



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

POPIISH
INFALLIBILITY.
1/-

1303 f. 73



600095163U

50.842

1303 f. 73



POPIISH INFALLIBILITY.

LETTERS

TO

VISCOUNT FEILDING

ON HIS SECESSION FROM THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND.

BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE,

AUTHOR OF "ROMANISM IN ENGLAND EXPOSED."

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."—1 THESS. v. 21.

LONDON:

ARTHUR HALL, VIRTUE, & CO.,

25, PATERNOSTER-BOW.

1850.

Digitized by Google

WHITING, BEAUFORT HOUSE, STRAND.



P R E F A C E.

IN submitting the following pages to the public, the writer would wish it to be understood that he lays no claim to originality. He is aware that the same ground has been gone over, again and again, by many more able reasoners and industrious compilers than himself. But, as Rome is engaged incessantly in repeating her arguments, and putting forth her claims, they must be repeatedly met, answered, and their fallacies exposed. And this is rendered the more necessary at the present time, when we find those who are possessed of superior education, and have the means before them of readily ascertaining *the truth*, are not only led away by the allurements of these vain arguments and pretensions, but become themselves, in turn, bold dogmatists. Each particular case, therefore, as it presents itself to us, should, in like manner, be promptly met, exposed, and refuted.

Lord Feilding is one of those late perverts to Popery, who, in every sense of the word, has had nothing to gain by the change but a most unenviable notoriety. We, therefore, naturally ask, What could have been the reasons and motives which induced him to secede from the Church of England? His motives we must believe to be sincere, for he declares his readiness, like a "true child of the Crusaders," to "fight for the truth, careless of obloquy and the world's opinion." His lordship declares his reason for leaving the Church of his birth, education, and country to be, that there is, in her, as he asserts, an "entire absence of a living definite authority in matters of Faith. . . . Such a living definite authority, conclusive and infallible, as guided by the promised teaching

of the Holy Ghost, he finds *alone claimed* and *alone EXERCISED* in the Church of Rome." It is, then, this phase of Romanism, so arrogantly assumed and put forward by the Church of Rome, and so dogmatically repeated by her new disciple, which the writer has endeavoured to meet, expose, and refute, in the following letters.

Though we may not doubt the integrity of purpose of his lordship, we have sufficiently cogent reasons for doubting the soundness of his reasoning powers; the writer despairs, therefore, of making any impression on his mind by the arguments adduced; but he lives in hope that his lordship's advisers may consider this pamphlet worthy of their consideration, and may be induced to come forward and vindicate the position assumed by their over-zealous pupil.

Lord Feilding has been led to believe that the Church of Rome is the "centre of unity." It is proved that, on the subject of "Infallibility" (the key-stone of her belief), this Church has never claimed it, and her members are themselves at variance as to the locality, extent, and effect of this attribute. It was the author's original intention to have examined each peculiar dogma of the modern Church of Rome, and to have proved each, in its turn, to be not only novel and unscriptural, but that her followers, when they come to define their peculiar views on each dogma, are not in agreement among themselves, and therefore, her claim to be the "centre of unity" is as vain and false as her claim to infallibility: but, for the present, he has contented himself with the subject immediately raised by Lord Feilding's Letter to the "*Times*," viz., "Popish Infallibility." His lordship's advisers may, hereafter, afford the writer an opportunity of carrying out his original intention.

. *The first six Letters appeared in successive numbers of the "Historic Times;" the other five have been added in this reprint.*

London, December, 1850.

POPISH INFALLIBILITY.

LETTER I.

TO VISCOUNT FEILDING.

MY LORD,—What had been the subject of rumour, was confirmed by your letter to the editor of the *Times*. You have, my lord, openly declared your secession from the Church of England, to join that which we, from our infancy, have been taught to consider a false and an apostate Church. By this act you have withdrawn your allegiance from our Most Gracious Queen, in matters temporal as well as spiritual, to obey the dictates of the head of the Church Papal. The decrees and bulls issued from the fountain head of the so-called “centre of unity,” which to this day remain unrepealed, absolve you from your allegiance to all heretical princes. *Roma locuta, causa finita est.*

England is a land of religious, as well as civil liberty. Here the idolatrous Hindoo, the rigid Mussulman, the unbelieving Jew, and intolerant and superstitious Papist, enjoy equal protection. Here each may openly declare and teach his peculiar doctrines and sentiments, and glory in maintaining the religion of his forefathers. The liberty of the press of this country, is one of those great privileges which we, and all these sects and denominations of believers, enjoy,—the boast of this enlightened nation, and the envy of the world. Availing yourself of this glorious liberty, you should, in publicly announcing your determination to secede from the Established Church of this country, have congratulated yourself that you enjoyed that liberty, which the “infallible” head of that “centre of unity,” “guided by the Holy Ghost,” denies to his subjects in his own country. Is it not strange that you, a Romanist, avail yourself of that liberty of conscience and liberty of th^o

press by which you can give free circulation to your sentiments, which the predecessor of the present Pope (the late Pope Gregory XVI.) most heartily condemned? In 1832 this infallible head of the centre of unity thus wrote: "Hither tends that worst and *never-sufficiently-to-be-execrated and detested liberty of the press*, for the diffusion of all manner of writings which some so loudly contend for." And he adds: "From this same fountain of indifference flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather *raving, in favour, and in defence of liberty of conscience*, for which most pestilential error the course is open by that entire and wild liberty of opinion," &c. (1) I do not exaggerate when I state, that had your lordship publicly expressed in Papal Rome, the like sentiments against the Romish Church which you have against the Established Church in this country, your lordship would have been politely escorted, by a guard of honour, across the frontier, if no worse befel you; a native, under similar circumstances, would have had a practical enjoyment of the "sweets of solitude." In thus availing yourself of the glorious privileges of this Protestant country, you must inwardly congratulate yourself that you are under the protection at least, if not the subject, of a Protestant monarch.

Respecting then, as I do, this liberty, it would be inconsistent in me were I to find fault, in the present instance, with your having made a public declaration of your religious sentiments. But, my lord, when this public declaration is accompanied by statements and assertions which are not only erroneous, but tend to lead astray the uninstructed and unstable; particularly those who, like your lordship, have not been able to distinguish facts from fictions, and are weak enough to suppose that to claim a thing, title, or attribute, is the same as to be lawfully and actually in possession of the thing claimed—to claim infallibility is the same as actually to enjoy it—and when others, like yourself, take for granted certain assertions put forward by interested parties, speaking with an assumed authority, and like yourself boldly retail them as ascertained facts, and adopt them as a ground or basis for their motives and actions, deluding themselves with the idea that they are acting consistently and with reason; "conscientiously convinced that it is for the sake of truth and duty," and thus blindly propagating falsehood and error; when, I say, such is the nature and tendency of your public declaration, I have a right, and feel it a duty, to enter a protest and warn the public, at least the "unstable and unwary," against the danger they incur in blindly adopting the course you have thought proper to take, founded, as it is, on false grounds, false reasoning, and perversion of facts.

I am willing to believe that your lordship is sincere, when you state that it is "the duty of every Churchman to fight for the truth, careless

(1) "The Laity's Directory, A.D. 1833." Keating and Brown, London.

of all obloquy and the world's opinion," and that *you* are prepared to do so; and I am also willing to believe that you would not have adopted such a course had you not been conscientiously convinced that it was for the sake of *truth and duty*. If, however, I can show that your lordship's reasons for seceding from the Church of England to join the Church of Rome are erroneous, will your lordship be bold enough to acknowledge yourself in error, and be ready to retrace your steps?

The following is your own declaration, which I take from the *Times* of the 5th Sept., conveying your reasons for seceding from our Church:—

"The late painful conflicts in the (so-called) Church of England have only been instrumental in my conversion to the Catholic Church, in so far as they proved to me the entire absence of a living definite authority in matters of faith, without which creeds and formularies, being liable to different interpretations, are mere dead letters. Such a living definite authority, conclusive and infallible, as guided by the promised teaching of the Holy Ghost, I find *alone* claimed and *alone* exercised in the Church of Rome. For this reason, and from the firm and overpowering conviction that the Church of England at the Reformation had forfeited her catholicity in separating herself from the centre of unity, I felt myself bound to leave her, being convinced that she is now only reaping the natural fruits of what she had then sown. My doubts on this point were not the growth of a day or a week; they had long harassed me, and the principal essays to prove the contrary appeared to me eminently unsatisfactory and inconclusive."

Now, my lord, while I acquit you of all *intentional* dishonesty, I am constrained to say that the above sentiments could not have been written by any honest man, by a sincere inquirer for the truth, who had himself carefully and dispassionately examined the subject on both sides, but by one who, with an *amiable* weakness, the characteristic of some few of our young nobility, has implicitly believed and swallowed all that his Tractarian or semi-Popish instructors have thought proper to impart to him. If I put any other construction on your words in the present instance, it must be the unpleasant alternative of imputing to your lordship a conscious and deliberate perversion of facts. I will most willingly assume the former to be the case.

In the above extract you assume, as ascertained and admitted facts, that the Roman Church is *the* Catholic Church, in exclusion of all other branches of the Holy Catholic Church; that in this Roman Church is a living definite authority, conclusive and infallible, which is guided by the promised teaching of the Holy Ghost, and this assumption you have found *alone* claimed and *alone exercised* in the Church of Rome; that this Church is the centre of unity; and that the Church of England (according to your overpowering conviction) at the Reformation had forfeited her catholicity in separating herself from the centre of unity.

All this, if true, would fully justify you in the course you have thought proper to adopt; but you will pardon me if I assure your lordship that you have been most lamentably deceived. What "principal essays" on the subject you have consulted, I cannot guess; but it is very evident that you have betrayed a too credulous disposition by accepting bare assertions, destitute of all proof, for ascertained and existing facts, which proves you to be most eminently fit to become a member of that Church which requires from every one an implicit obedience, an unquestioning faith, and a total renunciation of private judgment, sense, and liberty of conscience, and an unqualified submission to the head of the Church—the Pope.

I now boldly tell your lordship, that if the sentiments uttered by you are the result of honest conviction, you have been most grievously deceived. I shall prove to you, in the sequel, that this Church of Rome is not "the Catholic Church," but a withered and apostate branch of the Christian Church; that she is not herself, nor does she possess in herself, a "living, definite, conclusive, and infallible authority;" nor does she exercise it, for it does not exist in her. I am aware that *some* of her members claim some such authority to exist somewhere, or in some one; but they are far from being agreed among themselves as to the seat of this infallibility. So much for *unity*. Your lordship has *found* the locality of this infallible authority, and, perhaps, can point it out to us; but you should bear in mind that this Church herself has *never* claimed to possess this infallible authority by either canon, decree, or other authoritative declaration; and I call upon you to show me, where and when the Church of Rome has claimed to be infallible, and how or in what manner she has ever exercised, or ever given any practical exemplification of the existence of, this divine attribute; and whether she has ever defined the seat, nature, or extent of that infallibility. I shall prove to you that the Church of Rome is not the centre of unity, unless you mean that the Pope of Rome, for the time being, is the Church concentrated in himself; then we should, indeed, have a centre of unity after a certain fashion. But you cannot mean this, but that in the Church of Rome there is a harmony and unity of doctrine and faith existing throughout. This is, however, far from being the case. This pretended harmony has not been inaptly compared to the harmony that is supposed to exist among the animals of opposite natures, brought together in the well-known perambulating menagerie called the "Happy Family." The secret consists in the awful presence of the keeper, who is prepared to smite on the mouth the first unfortunate animal who may show an inclination to give way to his natural propensity; (1) and so in the Church of Rome, no sooner does a man ex-

(1) It has been suggested, that there are other causes which account for the docile nature of these animals. Some are fed up and pampered, some drugged,

press an honest opinion, than he is excommunicated and anathematised as a heretic (formerly a serious matter, and still so in Popish countries), his works undergo an expurgatory process, or are placed in the Index of Prohibited Books. I would undertake to show a complete refutation of Popery or Romanism from the works of Roman Catholics placed in these indices. I shall prove that the Church of England has not forfeited her claim to membership with the "Holy Catholic Church," by separating herself at the time of the Reformation from the Church of Rome. Your expression of "forfeited catholicity" I do not exactly understand. I was not aware that the Church of England claimed *catholicity* in herself.

I would remark that the members of the Church of Rome are *not* the *only* claimants for the existence of the divine attribute of infallibility in their Church; the members of the Greek Church are equally arrogant, and can show as good a title to this claim as the Church of Rome. You speak dogmatically on this subject, and justify yourself on the assumed position of the Church of Rome in this respect; and you seem to have overlooked the above important fact, otherwise, perhaps, you might have been placed in a similar situation to the unfortunate and much-abused animal who found himself unhappily between two equally inviting bundles of hay.

The "principal essays" on the subject in question having proved eminently unsatisfactory in removing your doubts, it may be considered presumptuous on my part to attempt to convince your lordship of the fallacies of the position you have assumed. I will, notwithstanding, apply myself to the task of addressing to your lordship a series of letters, relying on the sincerity of your declaration, "that you are prepared to fight for the *truth*, careless of all obloquy and the world's opinion;" and I fervently pray that the "Holy Spirit" may lead us both into the way of all truth.—I have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

A LAY SUBSCRIBER.

P.S.—I have taken the liberty of forwarding to your lordship a copy of the last number of the *Historic Times*. You have given us to understand that you have found the seat of infallibility; may I request your careful attention to the letter signed "A Lay Subscriber," and to the questions set out at foot. Your lordship will doubtless find no difficulty in answering the several questions.

THE LETTER REFERRED TO IN THE LAST POSTSCRIPT.

This letter is here set out in full, as appropriate to the subject under consideration. The writer was challenged by a gentleman, a Roman some have their teeth filed, and others their claws cut. It would not be difficult to carry out the similarity of treatment adopted by the Church of Rome towards her refractory members.

Catholic and a Barrister, in consequence of certain previous letters published in the *Historic Times*, containing a correspondence with Dr. Wiseman. In answer to the challenge, the subjoined questions were forwarded to the learned gentleman. But as no answer has been hazarded, perhaps his lordship, Viscount Feilding, or any of the late perverts to Romanism, may undertake to answer them.

A ROMANIST'S CHALLENGE ANSWERED.

SIR,—It may not be uninteresting to your readers—at least to such of them as have expressed their approval of my humble efforts in the Protestant cause—to hear that the publication of my correspondence with Dr. Wiseman has provoked a challenge from a barrister, a member of the Romish Church. The subject he has chosen is “INFALLIBILITY.”!! The challenge was conveyed to me by a mutual friend. I regret that my opponent is not a priest, and the subject “Liguori’s Moral Theology.” (1) In accepting the challenge, I wrote to my opponent, stating, that as he would have to prove the existence of “Infallibility,” he should begin the discussion, for I could not be called upon to prove a negative. But as a great deal of circumlocution or irrelevant matter might be introduced for want of a proper understanding as to definition of terms, I asked permission to put a few questions, which would considerably abridge his labours in opening the subject, as also mine in my reply. I further proposed, as a rule never to be departed from, that no assertion, fact, or doctrine, should be brought forward by either party, unless accompanied by a reference to a canon, decree, or to the works of some eminent and acknowledged authority to prove that asserted fact or doctrine.

I add, at foot, the questions I have submitted for the consideration of my learned opponent. I am rather curious to know what answers will be given; for, whichever ground he takes, I can show him that there are two or more powerful sects within the bosom of the Romish Church, who hold opposite views on this all-important doctrine. Infallibility is one of the fundamental principles or points of faith of the Romish Church; indeed, my learned opponent declared, that, were he not convinced of the existence of Infallibility (of course he has satisfied himself where it is to be found), he would cease to be a member of the Church of Rome. Now, it so happens that there is no point of faith or doctrine taught by this Church on which there is so great a diversity of opinion. Notwithstanding which, the great Cardinal Bellarmin declares, that one of the *notes* or marks by which this Church is known, is the “union of the members among themselves, and with the Head.” (2) He declares that

(1) The subject of former letters, now published under the title of “Romanism in England Exposed.” Messrs. Hall and Virtue, 25, Paternoster-row.

(2) Bell., lib. iv., cap. x., De Notis Ecclesie.

the Head to which the members are united is the POPE; and, as among themselves, he asserts, that all the members must agree in *all points of faith*, "since they all submit their own senses to the sense of one and the same chief pastor (the Pope), guiding the Church from the chair of Peter, with the advice of other pastors:"—and again, that "the union of the members of the Roman Church to the Pope, as the Head, and their union among themselves (consists) in believing all that he (the Pope) teaches from the chair of Peter," &c. Here we see that all true members of the Church must, in matters of faith, agree with the Pope and with each other. How my friend will reconcile the differences which really exist on this point of faith, time may show. In the mean time, a most important subject suggests itself for our consideration. Bellarmin, the great authority of the Romish Church, makes a plain acknowledgment, and, by his own showing, declares that his Church, the "Roman Church," is a distinct Church from the "Holy Catholic Church," the former appointing the Pope as Head, to whom the members submit their "sense," while the latter acknowledges no other HEAD than our Lord Jesus Christ. The Scriptures teach us, "that when God raised him (Christ) from the dead, he gave him to be HEAD over all things to the Church, which is HIS BODY" (Eph. i. 20, 22, 23), and that "as they have many members in one body," "so we, being many, are ONE BODY in Christ" (Rom. xii. 4, 5); that, "as the body is one and hath many members . . . so also is CHRIST;" that is, Christ and the Church, the whole being denominated from the Head, for we "are the BODY OF CHRIST." (1 Cor. xii. 27.) And again, we are taught that "He is the Head, even Christ, from whom the whole body is fitly joined together" (Eph. iv. 16), and that HE is the Head of the Church, and the Saviour of the body," and that He "is the head of the body, the Church. (Col. i. 18.) Now, Sir, if the Roman Church declares herself to be "The Church," I have yet to learn that the Church of Christ has two heads—is a two-headed monster. We have seen that the members of the true Church form but one body, under one Head. Therefore, each Head must have its distinct body and members: one is Christ, the other must be Anti-Christ—the Pope. If there be two infallible heads, there must be two Churches, for we are taught that we cannot serve two masters. I must leave my learned opponent to choose of which body he is a member; but, for my part, being thoroughly satisfied that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only Infallible Head, I fervently pray that I may be made worthy to be called a member of that "one body in Christ." How my learned opponent will prove "Infallibility" to exist in any one member, or class of members, of his Church, or in the Pope as Head of his Church, when the true Head alone is infallible, I am at a loss to conjecture. He will find a sufficient field for the exercise of his ingenuity; and such of your readers as are in any

degree acquainted with the Romish controversy, will appreciate the difficulties suggested by my questions, when the answers must be consistent with the rule laid down by Bellarmin in his "Notes of the Church," as a test by which the true Church may be known.—I am Sir, &c.

THE QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR SOLUTION. (1)

1. I require a definition of the term "Infallibility," and the authority for such definition.

2. Where, in whom, and in what man or men, does Infallibility reside?

3. Is the Pope of Rome, for the time being, infallible? And if so, how do you prove him to be so?

4. On what authority do you claim Infallibility in the Pope, to the exclusion of every other mortal?

5. Having given your authority, am I required to receive that authority without question, or am I required to exercise my private judgment in examining the meaning or application of that authority? or on whose *dictum* am I to receive it?

6. How do you prove the Infallibility of the authority quoted to support your position, and who is to judge whether that authority be infallible?

7. Does Infallibility reside in a General Council, the council being viewed collectively, the members individually being fallible?

8. What is a General Council? How many men must there be to constitute a General Council? What clerical rank must they severally hold? Of what nations? By whose authority must they meet? When and where must they meet? How must they proceed when they meet? Must they determine by unanimity; or may they deliver their infallible decree by a given large majority, or by a majority of one?

9. How do you prove that Infallibility rests in a General Council?

10. On what authority do you claim Infallibility in a General Council?

11. Having given your authority, &c. (repeat here questions 5 and 6).

12. Does Infallibility reside in one or few members of the General Council, and in no more?

13. Or does Infallibility reside in every single member of the General Council, or in the members collectively?

14. How are those few, or that single one, to be ascertained?

15. Repeat here the questions 4, 5, and 6, applying them to the questions 12 and 13.

(1) See Rogers' Anti-popo-priestian, whose arrangement is here partially adopted.

16. Does Infallibility reside in the Pope and General Council taken together?

17. On what authority do you claim this?

18. Repeat here the questions 5 and 6.

19. Does Infallibility reside in any other set of individual priests or men?

20. On what authority do you claim this?

21. Repeat here the questions 5 and 6.

Having defined what Infallibility is, and where to be found, I proceed to ask—

22. How far does Infallibility extend? On what is it employed? What is the range or scope of its application? Does it include doctrine only, or practice too? Does it apply to both discipline and government? Does it include revealed religion, or natural as well? Does it refer to opinion exclusively, or relate to fact? If not all, who is to draw the line of demarcation—the extent, in fact, of Infallibility?

23. On what authority do you speak?

24. Repeat here the questions 5 and 6.

You may, perhaps, disclaim Infallibility in any of the above, but declare that "THE CHURCH" is infallible.

25. I then shall require you to give me a definition of the term "The Church," and the authority for such definition, and answer to the questions 5 and 6, as if here repeated. And is the Church of Rome that Church?

26. On what authority do you declare that "The Church," thus defined, is infallible?

27. Repeat here the questions 5 and 6.

28. I read in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.—the universally-accepted Creed of the members of the present Church of Rome—"I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our Holy Mother, "The Church," has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures." (1) This you have sworn to obey. I now ask you, do you appeal to Scripture to prove the Infallibility of this Church?

The Church, you will perceive, first declares herself to be the sole interpreter of the Scriptures, and then claims her Infallibility on the authority of the Scriptures. This you will also perceive is to make the foundation the superstructure, and, at the same time, the superstructure the foundation—a "vicious circle." I must therefore request you to

(1) *Concl. Tridit., can. et decret., Paris, 1823, p. 331, and Kerk and Berrington, 1st edit., p. 456; 2nd edit., p. 454.*

give me some infallible authority independent of the Scripture to prove the Infallibility of the Church.

29. Having furnished me with that authority, I must here repeat questions 5 and 6 to be answered.

30. If you have no other authority but Scripture, am I required to exercise my private judgment in examining the meaning or application of that text or texts quoted (not being a Roman Catholic)? If not, whose *dictum* or interpretation am I to take—my own bishop, or a Romish bishop, or whose?

31. Presuming that you have, to your own satisfaction, found the seat of Infallibility, and the extent and quality of its operation, what benefit have you derived from it, that I, a Protestant, do not also enjoy?

32. Have you found that your Church has ever printed and published an infallible interpretation of any one chapter of the Bible?

It has not.

33. This being the fact, and you being satisfied that Infallibility does exist somewhere, I ask you to give me a practical illustration of its utility to you. I require you to consult your oracle, and give me an infallible interpretation to the following texts, bearing in mind that you and your priest have sworn "that I will never take and interpret them (the Scriptures) otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers" (references *ut supra*). The texts are Matt. xvi. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15. I limit myself to these two at present, to bring the matter to a proper issue and test.

In the mean time, I request your attention to the following texts. I quote from the *Douay version*, for, maybe, you may object to the Protestant version, though I do assure you that the Douay version is by no means so perfect or so forcible as the latter.

St. Paul, writing to the Christians at Rome, or the Church at Rome, warns them, saying, "Because of unbelief they (the Jews) were broken off. But thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but *fear*. For if God spared not the natural branches (the Jews), *fear lest He also spare not thee*. See, therefore, the goodness and the severity of God: towards them indeed that are fallen, the severity: but towards thee (Romans) the goodness of God, if thou continue in goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off." (Rom. xi. 20—22.) Could Paul have thus written to an infallible Church? "But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your Master, and *all* you are brethren. And call none your father [*Papa—Pope*] upon earth, for one is your Father who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, Christ." (Matt. xxiii. 8, 9, 10.) "Not because we lord it over your faith, but we are helpers of your joy: for in (by) faith you stand." (2 Cor. i. 24.) "Neither as domineering over the clergy, but being made a pattern of

the flock from the heart (being examples to the flock)." (1 Peter v. 3.) "Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." (1 John iv. 1.) "To the law rather, and to the testimony, and if they speak not according to this word, they shall not have the morning light (it is because there is no light in them)." (Isah. viii. 20.) "Now these (the Bereans) were more noble than those of Thessalonica, who received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures, whether these things were so." (Acts xvii. 11.) "But prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. v. 21.) "From thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee unto salvation, through the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture divinely inspired, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice: that the man of God may be perfect, (thoroughly) furnished unto every good work." (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17.) "Search the Scriptures." (John v. 39.) "But if any of you want wisdom, let him ASK OF GOD, who giveth to ALL abundantly, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him; but let him ask in faith, nothing wavering." (James i. 5, 6.)

LETTER II.

MY LORD,—Before I proceed to examine the various positions assumed by your lordship, it is necessary that we should come to some clear understanding as to the meaning or value of terms. The words "Church" and "Catholic" are frequently used both by Romanists and Protestants, without a clear and definite idea as to their true meaning. Protestants, in common parlance, designate the members of the Romish Church, or those who subscribe the Tridentine declaration of faith, as "Catholics"—a contradiction—Catholic meaning *universal*, while Romanism (Roman Catholicism) is local, and limited to a comparative few; and whenever the word "Church" is added to the word "Catholic," Romanists invariably assume that the Roman or Papal Church must be understood: and, again, when any peculiar promise of grace is made to a Church, in the Scriptures, they also declare that the Church of Rome is exclusively pointed out. This is to assume the whole point of argument in dispute between us. It is, therefore, most important that we should fully understand, and be agreed in the meaning of, these terms in the outset.

