



SPECIAL COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

Presented by
Dr. A.R.M. Lower. 1965.

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

A

SECOND LETTER

TO THE

REV. HERBERT MARSH, D.D. F.R.S.

Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge;

CONFIRMING THE OPINION

THAT

THE VITAL PRINCIPLE

OF THE REFORMATION

HAS BEEN LATELY CONCEDED BY HIM

TO THE

CHURCH OF ROME.

BY THE REV. PETER GANDOLPHY,

Priest of the Catholic Church.

1813.

A LETTER, &c.

REV. SIR,

THE polite answer you have published to the CONGRATULATORY LETTER I had the honor of addressing to you, on the subject of your INQUIRY, calls upon me to acknowledge that every line therein exhibits evidence of having been inscribed by the pen of the scholar and the gentleman. I feel moreover rather *compelled* again to obtrude myself upon your attention, because you appear completely to have mistaken the circumstance that occasioned my CONGRATULATORY LETTER to you, and I should be extremely sorry were it believed, that I had imputed to you any sentiment which your own language does not convey to the reader. You seem to think that I was referring to a defence of religion against Dissenters, when I extolled the good sense of those arguments urged by you, in favor of a distribution of the Liturgy.—By no means.—Your SERMON AT ST. PAUL'S, your INQUIRY, your LETTER TO MR. VANSITTART, all clearly proved to me, that you were reasoning with Protestants of the Established Church, and laboring to convince them, that if they sincerely wished their children to profess the same religion as themselves, if they were desirous of imparting to the rising generation the doctrines of the Church of England, as they had been received from the Reformers, they must accompany the distribution of the Bible, with the distribution of the Liturgy. You

asserted in your *INQUIRY*, (No. I. p. 113.) that such were the very principles of “*your Reformers*;”—“those Priests who composed the Liturgy and Articles;”—that by “this *clue*, their disciples would be led in safety through dark and intricate passages, where many a pilgrim had lost his way” *without it*. You stated (No. I. p. 100.) that the *POOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT*, could not be preserved in the religion of their fathers, if they were not provided with this “*safe-guard* against the delusions of *false interpretations*.”—You also say (No. I. p. 104.) that the *BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER* is necessary to prevent “the *Poor of the Establishment*,” from being seduced from the religion of the Established Church, although they have *the Bible* as a safeguard.

I am truly sorry then to perceive that you have so completely mistaken the circumstance that induced me to address to you the *CONGRATULATORY LETTER*.—Nothing was ever more foreign from my thoughts, than to compliment you, for appealing to an authority, whilst arguing with the Dissenter, which the Dissenter does not admit.—I should first endeavour to convince him of the necessity of admitting that authority;—which was my real motive for inscribing to you *THE SERMON ON THE INADEQUACY OF THE BIBLE TO BE AN EXCLUSIVE RULE OF FAITH*.—For admit but the principle of *authority*, and you must either be a Catholic, or what you have defined a *Generalized Protestant*.—Thus Catholics in contending against Dissenters never appeal to tradition, but to *the Bible only*, because *the Bible only* is the rule of faith for the Dissenters. But if the Dissenters appeal *from* or *over* the Bible to *Luther* or to *Calvin*, then I conceive the Catholic is also justified in appealing to authorities not less respected by *him*. On this account, when I observe that you so strongly urged the necessary distribution of the Liturgy with the Bible, to the *MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT*, I insisted that as *your* principle was *ours*, so had I a right to look forward to the happiest result; viz *THE FULL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE SOUNDNESS OF OUR CATHOLIC PRINCIPLE*. For principles are as efficient in establishing other principles, as causes in generating effects. Fairly then did I conclude, that by insisting on the necessity of “this *clue*, which would lead the members of the Establishment in safety,” (No. I. p. 113.) you were fast approxi-

inating to our principle of TRADITION, if not directly advocating that point of Catholic doctrine.

To this conclusion, however, you now say, you had no intention of proceeding—but, Sir, as you well know, principles will carry us along with them in spite of ourselves: and a good logician sees no other alternative than to renounce the principle, or follow it through its long train of consequences. You must, therefore, either admit that the “*poor of the Establishment* do not require the *Common Prayer Book*, to keep them in the religion of their fathers, and secure them against ‘the delusions of *false interpretations*,’” whilst they have the Bible, or acknowledge that *another* evidence, another authority or *clue* is necessary, and that is, what is styled in the Catholic Church TRADITION; the WORD, unwritten in the Scriptures. Else whence do you make a distinction of orders in the hierarchy of your Church? Else how do you justify the practice of baptizing infants who have no actual faith? Else how do you dispense with the obligation of *washing one another’s feet*? Else why do you keep holy the first day of the week instead of the Sabbath day? Else why do you ever venture to eat blood or strangled meats? Else how do you justify in a minister of Christ, the possession of *gold and silver*, and rich livings? Else how do you justify the tendering and taking of oaths? In all these points the Bible is either against your practice or silent. Have you then presumed to add to the text, or have you admitted Tradition, as “*a CLUE to lead the members of the Establishment in safety?*”

But you express a serious complaint against me for placing between inverted commas a proposition not to be found in your works, viz. “true religion cannot be found by the Bible *alone*,” and saying that it is a principle for which you contend. It was far from my intention, Sir, to impute to you a sentiment which either you had not written, or was not a direct inference from your principles. You are not unacquainted with the universal principle in logic, *quæ sunt eudem uni tertio, sunt eadem inter se*: and therefore I did conceive, that I had ascribed to you no more than yourself had contended for, in different words only; and I cannot therefore believe, that I have imposed upon my readers, nay I still maintain it to be your principle that, “true religion cannot

be found by the Bible *alone*." For you affirm that the religion of the Church of England is the most correct system,—the correct system of religion, (Inquiry, No. I. p. 107. Sermon. p. 77.) the true system of religion, (No. I. p. 100.) but that those who have the Bible *alone*, cannot find it, (Inquiry, No. I. pp. 100, 104, 107, 124.) therefore this *most correct*, this *correct*, this *true* system cannot be found by the Bible *alone*—therefore, "TRUE RELIGION CANNOT BE FOUND BY THE BIBLE ALONE." Indeed if the religion of the Church of England be *true*, and if you believe that it can be found by the Bible *alone*, I cannot conceive what is the real object of your writings on this subject: you speak throughout of the necessity of accompanying the Bible with the Prayer Book,—you speak of the Bible *alone* leading to abstract or generalized Protestantism (Note, No. I. p. 119.)—in short, if expressions are sentiments, and if a true syllogistic conclusion is always *identifiable* with the premises, I still conceive that I did not deviate from the truth, when I affirmed that a Margaret Professor was contending for this principle that "true religion cannot be found by the Bible *alone*." For you even acknowledge in the plainest language, that men may therein seek in vain for the essentials of Christianity;—"that even in the essentials of Christianity very different conclusions have been drawn from the BIBLE, and by men of whom it would be very unjust to say that they had not studied it *devoutly*." (Note, No. I. p. 125.)

After what you have already said, I still apprehend that you will deny the justness of my position—you will distinguish between the *fact* of finding the true religion of the Church of England by the Bible *alone*, and the *possibility*—but surely, Sir, this would amount to a mere quibble of distinction—for what is only morally *possible*, may be in a variety of circumstances morally *impossible*, and is *absolutely improbable*. For it must be dependent upon such an extraordinary coincidence of contingents, that no prudent and sensible man would be justified in calculating upon it. We are therefore authorized to say, that what is only morally possible to some persons, is to many others morally impossible. Consequently, if you mean to infer that it is morally possible to find the religion of the Church of England by the Bible *alone*, you equally negative the proposition, and assert the moral impossibility.—To sum up this argument in a very few words, I acknowledge I was

unintentionally incorrect, in placing the words "true religion cannot be found by the Bible alone" between inverted commas, which denoted them to be your precise expression; and for that I most readily make you an apology. But I cannot persuade myself to admit that there was any want of correctness as to the sense of those words: because you declare, that in your belief the *true* religion and the *established* religion of this country are the same. Now you contend that the established religion cannot be found by the Bible *alone*. The conclusion therefore is, if ever conclusion was fully evident, that TRUE RELIGION CANNOT BE FOUND BY THE BIBLE ALONE.

However, although I complimented you, in my first Letter, on the manly manner in which you had surrendered this vital principle of Protestantism, I observe that you are still wavering between the right and the wrong—still hesitating before you finally renounce the untenable principle of your church. You seem to have clothed yourself in Catholic armour, unconscious of the banners under which you were fighting. But let us take courage in consistency, and our cause will never fail to triumph—having thrown away your own arms, as it is a Catholic weapon that you have seized, it is from a Catholic you should learn how to manage it.

