



120-6

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.	
Princeton, N. J.	
<i>Case,</i>	Division.....
<i>Shelf,</i>	Section.....
<i>Book,</i>	No,.....

BS1135

T51

copy 1

THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PROVED
TO BE CORRUPT ADDITIONS TO THE WORD OF GOD.

THE

ARGUMENTS OF ROMANISTS

FROM THE

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH AND THE TESTIMONY
OF THE FATHERS IN BEHALF OF THE APOCRYPHA,

DISCUSSED AND REFUTED.

BY

JAMES H. THORNWELL,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE AND THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY
IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGE.

NEW-YORK :

LEAVITT, TROW & COMPANY,

ROBERT CARTER. — BOSTON, CHARLES TAPPAN. — PHILADELPHIA,
PERKINS & PURVES. — BALTIMORE, D. OWEN & SON. —

CHARLESTON, S. HART, SENIOR, D. W. HARRISON.

— COLUMBIA, S. WEIR, MC CARTER & ALLEN.

1845.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1844,

BY LEAVITT, TROW, & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New-York.

DEDICATION.

TO THE

REV. ROBERT J. BRECKENRIDGE, D. D.,

AN ORNAMENT TO HIS CHURCH,

AND A

BLESSING TO HIS COUNTRY,

A STRANGER TO EVERY OTHER FEAR BUT THE FEAR OF GOD,

THE BOLD DEFENDER AND UNTIRING ADVOCATE

OF

Truth, Liberty, and Religion,

THIS BOOK,

WHICH OWES ITS EXISTENCE TO HIS INSTRUMENTALITY,

IS NOW AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED BY

THE AUTHOR.

P R E F A C E .

THE history of the present publication is soon told. Some time in the year 1841 I wrote, at the special request of a friend in Baltimore, Rev. Dr. Breckenridge, a short essay on the claims of the Apocrypha to Divine Inspiration. This was printed anonymously in the *Baltimore Visiter*, as No. V. of a series of articles furnished by Protestants, in a controversy then pending with the domestic chaplains of the Archbishop of Baltimore. From the *Visiter* it was copied into the *Spirit of the Nineteenth Century*, some time during 1842. From the *Spirit of the Nineteenth Century* it was transferred, by the editor of the *Southern Chronicle*, a valuable newspaper published in this place, to his own columns, and without consulting me, or in any way apprising me of his design, he took the liberty, having ascertained that I was the author, to append my name to it. Seeing it printed under my name, and, as he might naturally suppose, by my authority, Dr. Lynch, a Roman Catholic Priest of Charleston, of reputed cleverness and learning, no doubt regarded it as an indirect challenge to the friends of Rome to vindicate their Mistress from the severe charges which were brought against her. He accordingly addressed to me a series of letters, which the members of his own sect pronounced to be very able, and to which the following dissertations (for though in the form of letters they are really essays) are a reply. The presumption is that the full strength of the Papal cause was exhibited by its champion; and that the reader may be able to judge for himself of the security of the basis on which the inspiration of the Apocrypha is made to depend, I have given the substance of Dr. Lynch's articles in the Appendix. This work, consequently, presents

an unusually full discussion of the whole subject connected with these books. I have insisted largely upon the dogma of infallibility—more largely, perhaps, than many of my readers may think to be consistent with the general design of my performance—because I regard this as the prop and bulwark of all the abominations of the Papacy. It is the stronghold, or rather, as Robert Hall expresses it, “the corner-stone of the whole system of Popery—the centre of union amidst all the animosities and disputes which may subsist on minor subjects; and the proper definition of a Catholic is, one who professes to maintain the absolute infallibility of a certain community styling itself the Church.”

It is not for me to commend my own production, neither shall I seek to soften the asperity of criticism by plaintive apologies or humble confessions. In justice, however, I may state that the following pages were composed in the midst of manifold afflictions—some of the letters were written in the chamber of the sick and by the bed of the dying, and all were thrown off under a pressure of duty which left no leisure for the task but the hours which were stolen from the demands of nature. If, under circumstances so well fitted to chasten the spirit and to modify the temper, I could really harbor the malignity and bitterness which, in certain quarters, have been violently charged upon me, I must carry in my bosom the *heart* of a *demon* and not of a *man*. “And here will I make an end. If I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.”

J. H. THORNWELL.

COLUMBIA, S. C., July 12, 1844.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LETTER I.	
Severity of rebuke necessary in reproofing error.—Mistaken notions of charity exposed.—The real character of Popery—shown to be Anti-Christian and dangerous—no better than Mahometanism.—The decree of the Council of Trent in reference to the Apocrypha,.....	9
LETTER II.	
Dr. Lynch's great argument in proof of the inspiration of the Apocrypha shown to be ambiguous.—The testimony of the Papacy, on moral grounds, entitled to no consideration,.....	26
LETTER III.	
Examination of the argument from the necessity of the case in favor of some infallible tribunal, shown to be presumptuous and weak,.....	36
LETTER IV.	
It is just as easy to prove the Inspiration of the Scriptures as the Infallibility of any Church,.....	57
LETTER V.	
Historical difficulties in the doctrine of Papal Infallibility,.....	72
LETTER VI.	
The doctrine of Papal Infallibility the Parent of Skepticism,.....	89
LETTER VII.	
Papal Infallibility shown to be conducive to licentiousness and immorality,.....	105
LETTER VIII.	
Papal Infallibility proved to be the patron of Superstition and Will-worship,	116
LETTER IX.	
Papal Infallibility proved to be unfriendly to civil government,.....	143
LETTER X.	
Apocrypha not quoted in the New Testament,.....	162
LETTER XI.	
Exclusion of the Apocrypha from the Jewish canon.—Definition of the term canon; account of the manner in which it was formed.—The evidence necessary to make a book canonical.—The distinction between not receiving and rejecting a book shown to be false.....	175
LETTER XII.	
Our Saviour approved the Jewish canon and treated it as complete. Sadducees vindicated from the charge of rejecting all the Old Testament but the Pentateuch. The real point which Papists must prove, in order to establish the inspiration of the Apocrypha,.....	189

	PAGE
LETTER XIII.	
Rejection of the Apocrypha by the Jews.—Faith of the Primitive Church not a standard to us,.....	205
LETTER XIV.	
The existence of the Apocrypha in ancient versions of the Scriptures, no proof of inspiration.—Not quoted by the Apostolic Fathers,.....	215
LETTER XV.	
The application of such expressions as 'Scripture,' 'Divine Scripture,' by ancient writers to the Apocrypha, no proof of inspiration,.....	231
LETTER XVI.	
Examination of Testimonies,.....	246
LETTER XVII.	
Testimony of the writers of the third century considered—Cyprian, Hippolytus, Apostolic Constitutions,.....	266
LETTER XVIII.	
Testimony of the Fourth Century considered.—Council of Nice.—Councils of Hippo and Carthage.—Testimony of Augustine—Ephrem the Syrian—Basil—Chrysostom—Ambrose,.....	277
LETTER XIX.	
The real Testimony of the Primitive Church.—The Canons of Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Gregory Naz., Jerome, Rufinus, Council of Laodicea.....	310
APPENDIX,.....	339

ROMANIST ARGUMENTS FOR THE APOCRYPHA DISCUSSED AND REFUTED.

LETTER I.

Severity of rebuke necessary in reproving error.—Mistaken notions of charity exposed.—The real character of Popery—shown to be Anti-Christian and dangerous—no better than Mahometanism.—The decree of the Council of Trent in reference to the Apocrypha.

SIR:—If you had been content with simply writing a review of my article on the Apocrypha, without alluding to me in any other way than as its author, I should not, perhaps, have troubled you with any notice of your strictures. But you have chosen the form of a personal address; and though the rules of courtesy do not require that anonymous letters should be answered, yet I find that your epistles are generally regarded as a challenge to discuss, through the public press, the peculiar and distinctive principles of the sect to which you belong. Such a challenge I cannot decline. Taught in the school of that illustrious philosopher who drew the first constitution of this State, I profess to be a lover of truth, and especially of the truth of God; and as I am satisfied that it has nothing to apprehend from the assaults of error, so long as a country is permitted to enjoy that “capital advantage of an enlightened people, the liberty of discussing every subject which can fall within the compass of the human mind,” (a liberty, as you well know, possessed by the citizens of no Papal State,) I cannot bring myself to dread the results of a controversy conducted even in the spirit which you ascribe to me.

If, sir, my sensibilities were as easily wounded as your own, I too might take offence at the asperity of temper which you have, indeed, attempted to conceal by a veil of affected politeness, but which, in spite of your caution, has more than once

been discovered through the flimsy disguise. But, sir, the spirit of your letter is a matter of very little consequence to me.

If the moderation and courtesy of the Papal priesthood were not so exclusively confined to Protestant countries, where they are a lean and beggarly minority, there would be less reason for ascribing their politeness to the dictates of craft instead of the impulses of a generous mind. It is certainly singular that Papists among us should make such violent pretensions to fastidiousness of taste when the style of their Royal Masters—if the example of the Popes is of value—stands pre-eminent in letters for coarseness, vulgarity, ribaldry and abuse. Dogs, wolves, foxes and adders, imprecations of wrath and the most horrible anathemas, dance through their Bulls, “in all the mazes of metaphorical confusion.” If these models of Papal refinement are not observed in a Protestant State, men will be apt to reflect that an Order exists among you whose secret instructions have reduced fraud to a system, and lying to an art. How you, sir, without “compunctious visitings of conscience,” could magnify breaches of “the rules of courtesy” on the part of Protestants towards the adherents of the Papal communion, into serious evils which often required you “to draw on your patience,” is to me a matter of profound astonishment.* Standing as you do

* “Permit me to take this occasion of expressing once for all my regret at finding an essay from you so plentifully interspersed with the vulgar epithets, *Papist*, *Romanist*, and such manifestations of ill feeling as the expressions, *rassals of Rome*, and *captives to the car of Rome*, the assertion that our “credulity is enormous,” and your mocking language concerning the awful mystery of transubstantiation, and the Church with which even in quotations I am unwilling to sully my pen. Believe me, reverend sir, such invectives contain no argument. They are unbecoming the subject, and I may presume to add, the dignified station you occupy. Your essay would have lost none of its weight, and to Catholics would have been infinitely less revolting, had they been omitted. Catholics are neither outcasts from society, nor devoid of feeling; they are neither insensible to, nor think they deserve, such words of opprobrium. It is true we have often to draw on our patience, for the rules of courtesy are frequently violated in our regard. Still it is painful to see a Professor descending from calm, gentlemanly and enlightened argument, to mingle with the crowd of those whose weapons are misrepresentations and abuse. I will not recur to this disagreeable topic, but will endeavor to write as if your arguments were unaccompanied by what Catholics must consider as insults.”—*A. P. F. Letter I.*

among the children of the Huguenots, whose fathers tested the liberality of Rome, and signalized their own heroic fortitude at the stake, the gibbet, and the wheel, were you not ashamed to complain of "trifles light as air," mere "paper bullets of the brain," while the blood of a thousand martyrs was crying to heaven against you? Two centuries have not yet elapsed since the exiles of Languedoc found an asylum in this State. Who could have dreamed that, in so short a time, those who had pursued them with unrelenting fury at home, should have been found among their descendants, whining in deceitful strains about charity and politeness? They who, in every country where their pretended spiritual dominion has been supported by the props of secular authority, have robbed, murdered and plundered all who have been guilty of the only crimes which Rome cannot tolerate—freedom of thought and obedience to God—are horribly persecuted if they are not treated with the smooth hypocrisy of courtly address! Did you feel constrained, sir, in the city of Charleston, where the recollection of the past cannot have perished, where the touching story of Judith Manigault must always be remembered, to make the formal declaration that "*Catholics* (meaning Papists) *are not devoid of feeling?*" Were you afraid that the delight which you formerly took in sun-dering the tenderest ties of nature, tearing children from their parents, and husbands from their wives, and above all your keen relish for Protestant blood, coupled with the notorious fact that you have renounced your reason and surrendered the exercise of private judgment, might otherwise have created a shrewd suspicion that you possessed the nobler elements of humanity in no marked proportions? But I am glad to learn that you are neither "outcasts from society nor devoid of feeling;" and I shall endeavor to treat you in the course of this controversy as men that *have* "discourse of reason," though I plainly foresee, that your punctilious regard to "the rules of courtesy" will lead you to condemn my severity of spirit. It is a precious truth that my judgment is not with man. To employ soft and honeyed phrases in discussing questions of everlasting importance—to deal with errors that strike at the foundation of all human hope, as if they were harmless and venial mistakes—to bless where God curses,

and to make apologies where God requires us to hate, though it may be the aptest method of securing popular applause in a sophisticated age, is cruelty to man and treachery to heaven. Those who, on such subjects, attach more importance to the "rules of courtesy" than the measures of truth, do not defend, but betray the citadel into the hands of its enemies. Judas kissed his Master, but it was only to mark him out for destruction; the Roman soldiers saluted Jesus—Hail King of the Jews! but it was in grim and insulting mockery. Charity for the *persons* of men, however corrupt or desperately wicked, is a Christian virtue. I have yet to learn that opinions and doctrines fall within its province. On the contrary, I apprehend that our love to the souls of men will be the exact measure of our zeal in exposing the dangers in which they are ensnared.* It is only among those who hardly admit the existence of such a thing as truth—who look upon all doctrines as equally involved in uncertainty and doubt—among skeptics, sophists, and calculators, that a generous zeal is likely to be denounced as bigotry, a holy fervency of style mistaken for the inspiration of malice, and the dreary indifference of Pyrrhonism confounded with true liberality.—Such men would have condemned Paul for his withering rebuke to Elymas the Sorcerer, and Jesus Christ for his stern denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees. Surely if there be any subject which requires pungency of language and severity of rebuke, it is the "uncasing of a grand imposture;" if there be any pro-

* "We all know," says Milton, in a passage which I shall partially quote, "that in private or personal injuries, yea, in public suffering for the cause of Christ, his rule and example teaches us to be so far from a readiness to speak evil, as not to answer the reviler in his language, though never so much provoked; yet in the detecting and convincing of any notorious enemy to truth and his country's peace, I suppose, and more than suppose, it will be nothing disagreeing from Christian meekness to handle such an one in a rougher accent, and to send home his haughtiness well bespurred with his own holy water. Nor to do this are we unauthorized either from the moral precept of Solomon, to answer him thereafter that prides himself in his folly; nor from the example of Christ and all his followers in all ages, who, in the refuting of those that resisted sound doctrine and by subtle dissimulations corrupted the minds of men, have wrought up their zealous souls into such vehemencies as nothing could be more killingly spoken."—*Animadversions upon the Demonst. Def. Pref.*

per object of indignation and scorn, "it is a false prophet taken in the greatest, dearest, and most dangerous cheat—the cheat of souls."

If I know my own heart, I am so far from entertaining vindictive feelings to the *persons* of Papists, that I sincerely deplore their blindness, and would as cheerfully accord to them as any other citizens, who have no special claims upon me, the hospitalities of life. It is only in the solemn matters of religion, that an impassable gulf is betwixt us. You apply, it is true, to the Papal community, throughout your letters, (I have three of them now before me,) the title of the Catholic Church; and perhaps one ground of the offence that I have given is to be found in the fact that I have not acknowledged, even indirectly, your arrogant pretensions. Sir, I cannot do it until I am prepared with you to make the word of God of none effect by vain and impious traditions, and to belie the records of authentic history. I say it in deep solemnity, and with profound conviction, that so far are you from being the Holy Catholic Church, that your right to be regarded as a Church of God *at all* in any just or scriptural sense, is exceedingly questionable. A community which buries the truth of God under a colossal pile of lying legends, and makes the preaching of Christ's pure Gospel a damnable sin—which annuls the signs in the holy sacraments, and by a mystic power of sacerdotal enchantment pretends to bestow the invisible grace—which, instead of the ministry of reconciliation, whose business it is to preach the word, cheats the nations with a pagan priesthood whose function it is to offer up sacrifice for the living and the dead—which, instead of the pure, simple, and spiritual worship that constitutes the glory of the Christian Church, dazzles the eyes with the gorgeous solemnities of pagan superstition; a community like this—and such is the Church of Rome—can be regarded in no other light than as "a detestable system of impiety, cruelty and imposture, fabricated by the father of lies." Like the "huge and monstrous Wen" of which ancient story* tells us, that claimed a seat, in the council of the body next to the head itself, the constitution of the Papacy is an enormous

* See the story told in Milton, Reform. in Eng. b. ii.

excrescence which has grown from the Church of Christ, and which when opened and dissected by the implements of Divine truth, is found to be but a "heap of hard and loathsome uncleanness—a foul disfigurement and burden." The Christian world was justly indignant with the fraternal address which English Socinians submitted "to the Ambassador of the mighty Emperor of Fez and Morocco" at the Court of Charles the Second.* But their own spurious charity to Papists is a no less treacherous betrayal of the cause of truth. What claims have Roman Catholics to be regarded as Christians, which may not be pleaded with equal propriety in behalf of the Mahometans? Is it that Rome professes to receive the word of God as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments? The false Prophet of Arabia makes the *same pretension*. Assisted in the composition of the Koran by an apostate Jew and a renegado Christian, he has given a lodgment to almost every heresy which had infected the Church of Christ in this rude and chaotic mass of fraud and imposture. Professing to receive the Bible, he makes it of none effect by his additions to its teaching. The *real* creed of Mahometans has no countenance from Scripture. It is on the ground that *Mahomet makes void the word of God by his pretended Revelations*, that he is treated by the Christian world as a blasphemer and impostor. Has not Rome equally silenced the oracles of God in the din and clatter of a thousand wicked traditions? Her *real* creed—that which gives form and body to the system—which is proposed alike as the rule of the living and the hope of the dying—is not only not to be found in the Bible, but contradicts every distinctive principle of the glorious Gospel of God's grace. If Mahometans justify the heterogeneous additions of their Prophet to the acknowledged revelation of Heaven, by pretending that the Bible is imperfect, and consequently, inadequate as a rule of faith and practice, how much better is the conduct of Rome in reference to the same matter? She may not assume with Mahomet that the Scriptures have been corrupted, but she *does* assume that the Scriptures are not what God declares that they are—able not only to make us wise unto salvation,

* See Leslie's Socinian Controversy. For the authenticity of this address see Horsely's Tracts in controversy with Dr. Priestly.

but to make "the man of God *perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto every good work."* Again, Rome's bulwark is tradition. Mahomet, however, far outstrips her in this matter, and appeals to a tradition preserved by the descendants of Ishmael that reaches back to the time of Abraham.