And, first, as to the term "The Church." What does it mean? Where is it to be found? Augustine, encountering the Donatists, settles the disputed point between them in the following words: "The question is, where the Church should be, what then shall we do? Shall we seek it in our own words, or in the words of our Lord Jesus? In my

judgment, we ought rather to seek the Church in His own words, for that He is the truth, and knoweth His own body." (1) To find the Church, he appeals to Scripture, and not to councils, bishops, or writings. He says: "Let them, the Donatists [and as we say of the modern Romanists], if they can, show their Church, not in rumours and speeches of the men of Africa [read Italy], not in the councils of their bishops, not in the discourses of any writers whatsoever, not in signs and miracles that may be forged, for we are forewarned by God's Word, and therefore forearmed against those things; but in the pre-script of the law, in the prediction of the Prophets, in the verses of the Psalms, in the voice of the Shepherd himself, in the preaching and works of the Evangelists; that is, in all the canonical authorities of the Sacred Scriptures." (2) And again he says: "To that end thou mightest not err in the Church, and lest any man should say, This is Christ, who is not Christ, or This is the Church, which is not the Church, hear the voice of the Shepherd; He hath showed thee the Church, that the name of the Church may not deceive thee." (3) "In them (the Scriptures) we have known Christ, in them we have known the Church." (4) And Jerome tells us, that in his days "the Church was not gone out of her limits of the Holy Scriptures, and from thence the timber and materials must be taken with which the house of wisdom is to be built." (5) And to the like effect Chrysostom: "It can no way be known which is the true Church (*nisi tantummodo per Scripturas*) but only by the Scriptures; otherwise, if they had regard to other things, they should be offended and perish, and not understand which is the true Church." (6) If we refer to the sacred oracles, given to us for our instruction, and learn from them what we are to understand by "The Church;" and then, having satisfied ourselves on this head, if we compare the doctrines taught by the modern Church of Rome with the standard of Scripture and the true Church there pointed out to us, you will find, and I am prepared to prove, that the Church of Rome is not *the* Catholic Church. Here let me observe, that I shall in every instance quote from the Roman Catholic Douay version, for now, as a Romanist, you will be taught to designate our translation—the translation which hitherto you have cherished with so much reverence and affection—an "heretical book," which the late Pope Gregory XVI. classes with other works as "pernicious and mortal pastures." (7)

(1) "Quæstio est ubi sit ecclesia," &c.—Aug. de Unit. Ecol. c. 1, sect. 2; Bened., tom. 9, p. 236. Ed. Antr., 1700.

(2) "Remotis ergo omnibus," &c.—Ibid, p. 371, tom. 9. Paris, 1688.

(3) "Ne in ecclesia errares, &c.—Aug. Psal. 69, tom. 4, p. 715. Paris, 1681.

(4) "In Scripturis didicimus," &c.—Ep. 166, p. 301, tom. 2. Paris, 1679.

(5) "Non est egressa," &c.—Hier. in Mich., p. 445, tom. 6. Veron., 1736.

(6) Hom. 49, c. 24, tom. 6, p. 204. Paris, 1718.

(7) "The Laity's Directory," A.D. 1833. Keating and Brown, London.

From the Scriptures, then, we learn that "The Church" (1)—

I. Signifies—*A religious assembly selected and called out of the world by the doctrines of the Gospel to worship the true God in Christ according to his Word*, as we read in 1 Cor. i. 2, "To the Church of God that is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place of theirs and ours;" and in Rev. ii. 7, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches; To him, that overcometh, I will give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of my God."

II. Signifies—*All the elect of God, of what nation soever, from the beginning to the end of the world, who make but one body, whereof Jesus Christ is the head.* Acts ii. 47. "And the Lord added daily to their society (*ἐκκλησία*, Church) such as should be saved." Col. i. 18, "And He is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he may hold the primacy." "His body which is the Church," Ibid, 24; and see the texts, Eph. i. 20, 22, 23; Rom. xii. 4, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27; Eph. iv. 16, v. 23. By these several last-cited texts we learn that the Church is the Body of Christ, that all believers in Him are members of that Body, and "that He is the Head, even Christ: from whom the whole body, compacted and fitly joined together by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, making increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity." (Eph. iv. 15, 16.)

III. Signifies—*The faithful of some one family, together with such Christians as were wont to assemble with them for solemn worship.* "And the Church which is in their house" (namely, of Priscilla and Aquila). (Rom. xvi. 5.) "Salute the brethren who are at Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the Church that is in his house." (Col. iv. 15.) "And to Appia, our dearest sister, and to Archippus, our fellow-soldier, and to the Church which is in thy house." (Phil. ii.)

IV. Signifies—*The faithful of some one province.* "Paul and Silvanus, and Timothy, to the Church of the Thessalonians in God our Father," &c. (2 Thess. i. 1.) "The Church which is in Babylon elected together salute you." (1 Pet. v. 16, &c.)

V. Signifies—*The representatives of the Church.* As in Matt. xviii. 17, "Tell it to the Church;" *i.e.*, If there be a quarrel, "*if thy brother offend thee,*" first reprove him; if he shall not hear thee, take with thee one or two; and if he will not hear then, "tell it to the Church;" that is, to such of the rulers to whom the censures of the Church do of right belong, that by them it may be communicated to the whole society or body. Here no question of doctrine, or controversy in

(1) In these definitions I have, to some extent, followed the arrangement set out in "Cruden's Concordance," title, "Church."

points of faith, discipline, &c., is contemplated to be referred to the Church, but simply a quarrel—"if thy brother offend thee."

VI. "The Church" may signify—"The congregation of the Jews, which was formerly the Church and people of God; as may be gathered from Acts vii. 38: and

VII. Signifies—*The place of worship*.—"For first of all I hear that when you come together in the church, there are divisions among you" (1 Cor. xi. 18); "But in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding," &c. (xiv. 19); "Let your women keep silence in the churches." (xiv. 34.)

Such are the various significations of the term "The Church" gathered from the New Testament, and I write subject to correction if I have omitted any other interpretation. Here, then, we find that it is presumptuous arrogance on the part of the modern Papal Church to declare herself to be *the Church* spoken of in Scripture, while the remarkable fact must not be overlooked, that there is not *the name of a Church* given to the Romans, in all the Scriptures, *as a Church*, though we read of a Church at Jerusalem (Acts vii. 1), which was the mother and mistress of all Churches; the Church at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1), where the Disciples were first called Christians; at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13); in Laodicea (Col. iv. 16); the Church of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira (Rev. ii. 1, 8, 12, 18); Sardis (iii. 1); Philadelphia (iii. 7); of Galatia (1 Cor. xvi. 1); Macedonia (2 Cor. viii. 1), &c.; but no mention of a Church of, or at, Rome by name. And what were the testimonies and promises made to these different Churches? Paul, writing to the Thessalonians *as a Church*, gives this testimony on their behalf: "For from you was spread abroad the Word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and in Achaia, but also in every place, your faith which is towards God, is gone forth, so that we need not to speak anything." (1 Thess. i. 8.) He even gives them a promise of perpetuity of faith. "God is faithful, who will strengthen and keep you from (all) evil." (2 Thess. iii. 3.) The Ephesians he declares to be "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1) (1 Tim. iii. 15); and

(1) This text is quoted by Romanists to prove that *the Church* of Rome is "the pillar and ground of the truth;" but, according to the proper punctuation of the text, it will be observed that it is not *the Church* but *the great mystery of godliness* which is declared to be the "pillar and foundation of the truth." Ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῆς, πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεισθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλήσια θεοῦ ξῶντος. Στύλος καὶ ἐδραῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ὁμολογούμενως μέγα, ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. (1 Tim. iii. 15, 16.) Griesbach. The interpretation in the letter is given as referring to *the Church*. This is done to give Romanists all the benefit of the text they can make of it. The Church here referred to, if at all, applies to the Church of Ephesus, and not to that of Rome.

for this Church He prayed that she "might be strengthened with power by the Spirit." (Eph. iii. 16.) The Corinthians are termed by St. Paul "the Church of God called to be saints" (1 Cor. i. 2); and he testified that she was made rich by the grace of God, that is given to her through Jesus Christ, in all things, in every word, and in all knowledge, and that there was nothing wanting in her in any grace, and that the Lord would "confirm you unto the end, without crime, waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ." But notwithstanding these promises and assurances, all these several Churches have utterly fallen from the truth. Did Paul write words of comfort to the persecuted Christians at Rome? He did. He greets them, "To all that are at Rome the beloved of God, called to be saints," and thanks God that their "faith is spoken of in the whole world." (Rom. i. 7, 8.) But mark this great difference, that they received no promise of infallibility or promise of perpetuity; but St. Paul warns them that "because of unbelief they (the Jews) were broken off. But thou (Romans) standest by faith: be not high-minded, *but fear*. For if God spared not the natural branches (the Jews), *fear lest he also spare not thee*. See, therefore, the goodness and the severity of God: towards them indeed that are fallen, the severity; but towards thee (Romans), the goodness of God, *if thou continue in goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off*." (Rom. xi. 20, 22.) Could Paul have thus written to those who subsequently should become "the Holy Catholic Church" and infallible? That the Church of Rome, subsequently established, has not continued in all "goodness," and has fallen off from the "faith once delivered to the saints," I shall presently fully prove to your lordship, and establish the truth declared in our Nineteenth Article, that "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manners of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."

But to return to our subject, "The Church." Perhaps, my lord, now that you are turned Romanist, you will, true to your newly-adopted faith, decline to admit the Scriptures as a sufficient guide to determine the question raised. You may exclaim, "What say the Fathers? I have sworn *never* to interpret the Scriptures except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." I will consider the definition given by the Fathers in my next letter; and by way of digression, might I ask your lordship whether you have read any one volume of the "Fathers?" Surely when taking the oath contained in Pope Pius IV.'s Creed, you must have felt some curiosity to know what was contained in these numerous and ponderous tomes. Or did you blindly swear, on subscribing to the Tridentine Creed, unreservedly to ascertain first the "unanimous consent of the Fathers" upon every text of Scripture before you would interpret the meaning of it? Did it ever strike you, my

lord, that though Romanists are denied all private judgment, in matters of faith, and in the interpretation of Scripture, it requires, in very fact, a far greater degree of learning, and the exercise of private judgment, for a Romanist, than a Protestant, to learn his faith, for the former must collect the uniform consent of the "Fathers" (their works consisting of no less than thirty-five folio volumes, written in Greek and Latin), and ascertain their sentiments on the subject required to be solved, before he can even pretend to understand it? But this is not all; he must first have ascertained which are genuine productions and which are spurious—a task beyond the powers of any single or even collective number of individuals; and though he may have received a special dispensation from the Pope or bishop of his diocese to read the Scriptures, and supposing that he had arrived at a unanimity of interpretation from the "Fathers" (a matter impossible), he has even then to submit to the subsequent interpretation of that great and incomprehensible authority, "The Church," "whose office it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures," and even then he will find himself no nearer to the truth; while, on the contrary, the sincere Protestant reads his Bible, and, in addition to his pastor's assistance, relies on God's gracious promise, that if he want wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all abundantly, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him; but let him ask in faith (James i. 5), and that He will lead him into the way of all truth. Did your lordship ascertain, before you adopted the Romish faith, whether "Holy Mother Church" had cleared the way for your lordship, and had in any edition, in any age, given the unanimous consent of the Fathers on any one chapter of the Bible? or did you expect to find every parish priest a walking library of the Fathers, to give you on demand an infallible interpretation, which interpretation will be acknowledged by your Church? for they, too, have taken a similar oath.

My lord, the whole is a deception. Common sense will prove to you the fallacy of your newly-assumed position. These so-called Fathers were, at best, mere fallible men, who had no greater advantage than ourselves. Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, &c., &c., had the same Bible that we have; but we, in addition, have all their experience and research, to which add all our modern, in many instances not less learned and spiritual, theologians. Had your lordship studied these latter a little more, and listened to the Tractarians less, you would not have allowed your mind to have been so miserably perverted. To leave the Scriptures to grope among the writings of the Fathers is unprofitable; it is labour lost; but however unwelcome the task may be, in the present instance, their testimony totally condemns the modern and exclusive explanation of "The Church," as interpreted and applied by the modern Romanists. This part of my subject I will consider in my next.—I have the honour, &c.

LETTER III.

MY LORD,—In my last, I gave the several Scriptural definitions of the word "Church;" I now propose, according to promise, to add that given by the early Christian writers, when it will be at once seen that the Church of England, taking her Articles of Faith, in this respect, as a standard, is more in accordance with Scripture and the early Christian Church, than is the modern Church of Rome; the latter exclusively confining the Church of Christ, as we shall presently see, to the person of the Pope himself, or to the council or bishops of that particular Church, while the former declares that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." (Art. XIX.) The second part of the above having been rendered necessary, as the Church of Rome had added to the two sacraments ordained by Christ (Baptism and the Lord's Supper), five others, which she declares to be *instituted* by Christ; and adds a curse against any one who should say that each one of these five pretended sacraments, namely, Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, "is not truly and properly a sacrament *instituted* by Christ." (Con. Trid., 1 can., 7 sess.)

Augustine thus defines "The Church of Christ:" "By the second day of the week we ought only to understand the Church of Christ; but the Church of Christ which is in the saints; the Church of Christ which is in those who are written in heaven; the Church of Christ which is in those who yield not to the temptations of this world." (1) And again: "His whole Church, which is spread everywhere, is His body, of which He is the head. But not only do the faithful of the present day, but those who were before us, and those who shall exist after us to the end of time, belong to His body, of which body He is the head, who ascended into heaven." (2) And to the like effect in Psalm 36. (Tom. 4, p. 284.)

Jerome says: "The Church of Christ, which has Churches in the whole world, is united by the unity of the Spirit, and has the cities of the law, the prophets, the gospels, and the apostles; she has not gone forth from her boundaries—that is, the Holy Scriptures." (3) It is evident, from this definition, that the Church which accepts tradition as of equal authority with Scripture, has travelled out of Scripture, and ac-

(1) "Secundum ergo," &c.—*Enarratio in Psalm 47*, tom. 4; Bened. Edit. Paris, 1691.

(2) "Tota ecclesia ejus," &c.—*Ibid in Psalm 62*, tom. 4, p. 607.

(3) "Ecclesia Christi in toto orbe," &c.—*Can. in Mich.*, lib. 1, c. 1, tom. 5, p. 334. Paris, 1602.

ording to Jerome, cannot be *the Church of Christ*. Again he says: "The Church does not consist of walls, but of true doctrine. *Wherever the true faith is, there is the Church.*" (1) "The human soul is the only true temple of Christ. The Church of Christ is nothing but the souls of those who believe in Christ." (2) "But the Church herself, which is the congregation of all the saints on account of her eternal steadfastness in the Lord, is called the pillar and ground of truth." (3) "Let the Church be anxious to be united with Christ. But mark, the Church is the assembly of all the saints." (4) "The heart of Christ means the Church." (5)

Jerome has much to the like effect; but, in quoting from his Commentaries on the Psalms, I must observe, that some Romanists, among them Dupin, deny that Jerome wrote this work, while others stoutly maintain its authenticity; such is the glorious state of uncertainty in which every Romanist must find himself entangled, since, as I before remarked, he must not only find the uniform agreement of the Fathers on the interpretation of Scripture, but also ascertain which are really the genuine productions of a particular writer. In this extremity the *Infallible Church* will not and cannot assist him.

Chrysostom, on the Church of Christ being a spiritual Church, says: "For behold the Church is what I said, for sometimes she is a bride, sometimes she is a daughter, sometimes a virgin, sometimes a handmaid, sometimes a queen; sometimes she is barren, sometimes she is a mountain, sometimes a garden; sometimes she is fruitful, sometimes a lily, sometimes a fountain; in fine, she is all things. Wherefore, when you hear these things, do not think, I pray you, that they are corporeal, but rather apply your mind to their meaning. These things cannot be corporeal. For example, a mountain is not a virgin, a virgin is not a spouse, a queen is not a maid. But the Church is all these things. And why? Because these things are not in the body, *but in the soul.*" (6)

Tertullian thus defines *the Church*: "The Church is properly and principally the Spirit, in the which there is the Trinity of one Deity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. He collects that Church, which the Lord established in the three, and hence any number of persons who have agreed in this faith, is esteemed a Church by the author and consecrator. And, therefore, the Church, indeed, will pardon sins; but the Church is the Spirit acting by the spiritual man, *the Church is not a number of bishops.*" (7) *Tertullian* has been declared a heretic, notwithstanding

(1) "Ecclesia non parietibus," &c.—In Psalm 133, tom. 7, p. 388.

(2) "Verum templum Christi," &c.—De Eccles. Com. on Psalm 86, tom. 7.

(3) "Sed et ipsa ecclesia, &c.—Com. in Job, c. 27, p. 72.

(4) "Ecclesia sit desiderans," &c.—In Cant. Cant. Hom. 1, tom. 8, p. 290.

(5) "Cor. Christi," &c.—Com. in Psalm 21, tom. 7, p. 17.

(6) "Ὁρα γὰρ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν," &c.—Chry. Hom. in Psalm 44. Moguntise.

(7) "Ecclesia proprie et principaliter . . . non ecclesia numerus episcoporum." —De Prudiritia. Paris Edit., 1675.

which he is quoted and misquoted by modern Romanists when it suits their purpose.

Cyri], Bishop of Alexandria, says, "When you hear the word Church, understand by it the holy multitude of believers." (1)

Basil declares that "all who believe in Christ constitute one people, and they who are Christ's are one Church, although it is called together from different places." (2)

Ambrose—"What is, therefore, the habitable world, but the holy Church, the temple of God, the dwelling-place of Christ." "For the Church is the dwelling-place of the just." (3)

Clemens Alexandrius—"For I do not now call any locality, but *the assembly of the elect*, the Church of God." And, in another place, he calls those saved by God, "the Church." (4)

And *Lactantius* declares the Church to be "the true temple of God, which does not consist of walls, but the hearts and faith of the men who believe in Him, and are called the faithful." (5)

Having thus gathered from the Scriptures, and from the writings of the early Christians, the meaning of the term "The Church," which is in accordance with the teaching of the Article XIX. of the Church of England—a Church which you affect to despise—I would now wish to call upon your lordship to favour us with your definition. I would dare venture to assert that your lordship never gave the matter one moment's thought. Had the question been suggested to you before your mind had been perverted, you doubtless would have answered, that where two or three are gathered together *in the name of Christ*, there the true Church is to be found (Matt. xviii. 20); but now that you have entered the Church of Rome, to be consistent, you must renounce for ever all right to private judgment; you must surrender your conscience to the keeping of your newly-adopted Mother; you have bound yourself hand and foot, and must submit your sense "to the sense of the chief pastor guiding the Church from the chair of Peter," and are bound to believe all he teaches. (6) You must now adopt whatever interpretation is dictated

(1) "Εκκλησιαν οσον," &c.—Glaphyrorum in Gen., lib. 4, tom. 1, p. 139. Paris, 1638.

(2) "Εις λαον παντες," &c.—Epis. 161. Amphil. ordinato Epis., Bened. Edit. Paris, 1730.

(3) "Quæ est ergo," &c.—In Psalm 47, Enarr., tom. 1, p. 946. Paris, 1686. Bened. Edit. "Ecclesia enim justorum est tabernaculum," lib. 3, c. 3, tom. 1, p. 318.

(4) "Ου γαρ νυν τον τοπον," &c.—Stromatum, lib. 7, p. 715. Paris, 1641. And in Pœdag., lib. 1, c. 7, p. 93.

(5) De Vera, Sap. et Relig., p. 306, lib. 4, c. 13. Paris, 1748.

(6) Bell., lib. 4, c. 10. De Notis Ecclesisæ.

to you by the bishop of your diocese, who doubtless will have his own particular views on the subject. What a happy state of mind must your lordship enjoy, to be freed from all responsibility of thought and action; to have at last found an infallible source and centre of unity to consult, and to be dictated to on all occasions! Your irresponsible position puts me in mind of the Italian merchant of Placentia mentioned by the Roman Catholic schoolman and theologian, Gregory of Valentia. This merchant congratulated himself on his happy fate in being a member of the Roman Church. He gives for reason, "I hold it is better to profess the Roman religion than the Lutheran: first, because I can briefly learn the Roman faith; for if I say what the Pope says, and deny what the Pope denies; and if he speak, and I hearken unto him, this alone is sufficient for me; but if I should be a Lutheran, I must learn a catechism, I must search the Scriptures, which, in truth, I cannot intend, when I must look after the ships of Italy, and my merchandise beyond seas." (1) Gregory highly approves of the layman's reasoning, and adds, "God will have nothing to lay to the charge of this man at the dreadful day of judgment."!! If, however, your lordship makes the inquiry from others beside your own bishop, What, and where the Church is? you will begin to find, to your astonishment, that even in the bosom of your own community the matter is not yet agreed upon. You will find some say that "The Church" consists of bishops in council; others, the Pope and cardinals; and by others you will be told that the Pope himself is *the* Church. Bellarmin, a great authority in such matters, and of whom you will now hear a great deal, mentions four different interpretations, or, in fact, four sorts of Churches, not one of them agreeing with the Scriptural definition, or that given by the Fathers. I. *The Essential Church*, he informs us, "is a company of men professing the same Christian faith and sacraments, and acknowledging the Bishop of Rome to be the chief pastor and vicar of Christ upon the earth. II. *The Representative Church*, which "is an assembly of bishops in a general council, representing the whole body of the Church." III. *The Virtual Church*—"the Bishop of Rome, who is said to be the chief pastor of the whole Church, and hath in himself eminently and virtually both truth and infallibility of judgment, and upon whom dependeth all that certainty of truth which is found in the whole Church." And IV. *The Consistorial Church*—consisting of Pope and cardinals, termed "*Curia Romana*," the Court of Rome. (2) And Bellarmin elsewhere says, "A lawful council by the most general consent is most properly termed the

(1) Laurent., *Disceptatio Theolog.*, p. 5.

(2) "*Ecclesia Essentialis, Representativa, Virtualis, Consistorialis.*"—Bell. de Eccl., lib. 3, c. 2.

Church;" (1) while at another time he makes the *Pope* the Church, he favours us with an original interpretation of the text, "Tell it to the Church," which, perhaps, even your lordship is not ready to accept. "The Pope," says he, "ought to tell it to the Church; that is, to himself." (2) This is a startling interpretation of the word "Church;" while, on the contrary, the Gloss upon Gratian puts the question and resolves it in a totally different manner: "I would know what Church you understand when you say it cannot err? I answer, it is the congregation of the faithful, that is here meant by the Church." (3) But Gretzerus, the learned Jesuit, agrees with the former position, declaring, "I deny not, but by the Church we understand the Bishop of Rome for the time being who guides the ship of the militant church." (4) And so also the same Gregory de Valentia: "By the Church, we mean her Head; that is to say, the Roman Bishop, in whom resideth the full authority of the Church;" (5) while, again, Marsilius Patavinus, another Roman Catholic theologian, declares the Church to be "the Pope and cardinals." (6) Now, my lord, despite this diversity of opinion entertained by different Romanists as to the locality of the Church, you, of course, have made up your mind where "this living, definite, and infallible authority is to be found"—this boasted "centre of unity;" but with the evidence I have laid before you, it is very certain that neither the person of the Pope, the Pope and cardinals, the general councils, or Pope and bishops in council, nor even all these put together, is "*The Church*" of Christ; but, on the contrary, the Church of England, which you have left, has far greater claims to the title than her fallen and apostate sister; and this, when you have learnt a little more of the workings of the "mystery of iniquity," you will, to your regret, find out.

Before dismissing this part of my subject, I must again refer to the circumstance that Rome, as a Church, is not mentioned in Scripture. I must not overlook the fact that Romanists, feeling this defect in their title, have not failed to press Scripture into their service: I wish to give them the full benefit of their reference. Protestants have been deemed uncharitable for declaring that *the* Babylon of the Revelations is Rome; but, my lord, this is no "private interpretation" and "wresting of Scriptures" by Protestants: we have the authority of Romanists themselves confirming this interpretation. There is no evidence whatever in the

(1) "Concilium legitimum," &c.—Bell. de Conc. et Ecol. i. 1, c. 18, sect. 5. Prag., 1721.

(2) "Prostrerno dicere ecclesie. Id est sibi ipsi," p. 60, tom. 2. Prag., 1721.

(3) "Quero de qua ecclesia." &c., p. 1387, tom. 1, par. 1. Lug., 1671.

(4) "Per Ecclesiam intelligimus Pontif.," &c.—Desp., c. 10, lib. 3, de verbo Dei.

(5) Greg. de Val. disp. theol., tom. 1, disp. 1, q., &c.

(6) "Apud modernos maxime," &c.—Defens. pacis, pt. 2, c. 2. Carmen, lib. 1, sec. 8, c. 6.

New Testament that Peter ever was at Rome; on the contrary, the evidence goes to prove the reverse to be the fact. In this emergency, they have not failed to declare that Babylon meant Rome, and that Peter wrote his first Epistle from Rome. He writes: "The Church which is in Babylon, elected together, salute you." (v. 13.) In the "argument" to this Epistle in the Douay Bible, we read: "He wrote it (the Epistle) at Rome, which figuratively he calls Babylon."! Delahogue, the redoubtable Papistic champion, on the same subject says: "But it cannot be affirmed that the Scriptures are altogether silent respecting the seat of Peter being placed at Rome. It is far more probable that mention is made of that fact in the words with which Peter concludes his first Epistle: 'The Church which is in Babylon, elect with you, salute you.' For if that is compared with the words which we read in the 5th and 9th verses of the 17th chapter of the Apocalypse, (1) respecting Babylon the Great, who has seven hills, and who, in verse 18th, is represented as a great city which rules over the kings of the earth, it is clearly perceived that by Babylon Peter points out Rome herself, as Tertullian, Eusebius, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Orosius, and others explain it." (1). Cardinal Bellarmin (in his book, "De Romano Pontifice," lib. 2, ch. 2, "Ingolstadii") bears the same testimony; but, to get over the difficulty which presents itself in the description of Babylon of the Apocalypse, Romanists, you will find, declare that *ancient* Rome alone is meant. But, my lord, if you will give the matter a serious consideration, and examine the different eras of fulfilled prophecy, you will find that much yet remains to be accomplished, and that Papal Rome is clearly pointed out to us in the Revelations, and that upon her forehead is plainly written, "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." (Rev. xvii. 5.) And if *this* is the Church you have selected for yourself, I sincerely pray that the Lord Jesus Christ may, in His mercy, bring you back to His true Church, and that you may hear the warning voice—"the voice from heaven, saying, Go out of her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues." (Rev. xviii. 4.)—I have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant, &c.