This recalls to my recollection an anecdote of a brother clergyman of your church at Paris, who was visiting the lions of that famed metropolis, in the society of an English Catholic Priest, and another countryman of ours, who happened to be a dissenting minister. As they visited the different churches, and paid a particular attention to all the forms and ceremonies of the national religion, freely expressing their opinions upon every point, the Church of England clergyman was perpetually engaged in supporting either the arguments of the Catholic priest, or those of the Dissenting minister. When the propriety of a liturgy—ritual observances, or ecclesiastical institutions, and the sinfulness of schism and heresy were discussed, the Church of England Protestant immediately dressed himself out in the full livery of the Catholic priest, and argued most earnestly against the simplifying doctrine of the Dissenter. But as soon as the Dissenter began to maintain the right of private judgment in matters of faith, and the sufficiency of the scriptures,—as soon as he began to inveigh against

the Bishop of Rome, the authority of the Church, and her ecumenical decrees, he immediately stood up in defence of the Dissenter's arguments, and contended, that as they were two to one, the Catholic Priest was in the minority, and therefore he ought to surrender at discretion. As the conversation, however, was carried on with that freedom and good humor which should distinguish all religious controversies, the Catholic Priest and the Dissenting Minister, knowing the consistency of their own principles, and seeing at the same time the inconsistency of those professed by the Clergyman of the Establishment, observed to him, "We acknowledge, Sir, that you have shown much courage in this controversial contest, but you have fought on both sides, and you have fought with weapons which were not your *own*—have you, then, none to arm yourself with, which are really *yours*?" "None!!!" "Really then you are to be pitied; for what would you do in your defence if we both should come against you, clad in the armour of those very arguments in which you conceive yourself victorious? unarmed and defenceless, you would be under the necessity of surrendering to one or the other."

Now, Sir, I consider this anecdote very applicable to our present controversy, and entertain the hope that in this story you perceive a miniature description of the future struggles of the Established Church, against her numerous adversaries. I certainly think, with many others, that the time is come, when the Church of England must choose between an approximation to the Catholics or the Dissenters.—A middle course is no longer possible, and you must either agree to maintain the Christian Hierarchy by a re-union with the Church of Rome, and a concordatum with the Papal See, grounded upon mutual concessions, or you must be prepared to see the whole religious establishment of this empire absorbed in that overwhelming current which, as you are so well aware, is fast undermining its foundations. To withstand the torrent which is now set in against this fabric, it should have been built upon a rock, which it is not; it must, therefore, pass away, like all establishments raised on a sandy foundation. *My Church, said Jesus Christ, is built upon a rock and against her the gates of hell shall never prevail.*¹

¹ I shall perhaps be answered in this manner. If the Protestant Established Church be swept away, be pleased to recollect that the Church of

There is another position in your letter to me (No. III. p. 78.) which I cannot pass by without an observation. Do you, Sir, as Margaret Professor in the University of Cambridge, as one of the Theological Doctors of your Church, assert that, “without the Bible indeed we cannot be *Christians*?”—I really do not pretend to understand this sentence—but surely, when a Doctor of Divinity writes upon so grave a point, I think he should write with precision. These words, Sir, imply that Baptism does not make us *Christians*—they imply, that men *cannot be Christians*, till they are made so by the *Bible*.—Are then all infants, all those who cannot read or procure a Bible, *non-Christians*? Were not you, Sir, a *Christian*, till you had read the *Bible*? Were then *the three thousand souls who were added to the Church in one day*, by St. Peter, *non-Christians*, because they had no Bibles? Were all the primitive disciples of the apostles *non-Christians*, the whole Church *non-Christian*, because the New Testament had not then been written? Really, Sir, unless you explain yourself more precisely, the reflection you have dropped must create great uneasiness in the minds of many of your readers; for it is a sentiment which will descend to posterity, stamped with the authority of a Margaret Professor.

After writing, therefore, the foregoing pages, I do not see, Sir, why you should tell me, “that I congratulate myself in vain on the similarity of our opinions;” adding, “unless I am prepared to let the Bible *without tradition*, as you are to let the Bible *without the Liturgy and Articles*, be the rule for deciding controversies between your church and mine.” (Letter to the Rev. P. G. No. III. p. 82.) Sir, I profess to deal out to *others* in the same measure, in which I deal out to myself; and my only complaint against you is that you decline this just principle. I conceive, Sir, that religion should be taught as it has been learnt—and that it should be maintained and defended by the same means by which it has been found and acquired. On this account, when controverting with a Dissenter, we appeal to the Bible *alone*, because he does not, like *us*

Rome once met a similar fate. She is therefore not built upon a rock.—To this plausible objection I would make this reply. The Church of England exists in this country as a *whole*; and thus it may be entirely subverted. But the Roman Catholic Church when established in this country, was only a *part* of a whole; and when subverted, it fell as a principal limb of a great tree. But the tree itself continued to stand firmly rooted.

churchmen, admit a church authority (see Article 20th among the 39) ; but we always tell him that no controversy can be finally settled without the aid of tradition. And we even charge him with the *practical* admission of it, although he *theoretically* exclude it from his principles. And for the justice of this assertion I can quote a Protestant writer. Nightingale, in his *Portraiture of the Catholic Religion*, says: “the Bible! the Bible only! is the religion of Protestants!” exclaims good William Chillingworth.—“Very true,” says the judicious Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*; “but then you must submit to receive the Bible from the hands of Church-of-England men.”—“Certainly, the Bible, by all means,” adds the learned Margaret Professor; “yet the Bible is nothing without the Book of Common Prayer.”—“Nay, nay, the Bible is not the thing you want, unless you discover in it all the great and precious truths contained in the Assembly’s Catechism, and can submit to the wholesome discipline of the Directory,” replies the pious and sober Presbyterian. “No, no, no,” says the zealous Methodist; “it is the Bible collated with Mr. Wesley’s Sermons and Mr. Fletcher’s Checks, that is the religion of Protestants.”—“And thou mayest read the Bible and the checks till Doomsday, friend, to no purpose, unless thou hast the light of the spirit,” adds the modest Quaker.—“A truce with your spirit!” exclaims the Swedenborgian; “why dont you read the works of the highly illuminated Baron, wherein are answered all questions, be they high as heaven or deep as hell?”—“You all are right, and all are wrong,” rejoins the Rev. Dr. Sturges, the Prebendary of Winchester; “provided ‘the magistrate chooses’ to say so; for it is his province to decide which shall be the NATIONAL RELIGION.”

You perceive, Sir, that you are not the only one, who denies in *theory* what he admits in *practice*. I must therefore again beseech you to recollect, that my observations respect the means of learning and teaching religion, not the mode of defending it against those who dissent from us. I hardly think that I have once even glanced at this extraneous question in my CONGRATULATORY LETTER to you. I see not then how you can consistently challenge me to meet you with the Bible *alone*, whilst you hold the Liturgy and Articles in your hand, or as a defence keep them hidden in your bosom. But if it really be your intention fairly to come forth in the presence

of the whole university of Cambridge, armed with the BIBLE ONLY, and dash on the floor the gauntlet of defiance, I'll not decline the challenge, but take it up and face you in single combat on equal terms.

Now, Sir, joking apart, as you well know, were we to meet on this ground, at the end of the contest our general appearance would be so completely metamorphosed, our whole aspect so perfectly new, and *sui generis*, so perfectly different from any thing that has hitherto been seen in Christendom, that we should neither be known by a Catholic, a Church of England Protestant, a Dissenter, or Methodist. We should return into the world as a *lusus naturæ*, some monster in religion, which would be both the pity and the wonder of men. Amphibious in our relations to the old and new law, we should walk through life like the camelion, showing some new shade and color in every diversity of circumstance. Oh then what solicitude would be expressed by our respective friends that we should return from this heterogeneous condition to civilized society, that you should resume your LITURGY AND ARTICLES, and I my TRADITIONS, and that we should together confess the folly of aspiring to true virtue and discreet religion in the savage state of an *unregulated, emancipated* mind.

If then you acknowledge the wildness of this scheme which you have proposed, and, re-entering into your more just reflections, think you may venture to descend into the *arena* as a Church of England Protestant, girded with the *Liturgy and Articles*, again I declare my readiness to meet you.⁴ Nay, ere many weeks have elapsed you shall behold a hostile shield, against which, unless your courage fail you, you may break a spear: and it is this very circumstance which has necessarily drawn off my attention from your Letter to me, which otherwise I should have had the honor of sooner replying to.

You have most sensibly and happily admitted, that "*true* religion and *established* religion," are distinct things, (Letter to the Rev. P. G. No. III. p. 74.); and you very properly add, "that if the terms were synonymous, TRUTH would be often at variance with itself; it would apply, or not apply, to the very same thing according to mere accident." I shall take the liberty then of placing myself upon this

⁴ A *Defence of the ancient Faith*, in four volumes.

cardinal principle, and my object shall be to show, that although the CATHOLIC RELIGION is not the *established* religion of this country, it is nevertheless the *true* religion. Yourself having admitted the *possibility* of this case, my endeavour shall be to prove the *fact*. Your own distinction relieves me from all squeamishness on this subject; for you say, that “the establishment of religion in any country (as both Bishops Warburton and Dr. Paley have clearly shown), is not founded in the consideration of its *truth*;—this question lies *without* the province of the legislature: it is a question of theology, and not of civil government.”—I then shall undoubtedly argue, not as a *civil lawyer*, or *legislator*, but as a *theologian*, acting within my own just province; and I cannot hesitate in supposing, that all *Protestant theologians* will express an eternal gratitude to me, if my humble efforts should throw some new light upon the subject, and enable them to discover a mistake in their *theological* calculations.

