invectives against popes and papists, he replies

plies "that though St. Austin had actually viewed all faith as founded on the testimony of the church, it by no means follows as a consequent that his sentiments are just, p. 249. After citing some passages from that Father, which have the same tendency, and only serve to confirm the writer's remarks, blending ignorance with artifice, he attempts an evasion, by wresting Austin's words from their natural signification, and the only sense which they can bear: Austin says: "I would not believe the gospel unless the authority of the *universal* Church induced me." In quoting these words, he says, the writer had omitted the term *universal*, which is true and with unusual sagacity he discovers that Austin did not found his belief on the *testimony* of the church, but on the *universality* of the testimony. A plain man, not possessed by this castigator's *ob*, could not discover this *universality of testimony* in Austin's words at all. He speaks of the *authority* of the Catholic church, not a word of the *universality of its testimony*: "*Ecclesie Catholice Auctoritas.*"

This section the castigator closes with strictures on the writer for attempting, as he impudently asserts, to destroy the authority of the scriptures through interested views; the writer easily conceives, why a self-constituted pastor, engaged in the propagation of the human species, as his most indispensable duty, finding an honorable support for a family in the simplicity of his admirers, should feel seriously alarmed at any attempt to dissipate the delusion; but why he should lend these motives, which operate so powerfully on himself, to a man, who has not the same inducements, is not so easily conceived: they were not teachers subject to the severity of catholic discipline, whom the apostle introduced, saying: "by this craft we have our wealth."

He opens the next section by exposing the views of the Romish church: "she is conscious," he says, "that many of her doctrines are inconsistent with the plainest principles of religion." The reader must not suspect him  
of

of calumny : his *ob* inspires him, and enables him to detect the views of men, though concealed from the eyes of the world ; and it is to support these doctrines that she has invented tradition. This tradition conveys a terrific idea, and what makes it doubly alarming is, that both the term and the idea, which it conveys, is of the most venerable antiquity ; by this tradition all the errors and heresies, which have disfigured christianity since the apostles' days, have been refuted and condemned, and their authors consigned to infamy ;—see Tertullian's reasoning, *Remarks*, p. 142, and Irenæus's, p. 93, in this work. To these the writer adds an extract from *Basil the Great*, a writer, who though his authority may not be equal to that of this Edinburgh calligrapher's *ob*, has been considered as one of the most intelligent, eloquent and pious writers whom the christian world has yet produced. The writer of his life, a severe critic, says of Basil : “ His style is elevated and majestic, his reasoning profound, his erudition extensive ; his writings were read by all people even the heathens, they compared him to the most celebrated orators of antiquity ; and he may be equalled to the most eloquent fathers of the church. From his book on the Holy Ghost, which St. Jerom, calls an egregious work, the writer gives a transcript in the original now before him. “ Ἰὼν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένον δόγματῶν τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἀγραφῆς διδασκαλίας ἐχόμενα, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόξως διὰ θεοῦ ἐμὴν ἐν μυστηρίῳ παραδειχθέντα, ἀπεραμφοτέρα τὴν αὐτῆν ἰσχὺν ἐχει πρὸς τὴν εὐσεβίαν καὶ τούτοις οὐδεὶς ἀντιτείνων ὅτις γε καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν γούνησι τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πεπειραται. Ἐὶ γὰρ ἐπιχειρήσῃμεν τὰ ἀγραφα τῶν ἐθνῶν ὅς οὐ μεγαλὴν ἐχόντα τὴν δύναμιν παρατείσθαι λάθοιμεν ἀνὰ τοὺς αὐτὰ τὰ κείρια ζεμιούμενοι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ἰνὰ ἡμεῖς οὐ μὴ πῶς περὶ ἡμῶν τοῦ κηρύγματος, ὅτι οὐκ ἴσμεν τὸν πρῶτον καὶ κοινὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων μνήσθω τῷ τυπῷ τοῦ σφραγιστοῦ τοῦ οὐνοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐλπίζοντες καταλείψασθαι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς γραμμῆς διδασκαλίας ; τοῦ ἀνατολῆς περὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ποῖον ἐδίδαξαν ἐμάς

ἑμας grammata tēs epiklēseōs remata epi anadeixei tou artou eucharistias ē tou potēriou tēs eulogias tis tōn âgiōn eggraphōs ēmin kataleloipen ; ou gar de toutois arkoumetha, ōn ō apostolos ē to euaggelion epemnēsthē, alla kai prolegomen kai epilougomen ētera ōs megalēn, echonta pros to mustērion tēn ischun ek tēs agraphou didaskaliōs paralabontes. Eulougoumen de to údōr tou Baptismatos kai to elaiou tēs Chryseos kai profeti auton ton baptizomenon apo poion eggraphōn ; ouk apo tēs siōpōmenēs kai multikes p̄sradoseōs, ti de auten tou elaiou tēn Christen tis logos gegrammenos edidaxe ; to de tris baptizesthai ton anthropon potken ; alla de ōfa per to Baptisma apotassesthai tō Satana kai tois aggelois autou ek poias estī graphes ; ouk ek tēs ademoseioutou toutes kai aporetou didaskalias ēn en apolupragmōnētō, aperiēgastō sigē ōi pateres ēmon ephulaxan kalōs ekeinoi dedidagmenoi tōn mustērion ta femma siōpē diafōsesthai ā gar oude epopteuein exesti amue-tois toutōn pōs an ēn eikos tēn didaskalian thriambeueinai en grammatin.”

“ Of institutions observed in the church we have some from written doctrine, and some delivered to us from the tradition of the apostles, both which have the same tendency to piety, and these no man contradicts, if he be in the least conversant with ecclesiastical laws: for if we attempt to set aside unwritten customs as having no great force, we imprudently hurt the gospel in its principal parts, and reduce preaching to an empty name. For to assign first, what is first and most common, who in writing has taught that they, who hope in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ are to be signed by the figure of the Cross? To turn to the east in prayer, what writing has taught us? The words of invocation over the oblation of the bread of the eucharist, or the chalice of benediction, who of the saints has left us in writing? For we are not content with these, which are remembered by the apos-

tle, and the gospel, but both before and after, we say others, as having great virtue towards the mystery, and which we have received from unwritten doctrine; we bless the water of baptism and the oil of unction, and also the person to be baptised, from what writing? Is it not from secret and mystical tradition? And the unction of oil, what written word has taught it? To immerse the person thrice, whence is it? And whatsoever other things concerning baptism, as to renounce Satan and his angels, from what writing is it? Is it not from that doctrine not publicly spoken, which our fathers in peaceful silence, free from vain curiosity, preserved? And they themselves, well instructed to preserve the gravity of mysteries, in silence. How is it verisimilar that the doctrine of these things, which are not to be seen by them, who are not initiated, would be triumphantly shewn in writings."

After saying that Moses did not expose to public view, the rites and ceremonies practised in the temple, Basil assigns the reason, why doctrines taught, and rites instituted by the apostles, were not committed to writing at all. *Kata ton auton de tropon de oi ta peri taseklestias exarchês diathesimothetês fantes apostoloi de patres en tô kekrummono de aphotegeto to setanon tois musteriois ephulasson oude gar alôs musterion to eis tèn demodê kai eikaian akouên ekphoroun, outos ò logos tês tèn agraphôn paradoseôs ôs mē katamelletê: heisan tón dogmatón gnôsin eukatophroneten tois pollois genesthai dia funetheia: allo gar dogma allo kerugma. Ta men gar dogmata siopatai ta de kerugmata demousetai siopes de eidos kai asapheia é kechrêtai é graphe dultheôreton katoskeuaxousa tón dogmatón ton noun pros to tèn entugchanton Luliteles."* In the same manner the apostles and fathers in the commencement, instituting rites and things concerning the churches, preserved in secret and in silence their majesty to the mysteries: for that is not altogether a mystery, which is brought to public and common hearing.

hearing. This is the reason of the tradition of unwritten things; that the neglected knowledge of rites may not become contemptible to many from custom: a rite is one thing, a doctrine is another, rites are passed in silence, doctrines are published. There is a secret of silence and obscurity, which the scripture uses pre-disposing the sense of institutions, so that it is with difficulty discovered, and that for the advantage of them who find it." He then enumerates many rites instituted by the apostles, and says: *epileipse me emera ta agrapha tes ekklesias musteria diégoumenon. Eó ta alla. auten de tén omologian tés pisteos pisteuein eis patera kai úion kai ágion pneuma ek poion grammatón eckomen.* The day would fail me relating the unwritten mysteries of the church. I omit other things; the very confession of faith, to believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, from what writings have we it? *Lib. de Spiritu Sancto. Cap. 27.*

Our Edinburgh castigator would have told him that the most illiterate of his new-modelled converts finds it in the scriptures. How wonderfully the world has been enlightened by these new teachers! What Basil the Great could not find in the new testament, though written in his native language, in the language which he had learnt from his mother, every disciple of the new school finds in the English version! And, what to all plain men seems incredible, even they, who have yet their alphabet to learn.