LETTER IV.

MY LORD,—Having, in my former letters, proved, if not to the satisfaction of your lordship, at least to the satisfaction of those who are open to conviction, that the Church of Rome is not *the* Church of

(1) "Ceterum nondum affirmari," &c.—Delahogue, Tract. de Eccles. Edit. Tertia, 1829.

Christ; it follows, therefore, that she cannot be the *Catholic* Church. But, as this is a logical deduction which you will not admit, judging from your letter to the *Times*, I must enter more into detail in addressing one who reasons thus, that because in the Church of England "there is (as you assert) an entire absence of a living definite authority in matters of faith," therefore her "creeds and formularies, being liable to different interpretations, are mere dead letters;" that because you find some Romanists claim infallibility in their Church, somewhere, or in some one, as yet not definitely agreed on, that therefore "such a living definite authority, conclusive and infallible, as guided by the promised teaching of the Holy Ghost, is really exercised by, and exists in, the Church of Rome;" that because the Privy Council, and indeed the Church of England (because she nowhere finds it stated in the Bible), have not dogmatically declared that baptism, *ex opere operato*, confers a grace, while the Church of Rome, of her own private authority does, therefore you must also implicitly believe that a priest can, at will, transubstantiate a wafer into the Lord Jesus Christ whole and entire, "body and blood, flesh, bones and nerves, soul and divinity," and that the supreme worship due to the Divinity is to be given to this Wafer God, and that a propitiatory sacrifice is thereby offered to God, for the living and the dead—that there is a purgatorial fire for *the faithful*, from which the priest can judicially free them, by granting indulgences—that there are many mediators between God and man—and, in addition, give implicit credence to all the superstitious absurdities and blasphemies propagated by this apostate Church;—in fact, when a man's mind has betrayed such weakness as to be carried away by vague and groundless assertions, it will not be safe to leave any point to inference; I must, therefore, proceed to examine the meaning of the word "Catholic," and in turn, also, prove that the Church of Rome is not "the Catholic Church."

Your lordship is well aware that the word "Catholic" literally means *universal*. Now, in no sense is the Romish Church or religion *universal*. But if a majority of believers will entitle a Church to be call Catholic, then the Jews (at the time of the apostles), and after them the followers of Mahomet, in their time, must have been the Catholic Church. Nor, indeed, is a Church the less a true Church because her followers are few: the true believers have ever been in a minority, in time of prosperity as well as in persecution. Neither in this, nor in any other sense of the word, is the Church of Rome *universal*; but "sporadic unquestionably she is, since her emissaries are scattered over every part of the habitable globe, and, like the Scribes and Pharisees of old, they 'compass sea and land to make one proselyte.'"(1)

(1) "Horne's Popery Delineated." Painter, Strand.

Scripture, and the early Christian writers, are at variance with the modern Papistic Church in her acceptance of the term "Catholic;" and she remains single and separate, not only in her interpretation of the word, but also in her faith and discipline; by which she has proved herself to be neither scriptural nor apostolically traditional—she is not the Holy Catholic Church.

Though the "Trinity" is not to be found in Scripture, by name, we clearly find *the thing itself*, as is admitted by all denominations of Christians. And so the Catholic Church; though not named in Scripture, it is clearly pointed out to us in the following texts: "And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; *and they shall be made one fold and one shepherd.*" (John x. 16.) "So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and each are members one with another." (Rom. xii. 5.) "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all who partake of one bread. (1 Cor. x. 17.) "For in one spirit were we all baptised unto one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one spirit we have all been made to drink." (xii. 13.) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: *for you are all one in Christ Jesus.*" (Gal. iii. 28.) "And to the Church of the first-born, who are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect." (Heb. xii. 23.) From these, and similar texts, we can form some idea of the Catholic Church.

Whenever the word Catholic was used by the early Christian writers, they never meant to confine it within the limits of the Church of Rome, or to those who acknowledge the Pope's supremacy; though such is the modern Papistic interpretation of the term, as we all know.

Pope Innocent III. makes it a necessary condition for all who claim to be Catholics, that they should acknowledge the Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all Churches, and submit to her declaration of faith and rule. (1) Your sect states its own case as follows:—"The Church of Rome, and that Church only, and the multitude adhering to it, is the Catholic Church: the religion of this Church is Catholic, the faith is Catholic, the doctrine is Catholic, and their followers are termed Catholic." (2) While, on the contrary, our early English Reformers, in their definition of the Holy Catholic or universal Church, state that "it comprehends *all assemblies of men over the whole world that receive the faith of Christ; who ought to hold an unity of love and brotherly agreement together, by which they become members of the Catholic Church.*" (3)

In comparing the above Romish and Protestant definitions with that

(1) Innocent III., Ep. i., 353; lib. ii., 208.

(2) "Sola Ecclesia Romana," &c.—Lessius in Consult. Consid., 6.

(3) "Burnet's History of the Reformation."—Book iii. Anno 1540.

given by the Fathers after named, your lordship will at once perceive that the modern Roman Church is wanting in the essentials which constitute a Catholic Church.

Augustine, you will find, declares that the Catholic Church "is not this Church or that Church, but the Church dispersed throughout the whole world;" and that from hence "our ancestors named the Church Catholic, that by that name she might demonstrate the universal." (1) *Ignatius*, in his "Epistle to Smyrn.," says: "Wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church. The Church is one body, made up of Jews and Gentiles."

Theophylact, on 1 Cor. xii. 27, says: "The Catholic Church is a body made up of all Churches, whereof Christ is the head;" and *Cyril*, that "the Church is called Catholic because it is *universally* spread, and teaches the whole doctrine of Christ to all sorts of persons." (2)

Athanasius declares that "it is called Catholic because it is dispersed all over the world." (3)

Having thus ascertained the true meaning of the words "Catholic Church," we can now safely proceed a step further, by asserting, that when we declare we believe in "the Holy Catholic Church," we cannot mean the Roman Church, as some Romanists cunningly insinuate, when they meet an uninitiated Protestant, and think thereby to confound him. But, thank God! we have yet among us some staunch and true men, who hold that "faith once delivered to the saints;" men who are not to be, like your lordship, "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. iv. 14.)

The question then suggests itself, What is the Catholic Church? and what her declaration of faith? I answer, in the language of my Church, "Christ's Holy Catholic Church is the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20); in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same." (4) And her declaration of faith is founded on, and derived from the Bible alone. "If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel . . . let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 9.) Comparing the teaching of the modern Roman Church (which she in her arrogance calls *the* Catholic Church) with the Bible and the early Christian writers, we at once declare her to

(1) "Non hæc aut illa," &c.—Aug. de Radibus Catech., c. 20. "Majores nostri," &c.—De Unit. Eccles., c. 2. Paris, 1837.

(2) Catech., c. viii., p. 20.

(3) Tom. 2, p. 402.

(4) Can. 55 and Art. 19.

be an apostate Church—to have fallen away from that position among the other Churches of Christ who took the Bible as their only standard of faith. “For (now) neither is she built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus; neither does she order the sacraments . . . in such sort as He did first institute and ordain them; but has so interchanged her own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now she seems to be converted into a new guise.” (28 Hom., pt. ii.) She teaches another gospel—“she teaches for doctrines the commandments of men.”

I shall proceed, step by step, to prove to your lordship the truth of this last declaration, and illustrate and confirm the statement by examining, *seriatim*, each peculiar doctrine and dogma taught by your Church, and prove them to be neither founded on Scripture nor apostolic tradition. (1)

The standard of faith of the Catholic Church should be God’s Word alone—THE BIBLE: this is the teaching of the true Church in all ages. On the other hand, Pope Gregory the Great, in his day, declared “that the standard of the Holy Catholic Church ariseth from the first four general councils, and that whosoever does not hold this solid ground, although he appears a stone, yet lies out of the body.” (2) Now, whichever definition we take, the modern Church of Rome is evidently excluded. She lies out of the Bible, according to her own admission, by maintaining tradition to be of equal authority with Scripture; and as she has added twelve new points of faith to the Christian faith, which I assert, and will in the proper place prove, were never taught or even heard of in the early Church, she therefore also lies under the direct anathema of these four first general councils of the Christian Church, mentioned by Pope Gregory I., and which councils, the Church of Rome carrying out her admirable system of “unity,” has declared to be general and œcumenical!

My lord, you are not perhaps aware that the modern Church to which you have attached yourself, has altered the primitive faith of the Christian Church. Facts cannot be set aside by bare assertions. At the first general council held at Nicea, in Asia, A.D. 325, the early Christians settled, by unanimous consent, the declaration of faith of the “Holy Catholic Church,” which was that creed you have so often repeated in our churches, found in our Communion Service, called the “Nicene Creed.” This is the standard of faith alluded to by Pope Gregory. In the year 381, at the Great Council of Constantinople, this same creed was solemnly read, and adopted. The third general council, namely, of Ephesus, in A.D. 431, affirmed this creed, and sub-

(1) This is made the subject of a challenge. See Letter XI.

(2) Epist., lib. 1, c. 24.

jected to an anathema all those who should "compose, profess, or offer any other form of faith," in the following words:—"These things, therefore, having been read, the holy council decreed that no one should be allowed to set forth, or write, or compose any other faith but that defined by the holy Fathers who assembled under the influence of the Holy Spirit at Nice; and that whosoever dared either to compose any other formulary of faith, or to set it forth, or to offer it to converts, whether from the Gentiles, or Jews, or from any heresy, to inform them of the truth, if they are bishops, they shall be put out of their episcopal office; if clergymen, they shall be put out of their clerical office; and if laymen, they shall be subjected to anathema." (1) And at the fourth general council, namely of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, this same Nicene Creed was again most solemnly adopted. The bishops there assembled declared "the Catholic faith delivered by the holy 318 Fathers (namely, at Nice), and by the holy 150 Fathers (at Constantinople), also by the other most holy and glorious Fathers (at Ephesus), we guard, and according to that we believe No person makes any other exposition of faith. We neither attempt nor dare to do so. For the Fathers have taught, and *in writings are preserved* (mark this! here they appeal to no *unwritten* traditions), those things which have been set forth by them; and other than these we cannot speak. Those principles which we have set forth are sufficient: it is not lawful to make any other exposition." The creed attributed to St. Athanasius, which is also repeated in our churches, corresponds in all respects with the Nicene, and also the Apostles' Creed, wherein we in vain search for those modern Popish dogmas against which we protest.

To A.D. 451, therefore, no other declaration of faith was made by the Catholic Church; but, by the subsequent introduction of Jewish and Pagan superstitions and ceremonies, the simplicity of the primitive Christian Church soon became overladen and complicated, and eventually smothered; so that the pure faith was hidden under accumulated rubbish; and it shall be my task to examine the several doctrines and points of faith that have been subsequently and from time to time added by the Roman Church. But it was not till *after* the sitting of the Council of Trent that any person had dared to alter, or rather add to, the creed of the "Catholic Church." Respecting this same original creed, at the 3rd session, 4th February, 1546, of the Council of Trent, it was declared "that this creed, which the Roman Church uses as that summary in which all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, and that firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, shall be read in those words in which it is read in all churches." They then repeated the Nicene Creed just as it is used in

(1) "His igitur prelectis," &c.—Phil. Labb. et Gal. Coss. Concil., tom. iii. Paris, 1671, and Mansi, vol. iii., p. 1362.

our churches, without one point superadded; and it was not till 1564 that Pope Pius IV. embodied certain decrees passed at the last-named council, in those twelve new articles of faith, and added the same to the original creed, and which now forms the creed of that Church which you have joined, out of which she most impudently declares there is no salvation. These twelve new articles of faith I am prepared to prove are both novel and unscriptural, and the Church of Rome has (to borrow your expression) "forfeited her catholicity" in adopting this new creed.

I shall, however, apply myself to the great question of **INFALLIBILITY**, and prove to you that neither the Church of Rome in the aggregate, or any section thereof, nor the Pope, the head of that Church, or any of her members, collectively or individually, are infallible.—I have the honour, &c.

[For the old creed of the Christian Church, and the new creed of the Church of Rome, see post. between Letters X. and XI.]

LETTER V.

MY LORD,—Without further preface, I now enter on the main point raised in your letter, namely, **INFALLIBILITY**: You declare, that in the Church of England there is an "entire absence of a living definite authority in matters of faith. . . . Such a living definite authority, conclusive and infallible, I find alone claimed and alone exercised in the Church of Rome." The expression made use of by your lordship is peculiar: you find infallibility claimed and exercised in—not by—the Church of Rome. I shall not, however, be critical, but endeavour to apply myself to the intention you appear desirous of conveying.

In the first place, I must own that I am at a loss to understand the exact meaning of the term "Infallibility," how far it extends, and on what it is employed; the range and scope of its application, whether it includes doctrine only, or practice also; whether it includes revealed religion, or natural as well; or whether it refers to opinion only, or to fact;—in short, the extent of the infallibility claimed.

In the second place, I have not been able to ascertain the exact locality of this **INFALLIBILITY**. As before remarked, the Church of Rome has never claimed it; and her members, though they pertinaciously assert the existence of infallibility in their Church, are far from being agreed where, or in whom, it is vested. But your lordship has of course made up your mind on both these heads after grave and diligent consi-

deration; and, notwithstanding the great diversity of opinions existing in the bosom of this so-called "centre of unity," have arrived at a satisfactory conclusion. Your lordship would be conferring a lasting benefit on the Romish community if you would proclaim the result of your deliberations on the "momentous question;" for as yet, to my knowledge, no Romanist has dared more than to define vaguely the nature and extent of this attribute, and none have undertaken to reconcile conflicting opinions.

For my part, I have hitherto considered there is none infallible but one—namely, OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

But, the probability is, that your lordship never did give the subject a moment's serious consideration, otherwise you would not have left the Church of England for the reasons assigned. The fact, doubtless, is that you have lent a too willing ear to some wily Tractarian, "the wolf in sheep's clothing;" but for want of proper instruction, "the seed" had been sown, had fallen on the "wayside;" had been trodden down, and the fowls of the air have devoured it. (Luke viii. 5.) Otherwise, you would not have committed yourself to so crude, vague, and stale an assertion; had your determination been the result of honest conviction, founded on a personal examination of facts and evidences, you would have stated to which section of the Romish Church you had attached yourself.

There are four grand sections in the Romish Church, four conflicting factions, each holding particular views on the subject in question. The *first* declares that infallibility resides in the Church collectively, or dispersed, which includes the whole body of professors, clergy and laity, of the Romish communion. The *second*, in the Church representative, or general council. The *third*, in general council presided over by the Pope; and the *fourth* reject all the other systems and opinions, and insist that infallibility resides only in the virtual Church, which is the Pope of Rome for the time being. To which of these four opinions does your lordship subscribe?

Want of space precludes me from examining the opinions of each. I shall therefore briefly consider the differences of opinions existing as to the authority of the Pope and councils respectively.

At the 5th session of the Council of Constance, a council is placed above the Pope. It was declared, in the first place, "that this council, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, and constituting a general council, and representing the Church of Christ, derives its power directly from Christ, and that every one, be his condition or dignity what it may, *even be it the dignity of the Pope*, is bound to obey it in those things which appertain to faith, and the extirpation of the said schism, and the reformation of the said Church in her head and members." (1) While, on the

(1) "Et primo declarat," &c. Labb. et Coss., tom. 12, p. 22. Paris, 1672.

other hand, at the 11th session of the 5th Lateran Council, the Pope is declared above a council: "It manifestly appears, not only from the evidence of the Holy Scriptures, the sayings of the holy Fathers, and from the decrees of the other Roman Pontiffs our predecessors, and of the sacred canons, but also from the very confession of the same councils, that the only Roman Pontiff for the time being, *as having an authority over all councils*, has the full right and power of calling, transferring, and *dissolving councils*." (1) This council went so far as to assert that Christ "appointed Peter and his successors his vicars on the strength of the rock, whom, by the testimony of the Book of Kings, it is so necessary to obey, *that let him who does not obey die the death*." Cardinal Bellarmin, your great champion, quotes different opinions on this same subject. He says: "The second opinion is, that a Pope, even in his character as Pope, may be a heretic and teach heresy, if he defines without a general council, and that this has in fact happened. Nilus follows and defends this opinion in his book against the Pope's primacy; certain Parisians, as Gerson and Almaine, in their books on the power of the Church, follow the same opinion; and, moreover, Alphonso de Castro, in his first book against Heresies, cap. 2, and *Pope Adrian VI.*, in his question on Confirmation, all of whom vest infallibility in the Church only, or in a general council only, and not in the Pope." (2) But elsewhere he says: "A council *without a Pope may err* even in decrees of faith, as appears in the Council of Sirmium, to which Hosius subscribed; also in the Council of Milan, Rimini, Ephesus, Constantinople under Justinian II., Constantinople under Leo the Isaurian, and another under Constantine Copronymus. But a *council with a Pope cannot err*; therefore a council without a Pope cannot do all those things that a council with a Pope can do. Nor can it be replied, that those councils erred, because they were not lawful, for to most of them nothing was wanting but the Pope's assent. The second Council of Ephesus, moreover, was precisely similar to the Council of Basil: *each was called by a Pope*, the Pope's legate was present at the opening of each of them, the Pope's legate shortly after withdrew from each of them, **THE POPE WAS EXCOMMUNICATED IN EACH OF THEM**—all of which things respecting the Council of Basil appear in its acts, as related by *Æneas Sylvius*," &c. (3) But this same cardinal seems to hold all the councils of the Church in little estimation in comparison with the Council of Trent, whether presided over by Popes or not; for he says,

(1) "*Solum Romanum Pontificem*," &c. Labb. et Coss., tom. 14. Edit. ut supra.

(2) "*Secunda opinio est, pontificem*," &c. Bell. de Rom. Pont., lib. 4, c. 2. In-golstadtii, 1590.

(3) "*Tertio, concilium sine Papa potest errare*," &c. Bell. de Concil. Auctoritate, lib. 2, c. 17. Edit. ut supra.

on the subject of the Sacraments, "If we should take away the credit of the present (Roman) Church and present Council of Trent, *the decrees of all other councils*—nay, even Christian faith itself—may be called in question." (1) Which opinion he contradicts by elsewhere denying the necessity of general councils, which, he says, may be abolished without endangering the Catholic Church; giving as a reason, that for the first three hundred years the Church did without them. (2) He gives, however, his own private opinion on the Pope's infallibility in the following words: "It is probable that the Pope, not only as Pope, cannot err, but, as a private man, cannot fall into heresy, or hold any obstinate opinion contrary to the faith." (3) Though he admits that at the Council of Constance "there were three Popes; neither could it be easily solved which of them was the true and legitimate Pope;" (4) and says that "a doubtful Pope (!) is no Pope at all." (5)

The following are the names of some of the most influential of that numerous class of Roman Catholic theologians, &c., who uphold the Pope's personal infallibility:—Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, Carranza, Albertus Pighius, Hosius, Johannes Turrecremata, Silvester Prierius, Cornelius Mus, Canus, Pole, Duval, Lainez, Aquinas, Cardinal Cajetan, Fabulottus, Palavincino, Alphonsus Liguori, &c. And many Popes have, of course, asserted their own infallibility. Among others, we find Pascal, Pius, Leo, Pelagius, Boniface, and Gregory. (6) Bellarmin, Duval, and Arsdekin, have gone so far as to declare that this is the doctrine entertained by *all* theologians of note. (7) The councils that have declared the Pope to be of greater authority than a general council, are those of Florence, 5th of Lateran, and Trent. (8) Cardilbus, at the Council of Trent, declared, "that a Pope is so supplied with the aid and light of the Holy Spirit, that he cannot err to a degree of scandal, in defining faith or enacting general laws." The last-named councils are acknowledged in the Romish Church as general councils, though

(1) "Si tollis auctoritatem presentis Ecclesie," &c. Bell., tom. 3, de effectu Sacr., sect. 4, p. 109. Prag., 1721.

(2) Bell. de Eccl. et Concil., lib. 1, c. 10, in initio. Prag., 1721.

(3) Bell. de Rom. Pont., lib. 4, c. 6, sect. 1. Prag., 1721.

(4) Ibid., lib. 4, c. 14, sect. 28.

(5) "Dubius Papa habetur pro non Papa." Bell. de Concil., lib. 2, cap. 19, sect. 19. Prag., 1721.

(6) Bellarmin, ut supra; Fabulottus, "De Potestate," c. 8; Venice, 1728; Caron, "Remonstrantia," c. 18; Paris, 1665; Du Pin, "History," 336; Dublin, 1724; Labbeus, "Concilia," 18, 1427; Venice, 1728; Maimbourg, "Traité," 5, 6; Paris, 1686.

(7) "Hæc doctrina communis est inter omnes notæ theologos." Arsdekin, "Theologia," vol. 1., 118; Antwerp, 1682.

(8) Arsdekin, 1, 114, 118; Du Pin, 3, 148; Crabbe, "Concilia," tom. iii., 697; Colon., 1551; Labbeus, 19, 968; Card. in Labb., 20, 1177. ("Romanum Pontificum in Rebus," &c.)

it must be remembered that none of these have by special decree declared the Pope to be infallible.

On the other hand, we have a phalanx of equally redoubtable theologians of the Roman Catholic school, who reject and disclaim the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility, and that he cannot err. Among many others, I name Alphonsus de Castro, Launoy, Almain, Richerius, Gerson, Lyra, Alliaco, Victoria, Arboreus, Laurentius Valla, Tostatus, Marca, Du Pin, Bossuet, Erasmus, &c. This last-named Romish author pithily remarks: "If it be true, which some said, that the Bishop of Rome can never err judicially, what need of general councils? Why are men skilful in the laws, and learned in divinity, sent for to councils? If he pronouncing cannot err, wherefore lieth there any appeal from the Pope to a council, or to the Pope himself being better informed? To what purposes are so many universities troubled with handling questions of faith, when truth may be had from his mouth? Nay, how cometh it to pass, that one Pope's decrees are found contrary to another?" (1)

Popes themselves have equally disowned this attribute. Among whom we find Popes Damascus, Celestin, Pius, Gelasius, Innocent, Eugenius, Adrian, Paul, &c. And the Pope's arrogant and ambitious pretensions have been rejected by the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil.

The particular opinions of the various individuals named I may again have to refer to, for I shall be able to show that even those who appear to agree to a certain opinion in the abstract, and are classed together under one section, are far from being agreed among themselves as to the extent, range, scope, or application of this infallibility, or even the meaning of the term. In the mean time, let me quote from Romish writers of our own times.

Charles Butler, whose works you will now no doubt study, on the subject in question says: "In spiritual concerns the *Transalpine* opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority and controlling power over the whole Church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and consequently over a general council, his representative.

"They likewise ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of *personal infallibility*, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith.

"The *Cisalpin*es affirm, that in spirituals the Pope is subject in doctrine and discipline to the Church, and to a general council representing her. . . . They affirm that a general council may without, and even against, the Pope's consent, reform the Church. They *deny his personal infallibility*, and hold that he may be deposed by the Church, or a general council, for heresy and schism." (2)

(1) "Si verum est quod quidam," &c. Eras. Annot. in 1 Cor. vii., p. 696, tom. 6; Lug. Bat., 1705.

(2) "Book of the Roman Catholic Church." Edit. 1825; Letter X., p. 122.

And again, in Letter X., p. 119, he says: "A chain of Roman Catholic writers on Papal power, might be supposed: on the first link we might place the Roman Catholic writers who have immoderately exalted the prerogative of the Pope; on the last we might place those who have unduly depressed it; and the centre link might be considered to represent the canon of the 10th session of the Council of Florence, which defined that full power was delegated to the Bishop of Rome, in the person of St. Peter, to feed, regulate, and govern the universal Church, *as expressed in the general councils and holy canons.*"

Delahogue thus expresses himself on this most momentous question: "Thus, moreover, the matter stands with regard to the article on the respective authority of general councils and the Roman Pontiff, which the Ultramontanists (Italians) and the French declare to have been defined *in a wholly contrary sense*, the former by the Council of Constance, the latter by the Council of Lateran. The Ultramontanists, namely, deny the œcumenicity of the Council of Constance in respect of its 4th and 5th sessions, in which the canons concerning the authority of general councils above Popes were compiled, and restrict the meaning of those canons to the time either of the schism or of a doubtful Pope: and in truth this was the question upon account of which that council was assembled. The French, on the other hand, deny, and not without strong arguments, the œcumenicity of the Council of Lateran, which was assembled at a very cloudy season, when an unhappy war raged between Julius II. and the Most Christian King of France, and which only a few bishops could attend, and scarcely any one from the provinces of France." (1) And the same author states: "Moreover, the Ultramontane theologians ascribe infallibility to the Pope when regarded in this last point of view, and speaking, as they say, *ex cathedrâ*, which opinion others, and more particularly the French, oppose." (2)

"The class book of Maynooth stoutly advocates the probability of both systems. (3) The sage writer's penetrating eye could, at a glance, discern the probability of two contradictory propositions. The author must have been a man of genius. Anglade, Slevin, and Kenny, at the Maynooth examination, *declared on oath* their indecision on this inquiry. The learned doctors could not tell whether their visible head be the organ of truth or the channel of error, even in his official decisions and on points of faith. A communion, which boasts of infallibility, cannot determine whether the sovereign Pontiff, the plenipotentiary of Heaven,

(1) "Porro res ita se habet quod," &c. Tract. de Ecclesiâ Christi, &c. Auctore. Lud. Ægid. Delahogue. Edit. tertia, Dublinii. R. Coyne, 1829, p. 50.