But in your letter to me (p. 7.) I notice another proposition, to which I cannot by any means subscribe, and my only surprise is, that you should have left your readers in any doubt whether you subscribe to it yourself. I think, Sir, it almost contains a libel upon the virtues and the consciences of men. You say, “the truth of a religion may operate, *remotely or indirectly*, on the decision of the legislature. But the immediate and *direct* motive which operates in the establishment of religion, is its utility to the state.”—I say, Sir, God forbid that I should ever subscribe to this principle, or charge it against any christian government. Mahomet indeed is accused of having made his religion purely subservient to the state, but I will not confound Mahometan principles with those of Christians; I will not place the KORAN in society with the BIBLE. However, is not the very admission which you have made of this governing principle sufficient to shake that misplaced *confidence* which so many repose in a religion because it is *established*. I conceive that as true religion is anterior in point of date to the establishment of every christian government in Europe, the very circumstance of a religion being formally introduced by a legislature as the established religion of any country, strongly militates against its claim to originality. To the Church might very properly be applied the armorial motto of one of our noble families:

Reges ex nobis, non nos ex regibus orti:

But you observe moreover in the same page, “that *Protestantism* became the established religion of this country, because the great body of the people agreed to profess Christianity under *that* form, and it would *cease* to be the established religion, if at any time the great body of the people should determine to profess Christianity under *another* form.” But, Sir, unless you intend to measure for your neighbours by a different standard than that by which you square for Englishmen, how will you reconcile this principle with the justice of the penal laws in Ireland for the last two centuries, or with the objections you express in your postscript, to the emancipation of the GREAT BODY OF THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND, who have not so much as even hinted a wish that their religion should be made the established religion of Ireland? You were not aware then I dare say, when you wrote that postscript, of the *principle* you had advanced in the body of your letter. But now that you have reconsidered *yourself*, I think the Catholics of Ireland have good grounds for expecting, that with your own pen you will cancel those “REMARKS” which your postscript contains, “on the consequences which must result from the concession of the Catholic claims.” I am confident they *would* not ask you to carry your consistency farther, though they evidently *might*.

You say, page 82 of your Letter to me, “that I agree with other writers of my community in making Tradition the *paramount authority*, by which the truth or falsehood of Christian doctrines is to be decided.” I must then notice a little error in the proposition you have stated. We do not say that Tradition is a *paramount authority*—or that *Tradition* is to decide the truth or falsehood of *Christian doctrines*, any more than we say, that legal evidence is a *paramount authority*, and decides on a civil transaction in a judgment given by the TWELVE JUDGES. I conceive the language would be more legal, to say, that the TWELVE JUDGES decide on any civil transaction, by the statute and common law of the land, and the evidence adduced. In the same manner also, I would reverse your proposition and say, that the CATHOLIC CHURCH decides on the truth and falsehood of religious doctrines, by the strength of those written and unwritten evidences which have been handed from father to son, through succeeding generations, which

evidences are generally styled *Tradition*. It is not *Tradition* therefore, but the Church, that decides by the testimony of *Tradition*, and SHE is the *paramount authority*. With this explanation I admit your statement; yet perhaps, Sir, you will feel surprise when I tell you, that I mean to place a similar account at your own door, and instead of admitting the justice of your remark, in your Letter to me, p. 81, Pamph. No. III. viz. “that as *my basis* is false *my* superstructure falls at once to the ground”—I mean to prove to you that as you have placed your very *Bible* upon the *basis of Tradition*, so the *whole* superstructure you have raised is *grounded on Tradition*.

Since I had the honor of addressing to you my CONGRATULATORY LETTER, I have had the great satisfaction of perusing your two Courses of Lectures on Divinity. They have fully established in my mind the opinion I had conceived of your extensive reading, your learning, and solid judgment, and this opinion is particularly strengthened by observing these Lectures universally inculcate the necessity of *Tradition*; and I may add, the necessity, by inference, of a supreme defining authority. I conceive, Sir, it is impossible for any Christian, any Theologian to hear, or peruse your Lectures, and not to feel *discouragement*, if not absolute *dismay*, at the Herculean work your labors have cut out for him. At it I think the very bravest and most undaunted will stand appalled. *You* can best tell the difficulties of the course you have run, and the obstacles to be encountered. *You* can say how much farther you are now advanced towards certitude in biblical knowledge, than you were at the commencement of your career. I only feel confounded at my own comparative insignificance, and am forced to look towards heaven, to know how, with the inexperience, the youth and feebleness of a David, I can possess sufficient fortitude to match myself against a Goliath in Biblical Theology. Surely, you will say, there must be operating some potent principle which can render *me*, without the armour of your learning, so perfectly fearless and composed. There is, I avow it; and as the Hero of Israel confided in his sling and pebbles, so you will see yourself defeated by *Tradition*, and perceive that you have only armed yourself to fall by your own weapon.

I trust, Sir, I shall not offend you by the strength of this figurative language, since I assure you I intend nothing disrespectful by it. But the Lectures contained in your two first Courses of Divinity, all point at the necessity of studying and collating the *criticisms* of the Bible; and as I wish to build my assertion on a very solid foundation, I shall be under the necessity of placing before you some very considerable extracts.

“¹ Your Lectures,” you say, “may be compared with a map and a book of directions, from which the traveller may learn the road which he must take, the stages which he must go, and the places where he must stop, in order to arrive with the greatest ease and safety at his journey’s end. Descriptions of this kind are no less useful in travelling through the paths of knowledge than in travelling over distant lands. And it is a description of this kind, which will be attempted in these Lectures.”

“Here it may be asked, *what* is the end of the journey to which these Lectures are intended to lead? Is it the object of elements, thus general and comprehensive, to generalise Christianity itself, to represent it in the form of a general theorem, from which individual creeds are to be deduced as so many corollaries? Or is it their object to maintain one particular creed to the exclusion of all others? The latter may appear to be less liberal than the former, but it is only so in appearance; while the advantages ascribed to the former, are as *imaginary*, as those possessed by the latter are *substantial*. It is difficult to conceive any thing more painful or more injurious to the student in divinity, than to be left in a state of *uncertainty*, what he is at last to believe, or disbelieve. Where no particular system of faith is inculcated, where a variety of objects is represented without discrimination, the minds of the hearers must become so unsettled, they must become so bewildered in regard to the choice of their creed, as to be in danger of choosing *none at all*. The attempt to generalise Christianity, in order to *embrace* a variety of creeds, will ultimately lead to the *exclusion* of all creeds; it will have a similar effect with Spinoza’s doctrine of Pantheism; it will produce the very opposite to that, which the name itself imports. And as Pantheism, though nominally the

¹ Part I. p. 8.

reverse, is in reality but another term for Atheism, so Christianity, when *generalised*, is no Christianity at all. The very essentials of Christianity must be omitted, before we can obtain a form so general, as not to militate against any of the numerous systems, which in various ages have been denominated Christian. Some particular system, therefore, must be adopted, as the object and end of our theological study. What particular system must be the object and end of our theological study, cannot be a question in this place; it cannot be a question with men who are studying with the very view of filling conspicuous stations in the Church of England. That system, then, which was established at the Reformation, and is contained in our *Liturgy, our Articles, and our Homilies*, is the system, to which all our labors must be ultimately directed."

"If it be objected, that the student will thus be prejudiced in favor of a particular system before he has had an opportunity of comparing it with others, one answer to the objection has been already given, namely, that however specious the plan of teaching Christianity on a broad basis, it is *incapable* of being reduced to practice; that, if various systems be taught, they must be taught, not in union, but in succession; and consequently, that at least in point of time some one system must have the precedence."

"That theological learning is *necessary* to make a good divine of the Church of England, is a position, which a learned audience will certainly be disposed to admit. And this position will appear still more evident, when we consider what it is which constitutes the chief difference between the learned and the unlearned in theology. It is not the ability to read the New Testament in Greek, which makes a man a learned divine, though it is one of the ingredients, without which he cannot become so. The main difference consists in this, that while the unlearned in divinity obtain only a knowledge of what the truths of Christianity *are*, the learned in divinity know also the *grounds* on which they rest. And that this knowledge ought to be obtained by every man who assumes the sacred office of a Christian teacher, nothing but the blindest enthusiasm can deny. If St. Peter, in addressing himself

to the numerous converts of Pontius, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, required that they should be always ready to give a reason of the hope that was in them, how much more necessary must he have thought this ability in those who were set apart to be teachers of the gospel?"

"But ask any one of those illiterate teachers with which this country unfortunately abounds, ask him why he is a Christian and not a Mahometan; ask him why he believes that Christianity is a real revelation, and Mahometanism only a pretended one? He would answer either with a vacant stare, or with a reproach at the impiety of the question, as if it had been proposed with any other view than to try his knowledge. Not so the learned divine. He would enter into those historical and critical arguments, of which the unlettered enthusiast has no conception, but by which *alone* the *authenticity* of the gospel history can be established, by which *alone* the miracles recorded in it can be confirmed, by which *alone* the claims of Christianity to a *divine* origin can be proved legitimate."

"There is no ground then for that distinction between science and religion, that the one is an object of reason, the other an object of faith. Religion is an object of both; it is this very circumstance which distinguishes the unlearned from the learned in divinity; while the former has faith only, the latter has the same faith accompanied with reason. The former believes the miracles and doctrines of Christianity, as being recorded in the New Testament; the latter also believes the miracles and doctrines recorded in the New Testament, and he believes them, because by the help of his reason he knows *what the other does not*, that the record is *true*."