How this venerable Greek would stare, if he were told that all these rites and ceremonies, which he, on the testimony of his predecessors, believed to have been instituted by the apostles, were popish superstitions, and this unwritten tradition invented by the pope in support of them! This great prelate, revered by the Christian world, died in the year 379, that is two hundred and eleven years before Gregory the Great began to govern the church, after whose death the

pope



pope was converted into Antichrist by the imposture of an impudent monk.

Be that as it will, Basil informs us that these rites and ceremonies, which the castigator derides because they are not found in the scriptures, were instituted by the apostles and assigns the reason why they were not written, but transmitted by oral tradition to the pastors in succession; some eleven or twelve hundred years before Calvin or Knox had enlightened the world with their lucubrations; and so universally was it believed that these rites were of apostolical institution, that no man in the least conversant with ecclesiastical discipline was found to contest it; he also informs us that doctrines of faith were founded on this apostolical tradition: beginning his seventh chapter of that celebrated work on the Holy Ghost, he says: ἐδὲ δε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὰς κοινὰς ἐμὸν ἐνόησας ἀπολαί τινες εἰς ἡμετέρας τὰς τε ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ συνάχοντας ἐμὴν καὶ ἀσ ἐκ τὰς ἀγραφῶν παραδόσεις τῶν πατρῶν διεδέξαμεθα," and now concerning the Holy Ghost we shall examine our common notions of what nature some are concerning him; these are collected by us from the scriptures, and those we have received from the unwritten tradition of the fathers.

In his 29th chapter in reply to an exception taken against the doxology on which he had founded a proof of the divinity of the Holy Ghost, Basil says, *pros egen amarturon kai agraphon einai ten sun to pneumati doxologian ekeino legomen, ati ei men meden eteron agraphon mede auto paradechtheto ei de ta pleista ton mustion agraphos emin empoliteuetai ineta pollon eteron kai auto katadexometha, apostolikon de oimai de to tais agraphois paradosi paramenein*; as to the doxology (with the Holy Ghost) being unattested and unwritten this we say: if there be nothing else unwritten let that also be not received; but if many mysteries are received by us without writing, let us receive this with many others. I think it is apostolical

to persevere in unwritten traditions. He then cites the following passage from St. Paul's epistle 1st. C. xi. 2. *epainō gar phein ūmas ōti panta mou menmēthe kai kathōs paredōka ūmin tas paradoseis katechete.* I praise you, says he, (P.) because you remember all things of mine and as I delivered to you, you hold the traditions." To this passage, from the first to the Corinthians, he immediately subjoins the following passage from the second to the Thessalonians, ii. 14. *kai te krateite tas paradoseis as paralabete eite dia logos, eite di epistolas;* and this, "hold fast the traditions which you have received, whether by word or by letter;" he then shews that though the doxology be not found in Scripture it is not the less certain as it is found in the writings of these, who were instructed by the apostles and their immediate successors, he cites Clement of Rome, Ireneus, Dennis of Rome, Dennis of Alexandria, &c.

Of all the great writers of antiquity, there is not one of greater weight and authority than Basil, and he attests that these rites and ceremonies, which imposture impudently pretends to have been invented by popes some centuries after his death, were religiously observed in his time, and believed to be of apostolical institution, the same truth is attested by the few writers who preceded Basil, and whose works are yet extant. Tertullian, in his book on the soldiers' crown, says: we make oblations for the dead, and for our birth on the annual day; we think it a crime to fast on Sunday . . . . at going out and coming in, at putting on our cloths and our shoes . . . . we wear our forehead with the sign of the cross, of these and many other customs if you ask the law from the scriptures you will find none. Tradition is offered as founding, custom confirming and faith observing. Cap. 4.

A similar testimony is given by Clement of Alexandria, a writer more ancient than Tertullian by some years, and of more unquestionable authority: they, says he, "who preserved the true tradition of holy doctrine"

doctrine from the holy apostles Peter, James, John and Paul, as a son receives from their father, [few sons are like their fathers] through the will of God arrived at our time to deposit with us, the apostolical seeds received from ancestors. He did not reveal to the many these things, which did not belong to the many, but to the few, whom he knew fit to receive them and be formed by them." Sh. Lib. I.

Clement had studied under the celebrated Pantenus, and succeeded him in the Christian school at Alexandria, founded by the evangelist St. Marc. His works Jerom calls *insignia volumina plena eruditionis & eloquentia, remarkable works, full of erudition and eloquence*. In the school founded by the evangelist he had learned that Christ did not think it necessary to reveal to the multitude the rites and ceremonies, by which the bishops and other ministers of his church are instituted, nor the rites and ceremonies to be observed by them in the celebration of the divine mysteries and administration of sacraments committed to them, not to the multitude; and we know from Basil that in his time these rites were not committed to writing at all. This injunction of St. Paul to his disciple Timothy, "*these things which you have heard from me by many witnesses the same commit to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others,*" 2. Tim. ii. 2, was observed by other bishops as well as by that prelate: they did not write these things for the multitude because it was not the duty of the multitude to teach others, it was their duty to learn; but they committed them to faithful men, whose duty it was to teach others. Thus the chief pastors transmitted the doctrines, the rites and ceremonies, which they had learned from their predecessors, to their successors in office.

Ignatius, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, bishop of Antioch, on his way to Rome, where he suffered for the faith; exhorted the faithful in the different cities through which he passed to persevere in the traditions

of

of the apostles Eusebius, His. Ec. lib. 3. cap. 36. says of him, "Ignatius, who, second after Peter, obtained the chair of Antioch when he was conducted through Asia, under a strict guard of soldiers confirming the churches in the several cities through which he passed, admonished them in the first place to beware of the corrupt opinions of sectaries, which then began to come to light and to spread widely; he exhorted them to adhere with firmness to the traditions of the apostles, which for the more certain knowledge of posterity he thought it necessary to commit to writing, confirmed by his testimony."

The letters of this apostolical patriarch are yet extant: he strictly and repeatedly recommends unity of sentiment, and obedience to bishops, priests and deacons. Our Edinburgh castigator, with the newest modelled modesty, tells us on the veracity of his *ob*, that his new church, in which there is neither bishop, priest nor deacon, has re-assumed the form of this primitive church. This is, perhaps, the most gross imposition that ever was obtruded on public credulity.

In order, if possible, to undeceive many well-meaning and piously disposed persons, who are the victims of their own simplicity, the writer adds to the testimony of these venerable prelates of the Greek church, against whom no exception can be stated, the testimony of the greatest Latin writers which the Christian world knows.

St. Austin in his fifth Book on Baptism against the Donatists, cap. 23. n. 31. says, "that custom which was opposed to Cyprian must be believed to have taken its beginning from their (the apostles') tradition, as there are many other things which the whole church holds and for this are justly believed to have been commanded by the apostles though they are not found written."