(2) "Porro Romano Pontifici sub hoc," &c. Ibid. p. 385.

(3) "Utrumque sententiam esse probabilem." Anglade, Maynooth Report, London, 1827, pp. 180, 181. Slevin, *ibid.* London, 1827, pp. 201, 202. Kenny, p. 36.

and 'the father and teacher of all Christians,' be, even when speaking from the chair, the oracle of Catholicism or of heresy."! (1)

To take the opinion of a Lay Romanist, the late Daniel French, Esq., a barrister, and a gentleman held in great estimation. In his famous discussion with Dr. Cumming, at Hammersmith, he states his *private opinion* in the following words: "It is *quite clear* that Popes are peccable; that is, liable to sin. We think the Pope fallible in judgment, and we attribute to him no impeccability in moral living. We *only think* that the Church, the assembled council of Catholic bishops, with the Pope at their head, and the Pope having only a casting voice in that council, is infallible. We do pronounce decrees emanating from such a body to be infallible I know there are some divines of the Church of Rome who *think* that the Pope, with regard to faith, is infallible. I am here this day, not to answer for *private opinions*, but to defend the article of faith. [?] If I believe the Pope infallible, I do not sin; but I am bound, *under pain of sin*, to believe a general council, with the Pope at its head, to be infallible. There are some of the Catholic divines who have asserted it: we do not believe it; it is not an article of our faith; it is rather *repugnant to our faith*." (2) Mr. French seemed to be ignorant that the great Cardinal Bellarmin, who surely is of greater authority than himself, had said: "We *maintain* that the Pope is simply and absolutely above the universal Church, and above general councils." (3) Nay, he goes so far as to declare, that "if the Pope should so far err as to command vices, and forbid virtues, the Church was bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues are evil, unless she will sin against her own conscience." (4) However shocked your lordship may be at hearing such blasphemy from the pen of a CARDINAL of your Church, he has just as good right and authority to maintain his position and private opinions as Mr. French or any one else have, neither one nor the other having God's command to sanction his own particular views; and though you may consider one at least in the right, we Protestants *know* that they are both wrong.

Such is a brief outline of the conflicting opinions, such the glorious and happy state of unanimity in the Roman Catholic Church, this so-called "Centre of Unity," on a subject of such paramount importance as "INFALLIBILITY;" without a certainty of which "*all creeds and formularies, being liable to different interpretations, are mere dead letters.*"

(1) Edgar's Variations of Popery. 2nd Edit. Seeley, 1838, p. 162.

(2) Hammersmith Protestant Discussion. Hall and Co., London, 1841, p. 421.

(3) Bell. de Concl. auctor., lib. 2, cap. 17, sec. 1. Prag., 1721.

(4) "Si autem Papa erraret, præciendo vitæ vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitæ esse bonæ, et virtutes malas nisi vellas contra conscientiam peccare." Bell. de Pont., lib. 4, c. 5, sec. 8. Prag., 1721.

And it is in search of this unanimity that your lordship has left the Church of your country, of your fathers!

You dogmatically assert that a living definite authority, conclusive and infallible, you *find* alone claimed and alone exercised in the Church of Rome. Your lordship has *found* it. I am bound to believe you; but, at the same time, let me assure you that you have solved a problem that has racked the brains of many theologians and schoolmen of your Church, who, in the end, could only give an opinion—a private opinion—on the subject. You have solved a far greater problem than ever did the famous Archimedes of old; and in an equal delirium of joy at the discovery, you doubtless shouted, “*Ευρηκα! Ευρηκα !!*” from one end of Edinburgh to the other, and, like a second Pythagoras, vowed a sacrifice, a “hecatomb”—of wafer gods—in celebration of the event; and in an ecstatic moment penned your declaration to the *Times* newspaper. Thrice happy man! the discovery will immortalise you, and may hereafter entitle you to a “sainthood,” and an honourable place in the Romish calendar.

As yet, however, your lordship has been most prudent; you have not divulged *where* this infallibility is to be found. Take one word of advice from me, my lord, though a heretic. Keep your own secret; for, be assured, the moment you divulge it, you will at once be discarded by some or one of the opposite sects above mentioned, who will forthwith reject you as an idle impostor; while, on the contrary, if you will follow my advice, you will be petted and feasted and lionised by *all* parties; for a real lord is always acceptable, be it at a board of an insurance-office or in a Popish mass-house. (1)—I am, &c.

Oct. 9, 1850.

LETTER VI.

MY LORD,—I have endeavoured in my last letter to show, in as brief a manner as possible, that within the Church of Rome conflicting and irreconcilable opinions exist on the subject of infallibility. To an ordinarily intelligent person, the question that would at once suggest itself is, Of what practical use is infallibility?—what practical benefit can be derived from it, if the individuals who are to be benefited by it cannot agree among themselves to whom they are to look for an infallible guide? What one receives, as an infallible truth, uttered by the Pope or a council, another rejects, as wanting that stamp of authority which he deems to be the mark of infallibility; and again, both may admit the

(1) Lord Feilding is the chairman of the Etonian Life Assurance Office. I presume he will now transfer his patronage to the “Catholic.”

authority, but may disagree as to the extent to which this prerogative should be exercised.

I shall now proceed to examine the subject in all its bearings. I shall first, for argument's sake, take for granted that infallibility does exist in the Church of Rome, in one or other of the four different classes or sects named in my last. But how is it to be made available by any single individual? We find council arrayed against council, Pope against Pope, and council against Pope; one class of the Romish clergy opposing another, Dominicans against Franciscans, Jansenites against Jesuits; indeed, before I have completed this course of Letters, I shall be able to show your lordship that the boasted unity and infallibility of the Romish Church is, to use the old but not the less appropriate simile, like a rope of sand.

To be practical, let us suppose a case. Your lordship requires an infallible interpretation of the text, Matt. xvi. 18. How would you obtain it, no authoritative interpretation to that or any other text in Scripture having been published by either of the four sects mentioned? You cannot consult the Church collectively, or obtain the required information from a general council. A council has not met for 300 years; they must be summoned for the purpose. To be sure, those who believe the Pope to be infallible are the more practical; they can consult him, and, maybe, he will furnish them with an interpretation; but then they have sworn not to interpret Scriptures except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and this interpretation they must only admit according to the sense "which Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold," so that therefore the Romanist, to satisfy his conscience, must first compare the Pope's *dictum* with the interpretation of the Fathers, and then ascertain the sense of "the Church," and reconcile the two, if he can, having first of all satisfied himself what and where "the Church" is, remembering that on this last point no satisfactory answer can be given; a like diversity of opinions existing on the term "the Church," as there is on infallibility itself.

But you will state that you find no difficulty whatever; you have only to go to the bishop of the diocese, or parish priest, and through him obtain the required information. He is the properly-constituted authority appointed by "the Church" to convey instruction to the laity on all points of doctrine, faith, morals, Scriptural interpretations, &c., &c.; he is the conduit-pipe or artery in direct communication with the infallible source, wherever it may be, and every true Catholic has thus at hand a ready means of satisfying all doubts, and the inquiring individual need go no further. This is very plausible, but in practice is found totally fallacious. D'Alembert, in his "Account of the Destruction of the Jesuits in France," in his severe strictures against the contending sects, the Jansenites and the Jesuits (two

sects in the Romish Church, who, for awhile, disturbed the peace of Europe by their vain, frivolous, and absurd disputes on points of their religion—the Roman Catholic religion), suggested the following case:— I will suppose, says he, that one of those men who have had the misfortune to attack religion in their writings, and against whom the Jesuits and Jansenites have equally exerted themselves, should address at the same time the two most intrepid theologians of each party, and speak to them thus:—“You are right, gentlemen, to cry out shame against me, and it is my intention to repair it. Dictate to me then in concert a confession of faith proper for the purpose, and which may reconcile me, first with God, and afterwards with every one of you.” On the very first article of the Creed, “I believe in God, the Father Almighty,” he would infallibly set by the ears the two catechists, by asking them if God is equally powerful over the heart and over the body? “Without doubt,” the Jansenist would aver. “Not quite so,” the Jesuit would mutter. “You are a blasphemer,” the former would cry. “And you,” would reply the second, “a destroyer of the freedom and the merit of good works.” Both addressing themselves afterwards to their proselyte, would say to him, “Ah, Sir, infidelity is still better than the abominable doctrine of my adversary: beware of confiding your soul to such bad hands. If the blind lead the blind, they will both fall into the ditch.” It must be owned that the blind infidel would find himself a little embarrassed between two men who offer each to serve him as guide, and yet mutually charge each other with being blinder than him. “Gentlemen,” would he say to them, without doubt, “I thank you both for your charitable offers: God has given me, to conduct me in the dark, a staff, which is reason, which you say will lead me to the faith; well, I will make use of this salutary staff, and will draw from it more utility than from you two.”

If you ask an individual priest if he is infallible, and capable of giving an infallible interpretation of the Church's meaning, he will thus state his case:—“It is a rule of the Church that the minister is to teach the faithful; and if he deny one article of the faith belonging to the Catholic Church, he can be excluded from her pale. He must have the same faith as the bishop, the bishop as the head of the Church, and the head of the Church as the whole Church. He will assert that he holds the same doctrines in every respect as those received by all Catholic bishops, priests, and laymen in the world. Such is the principle of the Church, and the minister can give his opinion. As a sanctioned incumbent in that Church, he is liable to excommunication if he speak contrary to the faith. His declaration is to be respected, because he has a living voice, which can be punished for deviating from the faith that he preaches.” And, again: “My [Mr. Naghten, the priest's] expositions as a private minister are not infallible in this respect, that I, as an individual, am

not infallible; but as I am one of the whole body, the expositions of which are infallible, my exposition is the declaration of the infallible Church, according to my belief." (1) Now experience has shown, and by examples I shall prove, that it is unsafe to submit our judgment to the mercy of the priest or bishop, and blindly admit that we can receive through him infallible truth. "Water," justly observes Edgar on this subject, "though clear in the fountain, may contract impurity as it flows through muddy channels to the reservoir. Truth, in like manner, may be misrepresented or misunderstood in its transmission in various ways, and through diversified mediums, to the minds of men." Priests have misrepresented, and continually do misrepresent or misinterpret, the meaning of the Church, disagreeing among themselves as to the meaning and force of decrees, canons, and bulls; have interpreted the Scriptures differently, to suit their various purposes; and, again, priests, bishops, nay, Popes, have been described by Roman Catholic historians themselves as having been, in various ages, thoroughly corrupted.

If we are required to submit ourselves to the pastors of the Church as our infallible guides, we have the warrant of Scripture for protesting against any such required blind submission. How can we be sure that all the pastors and teachers of the Church are what they profess and should be, and are capable of giving "instruction in righteousness?" How, then, can we expect to find in each an infallible guide? St. Paul says, that "after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves (the clergy) shall many arise, and speak perverse things, to draw away disciples." (Acts xx. 29.) Was there not a Judas among the disciples? It was not the design of the Almighty that we should blindly submit to the *dicta* of any individual as a means of salvation, but we are "to try the spirit;" "to the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isaiah viii. 20.) That we are to avoid the teaching of pastors, I by no means wish to assert, for we read that "he 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." (Eph. iv. 11.) But the standard by which we are to test his ministration and doctrines is by the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the apostle declares, "that if we or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel, let him be anathema." Nor did they ever require of their hearers that they should interpret God's Word according to any assumed standard of "the Church," but submitted the plain Word, and requested them to exercise their private judgment on what they taught—"Judge ye what I say;" "Judge if it be so." And

(1) "See Workshop Discussion," published by the British Reformation Society, 8, Exeter Hall, Mr. Naghten's speech, pp. 12-19.

St. James (i. 5) assures us that, if any want wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all abundantly . . . and it shall be given him; but let him ask in faith.

To return to Matt. xvi. 18: I challenge your lordship to get from any priest, bishop, or Pope, councils, or "the Church," an infallible interpretation of that text, such interpretation to be consistent with the declaration made by every Romanist in his creed. And yet it is mainly on this very text that the claim of infallibility of your Church is founded.

I shall now take two examples proving the fallibility of individual priests on the interpretation of Scripture, merely as illustrations.

The Rev. R. Smiddy, parish priest of Youghall, Ireland, has just published a little book, "The Bible, and the Manner in which it is Used by Catholics," (1) which is extensively advertised, reviewed, and applauded in Romish journals. He says: "It is on this authority of tradition that we believe in the validity of infant baptism, *there being nothing about it in the Bible.*" Here we have a bold assertion. Cardinal Bellarmin says (I quote from him, as he is an universally accepted authority in your Church in matters of controversy)—"For although we do not find it expressly commanded that we should baptise infants, yet this is *sufficiently* gathered from the Scriptures, as we have already shown." (2) And if you turn to your Douay Bible, and consult the Index, or Table of Reference, you will read—"For the baptism of infants, see Luke xviii. 16, compared with St. John iii. 5." Now, while the Rev. Mr. Smiddy declares that, on the validity of infant baptism, there is nothing about it in Scripture, the cardinal declares that it is sufficiently gathered from the Scripture; and Dr. Challoner and the other commentators of the Douay Bible, the edition which is declared to be published by authority, and has the sanction of Dr. Wiseman, directly refer us to two texts, to prove the point in question. Again, the Rev. Mr. Smiddy says—"It is also on the authority of tradition that we believe in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, which, we contend, can *never be proved from the Scriptures alone.*" This is Mr. Smiddy's private opinion as a parish priest; but, on consulting the Table of Reference above alluded to, we read—"The Holy Ghost. He proceeds from the Father and the Son (John xv. 26);" and, on referring to that text in your own edition of the Testament, we read the following note:—"Whom I will send. This *proves*, against the modern Greeks, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father; otherwise he could not be sent by the Son." Mr. Smiddy, in his book, expatiates largely and rapturously on the advan-

(1) Richardson and Son, London and Derby, 1850, pp. 45, 46.

(2) "Licet enim non inveniamus expresse mandatum, ut baptizemus infantes, tamen id et colligitur satis aperte ex Scripturis ut supra ostendimus." Bell. de Sacraments. Bap., lib. 1, c. 9.

tages enjoyed by "Catholics" in being blessed with an infallible guide in the perusal of the Scriptures. It is a pity he did not consult his oracle before he committed himself to print. I might point out many other blunders, but I notice these two as being the usual clap-trap arguments raised by priests to prove the insufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith.

And now for a bishop. The Romish "Primate of Ireland," Dr. Cullen, in his Pastoral Letter, dated Drogheda, July 31, 1850 (see *Tablet*, p. 502), issued previous to the Synod on the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (when, as he states, "her pure soul is, by the Divine power, translated into heaven, and placed at the right hand of her Eternal Son"), dwells, with the usual rapturous language, on the glories of the Blessed Virgin, he most unwarrantably, most blasphemously, introduces and perverts Scripture, to assist him in celebrating her praises. He says, "Here, to use the words of Scripture, she appears 'bright as the morning rising, elect as the sun, beautiful as the moon, terrible as the array of battle.' (Cant. vi. 9.) The angels and saints of heaven, filled with astonishment at the splendour of her Majesty, cry out, 'Who is she that cometh up from the desert, flowing with charms and delights, leaning upon her beloved?' (Cant. viii. 5.) With what raptures do all the celestial spirits receive their Queen! With what exultation do the patriarchs, prophets, and all the saints, rise up to greet her, through whom they received their Redeemer, and to whom they were thus INDEBTED for their glory!" Here this Roman Catholic Primate of all Ireland, no doubt a great authority, applies the texts from the "Canticles" to the praises of the Virgin Mary. Is this an infallible interpretation? On referring to the notes in the Douay Bible, we find, to the first text from chap. vi., v. 9, the following note: "'Who is she?' &c. Here is a beautiful metaphor, describing the Church from the beginning. As the *morning rising*—signifying the Church before the written law; *fair as the moon*—showing her under the written law of Moses; *bright as the sun*—under the light of the gospel; and *terrible as an army*—the power of Christ's Church against His enemies." And to chap. viii., v. 5, we find the following note:—"'*Who is this?*' &c. The angels, with admiration, behold the Gentiles converted to the faith; *coming up from the desert*—that is, coming from heathenism and false worship; *flowing with delights*—that is, abounding with good works which are pleasing to God; *leaning on her beloved*—on the promise of Christ to His Church," &c. Here the commentators, in their notes, "published with approbation," apply the whole metaphor to the "Church of Christ," while this "Priest" most grossly, blasphemously, and deliberately, perverts God's words to uphold the superstitious and idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary, which your Church delights in teaching. And it must not be overlooked that he has also tampered with the text, for

very obvious reasons, by substituting "Who is *she*?" for "Who is *this*?" as found in the Douay version. And in the same "Pastoral" he declares the Virgin Mary to be *the* "mother of fair love, and of fear, and of knowledge," and "of holy hope," which he quotes from Eccles. xxiv. 24, as applied to the Virgin Mary, while in his own Douay Bible this text is declared to apply to "Wisdom." And again, the blessing of Joachim, the high priest, which he gave to Judith when he came from Jerusalem to Bethulia to meet her, is thus similarly perverted and applied to the Virgin Mary: "Oh! thou art blessed among all the daughters of Eve, surpassing them by the exalted privileges and the splendour of thy virtues. '*Thou art the glory of Jerusalem, thou art the joy of Israel, thou art the honour of our people.*'" (Judith xv. 10—Apocrypha.) Knowing full well that Scripture, from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelations, including even the Apocrypha, does not furnish one single text to sanction the thought that the Virgin Mary has any influence with God on our behalf, or that we should invoke her for her good offices of intercession, advocacy, or patronage, or that we should offer our thanks, or praises, or prayers through her, nor that it sanctions the titles given her by your modern Church, this gentleman does not hesitate deliberately to pervert the Word of God to sanction the idolatrous ravings with which this "Pastoral" is replete.

As this "Pastoral" is a masterpiece of blasphemy and perversion of facts and texts, I shall have again to recur to it; in the mean time, it will be conceded that not only are individual priests not infallible, but are not to be implicitly trusted without a previous exercise of that faculty, "reason," which the Lord has more or less implanted in each of us, and which we are not to keep "folded in a napkin;" and though Romanists may boast of having an infallible Church to consult and guide them, what security have you that the priests do not continually pervert the truth for their own private ends? And as I commenced this letter by assuming that infallibility did exist in the Church of Rome, I conclude by asking your lordship how you purpose to make it available to yourself except through this fallible and often vitiated channel?—I am, &c.

LETTER VII.

MY LORD,—In search of Popish infallibility, I assumed, as a first approach, that this divine attribute or prerogative did really exist in the Church of Rome. I also suggested that the parish priest or bishop of the diocese was the only means through whom a layman could avail himself of this inestimable treasure, but, at the same time, I showed

that no reliance whatever could be placed in either priest or bishop, as a means of obtaining the sense of "the Church," or an infallible interpretation of Scripture. It will not be foreign to the subject under consideration, if I now again refer to the Pastoral Letter of Dr. Cullen, of Ireland—a document, as we have seen of the present day, issued the 31st of July, 1850, and published in full in the *Tablet*, p. 502. I exposed, in my last, the gross perversions of *texts* in this precious document; I now proceed to expose the blasphemy and perversion of *facts* indulged in by this gentleman.

This Pastoral was written in anticipation of the "Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary." It must be observed there is neither scriptural authority nor apostolic tradition to warrant the celebration of such a feast-day among Christians; both being profoundly silent as to the history of the Virgin Mary after the departure of Christ. Epiphanius declared "that her end was not known." (1) That she is in heaven we sincerely hope and believe, but to fix and celebrate any particular day when her miraculous ascension is said to have happened, is an invention of the modern Romish Church; and the whole story, as related of the Assumption, is one of those fables and lying wonders propagated by this apostate Church with which the Roman breviary is replete.

The Pastoral commences by giving the title "Holy" to the Virgin Mary. In the Scriptures we read that all generations shall call her *blessed*, but nowhere are we commanded to call her "holy." He declares that the Festival of the Assumption "reminds us that she (the Virgin Mary) passes from the darkness of this world to the regions of eternal bliss, where she receives from her Divine Son a crown of glory and an eternal reward, corresponding with the greatness of her dignity and to the sublimity of her merits, and where she shall, for all ages, be the health of the weak, the consolation of the afflicted, the refuge of poor sinners, the *source of all spiritual grace and favour*." Recommending to families to repeat the "Holy Rosary and Litany of the Blessed Virgin" in honour of the occasion, he says: "Knowing as I do the intensity of your devotion towards the Most Holy Mother of God, I have no doubt but that you will join in this Novena with fervour and zeal, and that you will make every exertion to celebrate, with the profoundest veneration, and with the warmest sentiments of piety, the greatest of her festivals. All the honour that we can pay to this great Virgin—to this most holy and devoted of all mere creatures—is nothing when compared to what is due to the sublimity of her dignity, to the extent of her merits, and to the power of her patronage." My lord, is this the infallible teaching of an infallible Church? Could more be said in honour of our

(1) P. 1008. Paris, 1622.

Saviour Christ? But worse follows. After describing the "ineffable dignity" of the Virgin Mary in being the "Mother of our Lord," whom he calls the "Mother of God," he adds: "We cannot but learn to *love* the Divine Son of God, who thus humbled Himself for our salvation; and to *admire* the great Mother of God, whose elevation must be to us, poor mortals, the purest source of joy and consolation. 'Choose,' says St. Bernard, 'which you will *most admire*—the most beneficent condescension of the Son, or the *sublime dignity* of the Mother. On each side it is a subject of wonder and astonishment: that a God should *OBEY* (!) a woman is a humility beyond example—and that a woman *COMMANDS* a God is an unparalleled privilege.'" Is this not, I ask, a masterpiece of blasphemy? To a thorough-going Romanist such rhapsodies in honour of a creature is an every-day occurrence; but you, my lord, as yet a novice in such matters, must shudder at hearing such doctrines propagated by a Roman priest. Here the Virgin Mary is placed before us with the Saviour, and we are asked which most to admire—the *condescension* of the Son, or the *sublime dignity* of the Mother *commanding* God! This prelate is only retailing the blasphemy of *Saint Bernard*, and makes it pass current as his own by repeating it.

Describing her virtues and dignities on earth, he mentions the "ardour and force of her charity towards God and man,"!! which should excite us to "implore her assistance." "Now that she is seated at the right hand of God, and crowned with glory; and now that she rules as Queen of Heaven, her power is still greater, and she will not be less ready to attend to our wants and our supplications. By her prayers she can obtain whatsoever God can perform by His omnipotence. 'Quod Deus imperio, tu Virgo, prece potes.' *All* the graces of heaven descend to us through her hands; she watches over the destinies of the Church of God; she puts to flight heresy and schism; and she preserves the faithful from the attacks of the enemy of mankind. The annals of the Church, the lives of the saints, the works of the Fathers [a deliberate falsehood], and of all spiritual writers, present to us at every step examples of the wonderful efficacy of her intercession, and of the greatness of her power. 'If any one,' says St. Bernard, 'ever invoked thy aid in his necessities, and found it to fail him, let him cease to extol thy clemency, O! holy Virgin.' Oh! my brethren, let us, then, not neglect to avail ourselves of this *GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION*. In our dangers and our difficulties, in our wants and our sufferings, let us invoke the sweet help of Christians; in our temptations and our trials, when we are tossed about by the waves of concupiscence, when we are led astray by the allurements of this world, let us raise our eyes to the bright star which will guide our steps in the right path—let us invoke the most holy name of Mary. This name is a tower of strength against our enemies; it is a shield of protection in the hour of danger, and suf-

fering, and sickness; and in the agonies of death it will be to us a safe anchor of hope." Here, then, is a specimen of "the Church's" infallible teaching—here is a "new Gospel" preached to us. Roman Catholics are desired to look to the Virgin Mary as a *means of salvation*. Our blessed Redeemer is superseded. Oh! that your lordship could be brought seriously and earnestly to examine into this subject; you would find that you had abandoned a Church whose faithful ministers teach the "pure and unadulterated Word of God," who teach us that there is salvation in none other than in Him who died for us on the cross; that his Atonement was an all-sufficient sacrifice for sin, and that we should look to none but him; "nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." (1) "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." While, on the contrary, the priests of your newly-adopted Church will say, "Look to the sacraments and formularies of the Church—look to the Virgin Mary and the saints—hear the Church—look to the interpreters and ministers of an infallible Church—have no thought or fear for your own soul, we are responsible for that; believe in the Church, and that is all that is required of you—you are not responsible creatures."

Not content with thus exalting the Virgin Mary, and practically placing her on a level with, if not above, her divine Son, this Romish priest and perverter of God's Word does not hesitate to put in the mouth of the Virgin Mary the threatenings of the Lord Jehovah, which were uttered against the sins of Judea and Jerusalem; he says, she will cast us off unless we so act as to "merit her protection." "Our praises will be rejected by the Holy Virgin unless the sentiments of our souls begin to correspond to, and animate the actions we perform. 'When you stretch forth your hands,' she may say to us, 'I will turn away my eyes from you; and when you multiply prayer, I will not hear you; wash yourself, be clean, take away the evil, &c. If you be willing and will hearken to me you shall eat the good things of the land; but if you will not, and *will provoke me to wrath*, the sword shall devour you, because the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.' (2) Let us, then, my brethren, begin to do penance for our sins—let us mortify, &c., and then we may approach with confidence the throne of the holy Virgin, and place ourselves under the shield of her protection. Let us show ourselves to be true children of Mary by walking in her footsteps, and imitating all her virtues," &c., &c.

But, further, to show your lordship how utterly unsafe it is for a lay member of your Church to rely on his priest for infallible teaching, I shall point out to you, in this very Pastoral, how grossly Dr. Cullen has perjured himself, by giving an interpreta-

(1) Acts iv. 12 (*Douay version*).