"But is not religion, it may be said, a matter of general import? Does it not concern all men, the unlearned as well as the learned? Can it be true then that such a literary apparatus is necessary for the purpose of religion? and would not at least nine-tenths of mankind be, in that case, excluded from its benefits? certainly not from its *practical* benefits, which *alone* are wanted, as they *alone are attainable* by the generality of mankind. Men, whose education and habits have not prepared them for profound inquiry, whose attention is wholly directed to the procuring of the

necessaries of life, *depend*, and MUST *depend*, for the truth of the doctrines which are taught them, on the authority of their *teachers* and *preachers*, of whom it is taken for granted, that they have investigated and really know the truth. But is this any reason why men, who are set apart for the ministry, should likewise be satisfied with taking things upon trust? Does it follow, because a task is neglected by those who have neither *leisure* nor *ability* to undertake it, that it must likewise be neglected by those who possess them both? Ought we not rather to conclude, that in proportion to the *inability* of the hearers to investigate for themselves, in proportion therefore to the *confidence* which they must place in their instructor, their instructor should endeavour to convince *himself* of the truth of his doctrines? And how is this conviction, this real knowledge of the truth, to be attained without *learning*?"

"¹ We have every reason, therefore, to persevere in the study of divinity: there is none whatever to dissuade us from it. We have every reason to applaud the wisdom of our illustrious founders, who were not of opinion that it is easier to become a good divine than a good mechanic; who were not of opinion, that the head requires less exercise than the hands; or that, if a seven years' apprenticeship is necessary to learn the manual operations of a common trade, a less time is requisite for the intellectual attainments of a Christian teacher. No; they required a two-fold apprenticeship to divinity: a seven years' study of the liberal arts, as preparatory to the study of divinity, and another seven years' study of divinity itself before the student was admitted to a degree in that profession."

"² When we attempt to expound a work of high antiquity, which has passed through a variety of copies, both ancient and modern, both written and printed; copies which differ from each other in very numerous instances, we should have some reason to believe, that the copy, or edition, which we undertake to interpret, approaches as nearly to the original as it can be brought by human industry or human judgment. Or, to speak in the technical language of criticism, before we expound an author, we should

¹ Part I. p. 17.

² Part I. p. 24.

procure the most correct text of that author. But in a work of such importance as the Bible, we should confide in the bare assertion of *no man*, with respect to the question, in what copy or edition either the Greek or the Hebrew text is contained *most correctly*. We should endeavour to obtain sufficient information on this subject to enable us to judge for ourselves; and the information which is necessary for this purpose, may be obtained even before we are acquainted with any other branch of theology. For when a passage is differently worded in different copies; or, to speak in technical terms, when it has various readings, the question, which of those readings is *probably* the original, or genuine reading, must be determined by AUTHORITIES and by RULES similar to those which are applied to classic authors. The study of sacred criticism, therefore, as far as it relates to the obtaining of a correct text, *may* precede the study of every other branch: but, if it *may*, there are obvious reasons why it *should*. And, if that department of it which relates to the genuineness of whole books belongs on one account to a later period of theological study, it may still on another account be referred even to the first. Though the application or the practice of it requires the assistance of another branch, yet a knowledge of its principles may be previously obtained. Now the study of sacred criticism produces a habit of accurate investigation, which will be highly beneficial to us in our future theological inquiries. Its influence also is such, that it pervades every other part of theology; and, as our notions in this part are clear or obscure, our conclusions in other parts will be distinct or confused. In short, it is a branch which affords nutriment and life to all the other branches, which must become more or less vigorous, in proportion as this branch either flourishes or decays. To sacred criticism, then, the foremost rank is due."

"The reproaches which have been made, and the dangers which have been ascribed to it, proceed only from the want of knowing its real value. It is not the object of sacred criticism to expose the word of God to the uncertainties of human conjecture; its object is not to weaken, and much less to destroy the edifice which for ages has been the subject of just veneration. Its primary object is to show the firmness of that foundation, on which the sacred edifice is built, to prove the genuineness of the materials, of

which the edifice is constructed. It is employed in the confutation of objections, which, if made by ignorance, can be removed only by knowledge. On the other hand, if in the progress of inquiry excrescences should be discovered, which violate the symmetry of the original fabric, which betray a mixture of the human with the divine, of interpolations, which the authority or artifice of man has engrafted on the oracles of God, it is the duty of sacred criticism to detect the spurious, and remove it from the genuine. For it is not less blameable to accept what is false, than to reject what is true: it is not less inconsistent with the principles of religion to ascribe the authority of Scripture to that which is *not* Scripture, than to refuse our acknowledgment, where such authority exists. Nor should we forget, that, if we resolve at all events to retain what has no authority to support it, we remove at once the criterion, which distinguishes truth from falsehood, we involve the spurious and the genuine in the same fate, and thus deprive ourselves of the power of ever ascertaining what is the real text of the sacred writings."

"¹ But the qualification next to be mentioned, as necessary for a good interpreter of the Bible, is not of so easy attainment, namely, the knowledge of some *fixed-rule* or principle, by which we may direct our judgments, amid the *discordant* interpretations of biblical commentators. That all men should agree in adopting one rule of interpretation is no more to be expected, than that all men should agree in one religious creed. The very first principle of interpretation, namely, that the real meaning of a passage is its literal or grammatical meaning, that, as the writer himself intended to apply it, so and no otherwise the reader must take it, this principle, from which no expounder of any other work would knowingly depart, is expressly rejected by many commentators on the Bible, not only among the Jews, who set the example in their Targums, but also among Christians, who have followed that example in their comments and paraphrases. It would be foreign to the present Lectures to discuss the question, whether it is allowable in our interpretation of the Bible, to depart in some cases from the principle just mentioned. But if it be allowable, this

¹ Part I. p. 29.

departure must be made at least with consistency ; it must not be made, till the divine authority of the Bible, is already established, for on that ground only can we defend the adoption of other rules."

"¹ When by the means above-mentioned we have acquired due information in respect to any portion of Scripture, for instance, the Five Books of Moses, or the Four Gospels, we are then qualified, if not to investigate for ourselves, at least to study the investigations which have been made by others, in respect to the *authenticity* of those books, that is, whether they were written by the authors, to whom they are ascribed. This is the plain question, which we must ask before we go further, Did such a person write such a book, or did he not? It is a mere historical question, which must be determined, partly by external, and partly by internal evidence. But great confusion has taken place on this subject, by intermixing matter, with which it has no necessary connexion. When the fact, that the first of our Four Gospels, for instance, was written by St. Matthew, has been once established, by historical and critical arguments (*which historical and critical arguments must be applied precisely as we would apply them to a profane author*) it will follow of itself, that the Gospel was inspired, when we come to the subject of inspiration, and show, that the author, whose works we have already proved it to be, had received the promise of the Holy Spirit. But if we investigate the two subjects at the same time, if we intermix the question of inspiration with the question of authenticity, we shall probably establish neither. In fact, the two questions are so distinct, that we cannot even begin with the one, till we have ended with the other. Before the point has been ascertained, whether this Gospel was written by St. Matthew, or by an impostor in his name, there is no ground even for asking, whether it was written by inspiration ; for in the latter case it would not be Scripture. It is obvious therefore, that in our inquiries into the authenticity of the sacred writings, the subject of inspiration must be left for future discussion."

"When we have established the authenticity of the sacred writings, that is, when we have established the historical fact, that

¹ Part I. p. 31.

they were written by the authors, to whom they are ascribed, the next point to be ascertained is, the credit due to their accounts. And here we must be careful to guard against a *petitio principii*, to which very many writers on this subject have exposed themselves. If we assert, that the narratives, for instance, in the New Testament are therefore intitled to credit, because the writers were prevented by divine assistance from falling into material error, we assert indeed what is true; but it is a truth, which we can no more apply in the present stage of our inquiry, than we can apply the last proposition of a book of Euclid to the demonstration of the first. For what other arguments can we produce, to show that those writers *had* such assistance, than arguments deduced from the writings themselves? And does not this argumentation imply, that the *truth* of those writings is already established? It must be established therefore *without* an appeal to inspiration, or it cannot be established at all. For as long as this truth remains unestablished, so long must inspiration remain unproved. The credibility, therefore, of the sacred writers, must be estimated, in the first instance, as we would estimate the credibility of other writers. *We must build on their testimony as human evidence, before we can obtain the privilege of appealing to them as divine.*"

" But in order to obtain both a firm conviction, and a clear perception of the Christian doctrines, we must be content to travel through the paths of Theology, without departing from the road which lies before us. We must not imagine, that any particular branch may be selected at pleasure, as it may happen to excite in us a greater degree either of interest or of curiosity; for if this were allowable, where would be the utility of *theological order*? We must *study the criticism* of the Bible, before we can be qualified, or at least before we can be *well* qualified to *study the interpretation* of the Bible. And we must obtain a *knowledge* of the Bible, before we can even *judge* of the arguments which are alleged for its authenticity and credibility. But till these points have been established, we have established *nothing* in a religious view; and consequently, if we undertake the latter branches of

¹ Part I. p. 39.

Theology before we have gone through the former, we shall not only build the doctrines of Christianity, but Christianity itself, on a *foundation of sand*. In short, whoever undertakes to study Theology, without preparing himself for the latter branches by a knowledge of the former, undertakes as desperate a task, as a student in mathematics, who should venture upon Newton's *Principia*, before he had learnt either the properties of conic sections, or even the elements of plain geometry."

"I am well aware, that a numerous sect of Christians in this country have a much more easy and expeditious mode of studying divinity. No *literary apparatus* is there *necessary*, either for the *interpretation* of the Bible, the establishment of its truth, or the *elucidation* of its doctrines. Inward sensation supplies the place of *outward argument*, divine communication supersedes theological *learning*. But as I am not able to teach divinity in any other way than I have been able to *learn it*, as my own *conviction* of the truth of Christianity is the result, not of *suāden* impulse, but a *long and laborious investigation*, as I have no other knowledge of its doctrines than that which is founded on the Bible, interpreted by *human learning*, my hearers must be satisfied, if they continue their attendance, to follow with patience and perseverance in all the portions of Theology through which it is prepared to lead them."