Jerom in his book against the Luciferians, introduces the Luciferian advancing a truth which he endeavour-

ed to wrest in support of error: "do not you know," says the Luciferian, "this to be the custom of churches that after baptism hands are imposed on the baptized, and the Holy Ghost thus invoked! You ask where it is written? In the Acts of the Apostles; but if for this the authority of the scripture were not found, the consent of the whole world is as a precept; for many other things are observed in the church on tradition, which have obtained the authority of written law." To this Jerom replies; "I do not deny the custom of the church . . . but why is it that you transfer the laws of the church to heresy? he then shews that though it be the established and universal custom of the church for the bishop to impose hands on the baptized to invoke the Holy Ghost, it is not the less true that the grace of the Holy Ghost is conferred in baptism. This power of imposing hands, that is, of administering the Sacrament of Confirmation is reserved to the Bishop, he says, for the honour of the priesthood. These are his words, "the safety of the church depends on the dignity of the chief priest; for if there be not some extraordinary and eminent power given to him there will be as many schisms in the church as priests." Hence it is that without the *Christm* and the bishop's order, neither priest nor deacon has a right to baptise though it be allowed when necessity compels even for the laity to do it." He proves that the grace of the Holy Ghost is conferred in baptism from the baptism of the eunuch by Philip the deacon, on whom the Holy Ghost immediately descended without the imposition of the bishop's hands, Acts viii. 38. that this power is reserved to the bishops is manifest from a fact related in the same chapter; for when Samaria had received the word, though the converts there had been baptized by Philip, and had received the Holy Ghost as the eunuch did without any visible signs, yet the Holy Ghost did not visibly descend on any one of them till Peter and John had imposed hands on them. The castigator cannot

cannot find in the scriptures that this imposition of hands, by which the grace of the Holy Ghost is conferred on the baptised Christian, is a sacrament. There are none so blind as they, who will not see. This unction too, and these other ceremonies of baptism, which he derides, were as universally observed by the Latins as the Greeks, Jerom is a witness for the one, and Basil for the other.

Hilarius, a deacon more rigid than other Luciferians, would not acknowledge the Arian baptism, though in the common form, valid, of him Jerom says: "Hilarius as he has receded from the church a deacon, and is himself, as he thinks, the people of the world, cannot consecrate the eucharist, having neither bishops nor priests. . . . As the man is now dead the sect died with him, because a deacon could not ordain a clergyman after him, and that is not a church which has not a priest, but to pass unnoticed a few worthless men, who are to themselves both bishops and laity, hear what you are to believe of the church." He then describes the Catholic church such as it was then, such as it is now, and such as it will be until the consummation, and finally concludes: "in that church you must remain, which, founded by the apostles, continues until this day. If you hear those, who are said to belong to Christ, named not after our Lord Jesus Christ, but after some other, as Marcionites, Valentianists, Montanists, or Campanists, know that it is not the church of Christ but the synagogue of Antichrist: for by this alone that they have been since instituted they shew themselves to be the sectaries foretold by the apostle; and let them not flatter themselves if from some passages in the scriptures they seem to confirm what they say, since the devil himself spoke some things from the scriptures, and the scriptures do not consist in the reading but in the understanding: for if we follow the letter, we may also compose a new doctrine and refuse to admit into the church them who have shoes on their feet, or two coats," Dial. Con. Luci.

Our castigator, who in vain fought his ancestors amongst the Wicklefites, the Hussites, the Waldenses, and even amongst us idolatrous Papists, would have found them in Hilarius' sect, in which there was neither bishop nor priest. It is true Jerom says the sect died with him, but it is revived in this Edinburgh castigator's little church, and the form re-assumed.

St. Austin, de. Reg. Ex. Cap. 52, says: "persons baptised amongst heretics, who baptise in the confession of the Holy Trinity and come to us, are received as baptised, lest the invocation or confession of the Holy Trinity be annulled, but they are taught and well instructed in what sense the mystery of the Holy Trinity is held in the church. If they consent to believe and acquiesce to confess, being already purified, let them be confirmed in the integrity of the faith by *the imposition of hands*; if they be children, or so stupid that they cannot learn the doctrine, let these, who offer them, answer for them, according to the custom of the person to be baptised, and thus strengthened by *the imposition of hands* and the *chrism*, let them be admitted to the mysteries of the eucharist," the unction of chrism, which this castigator, in derision, calls grease, was therefore religiously observed in the primitive church, though not mentioned in the scriptures. This venerable, learned and pious prelate, St. Austin, in his homilies to the new Christians, explains all the ceremonies of baptism now observed in the Catholic church, which this castigator, whose petulance is equalled but by his ignorance, in coarse and offensive terms, impudently derides.

From these extracts, not transcribed from a repertory, in which the works of eminent writers are garbled and fashioned by imposture, but from the works themselves now before the writer, the reader will see with what appearance of truth this Edinburgh castigator confidently asserts that these ceremonies are of popish invention, and tradition invented to support them.

If any man upon cool reflection can prevail on himself  
to

to believe that all these great writers of different countries, so eminent in science and venerable for sanctity, in whose doctrine there is such a perfect coincidence, have been deceived; or have combined to deceive the world, and that half a dozen profligate and petulant monks, renouncing their vows and promises to gratify their passions, in whose opinion there is nothing but contradictions, each as inconsistent with the other, as they are all with truth, have been sent to undeceive the world, his infatuation is lamentable indeed.

After shewing, as he imagines, that the rites of administering the sacraments of baptism, and the eucharist, and of instituting *the Officers* of the church, are distinctly taught in the scriptures, though not one of these great writers of antiquity could find them there, and the most intelligent, as we have already seen, say they are not there, the castigator tells us that the observance of the sabbath was a Jewish peculiarity; this, he says, did not occur to the writer. True it did not occur to him: he had read somewhere: "and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because on it he had rested from all his works," Gen. ii. 3. This sabbath which the castigator's *ob* discovers to have been a Jewish peculiarity, was, if Moses tell truth, sanctified and consecrated to the divine service, some two thousand years before Abraham, the father of the Jewish nation, was born; and in the xx. of Exodus, Moses assigns the same reason as he did in the ii. of Genesis: "in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them are, and rested the seventh day, and, wherefore, Jehovah blessed the seventh day and sanctified it."

In the 5th of Deuteronomy he assigns an additional reason why he enjoins so strict an observance of the Sabbath in the Jews, "that thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou, and remember that thou wast a servant in the Land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out from thence with a strong hand."

The benefit of the creation was common to all, to the Gentiles,



Gentiles, as to the Jews, the obligation of paying due homage to the Creator founded on the benefit of the creation, equally common; hence this positive precept universally obliged, from the time of the creation; the deliverance from the Egyptian bondage was an additional favour conferred on the Jews, which did not diminish the benefit conferred on all mankind by the Creation, nor the obligation of acknowledging it by the sanctification of the sabbath. This precept, therefore, did not commence with the ceremonial law of the Jews, and if it terminated with it, it was because the same God who had ordered the sanctification of the seventh day, in commemoration of the creation, transferred the obligation to the first day in commemoration of a yet greater benefit, that is, the redemption; and this we know not from the scriptures, but from tradition.

With respect to the institution of the first day, says the castigator, p. 251, both the language and conduct of the apostles can be exhibited to its being appropriated to divine worship; it is not, therefore, in the scriptures that he finds this institution: he deduces it from the language and conduct of the apostles. How will the illiterate protestant, not gifted with the castigator's *Ob*, nor blessed with his powers of divination, deduce from the language and conduct of the apostles, the moral obligation of sanctifying the first day of the week, whilst he finds the obligation of sanctifying the seventh day expressly stated and repeatedly inculcated in the scriptures? Is he not told that he will find every truth of faith, and every moral obligation distinctly taught in his rule of faith, the scriptures? After all this, the castigator, with all his powers of divination, cannot deduce this truth from the language and conduct of the apostles. The passages which he cites do not support the deduction: in the original it is thus written: "*en de te mia ion sabbaton*," that is, "*on one of the sabbaths*," or as *mia* does not correspond with *sabbaton*, supposing *emera* understood "*on one day of the sabbaths*," which very naturally signifies "*one sabbath day*," not  
the

the first day of the week ; if therefore it be understood of the first day of the week, it is because tradition has transmitted to us the sense intended by St. Paul. Recourse may be had to the rhetorical figure Synecdoche and to Hebraisms, in which the cardinal number supplies the place of the ordinal, and the plural is taken for the singular, but this is a forced construction, and not within the reach of the unlearned.