(2) Isaiah i. 15, 19.

tion to Scriptures contrary to the teaching of the "Fathers," having sworn that he would never interpret the Scriptures except according to their unanimous agreement. I will take two or three points wherein he directly opposes them. He states that "The annals of the Church, the lives of the Fathers, and of all the spiritual writers, present to us, at every step, examples of the wonderful efficacy of her (the Virgin Mary's) intercession, and the greatness of her power." Here is a deliberate perversion of fact. I challenge the gentleman, your lordship, or any other Roman Catholic, to show me any such sentiments recorded in the works of any single Father, or early Christian writer, up to the year 500. The BIBLE is entirely silent on the subject. The works, or parts of the works of the following, are still extant:—St. Barnabas, Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius, and Polycarp, who were called the Apostolic Fathers; Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus, A.D. 150; Irenæus, A.D. 180; Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, A.D. 190; Origen, A.D. 230; Gregory Thaumaturgus and Methodius, A.D. 245; Cyprian, A.D. 258; Lactantius, A.D. 280; Eusebius, A.D. 314; Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, and Macarius, A.D. 350; Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Ephraim the Syrian, A.D. 370; Gregory Nyssa, A.D. 390; Ambrose, A.D. 397; Chrysostom, A.D. 405; Augustine, A.D. 430; Jerome, A.D. 418; Vincent of Lirin, A.D. 440; Orosius, Sedulius, Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 440; Isidore, A.D. 450; Theodoret, A.D. 457; Prosper, A.D. 460. Popes, or rather Bishops: Leo, A.D. 461; Gelasius, A.D. 496; Anastasius and Symmachus, A.D. 514. I name them severally, that your lordship may make your own selection; not one of these Christian writers, or any other of their contemporaries, ascribe to the Virgin Mary any such attributes as this priest would ascribe to her, and which he declares to be derived from their teaching. On the contrary, "We find all the genuine and unsuspected works of Christian writers, not for a few years, or in a portion of Christendom, but to the end of the first 500 years and more, and in every country in the Eastern and the Western Empire, in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia, testifying as with one voice that the writers and their contemporaries knew of no belief in the present power of the Virgin Mary, and her influence with God; no practice in public or private praying to God through her mediation, or of invoking her for her good offices of intercession, and advocacy, and patronage; no offering of thanks and praise made to her; no ascription of divine honour and glory to her name. On the contrary, all the writers through those ages testify that to the early Christians God was the only object of prayer, and Christ the only heavenly mediator and intercessor in whom they put their trust." (1)

(1) "What is Romanism?" J. E. Tyler, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The Roman Primate refers to the miracle at Cana of Galilee: "The holy Virgin was powerful whilst on earth; her charity impelled her to induce her son to perform his first miracle, and to supply the want of the guests at the marriage of Cana." Such a sentiment and interpretation of Scripture is peculiar to modern Roman theology. Augustine (1) enters very fully on this incident; but expresses no such sentiment. And Chrysostom directly asserts, relative to this very miracle, that she did not know his power, and therefore could not possibly have induced him to perform the miracle; (2) and he goes so far as to speak of her "excessive ambition" and "foolish arrogance." And Irenæus, on the same subject, declares that on her interference "the Lord repelled her untimely hurrying." (3) And Theodoret declares that "at one time He (Christ) honours his mother as her who gave him birth, at another [namely, at this marriage feast], as her Lord, He chides her." (4)

Once again. Dr. Cullen refers to Simeon's prophecy (Luke ii. 35). And here, my lord, mark the admirable consistency and infallible teaching of Romanists, who, as I have again and again shown, have sworn not to interpret Scriptures except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Those Fathers who have written on the text of Luke ii. 35, declare, that the sword which should pass through Mary's heart meant her *want of faith*; while he declares it to be her grief (which she suffered when Christ was crucified); and further on he dwells largely on her faith, and refers particularly to Christ's death on the cross: "She sees him expire on the cross, and still she never doubted but that he was the true God." Origen, referring to this text, calls it the "sword of unbelief:" "Thou shalt be struck with the sharp point of doubt, when thou shalt see Him whom thou heardest to be the Son of God, and whom thou knowest that thou broughtest forth without a husband, crucified and dying, and subject to human sufferings." (5) St. Basil says: "The sword is the word that trieth, &c. As, therefore, every soul was subject to some doubt at the time of the Passion (according to the voice of the Lord, 'All shall be offended because of me'), Simeon prophesied concerning Mary also herself, that, standing by the cross, and seeing what was being done, and hearing those words, notwithstanding the testimony of Gabriel notwithstanding the ineffable knowledge of the divine conception, notwithstanding the great display of miracles; yet, after all, saith he, there shall arise a certain wavering in thy own soul . . . consequently even thee (Mary), also thyself,

(1) Vol. iii., part ii., pp. 354-357. Paris, 1700.

(2) Vol. iii., p. 125. Paris, 1718.

(3) Lib. iii., c. 2, p. 219, 2. Benedict. edit.

(4) Vol. iv., p. 105. Halle edit., 1769.

(5) Hom. in Luc. xvii., vol. iii., p. 952.

who has been intrusted from above with the things of the Lord, some doubt shall affect. *This is the sword.*" (1) I have already named Chrysostom; Jerome confirms the interpretation of Basil given above (2); Cyril of Alexandria gives the same meaning to Simeon's prophecy: "Yea, a sword shall pass through thine own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. By the sword he meant the sharp attack of the Passion, which distracted the female mind into reasonings which were out of place; for temptations try the hearts of those who suffer, and lay bare the surmisings which are in them." (3) While Epiphanius interprets the prophecy in quite a different manner to either the above or the modern Romanists; he refers the text to her probable martyrdom: "Whether (says he) the Holy Virgin be dead and buried, in that case her death is in honour, her end in purity, and her crown in virginhood; or whether she was slain (as it is written), a sword shall pierce through her soul also, her glory is among martyrs," &c. (4)

I think that I have proved the charge made in my last letter that this Pastoral of the Roman Priest is a "masterpiece of blasphemy and perversion of facts and texts," and that, too, perpetrated in an epistle issued by a bishop to his flock on a most solemn occasion (to Romanists at least), which should announce solemn truth, the glad tidings of Gospel salvation through Jesus Christ, our only Saviour. Such, then, is the vitiated channel through which Romanists are obliged to derive *infallible* teaching from a so-called infallible Church; and let me add that the Rev. Mr. Smiddy, mentioned in my last, and Dr. Cullen are fair samples of pastors and teachers of the Romish Church.

Though Protestants may hold the Romish priesthood in little estimation, they are, in their own estimation, *gods* in their way. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, "on the Sacrament of Orders," declares that "since the bishops and priests are, as it were, God's interpreters and messengers, who, in His name, teach men the divine law and the precepts of life, and represent the person of God upon earth, it is evident that no greater office than theirs can be imagined. Wherefore they are justly called not only angels, but *gods* (*non solum angeli, sed Dii etiam*) because they possess, amongst us, the strength and power of the immortal God. For although at all times they enjoyed the highest dignity, yet the priests of the New Testament far exceeded the rest in honour. For the power as well of making and offering the body and blood of our Lord, as of remitting sins, which is conferred upon them,

(1) Vol. iii., epist. 260, p. 400. Paris, 1721; and edit. 1839, vol. iii., p. 579.

(2) Vol. vii., p. 300. Verona edit., 1734.

(3) Vol. iv., p. 135 and p. 1064. Paris, 1633.

(4) P. 1003. Paris, 1622.

exceeds human reason and intelligence, nor can anything equal to it, or like it, be found upon earth." (1) This is the solemn declaration of the Roman Church. The Rev. Dr. Doyle declared on oath before the Committee of the Lords, 21st March, 1825, that this Catechism contained, with Pope Pius' Creed, the most authentic summary of the Roman Catholic faith; and the Rev. Dr. Murray gave similar evidence before the Committee of the Commons, 22nd March, 1825, (2); and however much Romanists may honour the Virgin Mary, and extol her powers, each individual priest must consider himself more honoured and more powerful than she was. She was the mother of the Saviour; what *she* was the humble means of accomplishing once, the Romish clergy boast of repeating every day. My lord, be not hasty in exclaiming "Blasphemy!" though such it is. This is no Protestant sarcasm, but the deliberately expressed opinion of the great Roman Catholic schoolman and divine, Gabriel Biel; while Pope Urban, confining the matter to the Pope, said, "The hands of the Pontiff are raised to an eminence granted to none of the angels, of creating God the Creator of all things, and of offering him up for salvation of the world;" and to which speech, uttered by him at a general council, the synod, with the utmost unanimity, responded an Amen! (3) Biel extends this same power to all priests. This cardinal says: "He that created me, gave me, if it be lawful to tell, to create himself. The Virgin Mary once conceived the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world; WHILE THE PRIEST DAILY CALLS INTO EXISTENCE THE SAME DEITY." (4) And hence the priests have not been inaptly called "sacerdotal artisans." —I am, &c.

P.S.—I forwarded to Mr. Smiddy copies of Letters VI. and VII. Having been in correspondence with the reverend gentleman before, on the subject of his book, I put some rather awkward questions on his perversions; being hard pressed by me, he refused to answer my letters except through the public press, and I have taken the first opportunity of bringing him to the point.

The following is his last reply:—

"Youghall, Oct. 29, 1859.

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the *Historic Times*, together with your letters, one of which contained slips of your seventh

(1) Catech. ex Decret. Concl. Tridit. ad Parochos. Pius V., Pont. Max. Jussu. editus. Venetiis, apud Aldum., 1582. De Sacram. Ordinis. "Cum episcopi et sacerdotes tanquam Dei interpretes," &c.

(2) See Phelan's and Sullivan's "Digest of Evidence," Lords' Report, p. 503; Commons, p. 224.

(3) "Dicens, nimis execrabile videri," &c. Hoveden's "Annales" ad ann. 1099, p. 268. Lond., 1596. Labb., Concilia, 12, 960. Venice, 1728. Bruy's "Histoire," 2, 635. Hague, 1732.

(4) "Qui creavit me, si fas est dicere, dedit mihi creare se. Semel concepit Dei filium, eundem Dei filium advocant quotidie corporaliter." Biel, Lect. 4.

public letter. I must confess that I have been unable to discover any strong point in either of your letters. You refer to the notes of the Douay Bible, and you imagine that as these explain certain passages of the Book of Canticles as applying to the *Church*, they cannot by a possibility be understood, or employed in another way by a Catholic. In the offices of the Church these expressions are also referred to the Blessed Virgin, and the eminent saints of God; and most beautiful is their application. It is in this way, as I understand, they were employed by the Primate.

“Are you not aware that this Canticle is supposed to have been written by Solyman, on the occasion of his marriage? Does that, however, prevent its being understood by us in a mystical and spiritual sense? Surely not. I need only recal to your mind the passage ‘Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.’ Has not that a spiritual as well as a literal sense?”

“I do not mean to notice the allusion to me, as I do not deem such notice called for. You seem to me to think that the Church is bound to publish, for the gratification of all whom it may concern, an infallible commentary on the 1st chapter of Genesis! and pronounce which is *true* among the one thousand and one systems of geology! I expected your name would have been appended to your public letters, &c., &c.

“RICHARD SMIDDY.”

I. The *strong* point in my two letters is, that I have stated a few *facts*, exposing Dr. Cullen's and Mr. Smiddy's *fictions*.

II. All the editions of the Douay *notes*, that I have seen, give the *spiritual* interpretation of the *bride*, named in the Canticles, as the *Church of Christ*, and never the *Virgin Mary*. Which of the *two* spiritual interpretations are we to accept as the true one?

III. I do not deny a spiritual meaning to this and certain other portions of Scripture; for instance, “this is my body,” we understand in a “mystical and spiritual sense.” “Surely not!” his Reverence will reply.

IV. The Reverend Gentleman finds it inconvenient to answer in his own defence.

V. I *do* think, that a Church which declares herself infallible, and denies to the laity the privilege of private judgment, and the power of putting any sense on the Scriptures except that which the Church has held and does hold, “whose province it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures,” is bound to publish, “for the gratification of all,” an infallible interpretation to every chapter of the Bible. If she does not, she is guilty of *muzzling* the ox that treadeth out the corn.

VI. I asked for an interpretation of one single verse, namely, Matt. xvi. 18, upon which the whole superstructure of Popish infallibility is built, and which should be clear and explicit in itself, though I should have no objection to hear the infallible commentary on the first chapter of Genesis.

VII. Mr. Smiddy had my name and address; and so has Dr. Wiseman, and the principal priests of England; and my name is attached to this pamphlet.

LETTER VIII.

MY LORD,—From what has gone before, it would be almost needless to examine the claims raised by each of the four sects mentioned in a former letter. But, as I despair of hearing from your lordship to which of these four sects of the Romish Church you have attached yourself, I shall, here, briefly consider the claims put forward by each.

I. One section, we have seen, claims infallibility to exist in the Church collectively; or dispersed, denying that it exists in Popes or Councils. This class is represented by Panormitan, Mirandula, and Alliaco—who have publicly advocated their opinion. Edgar, in his "Variations of Popery," says, "Panormitan, the famous canonist, was one of the advocates of this theory." Councils, according to this author, may err, and have erred. "The universal Church," he adds, "comprehends the assembly of all the faithful; and this is the Church which is invested with infallibility." Mirandula adopted the opinion of Panormitan. He represents the second Council of Ephesus as general and lawful, which, nevertheless, "betrayed the faith." Alliaco's statement on this head, in the Council of Constance, is remarkable. He observed, that "a general council, according to celebrated doctors, may err, not only in fact but also in right, and, what is more, in the faith." He delivered the statement as the opinion of many. The declaration, besides, was made in an assembly containing about a thousand of the clergy, and constituting a representation of the whole Church, with general approbation and consent. (1)

"This party, dissenting from pontifical and synodal infallibility, differ also among themselves, and are subdivided into two sections. One subdivision places infallibility to error in the clergy dispersed

(1) "Tota ecclesia errare non potest." Panormitan, a. 1, N. 21, p. 140; "Ecclesia universalis non potest errare." Ibid, de Jud., No. 4. (Lyons edit.); "Nihilominus in eversionem fidei agitatum." Mirandula Th., 4; "Secundum magnos doctores, generale concilium potest errare, non solum in facto, sed etiam in jure, et quod majus est, in fide." Hard. 2, 201; Lenfant 1, 172. (References given by Edgar.)

through Christendom. The laity, according to this speculation, have nothing to do but obey the clergy, and be safe. The other subdivision reckons the laity among the other participators of infallibility. Clergy and laity, according to this supposition, form one sacred society, which, though dispersed through Christendom, and subject to mistake, in an individual capacity, is, in a collective sense, raised above the possibility of error in the faith."

The absurdity of such a position is manifest; as it is impossible for any person to consult this tribunal, in order to obtain an infallible interpretation, of either Scripture, Canon, or Bull, or the sense of the Church, on any given subject.

II. The second sect ascribe infallibility to the Church Representative, or General Councils,—to which the Pope himself is declared to be subject. This opinion is maintained by the French, or Cisalpine school; as is acknowledged by Arsdekin, Dens, Launoy, Dupin, and others. (1)

We find the redoubtable champions, Gerson, Almain, Bossuet, and others, fighting under this banner; and their opinions are, as we have seen, supported by the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil. These Councils having gone so far as to return a verdict against several Popes of perjury, schism, heresy, &c., which decision history has corroborated. (2) Labbeus records: "The holy Council of Basil pronounces, decrees, and declares Pope Eugenius IV. to be notoriously contumacious, a simoniac, a perjured man, an *obstinate heretic!*"

III. The third sect claim infallibility for Popes in council, the *virtual* and *representative* Church united. The theorists, holding this opinion, admit the fallibility of each, individually, or separated; but together they are inerrable. This class has, perhaps, the most numerous supporters; but they find themselves in this difficulty,—namely, that they admit the infallibility of the first four General Councils, which were neither summoned, nor presided over by Roman Pontiffs; which councils, as I shall presently show, contradict the so-called infallible Council of Trent, which they also believe, or pretend to believe, to be infallible.

The fourth section, which vests infallibility in the Pope personally, I shall leave for a future occasion; while I consider the claims of the last two sects named.

In the first place, Romanists are not yet agreed as to which of the Councils that have met are admitted as *General*. Delahogue, in his "Treatise on the Church of Christ," says, "The opinion of the learned

(1) Arsdekin, "Theologia," Antwerp, 1682, 1, 117; Dens, "Theologia," Dublin, 1832, 2, 156; Dupin, History, 362, 364; Maimbourg, c. 15, Paris, 1684.

(2) "Nonnulli summi Pontifices, in hæreses et errores lapsi leguntur. Errante Pontifice, sicut sæpe contingit, et contingere potest." [Crabb, "Concilia," Colonia, 1551, 3, 12, 146, 148; Binius, "Concilia," Paris, 1636, 8, 23, &c., &c. Labbeus, vol. xiii., p. 619.

respecting the number of General Councils that have been held, is not uniform.”(1) And further on he quotes the opinion of Bellarmine, who states, relative to the fifth Lateran Council, “Whether this was truly a General Council, is at this day a question even among Catholics.”

In the second place, it has never been decided what constituted a General Council; for, according to the usual acceptation of the term, the Council of Trent was not a General Council, as it was neither properly convoked, nor were the different “Catholic” countries properly represented, nor was free discussion allowed.

And, thirdly, it has not been determined whether unanimity, or a given majority, decided a question.

It is evident that Augustine did not consider General Councils to be infallible, for, says he, “Whatever is found written in Scriptures may neither be doubted nor disputed, whether it be true or right; but the writings of bishops may not only be disputed, but corrected by bishops that are more learned than themselves; or, by Councils and National Councils, by plenary or general, and even General Councils *may be amended by the latter.*” (2) And even Councils themselves cannot be, according to Bellarmine’s own admission, a safe guide for after ages, for he declares that “the books of Councils, being negligently kept, do abound with many errors.” (3) And, as we have seen, he goes so far as to deny the absolute necessity of General Councils; his words are, “They are not absolutely and simply necessary, and of this I am easily persuaded, for this reason: first, because the primitive Church for the first 300 years had no General Councils, and yet perished not; again, as the Church during those 300 years continued safe without General Councils, so, without doubt, it might have continued 300 years more; and again, 600 years after that, and so likewise 1000 years more; for in those (first) times, there were many heresies, many schisms, many vices and abuses, all which, notwithstanding they wanted the assistance of General Councils, *could not* endanger the Catholic Church.” (4) While, on the contrary, Gregory of Valentia held Councils in such great estimation, that he has recorded his opinion in the following words:—“If you find but an episcopal synod, or consent of divers divines only, affirming such a doctrine to be the sentence of the Church, you are bound to believe it, though it be a lie.” (5)

But we have direct proof that Councils are not infallible, in the fact

(1) “De numero Conciliorum,” &c.; Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi. Appendix 2, de Conc. Gen.

(2) “Aug. de Baptist. contr. Donat.,” p. 98, tom. 9. Paris, 1688.

(3) “Libri Concilioris negligenter conservanti sunt, et multis vitiis scatent.” Bell. de Concil., lib. 1, c. 2, sect. 1. Prag. 1721.

(4) Bell. de Eccles. et Concl., lib. 1, c. 10, sect. 1. Prag., 1721.

(5) Valent., p. 365, tom. 3, Lutet. Paris, 1660.

that they have contradicted each other; which is so notoriously the case, that I need scarcely have entered on the subject, had not your lordship evidently betrayed supreme ignorance of the circumstances, by rashly admitting that the Romish Church is infallible, and the centre of unity. I shall, therefore, note down two or three instances to prove the fallacy of your position.

The Nicene Creed was, we have seen, received by the Church in the year 325. The three subsequent General Councils solemnly adopted this same creed, and subjected to an anathema any who should add to it any article of faith; while the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, passed several decrees, altering the primitive Catholic faith, which decrees were, by Papal bull, embodied in twelve new articles of faith; and in the face of the above anathema, were added to, and made part of, the Catholic creed, out of which they blasphemously assert there is no salvation.

The Council of Eliberis, in the year 328, decreed "that no images should be set up in churches;" (1) while the 2nd Council of Nice anathematised all those who should condemn the worship of images, and, in this respect, opposed the Council of Eliberis, as also the 7th General Council, held at Constantinople in 754, which by decree condemned the use of images, and which last-named decree was confirmed by the 2nd Council of Frankfort in 794, excommunicating the 2nd Council of Nice. And the Council of Trent again opposing the Councils of Eliberis, Constantinople, and Frankfort, declared that all bishops, &c., must teach "that the images of Christ, and of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are especially to be had and retained in churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be paid to them." (2)

The Council of Laodicea, in 365, rejected the Apocryphal books from the canon of Scripture, (3) which canon was strictly observed by the early Christian Fathers, Origen, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Eusebius of Cesarea, Jerome, Epiphanius, Augustine, Pope Gregory the Great, &c., &c., but was, nevertheless, contradicted by the Council of Trent, which anathematised all those who should not receive these Apocryphal books as canonical. (4)

The Council of Nice, A.D. 325, decreed that the Bishop of Rome should not have supremacy over other patriarchs. The Councils of the 4th Lateran, Florence, and Trent, gave the supremacy over all other sees to the Pope of Rome. (5)

(1) "Placuit picturas in ecclesia non debere." Canon 36, Lab., p. 986. Paris, 1671.

(2) Concil. Nicen. ii., act. iv., Lab., tom. vii., p. 317, 318, C. D.; Concil. Francfortense, can. ii., Lab., tom. vii., col. 1057, E.; Concil. Trident., sess. xxx., p. 507, 508.

(3) Bin. Concil., can. 60, p. 304, tom. i. Paris, 1636.

(4) Concil. Trident. Paris, 1824, p. 24, 25.

(5) Concil. Niceni, can. vi., in Bishop Beveridge's *Συνοδικον*, sive Pandectæ

But how can an infallible Church be formed out of fallible materials?—a general council, consisting of bishops and priests, who, even according to Romish testimony, have been most depraved and corrupt. Pope Gregory the Great, himself, testifies to the fact in his age: “The worshippers of idols daily rage and rule, to the destruction of the faithful; and yet the priests, who ought to be weeping on the pavement, and in ashes, seek for themselves names of vanity, and glory in their new and profane titles.” And again, he says, “All things which were predicted are taking place. The King of pride is at hand, and what is unlawful to utter, an army of priests is prepared for him.” (1)

And Baronius, in his Annals, gives us a fearful picture, from year to year, of Popes, bishops, and priests, of the Romish Church—the channel through which infallibility is to descend. I will give but one example, from many of a similar nature, to be found throughout his work: “Behold the nine hundredth year of the Redeemer begins, which, by reason of its asperity and barrenness of good, has been wont to be called the iron age; and by the deformity of its exuberant evil, the leaden age; and by its poverty of writers, the dark age. Standing upon the threshold of which, we have thought it expedient, before we proceed further, on account of the crimes, which it has been our lot to behold before the door, to make some preface, by way of admonition to the reader, lest the weak-minded should take offence if he sometimes perceived the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION STANDING IN THE TEMPLE. What unworthy, unsightly, yea, what execrable and hateful things the sacred and apostolic See has been compelled to suffer! To our shame and grief be it spoken, how many monsters, horrible to behold, were intruded by them, into that seat which is revered by angels! With what filth was it her fate to be besprinkled, which was without spot or wrinkle—with what stench to be infected—with what impurities to be defiled!” &c., &c. And further on he says, “Lust claimed everything to itself. Christ evidently was in a deep sleep in the ship, and the ship itself covered with waves.” (2)

If, my lord, the above facts are not sufficient to prove that the Roman Church is fallible, I will yet add another. You have heard of the prohibitory indices of Rome, a sort of “literary gaol, the *carcere ecclesia*, very analogous to the purgatory which the Church has created?” (3)

Canonum, vol. i., p. 66; Concil. Lat. iv., can. 5, Lab. tom. xi., col. 153, B. C; Concil. Florentin., sess. 25, Lab., tom. xiii., col. 515, 516, D. E. [For these three references I am indebted to the Rev. H. Horne, “Popery Delineated,” Painter, Strand, and I am happy to take this opportunity of making this most excellent little work more generally known.]

(1) “*Sæviunt et dominantur quotidie,*” &c. Greg. Reg., lib. 4, Epis. 32. “*Omnia, quæ prædicta sunt,*” &c., lib. 4, Epis. 38.

(2) Baronii Annales, Eccle. Antwerp, 1603, p. 7, An. 4.

(3) I borrow this idea from the excellent work of the Rev. Joseph Mendham

“The Sacred Congregation of the Index” is a regularly-constituted body, and forms a most essential portion of the Romish Church. It has its Prefect and associated Cardinals, its secretary and consultants; and the Pope is the head of this assembly. They, at will, place in this Index all those works which they deem to be injurious to the temporal or spiritual welfare of the Church.

The works of Copernicus, Foscarini, and Galileo, were successively consigned to this “literary purgatory,” for teaching the “*doctrinal heresy, that in the solar system, the sun is the immovable centre, and the earth, and all the other planets, revolve round it.*” The Index of 1704 not only contained the particular condemnation of the works of the three above-named individuals; but also “*libri omnes docentes mobilitatem terræ; et immobilitatem solis.*” These prohibitory indexes have been from time to time republished, and that of 1819 contains the same entries, with some additions.

The Church of Rome, ever watchful over her children, lest they should fall from the faith, thought they perceived in this new doctrine a contradiction of Scripture. Galileo was at once examined before the Inquisition, convicted of heresy, and condemned to be punished. The inquisitors, by desire of the Pope, and the Cardinals of the Inquisition, declared that “the two propositions of the stability of the sun, and the motion of the earth, *were qualified by the theological qualificators, as follows:*

First, The proposition that the sun is in the centre of the world, and immovable from its place, is absurd, philosophically false, and formally heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scripture.