So also in the article of infallibility and authoritative teaching, the Arabian impostor and the Roman harlot stand on similar ground. The doctrines of the Koran are announced with no other evidence than the *αυτος εφη* of the master—and the Edicts of Trent claim to bind the world, because they are the Edicts of Trent. In one respect the religion of Mahomet is purer than that of Rome—it is *free from idolatry*. There is in it no approximation to what Gibbon calls the "elegant mythology of Greece."

Mahometanism and Popery are, in truth, successive evolutions in a great and comprehensive plan of darkness, conceived by a master mind for the purpose of destroying the kingdom of light, and perpetuating the reign of death. For centuries of ignorance and guilt, the god of this world possessed a consolidated empire in the unbroken dominion, among all the nations but one, of *pagan idolatry*. This was the grand enemy of Christ in the Apostolic age. When this fabric, however, in the provinces of ancient Rome tottered to its fall, with his characteristic subtlety and fraud, the Great Deceiver, according to the predictions of Prophets and Apostles, began another structure in the corruption of the Gospel itself, which should be equally imposing and more fatal, because it pretended a reverence for truth. Under the plausible and sanctimonious pretexts of superior piety and extraordinary zeal, the simple institutions of the Gospel were gradually undermined—errors, one by one, were imperceptibly introduced—the circle of darkness continued daily to extend, until, in an age of profound slumber, through the deep machinations of the wicked one, the foundations of the Papacy were securely laid. The Temple of the Western Antichrist, erected on the ruins of Christianity in the bounds of the Roman See, and requiring, as it did, the corruptions of ages to prepare, cement, and

* 2 Tim. 3. 17.

consolidate its parts, owes its compactness of form and harmonious proportions to the profound policy and consummate skill of the enemy of souls. As left by the Council of Trent, the Papal Church stands completely accoutred in the panoply of darkness—the grand instrument of Satan in the West as Mahometanism in the East—to oppose the Kingdom of God.* The lights are now extinguished on the altar—those in her, but not of her, who have any lingering reverence for God are required to abandon her—her gorgeous forms and imposing ceremonies, are only the funeral rites of religion—the life, spirit, and glory have departed. Entertaining, as I do, these convictions in regard to the Papal community, I shall not pretend to sentiments which as a man I *ought* not to cherish, and as a Christian I *dare* not tolerate. Peace with Rome is rebellion against God. My love to Him, to His Church, His truth, and the eternal interests of men, will forever prevent me—even indirectly by a mawkish liberality which can exist only in words—from bidding God-speed to this Babylonish merchant of souls. But I wish it to be distinctly understood that my most unsparing denunciations of doctrines and practices which seem to me to lead directly to the gates of death, are not to be construed into a *personal abuse* of the Papists themselves. Little as they believe it, I would gladly save them from the awful doom of an apostate church.

With these general explanations of the spirit by which I am and shall continue to be actuated, I shall pass on to make a few remarks in vindication of the expressions at which you have taken offence, as indicating ill feelings on my part, and “with which even in quotations you are unwilling to sully your pen.” These expressions, you will excuse me for saying, are perfectly proper.

Protestants designate their own churches by terms descriptive of their peculiar forms of government, or the distinctive doctrines they profess. Some are called Presbyterians, and some Prelatists, some Calvinists, and others Arminians. You acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope—this is a distinctive feature of your system—where then is the ground of offence in

* The doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin is supposed to be derived from the Koran. See *Gibbon*, p. 310, vol. vi.

applying to you a term, or as you choose to call it, a "vulgar epithet," which exactly describes a characteristic principle of your sect?

Then again, as to the phrases "vassals of Rome," and "captives to the car of Rome," they are really the least offensive terms in which your relations to the Papal See, as set forth in standard writers of your own Church, can be expressed. You must be aware, sir, or you would hardly venture to assume with so much confidence the air of a scholar, that the word vassal was employed by our earlier writers as equivalent to a man of *valor*, and was far from conveying a reproachful meaning. "The word," says Richardson, "is, indeed, evidently as much a term of honor as knighthood was." It is certainly a softer term than *slave*, which, according to Cicero's definition of servitude—"obedientia fracti animi et abjecti et arbitrio carentis suo"*—seems to be more exactly adapted to describe your state. Captivity to Christ is the glory of a Christian, and as the voice of Rome is to you the word of the Lord, I do not see why you should object to being called "captives to the car of Rome." I am afraid, sir, that the real harm of these words is not to be found in their vulgarity and coarseness, but in the unpalatable *truth* which they contain. If there were no sore, there would be no shrinking beneath the probe. As to my "mocking language concerning the awful mystery of transubstantiation," I am not yet persuaded that there is any other mystery in this huge absurdity, but "the mystery of iniquity." To you, sir, it may be *awful*—so no doubt were calves and apes to their Egyptian worshippers.

I. Your letters contain, or profess to contain, an explanation of what the Council of Trent actually did in regard to the Canon of Scripture—a vindication of its conduct, and a labored reply to my short arguments against the inspiration of the Apocrypha. In other words, they naturally divide themselves into three parts—a statement, the proof, and refutation—of each in its order.

In your statement of what the Council did, you have given us a definition of the word Canon† which, as it adequately repre-

* Cicero Paradoxon, v. i.

† "A Canon I have always understood to be a list or catalogue, *setting*

sents neither ancient nor modern usage—the term not being, as you seem to imply, univocal—may be regarded as an humbling confession of your own ignorance. If, sir, you “have always understood the word” in the sense which you assign to it, your acquaintance with the early Ecclesiastical writers is so manifestly limited as to create a very strong suspicion that, with all your parade of learning, you have been little more than the ferret and mouse-hunt of an index. As I shall have occasion, in another part of this discussion, to revert to this subject again, it will be sufficient for my present purpose to observe that, in the modern acceptation of the term, the Scriptures are *not* called *canonical* because they are found in any given *catalogue*, but because they are authoritative as a *rule* of faith. The common metaphorical meaning of the Greek word *κανων* is a *rule* or *measure*. In this sense it is used by the classical writers of antiquity,* as well as by the great Apostle of the Gentiles.† Whether found in a catalogue or not, if the inspiration of a book can be adequately determined, it possesses, at *once*, *canonical authority*. It becomes, as far as it goes, a *standard of faith*. And with all due deference, sir, to your superior facilities for understanding aright the decisions of your Church, you will permit me to declare that the Council of Trent, which you so much venerate, in pronouncing the Apocrypha *canonical*, either employed the term in the sense which I have indicated, and made these books an *authoritative rule of faith*, or was guilty of a degree of folly, which, with all my contempt for the character of its members, I am unwilling to impute to them. You inform us, sir, that a book is to be regarded as *sacred* because it is inspired; but that no book, whatever be its origin, is to be received as *canonical* until it is inserted in some existing

forth what books *are* inspired, not giving or dispensing inspiration to uninspired books. A work to be entitled to a place in a Canon, must be believed to have been always inspired; and if believed to have been inspired at any one period, it must be believed to have always been inspired. Until a Canon is formed, a catalogue of inspired books drawn up, manifestly though many works may be *sacred* because *inspired*, none can be *canonical*, because none can be inserted in a catalogue which does not yet exist.”—*Letter I.*

* Aristotle Polit. lib. ii. cap. 8. Eurip. Hec. 602.

† Gal. 6. 16. Phil. 3. 16.

catalogue. With this key to the interpretation of its language, the Council of Trent* has pronounced its anathema not only on the man who refuses to receive these *books as inspired*, but also on him who does not believe that they are found in a *catalogue*. He is as much bound, on pain of what you interpret to be excommunication, to believe in the existence of a *list* of inspired books, as he is to believe in the Divine authority of the books themselves. It is not enough for him to know that the various documents which compose the Bible were written by men whose minds were guided by the Holy Ghost,—he must also know that a body of men in some quarter of the world has actually inserted the names of these books in a catalogue or list. “*Risum teneatis, amici!*”

Now, sir, to borrow an illustration from your favorite quarter—suppose one of our slaves should be converted to Popery, that is, should receive as true all the dogmas that the Priests inculcate, and yet be ignorant that such a learned body as the Council of Trent had ever been convened, or, what is no uncommon thing among you, be profoundly ignorant that such a book as the Bible exists at all, *would he be damned?* To say nothing of his not receiving the Scriptures under such circumstances as *sacred*, he most assuredly does not receive them as *canonical* in your sense. He knows nothing of a list or catalogue in which these books are enumerated. It is an idle equivocation to say that the curse has reference only to those *who know* the existence of the catalogue. In that case the sin which is condemned, is evidently a sheer impossibility except to a man who was stark mad. *To know* that a catalogue is composed of certain books, and this is the only way of knowing it as a catalogue, and yet *not to believe* that the books are in it, is a mental contradiction which can only be received by those whose capacious understandings can digest the mystery of transubstantiation.

* “Now if any one does not receive as *sacred* and *canonical* those books entire with all their parts, as they have been usually read in the Catholic Church and are found in the old Latin Vulgate edition; and shall knowingly and industriously condemn the aforesaid traditions: let him be anathema.”—*Letter I.*

According to your statement, the venerable Fathers assembled at Trent did three things:—1. They decided what books were inspired—2. They arranged them in a list—and 3. They excommunicated all those heretics who would not receive both books and list. In my humble opinion, however, the Holy Fathers declared what books they received as sacred and *authoritative* in matters of faith, and pronounced their curse upon those who did not acknowledge the *same rule* with themselves. I shall quote from the decree itself, *in your own beautiful and accurate translation*, a sentence which shows that your sense of the term *canonical* was foreign from their thoughts. “It has, moreover, thought proper to annex to this decree a *catalogue* of the sacred books, lest any doubt might arise which are the books *received* by this Council.” You will find on recurring to the original, that the word which you have rendered *catalogue* is not *canona*, but *indicem*. Again, sir, as the Fathers are said to receive these books before their own list is made, how did they do it?—Evidently in the same way, unless there be one sort of faith for the people and another for divines, in which they required others to *receive* them, that is, as *sacred* and *canonical*. But the preceding part of the decree contains not a word about the existence of former *catalogues*, though it is particular to insert the *inspiration* of these books as well as of tradition as the ground of their reception, maintaining, at the same time, that they were, if not *the rule*, at least what is equivalent to it, the *source* (*fontem*) of every saving truth and of moral discipline. Hence in the sense of Trent to be sacred and canonical, “is to be *inspired as a rule of faith*.”

After this specimen of your skill in the art of definitions, we are not to be astonished at still more marvellous achievements in the way of translation. The following words, clear and explicit in themselves, “*pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur*,” I find are rendered by you in English, hardly less equivocal than the language of an ancient oracle.*

* “Receives with *due* piety and reverence and venerates.” The same blunder is found in the translation of this decree prefixed to the Doway version of the Scriptures.

Sir, to say nothing of the obvious meaning of the words, as it might be gathered from a Lexicon, if you had read the debates of the Council even in your own Jesuit historian, *Pallavicino*,*

* “Deinde quo res per futuram Sessionem statuendae discutiuntur, idem Legatus exposuit : Optimum sibi factu videri, ut primo loco recenserentur ac reciperentur libri Canonici sacrarum Literarum, quo certo constaret, *quibus armis esset in haereticos dimicandum, et in qua basi fundanda esset Fides Catholicorum* ; quorum aliqui superare misere angebantur, cum cernerent in eodem libro a plurimis Spiritus digitum adorari, alios contra digitum impostoris execrari. Hoc statuto tria in peculiaribus coetibus proposita sunt. Primum, an omnia utriusque testamenti volumina essent comprobanda. Alterum, an ea comprobatio per novum examen peragenda : tertium a Bertano ac Seripando propositum, an expediret sacros libros in duas classes parti : alteram eorum quae ad promovendam populi pietatem pertinent, et illius ergo solum ab Ecclesia recepti tamquam boni, cujusmodi videbantur esse Proverbiorum et Sapientiae libri, nondum ab Ecclesia probati tamquam Canonici, tametsi frequens eorum mentio haberetur facta apud Hieronymum et Augustinum, aliosque veteres auctores ; alteram eorum, quibus etiam fidei dogmata innituntur. Sed ea divisio, tametsi ab aliquo auctore prius facta, et tunc a Seripando promota per libellum eruditissimum ea gratia conscriptum, quo cuncti libri Canonici rite experentur, uti revera firmam rationem non praeferebat, ita nec sua specie Patres allexit, vix nacta laudatorem : quare nihil ultra de illa disputabimus.” *Pallavicino, Hist. Conc. Trident. lib. vi. cap. 11.*

“How the business to be transacted by the approaching session should be discussed, was explained by the same legate. It seemed to him most advisable that the canonical books of the Holy Scriptures should be in the first place enumerated and received, so that it might be certainly understood, with what weapons they were to fight the heretics, and on what basis the Catholic faith should be founded. In regard to this matter, some were miserably perplexed, since they perceived that, in the same book, many adored the hand of the Spirit, while others detected the hand of an impostor. Three propositions were before the committees : 1. Whether all the books of each Testament should be approved. 2. Whether the approbation should be given upon a new examination to be gone through. 3. The third proposition was that of Bertan and Seripand, whether it would be better to distribute the sacred books into two classes, the first embracing those that were received by the church on account of their subserviency to the piety of the people, (of which sort were Proverbs and Wisdom,) but which were not allowed to be inserted in the canon, though frequently mentioned by Jerome, Augustine, and other ancient writers. The other class embracing those upon which the doctrines of the faith depend. This division, however, into two classes, though it had been previously made by a certain author, and was then learnedly promoted by Seripand in a work written with the view of setting all the books of the canon in their proper light, was supported by no good reason, and found so little favor that it obtained scarcely a single vote.”

you would have learned, what you seem not now to know, that it was the intention of the Fathers in this famous decree to place the Apocrypha and unwritten traditions upon a footing of equal authority with the book which the Lutherans acknowledged as inspired.—Their object was to give their *canon* or rule of faith. Determined as the Pope and his legates were to suppress the Reformation, which had then been successfully begun, and to perpetuate the atrocious abuses of the Roman Court, they commenced the work of death by poisoning the waters of life at the fountain. In the sentence immediately succeeding the anathema, we are given to understand that the preliminary measures in reference to faith were designed to indicate the manner in which the subsequent proceedings of the Council touching questions of doctrine and order should be conducted. They settled the *proofs* and *authorities*—to which in all their future deliberations they intended to appeal. As Luther was to be crushed, and as the armory of God's word furnished no weapons with which this incorrigible heretic could be convicted of error, a stronger bulwark must needs be raised to protect the abuses and cover the corruptions of the Church of Rome. You cannot be ignorant, sir, that much difficulty was felt by the Council in settling the list of Canonical books.* It was not prepared at once to outrage truth and history by making that divine, which