"As a reason for recommending so laborious a pursuit, which perhaps to many persons will appear unnecessary, it may be observed, that the object of these lectures is to form a theologian, who shall be thoroughly acquainted with his ground from the commencement to the close of his theological career, who, in the interpretation of the Bible, shall never refer to a fact in the criticism of the Bible, with which he is not previously acquainted, nor be compelled when he is searching the doctrines of the Bible, to adopt a rule of interpretation, without perceiving the foundation on which it rests."

"To those especially, who seek for conviction in certain inward feelings, which the warmth of their imaginations represents to them as divine, I would recommend the serious consideration of this important fact, that the foundation which *they* lay for the Bible, is no other than what the Mahometan is accustomed to lay for the

Koran. If you ask a Mahometan why he ascribes divine authority to the Koran, his answer is, because, when I read it, sensations are excited, which could not have been produced by any work that came not from God."

"But do we therefore give credit to the Mahometan for this appeal? Do we not immediately perceive, when the *Mahometan* thus argues from inward sensation, that he is merely raising a phantom of his own imagination? and ought not this example, when we hear a similar appeal from a Christian teacher, to make us at least distrustful, not indeed with respect to Christianity itself, but with respect to his mode of proving it? He may answer, indeed, and answer with truth, that his sensations are produced by a work which is *really* divine, while the sensations excited in the Mahometan, are produced by a work which is only *thought* so. But this very truth will involve the person who thus uses it in a glaring absurdity. In the first place he appeals to a criterion which puts the Bible on a level with the Koran: and then to obviate this objection, he endeavours to show the superiority of his own appeal, by *pre-supposing* the fact which he had undertaken to prove."

"The criticism of the Greek Testament is a subject of the very *first* importance to *every Christian*; and though a knowledge of the language in which it was written is necessary for the *exercise* of that criticism, yet even without such knowledge some notion may be formed of the efforts of the learned to place the documents of Christianity on a firm foundation. The importance of this subject must be manifest to every one, who considers, that the criticism of the Greek Testament contains the *elements* of that analysis, by which we gradually discover the *truth* of our religion."

"To determine the *mode* of analysis which is necessary for this purpose, of analysis which shall bring with it conviction, let us suppose a man of liberal education, of sound understanding, and of serious disposition, who in his religious opinions, for want of proper instructions on that subject, has remained unsettled, but would willingly assent to the truth of Christianity, provided certain

propositions, necessary to establish that truth, were clearly explained to him. A man of this description, if a person endeavoured to convince him from the New Testament, would argue in the following manner: 'The book which you lay before me professes indeed to contain a faithful-account of what was done and taught, both by the Founder of Christianity, and by others who assisted in the propagation of it. But you cannot expect that I should allow its pretensions to be valid, till you have assigned sufficient reasons that they *are* so; and these reasons involve several propositions, which must be distinctly stated and distinctly proved. That our attention may not be distracted by discussing different subjects at the same time, let us, in the first instance, confine ourselves to the epistles which you ascribe to St. Paul, who, as you assure me, not only became a zealous promoter, from a zealous enemy of Christianity, but was vested even with divine authority for that purpose. On this divine authority you found a set of doctrines, which you require me to receive through the medium of your interpretation, and declare at the same time that if I do not receive them, the consequences will be the most dreadful that imagination can conceive. Now I am perfectly willing (the supposed person might continue to say), I am perfectly willing to assent to truths of such importance, but I must previously know that they *are* truths, or I have no *foundation* for my assent. For the present I will waive the question, whether your *interpretations* be right or wrong; though I am well assured that something *more* is requisite to a *right understanding* of those Epistles, than is possessed by many who venture to explain them. But whatever be their *meaning*, you must first convince me that St. Paul was the *author* of them, or you leave them devoid of all religious obligation. And I expect that your proof be conducted, not with lofty declamation, or deep denunciation against unbelief; but by sober sense and plain reason. For though I am ready to place implicit confidence in St. Paul, as soon as you have proved that he was a teacher sent from God; though I am ready to have unbounded faith in *divine* doctrines, as soon as I know that they *are* divine; yet I cannot transfer this unbounded faith to any *modern* preacher of the gospel, however great his pretensions, whether from learning or from sanctity. When you, therefore, assure me,

that St. Paul had a divine commission, and that he wrote the Epistles in question, I expect these assertions, on your part, to be supported by argument; for *your* authority goes as far as your *arguments* go, and *no* farther."

"If the theologian, to whom this supposed person addressed himself, were a man accustomed to biblical investigation, and had sought a *basis* for his faith, such theologian would reply: 'I will undertake to produce arguments, which shall convince any reasonable man, that Paul, the apostle of Jesus Christ, was really the author of the Epistles ascribed to him: and when this point has been established, we have then a *foundation*, on which our *superstructure* may rest without danger.' But before you undertake this task, the objector may still reply, there are certain preliminaries, which must be settled between us, or we shall never come to a definite conclusion. You must not take the English translation, as the work, which is to be proved authentic; for the term *authentic translation* is a term without meaning. You may say a *correct* translation, or a *faithful* translation; but the term *authentic* applies only to the *original*, it applies only to the *Greek* Epistles, as written, or alleged to be written, by St. Paul himself. Now that the Greek manuscripts of those Epistles very frequently differ, as well from each other, as from the printed editions, is a fact, which it would be useless to deny, and absurd to overlook. *Which* therefore of the Greek manuscripts will you take into your hand, when you assert, '*these* are the Epistles, which proceeded from the pen of St. Paul.' This is no easy matter to determine; and yet it *must* be determined, if the question of authenticity be examined with that precision, which the importance of the subject demands. This supposed conversation will render our present subject familiar to every hearer: it will show him, where, and what is the key-stone of the arch, which supports the fabric of Christianity."

"The first operation, therefore, in respect to the Greek Testament, which must be performed by a theologian, who intends to build his *faith* on a *firm foundation*, is to ascertain what copy of the Epistles ascribed to St. Paul, what copy of an Epistle ascribed to any other apostle, what copy of a Gospel ascribed to this or that Evangelist, has the strongest claim to be received by us, as a

true copy of the author's own manuscript ; whoever the author, or authors, may really have been, which must be left to *future* inquiry, or we shall again take for granted the thing to be proved. Now the investigation of this previous question is a work of *immense labor*. The Greek manuscripts of St. Paul's Epistles (or as we should rather say in the present stage of our inquiry, of the Epistles ascribed to St. Paul) amount, as far as we know them, to more than a hundred and fifty : and the Greek manuscripts of the Gospels, with which we are acquainted, amount to more than three hundred and fifty. But among all these manuscripts there is none, which is so far intitled to precedence, as to be received for the *true copy*, of which we are in search. In fact, the truth lies *scattered* among them all ; and in order to obtain the truth, we must *gather* from them all. Nor is an examination of these manuscripts, *numerous* as they are, *alone* sufficient for the object which we have in view. The quotations from the Greek Testament in the *voluminous* writings of the Greek fathers, must *likewise* be examined, that we may know, what *they* found in *their* Greek manuscripts. The *ancient versions* must *also* be consulted, in order to learn *what* the writers of those versions found in *their* copies of the Greek Testament. When *all* these collections from manuscripts, fathers, and versions, have been formed, and reduced into *proper* order, we have *then* to determine in *every single* instance, which among the *various* readings is *probably* the *genuine* reading. And that we may know *how* to determine, we must establish laws of criticism, calculated to counteract the causes, which produced the variations, and, by these means, to restore the true copy, of which we are in search."

" Now it cannot be supposed that labors, for which, when taken collectively, no *single life* is sufficient, would be recommended even by a zealot in his profession, as forming a *regular part* of theological study. Those labors are *unnecessary* for us : they have been *already undertaken*, and executed with success. But if the industry of our predecessors has *removed the burden* from our shoulders, we must not, therefore, become indifferent *spectators*, unconcerned whether the burden be *well* or *ill* supported. We must at least inform ourselves of the *nature*, and *extent* of those labors ; or we shall *never* know, whether the *object* has been ob-

tained, for which they were *undertaken*. We must make ourselves acquainted with the *causes* which produced the variations in question, or we shall never know, whether the laws of criticism, which profess to remedy that evil are founded in *truth* or *falsehood*. We must inquire therefore,—first, into the causes of the evil, and then—into the remedies, which have been applied to it; remedies which we shall find hereafter to have been applied with great success.”

“The manuscripts of the Greek Testaments during the fourteen hundred years which elapsed from the apostolic ages to the invention of printing, were exposed, like all other manuscripts, to mistakes in transcribing: and as every copy had unavoidably *some* errors, those errors multiplied with the multiplication of the copies. Letters, syllables, words, were added, omitted, or transposed, from mere *carelessness* in writing, whether the writer transcribed from a manuscript before him, or wrote, as was frequently the case, from the dictation of another. In the latter case, his *ear* might be deceived by a similarity in the *sound* of different words; in the former case, his *eye* might be deceived by a similarity in their *form*, by different words having the same final syllable, or by different sentences having the same final word. At other times, a transcriber misunderstood the manuscript from which he copied, either falsely interpreting its abbreviations, or falsely dividing the words, where they were written (as in the most ancient manuscripts) without intervals. Or the fault might be partly attributable to the manuscript itself, in cases where its letters were wholly or partially effaced or faded.”