Second, The proposition that the earth is not the centre of the world, nor immovable, and that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is also absurd, philosophically false, and theologically considered, at least, erroneous in faith.”

Thus it will be seen that the question was handled as a theological question, as a point of doctrine and faith, and that this Copernican system was considered, by Pope, cardinals, and councils, to be heretical and contrary to the Catholic faith.

Time and science, however, have proved that Galileo’s principle was wholly true, and not contrary to Scripture. And the Church and Court of Rome, in spite of their claim to infallibility, have been the laughing-stock of Europe.

But this Church has, by some strange system of its own, unknown by other Churches, declared, in 1835, *that doctrine to be true, which in*

entitled “An Index of Prohibited Books, by Command of the present Pope, Gregory XVI., in 1835.” London: Duncan and Malcolm. From this source I borrow, also, the matter in the text. This work, as well as “The Literary Policy of the Church of Rome,” by the same talented and indefatigable author, are particularly valuable at the present time.

1620, and each successive year, they declared to be *false*: for by the Index of 1835 the three literary prisoners are secretly and quietly released; and, as if their judges were ashamed of their former acts, the doctrine is no longer condemned by the Church, and all the faithful may now believe, as a certain matter of faith and doctrine, that the earth and planets *do* revolve round an immovable sun.

These three sects, each giving its own particular definition of the term "The Church," appeal, severally, to the same portions of Scripture in support of their claims to infallibility—Matt. xviii. 17, and Matt. xxviii. 29.

"Hear the Church," is their motto. Christ commands us to "hear the Church," say they. To this I answer, Christ never pointed out the Roman Church as the court of appeal;—but let the *whole* text speak for itself:—"If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go, and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone." Here our Saviour evidently contemplated no question of doctrine or faith, or matters of controversy, but a simple question of trespass, quarrel, or disagreement with another. "If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." So we see that the second appeal is to two or three witnesses; surely the Church would not consent to submit matters of doctrine or faith to be decided by such an ordinary tribunal. "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church;" which, say some Romanists, is the general body of Catholics, dispersed throughout the world: others, the General Councils; others, again, the Pope personally. "But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican." Here, I repeat, doctrinal or controversial questions were not contemplated. The word *ἐκκλησία* would be more properly rendered by "assembly" or "society,"—as Acts xix. 32, 39, and 41—which would signify a tribunal consisting of lay as well as ecclesiastical members. In quoting this text Romanists make this great oversight—viz., that the Church does not consist exclusively of the clergy, but of the whole body of the faithful, including the laity; the lay members have, therefore, as much right to be heard as the clergy, whether the text be applied to doctrine or not—a truth which the Tractarians, anti-Privy-Council, and anti-Supremacy-divines of the present day, appear also to forget.

The next text cited is Matt. xxviii. 29, wherein Christ gave a commission to the apostles to "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" and he adds this express promise: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The Romish priesthood, claiming for themselves, exclusively, an apostolic succession, claim also this commission.

My Lord, I am one of those heretics who believe that truth is not the less truth because it is uttered by one who does not claim *per-*

somal apostolic succession. I believe, with that arch-heretic Ambrose, that "they have not the succession of Peter that want the faith of Peter" (1); whom your Church has grossly falsified, by making him say, "They have not the succession of Peter who have not the *chair* of Peter." (2)

But observe this important condition annexed to Christ's promise,—which Romanists not unfrequently omit, when they tell us to "hear the Church,"—viz., "Teaching to observe all things whatsoever I command you; and lo, I am with you," &c.

If your lordship, or any other Romanist, can prove to me that Christ or his Apostles commanded us to accept any one of the twelve new articles, added by your Church to the primitive creed, now forming the distinctive principles of Popery, I will, at once, follow the example set by yourself, and become also a Romanist. But, as I am prepared to prove that each one of these twelve new articles is anti-scriptural, I can come to no other conclusion, than that the command to preach God's word and the Catholic faith is not, by Divine commission, entrusted to the Romish priesthood.—I am, my Lord, &c.

LETTER IX.

MY LORD,—I now proceed to consider the claims of the fourth sect; namely, that which declares that the Pope is infallible, the Pope being the "virtual Church." This sect, your lordship will doubtless repudiate, but they nevertheless reckon among them numerous and influential supporters. In the foremost rank we find Cardinal Bellarmine, who thus defines their position: "We maintain that the Pope is simply and absolutely above the universal Church and above General Councils." (3) And Gretzerus, equally ready to maintain the same sentiment, declares it to be the faith of the Church that "we do receive and reverence that only for the word of God, which the Pope, as supreme master of the Christians, and judge of all controversies, doth determine in the chair of Peter." (4) But Bellarmine, determined not to be outdone by his brother Jesuit, goes still further, and says, that "if the Pope should so far err as to command vices, and forbid virtues, the Church were bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues are evil, unless

(1) "Non habent Petri hæreditatem qui Petri *fidem* non habet." Amb. de Pœnit., c. 6., tom. 1, p. 156. Apud Joh. Forb. An. Basil, 1527.

(2) "Non habent Petri hæreditatem qui Petri *sedem* non habent." Gra. de Pœnit., cap. liii., p. 1687, tom. 1. Iug., 1671.

(3) Bell. de Concil., author., lib. 2, cap. 2, sect. 1. Prag., 1721.

(4) "Id solum pro verbo Dei veneramur ac suscipimus, quod nobis Pontifex ex Cathedra Petri," &c. Def. c. 1, 1, 1, de verbo Dei, p. 16.

she will sin against her own conscience," (1) so that, by the acknowledgment of this Cardinal, an implicit faith in the Pope is commanded, whether his doctrine be true or false; in fact, as he says, "to make that no sin which is sin."

As your lordship was, doubtless, ignorant of the fact that Romanists are diametrically opposed to each other in the belief of the Pope's personal infallibility, I propose to exemplify the teaching of the opposing members of this "Centre of Unity" on this part of our subject, and put in opposite columns the conflicting opinions of a few only of the leading members of the sects. (2)

(1) *Bellarmino*.—"It is probable that the Pope, not only as Pope, cannot err, *but, as a private man*, cannot fall into heresy, or hold any obstinate opinion contrary to the faith."

(2) *Albertus Pigghius*.—"The judgment of the Pope is more certain than the judgment of a general council, or else the whole world."

(3) *Hosius*.—"Be the wickedness of the Popes never so great, it can never hinder, but that this promise of God shall ever be true; the Popes shall show thee the truth of judgment."

(4) *Johannes de Tarrecremata*.—"It is better to rest on the sentence of the Pope, which he delivers out of judgment, than the opinions of whatsoever wise men in matters of Scripture: for even Caiaphas was a high priest, and although he was wicked, yet he prophesied truly."

(5) *Silvester Prieras*.—"Whosoever leaneth not to the doctrine of the Roman Church, and Bishop of Rome, as unto the infallible rule of God (of which doctrine the Holy

(1) *Alphonsus de Castro*.—"We doubt not whether one man may be a Pope and a heretic both together; for I believe there is none so shameless a flatterer of the Pope that will grant him that prerogative, that he can never err, nor be deceived in expounding Scripture, seeing it is well known, that divers Popes have been so palpably unlearned, that they have been utterly ignorant of their grammar, and therefore how can they be able to expound Scripture?"

(2) *Lyra*.—"Hereby it appeareth, that the Church standeth not upon men, in consideration of their power or dignity ecclesiastical, or temporal: for many princes and Popes have proved apostates, and strayed from the faith."

(3) *Arboreus*.—"The Pope may err in faith: and he seemeth to me to be in a foul error that thinketh otherwise: surely they do but flatter the Bishop of Rome, that make him free from falling into schism or heresy."

(4) *Laurentius Valla*.—"No man's dignity doth defend him from con-

(1) "Si autem Papa erraret, præcidendo vitæ vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitæ esse bonæ, et virtutes malas nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare." Bell. de Pont., lib. 4, c. 5, sect. 8. Prag., 1721, and tom. 1., p. 456.

(2) I am indebted, for the passages quoted, to Sir H. Lynde's "Via Tuta," a new edition of which has been lately published by the British Reformation Society, passages quoted, have been examined with the original texts, and Rev. R. P. Blakeney, Incumbent of Ison Green, Nottinghamshire.

Scripture hath taken force and authority), he is a heretic."

(6) *Cornelius Mus.*—"I must ingenuously confess, I would give more credit to one Pope in matters of faith, than to a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, or Gregories, &c. For I believe and know, the chief bishop in matters of faith cannot err, because the authority of the Church in determination of things belonging to faith, is resident in that bishop; and so the error of that bishop should come to be the error of the universal Church."*

Such, then, is the glorious state of unity among members of the Roman Catholic Church on that most important subject, the infallibility of the Pope, which, with some Romanists, is deemed a matter so essential, that the whole welfare of the Church depends on it. Alphonsus Liguori, the last canonised Saint of the Church of Rome, declared that if the *foundation*, the Pope, be not infallible, the Church may err and fall. (1) The several authorities quoted are considered by each sect as orthodox teachers of the "Catholic faith," and each was, in his day, looked to as a faithful guide, and duly constituted authority; and each had his numerous followers.

I have now the painful duty to record the blasphemies indulged in by the advocates of this theory of infallibility, and I feel persuaded that your lordship will own, that whatever may be the intention of those who uttered them, you, at least, will not subscribe to their doctrines, at the expense even of being declared a heretic.

In the decree made by Pope Boniface, we read: "We declare, affirm, and pronounce, that it is *altogether necessary to salvation* for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." (2) Bellarmine acknowledges that "all the names which are given in the Scriptures to Christ, whence it appears that he is superior to the Church, all these same names are given to the Pope." (3) And the following are the titles

* (1) Bell. de Rom. Pontif., l. 4, c. 6, sect. 1. Prag. 1721. (2) Pigh. de Eccle. Hier., lib. 6, c. 13. (3) Hos., lib. 2, cont. Brent. (4) Joh. Sum. de Eccles., lib. 2, cap. 112. (5) Prier. contr. Lutherum. (6) Episc. Bitont. Conc. ex Rom. i., cap. 14.

for Peter was not so defended, nor many others that were advanced to that degree, as Pope Marcellius, in that he offered sacrifices unto idols, and Pope Cælestinus, in that he agreed with the heretic Nestorius."

(5) *Gerson.*—"Every one, of what degree soever in the Church, although he be Pope himself, is compassed with infirmities, and subject unto error, and is in possibility of deceiving, and being deceived."

(6) *Erasmus.*—See p. 36, ante, for the conclusive opinion of Erasmus.†

† (1) Alphonsus advers. Hæres, lib. 1, cap. 4. (2) Lyræ in Matt. 8. (3) Theoph., lib. 4, cap. 32. (4) De Donat. Constantini, p. 782. Basil, 1540. (5) Gerson De Examinat. Doctor. Consid. 1, p. 8, tom. 1. Antw., 1706.

(1) Tom. 1, p. 125. Venet., 1828. Liguori was canonised in 1839.

(2) "Subesse Romano Pontifice," &c. Extrao. Can., lib. 1, tit. 8, c. 1.

(3) "Omnia nomina, quæ in Scripturis," &c. Bell. de Concil. Auct., lib. 2, cap. 17. Ingoldstd. 1590.

given to the Pontiff, as set forth in his treatise "De Romano Pontifice" (lib. 2, c. 31):—"Pope; father of fathers; the pontiff of Christians; high-priest; the prince of priests; the vicar of Christ; the head of the body—that is, of the Church; the foundation of the building of the Church; the father and doctor of the faithful; the ruler of the house of God; the keeper of God's vineyard; the bridegroom of the Church; the ruler of the apostolic see; the universal bishop." Christopher Marcellus, at the fourth Lateran Council, addressed the Pope in the following words:—"For thou art the shepherd; thou art the physician; thou art the ruler; thou art the cultivator; finally, thou art another God upon earth (*tu denique alter Deus in terris*"). (1) And at the sixth Council of Lateran, Bishop Bignius cried out, amidst an applauding multitude, addressing Pope Leo X., "Ecce venit Leo! Behold here cometh a lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David; behold he hath raised up a Saviour, which shall deliver the people of God from the hand of the destroyer. Thou art he, O most blessed Leo, whom we have expected as a Saviour; take up thy sword and buckler and rise in our defence." (2) On the inauguration of Pope Alexander VI., the following inscription was placed on one of the triumphal arches: "Rome was great under Cæsar, but now she is greatest, Alexander VI. reigns; the former was a man, the latter is a God" (*Ille vir, iste Deus*). (3) Once again, Pope Nicholas, in his letter to the Emperor Michael, writes: "It may very evidently be shown that the Pope, who, as we have seen already related, was called God by Prince Constantine, can neither be bound nor released by the secular authorities, for it is manifest that God cannot be judged by man." (4) Nor is Dr. Wiseman a whit behind his predecessors in his servile adulation of the Pope. Doubtless, viewing a cardinal's hat in perspective, he edits the following most blasphemous passage, without making any comment of disapproval or otherwise: "As soon as Cardinal Spinelli, to whom the saint (Liguori) had written upon the subject, i.e., to entreat that the Pope would not make him (Liguori) bishop, was told what the Pope had said, he immediately exclaimed, '*It is the will of God. The voice of the Pope is the voice of God.*'" (5) Doubtless the doctor, in his extreme humility, made a similar ejaculation, when he heard of his Holiness's intention to confer upon him the scarlet hat.

I might, my lord, weary you with numerous other quotations of a similar nature; but enough has been said to show that the Pope of Rome is the Man of Sin prophesied by St. Paul, who "sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God." (*Douay version.*)

I now proceed to prove how impossible it is that infallibility should

(1) Labb. et Cossart., tom. 14, p. 109. Paris, 1672.

(2) "Te Leo Beatissime, &c." Concil. Lat., 5, sess. 6., Beng. ad Leo X.

(3) Cairo, Storia di Milano, par. 7, p. 888.

(4) Grat. Decret. Turini, 1600, pt. 1, cap. 7. "Satis evidenter," &c.

(5) Lives of St. A. Liguori, &c. Edited by N. Wiseman, D.D. London: C. Dolman, 1846, p. 28.

reside in the Roman Pontiff. First, we have had heretical Popes. Victor was a Montanist; Liberius was an Arian; Honorius was considered as a Monothelite, and condemned by the third Council of Constantinople, the sixth General Council; Vigilius denied the existence of two natures in Christ; John XXIII. was condemned as a heretic by the Council of Constance for denying the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body, and of heaven and hell; Eugenius IV. was condemned by the Council of Basil. In fact, the canon law itself contemplates the case in point, when it says that "a Pope may be deposed from his chair for heresy." (1) Platina records the fact that Benedict VIII., Sylvester III., and Gregory VI. were "three most filthy monsters;" and adds a long list of Popes who came to the Popedom by treachery, craft, bribery, murder, and witchcraft. Genebrand, a Popish chronicler, informs us that about fifty Popes, from John VIII. to Leo IX., were *apostatical* rather than *apostolical*. Baronius's description of some of these infallible monsters is striking. "How foul," says he, "was it (the Roman Catholic Church) when sordid and abominable women ruled at Rome; and, what is horrid to hear, and unutterable, *false pontiffs*, their lovers, were intruded into the chair of St. Peter! Who can affirm that men illegally intruded by wicked women of this sort were pontiffs? All the canons were closed in silence; decrees of pontiffs were suppressed; ancient traditions proscribed, and the usages of former days wholly extinct." Such were the "chosen vessels of the Lord!"

Again we have had two laymen Popes,—namely, Constantius II. and Bennet VIII. Some, children: Bennett IX. was ten years old, and John XII. not eighteen.

But it is argued by this same 4th sect., that, notwithstanding all this, yet, as Popes are successors of St. Peter, they are infallible. This, again, is an extraordinary position to assume when we know that Gregory I. abolished the decrees of Pelagius; and, in turn, Sabinian and Innocent those of Gregory, Stephen those of Formosus; and Romanus annulled those of Stephen. Gregory I. wrote: "I *confidently* say, that whoever doth call himself UNIVERSAL BISHOP, or desireth to be so called, doth in his elation forerun ANTI-CHRIST, because he pridingly doth set himself before all others." The Anti-Christ Boniface III. immediately came, and assumed the title of Universal Bishop, which has been retained by the successive Anti-Christ's up to Pope Pius IX. (2) This same Pope Gregory declared that the books of Maccabees were not canonical, which has been denied by Popes subsequent to 1564.

(1) Gra. Decret., 40 can., cap. 6, "si Papa," &c., &c. Vid. P. Innocent III., apud Laun. contr. Baron.

(2) It is important to remark that *Anti-Christ* does not mean against, or opposed to Christ, but in the place or stead of Christ; for *anti*, in combination, most usually takes that meaning. Is it not evident that the Pope does take the place of Christ, "showing himself as if he were God?"

Gregory commanded, "Let not the priest alone celebrate mass; for as he cannot perform it without the presence of the priest and people, so likewise it ought not to be performed by one alone: for there ought to be present some to whom he ought to speak, and who, in like manner, ought to answer him," &c.: (1) while the present Pope Pius IX. subscribes and enforces the decrees of his Church which "anathematizes" Pope Gregory: "If any shall say that private masses, in which the priest alone doth sacramentally communicate, are unlawful, and therefore ought to be abrogated, let him be accursed." (2)

Popes themselves have disclaimed infallibility, as did Gregory XI., for in his will we find that he says, "If, whether in consistory or in councils, or elsewhere, he had maintained any doctrines contrary to the Catholic faith, he revoked it, detested it, and willed that it should be accounted as not having been spoken." (3)

But, my lord, where was infallibility seated, or to be found, when two Popes occupied the papal chair at one time, Clement VII. and Urban VI? and, at another time, when three Popes ruled, Boniface VII., John XV., and Benedict VII., these amiable Christ's vicars on earth abusing, cursing, and anathematizing each other to a degree that would even shame one of our Billingsgate fish-women?

Why need I accumulate proofs of Popish fallibility, when Romanists of this fourth sect are themselves so far from agreeing on the subject, that some say the Pope personally is infallible, while others say he is only infallible when he speaks what they call *ex cathedra*?—a term of which they can give us no definite meaning.

Perhaps, my lord, you are not aware that the infallibility of the present Pope has been put to the test, and found deficient. That most serious and important doctrine of the "Immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary" has been for 500 years "a bone of contention" in the Romish Church. It was considered most important that the question should be settled; so the contending parties agreed on a petition to the Pope for his infallible judgment. The *Tablet* of the 24th of March, 1849, in a "leader," thus adverts to the subject:—"Now, while deprived of all political power, whilst almost a wanderer on the earth, he (Pope Pius IX.) is about to determine a question, which, for 500 years, has been open, and, for a portion of that time, *hotly debated to and fro*. The Franciscans and Dominicans *are now agreed* [not on the question at issue, be it remembered, but only on petitioning his Holiness], and the whole Catholic world calls for a definite sentence from the *infallible* judge. In the course of ages the *contested doctrine* has become clearer; holy and wise men have poured forth the stores of their learning; and,

(1) Greg. in lib. Capitulari, Liturg. 33, p. 83. Paris, 1605.

(2) Concl. Trid., can 8, sess. 22, p. 150. Paris, 1832.

(3) Dachery, Spicilegium, tom. iii., p. 738, col. 2. See Horne's "Popery Delivered" Printer, p. 122, where the original passage is set out.

above all, the devotion of the faithful has unravelled many *perplexities*. The apostolic See has been petitioned to determine the truth, and by a solemn decree to pronounce the conception of the Virgin Mary immaculate." You are now a Roman Catholic; the subject of the immaculate conception will claim your most serious attention; you will have to attach yourself to one of the two contending parties; those who uphold that the conception of the Virgin Mary was immaculate, actually *rave* on the point; this sect may be compared to our "High Church" party, and their opponents the "Low Church;" in fact, the cause of "Gorham v. Exeter" was such another question. When professing to be of our Church you took a leading part in that cause, and the result of the decision of the Privy Council seems to have determined you to take the fatal and precipitate step—to become a pervert; but now you have gone over, you will find that you are not one whit the better off, for your *active* and *decisive* mind will lead you to take a prominent part in the warfare now raging in the bosom of your newly adopted Church. It is a pity your lordship did not delay till the infallible head had given his infallible decision; for then, in answer to the gentlemen of Coventry, you might have pointed with exultation to the Church of Rome, and said, "See how this Church, the 'centre of unity,' settles her matters of faith; they, despising all fallible privy councils and lay tribunals, at once appeal to the infallible head, and get an infallible decree." But, alas! you will find that though the Gorham case is settled, at least to the satisfaction of a very large majority of the clergy, and certainly of the laity, the question of the immaculate conception is *not*.

To answer this petition his Holiness found difficult; for whichever way he decided, he was sure to offend one of the contending parties; and while a refugee at Gaëta, he could not afford to make enemies. So he very wisely determined to *give no decision at all*, but by letter, under date Gaëta, 2nd of February, 1849, addressed "To the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the whole Catholic World," acknowledging the importance of the subject, says, "We have directed, with an extreme interest, our most serious cares and thoughts towards an object of *such high importance*, and have not ceased to raise unto Almighty God humble and fervent prayers that he may deign to illuminate our soul with the light of His heavenly grace, and make us know the determination which we ought to make on this subject." After going through the usual invocations and incantations to the "Blessed Virgin" to assist him in his meditations, instead of giving what the "Catholic World" expected and called for—an infallible determination on the point—the Old Fox got out of his difficulties by stating, that he had "chosen some ecclesiastics distinguished for their piety and well versed in theological studies . . . illustrious for their virtue, their religion, their wisdom, their prudence, and for their knowledge of Divine things; and we have commissioned *them* carefully to

examine this grave subject in all its relations, according to their prudence and their learning, and thereafter, as soon as possible, to lay before us *their* resolution." He then proceeds to ask the prayers of all the faithful, "to obtain of the Merciful Father of Light that he may deign to illuminate us with the superior brightness of his Divine Spirit, and may inspire us with a breath from on high, and that in an affair of such great importance," &c., so that he may come to a decision on the point at issue. But his Holiness finding himself in what is vulgarly called "a fix," knowing the "Catholic World" required of him an infallible decision, he concludes by requesting a return from the clergy *their* wishes, that he may shape his decision accordingly. "We have a lively wish," says he, "that you should, as soon possible, make known to us with what devotion your clergy and faithful people are animated towards the conception of the immaculate Virgin, and what desire they have to behold the apostolic See promulgate a decree in this matter. We, above all, desire to know, venerable brethren, what are in this respect the wishes and feelings of your eminent wisdom." The "Catholic World" may depend upon having—if not an infallible decision—a decision according to the wish of the majority, whatever learning or prayer may be bestowed on the subject.

Your lordship left the Church of England because you could find in it no living, definite, infallible authority; but such a living, definite, infallible authority, you give us to understand, that you have found in the Church of Rome, why delay one moment in offering your services to "his Holiness?" Consult your oracle, and give the "Catholic World" the benefit of the decision, and at once set at rest this important question, which has for 500 years been open, and hotly debated to and fro, and still remains unsettled. It might assist his Holiness if you suggested to him, that Bishop Canus, who had the reputation of being learned in these matters, and appears to have given the subject due consideration, informs us that "all the holy Fathers, with one consent, affirm the blessed Virgin to have been conceived in original sin," (1) and that a decision contrary to "all the holy Fathers," and Bishop Canus included, would destroy the glorious unanimity of opinion existing in the Church of Rome, which allured you to her bosom.—I am, &c.

LETTER X.

MY LORD.—Before dismissing the subject of Popish Infallibility, it will be necessary that I should notice the scriptural texts adduced by that section of the Romish Church, which claims infallibility to reside in the Pope.

(1) "Sancti omnes uno ore asseverarunt beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam fuisse." Canus loc. Theol., p. 348. Colon., 1605.

They declare the Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, who, they assert, was the first Bishop of Rome; they tell us that Christ promised Peter that upon *him* his Church should be built, when he pronounced the words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church;" and that the Church (which they maintain means the Romish Church) should never fail, when he declared that "the gates of hell should not prevail against it;" that this promise was made to Peter and his successors (the Popes), and that in conferring the keys upon Peter, Christ gave to him and his successors the power of loosing the bands of temporal punishments due to sins, called an indulgence, as interpreted in the note to the Douay version. And again: that a primacy was assigned to Peter and his successors over the Church, not only by the declaration that he (Peter) was the rock, but also by Christ's charge to him, "to feed his sheep."

Such is the position assumed by this sect, and so strongly do they insist on the primacy of Peter, that it is declared to be a main article of the Romish faith, and not "only a sin ple error, but a pernicious heresy to deny this primacy." (1)

It is well known that Romanists claim Peter to have been the first Bishop of Rome, and they therefore endeavour to wrest Scripture to serve their purpose. Without going into the question, which has never been satisfactorily answered, whether Peter was ever at Rome at all—much less a Bishop of Rome—let me apply myself to the above texts. Romanists declare *Peter* to be the *Rock*; the note to the Douay version tells us, "by the plain course of the words *Peter* is here (Matt. xvi. 18) declared to be the *rock* upon which the Church was to be built." It is always my practice in dealing with Romanists to use their own weapons against them; they are sworn that they will never take and interpret the Scriptures "otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers;" I hold you to this. It so happens that on this, as on all other texts on which Romanists would build their arguments to support their peculiar dogmas, they are far from being unanimous in their interpretation. Some *few* say that the rock was Peter; others, that it was the confession of faith made by Peter; others, Christ.

Hilary declared that "the building of the Church is upon this rock of his confession." (2)

Ambrose: "Faith, therefore, is the foundation of the Church; for it was not said of the flesh of Peter, but of his faith, that the gates of hell should not prevail." (3)

Theodoret: "He calls the piety of faith, the profession of the truth, the rock." (4)

(1) Bell. de Pont., p. 306, vol. i. Prag., 1731.

(2) De Trin., lib. 6. Paris, 1652.

(3) De Incar. Dom. Sacram., lib. 1, c. 5, p. 71. Paris, 1690.