* "Some thought fit to establish three ranks. The first, of those which have been always held as divine; the second, of those whereof sometimes doubt hath been made, but by use have obtained canonical authority, in which number are the six Epistles, and the Apocalypse of the New Testament, and some small parts of the Evangelists. The third, of those whereof there *hath never been any assurance*; as are the seven of the Old Testament and some chapters of Daniel and Esther. Some thought it better to make no distinction at all, but to imitate the Council of Carthage and others, making the catalogue, and saying no more. Another opinion was that all of them should be declared to be in all parts, as they are in the Latin Bible, of Divine and equal authority. The book of Baruc troubled them most, which is not put in the number, neither by the Laodicians, nor by those of Carthage, nor by the Pope, and therefore should be left out, as well for this reason, as because the beginning of it cannot be found. But because it was read in the Church, the congregation, esteeming this a potent reason, resolved that it was, by the ancients, accounted a part of Jeremy and comprised with him."—*Father Paul*, pp. 142, 143.

the Church of God had never received as the work of the Holy Ghost. But, sir, without the Apocrypha and unwritten tradition, the Holy Fathers were unable to construct an embankment sufficient to roll back the cleansing tide of life which Luther was endeavoring to pour into the Augean stable of Papal impurity and filth. The awful plunge was consequently taken, and these spurious books and lying legends were made *standards of faith of equal* authority with God's holy word. Inspired Scripture, apocryphal productions, and unwritten traditions were not only received with *due* piety and reverence, as you would have us to believe, but were received with *equal* piety and veneration, as the decree itself asserts. This, sir, is what Trent did—and until it can be shown that all these elements of Papal faith are really entitled to the same degree of authority and esteem—that they are all, in other words, equally inspired—my charge of intolerable arrogance remains unanswered against the Church of Rome. I said, and repeat the accusation, that she made that divine, which is notoriously human, and that inspired, which, in the sense of the Apostle, is notoriously of private interpretation." I did not impeach the Council for having presumed to draw up a catalogue of sacred and canonical books—but I *did* impeach it and *do still* impeach it of one of the most awful crimes which a mortal can commit, in having solemnly declared "thus saith the Lord," when the Lord had neither spoken nor sent them. The insulted nations, heart-sick with abuses, were looking, with the anxiety of a dying man, for the sovereign remedy which it was confidently hoped would be prepared and administered by this long-looked for assembly of spiritual physicians; but when the day of their redemption, as they fondly dreamed, had at length arrived, and the cup of blessing was put to their lips—behold! instead of the promised cure, a deadly mixture of hemlock and nightshade! Five crafty cardinals and a few dozen prelates from Spain and Italy, called together by the authority of the Pope, and acting in slavish subjection to his sovereign will, as if the measure of their iniquity was now full, and the hour of their final and complete infatuation had at length arrived, proceeded, with the daring desperation of men bereft of shame and abandoned of God, to collect the accumu-

lated errors of ages into one enormous pile, and to send forth, as if from the "boiling alembic of hell," the blackening vapors of death to obscure the dawning light, to cover the earth with darkness, and involve the people in despair. Where were truth and decency, sir, when this miserable cabal* of scrambling politicians claimed to represent the *universal Church*? Is it not notorious that when the canon of your faith was settled, even Papal Europe was so poorly represented that not a *single deputy* was found in the Council from whole nations that it assumed to govern? Its pretensions, too, to be guided by the Holy Ghost, when its whole history attests that the spirit of the Pope was the presiding spirit of the body, afford "damning

* When we call to mind the arts and subterfuges by which the Court of Rome endeavored to evade the necessity of calling a Council—its long delays, while groaning Europe was clamoring for reform—its wily manœuvres, when the necessity at last became inevitable, to have the Council under its own control—the crafty policy by which it succeeded—when we look at these things, and whoever has read the History of Europe during that period cannot be ignorant of them—the language of the text "cannot be deemed too severe." The Council was evidently a mere tool of the Pope. The following extracts, one from Robertson, the other from Father Paul, (a Papist himself,) may be taken as an offset to the testimony of Hallam—and a flat contradiction to "A. P. F.'s" account of the *learning* of the body.

"But whichever of these authors," says Robertson, referring to the histories of Father Paul, Pallavicino and Vargas, "whichever of these authors an intelligent person takes for his guide, in forming a judgment concerning the Spirit of the Council, he must discover so much ambition as well as artifice among some of the members, so much ignorance and corruption among others; he must observe such a large infusion of human policy and passions, mingled with such a scanty portion of that simplicity in heart, sanctity of manners, and love of truth, which alone qualify men to determine what doctrines are worthy of God, and what worship is acceptable to him, that he will find it no easy matter to believe that an extraordinary influence of the Holy Ghost hovered over this assembly and dictated its decrees."—*Charles V.* vol. iii. b. x. p. 400.

"Neither was there amongst those Prelates any one remarkable for learning: some of them were lawyers, perhaps learned in that profession, but of little understanding in religion; few divines but of less than ordinary sufficiency; the greater number gentlemen or courtiers; and for their dignities some were only titular and the major part Bishops of so small cities, that supposing every one to represent his people, it could not be said that one of a thousand in Christendom was represented. But particularly of Germany there was not so much as one Bishop or divine."—*Father Paul*, p. 153.

proof" that it was given up to "hardness of heart and reprobacy of mind." You have favored us, sir, with an extract from *Hallam*, which I shall not crave pardon for asserting is entitled to about as much respect as his *discriminating* censures of Pindar's Greek. I am surprised, sir, that you should have ventured to commend the *learning* of the Fathers of Trent. The matter can easily be settled by an appeal to facts. *Cajetan* was reputed to be the most eminent man among them, "unto whom," says Father Paul, "there was no prelate or person in the Council who would not yield in learning, or thought himself too good to learn of him;"* yet, with all his learning, he knew not a word of *Hebrew*. What divine of the present day would be deemed a scholar at all, who could not read the Scriptures in the original tongues? When the question of the authenticity of the Vulgate was under discussion in the Council, what a holy horror was displayed of Grammarians! what shocking alarm lest the dignities of the Church should be given to Pedants, instead of Divines and Canonists?† Sir—why this dread of the *Hebrew* and *Greek originals* if your pastors and teachers could read them? Is it not a shrewd presumption that you made the Bible authentic in a tongue which you *could* read, because God had made it authentic in tongues which you *could not* read? So much for the *learning* of these venerable men.

II. Having sufficiently shown that your statement is a series of blunders, and your eulogy on the Council wholly unfounded, I proceed to your proof. The point which you propose to establish is, that the Apocrypha were given by inspiration of God. You undertake to furnish that positive proof which I had demanded, and without which I had asserted that no moral obligation could exist to receive them. Before, however, you proceed to exhibit your argument, you step aside for a moment to show us the extent of your learning in regard to the disputes which at various times have been agitated touching the books that should be received as inspired. Sir, the object of such statements is obvious—you wish to create the impression that the whole subject of the canon is involved in inextricable confusion, and that the only asylum for the

* Page 145. † Father Paul, page 146.

doubting and distressed—the only place in which the truth can be found and perplexities resolved, is the bosom of your own communion. In your zeal, sir, to represent Protestants as without any solid foundations for their faith, it would be well to confine yourself to statements better supported than some that you have made. That the Sadducees, as a sect, rejected all the books of the Old Testament, with the exception of the Pentateuch, is certainly not to be received upon the conjectures of the Fathers against the violent improbabilities which press the assertion—improbabilities so violent that with all his regard for the Fathers, Basnage* has been compelled to soften down the proposition into the milder statement that this skeptical sect only attributed *greater* authority to the writings of Moses than to the rest of the canon. If by the *Albigenses* you mean the *Paulicians*, you can know but little about them except what you have gathered from their bitter and implacable enemies. The documents of their faith have all perished. You cannot be ignorant, however, that Protestant divines have constructed a strong argument from the very nature of their origin, to rebut the assertion which you have ventured to assume as true. Really, sir, when I consider your wonderful ability in giving definitions and translating from Latin, and join to these your profound acquaintance with ecclesiastical antiquity, I may well tremble to encounter so formidable an opponent in the field of Dialectics. Upon this arena we are now to meet.

LETTER II.

Dr. Lynch's great argument in proof of the inspiration of the Apocrypha shown to be ambiguous.—The testimony of the Papacy, on moral grounds, entitled to no consideration.

I COME now, sir, to the examination of your argument for the inspiration of the Apocrypha, as well as of all the other books

* Basnage Histoire des Juifs, tom. ii. pt. i. p. 325.—Brucker Crit. Hist. Phil. tom. ii. p. 721. See particularly Eichhorn who has clearly shown that the charge is unfounded. Einleit. 4th Edit. vol. i. p. 136.

which you profess to receive as sacred and canonical. It is really a curious specimen of dialectic skill. I know of nothing fit to be compared with it in point of originality and power, but the famous oration of the Bishop of Bitonto, on opening the venerable Council of Trent, in which he predicted the most glorious results from a series of puns on the names and surnames of the presiding Cardinals,* or that still more remarkable specimen of ingenuity and acuteness by which your angelic doctor and eagle of divines so triumphantly proves that it is the duty of inferiors to submit to their superiors in the Church from the *very pertinent and conclusive* passage, “the oxen were ploughing and the asses feeding beside them.” No doubt your ambition is excited to rival these departed worthies of your sect; to achieve for yourself a name which posterity shall not willingly let die; to become, in process of time, and your efforts give every promise of being crowned with success,

“A second Thomas, or at once,
To name them all, another Dunce.”

In appreciating the force and importance of your argument, it will be necessary to bear distinctly in mind that the conclusion which you aim to establish is not to be *probably true*, but *infallibly certain*. You require of those who undertake to determine for themselves what books have been given by inspiration of God, to *decide* this matter with *absolute certainty*, or to renounce the exercise of their private judgments. In proposing, therefore, a

* “We enter upon and commence this General Council lawfully assembled, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, by the sanction of the Apostolic See, and under the direction of these prelates, who stand conspicuous in this holy company—a new Jerusalem, viz. Johanne Maria de Monte, whose looks and affections are continually directed upward to the mountain (montem) which is Christ, whence comes our strength. Marcello Politino, who formerly directed the efforts of his profound and impartial mind to the support of the Christian Commonwealth (politix), whose corrupt morals have afforded our enemies an opportunity to attack us. Reginald Pole, more resembling an angel than an Englishman (non tam Anglo, quam angelo).”

This extraordinary speech of the Bishop of Bitonto, in the midst of all its extravagance and blasphemy, contains *one truth*—a very just comparison of the Council of Trent to the Trojan horse. What could more forcibly illustrate the fraud, hypocrisy and mischievous designs of the Holy Fathers?

“ more excellent way,” you could not think of substituting one which did not fulfil this high and important condition. Your conclusion, then, is not to be a matter of *opinion* but *infallible truth*, and if your arguments do not establish beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt the inspiration of the Apocrypha, they fall short of the purpose which you have brought them forward to sustain. Your proposition consequently is that there is *infallible evidence* that the Apocrypha were given by inspiration of God—or to state it in another form, that the Apocrypha were inspired, is infallibly and absolutely certain. Your general argument may be compendiously expressed in the following syllogism :

Whatever the pastors of the Church of Rome declare to be true must be infallibly certain :

That the Apocrypha were inspired the pastors of the Church of Rome declare to be true :

Therefore it must be infallibly certain.

In other words, the Council of Trent *did not* err in this particular case, because it *could not* err in any case. It is the argumentum *a non posse ad non esse*, which is then only logically sound when the *non posse* is sufficiently established. Since the whole weight of your reasoning rests upon the truth of your major proposition, you have very judiciously employed all your resources in fortifying it. Still, sir, after all your care, it is signally exposed to heretical assaults. In the first place, you must be aware that your argument is vitiated by that species of paralogism which logicians denominate ambiguity of the middle. What is the precise extension of the words “pastors of the Church of Rome?” They may be understood either universally, particularly, or distributively; and you will excuse me for saying, that in the course of your first letter you have either employed them in each of these different applications or I have been wholly unable to apprehend your meaning. At one time it would seem that you mean the whole body of your priesthood collected together in a grand assembly. You speak of a *body* of individuals, to whom, in *their collective capacity*, God has given authority to make an unerring decision.” Then, again, you inform us that the “pastors of the Catholic Church” (meaning, of course, the

Church of Rome) “claim to compose it.” In addition to this you speak of a single priest “presenting himself to instruct a Christian or an infidel” as a member of the body—whence the inference is natural and necessary, that *every* priest is a member of the body. From a comparison of these various passages in your first letter, it would evidently appear that you employed the words “pastors of the Church of Rome” in your major proposition in their fullest extension. If, then, you meant an assembly composed of *all* the pastors of the Church of Rome, the Council of Trent, which comprised only a *small portion* of your teachers, has not manifestly the shadow of a claim to the precious virtue of infallibility. In this case your major might be true, and yet your minor would be so evidently false as to destroy completely the validity of your conclusion. A body consisting of *all* the pastors of the Church of Rome never *has* met, never *will* meet, and, from the nature of the case, never *can* meet; and an infallibility lodged in such an assembly for the guidance of human faith or the regulation of human practice, is just as intangible and worthless as if it were lodged with the man in the moon. Still, whether this infallible tribunal were accessible or not, your argument would be a contemptible sophism. It would stand precisely thus:—Whatsoever *all* the pastors of the Church of Rome in their collective capacity declare, must be infallibly certain. That the Apocrypha were inspired, *some* of the pastors of the Church of Rome collected at Trent declared.

Therefore it must be infallibly certain. An infallible conclusion, undoubtedly!

But, sir, the words may be taken particularly. If, however, they are to be taken in a restricted sense, you should have told us precisely what limitation you intended to prefix; otherwise your reasoning may be still vitiated by an ambiguous *middle*. Without such an explanation, we have no means of ascertaining whether the words as employed in the minor coincide, as they should do, with the same words as employed in the major. You should have told us under what circumstances infallibility attaches to *some* pastors of the Church of Rome, if you indeed intended to limit the phrase. That you have occasionally used it in a limited sense, is evident from the fact, that you attribute

infallibility to the Council of Trent, which was certainly a small body compared with *all* the pastors of your entire Church. Are you prepared to say that *any* number of Popish pastors, met under *any* circumstances, shall be infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost in all their decisions, concerning doctrine and practice?—that even the *same* number which met at Trent, collected together by *accident*, or merely by *mutual consent*, would be possessed of the *same* exemption from all possibility of error which you ascribe to Trent? If you are not prepared to make this assertion, your *major* proposition is not absolutely true, but only under special limitations. These limitations are not even *stated*, much less *defined*, and while your leading proposition is left in this unsettled condition, what logician can determine whether your argument be any thing more than a specious fallacy? Certain it is, that it can never be regarded as conclusive, until you show that all *those conditions* were fulfilled in the Council of Trent, which are necessary to secure infallibility to “*some of the pastors*” of the Church of Rome. Where, sir, in all your letters have you touched this point? *What was there that distinguished* the Fathers of Trent from an *equal* number of Bishops and Divines met together upon their own responsibility in such a way as to make the former infallible, and the latter not? Was it the *authority* of the Pope? Then, sir, your argument was not complete until you had proved, with *absolute certainty*, that a Papal Bull secures the guidance of the Holy Ghost! Was it the concurrence of the Emperor? This matter is nowhere established. Was it both combined? What was it, sir? Reasoning to you, sir, is evidently a *new vocation*. You have been in the habit of trusting so implicitly to the authority of others in the formation of your creed, that your first efforts at ratiocination are as awkward and ridiculous, as the rude motions of an infant just learning to walk, or of a bird just learning to fly. Let me remind you, sir, that as you aim at an *infallible conclusion*, every step of your argument must be supported by *infallible proof*. There must be no hidden ambiguities—no rash assumptions—no precipitate deductions. In so solemn a business, you should construct a solid fabric, able to support the enormous weight which you would have us to rest upon it.

There is still another meaning, which your major proposition may bear. You may have employed the words "pastors of the Church of Rome" in a distributive sense, and then you would distinctly inform us that every priest belonging to your sect, shall infallibly teach the truth. The application of your argument to the condition of the ignorant and unlearned, absolutely requires this sense. According to you, every man, no matter what may be his condition or attainments, may have infallible evidence on the subject of the canon. Where is he to find it? In the instructions of the priest, who informs him what books were inspired, and what books arose from "private interpretation?" The testimony of the single, individual priest, is all the evidence that he does or can have. If, then, he has *infallible* evidence, the testimony of the priest, which is his *only* evidence, must be infallible, and consequently the priest himself must be infallible too, or incapable of teaching error. It is not enough that the water should be pure at the fountain, it must also be pure in the channels through which it is conveyed. The Council of Trent may have been infallible, but if it has only fallible expounders, the *people* can have nothing but *fallible* evidence. According to you, however, the people *do* have *infallible* evidence—therefore, the Council must have infallible expounders—therefore every pastor must be individually, infallible.* While your argument,

* "Though there have been infinite disputes as to where the infallibility resides; what are the doctrines it has definitively pronounced true, and who, to the *individual*, is the infallible expounder of what is thus infallibly pronounced infallible; yet he who receives this doctrine in its integrity, has nothing more to do than to eject his reason, sublime his faith into credulity, and reduce his creed to these two comprehensive articles: 'I believe whatsoever the Church believes;' 'I believe that the Church believes whatsoever my father-confessor believes that she believes.' For thus he reasons: nothing is more certain than whatsoever God says is infallibly true; it is infallibly true that the Church says just what God says; it is infallibly true that what the Church says is known; and it is also infallibly true that my father-confessor, or the parson of the next parish, is an infallible expositor of what is thus infallibly known to be the Church's infallible belief, of what God has declared to be infallibly true. If any one of the links, even the last, in this strange *sortes*, be supposed unsound, if it be not true that the priest is an infallible expounder to the individual of the Church's infallibility, if his judgment be only 'private judgment,' we come back

however, indispensably requires this sense, you seem to disclaim it in those passages of your letters, which speak of a body of individuals in their collective capacity, as the chosen depositories of the truth of God. How, I beseech you, is a poor Protestant heretic, with no other helps but his grammar and lexicon, and no other guide but his own reason, to detect your *real* meaning in this mass of ambiguity and confusion? I would not misrepresent you, and yet I confess that I do not understand you. I can put no intelligible sense upon your words, which shall make all the parts of your letter consistent with themselves. You seem to have shifted your position, as often as you added to your paragraphs. We have no less than four distinct propositions covertly concealed under the deceitful terms of your major premiss:

1. Whatsoever *all* the pastors of the Church of Rome declare, must be infallibly true.

2. Whatsoever *some* of the pastors of the Church of Rome, *under certain special limitations*, declare, must be infallibly true.