“But the greatest variations arose from alterations made by *design*. The transcribers of the Greek Testament were not bound, like the transcribers of the Hebrew Bible, by rules prescribed to them in a Masora, or critical law book. Hence they often took the liberty of *improving*, as they supposed, on that manuscript, of which it was their business, to give only a copy; a liberty similar to that, which is now taken in a printing office, where a compositor often improves on the manuscript of an author.—Hence, a native of Greece, accustomed to hear his own language without an admixture of oriental idioms, and regarding therefore a Hebraism or a Syriasm, in the light of a solecism, would accordingly cor-

rect it, not considering or not knowing, that these Hebraisms and Syriasmis are the very idioms, which we should expect from Greek writers, who were born or educated in Judea, idioms therefore which form a strong argument for the authenticity of their writings. At other times, these same improvers, when they remarked that one Evangelist recorded the same thing more fully than another, (a circumstance again of great importance, as it shows there was no combination among the Evangelists) regarded this want of perfect coincidence as an imperfection, which they deemed it necessary to remove, by supplying the shorter account from the longer. Nor did they spare even the quotations from the Old Testament, whether those quotations were transcripts from the Septuagint, or translations from the Hebrew by the author himself. If they only differed from the *transcriber's* Septuagint, he concluded, that they were wrong, and required amendment."

"But the most fruitful source of designed alteration, was the removal of marginal annotations into the text. Indeed to this cause may be ascribed the alterations from parallel passages whenever those parallel passages had been written in the margin. Other marginal notes consisted of explanations, or applications of the adjacent text; and, when a manuscript with such notes, fell into the hands of a transcriber, he either supposed, that they were parts of the text, accidentally omitted, and supplied in the margin, or considered them as useful additions, which there would be no harm in adopting. In either cases he took them into the text of that manuscript, which he himself was writing."

"The latter case may indeed be referred to that class of various readings, which derive their origin from wilful corruption, being introduced for the sole purpose of obtaining support to some particular doctrine. That such things *have* been done, and done by all parties, is not to be denied: for we have examples on record. But as we have received our manuscripts of the Greek Testament, not out of the hands of the ancient *heretics*, but from the *orthodox* members of the Greek Church, we have *less* reason to apprehend, that they have suffered, in point of *doctrine*, from *heretical* influence."

Now, Sir, after cursorily reviewing the copious extracts I have made from your printed Lectures, it appears that you consider

fixed principles in Theology highly important, and even *necessary* to every one who aspires to a correct understanding of the Bible (see quotation in page 415.)—Secondly, you maintain that upon Protestant principles, *probability* is the NE PLUS ULTRA of successful research in Divinity, and that no one can be assured of the positive *correctness* of any particular reading of Scripture, although they employ all the pains *you* have bestowed upon that branch of theology (see quotations in pp. 414, 422.) Thirdly, you assert every line of the inspired writings, and consequently the sense which the language conveys, *absolutely* rests on the evidence of human *criticisms*—that these evidences are your *rule of faith*, and the basis of that trust which you repose in the Bible (see particularly quotation in p. 417.) Fourthly, that the private study of the *criticisms of the Bible*, is the only means Protestants possess, of discovering a probably—correct or a probably—true or a *probable* reading of the Bible. I refer you particularly to your third and fifth Lectures (see quotation in p. 417.).

I do indeed then perfectly concur with you in sentiment, that *fixed principles* are not only *important* but *necessary* to every one who desires not to be tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine; but am at a loss to conceive what in your opinion will constitute that *steadiness* of principle which you so forcibly recommend to the theologian. If it be true, as you say, (Part I. p. 14.) that “Men whose education and habits have not prepared them for profound inquiry, whose attention is wholly directed to the procuring of the necessaries of life, *depend*, and *MUST depend*, for the truth of the doctrines which are taught them, on the authority of their *teachers* and *preachers*, of whom it is taken for granted, that they have investigated, and really know the truth,” I am of opinion that such persons have a far more *fixed* principle than those who, with you, launch into the study of *sacred criticism*. For where the ground on which they tread, is so uncertain, so unsteady and variable, how can any fixed or steady principle be established upon it? As you confess that *certitude* enters not into your scheme of theology, and that your disciples must be satisfied to range in the wide field of *probabilities*; so you admit that all their labors are to terminate at a *probably genuine* reading of Scripture, and consequently,

that the doctrine or instruction, or word of God contained in such reading, is merely *probably genuine*; for you very properly say, (Part II. p. 50.) “ We shall frequently be obliged to determine the true *reading* of a passage, before we can determine its true *meaning*.”

I have taken the pains, Sir, to number *some* of the authorities and works to which you refer in your two first courses of Lectures, and have computed them at about thirty-seven thousand. Now as truth is one, and error always various, and as any *one* of these authorities may possibly be *right*, I shall only be surprised if your readers do not feel an alarm and anxiety similar to that which, you say, struck many Protestants when Dr. Mill published his edition of the Greek Testament, and which, it should be observed, is only a very small part of the *whole* Bible. “¹ We are greatly indebted,” you say, “ to Dr. Mill for having supplied us with such ample means of obtaining a more correct edition of the *Greek Testament*. But his labors were misunderstood and misrepresented by his contemporaries. The appearance of so many thousand various readings (they are said to amount to thirty thousand) excited an alarm for the New Testament: and those very materials, which had been collected for the purpose of producing a correct, an unadulterated text, were regarded as the means of undermining its authority. The text in daily use, originally derived from modern manuscripts, and transmitted through Stephens and Beza into the Elzevir editions, was at that time supposed to have already attained its highest perfection, and was regarded in the same light, as if Erasmus had printed from the autographs of the sacred writers. The possibility of mistakes in transcribing the Greek Testament, the consequent necessity of making the copies of it subservient to mutual correction, and hence the inference, that the *probability* of obtaining an accurate copy is increased by the frequency of comparison, did not occur to those who were offended at Dr. Mill’s publication. They were not aware that the *genuine* text of the sacred writers could not exclusively be found in any modern manuscript, from which the first editor of a

¹ Part II. p. 10.

Greek Testament might accidentally print: they were not aware that the truth *lies scattered among them all, and must be collected from them all.*"

If then, "truth lies scattered among them *all*, and must be collected from them *all*," every addition of fresh material to the present stock, by the discovery of some concealed ancient manuscript, must awaken in Protestants a painful curiosity to ascertain whether it confirm or contradict that *reading* which they hope to be genuine.

Now, unless men are willing to rely upon the *tradition* of others, some notion of the labor for which they should be prepared, may be gathered from the industry of an individual, which I will describe in your own words, (Part II. p. 34.) "But after all, the materials collected for the purpose of obtaining a correct edition of the Greek Testament, materials for which all the known libraries in Europe had been searched, and which it had employed nearly three centuries to obtain, there was still wanted an editor of sufficient learning, acuteness, industry, and impartiality, in the weighing of evidence, to apply those materials to their proper object. Dr. Griesbach, by his *first* edition of the Greek Testament, had already afforded convincing proofs of his critical ability; and hence the learned in general, especially in his own country, regarded him as the person who was best qualified to undertake this new revision of the Greek text. Indeed the subject had formed the business of his life. Like Wetstein, when he had finished his academical studies, he travelled into France and England for the purpose of collating manuscripts of the New Testament. But as the stock of materials was *then* very considerably larger than when *Wetstein* commenced his literary labors, it was not so much his object to increase, as to *revise* the apparatus already provided. For this purpose he re-examined the most ancient manuscripts, wherever doubts might be entertained, and it was important to ascertain the truth. The peculiar readings, which distinguish one class of manuscripts from another, and are the basis on which that classification is formed, were likewise objects of particular attention. But he in general disregarded the mass of readings which are common to most manuscripts, as serving rather to encumber than to improve our critical apparatus. At the same time, when-

ever uncollated manuscripts presented themselves to his notice, he neglected not to extract what was worthy of attention. The fruits of his researches, with his remarks on the examined manuscripts, he published in two octavo volumes, printed at Halle, in 1785 and 1793, under the following title: *Symbolæ Criticæ, ad Supplendas et Corrigenas variarum Novi Testamenti lectionum Collectiones: accedit multorum Novi Testamenti codicum Græcorum descriptio et examen.* This work contains the principles on which Griesbach has founded his critical system, and consequently should be studied by every man who attempts to form an estimate of his critical merits."

"As the quotations from the Greek Testament, which are scattered in the writings of the most ancient Greek Fathers, are of great importance in ascertaining the genuineness of disputed passages, he undertook a new and complete collation of the works of Origen, which he also published in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, accompanied with the quotations of Cleimant of Alexandria, which differed from the common text."

"Further, as the testimony of the most ancient Latin version, such as those which have been published by Blanchini and Sabatier, are, in many cases, important to the Greek text, he undertook a new edition of those ancient versions. Of the Sahidic version, or the version in the dialect of the Upper Egypt, he quoted the readings which had been furnished by Woide, Georgi, and Munter. Of the Armenian version a new collation was made for him by Bredenkamp of Bremen: and the Slavonian version was collated for him, both in manuscript and in print, by Dobrowsky, at Prague. Nor must we neglect to mention the fragments of two very ancient Greek manuscripts, preserved at Wolfenbittel, which Knittel had published with his fragment of the Gothic version."

"Such were the materials which Griesbach applied to his second and last edition of the Greek Testament, in addition to the apparatus which was already contained in Wetstein's edition, and which was subsequently augmented by the editions described in this lecture."