(4) In lib. Cantic. Cantel, p. 298. Latin edit. Paris, 1608.

Cyril of Alexandria: "When Christ said, Blessed art thou Simon &c. . . . He called, I think, denominatively, nothing but the immovable and *firm faith* of the disciple, the rock, upon which the Church of Christ was founded, without the possibility of falling." (1) In his commentary on Isaiah, he declares Christ to be the rock and foundation. "It is probable that by these words our Lord Jesus Christ is called our Rock." (2)

Origen: "But if you think that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter only, what will you say of John, the son of Thunder, and of each of the apostles? Shall we dare to say that the gates of hell were not to prevail against Peter in particular, and that they should prevail against the rest of the apostles and the perfect? and that it was not said concerning all and each of them that the gates of hell, &c.;" (3) and he says that "every disciple of Christ is the rock."

Chrysostom: "He did not say unto Peter, for He did not found his Church upon a man, but upon faith; what therefore means, upon this rock? Upon the confession contained in His words." (4)

Jerome: "But the rock was Christ. Petrus (Peter) was derived from Petra, the rock; whence the Lord said, Thou art Peter (Petrus), and upon this rock (petram) I will build my Church. And in another place, The floods came, the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it did not fall; for it was founded upon the firm rock (petram) which is Christ." (5) In his Book on Isaiah, he makes Peter the rock.

Augustine: "Thou art, therefore, he says, Peter; and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, on this rock which thou hast acknowledged, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, I will build my Church,—that is to say, I will build my Church upon myself, the Son of the living God. I will build you upon myself, and not myself upon you." (6) And in his "Retractions" he says, that he often expounded that Peter was the rock; and, not wholly rejecting that interpretation, he leaves it to his readers "to select which of these two opinions he deems the most probable." (7)

It is worthy of remark, that none of the other evangelists mention the circumstance alluded to in Matt. xvi. 18, beyond relating that Christ gave to Simon the surname of Peter. (John i. 42.) Had the Saviour intended that His Church should have been actually founded

(1) De Sanct. Trin., Dial. 4, tom. 5, p. 500. Paris, 1688.

(2) Comm. in Esiah, lib. 3, tom. 2, p. 460.

(3) Comm., in Matt. c. 16. Rothomagi, 1668, p. 276; and Paris, 1740, vol. 3, p. 524.

(4) Serm. de Pont., tom. 6, p. 233. Paris, 1621.

(5) Comm. in Psalm. ix., tom. 7, p. 178. Paris, 1602.

(6) Serm. lxxvi.; Rursus in Matt., c. 14; tom. 5, p. 415.

(7) Retract., lib. 1, tom. 1, p. 32; *ibid.*

on *Peter*, and that *his* successors only should have represented the true Church, surely such an important fact would have deserved notice from each of the sacred historians, and would have found a place in their writings.

John had equal claims, with *Peter*, to the primacy, as he was the beloved disciple; and *Jerome* would seem to give him the preference, for he says, "Peter was only an apostle; John, both an apostle and an evangelist, and also a prophet." (1)

Chrysostom said of St. John, "That he was a pillar of the churches through the world, he that had the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. (2)

And speaking of Paul, the same writer says, "That he was the ring-leader and guardian of the choir of all the saints." "He was the tongue, the teacher, the apostle of the world; he had the whole world put into his hands, and took care thereof, and had committed to him all men dwelling upon earth." "He was the light of the churches, the foundation of faith, the pillar and ground of truth." "He was better than all men; greater than the apostles, and surpassing them all." (3)

And *Pope Gregory I.*, speaking of Paul, said, "That he was made head of the nations, because he obtained the principate of the whole Church." (4)

After the exposition of "the Rock," it is needless to consider the meaning of the words, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" for, if *Christ* be meant by the Rock, all denominations of Christians subscribe to this interpretation. If the "Rock" be the declaration of faith made by *Peter*, then the Church of England, subscribing wholly to *Peter's* faith, is equally the true Church.

And, indeed, so far as your lordship is concerned, any explanation of this part of the text is, or ought to be, unnecessary, inasmuch as the Council of Trent has declared the Church against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, to be that Church which professes the Nicene Creed. At the third session, held Feb. 4, 1546, it was decreed as follows: "Wherefore, it (the council) commands, that this creed (the Nicene Creed), which the Holy Roman Church uses, as that summary in which all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, and that firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, shall be read in those words, in which it is read in all the churches, which is as follows."

(1) Hier. in Jovin., vol. 4, lib. 1. Paris, 1786.

(2) Hier. in Joh., p. 2, vol. 8. Paris, 1836.

(3) Chrysos. in Rom., p. 834, vol. 9. Paris, 1837; in 1 Cor., p. 211, vol. 10; in 2 Tim. 2, p. 731, vol. 2. And see De laud. Pauli. vol. 2. Paris, 1834.

† "Caput effectus est Nationum, quia obtinuit totius Ecclesie principatum."—*reg. M.*, in 1 Reg., lib. 4. *Videsis*, "Paulus Apostolorum Princeps."—*Epist. Spat.* in Lat. Syn. sub. P. Jul. II., sess. 1, p. 25.

The Nicene Creed was then recited, just as found in our service, without one addition. (1)

Rome declares that her bishops have a personal succession from Peter, and that the keys entrusted to him descend to his successors only. Here, again, Romanists are foiled; for these same Fathers declare that the keys were not given to Peter alone, but also to all the apostles.

Hilary says: "This faith has the keys of the kingdom of heaven." (†)

Ambrose: "To you he says, I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that you may bind and loose. . . . What is said to Peter is said to the apostles." (3)

Origen: "Are the keys of the kingdom of heaven given indeed to Peter only, and shall no other holy man receive them? But if this saying—'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven'—is common also to the rest, why not also those words which precede and which seem directed to Peter?" (4)

Augustine: "It appears, in many passages in Scripture, that Peter represented the Church, and particularly in that place where it is said, 'I give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' . . . For did Peter receive those keys, and did John and James, and the other apostles, not receive them? What was given to him 'as given to the Church. Therefore Peter represented the Church and the Church was the body of Christ.'" (5)

Jerome: "All the apostles did receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven." (6)

Theophylact: "Although it be spoken of Peter alone, I will give thee, yet it is given to all the apostles." (7)

Chrysostom declares this promise to apply to St. John. "He (St. John) that hath the keys of heaven." (8)

Again, Christ's commission to Peter, to "feed his sheep," was a commission given to all the disciples equally.

Augustine says: "When it was said to him, 'Lovest thou me,' 'Feed my sheep,' it was said to all." (9)

(1) The reader is referred, for a very clear and classical interpretation of this text, to a pamphlet entitled "The Barnet Discussion." "Dr. Cumming's reply to Dr. Faa di Bruno, Priest of Barnet, being a Solution of the various Passages of Scripture quoted in Defence of Romanism." Hall and Co., Paternosterrow, London, 1850. Price 1s.

(2) De Trin., lib. 6. Paris, 1652.

(3) In Psalm 38. Enarr., p. 858, tom. 1. Paris, 1690.

(4) Com. in Matt., c. 16. Roth., 1668.

(5) Serm. 149 de verbis, act. 10, tom. 5, p. 706. Paris, 1685.

(6) Vol. 4, p. 168. Paris, 1706.

(7) Theoph. in loc.

(8) Hom. 1, p. 2, vol. 8. Paris, 1836.

(9) De Agone. Christ., ch. 30, p. 260, tom. 6. Paris, 1685. And p. 439, vol. Paris, 1837.

St. Cyprian : "We being many shepherds do feed one flock, and all the sheep of Christ."

Ambrose : "Which sheep and which flock, not only St. Peter did receive, but also, with him, all we priests did receive it." (1)

Cyril : "It was a lesson to teachers that they cannot otherwise please the Arch-pastor of all, than by taking care of the welfare of the rational sheep."

I now proceed to the next step : viz., to consider the primacy conferred on Peter. The Scripture, ever replete with instruction on all subjects, foreseeing the false construction that might be put on these words in Matthew, and anticipating, as it were, that the words of Christ might be "wrested to some private interpretation,"—it is recorded, that *after* this confession, the apostles disputed which should be greatest. (2) Now, in the first place, from this fact, that the apostles did not understand Christ's words as conferring any particular favour or primacy on Peter, and as evidence that Christ did not intend that such a meaning should be put on his words, he declared, "If any man desire to be first, he shall be last of all, and the servant of all." Had his promise been misunderstood, Christ, doubtless, would have taken this opportunity of setting his disciples right on so important a point as the establishment of a primacy among them, but, on the contrary, he rebuked them. But this is not all; for, though the supposed promise of primacy is only recorded by *one* apostle, the spirit of ambition that displayed itself among the apostles is three times mentioned, and on each occasion met with a similar rebuke from our Saviour, as explained in Mark x. 37, 42.

And again in Luke (xxii. 24) : "There was also a strife amongst them, which of them should seem to be the greater." What was our Saviour's reply this time: "And he said unto them, the kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that have power over them are called beneficent. But you, not so; but he who is greatest among you, let him be as the least; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth." This reply should suffice any reasonable person that St. Peter derived no primacy or precedence from the words of Christ in Matt. xvi. 18: "But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your Master, and all you are brethren." "Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, Christ."

Peter denied his Lord thrice; and it seems, in reference to this event, that our Lord thrice asked him, "Lovest thou me?" We read that Peter was grieved at the rebuke; but if a primacy were conferred by these words thrice repeated, "Feed my sheep," he would rather have rejoiced, as his self-styled successors now do, in their fancied superiority.

(1) *Ambrose de Sacrad.*, 2.

(2) *Mark ix. 33*; and *Luke ix. 46*.

Taking for granted that Peter was the first constituted Bishop of Rome, Romanists claim a succession of persons from him, while they have *lost* the succession of *faith*. But, whatever this modern Church may claim, the primacy was not conceded to her, the Roman Church, by the early Christian bishops. For, as we have seen, Pope *Gregory* the Great disclaimed the title of universal bishop. *Cyprian*, in his prefatory address to the bishops at the Council of Carthage, declared, "No one of us has set himself up as the bishop of bishops, or has driven, by tyrannical fear, his colleagues to the necessity of obeying him, since every bishop has his own will for the exercise of his liberty and power, and can no more be judged by another, than he can judge another." (1) And *Jerome* wrote, "With the exception of ordination, what does a bishop (the name of Pope was not known then) do which an elder does not? The Church of the Roman city is not to be deemed one thing, and the Church of the whole world another. Gaul, and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and India, and all barbarous (foreign) nations, adore one Christ, and observe one rule of truth. (2) If you look for authority, the world is greater than a city. *Wheresoever a bishop is*, whether at Rome or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Alexandria, or Tanais, *he is of the same worth*, and the same priesthood. The power of riches and the humility of poverty do not make a bishop higher or lower. But all are the successors of the apostles. Why do you produce to me the custom of one city?" (3) *Augustine* is held as a great authority by your Church; he subscribed the acts of the Milevitan Council which decided against appeals being made to the Bishop of Rome, in opposition to Popes (or bishops) Zosimus, Boniface, and Cælestine. (4)

The infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, or any other bishop, was never heard of, or assumed, till about 1074. And it is a mere vain boast at the present day; for the idea is rejected by far the greater number of Romanists.

Having thus briefly considered the subject of Popish infallibility, and proved that it *does not exist* in the Church of Rome, I shall proceed to prove to your lordship that this Church does not hold the faith of the Catholic, apostolic Church, and that you evinced a most supreme ignorance of the subject you had taken in hand, when you wrote your letter to the *Times* newspaper, declaring that the Church of England had forfeited her claim to catholicity in separating herself from the Church of Rome at the Reformation.—I am, &c.

(1) *Sententia* 87, *Episcop. Synod. Charthag.* Labbæus, tom. 1., p. 786.

(2) This rule of truth was not, most certainly, the Tridentine distinction of faith, for not one of the distinctive principles of modern Romanism existed in the days of *Jerome*.

(3) *Ad Evagrium*, tom. 2, p. 512. Paris, 1602.

(4) *Mansl. concil. amplissima collectio*, tom. 4, p. 507. Venetiis, 1785.

It will be the proper place here to introduce—

THE OLD CREED OF "THE CATHOLIC CHURCH," AND OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES OF THE PRESENT DAY; AND THE NEW CREED OF THE MODERN CHURCH OF ROME.

The creed of "the Catholic Church," as settled at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, the first General Council, and now the creed of the Protestant Churches of the United Kingdom, and embodied in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, is as follows:—

"I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible:

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: Who for us men, and for our salvation came down from heaven, And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, And the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: Whose kingdom shall have no end.

"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins, And I look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

The second General Council, the Council of Constantinople, held A.D. 381, ratified the decree of the Council of Nice, and solemnly received and adopted this creed, without making any addition.

At the third General Council, the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, an attempt was made to alter this creed, but when it was read the Council decreed as follows:—

DECREE OF THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, A.D. 431.

"These things having been read, the Holy Synod decreed, that it should be lawful for no one to profess, to write, or to compose, any other form of faith than that defined by the holy Fathers, who with the Holy Ghost, had been assembled at Nice.

"But those who shall have dared to compose, or to profess, or to offer, any other form of faith to those wishing to be converted to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Paganism, or from Judaism, or from any sort of heresy, that these, if they were Bishops or Clergymen, that the Bishops should be deposed from their episcopacy, and the Clergy from their clerical office; but that if they were Laymen, they should be subjected to an 'anathema.'"—*Mansi*, vol. iii., p. 1362.

At the fourth General Council, the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, the Nicene Creed was again adopted. This Council decreed as follows:—

EXTRACT FROM THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 451.

“The Catholic faith delivered by the holy 318 Fathers (viz., at Nice), and by the holy 150 Fathers (viz., at Constantinople), also by the other most holy and glorious Fathers (viz., at Ephesus), we guard, and according to that we believe. The most reverend bishops exclaimed, ‘No person makes any other exposition of faith. We neither attempt nor dare to do so. For the Fathers have taught, and in writings are preserved, those things which have been set forth by them: and other than these we cannot speak.’

“Those principles which have been set forth are sufficient; it is not lawful to make any other exposition.”

This creed was subsequently adopted, and confirmed as the only accepted creed of the Christian Church, by no less than seven different Councils held in the following years, namely, A.D. 619, 633, 638, 649, 663, 675, and 680; and we find that no innovation in the primitive faith and worship was permitted.

Again: At the second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 681, and Toledo, 684, it was decreed, “That no innovations should be made in the Apostles’ Creed, and that the Nicene Creed was perfect.”

This testimony is corroborated by the Council of Trent itself. This Council, in the session held February 4th, 1546, declares as follows:—

EXTRACT FROM THE THIRD SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT,
FEBRUARY 4, 1546.

“In the name of the Holy and undivided Trinity of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

“This holy, œcumenical and general synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the apostolical See, presiding in it, considering the magnitude of the subjects to be treated, especially of those contained under these two heads, the extirpation of heresies, and the reformation of morals; on account of which chiefly it has been assembled: but acknowledging with the apostle that it is not to wrestle with flesh and blood, but with spiritual wickedness in heavenly places. With the same apostle it exhorts all and every one, in the first place, that they should be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might; in all things taking the shield of faith, by which they can quench all the fiery darts of the most wicked; and that they should take the helmet of the hope of salvation, with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.

“Therefore, that this its pious solicitude may have its beginning and continuance by the grace of God, it determines and decrees that before

all things the Confession of Faith is to be premised, following in this the examples of the Fathers, who in their Sacred Councils were accustomed to oppose this shield against all heresies, in the beginning of their actions, by which alone they both sometimes drew infidels to the faith, vanquished heretics, and confirmed the faithful.

“Wherefore it (the council) commands that this Creed, which the Holy Roman Church uses as that summary in which all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, and that firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, shall be read in these words, in which it is read in all the churches, which is as follows.”

Then it recited the Nicene Creed, and not one Article of the New Creed.

Though from the year 451 to 1546 no addition had been made to the creed of the Christian Church, the Church was not free from error. These had in course of time accumulated to such an extent, that the Council of Trent was convened for the express purpose of bringing about that reform in the Church which was universally required and subsequently accomplished by our Reformers; but this council being a packed council, the protesters against Popish errors were not allowed a fair hearing, and the council proceeded, by decree after decree, to confirm old abuses and errors, and added new ones.

After the sitting of this council, and on the 9th of December, 1564, Pope Pius IX. issued a bull publishing the new Creed, now universally adopted by the modern Romish Church, and out of which this Church most arrogantly and blasphemously asserts there is no salvation.

The Creed of the modern Church of Rome, then for the FIRST TIME PUBLISHED, is now as follows:—

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, &c.” (the Nicene Creed in full.) To which is added the following twelve novel articles:

“I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions and other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

“I also admit the holy Scripture, according to that sense which our holy mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

“I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege; and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of

not to eat of the fruit. When man fell, God, through Moses, established a code of laws, the Ten Commandments. These are all negative but one. These commandments were required when sin had overspread the world, but they were not, nor can they be, rejected because they are *negative*. The explicit denial of the points mentioned in the Romish Creed could not be taught, as Birckbeck most justly observes, before those errors were broached and obtruded on us; the implicit denial of each is proved by the positive doctrine of the Fathers, which is incompatible with these modern additions.

The distinctive principles of Romanism, ratified or established by the Council of Trent, and against which we protest, are—

I. The insufficiency of the Scriptures as a “rule of faith,” and the necessity of tradition; which latter is to be regarded with the like piety and reverence as the former.

II. The admission into the canon of Scripture of those books which are commonly designated as apocryphal.

III. The intercession of saints as good and profitable; that they hear our prayers; in fact, that Christ is not the only mediator between God and man.

IV. The use of images in religious worship, or that any honour or veneration should be rendered “by kissing them, uncovering the head, and falling down before them,” &c.; or that Christ is in any way adored by such relative worship.

V. That there is a purgatory, where the souls of the faithful are detained, and are there tormented (*Cruciate. Catech.*) and purged of their sins, and that they can be assisted by the prayers, good works, and suffrages of the faithful on earth, and especially by the sacrifice of the altar.

VI. The Romish doctrine of merit and justification, and works of supererogation, which teaches that justified persons truly deserve eternal life; and that the good works of the justified are truly and properly meritorious, and that we can do more than is commanded us by the Divine precept; and these superabundant merits may be applied to make satisfaction for another to God.

VII. That there are seven sacraments, which were instituted and ordained by Christ, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; and that the sacraments confer grace (*ex opere operato*) by the work done.

VIII. The doctrine of Transubstantiation, whereby it is asserted that the whole substance of the bread and wine, after consecration, are “truly, really, and substantially changed into the body, blood, bones, and nerves (*Catechism*), soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that the original substance does not remain, and that a whole and entire Christ is in each separate piece and drop of consecrated bread and wine, and that Christ is eaten *literally* and not *spiritually*. That

LETTER XI.

MY LORD,—Dismissing the subject of Infallibility, and having proved to your lordship that the Church of Rome is not *the* Catholic Church, I shall proceed to show that the Church of England has not forfeited her claim to be a member of the Catholic Church by separating herself from the Roman Church.

At the Reformation, the Church of England purged herself of the errors and superstitious which had entirely hidden the primitive Christian faith. A reformation presupposes existing abuses. It would be, indeed, a strange doctrine to teach, that by reforming abuses, the object reformed ceases to exist, nor is any longer the same original body. The only difference is, that the Church, prior to the Reformation, was as a field overrun with weeds, which the Reformers, like good husbandmen, cleared away, to make room for the good seed which had been so long choked. That the Church of England, by emancipating herself from the dominion and power of the Church of Rome, and reforming the abuses under which she had suffered for a series of years, and by reverting to the primitive faith, forfeited her "claim to catholicity," as your lordship terms it, is wholly untrue. My lord, you have yet to learn what is the true Catholic faith; to what Romanists had converted it; and what our ancestors achieved at the Reformation.

What are the distinctive principles of Romanism against which our ancestors protested? Did they refuse to receive any one point of the Catholic faith? Did they not retain intact that "summary in which all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, and that faith and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail;" that only declaration of faith which constituted the creed of the universal Church up to December, 1564? Did the Anglican Church forfeit her "claim to catholicity" when she rejected modern innovations, and retained that creed accepted by *the* Catholic Church for the first sixteen centuries?

To conform to your Church it is absolutely necessary to subscribe the Creed of Pope Pius IV. This creed was never known or heard of, as a creed, or was ever proposed to be subscribed by any man, or body of men, in the Christian or any other Church, before the 9th December, 1564, when it was first set forth in a Bull by the Pope of Rome; and it was against the errors contained in this creed that the Church of England protested; and though Protestantism has been declared to be a mere "negative principle," our Reformers negated the *errors* of Romanism, and shed their blood for the establishment of *Gospel truth*. The objection that Protestantism is a mere negative has been well answered. God, when he placed Adam in Paradise, commanded him

in the Scriptures, nor can any apostolic tradition be adduced in support of them. Not one of them form part of any creed of the Christian Church, or were taught, or received, as matters of faith and practice by the Universal, Catholic, or Christian Church, or by the Fathers of the first five centuries. But, on the contrary, the Scriptures, the writings of the orthodox Fathers of the Church, and the concurrent testimony of history, either negatively or affirmatively, contradict the dogmatic assertions of this modern Church of Rome—these Trentisms of the 16th century.

The immediate subject of these letters is, as the title announces, "Popish Infallibility;" it would be therefore beyond my limits were I here to enter into the proofs of my last assertion.

These, my lord, are not times to be indulging in complimentary speeches, but we must speak boldly. To challenge your lordship on the subject is useless; your precipitancy, your assumption of facts, your illogical and absurd conclusion, prove you to be both supremely ignorant of the subject on which you have expressed so decided an opinion, and eminently unqualified to enter on the discussion; but I here challenge the Romish priesthood of the United Kingdom, and undertake to prove that the Tridentine declaration of faith was *not* the "*faith of the blessed Peter and the apostles, and the faith of the Fathers and orthodox believers.*" *That her peculiar doctrines, against which we protest, are not revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and expressly as such have not been unanimously taught by the Fathers, and have not been received by the Universal Church.*

I. I am prepared to prove "that the Holy Scriptures do contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved therefrom, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought necessary to salvation," as declared by the 6th Article of the Church of England, in opposition to the modern Trentism on this subject. That this doctrine contained in the 6th Article was taught in all ages, I can prove from the *Bible*; from the Fathers of the 2nd century: Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus; of the 3rd, Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen; 4th. Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Ambrose; 5th. Augustine, Theodoret, Vincent Lirinenses, Cyril of Alexandria, Jerome, Chrysostom; 6th. Justus Orgelitanus, Bede; 7th. Pope Gregory the Great, Isidore; 8th. Damascen; 9th. Claudius Scotus; 10th. Radalphus Flaviacensis; 11th. Œcumenius Anselm; 12th. St. Bernard, Claudius, Seyssel Archbishop of Turin, Rupertus Tintiensis, Hugo de Sancto Victore, Waldensis; 13th. Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, and Bonaventure; 15th. Gerson, Gabriel Biel, &c., &c., &c.

II. That the Church of Rome has admitted into the canon of Scripture the apocryphal works, which are rejected by the Church of Eng-

land, were repudiated by the Jews, as acknowledged by Josephus, the historian; and can be proved to have been rejected by the apostles themselves. And in testimony against the Council of Trent, I bring, in the 2nd century, Melito, Bishop of Sardis; 3rd. Origen; 4th. Council of Laodicea, Hilary, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius, Ruffinus (or Cyprian), Gregory Nazianzen; 5th. Jerome, Augustine, and Epiphanius; 6th. Bishop Junilius and Isidore; 7th. Gregory the Great; 8th. Damascene and Alcuinus Abbot of Tours; 9th. Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople; 10th. Radulphus Flaviacensis, Ælfrick, Abbot of Malmsbury; 11th. Petrus Cluniacensis Abbot of Clugni; 12th. Hugo de St. Victore, Richardus de St. Victore, and Rupertus Tuitiensis; 13th. Hugo Cardinalis and Bonaventure; 14th. Gul. Occham, Nicholas Lyra, Richard FitzRalph, and Wickliffe; 15th. Alphonsus Tostatus, Dionysius Carthusianus, Thomas Waldensis, and Antonius; 16th. Cardinal Cajetan.

III. That invocation of saints is a "fond thing vainly invented" by this modern Church, "and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God," and not admitted by the early Church, I appeal to those early Christian writers named in my letter (p. 49) on the subject of the Virgin Mary. They acknowledged but one mediator between God and man, as saith Augustine—"He (Christ) is the High Priest, who has now entered within the veil, and *who alone* of those who have appeared in the flesh, intercedes for us. As a *figure* of which, among the first people and in the first temple, the High Priest alone entered into the holy of holies, whilst all the people stood without." (1)

I am prepared to produce a regular succession of witnesses bearing testimony in our favour. In the 7th century we have Gregory the Great; 8th. Bede and Antoninus; 9th. Ambrose Ansbertus and Haymo; 10th. Abbot Smaradus, Radulphus Flaviacensis; 11th. Anselmus Laudunensis and Theophylact; 12th. Gratian and Waldensis; 13th. Alex. Hales and Altiassidorensis; 14. Gregorius Arimiensis, John Sharp, and Wickliffe; 15th. Biel, Peter Lombard, &c., &c.

IV. And the like testimony against the use of images in religious worship, I am prepared to prove the direct command of the Holy Bible; and also the direct condemnation of the Fathers. In the 2nd century: Clement Alexandrius, Irenæus; 3rd. Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Cyprian, Minutius Felix, Council of Eliberis, Ambrose, Eusebius, Optatus; 4th. Jerome, Augustine, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Macarius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzum, Gregory Nyssa, and Chrysostom; 5th. Theodoret, Isidore, Pope Leo; 6th. Fulgentus, &c., &c., and the Councils of Constantinople and Florence.