3. Whatsoever *some* of the pastors of the Church of Rome under *any* circumstances declare, must be infallibly true.

4. Whatsoever *any* priest or pastor of the Church of Rome declares, must be infallibly true.

Until, sir, you shall condescend to throw more light upon the intricacies of your style, your leading proposition must stand like an unknown quantity in Algebra; and for aught that appears to the contrary the letter X might have been just as safely and just as definitely substituted. Those who look for an *infallible* conclusion in this exquisite specimen of reasoning, must not be surprised if they meet with the same success which rewards the easy credulity of a child in seeking for golden treasures at the foot of the rainbow. Thousands have fully believed that they were there, but none have been able to reach the spot.

The *infallibility* of testimony which you attribute to the pastors of the Church of Rome, you endeavor to collect from two general propositions, which it is necessary to your argument to

link together as antecedent and consequent. First you inform us that God must have "given authority to a body of individuals in their collective capacity to make an unerring decision upon the subject" of the canon; and then you infer that, if such a body exists at all, it must be composed of the pastors and teachers of the Church of Rome. Until you can show that the antecedent in the proposition is necessarily true, and the consequent just as necessarily connected with it, you must acknowledge, sir, that you have failed in presenting to your readers what your extravagant pretensions require, an *infallible* conclusion. You *must show*, according to the process of argument which you have prescribed for yourself, not only that *an* infallible body exists, but that it *is* and *can be* composed of no other elements but those that you embrace under the dark and unknown phrase, "Pastors of the Catholic Church." Deficiency of proof on either of these points is fatal to your cause.

It is not a little remarkable, in the history of human paradox, contradiction and absurdity, that absolute *infallibility* should be claimed for the testimony of those, who, if tried by the ordinary laws which regulate human belief, would be found destitute of any decent pretensions to the common degree of credibility. You have presented the pastors of the Church of Rome before us distinctly in the attitude of *witnesses*. Their power in regard to articles of faith is simply declarative; they can only transmit to others, pure and uncorrupted, that which they received at the hands of the Apostles. They can add nothing to it; they can take nothing from it; and whatever they may declare to be the truth of God according to the original preaching of the Apostles, we are bound to receive *upon their testimony*. Whatever they *declare* or *testify* to be true, according to your statement, must be *infallibly* certain. Now the *credibility* of a witness depends as much upon his *moral integrity* as upon his means and opportunities of knowledge. He must not only *know* the truth, but be *disposed* to speak it. As, too, our assent to testimony is ultimately founded upon our instinctive belief that every effect must have its adequate cause, when existing causes can be assigned which are sufficient to account for the deposition of a

witness, apart from the truth of his declarations, we are slow to rely on his veracity. In other words, when he is known to be under strong temptations to pervert, conceal, or misstate facts, we proportionably subtract from the weight of his evidence; and if it should so happen that he had ever been previously detected in a lie, few would be inclined to receive his testimony. If these remarks be just, whoever would undertake to establish the credibility of your pastors, must prove that they are possessed of such a degree of moral honesty as to constitute a complete exemption from all adequate temptations to bear false witness. To prove their *knowledge* of the subject is not enough—their *integrity* must also be fully made out. Any abstract arguments, however refined and ingenious, would be liable to a palpable *reductio ad absurdum*, if after all their extravagant pretensions, it should be ascertained from undeniable facts that your priesthood has ever been found destitute of those sterling moral qualities which lie at the foundation of all our confidence in testimony. Has it ever been shown, sir, that the Bishops of your Church have never been exposed, from their lordly ambition and indomitable lust, to adequate motives for bearing record to a lie? Has it ever been proved that the purity of their manners and the sanctity of their lives have always been such as to render them the most unexceptionable witnesses in the holy subject of religion? How will you dispose of the remarkable testimony of Pope Adrian VI., who confessed through his Nuncio to the Diet of Nuremberg, that the deplorable condition of the Church was “caused by the sins of men, especially of the *Priests* and *Prelates*?” What say you, sir, to that admirable commentary on the honesty and integrity of your pastors, the “*Centum Gravamina*” of the same memorable Diet, which was carefully and deliberately drawn up with a full knowledge of the facts, and despatched with all possible rapidity to Rome? Do the records of the past furnish no authenticated instances in which your infallible pastors have either testified to falsehood themselves or applauded it in others? Sir, if all history be not a fable, the priesthood of Rome, taken as a body, can yield in corruption, ambition, tyranny and licentiousness, to no class of men that ever cursed the earth. If infallible *honesty* can be proved of them; if the Holy Spirit

has, indeed, been a perpetual resident in this cage of unclean birds; if the ordinary credibility which attaches to a *common* witness can be ascribed to them, where their pride, ambition, or interest is involved, then all moral reasoning falls to the ground, the measures of truth are deceitful, and we may quietly renounce the exercise of judgment, and yield to the caprices of fancy. No, sir, instead of being the temple of the Lord, the habitation of the Holy One of Israel, your dilapidated Church is a dreary spectacle of moral desolation, peopled only by wild beasts of the desert, full of doleful creatures, owls, satyrs and dragons.*

Tried, sir, in the scale in which other witnesses are tried, you will be found deplorably wanting. Your *temptations* to *duplicity* are too strong, and your *weight of moral character* too small, to command the least respect for your testimony. Hence, you very wisely evade all moral considerations, and resolve your boasted infallibility, not into your own attachment to the truth, but into a stern necessity, to which God subjects you by his guardian Providence and the irresistible operations of his Spirit, of uttering whatever he shall put into your mouth, as Baalam's Ass, through his power, overcame the impediments of nature and spoke in the language of men. Whether you have succeeded in demonstrating by *infallible* evidence, that you are the subjects—the passive and mechanical subjects—of such an uncontrollable af-

* "Without entering into the mazes of a frivolous and unintelligible dispute about words, it is sufficient to remark, that the supernatural and infallible guidance of a Church, which leaves it to stumble on the threshold of morality, to confound the essential distinctions of right and wrong, to recommend the violation of the most solemn compacts, and the murder of men, against whom not a shadow of criminality is alleged, except a dissent from its dogmas, is nothing worth; but must ever ensure the ridicule and abhorrence of those, who judge the tree by its fruits, and who will not be easily persuaded that the eternal fountain of love and purity inhabits the breast, which 'breathes out cruelty and slaughter.' If persecution for conscience' sake, is contrary to the principles of justice and the genius of Christianity; then, I say, this holy and infallible Church was so abandoned of God, as to be permitted to legitimate the foulest crimes—to substitute murders for sacrifice, and to betray a total ignorance of the precepts and spirit of the religion which she professed to support; and whether the Holy Ghost condescended, at the same moment, to illuminate one hemisphere of minds so hardened, and hearts so darkened, may be safely left to the judgment of common sense."—*Hall's Works*, vol. iv. p. 249.

flatus from above, as may entitle you to a credit which your honesty and integrity would never warrant, remains now to be inquired.

LETTER III.

Examination of the argument from the necessity of the case in favor of some infallible tribunal, shown to be presumptuous and weak.

IN resuming now the analysis of your argument, it may be well to repeat that the ultimate conclusion which you propose to reach is, the *infallibility of Rome* as a witness for the truth. This point you endeavor to establish by showing, in the first place, that there *must be some* "body of individuals to whom, in their collective capacity," God has graciously vouchsafed the precious prerogative which you claim for your pastors. According to you the whole question of the truth of Christianity turns upon the existence of an infallible tribunal on earth, from which men may receive unerring decisions in matters of faith, and without which the overwhelming majority of the race must be abandoned to hopeless and complete infidelity.* If there were, indeed, no escape from the dilemma to which you have attempted to reduce us, the means of salvation would be hardly less fatal than the dangers from which they are appointed to rescue us. But it may yet be found, sir, that a merciful God has dealt more gently with his children than to commit their fate to the teachings of a body "whose garments are dyed in blood," whose

* "Does there exist a body of men clothed with this authority, guaranteed by such a divine promise from error? Has it made a declaration setting forth, in pursuance of that authority, what works are truly inspired? You, reverend sir, are forced to the alternative of either answering both questions in the affirmative, or of saying that the overwhelming majority of Christians are solemnly bound to reject the Scriptures; and if they have admitted them, it was in violation of the will of God, and of their solemn duty. From this dilemma, there is no escape."—*Letter I.*

"Unaided reason almost assures me, this is the course the Saviour would adopt."—*Letter I.*

whole career on earth, like the progress of Joel's locusts, has been marked by ruin, and which, if its future blessings are to be collected from its past achievements, can give us nothing but wormwood and gall, a stone for bread and a serpent for a fish. The friends of liberty and man, if reduced to the deplorable alternative of reaching the sacred Scriptures only on condition of submitting to a bondage more grievous than that from which the groaning Israelites were delivered by a strong hand and an outstretched arm, would, in all probability, prefer the frozen air of infidelity, to the deadly miasma of Rome. But, sir, I am persuaded that no such dilemma, so fatal in either horn, exists in reality; and that there is a plan by which we may be rescued at once from the gloomy horrors of skepticism, and the despotic cruelty of Rome. To you, sir, it is utterly inconceivable that the infinite God, whose judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out, should have been able to devise, in the exhaustless resources of his wisdom, *any* plan of authenticating the record of his own will, but that which you have prescribed. You undertake to prove that there *must* be a body of individuals authorized to make an unerring decision upon the doctrines of religion as well as the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures, from the *absolute impossibility* that any other scheme could be efficient or successful.* What is this but to *limit* the Holy One of Israel? You would do well to remember that the purposes of God are not adjusted by the measures of human prudence or of human sagacity. As the heavens are high above the earth, so His thoughts are high above our thoughts, and his ways above our ways. In his hands broken pitchers and empty lamps are capable of achieving as signal execution, as armed legions or chariots of fire. To judge, therefore, of the schemes of the Eternal, by our own conceptions of expediency or fitness—to

* "The fourth method alone is, therefore, both practicable in the ordinary condition of the Christian world, and efficient. * * * * After thus establishing the *absolute necessity* of admitting that authority which you impugn, and showing the frightful consequences of a contrary course—consequences from which, I am certain, you will shrink—I might rest satisfied that I have fully answered your essay, and proved, by clear and cogent arguments, the inspiration of those works against which it is directed."—*Letter I.*

bring the plans of Him who is wonderful in counsel, and whose government is vast beyond the possibility of mortal conception, to the fluctuating standard of the wisdom of this world, is to be guilty of presumption, equalled by nothing but the transcendent folly of the effort. A sound philosophy as well as a proper reverence for God would surely dictate that His appointments must always be efficacious and successful, simply because they *are* His appointments. We are not at liberty upon matters of this sort to indulge in vain speculations *a priori*, and pronounce of any measures, that they *cannot* be adopted, because they seem ill-suited to their ends. It is true wisdom to believe that He who originally established the connection of means and ends, can accomplish His purposes by the feeblest agents, the most unpromising arrangements, or by no subsidiary instruments at all. Plausible objections avail nothing against divine institutions. Whatever does not contradict the essential perfections of the Deity, nor involve a departure from that eternal law of right which finds its standard in the nature of God, is embraced in that boundless range of possibilities which infinite power can accomplish by a single act of the will. Any argument, therefore, which bases its conclusion upon the gratuitous assumption that the wisdom of God and the conceptions of man shall be found to harmonize, is built upon the sand. To you, sir, the theory of private judgment may be encumbered with difficulties so insurmountably great as to transcend your ideas of the power of God: you can perceive no wisdom in a plan on which priests are not tyrants, and the people are not slaves. But your objections are hardly less formidable than those of Jews and Greeks to the early preaching of the cross. Still, sir, Christ crucified was the *power* of God and the *wisdom* of God. In your attempt to fathom the counsels of Jehovah by arbitrary speculation, and to settle with certainty the appointments of his grace, may we not detect the degrading effects of a superstition which tolerates those who acknowledge a God in a feeble mortal, and finds objects of worship in departed men? Certain it is that your reasoning involves the tremendous conclusion that the great, the everlasting Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, is altogether such an one as we ourselves. Do you not tell us, in effect, that

God *could not* have given satisfactory evidence of the truth and inspiration of his own word, without establishing a *visible* tribunal protected from error by his special grace? And that he is thus limited in his resources, thus necessarily tied up to the *one only plan* which the pastors of Rome have found so prodigiously profitable to them, according to your reasoning, must be received as an *infallible truth*, just as *absolutely certain* as an axiom in geometry. The argument by which you reach this stupendous conclusion, has been wonderfully labored; but when weighed in the balances of logical propriety, it is found as wonderfully wanting; and it becomes a matter of astonishment how any human being who “bore a brain” could ever have been so egregiously duped as to have mistaken such a tirade of folly for legitimate reasoning. I shall now proceed, in all candor and fidelity, to expose the “nakedness of the land.”

With a self-sufficiency of understanding which never betrayed itself in such illustrious men as Bacon, Newton, Locke, or Boyle, you undertake to enumerate all the possible expedients by which God could ascertain his creatures of the inspiration of his word. These you reduce to *four*,* and as the first three, according to you, are neither “practical nor efficient,” the fourth

* “Now, reverend sir, there may be many ways of seeking to ascertain the fact of the inspiration of any writer or writers. They may, however, be all reduced to the *four* following methods:

“1. Is every man, no matter what be his condition, to investigate by his own labor and research, and duly examine the arguments that have been or can be alleged for and against the several books, which, it is asserted, are inspired; and, on the strength of that examination, to decide for himself with absolute certainty, what books are and what are not inspired?

“2. Is every individual to receive books as inspired, or to reject them as uninspired, according to the decisions of persons he esteems duly qualified by erudition and sound judgment, to determine that question accurately?

“3. Must he learn the inspiration of the Scriptures from some individual, whom God commissioned to announce this fact to the world?

“4. Must he learn it from a body of individuals, to whom, in their collective capacity, God has given authority to make an unerring decision on the subject? * * * * *

“To some one of these four methods *every* plan of proving the inspiration of the Scriptures can be reduced.”—*Letter I.*

remains as a necessary truth. In the species of argument * which you have thought proper to adopt, the validity of the reasoning depends on two circumstances: 1st. All the possible suppositions which can be conceived to be true must be actually made; and 2d, Every one must be legitimately shown to be false, but the one which is embraced in the conclusion. If all the others have been refuted, *that must* be true, provided, from the nature of the subject, some one must necessarily be admitted. In the present case it is freely conceded that there *is* some way of settling the canon of Scripture, and hence your argument proceeds upon a legitimate assumption.†

✓ 1. Now, sir, the first question which arises upon a critical review of your argument is: Do your *four* schemes completely *exhaust* the subject? Are these the *only conceivable plans* by which the inspiration of the Scriptures could be satisfactorily established? If not—if there indeed be other methods which you have not noticed—other schemes which you have suppressed or overlooked—some *one* of these may be the truth, and *your* infallible conclusion consequently false. In Paley's celebrated argument for the benevolence of God, if he had simply stated that the Deity must either intend our happiness or misery, and had omitted entirely all notice of the third supposition, that he might be indifferent to both—the conclusion, however true in itself, would

* The argument of "A. P. P." is a destructive disjunctive conditional. It may most conveniently be expressed in two consecutive syllogisms.

A man must either judge for himself concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures, or rely on the authority of others. He cannot judge for himself, therefore, he must rely on the authority of others. This is the first step.