Supposing it as certain from the text, independently on the sense which tradition has affixed to it, as it is uncertain that *mia tōn sabbatōn* signifies the first day of the week, and that "*klasai arton*," which in plain English signifies *to break bread*, implies *to communicate* or make the communion, from what principle does he conclude that this first day was not only appropriated to divine service, but also substituted to the seventh day, which was consecrated to divine service from the commencement of time ? The sacred penman says, Acts ii, 46, that the disciples assembled *daily, kath ēmeran, breaking bread, klōntes arton*" was every day in the week appropriated to divine service ? He finds in the Revelation that St. John calls it the Lord's Day, "*kuriake ēmera*,"—Rev. i, 10 ; but St. John does not say that this day, which he calls the Lord's Day, was the first or the last day of the week, or of the month. If this Edinburgh castigator knows it to be the first day of the week, he must know it by inspiration, or by tradition, or from his *ob* ; there is no other possible mean of knowing it.

He also finds in the scriptures the doctrine of infant baptism ; for there is nothing which his spirit of divination does not enable him to find in the scriptures, if you except these truths of faith, which are not to be reconciled with the opinions, which he lends his disciples : from these words of the apostle, Col. ii, 11-12, "in whom also you are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the body of the sin of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ buried with him

him in baptism," he deduces the doctrine of infant baptism: "it is," says he, p. 262, "a conclusion tolerably natural that all, who had a right to circumcision under the Old Testament, possess the same claim under the New;" but he forgot to inform his readers that the apostle did not write to children, nor speak of children at all in that passage, and this castigator's conclusion excludes one half of the human species from baptism: for the female sex had no claim to circumcision under the old law. Why not tell his disciples: we have fashioned the scriptures for your use; and in our deductions and annotations you will find the truths of faith and the maxims of morality, which it is our will that you should believe? Believe then that we are your lawful pastors and teachers, in due succession from the apostles, and that these popish bishops have intruded themselves into the ministry, which of right belonged to us: would this Edinburgh castigator condescend to inform us in what book of the scriptures this is found? Or from what passage of scripture it is deduced? If it be neither found in the scriptures, nor deduced from them, on what principle is it believed by his disciples, who have no rule of faith but the scriptures? These are embarrassing questions.

Our castigator has given some unequivocal proofs of experience in refitting the scriptures, and making deductions for the use of his disciples: who would have thought, if his *ob* had not told us, that the demons, so often mentioned in the gospel to have been cast out by Christ and his apostles, were not unclean spirits but *deified dead men* to whom divine honours ought to be paid? "If," says the castigator, p. 239, "he, [*this writer,*] be at all acquainted with antiquity, he must know, that demons were not viewed by the ancients as a distinct order of Beings but as *deified dead men*, to whom divine honours ought to be paid," so that legion of demons, which destroyed the herd of swine, Luke v. were *deified dead men*, not unclean spirits, though St. Luke, who

knew

knew something of antiquity, calls them demons, verse 12, *pantes bi daimones, all the demons*, and in the ensuing verse he calls them *unclean spirits, pneumata ta akatharta*, as if to confound the unclean spirit of this Edinburgh castigator. From the scriptures thus refitted he deduces that the saints and martyrs are these deified dead men, and the pope neither less nor more than the antichrist foretold by the apostle, thus he discovers in the gospel what escaped the observation of the evangelist; and his deduction surpasses the discovery. Though he sees so distinctly in the scriptures, what the inspired writers could not see, and makes deductions, which had escaped the notice of the world for ages, he cannot see what common sense, free from illusion, must see, and what the most intelligent writers have seen, that many books of the scriptures are lost without redemption. The books of Nathan the prophet, of Samuel the seer, of Gad the seer, he denies to have been divinely inspired, because it is not said they were; and his presumption is such as to deny that, what is expressly called the *prophecy of Abijah*, and the *vision of Addo*, were divinely inspired, as if the sacred penman would call any writing not divinely inspired a *prophecy* or a *vision*. St. Austin's words on this subject are remarkable: they give a correct idea of the canonical authority of the scriptures, and clearly demonstrate on what principle the scriptures are known to be canonical; "Let us," says he, "omit the fables of these scriptures, which are called apocryphal, because their occult origin was not clearly known to the fathers, from whom the authority of the true scriptures has descended to us by the most certain and most undoubted succession, "*certissima et notissima successione*;" in these apocryphal writings, though some truth be found, yet there is no canonical authority on account of many falsehoods. We cannot deny that Enoch, seventh from Adam, has written some divine things, since Jude, in his canonical epistle, says it; but yet they are justly excluded from the canon of the scriptures; which was preserved in the temple of the He-  
brew

brew people, by the diligence of the priests in "succession. From their antiquity they were judged to be of suspected fidelity because they were not produced by such, as were known by uninterrupted succession, to have legally preserved them, and it could not be found that he had written them . . . . Many things, under the name of other prophets, and more recent things, under the name of apostles, are produced by sectaries, all which, under the name of apocryphal writings, are by diligent examination removed from canonical authority. Aus. de Doc. ep. lib. 15. cap. 23. n. 4. Austin was well assured that Enoch wrote, but he would not acknowledge a writing then under his name, because, it was not attested genuine by the pastors of the church in due succession. — This is the true principle on which the scriptures are believed to be divinely inspired.

As the writings of the Fathers had been fashioned by Illyricus, in his Catalogue of Witnesses, our castigator confines himself to transcribe. He admits that "the primitive Fathers used the universal consent of churches as an evidence against innovations," p. 264, he at the same time intimates that we make it the ground of our belief. His *ob* deceives him, and he either ignorantly or intentionally deceives his readers: our faith is grounded on revelation, and we use as evidence against innovations, the universal consent of churches, by it we shew that the doctrines which we believe are revealed as our ancestors did. Almost in the same breath he says: "St. Cyprian will shew how the primitive Christians treated oral tradition." "Whence comes this tradition?" says Cyprian, "does it descend from the Lord's authority, or from the commands and epistles of the apostles, for these things are to be done which are there written;" and likewise, "if it be commanded in the Gospel, or in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles, then let this holy tradition be preserved." He has not told us of what tradition Cyprian spoke, what Cyprian said of one tradition, which he did not believe to be apostolical, our castigator,  
or

or his repertory, fitting it for the use of his disciples, applies to oral tradition in general. Cyprian, whose great aversion to heresy engaged himself in error, thought that he had manifestly deduced from the scriptures that the baptism of Sectaries is invalid; and as truth is not opposite to truth, he concluded that the tradition opposed to his erroneous opinion was not apostolical; though he refused to acknowledge this tradition, which condemned his innovation, he did not pretend that there were not many traditions truly apostolical. On tradition he offered the sacrifice of the altar for the repose of departed souls—*see review, p. 214*. On tradition he mixed water with wine in the Lord's Cup. *ibid. p. 203*. St. Austin, reasoning against the donatists, says: "what Cyprian admonishes that we recur to the fountain, that is, *to apostolical tradition*, and thence direct the canal to our own times is best and undoubtedly to be done," *Cen. Don. Lib. 5. Cap. 26. p. 37*. This venerable and accurate writer demonstrates, that the tradition opposed to Cyprian's opinion was apostolical, because it was universally observed, and not instituted by any general council, and then, from the principle, on which Cyprian thought the tradition not apostolical, that is, because truth is not opposite to truth, he concludes that Cyprian's opinion was erroneous. On this tradition, the irreconcilable enemy of innovation, the terror of reformists, an error founded on reasons strong in appearance, and exposed in all their force, by the eloquence of a Cyprian, was condemned, and Jerom, who is cited by this Edinburgh castigatour in the same page, to shew, as he pretends, what the primitive christians thought of oral tradition, in his dialogue against the Luciferians, after shewing that Cyprian's error had been condemned on tradition, refutes their error on the same principle. This extreme aversion to heresy, which had engaged Cyprian in error, was the source of Lucifer's schism, also: he thought the church defiled by communicating with the prelates who had been deceived at Rimini, and with-