The *relative* worship advocated by the Council of Trent was in *express*

words condemned by Arnobius, Origen, Ambrose, and Augustine. And to the same effect we have a succession of witnesses to the time of the Reformation.

V. The doctrine of purgatory was not known in the early Church, as was candidly acknowledged by Bishop Fisher, the Jesuit; and I can produce in direct testimony against this Romish doctrine, Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nyssen, Hilary, Lactantiüs, and Augustine. It is evident that this was not an established doctrine in Augustine's days, for he talks of the subject as a doubtful matter, while in other places he is directly opposed to the Tridentine doctrine. (1)

VI. In opposition to the Romish doctrine on justification—good works and works of supererogation—the Church of the Reformation declares that we are justified by faith only, and that good works are a natural fruit of faith, and “follow after justification;” and though good works are pleasing to God, yet to put any confidence in them, as by *merit* to purchase to ourselves, or others, remission of sin, is blasphemy, and derogatory to Christ. The Tractarians, as well as Romanists, will endeavour to make you believe that the doctrine “of justification through faith” was invented by Luther. Now, in answer to this, I am prepared to prove that the doctrine of the Reformers is plainly taught in the New Testament, and by a succession of Protestant witnesses from the time of the apostles; many of them using the expression so much objected to by the Tractarians, “that we are justified by faith ALONE.” In the 2nd century we have Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus; 3rd. Clement of Alexandria and Origen; 4th. Ambrose, Athanasius, Basil, Hilary, and Macarius; 5th. Theodoret, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine; 6th. Fulgentius, Cassiodore, Council of Orange, and Primasius; 7th. Hesychius Bishop of Jerusalem, and Gregory I.; 8th. Bede and Alcuinus; 9th. Scotus, Photius, Haymo, Remigius, Ambrosius Ansbertus, and Rabanus; 10th. Cœcumenius, Abbot Smaragdus, Radulphus; 11th. Ardens, Anselm, Cœcumenius, and Theophylact; 12th. Rupertus, Bernard, Petrus Blessensis Archdeacon of Bath; 13th. Alexander Hales, Scotus, and Cassander; 14th. Nicholas Lyra, Wickliffe, Ockham, Durand, &c., &c.; 15th. Gerson, Cardinal Cusanus, Thomas Walden, and many others.

VI. Against the five pretended sacraments of the Romish Church, and in favour of the certainty of the two received by the Reformed Churches, we have, in the 1st century, the New Testament; 2nd. Justin Martyr; 3rd. Tertullian; 4th. Cyril and Ambrose; 5th. Augustine; 6th. Junilius; 7th. Isidore; 8th. Bede; 9th. Paschasius, Rabanus; 10th. Ælfrick Fulbartus; 12th. Cassander's acknowledgment, Waldenses,

(1) See proofs given in my “Romanism in England Exposed,” Second edition, pp. 80, 81.

and Alexander Hales; 14th. Durand, Holcot, Wickliffe; 15th. Cardinal Bessarim, &c., &c.

VII. On *Transubstantiation*. The Reformed Churches declare that there is no conversion of the elements of bread and wine in the sacrament of the Eucharist, but that these elements are mere *symbols* or *figures* of the body and blood of Christ. In support of this figurative and symbolic meaning, we have the direct sanction of the early Christian writers, most of them using those very words. In the 2nd century: Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus; 3rd. Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen; 4th. Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Macarius, and Eusebius; 5th. Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Popes Gelasius and Theodoret; 6th. Fulgentius, Primasius, Gaudentius Brixensis, Bishop Facundus, and Euphrasimus Bishop of Antioch; 7th. Isidore, and Hesychius Bishop of Jerusalem; 8th. Bede and Council of Constantinople; 9th. Rabanus, Abbot of Fulden, Haymo Bishop of Halberstat, Christianus Druthmarus the monk, Walfridus Strabo, Abbot Bertram; 10th. Ælfrick Abbot of Malmesbury; 11th. Berenger Archbishop of Angiers; 12th. Gratian, Joannes Semeca, and Waldenses; 13th. Scotus; 14th. Ockham, Durand, and Wickliffe; 15th. Alliaco, Biel, and Cardinal Cajetan. (1)

That the Popish sacrifice of the Mass did not exist in the early Church, I can prove from the works of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrius, and Chrysostom. And the prophecy of Malachi, ch. 1, v. 11, which Romanists declare to be fulfilled in the modern sacrifice of the Mass, Justin Martyr and Augustine thus interpret it: "By the daily sacrifice spoken of in the prophet Malachi,

(1) I am aware that Romanists quote some of the above Fathers as advocating their carnal view of the Eucharist; and more particularly the Eastern writers, who, while they distinctly declare the elements to be *symbols* and *figures* of the body and blood of Christ, they at other times indulge in high-flown metaphors and figurative language. For instance, Chrysostom "to the Monk of Cæsarius" states that, after consecration, "*the nature of the bread remains.*" He, at another time, speaks of the "tongue of the communicant being red with gore, and his mouth filled with spiritual fire." But one might as well argue from such passages, that Dr. Watts, the Independent minister, believed in Transubstantiation, because, in his Hymns, we find the elements declared in express terms to be *flesh and blood*.

The Lord of life this table spread
With his own flesh and dying blood.

Hymn vi. B. 3.

Thy blood, like wine, adorns thy board,
And thine own flesh feeds every guest.

Hymn xix. B. 3.

Now you must triumph at my feast,
And taste my flesh and blood.

Hymn xxi. B. 3.

(Quoted by Dr. Cumming in his discussion with Mr. French. Hall and Co., Paternoster-row.)

is meant the prayers and praises of saints," "the giving of glory, blessing, laud, and praise to the name of God." (1)

It is well known that Romanists, to prove this most absurd doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, quote the words of our Saviour, "This is my body." I am prepared to prove, by the words and candid acknowledgments of most eminent schoolmen and divines of the modern Roman Church itself, that to deny the doctrine is neither repugnant to reason or Scripture. Among others, I name Gabriel Biel, Ockham, Cardinal Alliaco, Scotus, Durand, Fisher, Cardinal Cajetan, Odo Cameracensis, Christophorus Bishop of Cæsarea, Cardinal Centarenus, Melchoir, Canus, &c., &c.

Against the Romish interpretation of the 6th chapter of John, I can adduce Tertullian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Origen, and Augustine. The words of Origen and Augustine are totally subversive of this "theological canabalism." "Acknowledge," says Origen, "that some things written in the books are figures, and therefore examine and understand the things which are said, as spiritual men; for if you receive them as carnal men, they injure you. . . . There is in the New Testament a letter which killeth him who does not understand spiritually the things which are said. For if you take this according to the letter, 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, THIS LETTER KILLETH.'" (2) And Augustine says to the like effect, "If a passage is perceptive, and either forbids a crime or wickedness, or enjoins usefulness or charity, it is not figurative. But if it seems to command a crime or wickedness, or to forbid usefulness or kindness, it is figurative. 'Unless ye shall eat,' he says, 'the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye shall not have life in you.' He appears to enjoin wickedness or a crime. It is a figure, therefore, teaching us that we partake of the benefits of the Lord's passion, and that we must sweetly and profitably treasure up in our memories that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us." (3) This, my lord, is plain language, most essentially anti-Popish, and most truly Protestant.

VIII. *On Communion in Both Kinds*, I need say but few words. The Council of Constance, which first denied the cup to the laity, acknowledged that Christ instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in both kinds, and that the wine was administered to the laity in the early Church. In the first century we have the testimony of the Apostles, Ignatius, Dionysius called the Areopagite; 2nd. Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria; 3rd. Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian; 4th.

(1) Justin Martyr Dialog. cum Tryph. Lond., 1722, pp. 219-386. Augustine, p. 272, tom. 9. Paris, 1688.

(2) Orig. in Lev., c. 10, hom. 7. Latin edit. Basilea, 1571.

(3) De Doctrina. Christ., lib. 3, p. 52. Benedictine edit. Paris, 1685.

Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius, and Ambrose; 5th. Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and Popes Leo, Gelasius, &c., &c.

IX. That prayers were read in a tongue understood by the people in the early Church, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Origen testify. Origen's words are conclusive on the point: "The rest of the Christians use not the very words of the Scriptures in their prayers, but they that are Greeks use the Greek tongue, and they that are Romans use the Roman tongue, and every one according to his own dialect prays to God, and makes promises to him according to his ability; and he that is Lord of every language hears the prayers which are put up to him in every language." (1)

X. The *judicial* power of forgiving sins assumed by the priests of this modern Church is such a blasphemous assumption, that the point scarcely needs a word of remark; nevertheless, that this power was not assumed by the holy pastors and Fathers of the Church, I am prepared to adduce the testimony of Optatus, Cyril of Alexandria, Clemens Alexandrius, Cyprian, Hilary, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine.

XI. On the *Prohibition of Priests to Marry*, we have the fact before us, that after the sittings of the Council of Nice, when this subject was debated, many famous bishops were married men; among others, we find Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, Gregory Nazianzen the father of Basil the Great. And not only does the Word of God plainly tell us that "marriage is honourable in all" (Heb. xiii. 4), but that it is one of the signs of the apostacy that it should forbid marriage. (1 Tim. iv. 3.) And, in this respect, the priests of the modern Church of Rome are *not* the successors of St. Peter, for Peter was himself a married man (Luke iv. 38), though they may be Peter's successors in cursing (Matt. xxvi. 74) and denying his Lord. (Matt. xxvi. 72.)

XII.—On the twelfth and last head, *Supremacy and Infallibility*, I have already said enough.

Thus am I prepared to prove from a long succession of witnesses bearing testimony, that the faith of the present Church of Rome was *not* the faith of Peter and the Apostles, or of the orthodox Fathers, notwithstanding the awful imprecations uttered by her against all those who will not be deluded by her. And lest your lordship should think this challenge the vain boast of an anonymous scribbler, I would remark, that though I may not be known to your lordship, Dr. Wiseman, with whom I have been in correspondence, and many of the priests, know me full well as a troublesome customer.

This leads me, in conclusion, to make a few remarks on your assertions, founded on your "firm and overpowering conviction" that the

(1) Origen cont. Cels., lib. 8. Usher. Verif. Latin ed. Basilee, 1571.

Church of England at the Reformation had forfeited her catholicity in separating herself from "the centre of unity" (the Roman Church). I will, without difficulty, prove the fallacy of this position.

When the apostles were on earth, we read that the mystery of iniquity was then beginning to do its work; and when these grand architects and master-builders, whom God had singled out to the apostleship to build his Church upon that only foundation and chief corner-stone, CHRIST, "had been gathered unto their fathers," numerous heresies and schisms distracted the Church, arising from various causes; partly from persecutions, ignorance, and connivance of teachers, and partly from the adoption of Jewish and Pagan customs and superstitions, introduced by the numerous converts. Augustine enumerates no less than forty-three heresies which existed in the Church in the Nicene age, and he gives the names of eighty-eight sects existing in his own age. These innovations, and particularly the importunities of a sect called Arians, who denied Christ to be very God, rendered it necessary that one universal creed or profession of faith should be adopted, "as that summary," to use the words of the Council of Trent, "in which all who professed the faith of Christ should necessarily agree." Accordingly, at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, that creed which is still universally received by all denominations of Christians in the present day, and daily repeated in our churches, was, as I have proved to your lordship, formally adopted. All those who professed themselves to be Christians and members of the "Holy Catholic Church" accepted this creed. We have seen that this creed was ratified by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, and again confirmed by the two subsequent Councils of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and the strict prohibition against making, on any pretence, any other exposition.

Thus did the early Christian Church solemnly record the grounds of the faith by which the TRUE CATHOLIC CHURCH WAS KNOWN. There were, however, other truths which characterised the profession of faith, or rather discipline, if I might use the word in this sense, of the early Christian Church, which were plainly set forth in the Scriptures, by which standard alone all points relative to faith, doctrines, and morals were tested.

As *Irenæus* testified, "The Scriptures are perfect, as spoken and dictated from the Word of God and His Spirit." "We know not the dispensing of our salvation from any other, than from them by whom the Gospel came to us; which they first preached, and afterwards, by the will of God, delivered it over to us in the Holy Scriptures, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith." (1) *Tertullian*—"Let those of

(1) *Iren. advers. Hæres.*, l. ii., c. 47. *Iren.*, l. iii., c. 1.

Hermogenes' shop show that it is written: if it be not written, let them fear that woe which is allotted to such as add or take away." "How can we adopt those things which we do not find in the Holy Scriptures?" (1) *St. Augustine*—"Whether concerning Christ or his Church, or anything that appertaineth to our faith and life, I will not say, if we (who are no way to be compared to Him that so spake), but if an angel from heaven shall preach unto you anything besides that you have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be accursed." (2) And *St. Athanasius* says: "The Holy Scriptures, given by the inspiration of God, are of themselves sufficient to the discovery of the truth." (3) And *Hilary* wrote: "What is there concerning man's salvation that is not recorded in the Word of the Evangelist? What wants it, what obscurity is there in it? All things are full and perfect." (4)

The Scriptures, then, taught that Christ was the one only Mediator between God and men; that the sacraments ordained by Christ were but two—baptising with water unto the remission of sins; and communicating, in commemoration of the Lord's death, under the two signs of bread and wine. Reading the Scriptures and praying in a known tongue, they acknowledged no object of adoration other than God, nor expiatory sacrifice than that of Christ "once crucified." They, knowing the righteousness of God, did not go about establishing their own righteousness, not pleading their own merits, nor seeking other justification than through faith. Then there was no universal bishop; no belief of souls in purgatory, or a queen in heaven; and images were an abomination.

These established truths, clearly taught by Scripture, were so overlaid by the corruptions of time, that in a few centuries these distinctive principles of the early Church were scarcely discernible through the heap of rubbish which had subsequently accumulated, though the written creed was preserved intact. The *foundation* was retained, but upon it was built up, from time to time, "gold, silver, and precious stones," and then, "wood, hay, and stubble." Rome was not built in a day. So early as A.D. 375, we trace out the commencement of the first error, namely, that of addressing prayers to saints; but this was not generally adopted till about the year 700. About A.D. 400, prayers were first made on behalf of the dead; but then, the Virgin Mary and even the Apostles, were included in their petitions. Prayers in an unknown tongue date from the year 600. In 606 the pretended primacy and title

(1) Tertul. adv. Hermog., cap. 22; and De Off. Minst., lib. i., tom. 2. Paris, 1690.

(2) P. 301, tom. ix. Paris, 1688.

(3) Athan. Orat. cont. Gen. in init. Bened. edit.

(4) Hilary de Trinit., lib. ii. Basil, 1550.

of supreme bishop was first arrogated by the Bishop of Rome. The worship of images, the cross, and relics was solemnly decreed in A.D. 787. In A.D. 1000 the Church first took upon herself to canonise saints, and priests were by decree altogether forbidden to marry. In the year 1100, the canon of the mass was introduced. In 1160 the sacraments were first defined to be seven in number, though the doctrine was not made an article of faith till 1547. The monstrously absurd doctrine of transubstantiation was not received as an article of faith till the Council of Lateran, about the year 1200. Confession dates only from 1215. The elevation and worship of the host was introduced in 1220. The laity were first deprived of the cup by the Council of Constance, A.D. 1415. The Popish doctrine of merit was invented somewhere about the twelfth century, upon which was built that other pernicious error, "works of supererogation." The belief in a purgatory crept into the Church at an early period, but was for a long time a doubtful point; and before the definition of the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439, this doctrine had no authority, and was not finally decreed till 1563 at Trent, and out of this sprung that most monstrous and iniquitous system of indulgences. In 1546, tradition was declared to be of equal authority with Scripture, and the apocryphal books were also declared to be canonical. In 1547 it was decreed, that to give validity to the due administration of the sacraments, the priests' *intention* was required; and in 1564 the whole of this mighty superstructure, under which all the original simplicity and purity of faith of the primitive Church was buried, was digested and arranged into the form of a New CREED, by Pope Pius IV., and was added to, and made part of, that originally published by the four first general councils, and now forms the Roman Catholic declaration of faith, out of which they tell us there is no hope of salvation. (1)

The work of our glorious reformers and martyrs was not to destroy, but, under the direction and guidance of the Divine Providence, to exhume and bring to light the hidden truths which had been so long buried and corrupted in the accumulated rubbish of time. A popular preacher (2) thus graphically represents the work of the Reformation by an illustrative incident recorded in the travels of Lord Lindsay in Egypt:—

"He states, that in the course of his wanderings amid the pyramids of that patriarchal and interesting land, he stumbled on a mummy, proved by its hieroglyphics to be at least 2000 years of age. In examining the mummy after it was unwrapped, he found in one of its closed

(1) This part of the text I have adopted from a review, written a short time since by myself, of the excellent work of the Rev. C. Smith—"An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Church of Rome."

(2) Dr. Cumming, "Apocalyptic Sketches," p. 166. Hall and Co.

hands a tuberous or bulbous root. He was interested in the question how long vegetable life could last; and he therefore took that tuberous root from the mummy's hand, planted it in a sunny soil, allowed the rains and dews of heaven to descend upon it, and in the course of a few weeks, to his astonishment and joy, that root burst forth and bloomed into a beautiful dahlia. It seemed to me that we have in this an answer to the question, where was Protestantism before the Reformation? It was closed in the iron grasp of the Roman apostacy, and all that Luther did was to [dig up and unroll the mummy and] unclench that terrible hand, and extricate the seed of truth. Sowers started up in all lands, and planted it in England, in Scotland, and in Germany; and now the living seeds, through the blessing of God, have spread forth and grown up in all countries, and the vast numbers of churches scattered throughout the land are its blossoms."

There is, my lord, a beautiful truth illustrated in the above simple narrative, as applied to the labours of our Reformers. They, guided by the light of God's unerring word, the BIBLE, which was "a lamp unto their feet," while avoiding extremes, by rejecting the whole mass as corrupt, perceived the truth still living, though almost extinct, and hidden under this Tridentine declaration of Faith. They (to continue the simile) explored the dark and subterraneous caverns of Councils, Canons, and Decrees, and particularly those of that huge pyramid of error, the Council of Trent; they exhumed and unrolled the mummy (Pope Pius' Creed), and wrenched from the tyrannical grasp of Popery the seeds of truth; these they found, on comparison, to have been produced from the same root (the Bible) as were the Apostolic Churches of old, and these seeds were sown, and have bloomed and flourished in our "Island Churches," and God grant that, watered with the gracious dews of Heaven, the truth may still continue to flourish without the taint or alloy of Popery or Puseyism; and that He will, in His goodness and mercy, bring you back to that "faith once delivered to the saints," and that we may be made "one fold under one shepherd," Jesus Christ our Lord.—I am, &c.

A LAY SUBSCRIBER.

THE END.

SECOND EDITION
(ENLARGED AND IMPROVED),
ROMANISM IN ENGLAND EXPOSED.

BY
CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

“We strongly recommend this publication, which is particularly valuable just now.”—*Royal Cornwall Gazette*.

“We recommend the work to the serious and earnest attention of our readers as one of unusual interest, and as discovering the active existence, in our very midst, of a system of idolatry and blasphemy as gross as any recorded in the *History of Popery*.”—*Bell's Weekly Messenger*.

LONDON: HALL, VIRTUE, & Co., 25, PATERNOSTER-ROW.
AND TO BE HAD, BY ORDER, OF ALL BOOKSELLERS THROUGHOUT THE
KINGDOM.

WORKS
BY THE
REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

Seventh Edition. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 3s.

"IS CHRISTIANITY FROM GOD?"

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES

FOR SCRIPTURE READERS, SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS,
CITY MISSIONARIES, AND YOUNG PERSONS.

"We never read a work of this description which gave us so much satisfaction. It is a work of the utmost value."—*Ecclesiastical Times*.

"It is drawn up with much care, clearness, and earnestness."—*Aberdeen Journal*.

"The topics contained in this volume are treated with intelligence, clearness, and eloquence."—*Dr. Vaughan's Review*.

"As a popular compendium of Christian Evidence, we thoroughly recommend this volume."—*Nonconformist*.

"It bears the impress of a clear and vigorous understanding. Dr. Cumming has done great service to the cause of divine revelation by the publication of it."—*Church of England Journal*.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER-RROW.

2 WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

NOW COMPLETE, IN ONE VOLUME,
Containing 688 pages, price Six Shillings, cloth lettered,
A CHEAP EDITION

OF

THE CELEBRATED
PROTESTANT DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

AND

DANIEL FRENCH, ESQ.

BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

HELD AT HAMMERSMITH, IN MDCCCXXXIX.

"No Clergyman's library can be complete without it."—*Bell's Messenger.*

"A compendium of argument."—*Gentleman's Magazine.*

"The subject (*pro* and *con*) is all but exhausted."—*Church and State Gazette.*

The Publishers express the opinion of the most competent judges, when they state that this book ought to be in the hands of every Protestant in Britain, more particularly all Clergymen, Ministers, and Teachers, a more thorough acquaintance with the great Controversy may be acquired from this volume than from any other source.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER-RROW.

WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. 3

Beautifully printed in one thick volume, 8vo. cloth, elegantly gilt,
price 5s.

LECTURES FOR THE TIMES :
AN EXPOSITION
OF
TRIDENTINE AND TRACTARIAN POPERY.

NOTICES OF THE WORK.

“ In these Lectures Dr. Cumming gives the fullest scope to all his high powers. Careful research, acute argument, brilliant illustration, graphic description, eloquent appeal, all unite in enriching and embellishing his pages, alluring the most indifferent to read, and compelling the most prejudiced against his views to pause and consider.”—*Edinburgh Ecclesiastical Review*.

“ Dr. Cumming exhibits an extensive knowledge of the subject, great powers of reasoning, and a wish to proceed to a right conclusion. The volume is both interesting and instructive, and it unquestionably deals with matters of the highest importance, in which all mankind are deeply and permanently interested.”—*Newcastle Courant*.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

4 WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

In 2 vols. price 9s. each, cloth gilt,

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES;

OR,

Lectures on the Book of Revelation,

Delivered in Exeter Hall, and at Crown Court Chapel.

REVISED AND CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR.

THESE Lectures were begun in Exeter Hall, during the period occupied in the enlargement of the Church of which the Lecturer is the Minister. Not a few were then afraid that the Author might be led into rash and questionable theories in investigating a subject confessedly beset with difficulties, but, by the blessing of God, and the exercise of caution and prayerful study, all has ended more than satisfactorily. The unprecedentedly large masses of persons of every denomination, and of no denomination at all, who overflowed the spacious hall in which they were delivered, and the growing attention excited in the minds of these audiences, and the saving and very striking impressions made on unconverted minds by the means of the solemn truths they heard, are all signs and tokens that call for humble gratitude to God.

Numerous requests were made for their publication. A shorthand writer was therefore engaged, who took a *verbatim* report of every Lecture. These reports the Author has now corrected; and trusts that the work will be found a substantial summary of his Discourses on the Apocalypse. It is his earnest prayer that these, and all his labours, may redound to the glory of God, and to the good of souls.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. 5

FIFTH THOUSAND.

In one handsome volume, price 9s. cloth gilt; or 18s.
morocco extra,

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES;

(THIRD SERIES);

OR,

Lectures on the Seven Churches,

ILLUSTRATED BY WOOD ENGRAVINGS, REPRESENTING THE
PRESENT STATE OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES.

Just Published,

Uniform with the above Work,

PROPHETIC STUDIES,

OR

Lectures on the Book of Daniel.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

6 WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

Third Edition, in fcap. 8vo. price 3s. cloth gilt,

OUR FATHER ;
A MANUAL OF FAMILY PRAYERS
FOR
GENERAL AND SPECIAL OCCASIONS,
WITH SHORT PRAYERS FOR SPARE MINUTES, AND
PASSAGES FOR REFLECTION.

Uniform with above,

THE COMMUNION TABLE,
OR,
COMMUNICANTS' MANUAL ;
A PLAIN AND PRACTICAL EXPOSITION OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER.

8vo. sewed, price 2s.

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM ;
OR,
The Claims of Home and Country to Christian Consideration :
AN ESSAY.

Price, in cloth, 3s. 6d. ; roan gilt, 5s. : morocco, 6s. 6d.

THE PULPIT PSALM BOOK.

THE Psalms and Paraphrases according to the version of the Church of Scotland, with the names of suitable Tunes, Explanations of each Psalm, and a supplement of Hymns and Doxologies for Special and Missionary occasions ; to which are prefixed, Prayers and Services from John Knox's Book of Common Order, as at the Reformation ; also, the Confession of Faith and Shorter Catechism.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. 7

Second Edition, Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 2s.

INFANT SALVATION;

OR,

All Saved who Die in Infancy.

Specially addressed to Mothers mourning the loss of Infants
and Children.

Uniform with the above, price 2s.

THE BAPTISMAL FONT:

An Exposition

OF THE

NATURE AND OBLIGATIONS OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

WITH AN APPENDIX.

"Distinguished at once by eloquence, compactness, and
learning."—*Christian Witness.*

Also uniform,

Second Edition, Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.

A MESSAGE FROM GOD;

OR,

THOUGHTS ON RELIGION FOR THINKING MEN.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

8 WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

Just published, price 4s. cloth gilt,

OCCASIONAL DISCOURSES.

VOL. II.

CONTENTS.

1. LIBERTY.
 2. EQUALITY.
 3. FRATERNITY.
 4. THE REVOLUTIONISTS.
 5. THE TRUE CHARTER.
 6. THE TRUE SUCCESSION.
 7. PSALM FOR THE DAY.
 8. THANKSGIVING.
-

DR. CUMMING'S SERMON BEFORE THE QUEEN.

Seventh Thousand, price 1s.

SALVATION:

A Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Crathie, Balmoral,
before Her Majesty the Queen, on Sunday, Sept. 22d, 1850

In 8vo. price 1s.

DIVINE DEALING & HUMAN PREPARATION:

TWO SERMONS,

Preached on the Day of Humiliation, 1849.

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

172