If he must rely on authority, it must either be the authority of uninspired individuals, of a single inspired individual, or an inspired body of individuals. It cannot be the first two; therefore, it must be the last. Now, according to the books, this species of syllogism must contain in the *major* all the suppositions which can be conceived to be true, then the *minor* must remove or destroy *all but one*. That one, from the necessity of the case, becomes established in the conclusion. The argument in question, violates *both* rules, and therefore, upon every view of the subject, must be a *fallacy*.

† "We cannot be called on to believe any proposition not sustained by adequate proof. When Almighty God deigned to inspire the words contained in the Holy Scriptures, he intended they should be held and believed to be inspired. Therefore, there *does* exist some adequate proof of their inspiration."—*Letter I.*

not have been logically just. Without pretending that I am capable of specifying all the methods by which God might authenticate his own revelation, I can at least conceive of *one*, in addition to those enumerated by you, which *might* have been adopted, which may therefore possibly be true, and which, until you have shown it to be *false*, must hold your triumphant conclusion in abeyance. It is *possible* that God himself, by his Eternal Spirit, may condescend to be the teacher of men, and enlighten their understandings to perceive in the Scriptures themselves infallible marks of their divine original. That you should so entirely have overlooked this hypothesis—which *must* be overthrown before your argument can stand—is a little singular, since it is distinctly stated in the very chapter of the Westminster Confession to which you have alluded.*

√ “The heavens,” we are told, “declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen; being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.” If the material workmanship of God bears such clear and decisive traces of its divine and eternal Author, as to leave the atheist and idolater without excuse, who shall say that the *Word* which he has exalted above every other manifestation of his name, may not proclaim with greater power and a deeper emphasis, that it is indeed the law of his mouth? Who shall say that the composition of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, may not be distinguished by a majesty, grandeur, and supernatural elevation, which are suited to impress the reader with an irresistible conviction, that these venerable documents are the true and faithful sayings of God? Is there any absurdity in asserting with a distinguished writer, that “the words of God, now legible in the Scriptures, are as much beyond the words of men, as the mighty works which Christ did, were above their works, and his prophecies beyond their knowledge?” Jehovah has left the outward universe to speak for itself. Sun, moon and

* “Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, (Holy Scriptures,) is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.”—*Westminster Conf.* chap. i. 55.

stars, in their appointed orbits, proclaim an eternal Creator, and require no body of men, "of individuals in their collective capacity," to interpret their voice, or to teach the world that "the hand which made them is divine." Why may not the Scriptures, brighter and more glorious than the sun, be left in the same way, as they run their appointed course, to testify to all that their source "was the bosom of God, and their voice the harmony of the world?" Is not the character of God as clearly portrayed in them, as in the mute memorials of his power which exist around us and above us? Why should an infallible body be required to make known the Divine original of the Bible, when it is not necessary to establish the creation of the heavens and the earth? It is then a possible supposition, that the word of God may be its own witness; that the sacred pages may themselves contain infallible evidence of their heavenly origin, which shall leave those without excuse, who reject or disregard them. They *may* contain the decisive proofs of their own inspiration, and by their own light, make good their pretensions to *canonical* authority.

¶ The fact that multitudes who hold the Bible in their hand, do not perceive these infallible tokens of its supernatural origin, is no objection, upon your own principles, to the existence of such irrefragable evidence. The *reality* of the evidence is one thing—the power of perceiving it is quite another. It is no objection to the brilliancy of the sun, that it fails to illuminate the blind. Such is the deplorable darkness of the human understanding, in regard to the things that pertain to God, and such the fearful alienation of men from the perfection of his character, that though the light shines conspicuously among them, they are yet unable to comprehend its rays. Hence to the production of *faith*, in order that the evidence, the infallible evidence which actually exists, may accomplish its appropriate effects, the "Eternal Spirit, who sends forth his cherubim and seraphim to touch the lips of whom he pleases," must be graciously vouchsafed to illuminate the darkened mind, and remove the impediments of spiritual *vision*. The infallible evidence is in the Scriptures; the power of perceiving it is the gift of God. Your own writers, sir, acknowledge, and *you* among the number, that the *infallible* evidence which your Church professes to present, *cannot* produce faith without God's

grace; so that evidence may be *infallible* and yet not *effectual*, through the folly and perverseness of men. Bellarmin declares that “the arguments which render the articles of our faith credible, are not such as to produce an undoubted faith, unless the mind be divinely assisted.* And you have told us that the teaching of your pastors meets with a firmer and readier assent among minds that have been touched by the Spirit of God.† Now sir, if *your infallible* evidence can yet be *ineffectual*, through the blindness and wickedness of men, you cannot say that the *Scriptures* are not infallible witnesses of their own authority, because all who possess them do not receive their testimony. In either case the illumination of God’s Spirit is the means by which faith is really produced. According to you, it inclines the understanding to receive the teaching of the pastors of your Church—according to the doctrine of the Westminster divines, it enlightens the mind to perceive the impressions of Jehovah’s character and Jehovah’s hand, in the sacred oracles themselves.

There is, then, evidently, a fifth supposition by which an humble inquirer after truth may be assured of the divine inspiration and canonical authority of the Holy Scriptures. God, himself, may be his teacher, and the illumination of his Spirit may be the means by which, from infallible evidence contained in the books themselves, their divine inspiration may be certainly collected. Whether true or false, right or wrong, this has been the doctrine of the Church of God from the beginning.‡

* “Argumenta quæ articulos fidei nostræ credibiles faciunt non talia sunt ut fidem omnino indubitatum reddant, nisi mens divinitus adjuvetur.”—*De Grat. et Lib. Arb.* lib. vi. cap. 3.

† “We should ever bear in mind, too, that if this be the method adopted by Almighty God; if in reality, as the hypothesis requires, he speaks to that individual through this teacher, *His divine grace* will influence the mind of the novice to yield a more ready and firm assent, than the tendency of our nature, and the unaided motives of human authority would produce.”—*Letter I.*

‡ As a specimen of what have been the sentiments of distinguished writers, I give a few extracts, selected from the midst of many others equally striking, which may be found arranged in Owen’s admirable Discourse on the Reason of Faith.—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 359, seq. The following passage from Clemens Alexandrinus is remarkable, as asserting at once the sufficiency of Scripture and the right of private judgment in opposition to all human authority.

And before you can hope to overthrow it, you must be prepared to prove, what, I think, you will find an irksome undertaking, that the Scriptures *do not* bear any signs or marks characteristic of their author, and that God's grace *will not be* vouchsafed to

Ον γαρ απλως αποφαινομενοι ανθρωποις προσεχοιμεν οις και ανταποφαινεθαι επ' ισης εξεστιν. Ει δ' ουκ αρχει μονον απλως ειπειν το δοξαν, αλλα πιστωσασθαι δει το λεχθεν' ου την εξ ανθρωπων αναμενομεν μαρτυριαν, αλλα τη του Κυριου φωνη πιστουμεθα, το ζητουμενον. 'Η πασων αποδειξεων εχεγγυοτερα μαλλον δε η' μονε αποδειξις ουσα τυγχανει. Ουτως ουν και ημεις απ' αυτων περι αυτων των γραφων τελειως αποδεικνυντες εκ πιστεως πιθομεθα αποδεικτικως.—*Strom.* lib. vii. cap. 16. “For we would not attend or give credit simply to the definitions of men, seeing we have a right also to define in contradiction unto them. And as it is not sufficient merely to say or assert what appears to be the truth, but also to beget a belief of what is spoken, we expect not the testimony of men but confirm that which is inquired about with the voice of the Lord, which is more full and firm than any demonstration; yea, which rather is the only demonstration. Thus, we, taking our demonstration of the Scripture out of the Scripture, are assured by *faith* as by demonstration.”

Basil on Psalm 115, says:—Πιστις, ουχ' η γεομετρικαις αναγκαις, αλλ' ηταις του πνευματος ενεργειαις εκγινομενη. “Faith is not the effect of geometrical demonstrations, but of the efficacy of the Spirit.”

Nemes. de Hom. cap. 2.—Η των θειων λογιων διδασκαλια τα πιστον αφ' εαυτης εχουσα δια το θεοπνευστον ειναι. “The teaching of the divine oracles has its credibility from *itself*, because of their divine inspiration.”

The words of St. Austin (*Conf.* lib. ii. cap. 3) are too well known to require to be cited.

The second Council of Orange, in the beginning of the sixth century, in its 5th and 7th canons is explicit to my purpose. *Fleury*, b. xxxii. 12.—Si quis sicut augmentum ita etiam initium fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affectum, non per gratiae donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus Sancti, corrigentem voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, sed naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, apostolicis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur. Si quis per naturæ vigorem bonum aliquod quod ad salutem pertinet vitæ æternæ cogitare ut expedit aut eligere, sive salutari, id est, evangelicæ prædicationi consentire posse affirmat absque illuminatione et inspiratione Spiritus Sancti, qui dat omnibus suavitatem consentiendo et credendo veritati, hæretico fallitur spiritu. “If any one say that the beginning or increase of faith and the very affection of belief is in us, not by the gift of grace, that is, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit correcting our will from infidelity to faith, from impiety to piety, but by nature, he is an enemy to the doctrine of the Apostles. If any man affirm that he can by the vigor of nature think any thing good which pertains to salvation as he ought, or choose, or consent to saving, that is, to evangelical preaching without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who gives to all the

the humble inquirer to enable him to perceive, according to the prayer of the Psalmist, "wondrous things out of his law."—Unless you can disprove this fifth hypothesis, and show it to be what you have asserted of three that you have named, neither "practicable nor efficient," your triumphant argument vanishes into air; it violates the very first law of that species of complex

sweet relish in consenting to and believing the truth, he is deceived by an heretical spirit."

Arnobius *advers. Gentes*, lib. 3, c. 1, says: "Neque enim stare sine assertoribus non potest religio Christiana? Aut eo esse comprobatur vera, si adstipulatores habuerit plurimos, et auctoritatem ab hominibus sumpserit? Suis illa contenta est viribus et veritatis propriæ fundaminibus nititur nec spoliatur sua vi, etiam si nullum habeat vindicem, immo si lingue omnes contra faciant contraque nitantur et ad fidem illius abrogandam consensionis unitæ animositate conspirent." "Shall it be said that the Christian religion cannot maintain itself, without the aid of men to vindicate its truth? Or shall its truth be said to depend on the warranty and authority of man? No, Christianity is sufficient for itself, in its own inherent strength, and stands firm upon the basis of its own inherent truth; it could lose none of its power, though it had not a single advocate. Nay, it would maintain its ground, though all the tongues of men were to contradict and resist it, and to combine with rage and fury to effect its destruction."

The great Athanasius (*Orat. Cont. Gent.* c. 1) says:

Αυταρκεις εισιν αι αγιαι και θεοπνευστοι γραφαι προς την της αληθειας απαγγελιαν.
 "The Christian faith carries within itself the discovery of its own authority, and the Holy Scriptures which God has inspired are all-sufficient in themselves, for the evidence of their own truth." There is a beautiful passage to the same purport in Baptista Mantuanus de Patient. lib. 3, cap. 2. It concludes as follows: "Cur ergo non omnes credunt evangelio? Quod non omnes trahuntur a Deo. Sed longa opus est disputatione? Firmiter sacris Scripturis ideo credimus quod divinam inspirationem intus accepimus." "Why, then, do not all believe the Gospel? Because all are not drawn of God. But what need of any long disputation? We therefore firmly believe the Scripture because we have received a Divine inspiration." Those who wish to find a large collection of Patristic passages bearing on this point, will meet with ample satisfaction in chap. ix. of Good's Rule of Faith. The whole subject is ably discussed in Calvin's Institutes, Owen on the Reason of Faith and his kindred treatise, and Halyburton's inimitable essay on the Nature of Faith. Some valuable hints may also be found in Lancaster's Bampton Lectures, Jackson on the Creed, and Chalmers' Evidences. I cannot forbear, however, to advert to the two beautiful illustrations of the power of the Scriptures to authenticate themselves, which Justin Martyr and Francis Junius have given us in their accounts of their own conversion.

syllogism to which it may be easily reduced. You have beaten your drum, and flourished your trumpets, and shouted victory, when you had not been even in reach of the enemy's camp. If a man, sir, reasoning upon the seasons of the year, should undertake to prove that it *must be winter*, because it was neither spring nor autumn, his argument would be precisely like yours for an infallible tribunal of faith. His hearers might well ask why it might not be *summer*, and your readers may well ask why this *fifth* supposition, which you have so strangely suppressed when it must have been under your eyes, may not be, after all your elaborate discussion, the *true* method of God. In this ancient doctrine of the Church of God, there may be an escape from your *fatal* dilemma, and men may find a sure and infallible passage to heaven without making a journey to Rome to be guided in the way. Upon your principles of reasoning, dilemmas are easily made, but very fortunately they are just as easily avoided. Their horns, weak and powerless as a papal bull, cannot gore the stubborn and refractory. He who should infer that a sick man must be scorching with fever because he is not aching in all his bones with a shivering ague, would in this pitiful foolery present a forcible example of the sort of sophism in which you have boasted as triumphant argument.

2. Your reasoning is not only radically defective in consequence of an imperfect enumeration of particulars, but fatally unsuccessful in establishing the *impossibility* of those which you have actually undertaken to refute. The minor premiss is as lame as the major, and your argument, at best, can yield us nothing but a "lame and impotent conclusion." Your *fourth* method derives its claims to our confidence and regard from the pretended fact, that all other schemes are neither "practicable nor efficient." Unless, therefore, this can be made clearly to appear, your reasoning must fall to the ground. Have you *proved* it? So far from it, that the objections which you have adduced against your first three methods, apply just as powerfully to the fourth; and prove, if they prove any thing, that neither one of the methods specified by you, can possibly be the truth. The arguments, for instance, which you have employed to overthrow the Protestant theory of private judgment, as im-

plying the responsibility of men for their opinions, and a consequent exemption from all human authority, may be employed, with equal success, to demolish the pretensions of an infallible tribunal, or to show that such a body can neither be "practicable nor efficient."

Why then is private judgment inadmissible? Why is it that each man is not at liberty to examine for himself, and form his own opinions upon those solemn subjects in which his own individual happiness is so deeply concerned? Because,* according

* "The arguments in this course," (that is, in determining for one's self,) "would be of two classes, external and internal; either or both of which would form matter for investigation. He might seek, as you have endeavored to do, whether there exists a sufficient mass of testimony to establish the fact or facts, that God did, at certain times and on certain occasions, exercise over particular writers, the supernatural influence of inspiration; or from a consideration of the perfection of the Scriptures, he might conclude that they were above the power of unaided men, and therefore must be of divine origin. To perform the first properly, he must be deeply versed in the Latin, the Greek and the Hebrew, perhaps, too, in several modern languages; must have at his command a more extensive library than, I believe, Charleston can boast of; must spend, consequently, many long years of study in acquiring those languages, and obtaining and searching out the thousand and one testimonies scattered through a hundred musty tomes, and in acquiring that thorough knowledge of times, of men, of writings, which will enable him to judge of the credibility of those witnesses; must, finally, possess an unrivalled, almost supernatural accuracy of judgment to reconcile this mass of conflicting statements, and, distinguishing which are worthy and which unworthy of credit, to conclude confidently and evidently, in favor of, or against the inspiration of the books examined. The second requires a thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures in the original Hebrew, Greek and Chaldean, and in the ancient versions in Samaritan, Copht, Arabic, Syriac, Greek and Latin, and with the ancient manuscripts; and the ability to apply to all this the subtle rules of refined criticism, in order to determine, in the first place, as far as can be ascertained, the exact language and meaning of the sacred writers; a thorough knowledge of the abilities and acquirements of each writer, and the state of science and already revealed religion in his country and age, in order to see to what extent of perfection his own powers with such aids could naturally carry him; the faculty also, of duly appreciating the beauties of the sacred writings, and that knowledge of Chemistry, of Natural History, of Geology, of the History of Nations, and of almost every science, which may enable him fully and satisfactorily to refute all the objections brought from these different sources against the intrinsic truth, and consequently, internal evidence of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Need

to you, unless a man could speak with the tongues of men and angels, unless he comprehended all mysteries and all knowledge, unless, in other words, his mind was a living encyclopædia of science, he must be *incapable* of estimating properly the historical and internal evidences of the divine original of the Scriptures. Like the Jewish Cabalists, you have rendered the judgments of the people utterly worthless to them in that matter, which, of all others, is most important to their happiness. Maimonides* goes a little beyond you. He not only makes Logic, Mathematics and Natural Philosophy indispensable to our *progress* in divine knowledge, but absolutely necessary in order to settle the *foundation* of religion in the being and attributes of God; and according to him, those who are unfurnished with these scientific accomplishments, must either settle down into dreary atheism, or make up their deficiencies by submitting implicitly to cabalistical instruction! You, I presume, would grant that a man could be assured of the existence of the Deity, without an intimate acquaintance with Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and divers modern tongues, or without being master of Mathematics, Chemistry, Geology, Natural History and Physics. These things, on your scheme, are only necessary to settle the *inspiration* of the Scriptures.