drew himself from the communion of the catholic world. "The blessed Cyprian," says Jerom, "endeavoured to avoid broken cisterns, not to drink of strange water, for that end he sent an African Synod, on the subject to Stephen, bishop of the Roman city, who was the twenty-sixth from Peter; but the effort was vain: in the end, the very bishops, who decreed with him that heretics should be re-baptised, returned to the *old custom*, and formed a new decree. What are we doing? This is the tradition of our ancestors to us, and this the tradition of their ancestors to them;" against this tradition Jerom says, "that all Cyprian's efforts were vain; the very bishops who had adopted his opinion in Africa, renounced it," he then shews, in opposition to Lucifer's new opinion, that Sectaries had been at all times admitted on their repentance. "If," says he, "any man thinks it can be denied that heretics have been thus admitted by our ancestors, let him read Cyprian's epistles, and his strictures on Stephen, bishop of the Roman city; and the error of that inveterate custom; or let him read the books on re-baptisation, which Hilarius has published against us, and he will find Hilarius himself to acknowledge that all sectaries have been in a like manner received to repentance by Julius Malchus, Sylvester (R. P.) and all other the ancient bishops."

To this passage from Cyprian, our castigator subjoins a passage taken from St. Jerom's book against Helvidius;—has he seen that work?—What infatuation!—to cite a work expressly written against the doctrines which he himself teaches! Helvidius, an ignorant and fanatical Arian in Jerom's time, published a work in which he pretended to prove that the Virgin Mary did not continue a virgin after the birth of Christ, but that she had other children by Joseph, this error adopted by modern reformists in opposition to the settled doctrine of the Catholic world, Jerom refutes in the very work from which our castigator gives an extract for the condemnation of popery. Jerom replies to the passages of scripture in which

Mary

Mary is called Joseph's wife, and his brothers and sisters are mentioned, and explains them in the intended sense, (the sense in which they were always understood before that impious fanatic had fashioned them to his impiety,) on the authority of tradition. Jerom demonstrates that the mother of the Redeemer continued a virgin to her death though it be not expressly written. In the same work he shews, from St. Paul, the superior excellence of perpetual chastity which the unclean spirit of this modern Helvidius detests. From this work, professedly written in support of an article of doctrine founded on apostolical tradition, that is, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the Author of our Castigator's repertory garbles an extract to induce a belief that Jerom disregarded tradition: This is the greatest stretch of imposture, the most barefaced and impudent imposture that the writer remembers to have seen. Jerom thought it a monstrous impiety to suppose that the womb of the virgin, the chosen temple of God, consecrated to the inconceivable mystery of the incarnation of his only begotten Son, sanctified by the residence of Jesus Christ for nine long months, should be prophaned; in truth the indecency of the supposition has something horrible in it, and manifestly indicates the enmity of the unclean spirit. Helvidius had said that there was not more impropriety or indecency in supposing that the virgin had other children besides Jesus Christ, than in saying that God was born of a woman. This sentiment he expressed in coarse language, part of which Jerom reluctantly recites and in chaste language subjoins other humiliations to which the Saviour submitted, adding, "the more humiliating these things, which he has suffered for me, the more I owe him;" and when, says he, to Helvidius, you have recapitulated all these, you will produce nothing more ignominious than the cross, which we believe, and profess, and in which we overcome our enemies; but as we do not deny these (the humiliations of Christ) which are written, so we reject these (the humiliations of Mary) which



which are not written. We believe that God was born of a virgin, because we read it, but we do not believe Mary to have married after her child-birth, because we do not read it. . . . you say that Mary did not continue a virgin. I vindicate something more, that Joseph himself, by Mary, was a virgin, that of this virginal marriage, a virginal Son might be born.

Artfully concealing the subject of Jerom's work, in the face of truth this passage is cited, which the writer gives in the original language now before him: "*Sed ut hæc, quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta requimus, but as we do not deny these things, which are written, so we reject those things, which are not written.*" The passage is fitted for the intended delusion by translating the pronoun *hæc*, *these things*: thus *the things* substituting the English article *the* to the Latin pronoun *hæc*. "As we deny not *the* things, which are written, so we reject those which are not written." Thus imposing a flagrant falsehood on the simplicity of his readers, that Jerom believed nothing but what was written in the scriptures. What! Did he not believe the perpetual virginity of Mary, in defence of which he wrote that celebrated work? It is not expressly written. Did he not believe the perpetual chastity of Joseph? It is not written. It is extremely irksome, however necessary, to be obliged to detect such gross imposture.

To this artful illusion, manifestly intended by the author of the castigator's repertory, not by himself, (for the writer is persuaded that he never saw the work which he cites) succeed some pages, replete with malignant invectives against the Catholic clergy, and calumnious misrepresentations, both of their views and doctrines,—their views, he knows from his familiar spirit,—their doctrines he refutes by bold assertion; they are all contrary to scripture, if we believe him. As assertion without proof only excites contempt, the writer passes them unnoticed; these doctrines will be discussed in due time, if health permits, and shewn perfectly consistent with the scriptures;

not

not perhaps with that sense which the unclean spirit of this Edinburgh castigator pretends to affix to the scriptures. The words of the Lord are chaste, Ps. xii. 7. *teberoth, purified*; the unclean spirit cannot conceive them. There are some extracts from Ireneus, Austin, and Jerom, fashioned as usual, to deceive the simple and uninformed; but as the sentiments of these fathers have been explained more than once already in the course of this work, the writer will not consume time and paper in an useless repetition. A man is surpris'd to find an extract from the canon law in support of new modelled doctrine, and yet more surpris'd, if possible, to see with what artifice it is fashioned to the purpose; "If," says the castigator, p. 274, "the R. (this writer) turn his attention to the canon law, he will find it a strenuous supporter of Protestant principles;"—so strenuous a supporter of Protestant principles, that Luther, in one of his pious fits, burned the Decretals in Wirtemberg, l. ii. f. 123. He then transcribes from his repertory a citation from the eleventh cause, qu. 3. C. 101. "If any one command what God hath forbidden, or forbid what God has commanded, he is to be accursed of all that love God; and if any require any thing beside the will of God, or what God has evidently required in scripture, he is to be considered as a false witness of God, and a sacrilegious person. In Gratien's Work the chapter is thus expressed; *non est obediendum quod contra Deum precipitur.*

*Si is qui præest, fecerit, aut cuiquam, quod a domino prohibitum est, facere jusserit; vel quod præceptum est præterierit aut præterire mandaverit, sancti Pauli Apostoli sententia ei ingerenda est: "etiamsi nos aut Angelus de Cælo evangelizaverit vobis præterquam quod vobis evangelizavimus Anathema sit. Si quis prohibet vobis quod a domino præceptum est, vel rursus imperat fieri quod dominus prohibet execrabilis sit omnibus qui diligunt Deum. Is qui præest si præter quod in sanctis scripturis evidenter præcipitur dicit aliquid vel imperat tanquam falsus testis Dei aut sacrilegus habeatur. "If he, who presides, shall do, or shall command any person to do, what is prohibited by the*  
Lord:

Lord ; or shall pass by, or shall command to pass by, what is commanded ; the sentence of the apostle Paul is to be opposed to him : “ though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be an Anatheme. If any one forbids you what is commanded by the Lord, or again commands to be done what the Lord forbids, let him be execrable to all, who love God. If he, who presides, says or commands any thing beside (contrary) to the will of God, or beside (contrary) to what is evidently commanded in the holy scriptures, let him be considered as a false witness of God, or as SACRILEGIOUS. This is an extract, which Gratien makes from Basil the Great’s monastic institutions, to shew that the precept of any superior, if manifestly against the law of God, does not oblige the subject ; hence he gives it the title—*non est abediendum quod contra deum præcipitur* ; that is not to be obeyed which is commanded against God. Who would imagine that Basil’s instructions to his monks on the nature of the obedience, which they promise their superiors, would be wrested, by imposture, in support of an error so expressly condemned by that prelate, as we have already seen, that is, that there are no truths of religion believed, no rites or ceremonies instituted, but what are evidently taught in the scriptures ?