Now, Sir, I may possibly be asked, how any thing I have extracted from your Lectures can support the charge I have formally

made against you, of acceding to the Catholic principle of Tradition. I answer then by saying, that it is upon the Catholic ground of your taking every thing upon the authority of others, that is, upon the authority of TRADITION. I own that you betray a vast deal more *mistrust* than the Catholic, in the authorities on which you have chosen to repose your faith, and you profess a *caution*, that nearly amounts to *absolute indecision*. But do you say, that the individual who simply enters a shop, purchases and reads his Bible, is able so to recognise the word of God, in every page, in every sentence, that he can ground an act of divine faith upon the reading before him? No, you affirm, that this is only to be ascertained by studying the *criticisms* of the Bible—and what are these criticisms? why no other than the *authorities* who had previously examined and made report—they are human evidences built one upon another, and thus reaching up to the apostles—they form the basis of that superstructure which you consider so immovable; in short, your maxim *must be*, NIL ACCEPTUM, QUOD NON TRADITUM.

I do not, however, mean to insinuate, that because *your* faith like *our's*, is built upon Tradition, therefore your faith is not in the word of God. I can easily perceive that when you believe a scriptural sentence to be the word of God, though you only discover this truth by the means of biblical criticisms, your faith will really repose upon the testimony of God. Yet these criticisms will still be the *ground-work* and *rule* of your faith. And the only difference between the *ignorant* and the *learned* Christian, will be, that the former, (who you say *must* depend upon the authority of another for the truth of the doctrines which are taught him) reposes on the *criticism* of ONE or a *few*, whereas the other builds his acquiescence on the more *discordant criticisms* of a great many: and the only real distinction between a Catholic and a Church of England disciple of your's on this principle, is that the one retains a *Latin* term, whilst the other prefers a *Greek* expression,—the one makes Tradition a *rule* for explaining as well as receiving the Bible, the other *does both*, but *professes the reverse*. The true difference, therefore, between your *criticism* and our *tradition*, is, that the former signifies a *report made*, and the latter an *evidence received*. And to show you how exactly they accord, it will only

be necessary to quote the following passage from your seventh and ninth Lectures.

“¹ If the best Greek manuscripts, with the most ancient fathers and versions, agree in supporting any particular reading, we must conclude that it is the *genuine* reading, whether that reading were contained, or not, in the manuscript of Erasmus or the Complutensian Editors, whether that reading were contained or not, either in *their* editions, or in any which *succeeded* them. But such was the importance, which a reading was *then* supposed to derive from having been once in print, and so necessary did this stamp of authority appear, in order to legalize its claim to admission, that no reading was adopted by Bengelius, however great its *critical* authority, unless it had already received the sanction of the *press*. He himself says, *I will not admit into the text a syllable which has not been before received, though a thousand manuscripts, a thousand critics, say it should be. Ne syllabam quidem, etiamsi mille manuscripti, mille critici juberent, antehac non receptam, adducar ut recipiam.*”

“² Even that portion of sacred criticism, which in its *application* belongs to the third branch of divinity, or the authenticity of the Bible, is in its *principles*, so connected with verbal criticism, that the basis, on which they rest, is nearly one and the same. From the criticism of *words* we ascend to the criticism of *sentences*, from the criticism of *sentences* to the criticism of *chapters*, and from the criticism of *chapters* to the criticism of *whole books*. To illustrate this ascent, an example of each will be sufficient. If we turn to Griesbach’s Greek Testament at Matt. xxviii. 19. we shall find the passage thus worded: Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, where the whole difference from the common text consists in the omission of the particle *οὖν*. This omission is founded on the authority, not only of many ancient Greek manuscripts, but of the ancient Greek Fathers, Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, and Cyril, who are expressly quoted for this purpose. From the criticism of the particle *οὖν*, which is probably spurious, we ascend to the criticism of the whole passage, which is un-

¹ Part II. p. 17.

² Part II. p. 53.

doubtedly genuine. For if Origen, who was born in the century after that in which St. Matthew wrote, found the passage in *his* manuscript of the Gospels, with the exception of only a particle, and the Greek Fathers of the fourth century found it worded in the same manner in *their* manuscripts, we have as strong a proof of its authenticity, as can be given or required in works of antiquity."—"From the criticism of *sentences*, we ascend to the criticism of *chapters*. It is well known, that attempts have been made to invalidate the testimony which the two first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel bear to the doctrine of the incarnation, by contending, that those chapters were not original parts of St. Matthew's Gospel, but were prefixed to it by some other person, at some later period. Now, if we turn to the second volume of Griesbach's *Symbolæ Criticæ*, where he quotes the readings of the Greek Testament from Clement of Alexandria and Origen, we shall find a quotation from the *first* chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, and reference to the *second*, made by Celsus, the Epicurean philosopher, which quotation and reference are noted by Origen, who wrote in answer to Celsus: 'Hinc patet (says Griesbach, very justly) duo priora Matthæi capita Celso nota fuisse.' Now if Celsus, who wrote his celebrated work against the Christians in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and consequently little more than a hundred years after St. Matthew himself wrote, yet found the two first chapters in *his* manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel those chapters must either have been *original* parts of St. Matthew's Gospel, or they must have been added at a time so little antecedent to the age of Celsus, that a writer so inquisitive, so sagacious, and at the same time so inimical to Christianity, could not have failed to *detect* the imposture. But in this case he would not have quoted those chapters as parts of St. Matthew's Gospel. Consequently the truth must lie in the *other* part of the dilemma; namely, that those chapters are *authentic*."

I now, Sir, think it full time to bring this Letter to a conclusion; and in winding it up feel much disposed again to congratulate with you on the close approximation of our principles. God grant that we one day congratulate each other on a *perfect* union and fellowship in religion, for which these common principles so completely dispose us. I conceive, then, that I have justified

myself in attributing to you the sentiment, that admitting the religion of the Church of England to be *true*, another authority *besides* the Bible is necessary for “continuing that religion in its present *establishment*.” And though you may consider this *authority* as distinct from the religion thus inculcated, and rather as a human institution; yet it is the CHANNEL by which you acknowledge the religion of the *establishment* is to be continued, and no otherwise differs from the voice of our *tradition*, Catholic ecclesiastical authority, than inasmuch as the decrees of the one are the acts of a lay parliamentary tribunal, deciding by the human rules of state politicians, whilst the other is the voice of assemblies composed of the successors of the apostles, acting within their own province, and conscientiously giving evidence of what had been transmitted to them. Quod acceptum, hoc traditum. The one is an unnatural assumption of authority, the other a lawful exercise of invested power. The one is to confound *the things which are Caesar’s, with the things which are God’s*, the other is to follow the line of distinction. With every respect,

REV. SIR,

I have the honor to be,

Your obedient humble servant,

PETER GANDOLPHY.

POSTSCRIPT.

THE generous manner in which you have recalled your assertion, which stated that Catholics withhold the sacred Scriptures from the people, will justly intitle you to the esteem of all honorable men, while it has my fullest acknowledgment. I think it

really to be regretted, that, in general, men should take such pains to misunderstand each other, instead of exerting themselves to modify and explain their opinions in that way which would admit both harmony and charity. The reproaches which have been cast upon the Catholic Priesthood, for not consenting to what even many prudent Protestants disapprove of, I mean an *indiscriminate* distribution of the Bible, have been both severe and unmerited. I have clearly shown in my CONGRATULATORY LETTER AND SERMON addressed to you, that before the accidental invention of printing, Bibles, like other books, were within the reach of a very few, and that the Catholic clergy were as little amenable to blame on that account as the Protestant clergy at present, because pearls are not as plenty as oysters, or diamonds as numerous and as large as horse beans, or gold as common as iron. Now, should a future generation discover the art of making diamonds, pearls, and gold, would it be either fair or honest for men to tell an ignorant multitude, that the present Protestant Bishops and Protestant Clergy had kept the secret of this art to themselves, lest the people should become as rich as the whole clergy of England—and that they may thank Providence for having emancipated them from the mean necessity of using iron and earthenware, and for giving them the opportunity of becoming as rich as English lords and Indian kings?—I ask if this language would be fair and honest?—Certainly not—yet I have witnessed something very similar in several of the circular letters of the Bible Societies, and which nothing but an ignorance of the very grossest species can excuse. In these circulars I have seen it asserted, that in the dark ages the Papal priesthood had suppressed what never existed, and had prohibited men from reading, who had never known how to use a book. You are aware that the benefit of clergy was anciently a privilege exclusively limited to those who had learnt to read. Now as late as the reign of Edward the Sixth, it was found, that in criminal cases, the PEERS OF PARLIAMENT were often unable to take advantage of this privilege, and therefore it was enacted by a statute, (1 Edw. VI. c. 12.) “ that Lords of Parliament and Peers of the Realm, may have the benefit of their Peerage equivalent to that of Clergy (ALTHOUGH THEY CANNOT READ, and without being burnt in the hand) for all offences then clergyable to commoners,

and also for the crimes of housebreaking, highway robbery, horse-stealing, and robbing of churches." (Blacks. Com. Vol. iv. c. 28.) Surely then some allowance might be made for that difference of circumstances which improvement and education have occasioned in the space of three hundred years; and it might be supposed, that as men are at present more enlightened by information and science, they would be governed by a different treatment. I question much if education is not necessary to a certain degree, even to trust a man with a fowling-piece—surely then to commit to him a book of sublime theology. I have recorded in a note below, a curious account extracted from the Morning Chronicle of October 19, 1811, of a man that was tried at Leeds¹ for adhering too

¹ At the Leeds Sessions held last week, John Burnley, weaver, of Beeton, was brought before the Court on a charge of deserting his family, and leaving them chargeable to the township. When he was placed at the bar, he was interrogated in the following terms;

Court. What reason have you to assign for deserting your family?—*Pris.* I was called by the Word of God so to do.