✓ Let us grant, for a moment, that all this immense apparatus of learning is necessary to settle a plain, simple, historical fact; what becomes of the skill and competency of your *infallible body*? If *it* is to decide according to the evidence, and all these boundless attainments are absolutely requisite in order to a just appreciation of the evidence, every individual member of your unerring corps must be deeply versed in all human lore, as well as blessed with an "almost supernatural accuracy of judgment," before the body can be qualified, according to your statements, to make an infallible decision. Suppose, sir, Europe and America were ransacked, how *many* individuals could be found, each of whom should possess the varied and extensive attainments which you make indispensable in settling a plain question of fact

I say, it is all important that he should be able to possess and peruse the books, on whose inspiration he is thus to decide?"—*Letter I*

* More Neboch, pars i. c. 34.

connected with the events of an earlier age? How many of the pastors of the Church of Rome would be entitled to a seat in a general council composed only of those who could abide your test of competency to decide on matters of faith? Certain it is, sir, that there was not a single individual in the whole Council of Trent, who possessed even a *tithe* of the learning without which, in your view, an accurate decision is hopeless. As we have already seen, those holy Fathers seemed to be fully persuaded that

“Hebrew roots were only found
To flourish best in barren ground.”

Their skill in Samaritan, Coptic, Arabic, and Syriac *versions*, may be readily conjectured from their profound acquaintance with the original text. If they were deeply versed in the mysteries of Chemistry and Geology, they must have been endowed with an extraordinary prolepsis which has no parallel in the recorded history of man. How, then, could these venerable men decide with “*absolute certainty*,” when all the evidence in the case was high above, out of their reach? You tell us, sir, that they made their decision “after *patient examination*, and a *thorough investigation of all the evidence* they could find on the subject.” But yet, upon your own showing, the historical and internal proofs of inspiration were inaccessible not only to the prelates themselves, but to the whole rabble of divines who assisted them in their deliberations. How does it happen, then, that their decision is entitled to be received with absolute certainty? But perhaps you will say that the Fathers possessed some other evidence—that they themselves were *supernaturally* inspired, or irresistibly guided by God’s grace to make an unerring decision? To say nothing of the fact that your argument, in order to be conclusive, requires you to show that the same supernatural assistance *cannot* be vouchsafed to individuals as well as to a body, I would simply ask *how* could the Fathers *know* that they were inspired? You have made all human *knowledge* a necessary means of judging of *inspiration*. A man must be able “to *refute* all the objections brought from these different sources against the *intrinsic truth*, and, consequently,

internal evidence of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures.' If, then, a man cannot be satisfied of the inspiration of the Scriptures, until he is able to perceive the *intrinsic truth* of their teachings, that is, until he can show that scientific objections are really groundless, how can he be satisfied of *his own* inspiration, until he can, in like manner, determine that the propositions suggested to him are not contradictory to any truth received or taught in the wide circle of human science? And how, I beseech you, can the *people* be assured that any body of men has been supernaturally guided, until *they* are able to refute all the objections from all the departments of human knowledge to the decrees of the body? Will you say that inspiration, *once settled*, answers all objections? Very true. But how is the inspiration to be settled? You say that *an individual* cannot judge of inspiration until he is able to refute all objections and to defend the truths that profess to be inspired. No more, I apprehend, can a *body* of individuals. But a body of individuals may be inspired to judge of the inspiration of others. But how are they to determine their own inspiration? They must still be able to refute all possible objections, and perceive the intrinsic truth of what they are taught, themselves, or their own inspiration is uncertain, and the people need it just as much to judge of the inspiration of a council as of the inspiration of the Scriptures. So that your circle of science becomes necessary sooner or later for a body of men, if it be necessary for a private individual.

You perceive, then, that your argument against the rights of the people may be turned with a desolating edge against yourself. Like an unnatural mother, it devours its own conclusion. If, sir, the infallibility of a body depends upon the illumination of God's Spirit, it will be hard to show why God can supernaturally enlighten every man in a special assembly, and yet be unable to enlighten private individuals in their separate capacity. How the mere fact of human congregation, under any circumstances, can confer additional power upon God's Holy Spirit, you have nowhere explained, and I think that you will hardly undertake the task.

Upon your own showing, then, your triumphant argument is a

beggarly sophism. Your objections to private judgment prove too much, and therefore prove *nothing*. Whatever is simply necessary to establish *inspiration*, applies as much to the inspiration of Trent, as to the inspiration of David, Isaiah, and Paul. As I am now exclusively engaged in the examination of your argument, I shall not turn aside from my purpose to indicate the manner in which a plain, unlettered man can become morally certain, from the historical and collateral evidences of inspiration, that the authors of the Bible wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Your long, involved, and intricate account of the learning and attainments required for this end, could easily be shown, and has been triumphantly shown, to be a mere phantom of the brain. You are fond, sir, of raising imaginary difficulties in the way of the humble inquirer after truth, in order that you may find a ready market for the wares of Rome. But in this instance, sir, your own feet have been caught in the pit which your hands have dug. When you condescend to inform me how the Fathers of Trent could decide with infallible certainty upon the inspiration of the Scriptures, without the learning which is necessary, in your view, to understand the evidence, if they themselves were uninspired—or how, if inspired, they could, without this learning, either be certain themselves of the fact or establish it with infallible certainty to the mass of the people, who, without your learning, must judge of the inspiration of the holy Council—when consistently with your principles you resolve these difficulties, one of the objections to your argument will cease. Until then it must continue to be a striking example of that sort of paralogism by which the same premises *prove* and *disprove* at the same time.

3. But, sir, the chapter of your misfortunes is not yet closed. Your favorite, triumphant, oft-repeated argument not only labors under the two serious and fatal defects which have already been illustrated, but, what is just as bad, even upon the supposition that it is logically sound, it fails to answer your purpose. It does not yield you, what your cause requires, an *infallible* conclusion. At its best estate, it is a broken reed, which can only pierce the bosom of him that leans on it. You infer that a certain plan must be the *true* one, because all others are

false. It is evident that it must be absolutely certain, that the others are false, before it can be absolutely certain that the one insisted on is true. The degree of certainty which attaches to any hypothesis drawn from the destruction of all other suppositions, is just the degree of certainty with which the others have been removed. The measure of *their falsehood* is the measure of *its truth*. If there be any probability in them, that probability amounts to a positive argument against the conclusion erected on their ruins.

Now, sir, upon the gratuitous assumption that your argument is legitimate and regular, your conclusion *cannot* be infallible, unless it is absolutely certain that the three methods of determining the inspiration of the Scriptures which you have pronounced to be neither "practicable nor efficient," are grossly and palpably *absurd*. They must be *unquestionably false*, or your conclusion cannot be *unquestionably true*. If there be the least degree of probability in favor of any one of these schemes, that probability, however slight, is fatal to the *infallible certainty* required by your cause. Your conclusion, in such a case, can only result from a comparison of opposing probabilities; it can only have a *preponderance* of evidence, and, therefore, can only be *probable* at best.

I venture to assert upon the approved principles of papal casuistry, that two, most certainly, of your condemned suppositions are just as likely to be true, or can, at least, be as harmlessly adopted as that which you have taken into favor. We are told by your doctors, that a *probable* opinion may be safely followed, and their standard of probability is the approbation of a doctor or the example of the good—"Sufficit opinio alicujus gravis doctoris, aut bonorum exemplum."

Try your *third* supposition by this standard, and does it not become exceedingly probable? Why have you passed it over with so vague, superficial, and unsatisfactory a notice? Were you afraid that there was death in the pot? You, surely, sir, cannot be ignorant that scores of your leading divines have boldly maintained the infallibility of the Pope—a *single individual*, whom they have regarded as divinely commissioned to instruct the faithful. The Council of Florence decided that the Pope

was primate of the Universal Church; that he is the true Lieutenant of Christ—the father and *teacher* of all Christians; and that unto him *full* power is committed to feed, direct, and govern the Catholic Church under Christ. He, then, it would seem, is the very individual to whom that Council would refer us for satisfactory information concerning the canon of Scripture and every other point of faith. The prelates of the Lateran Council under Leo X. offered the most fulsome and disgusting flatteries to that skeptical Pontiff, calling him King of Kings, and Monarch of the earth, and ascribing to him all power, above all powers of heaven and earth. The Legates of Trent would not permit the question of the Pope's authority to be discussed; because the Pontiff himself, while he was yet ignorant of the temper of the Fathers, was secretly afraid that they might follow the examples of Constance and Basil. Pighius, Gretser, Bellarmin, and Gregory of Valentia, have ascribed infallibility to the head of your Church, in the most explicit and unmeasured terms.*

* Gregory of Valentia, carried the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope so far, as to maintain that his decisions were unerring, whether made with care and attention or not. His words are:

“Sive Pontifex, in definiendo studium adhibeat, sive non adhibeat; modo tamen controversiam definiat, infallibiliter certe definit, atque adeo re ipsa utitur autoritate sibi a Christo concessa.”—*Analy's Fid. Q.* 6. “Whether the Pontiff apply care and attention or not in his determinations, yet, provided he is determining controversy, his decisions are certainly infallible, and so in reality he uses the authority granted him by Christ.”

Augustinus Triumphus observes: “Novum symbolum condere solum ad Papam spectat, quia est caput fidei Christianæ, cujus auctoritate omnia quæ ad fidem spectant firmantur et roborantur.”—*Q.* 59, *Art.* 1. “To compose a new creed pertains to the Pope alone, because he is the head of the Christian faith, by whose authority all things pertaining to faith are confirmed.”

This same writer, treating of ecclesiastical power, observes again: “Error est non credere Pontificem Romanum universalis ecclesiæ pastorem, Petri successorem, et Christi Vicarium, supra temporalia et spiritualia universalem non habere primatum, in quem, quandoque multi labuntur, dictæ potestatis ignorantia, quæ cum sit infinita eo quod magnus est dominus et magna virtus ejus et magnitudinis ejus non est finis, omnis creatus intellectus in ejus persecutione invenitur deficere.” “It is an error not to believe that the Roman Pontiff, the pastor of the Church universal, the successor of Peter and vicar of Christ, has not a universal primacy over things temporal and spiritual; into which error many are apt to fall through ignorance of said power, which is infinite, because great

It is generally understood, too, that this doctrine is maintained by the whole body of the Jesuits. To my mind, wicked and blasphemous as it is, this is a less exceptionable doctrine than that which you have defended. A single individual can be more easily reached, more prompt in his decisions, and is always ready to answer the calls of the faithful. To collect a council is a slow and tedious process, and the infallibility slumbers while the Council is dissolved.

The infallibility of a *single* individual, which is your third hypothesis, is *probable* upon the well known principles of your most distinguished casuists. You ought to have shown, therefore, that this opinion is *palpably absurd*. Write a book upon this subject and send it to Rome, and it may possibly lead to your promotion in the Church. However, let Gregory XVI. be first gathered to his fathers, as he might not brook so flat a contradiction to his own published opinions.* I am inclined to think that,

is the Lord and great is his might, and of his greatness there is no bound ; therefore every created understanding must fail in the searching of him."—*Præf. P. John 22*. But the climax of absurdity and blasphemy is fairly reached in the following passage from Bellarmin, *De Pont*, 4, 1 : " Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutem, teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare." The plain meaning is, if the *Pope* should command men to violate *God's* laws, they are *bound* to do it. In other words, the Pope is *above* the Almighty.

Scores of passages to the like effect may be collected from the writings of the Popes themselves.

* I have before me the French translation of a book, written by the present Pontiff, when he was Cardinal Maur Coppellari, entitled the Triumph of the Holy See and of the Church, in which the dogma of the Pope's infallibility is fully and curiously discussed. His Holiness repudiates, with horror, the Gallican doctrine of the superiority of Councils, and stoutly maintains that the government of the Church is an absolute monarchy, of which the Pontiff is the infallible head. It is a little singular that A. P. F. should dismiss with contempt, as unworthy of discussion, the precise opinions which his master at Rome holds to be essential to the stability of the faith ; and whether the *real* doctrine of the Papacy is more likely to be gathered from an obscure priest or from the supreme Father of the faithful, I leave it to the reader to determine. As a specimen of the Pope's book, I give two extracts at random, as they may be found in the French version of Abbè Jammes :

" Le Pape, ainsi qu' il a été prouvé, est un vrai monarque ; donc il doit être pourvu des moyens necessaires à l' exercice de son autorité monarchique.

to the majority of papal minds, there is so much probability in this third opinion, that if your letter had been written by a Jesuit at Rome, it would in fact, have been made the *infallible conclu-*

Mais le moyen le plus necessaires à cette fin sera celui qui ôtera tout prétexte à ses sujets de refuser de se soumettre à ses decisions et à ses lois, et son *infaillibilité* seule peut avoir cette efficacité. Donc le Pape est *infaillible*."—*Prelim. Dis. Vol. 1. p. 174, § 82.*

" Quoique, après tous ce qui a été dit jusqu' à présent, il ne dût pas être nécessaire de rien ajouter d' avantage, je chercherai encore à les tirer de leurs erreurs pas des argumens plus pressans. Parmi toutes les sociétés, celle-la seule est infaillible, qui constituté la veritable Eglise ; c' est de foi : mais il n' y a pas de veritable Eglise sans Pierre ; nous l' avons démontré : donc l' infaillibilité appartiens exclusivement à la société qui est unie a Pierre et a ses successeurs. Or cette union avec Pierre ou avec le Pape ne serait pas une note suffisante pour distinguer entre plusieurs sociétés celle qui serait infaillible, si cette union ne contribuait en quelque maniere pas son concours à faire jouir cette société du privilège de l' infaillibilité ; donc cette doit réellement y contribuer et y concourir. Mais l' Eglise doit avoir, sans ses definitions, une infaillibilité perpetuelle et durable jusqu' a la fin des siecles ; donc la meme perpetuité, la meme duréé jusqu' a la fin des siecles doit être assurée au concours de cette union de l' Eglise avec le Pape, a laquelle est attachée l' infaillibilité de l' Eglise elle-meme. D' ou il s' ensuit que, dans le cas d' un point quelconque a definir, il sera aussi vrai de dire, avant meme qu' il ait lieu que ce concours positif et explicite ne manquera pas, qu' il est vrai de dire que l' Eglise est infaillible dans le decisions qu' elle portera, et qu' elle ne tombera pas dans l' erreur. Mais, s' il est certain que, toutes les fois qu' il s' agira de definir un point de foi, on pourra compter sur le concours de l' union de l' Eglise avec le Pape, il doit être également certain que Dieu ne permettra jamais que le Pape ne donne pas son assentiment à des vérités de foi, puisque, sans ses assentiment, il ne saurait y avoir de veritable definition de l' Eglise. Donc, si ce concours doit être continuel et perpetuel, Dieu devra continuellement et perpetuellement incliner le Pape à donner son assentiment aux verités de foi ; et il ne permettra jamais que la Pape, comme tel, s' éloigne de la vraie croyance. En effet, s' il y en était pas ainsi, et que Dieu put permettre que le Pape, en cette qualité abandonnat la verité, il pourrait arriver que par sa primanté dans l' Eglise, et par le droit qu' il a pour le maintien de l' unite, comme dit saint Thomas, de proposer le point de foi, il entraînat l' Eglise avec lui dans l' erreur. Donc Dieu a du accorder au Pape, comme tel, le privilège d' une infaillibilité independanté de l' Eglise, independanté de cette société, a l' infaillibilité de laquellé il contribue et concours par le moyen de l' union de celle-cé avec lui. Les novateurs ne peuvent rejeter cette consequence sans la necessité du concours du Pape ; et s' ils la nient, ils se rangent parmi les schismatiques et les protestans, que se font une Eglise separée du Pape."—*Vol. 1, chap. 2, pp 206-8.*

sion. Certain it is that you have not offered a single argument against it. You play off upon Esdras and the Jewish Sanhedrim, and sundry questions which "more veteran scholars than you" have found it hard to decide, and then conclude with inimitable self-complacency, that the "third method cannot be admitted." Sir, when you write again, let me beseech you to write in syllogisms. If you have *disproved* the infallibility of the Pope, I cannot find your premises; and yet, unless you have done it, your triumphant conclusion is a mere *petitio principii*. Your own Doctors will rise up against you if you undertake this task—you are self-condemned if you do not.

Then again, your first hypothesis—the theory of private judgment—must have some little probability in its favor, or such mighty minds as those of Newton, Bacon, Locke and Chillingworth, would not have adopted it with so much cordiality, nor would such multitudes of the race have sealed their regard for it at the stake, the gibbet, and the wheel. A principle, confessedly the keystone that supports the arch of religious liberty; which emancipates the human mind from ghostly tyranny, and calls upon the nations to behold their God; which lies at the foundation of the glorious fabric of American freedom, and distinguishes the constitutions of all our States, is not to be dismissed without examination as grossly false, or palpably absurd. The conditions which you have prescribed for its exercise, are not only arbitrary and capable of being turned to capital advantage against you, but as I shall show, when I come to the examination of your second argument, they have been virtually withdrawn by yourself. You have actually admitted, sir, all that the friends of private judgment deem to be important in the case. According to your own statement, the ignorant and unlearned may be assured, upon sufficient grounds, of the *genuineness* and *authenticity* of the books of the New Testament. This foundation being laid, inspiration will naturally follow. So that, notwithstanding all your objections, private judgment remains unaffected, in the *strength* and glory of its intrinsic probability.