Note : The Greek preposition *para* signifies indifferently *præter*, *contra*, &c. in English *beside*, *against*, &c. the subject matter determines the sense.

After this quotation from the canon law our castigatour says, “ were it requisite, a multitude of quotations to the same purpose might also be produced from the most celebrated divines of the Romish church,” true : in the third question of the eleventh cause, from which he has cited the 101st chapter, there are many extracts from the most celebrated writers of antiquity, which imposture might have fitted to its purpose with equal ease, and they would have made the same impressions on the un-informed mind. There is however a disagreeable consequence, the confusion which results from the detection of

of

of the fraud. This chapter is closed as usual with some virulent invectives against catholics in general, and this writer in particular, who is, with new modelled politeness, compared to Judas, and charitably consigned to perdition. His seventh chapter opens with an unmeaning preamble, about the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist, or, as he calls it, the Lord's supper, as it is intended to discuss this article with that accuracy which the great importance of the subject exacts; and to that extent, which its magnitude requires, the writer will for present confine himself to a few cursory remarks on this Edinburgh castigator's compilation: p. 278, he says: "the Lord's supper is dispensed to the church in the form of a *common repast*, which according to the appointment of God, and the practice of good men, is set apart *for the support of the body*, by an address to the father of mercies;" in this view of the sacrament the most consummate ignorance is blended with the most sacrilegious impiety: he gives for apostolical doctrine the abuse against which the apostle denounced the most dreadful judgment. "He, says the apostle, who eateth and drinketh unworthily, *eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.*"—1 Cor. xi, 29. From what could the body of the Lord be discerned or distinguished if not from the common food, which supports the body? Not to distinguish the body of the Lord from common food, is what constitutes the crime of the unworthy communicant, against whom the apostle denounces judgment; this castigator blasphemously calls it a *common repast for the support of the body!* there is something horrible in the blasphemy. Does he imagine that the Saviour and his disciples made two suppers, one immediately after the other, for the support of the body? If not, the eucharist was not intended for the support of the body. It was instituted after supper, *mea to depine/ai.*—Luke x x, 20.

As this true disciple of Epicurus has new modelled even the Eucharist, and fitted it for the support of the body,

body, so he has new modelled an essential rite, the form of consecration. Papists, as he truly says, think it consists in the words of Christ, "*this is my body, this is my blood*" "This, their opinion," he says, "is repugnant to scripture and antiquity." To this form, by his own apostolical authority, he substitutes a prayer and thanksgiving, which not being found in scripture every enthusiast may invent or model to his own fancy. It is true he cites from St. Paul, what he ignorantly calls an address to the father of mercies. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer"—1st Tim. iv, 4. This, however, is not the prayer by which the elements are consecrated: for the eucharist was instituted, and in constant use, many years before St. Paul wrote his epistle to Timothy; some years before St. Paul was himself a christian; and what shews the ignorance of this Edinburgh ass, in the most contemptible point of view, these words of the apostle contain neither an address to the father of mercies, nor a thanksgiving. St. Paul instructs the faithful, and warns them against the artifices and errors of false teachers: "the apostle," says Jerom, "writing against that Epicurean reformist apostate Monk Jovianian, designates *Tatian Marcion* and other heretics, who proclaim perpetual abstinence, to destroy and contemn the works of the Creator, which are to them abominable; but we praise every creature of God, and yet we prefer leanness to fatness, abstinence to luxury, and fasting to fulness." How unlike our castigatour! who, adding folly to ignorance, cites, in support of his epicurean impiety, a passage from Jerom's letter to Evagrius, which the author of his repertory has artfully fashioned to the purpose: "upon the prayer of the presbyters the body and blood of Christ is made." In that letter, which this castigatour cites from his repertory, Jerom professedly demonstrates that the priest is superior to the deacon. The first argument which he offers in support

port of his doctrine is the power of consecrating the elements of the eucharist, vested in the priest from which the deacon is excluded.—“What is it,” says he, “that the minister of tables and widows (the deacon) swelled with pride, should exalt himself above those (the Priests) at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ are made present?” *ad quorum preces Christi corpus et sanguis conficitur?* “*Conficitur*” is an expression in perpetual use with Latin writers, to signify that, by the words of consecration, the elements of bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. By concealing the subject of the letter, and changing a few words, an extract, in which the catholic doctrine of the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ is expressed with the utmost precision, is wrested in support of the opposite error. This passage, in its obvious sense, is destructive of the whole plan of Calvin’s pretended reformation: for if the principle of proof, assumed by Jerom, be founded in truth, that is, that the power of consecrating the elements of bread and wine for the eucharist, be exclusively vested in the priest, not in the deacon, much less in the meer laymen, where there is no priest of primitive institution, there is no consecration of elements, no eucharist, no church of Christ: for by the use of this adorable mystery, the death of the Lord is announced until he comes—1st Cor. xi, 26.

Jerom does not found his argument on the form of prayer used by the priest in the consecration of the elements, nor does he say in what the form consists: the argument would have been null: for the same form might have been used by the deacon, or by any old woman, he founds his argument on the power of consecrating the elements vested in the priest by his ordination, not in the deacon, and thus at once excludes from the ministry all self-constituted teachers and pastors, reducing to the common level themselves and their conventicles. “Where there is no priest,” said he, in his

dialogue against the Luciferians, "there is no church;" and, in this letter to Evagrius, he confines ordination to the bishop: "The deacon Hilarius," said he in the dialogue, "having neither bishops nor priests, cannot make the eucharist." "*Eucharistiam conficere non potest.*"

He must have learned from his *ob.* that to think the elements are consecrated by Christ's words, "*this is my body,*" is repugnant to scripture and antiquity. Does he believe that Christ himself did consecrate the elements? We do not find in the scriptures any other form of consecration: these words: "*take and eat,*" were addressed to the apostles, not used to consecrate the elements; and these also: "*do this in remembrance of me,*" did not consecrate the elements; but they consecrated the apostles priests, and vested in them a power of doing what Christ had done, that is, of consecrating the elements in the same manner, and consequently by the same words by which the Saviour himself did consecrate, and in this sense all antiquity understood them: Tertullian, in his book against Marcien, says: *that Christ made the bread his body, saying: "this is my body,"*—see Review, p. 207.

Cyprian, in his sermon on the Lord's supper, says, that "Christ consecrated the elements by these words, *this is my body, this is my blood,* and that his ministers consecrate them by the same words: "this, said he, (Jesus Christ) *is my body,*" they, (the apostles) eat and drink of the same food according to the visible form; but before these words, that common food was only useful to nourish the body, and administered a support to corporal life; however since the time that it was said by the Lord: *do this in remembrance of me: this is my flesh, this is my blood,* as often as it is done with these words and with this faith, that substantial bread and cup, consecrated by a solemn benediction, contributes to the life and salvation of the *whole man,* being at the same time a remedy and a sacrifice (*holocaustum*) to heal infirmities and purge iniquities."