Court. Where have you lived since, and what have you done?—*Pris.* I have lived at Potovens, near Wakefield, and have worked at my business as a weaver.

Court. What can you earn a week, upon an average?—*Pris.* From 18s. to 20s. per week.

Court. And how do you dispose of it?—*Pris.* After supplying my own necessities, I distribute the rest among my poor neighbours.

Court. But should not your wife and children be the first object of your care and bounty?—*Pris.* No: unless they are in greater distress than all others.

Court. The Scripture, which you profess to follow, says, speaking of the relation of man and wife, that they shall be one flesh; of course you are under as great an obligation to maintain her as yourself.—*Pris.* The Scripture saith, whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder; but God never joined me and my wife together.

Court. Who then did?—*Pris.* I have told you who *did not*, you may easily judge who did.

Court. We suppose you are as much joined together as other married people are.—*Pris.* My family are now no more to me than any other persons.

Court. The laws of your country require that you should maintain your family, and if you neglect or refuse so to do, you become liable to a serious

closely to the letter of the Scripture : and who, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the Court, like a consistent man, persisted

punishment.—*Pris.* I am willing to suffer all you think proper to inflict ; I expect to suffer persecution, for the Scripture says, those that live godly in Christ Jesus, must endure persecution. I regard the laws of God only, and do not regard any other laws.

Court. You seem to have read the Scripture to very little profit, or you would not have failed in so plain a duty as that of providing for your own household.—*Pris.* The Scripture commands me to love my neighbour as myself, and I cannot do that if I suffer him to want when I have the power to relieve him. My wife and children have all changes of raiment, but I see many others that are half naked. Should I not, therefore, clothe these rather than spend my money on my family?

Court. But your family cannot live upon their raiment ; they require also victuals.—*Pris.* They are able to provide for their own maintenance ; and the Gospel requires me to forsake father and mother, wife and children. Indeed it was contrary to the Gospel for me to take a wife, and I sinned in so doing.

Court. Have you any friend here ?—*Pris.* I have only one friend, who is above.

Court. Is there any person here who knows you ?—*Pris.* Mr. Banks knows me.

Mr. Banks being called upon, stated, that he should suppose from the recent conduct of the prisoner, that his mind was not in a sane state. Formerly he was an industrious man ; of late he understood that he had read the Bible with uncommon assiduity and fervency. He would absent himself whole days together, and retired into the woods and fields for the purpose of reading it. After some time spent in this manner he went away from his family, and refused to contribute to their support. His family contrived to carry on the business, and he bought of them what pieces they made. He understood that what the prisoner had said of giving away his earnings to objects of distress was correct.

The Court made another attempt to convince this deluded man of the impropriety of his conduct, but without the least effect ; he replied to all their reasonings by quoting appropriate texts of Scripture.—Nor would he even promise to permit his employer to pay to his family the small sum of five shillings weekly. He dared not, he said, make any promises or engagements of any kind. Nor was the attempt to work upon his feelings more successful ; his fanaticism had, apparently, rooted from his heart all the tender charities of domestic life. When it was intimated to him that one of his children was in a decline, he seemed perfectly unmoved ; nor did the tears of his wife, who implored him only to assist in paying the

in rejecting the authority of that TRADITION which the Judge most sensibly, but *catholically* urged him to admit. I consider this as an anecdote which should bring many to their better senses. For never was the triumph more complete of ignorance over sense, of folly over prudence, of fanaticism over religion.

But to convince you how wrongly Protestants harp upon this subject, I can assure you, that although for many years I have had the direction of a flock, consisting of some thousands of souls, I do not recollect that I ever interfered with, or expressed the smallest objection to any individual's practice of reading the Scriptures. Indeed, Sir, the Scriptures lie about in our Catholic families like any other book, for any one to open, and our Missals

debts contracted before he went away, in the least affect him. He coldly replied, that the landlord might distress for his rent.

The Court asked some questions of the Overseers as to the affairs of the family, the answers to which the writer of this did not hear; but they confirmed what Mr. Banks had said as to the manner in which he disposed of his surplus earnings; and expressed an opinion, that no benefit was likely to result by sending him again to the House of Correction. After some consultation with the Bench, the Recorder addressed him to the following effect—

“John Burnley—the Court are disposed to deal leniently with you, in hopes that better consideration will remove the delusion you labor under. For this purpose I would advise you to read your Bible with still greater attention, and ask the advice of some intelligent friends, particularly the Minister you attend upon. I would also beg of you seriously to consider, that all the rest of the world think it their duty to provide, in the first place, for their families; and you, surely, cannot suppose that they are all neglecting the care of their souls, and in the road to eternal destruction. This consideration should induce you to distrust your own judgment, and if you have any humility, and humility is a Christian virtue, you will conclude, that it is more probable that you should be mistaken than that all the rest of mankind should be wrong. Your wife has strongly expressed her wish that no severity should be used towards you. Influenced by these considerations, the Court has ordered that you should be discharged.”—*Pris.* The Scripture saith, that darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people. And again, in another place, that the whole world lieth in wickedness. I know that the way of duty is in the path of suffering; but it is the path which our Leader trod, and we must follow his steps.

and Common Prayer books as you know, are full of Scripture. I can, moreover, inform you, that since writing the last sentence, I have purposely interrupted this postscript to inquire of three other Catholic clergymen, (two of whom have superintended large congregations for near forty years, and the third for more than twenty) whether in the course of their ministry they ever interdicted any person from reading the Scriptures. You will not doubt then the word of a clergyman, when I tell you that they all answered in the negative, adding, that in their opinion, there is not a priest living in England, who has ever prohibited any one. Surely then, I think this broad and open declaration sufficient to shake Protestant prejudice; at least I am free to assert, that whenever Protestants return to cool reflection and calm inquiry, it will be to express their astonishment at the misconceptions they formed of the whole Catholic religion. Indeed they continually ask us, have you not changed? No, we answer, but you have.

There remains one more observation of your's to which I must reply before I withdraw—and which I think you have gone out of the way to make, for in my opinion it has as little to do with the theological question at issue between us, as with the discharge of the national debt, or the opening of the Indian trade.—You acknowledge that Catholics “constitute a respectable and loyal body: that they are attached to their sovereign and their country.” But their intentions must perpetually be checked by the intervention of that *external* allegiance they bear to the Pope, the head of their church. “The *strength* of that allegiance, and the warmth still excited by the object of it in the hearts of his true disciples, *I myself*, you say, have displayed, by exhibiting the Pope at the head of my pamphlet.” Therefore, you conclude, “the guidance of the constitution cannot be safely entrusted to those who *profess* such allegiance.”

My only motive, Sir, for placing the portrait of the Pope at the head of my CONGRATULATORY LETTER, was to show to you the point to which your principle would ultimately lead. But when you tell me that this is clear evidence of the external allegiance I bear to his person, I must be allowed to express my surprise, that a Margaret Professor of Divinity, at this time of

day, should need common information on the subject. I will not certainly attempt with you to weigh the comparative *goodness* and *utility* of Catholics and Protestants; I rest satisfied with your admission, that we are *good* and *useful* subjects. Yet I will not tamely allow any man to tell me, that I have divided my allegiance between my sovereign and another. Sir, you should have known that Catholics have renounced upon oath the recognition of any temporal authority of the Bishop of Rome in this empire, and consequently, whatever is commonly understood by external allegiance is solemnly disclaimed by us.

Therefore, though I have placed the portrait of the Pope at the head of my pamphlet, as I conceive you might exhibit the picture of Luther or Calvin without bringing your loyalty under suspicion, I neither owe the Pontiff, nor will I pay him, the homage of any *external* allegiance. And though I acknowledge in him the spiritual character of Chief Bishop, and Supreme Pastor of Christ's Church, surely that is easily distinguished from the character of a Sovereign, of a Prince, or of a Civil Legislator. In the same manner, the Catholics admit a spiritual brotherhood and fellowship between themselves and the Catholics of other countries; for instance, those of France, and believe that even those who die in arms against us, as children of the same spiritual mother, are intitled to and benefited by those prayers, which in the same spirit of charity we offer for our enemies as well as our friends.—But has any one heard that this principle ever led to any confusion in battle, and that the privilege of church fellowship was pleaded by Catholics, to persuade Catholics not to fight and kill their Catholic opponents? Has Lord Wellington ever found by experience that his Catholic soldiers were influenced in their duty by their religious principles, and that it was sufficient “perpetually to check their best *intentions*?” I can assure you, then, that as it is easy for a man in battle to distinguish between the character of a soldier and a *spiritual brother*, so it is as easy for Catholics to distinguish between the temporal and spiritual authorities of Popes and Councils, and to act upon the principle of that distinction. Till the year 1471, all Scotland was subject to the Metropolitan See of York—yet bloody wars had frequently been waged between

the Scotch and English—and during the Heptarchy, the authority of the See of Canterbury was acknowledged in many hostile kingdoms, without any inconvenience to the temporal authorities. (See Wilkin's Councils, Vol. iii. p. 606.) You were wrong, then, in confounding things which are so perfectly distinct in themselves.

London, March 20th, 1813.