How then, upon a just estimate of its merits, stands your boasted argument? Why, there are only *four suppositions* that can be made in the case. The first and third of these are so

extremely *probable* that millions of the human race have believed them to be true. Therefore the *fourth* must be *infallibly certain!* Weighed in the balances of logical propriety, the infallible certainty of your conclusion turns out to be like Berkely's "vanishing ghosts of departed quantities."

LETTER IV.

It is just as easy to prove the Inspiration of the Scriptures as the Infallibility of any Church.

WE owe it to the goodness of God that the most corrupt and dangerous principles are not unfrequently combined in the same person with a confusion of understanding which effectually destroys their capacity of mischief, and renders the triumph of truth more illustrious and complete. Error, in fact, is so multiform and various, so heterogeneous in its parts, and mutually repulsive in its elements, that it requires a mind of extraordinary power to construct a fabric of such discordant materials that has even the appearance of regularity and order. Truth, on the other hand, is simple and uniform. Her body, like that of the beautiful Osiris, is composed of homogeneous and well-adjusted parts; and as, in the progress of discovery, or the light of patient investigation, limb is added to limb, and member to member, the mind perceives in the harmony of the proportions, and the exquisite symmetry of the form, a mysterious charm which, like the magic of musical enchantment, chains its sympathies, and captivates its powers. The fascinations of falsehood are essentially distinguished from the "divine, enchanting ravishment" of truth, by their peculiar effects upon the health and vigor of the soul. Whatever pleasure they administer is like the profound slumber produced by powerful drugs or stupifying potions, in which the joys that are experienced are the unnatural results of a temporary delirium; or, as Milton expresses it, of that "sweet madness" in which the soul is robbed of its energies, and rendered impotent for future exertion; but "the sober certainty of waking bliss—a

sacred and homefelt delight"—a manly and solid satisfaction, which at once refreshes and invigorates the mind, belongs exclusively to the province of truth. Hence philosophy, which is only another name for the love of truth, was warmly commended among the ancient sages, as the health and medicine of the soul; the choicest gift of heaven, and the richest jewel of earth. Falsehood, however it may exhilarate, always *confounds*; and the stimulus, however powerful, which it may impart to the faculties of the mind, can produce nothing more substantial or real, than the vain phantoms of a sick man's dream. Hence defences of error are almost always inconsistent with themselves, and the advocate of truth has often no harder task than to place the different statements of the sophist or deceiver in immediate juxtaposition, and leave them, in their war of contradictions, to demolish the system which their master had laboriously toiled to erect. The most finished productions of superstition, infidelity, and atheism, when resolved into their constituent parts, are found to be wanting in that beautiful consistency which springs from the bosom of God, and which is written, as if by the finger of Heaven, upon every system of truth.

Without intending to degrade your understanding, you must permit me to call your attention to the fact, that the different portions of your own composition are "like two prevaricating witnesses, who flatly contradict each other, though neither of them speaks the truth." In your zeal to demolish the foundations of faith, you were permitted, in the righteous providence of God, to become involved in a maze of contradictions, which can have no other effect than to draw down upon you the pity and contempt of your readers. This confusion of ideas, is not perhaps to be attributed so much to native imbecility of mind, as to the nature of the cause which, with more zeal than prudence, you undertook to defend. Consistency cannot be expected from the advocates of a black and bloody superstition, which sprang from the father of lies, whose appropriate element is darkness, and whose legitimate effect upon the life, is to form a character homogeneous in nothing but implacable enmity to God. We are not to be astonished, therefore, to find that your elaborate defence of the infallibility of a body, which solemnly sanctioned

one of the most deliberate and atrocious frauds* that ever disgraced the annals of mankind, should be so ill-conceived and so awkwardly adjusted in its parts, as to resemble nothing more distinctly than the monstrous picture with which Horace opens his epistle to the Pisos. They who receive not the truth in the love of it, are smitten with such madness, blindness and astonishment of heart, as to grope at noonday, even as the blind gropeth in darkness, and to feel for the wall in the full blaze of the meridian sun. The blandishments of error, like the subtle allurements of Samson's wife, may rob the noblest genius of its strength, and leave it in the midst of its enemies, dark, dark, irrecoverably dark. I am far from contemplating such instances of mental eclipse with feelings of exultation or delight. There cannot be a more appalling spectacle in nature, than a mind in ruins: and in the righteous severity of God, which visits the

* "When John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer, was arrested, cast into prison, and publicly burnt alive at Constance, in spite of a safe-conduct given him by the Emperor Sigismund, merely because he refused to belie his conscience by abjuring his pretended heresy, all was executed under the eyes, and by the express authority, of the Council, who solemnly decreed that the safe-conduct of the Emperor ought to be considered as no impediment to the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but that, notwithstanding, it was perfectly competent for the ecclesiastical judge to take cognizance of his errors and to *punish* them agreeably to the dictates of justice, although he presented himself before them in dependence upon that protection, but for which he would have declined appearing. Nor were they satisfied with this impious decision alone. Because murmurs were heard on account of the violation of a legal protection, they had the audacity to add, that since the said John Huss had, by impugning the orthodox faith, forfeited every privilege, and since no promise or faith was binding, either by human or divine right, in prejudice of the Catholic faith, the said Emperor had done as became his royal majesty in violating his safe-conduct, and that whoever, of any rank or sect, dares to impugn the justice of the holy council, or of his majesty, in relation to their proceedings with John Huss, shall be punished without hope of pardon, as a favorer of heretical depravity, and guilty of the crime of high treason."—*Hall*, vol. iv. p. 245. *L'Enfant's Council of Constance*.

The third Council of Lateran, Canon XVI., decreed that *all oaths* contrary to the utility of the Church and to the institutions of the Fathers, are to be regarded as perjuries, and therefore not to be kept. "Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria, quae contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum renitent instituta."

advocates of error by sealing up the intellectual eyeball in impenetrable night, we may learn the awful majesty of truth, and the tremendous danger of trifling with the light. This disastrous judgment is the portentous herald of a deeper woe. It is, therefore, with feelings of the profoundest pity, and with the most heartfelt reciprocation of your prayer on my behalf, that I am now compelled to expose that tissue of inconsistencies, contradictions, and unwarrantable assumptions, which constitutes your second argument; and if, sir, you shall be made to feel, as I sincerely trust that you may, that you have been only weaving a tangled web of sophistry and deceit, you should take a salutary warning, and before you finally stumble on the dark mountains, contemplate the *severity* of God in them that fall.

Your object is to exhibit the historical grounds for believing, that God has in fact established, through Jesus Christ, a commissioned delegate from Heaven, "a body of individuals, to whom, in their collective capacity, He has given authority to make an unerring decision" on the subject of the Canon.*

* "One of such a body presenting himself to instruct a Christian or an infidel would first inform him, that a number of years ago, a person known by the name of Jesus Christ, appeared in Judea, and established a new religion.—Sufficient motives of credibility can easily be brought forward to induce the novice to believe this. He proceeds to state that Christ proved his heavenly commission to do so, by frequent, public, and manifest miracles. It will not require much to establish in those works certain striking characteristics, of themselves clearly indicative of a miraculous nature. Hence, common sense is forced to conclude that the religion established by Christ was Divine, springing from God, and binding on man. So far, we find nothing above or contrary to the means and understanding even of an Indian or negro. Our instructor then states, that Christ, in order to secure the extension of His religion to every people, and its perpetuation to the end of time, selected from among His followers certain persons, who, with their successors, were, in His name, and by the same authority as He possessed, to go forth and teach all nations all that He had Himself taught in Judea. (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) Such a delegation is by no means unnatural or strange, and there could be found no novice, however rude and uncultivated, whose mind could not grasp it, and who would not be led to believe it, on sufficiently credible testimony.

"The next lesson will be, that the Saviour assured them that they would be opposed, that others would rise up to teach errors, whom He sent not, and that some of their own number would fall away; but that God would recall to their minds all things He had taught them (Jno. xiv. 26); that He would

These historical proofs, you inform us, contain nothing that transcends the means, or surpasses the understanding, even of an Indian or a negro. Now, what are these historical proofs, and whence are they derived? The recorded *facts of the New Testament, received on the authority of the Apostles and Evangelists!* You appeal to “certain histories written by persons who lived at the same time with the Saviour, and were for years in daily and intimate intercourse with him, and the *accuracy* of whose reports is universally acknowledged, and can be *easily* substantiated.” In other words, the *genuineness* and *authenticity* of the books of the New Testament are matters so simple and plain, that there is nothing in the evidence “above or contrary to the means and understanding of an Indian or a negro.”

send them the Spirit of truth, who should abide with them for ever (Jno. xiv. 16, 17), and should teach them all truth (Jno. xiv. 26 ; xvi. 13) ; that He himself would be with them while fulfilling that commission, all days, even to the consummation of the world (Matt. xxviii: 20), and that the gates of hell—the fiercest conflicts of enemies—should never prevail against that Church (Matt. xvi. 18), which He had sent them to found, and ever to instruct. For stronger and more explicit evidence of this, he might, if necessary and convenient, recur to certain histories, written by persons who lived at the same time with the Saviour, and were for years in daily and intimate intercourse with Him, who could not mistake such simple points, and the accuracy of whose reports is universally acknowledged, and can be easily substantiated. ‘All this,’ replies the novice, ‘my own common sense would lead me to expect. The persecutions and errors you refer to, are but the natural workings of the passions of men, such as experience shows them in every day life. It would be strange, indeed, that while men change and contradict every thing else, they should not seek to change and contradict God’s doctrines and precepts too. If He willed that the Religion of Christ, that is, that the doctrines He revealed, should be ever preached and believed ; the precepts He gave, ever announced and obeyed ; it was necessary to make some adequate provision against this error, and change-seeking tendency of man. If those doctrines and precepts are to be learned from persons He appointed to teach in His name and by His authority, as delegates whom, in virtue of the power given Him, He sent, as He was sent by the Father, that provision must evidently and necessarily be directed to preserve the purity of their teaching—to preserve that body of teachers, by the power of God, from error, and to make them, in fact, teach all things whatsoever He had taught them. Unaided reason almost assures me this is the course the Saviour would adopt. The evidence you lay before me is satisfactory and worthy of credit—I assent.’”—*Letter I.*

These books contain satisfactory proof of the miracles of Christ—these miracles establish His divine commission, and consequently, impart divine authority to whatever he enjoined, and as a body of infallible teachers, to be perpetuated to the end of time, was His provision for preserving His truth pure in the world, that arrangement unquestionably possessed the sanction of God. Such is your argument. Now, sir, if the books of the New Testament are to be received as *credible* testimony to the miracles of Christ, why not on the subject of their own inspiration? Are you not aware, that the great historical “argument on which Protestants rely, in proving the inspiration of the Scriptures, presupposes only the *genuineness* of the books, and the *credibility*” of their authors? You have, yourself, admitted that the *teaching* of the Apostles was supernaturally protected from error; and if their *oral* instructions were dictated by the Holy Ghost, why should that august and glorious visitant desert them when they took the *pen* to accomplish the same object, when absent, which, when present, they accomplished by the *tongue*?* They, themselves, declare that their *writings* possessed the same authority with their *oral instructions*. Peter† ranks the Epistles of Paul with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which were confessed to be inspired; and Paul exhorts the Thessalonians to hold fast the traditions which they had received from him, either by *word* or *epistle*.‡ If, then, the *credibility* of these books is a matter so plain and palpable, and can be so “*easily substan-*

* “We have seen how fully gifted the Apostles were for the business of their mission. They worked miracles, they spake with tongues, they explained mysteries, they interpreted prophecies, they discerned the true from the false pretences to the Spirit; and all this for the temporary and occasional discharge of their ministry. Is it possible, then, to suppose them to be deserted by their Divine Enlightener when they sat down to the other part of their work, to frame a rule for the lasting service of the Church? Can we believe that that Spirit, which so bountifully assisted them in their assemblies, had withdrawn himself when they retired to their private-oratories: or that when their *speech* was *with all power*, their writings should convey no more than the weak and fallible dictates of human knowledge? To suppose the endowments of the Spirit to be so capriciously bestowed, would make it look more like a mockery than a gift.”—*Warburton, Doct. of Grace*, book i. chap. 5.

† 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

‡ 2 Thess. ii. 15.

tiated," and such is your concession, what need of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Chaldee, and divers modern tongues, together with Geology, Chemistry, Natural History, and almost every science, to make out their *inspiration*? They *assert* it, and they *are to be believed*; therefore one would think they *might* be believed by a simple, unlettered man, without being master of a library of which Charleston, and perhaps Columbia, is too poor to boast! I had always thought that the only difficulty in making out the external proof of inspiration, was in establishing the *credibility* of the books which profess to be inspired. It had struck me that if it were once settled, that their own testimony was to be received, the matter was at an end. But it seems now, that the *credibility* of a witness is no proof that he speaks the *truth*, and though "the *accuracy* of his statements can be easily substantiated, even to the mind of an Indian or a negro," there is one fact, about which he cannot be believed, except by a man who carries all the learning of Europe and America in his head. Nay, with all the advantages of a "larger library than Charleston can boast of;" with the tongues alike of the dead and living; with universal science pouring her treasures in boundless profusion at his feet; with an almost "supernatural accuracy of judgment," added to their other marvellous accomplishments, it is still doubtful whether, in the way of private judgment, a man could ever be assured that *credible* books were to be *believed* on the subject of their origin.* But just let one of an infallible body present himself before a Christian or an infidel—an Indian or negro, and how changed the scene! As if at the waving of a wizard's wand, the mists are dispelled, the shadows disappear, a flood of light removes all lingering doubt, and an infant mind can surmount those giant difficulties which "veteran scholars" and "sage philosophers" were unable to subdue. This teacher can achieve these mighty wonders before it is *proved* that he belongs to an unerring band—there is magic in his *voice*. Just let him open his ponderous lips

* "Whether any investigation in either or both classes (that is, of external and internal evidence) carried on even under the most favorable circumstances, will unerringly prove the inspiration of any books of the Scripture, I leave to be mooted by those who choose to undertake the task."—*Letter I.*

and give the word, and the sun of the Scriptures no longer "looks through the horizontal misty air, shorn of his beams; no longer stands in awful eclipse scattering disastrous twilight over half the nations," but shines out in the full effulgence of meridian day.

It is strange to me, that you did not perceive the egregious *absurdity* of attempting to establish the *infallible authority* of a *body of individuals* upon historical grounds, when you denied the *possibility of proving the infallible authority* of the *Scriptures* by the same process.

The evidence in both cases is precisely of the same nature. The inspiration of Rome turns upon a promise which is said to have been made nearly two thousand years ago—the inspiration of the New Testament turns upon facts which are said to have transpired at the same time. Both the promises and the facts are to be found, if found at all, in this very New Testament. Now, how does it happen, that when the point to be proved, is the pretended promise made to the pastors of Rome, the New Testament becomes amazingly accurate, and the proofs of its credibility are neither above nor contrary to the means or understanding of an Indian or a negro? But, when the point to be proved is the facts which establish the inspiration of the writers, then the New Testament becomes involved in a cloud of uncertainty, which no human learning is able to remove. Your argument, sir, has certainly placed you in a sad dilemma. You cannot make out the historical proofs of Papal infallibility, without making out at the same time the historical proofs of Scriptural inspiration. Both must be traced through the same channels to the age of the Apostles.

Now, sir, one of two things must be true; either the credibility of the Scriptures can be substantiated to a plain unlettered man, or it cannot. If it can be, then there is no need of your *infallible* body to authenticate their *inspiration*, since that matter can be easily gathered from their own pages. If it *cannot*, then your argument from the Scriptures, to an Indian or a negro, in favor of an infallible body, is inadmissible, since he is incapable of apprehending the premises from which your conclusion is drawn. You have taken both horns of this dilemma, pushing

Protestants with one, and upholding Popery with the other, and both are *fatal* to you. Now, as it is rather difficult to be on both sides of the same question at the same time, you must adhere to one or the other. If you adhere to your first position, that all human learning is necessary to settle the credibility of the Scriptures, then you must seek other proofs of an infallible body than those which you think you have gathered from the Apostles. You must first establish the infallibility of the body that claims to teach us, and then receive the Sacred Oracles at their hand. A circulating syllogism proves nothing, and if he who establishes the credibility of the Scriptures by an infallible body, and then establishes the infallibility of the body from the credibility of the Scriptures, does not reason in a circle, I am at a loss to apprehend the nature of that sophism. If you adhere to your other position, that the accuracy of the Evangelists can be *easily* substantiated, then your objections to private judgment are *fairly* given up, and you surrender the point, that a man can decide for himself with absolute certainty, concerning the inspiration of the Bible. Take which horn you please, your cause is ruined : and as you have successively chosen both, you have made yourself as ridiculous as your reasoning is contemptible.