These

These are of the most ancient Latin writers whose works have escaped the destructive hand of time. On this subject there is a perfect coincidence of the ancients, Greeks and Latins: Gregory of Nyssa, brother to Basil the Great, in his catechetical oration, ch. 37, says: "it must be considered how it can be that one body, which is always distributed to so many thousands of the faithful in the whole world, is entire, in each separately, and remains entire in itself." To this, the greatest difficulty which is, or can be, proposed, against the corporal presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist, this ancient, venerable and learned prelate replies: "the body of Christ by the inhabitation of the *word of God*, (the second person of the Trinity) has been transmitted into the divine dignity. Justly, therefore, I now believe the bread sanctified by the word of God, to be transmitted into the body of the *word* (Jesus Christ) for this bread, as the apostle says, is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, not that through the medium of food, "*mediante cibo*," it becomes the body of the *word* (Christ) but that it is immediately transmitted into the body of the *word* (Christ) as it is was said by the *word*: *this is my body*."

Eusebius of Emessa, a disciple of Eusebius of Cæsarea, the great historian, in his fifth sermon on the Easter, says: "the invisible priest changed the visible creatures (*the bread and wine*) into the substance of his body and blood by his word, his secret power, saying: take and eat: *this is my body*, and with a repeated sanctification, take and eat: *this is my blood*." It is thought by some critics that the homilies, ascribed to Eusebius, of Emessa, were written by St. Hilary, of Arles, who flourished in the beginning of the fourth century. This opinion, if true, only adds weight to the testimony, as Hilary, though not so ancient as Eusebius, surpassed him in science and sanctity. Chrysostom, superior to both, from his eloquence called the Christian Plato, in his second homily on the 2d. Tim. demonstrates that the eucharist, though consecrated by a wicked priest, is  
not



not less holy in itself, nor less sanctifying to the faithful who receive it worthily, than if it had been consecrated by Peter or Christ himself. "As," says he, "the words, which Christ spoke, are the same, which the priests now pronounce, so the oblation is the same: this is equally true of baptism."

In this second homily to the people of Antioch he institutes a comparison between Elias and Christ: "Elias," says he, "left his sheep-skin (mantle) to his disciple; the Son of God ascending left us his flesh, but Elias ascended stripped of his mantle, the Son of God *left us his flesh and ascended with it*. Let us not be depressed in mind nor lament, let us not fear the difficulty of the times: for what will he refuse to do for our salvation, who did not refuse to spill his blood for all, and again communicated to us his flesh and that same blood?" Is there any modern papist who speaks of the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist in terms more simple or more clearly expressive than these ancient writers? Without shadow of variation, they all agree that the Saviour consecrated the elements by these words: *this my body; this is my blood*, and that he continues to consecrate them by the same words pronounced by his ministers: "for it is not man, who makes the things proposed from the consecration of the altar the body and blood of Christ, but he, who was crucified for us, the Christ; the words are pronounced by the priest, but the proposed things are consecrated by the power of God and his grace: '*this*,' he says, '*is my body*.' By this word the proposed things are consecrated . . . . that word was said, indeed, but once, but yet on all the altars of the church until the present day, and even until the coming of Christ, it gives firmness to the sacrifice . . . . you hasten to the holy and terrible sacrifice; renew the concealed mysteries of the oblation; Christ slain is proposed."—*Homily on the treachery of Judas*. This is the language of these celebrated writers of antiquity, whom the world revered, and continues to revere. His *ob*,  
therefore,

therefore, has most grossly deceived the castigator, when he taught him to believe that the opinion of papists is repugnant to antiquity, and, deceived by *ob*, this castigating pastor most cruelly deceives his disciples.

Some pages are filled with a tiresome repetition of the same difficulty against the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist, which the disciples, who deserted the Saviour, stated against it when first proposed to their belief. John vi, 52, *how can this man give us his flesh to eat?* They did not believe the Saviour omnipotent. Does this Edinburgh castigator? The writer doubts it: for his omnipotence once admitted, all these difficulties, founded on pretended contradictions and impossibilities, vanish: it is admitted, that almighty power can create a body in any given place. If so, that same power can re-produce that same body in any given place: for it is not more difficult to re-produce a body, already existing, in any given place, than it is to give that same body an existence in that place when it had no existence at all. To compare difficulties the latter is certainly the greater: for our imagination may, in some manner, reach the former; but the latter, that is, to give an existence to a body which does not exist at all, is beyond its utmost stretch. Thus plain reasoning refutes in an instant all these pretended impossibilities which alarm simplicity: for if it be possible, as it manifestly is, to re-produce the same body existing in any place in any other given place, all these pretended impossibilities, proposed by imposture or ignorance, disappear. Our castigator's *ob* forgot to inform him that all these difficulties, with which he has swelled his volume, and others which were not found in his repertory, had been accurately discussed in the work which he pretends to refute, but did not read.—see Review, from p. 178 to p. 214.

He makes an awkward attempt to invalidate the testimony of the Council of Nice, adduced by this writer in his Remarks: “when,” says the castigator, p. 291, “these fathers said: the Lamb of God, which taketh away

away the fins of the world, is placed upon the sacred table," they forgot to add, "corporeally." If they had been as ignorant as this castigator, they might have added something equally absurd; but the fathers knew that Christ is the Lamb of God, as Man, in his adorable humanity, that he could not have been on the sacred table as man, without his body and soul.

He next attempts to elude the testimony of St. Andrew, by a conjecture of Dupin, who could not himself evade it, though in opposition to St. Bernard, Barnius, Bellarmine, Lanfranc and other writers, as far superior to Dupin, as Dupin was to this Edinburgh scribbler, that lurking hypocrite offered every conjecture which artifice could suggest to induce a suspicion of interpolation in the acts of St. Andrew, written by the priests of Achaia where he suffered, and from his conjectures pretends to conclude that it was to be esteemed a *dubious writing*, which cannot be applied, as St. Jerom declares to prove any doctrine of faith: however, as Dupin retracted his errors, it is not necessary to refute him; by his retraction he has refuted himself, and if he had not, this writer would find no difficulty in shewing that conjectures do not invalidate facts; that, if artful conjectures were sufficient to invalidate the authenticity of works, there would not be an authentic work in being; because there is not a book, even of the scriptures, against which conjectures apparently more solid than these of Dupin, may not, and have not been proposed.

If on other subjects he has been unlucky in his citations from the Fathers, he has been doubly so on this; "it will be granted," he says, p. 295, "that these writers have frequently called bread and wine the body and blood of Christ; and in doing so they are authorised by the expressions of scripture." His *ob* deceives him, the Fathers did not call bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, nor do the scriptures authorise such expressions: for the scriptures do not authorise nonsense, but they frequently called the body and blood of Christ,  
bread

bread and wine, authorised by the scriptures, and by common sense, because in the eucharist the body and blood of Christ are bread and wine in appearance and effect; but bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ either in appearance or effect, or in any possible sense which could authorise such a nonsensical expression as this castigator lends from his own stock to the scriptures and the Fathers,—see this error refuted, Review, p. 204. “But,” continues the castigator, “it is evident from their writings, that they never supposed any change in these elements.” The contrary of this assertion is true, and if this ignorant scribbler does not know it, it is because he knows nothing of the writings of these venerable ancients, but the few garbled extracts, which he transcribes from his repertory. The writer has already shewn that both Greeks and Latins say that the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood of Jesus Christ by his words: “*this is my body, this is my blood,*” a conversion which they ascribe to the almighty power of God. The writer adds to the passages already adduced these words of St. Ambrose, an ancient writer of unquestionable authority, in his sixth book on the sacraments, Cap. 1, N. 1, he says: “as our Lord Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, not as men are by grace, but as Son of the substance of the Father, so the flesh which we receive, as he himself said, is true flesh,” thus he demonstrates that as Jesus Christ, though in appearance man, was in reality the true Son of God, so the adorable eucharist, though in appearance bread, is true flesh. “But,” continues Ambrose, “perhaps you may say what the disciples of Christ then said, hearing him say: “if a man do not eat my flesh, and drink my blood, he will not remain in me, nor have eternal life,” perhaps you may say: “how true? I who see the similitude, do not see the truth of the blood.” To this supposed objection Ambrose replies: “first of all things I have told you of the word of Christ which operates, that it can

can change and convert the instituted kinds of nature "*Genera instituta nature.*" Ambrose thought the almighty power of Jesus Christ sufficient to effect the conversion of one substance into another, without making any change in the appearance to sense: the man who does not think it, is unaccountably ignorant, or monstrously impious.

Our castigator has also in his great zeal to exclude the real presence of Christ from the eucharist, as well as his paternal protection from the church, has given us a specimen of his philosophical researches; "Can," says he, "the existence of colours be conceived unconnected with matter? Or a taste and smell without any object to taste or smell?" He too with the reformed Mr. Norris, and many a good old wife, thinks that colours, taste and smell, exist in external objects composed of matter; other philosophers, who judge by the rules of common sense, think them sensations of the soul, of which external objects are the occasional causes, not the efficient; which may, and often have been, excited by God the efficient cause, without the interference of any material object or occasional cause: with what matter was the colour of the dove, under the appearance of which, the Holy Ghost was seen to descend on the Saviour connected? Was the Holy Ghost a lump of matter? The writer is tired of refuting such nonsense, there are as many errors insulting reason as well as religion in almost every page of this Edinburgh scribbler's compilation as would take a volume to refute: he tells us, p. 295, that the Fathers thought the eucharist merely a symbolical mode of exhibiting truth to the mind, and baptism an ordinance of the same kind. He then cites passages from the Fathers, in which the corporal presence of Christ is as clearly expressed as words can express it. For instance: Fulgentius says: "that every believer is then made a partaker of Christ's body and blood when he is made in baptism a member of Christ's body,"—de Bap. Æthiop.—and what Fulgentius said of the eucharist, which was  
received

received by the new Christians immediately after baptism, this castigator either through ignorance or imposture applies to baptism itself. If he had read Jerom's dialogue against the Luciferians, from which, if the writer recollects rightly, he had cited some garbled extract, he would have known that the sacrament of the eucharist accompanied that of baptism : for Jerom says : that Hilary being but a deacon, having neither bishops nor priests, could not consecrate the eucharist, nor give baptism without the eucharist : *nec Baptisma tradere sine Eucharistia.*" He cites from Chrysoptom, Theodoret, Gelasius, whom the author of his repertory, Illyricus of lying memory, calls pope, and he repeats it, for the man honestly transcribes passages in which the corporal presence is precisely expressed, but the nature of the bread is said to remain. All these the writer had already assailed, and shewn that by the nature of the bread they understood what logicians now call the metaphysical essence, these attributes by which they distinguish accidents from substance, and in these symbols there is no change,—See Review, p. 210.

The passage cited from Chrysoptom, was quoted by Peter Martyr in his book against Gardiner ; it is not found in Chrysoptom's works, though the writer, whoever he be, is perfectly orthodox. There is a quotation from St. Ireneus garbled, and falsified. It is thus stated by our castigator : " that which is bread from the earth, perceiving the call of God, is not now common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly and the other spiritual."—Lib. 4, cap. 34. In that chapter this venerable and most ancient writer, who had learned the doctrines of christianity from Polycarp the evangelist, St. John's disciple, proves against sectaries, the resurrection of the flesh; on this principle, that the flesh and blood of Christ in the eucharist, being immortal and incorruptible, communicates immortality and incorruption to our bodies, " how again," says he, " do they say, that the flesh which is nourished with

the body and blood of the Lord, will come into corruption and not receive life? . . . . For as the bread which is from the earth receiving the vocation of God is not now common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly the other celestial, so our bodies receiving the eucharist are not now corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection."

Ireneus assumes, as a principle of demonstration, that is, as an unquestionable truth, that our bodies are nourished with the body and blood of Christ. From this principle he concludes that our bodies have in them a source of immortality and incorruption, and on it he founds a certain hope of our resurrection. To illustrate this truth he institutes a comparison, as the bread, which is a production of the earth, and consequently in itself and of its own nature, corruptible, by the invocation and power of God, is converted into the eucharist, in which there is one thing celestial, that is, the body and blood of Christ, which is incorruptible and immortal, and one thing terrestrial, that is, the *species*, which as to appearance is corruptible, so our bodies by receiving the eucharist have in them a source and principle of immortality and incorruption, though they appear mortal and corruptible. So well assured were these primitive Christians of the apostolical times, that the body and blood of Christ were really in the eucharist, and received by the faithful in that adorable sacrament, that from this mystery so far remote from human sense, and transcending human reason, Ireneus demonstrates another mystery not less opposite to sense and experience, nor less transcending human reason, that is, the resurrection of our bodies on the last day. He resumes the same argument in his fifth book,—cap. 2, in which, after shewing that our flesh must of all necessity rise immortal, because it is nourished by the body and blood of Jesus Christ, things immortal and incorruptible, he says: "as the vine, planted in the earth, produces its fruit in its time; and the grain of wheat falling on the earth, and dissolved

dissolved, rise manifold by the spirit of God, which contains all things ; which after by wisdom come into use for men, and receiving the word of God become the eucharist, that is, the body and blood of Christ, so our bodies nourished by it, and reposed in the earth and dissolved, will rise in their time, the word of God giving them a resurrection to the glory of the Father.”

He compares the human body to the grain of wheat ; they are both dissolved in the earth, and in appearance reduced to their component elements ; but there is in the grain of wheat a vegetative principle from nature, in virtue of which it rises again in a more flourishing condition, and in the human body a principle of life and immortality communicated by the immortal body of Jesus Christ in the eucharist, in virtue of which the human body will rise immortal and incorruptible. To garble an extract from a work, in opposition to a doctrine there taught, with more force, precision and perspicuity than in any of our modern controversial works, must be the effect of the most blind infatuation, or the most unblushing imposture.

As there is an extensive work preparing for the Press in which this, and other doctrines are vindicated from misrepresentation, and all the exceptions which this Edinburgh castigator has transcribed from his repertory are minutely discussed, the writer dismisses the subject for the present.

*Laus Christo ejusque Matri  
Maria semper Virgini.*

E. B. V. G. Q.



## ERRATA CORRECTA.

---

Page 7, line 22.	<i>Pec.</i>	—	<i>Oecolompadius</i>
11,	4,	<i>probably,</i>	<i>—privately</i>
12,	37,	<i>eik,</i>	<i>—eikō</i>
39,	32,	doubted?	
44,	4,	<i>cer,</i>	<i>—cor</i>
47,	6,	<i>says,</i>	<i>the cas. — , says the cassi.</i>
47,	17,	<i>castigator. as.</i>	<i>—castigator, as</i>
78,	20,	<i>Grelafius,</i>	<i>—Gelafius</i>
105,	6,	<i>assemble,</i>	<i>—assembly</i>
119,	34,	<i>Monday,</i>	<i>—Sunday</i>
134,	34,	<i>illusion,</i>	<i>—allusion</i>
172,	15,	<i>calumniate,</i>	<i>—calumniate</i>
189,	18,	<i>acquainted.</i>	<i>—acquainted?</i>
196,	3,	<i>who,</i>	<i>—whom</i>
267,	37,	<i>that,</i>	<i>—that is</i>
277,	24,	<i>Voluma,</i>	<i>—Volume</i>
298,	30,	<i>distinguish between</i>	<i>the true</i>
333,	18,	<i>cleram,</i>	<i>—clerum</i>
335,	1,	<i>Narbonce,</i>	<i>—Narbonce</i>
337,	36,	<i>Patroka,</i>	<i>—Patrokōs</i>
347,	33,	<i>Scriptures. take,</i>	<i>— , take</i>
395,	14,	<i>transfinited,</i>	<i>—transfined</i>
—,	16,	<i>ditto,</i>	<i>—ditto</i>
—,	21,	<i>ditto,</i>	<i>—ditto</i>