The process by which you endeavor to elicit an infallible body of teachers from the Scriptures, is in perfect keeping with the rest of your argument. You do not pretend that they contain any *express* testimony to the fact; neither do you deduce from them any marks by which your unerring guides of faith can be discriminated from those who introduce errors and attempt to change the religion of Christ.—How then does it appear that such infallible instructors were appointed? Why, there is *no other* way in which God could accomplish His purpose of transmitting Christianity pure and uncorrupted to the remotest generations of men. This is the sum and substance of the argument, for the sake of which you have made yourself so consummately ridiculous, by contradicting your previous statements in regard to the credibility of the Scriptures! “Some adequate provision must be made against the error and change-seeking tendency of man,” and as Christianity is appointed to be learned from persons delegated to teach in the name and by the authority of

Christ, "that provision must evidently and necessarily be directed to preserve that body of teachers, by the power of God, from error, and to make them, in fact, teach all things whatsoever He had taught them."

That an infallible body of teachers presents the only effectual means of perpetuating the religion of Christ, unadulterated with error, is so exceedingly unlikely, that it would require nothing less than a constant miracle to preserve a system transmitted in this way from corruptions, additions, and radical changes. Unless each individual pastor were himself infallible, fatal errors might be widely disseminated before the body could be collected together to separate the chaff from the wheat, and to distinguish the precious from the vile. Three centuries have hardly passed away since the last General Council of the Roman Church was first convened. In that lapse of time, how many unauthorized opinions may have gained currency among the pastors of your Church, and have perverted your flocks from the true doctrines of Rome? The truth is, without a perpetual superintendence over the mind and heart of every *solitary teacher*, amounting to a miraculous protection from error, the plan of transmitting a system of religion by oral tradition, is the most unsafe, uncertain, and liable to abuse, of any that could be adopted. The commonest story cannot pass through a single community without gathering addition as it goes. How then shall a complicated system of religion be handed down from generation to generation—passed on from lip to lip, and from age to age, and lose nothing of its original integrity, and gain nothing from the invention of man? Sir, *your* "common sense," and "the common sense of an Indian or negro," might lead you "to expect that this is the course which the Saviour would adopt," but nothing but His own word can render it credible to me. No, sir, God has taken a different method to guard against the "error and change-seeking tendencies of men." He has committed His holy religion to *written documents*, which are to abide as an infallible standard of faith, till the heavens and the earth are no more. There, and there alone, are we to seek the truth. By them, and them alone, all the spirits are to be tried—all the teachers are to be judged—and if Roman pastors, with their wicked pretensions to infallible

authority, speak not according to these records, they are to be cast out as lying prophets whom the Lord hath not sent.

You have totally misconceived the appropriate functions of the Christian Ministry. Sir, the preachers of the Gospel were never designed to be the lords of the people's faith, but helpers of their joy. They are to *propose*, but it belongs to the Scriptures alone to *confirm* or *prove* the doctrines of religion. The *infallible standard* is in the Bible, and they who are noble, will, like Bereans, test the instructions of their pastors by the true and faithful sayings of God.

You must remember, sir, that the Scriptures, which you have admitted to be credible, which were written by men under a special promise of Christ to be protected from error and instructed in the truth, profess to be a *perfect* rule of *faith* and *practice*. "Their accuracy can be easily substantiated," even to the most illiterate understanding. Why, then, should there be an infallible stream of tradition, kept up by a constant miracle, running parallel with the infallible stream of Scripture, which can be, and has been preserved pure by the ordinary providence of God? Is a large variety of means for the accomplishment of any effect, when a few are abundantly adequate, characteristic of the works of God? Is it His ordinary course to multiply agents when a single cause is sufficient for His purpose? Your assumption, then, that a body of infallible teachers is necessary to preserve the doctrines of Christianity in their original purity, is wholly groundless, and your argument, consequently, may be given to the winds. The Bible shows us a more excellent way.

You have indirectly insisted upon the promises of Christ, that He would send the Spirit to guide His disciples into all truth, and be with them to assist and bless them in preaching His Gospel to the ends of the earth. But, sir, these promises do not serve your purpose. The first was fulfilled in *each* of the Apostles, and if it is to be applied in a similar form to all their successors, it would prove *the full inspiration of every* lawful minister of God. This is more than you are willing to admit. You have already told us that no *single individual* is to be received as an infallible teacher, but that the authority to make an unerring decision belongs exclusively "to a body of individuals

in their collective capacity." Our Saviour said nothing of such a body ; His promise in reference to the Apostles was evidently *personal*, and applied to them in the official relations which each sustained as a steward of the mysteries of God. How, then, was the promise accomplished to succeeding ages ? By leading the Apostles, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to record the *infallible instructions* of *Christ*, which should be a perpetual rule of faith, containing all things important for man to know or for man to do.* These venerable men *live* in their books :

* See this subject ably and satisfactorily discussed in Warburton's *Doctrine of Grace*, pt. i., and Bishop Heber's *Bampton Lectures*. The reader will excuse the following extract from the 7th of Heber's Lectures :

"It appears, then, that the advent of the Paraclete, and his abode among men, would be, during any period of Christian History, sufficiently evinced by the existence of one or more inspired individuals, whose authority should govern, whose lights should guide, whose promises should console their less distinguished brethren ; and by whom, and in whom, as the agents and organs of His will, the Holy Ghost should be recognized as Sovereign of the Church Universal. But if this be conceded, it will signify but very little, or (to speak more boldly, perhaps, but not less accurately) it will be a circumstance altogether insignificant, whether the instruction afforded be oral or epistolary ; whether the government be carried on by the authority of a present lawgiver, or through the medium of rescripts bearing his seal, and, no less than his personal mandates, compulsory on the obedience of the faithful. In every government, whether human or divine, the amanuensis of a sovereign is an agent of his will, no less ordinary and effectual than his herald : and St. Paul both might and did lay claim to an equal deference when, in the name and on the behalf of that Spirit by whom he was actuated, he censured by his letters the incestuous Corinthian, as if he had, when present and by word of mouth, pronounced the ecclesiastical sentence. It follows that the Holy Ghost as accurately fulfilled the engagement of Christ, as the Patron and Governor of Christians, by the writings of the inspired person when absent, as by his actual presence and preaching. And if St. Paul, having once by divine authority, set in order the Asiatic and Grecian Churches, had departed for Spain, or Britain, or some other country, at so great a distance as to render all subsequent communication impossible ; yet still, so long as the instructions left behind sufficed for the wants and interests of the community, that community would not have ceased to be guided and governed by the Holy Ghost through the writings of his chosen servant. But that authority which we allow to the writings of an absent Apostle, we cannot, without offending against every analogy of reason and custom, deny to those which a deceased Apostle has left behind him. For the authority of such writings, I need hardly observe, is of an official, not of a personal nature,

“ for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a progeny of life in them to be as active as that soul whose progeny they are ; nay, they do preserve, as in a vial, the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. A good book is the precious lifeblood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life.” It is in the records which they left that we now find the spirit of inspiration ; there is his abode, there the place of his supreme illumination, and in these books, consequently, Christianity must be sought in its purity and vigor.

The other promise pledges the assistance of Christ to those who preach the truth. It is a standing encouragement to all ministers that, in faithfully dispensing the word of God according to the law and the testimony, their labor should not be in vain in the Lord. Our Saviour had previously given a command, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. The prospect of success in the fulfilment of this solemn injunction, from the condition of society, the prejudices of the Jews, the philosophy of the Greeks, and the superstition of the Ro-

It does not consist in their having emanated from Peter or James or John, abstractly considered, (in which case, the authority of any one of them might, undoubtedly, terminate with his life,) but their authority is founded in that faith which receives these persons as accredited agents of the Almighty. We reverence their communications as the latest edicts of the Paraclete ; and we believe all further communications to have ceased for a time ; not because those eminent servants of God have long since gone to their reward, for it were as easy for the Holy Spirit to raise up other prophets in their room as it was originally to qualify them for that high office—not because we apprehend that the good Spirit is become indifferent to the welfare of the Church, for this would be in utter contradiction to the gracious assurance of our Saviour ; but because sufficient light has been already afforded for the government of our hopes and tempers ; and because no subsequent question has occurred for which the Scriptures already given had not already and sufficiently provided. * * * *

“ We conclude, then, as Warburton has long since concluded, (though he arrived at the same truth by a process somewhat different, and incumbered its definition by circumstances which I have shown to be irrelevant,) we conclude that it is by the revelation of the Christian covenant and by the preservation of the knowledge thus communicated to the ancient Church, in the Scriptures of the New Testament, that the Holy Ghost has manifested and continues, as the vicar and successor of Christ, to manifest his protecting care of Christianity.”

mans, was far from encouraging. To support their faith and quicken their hopes, their ascending Saviour pledged His almighty power to make His truth effectual, in bringing down lofty imaginations, and subduing the hearts of men in captivity to His cross. The promise in that passage is not that they should speak the truth, and nothing but the truth, but that in speaking the truth, in preaching whatever He had commanded, He would be with them always, even to the end of the world; and this promise has never failed.

Your letter contains a few incidental statements, introduced in the way of cumulative testimony, to confirm the pretensions of your infallible body. You tell us first, that it can trace its predecessors in an unbroken line up to the age of the Apostles themselves. So far is this from being the truth, that not a single priest in your Church can have any absolute certainty that he is a priest at all, unless he be invested with the prerogative of God to search the hearts and try the reins of the children of men. Intention, on your principles, is an essential element of a *valid* ordination! How can a priest be assured that his Bishop intended to ordain him, or how can the Bishop be assured that he himself was lawfully consecrated? The whole matter is involved in confusion, and you cannot know whether you are pastors at all, or not.

Again, you inform us of the prodigious numbers that have been converted by the labors of your infallible teachers. Sir, the world loveth *its own*, and it is characteristic of the *broad road* that leads to death, that thousands are journeying its downward course. Mahomet laid the foundations of an empire, which, in the course of eighty years, extended farther than the Roman arms, for eight hundred years, had been able to spread the jurisdiction of the Cæsars. In this comparatively short space of time, there were brought under the sway of the Crescent the Grecian, Persian, and Mogul States, with many others of inferior importance; and yet Mahometanism, notwithstanding its unparalleled success, was a gross system of imposture and fraud. The purity of a system is not to be determined by the multitudes that embrace it. How significant is the question of our Saviour: When the Son of *man cometh*

shall he find faith on the earth? Fear not, *little* flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

Why have you omitted all mention of the meekness and patience that have always been characteristic of the Church of God? Were you conscious, sir, that you had no claims to that discriminating badge of the faithful? Did the past rise up before you in horrible distinctness, and warn you to forbear? Rome, Papal Rome, which professes to be the *humble, meek, patient, suffering* Church of God, is literally steeped in human gore. Your pastors have inflicted more sufferings upon men, have shed more human blood, have invented a greater variety of tortures, have more deeply revelled in human misery and feasted on human groans, than all the tyrants, bigots, and despots of all the systems of superstition and oppression that have ever appeared in the world, from the fall of man to the present day. To Papal Rome the foul pre-eminence of cruelty must unquestionably be awarded. The holy ministers of the Inquisition, under the sacred name of religion, have tested to its utmost limits the capacity of human endurance; every bone, muscle, sinew, and nerve have been effectually sounded, and the precise point ascertained at which agony is no longer tolerable, and the convulsed and quivering spirit must quit its tenement of clay. The degree of refinement and perfection to which the art of torment has been carried in these infernal prisons is enough to make humanity shudder, and religion sicken, and nothing but the most invincible blindness could ever confound these habitations of cruelty, these dark corners of the earth, with the means of grace and the elements of salvation. How preposterous, while breathing out slaughter and cruelty, exhibiting more the spirit of cannibals than the temper of Christians, to claim to be the Holy Catholic Church—the chosen depository of truth—the special temple of the Holy Ghost!

Having, as you suppose, sufficiently proved that an infallible body exists, you next proceed to show us that it must be composed of the pastors and teachers of your own communion. This part of your argument need not detain me long, as I have clearly refuted your proofs of the existence of such a body. Still if it did exist, the mere *claim* of Rome would not establish

her pretensions to be received as an unerring tribunal of faith. Theudas and Judas each *claimed* to be the promised Messiah of the Jews. Mahomet claimed to be a true prophet of God, and the Devil himself sometimes claims to be an angel of light. If an arrogant claim is sufficient to establish a right, and such a right is founded in absolute certainty, how long would the distinctions of truth and falsehood, of virtue and vice, be preserved among men?

I have now, sir, sufficiently reviewed your pretended proofs of the infallibility of Rome as a witness for the truth, and have shown them to be alike ridiculous and vain. You have given us the true value of your argument, in saying that it would convince an infant mind. It may be adapted to children and idiots, but it is ill suited to bearded men. Perhaps one reason why you are so anxious to establish schools for Protestant children and erect asylums for Protestant orphans, while you suffer starving millions of your own flock to live by begging, and die in ignorance, is to be found in the secret conviction which you feel that your only hope of success is among those who cannot discriminate between legitimate reasoning and puerile sophisms. You are conscious, sir, of your total incompetency to encounter men, and therefore devote your ghostly attention to silly women and prattling babes.

LETTER V.

Historical difficulties in the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

THE infallibility of the Papal Church is a doctrine so momentous in its consequences, as to deserve a more extended view than a simple refutation of the arguments by which you have endeavored to support it. This, sir, is the *πρωτον ψευδος* of your system—the foundation of those enormous corruptions in doctrine, and abuses in discipline, by which you have enslaved the consciences of men, and transmuted the pure and glorious gospel of Christ into a dark and malignant superstition, which,

through fear of *your* malediction, keeps its deluded victims in bondage in this world, and, from the certain *malediction* of *God*, dooms them to perdition in the world to come. Your pretensions to the unerring guidance of the Holy Ghost render change impossible, and reformation hopeless. Whatever you *have* been in the past ages of your history you are to-day; and the errors which, in other times, ignorance engendered from a warm imagination, or which avarice and ambition have found it convenient to present to the world as the offspring of truth, must still be defended, and still carried out into all their legitimate results. The impositions which you practised in an age of darkness, must now be justified in an age of light. The *absurdities* of the past, which sprang from the blind superstition of monks and priests, or from the lordly pretensions of Popes and Prelates, must now be fathered upon the Spirit of God; and that aid, which neither reason nor the Scriptures impart to your dogmas, must be supported by an arrogant claim to the control and supervision of the Holy Ghost. This is your last resort; and when this corner-stone is removed, your whole system totters to its fall. It is the impression of Divine authority that conceals from your parasites the hideous proportions of the papal fabric; it is this which throws a charm of solemnity around it, and renders that awful and venerable, which, seen in its true light, would, at once, be pronounced the temple of Antichrist. The question, therefore, of infallibility, is to you a question of life and death. The very being of the papacy, depends upon maintaining the spell by which you have so long deluded the nations of the earth. Let this wand of your enchantment be broken, and the chambers of your imagery disclosed, and darker abominations will be revealed than those which the prophet beheld in the temple of the Lord at Jerusalem.

In pretending to the distinguished prerogative of infallibility, there is a prodigious and astonishing contrast between the weakness of your proofs and the extravagance of your claims. It seems that you act upon the principle by which Tertullian once supported a palpable absurdity, and resolve to believe it, because, under the circumstances of the case, it is absolutely *impossible* that it *can be true*.

The ordinary arguments which your writers are accustomed to adduce, proceed upon a principle radically false. They reason from *expediency* to *fact*, and because an infallible tribunal is *supposed* to be a *proper* appointment for suppressing heresy and terminating controversy in matters of faith, it is rashly inferred that such a tribunal *has been actually established*. The inconsistency of such an arrangement with that peculiar probation which the moral government of God involves; in which our characters are tested, our principles developed, and the real inclinations of the heart made manifest; a probation which necessarily supposes temptations, dangers and trials, both in apprehending the truth and in discharging the duties of life, seems to form no part of their estimate. With such a condition of moral discipline the plan which the providence of God has appointed, for arriving at *certainty* upon the truths of the Gospel, is perfectly consistent. The truth is committed to written documents—the reception of those documents depends in a great degree upon the state of the heart, which, as the medium through which it must pass, imparts its own tinge to the evidence submitted. They that are willing to comply with the commandments, are in that mental condition which disposes them to receive and justly to appreciate the *truth* of God; and to all such the Spirit of grace, which the Saviour bequeathed as a legacy to the Church, will impart an infallible assurance to establish their minds. A plan like this is in harmonious accordance with every other feature of the moral government of God. The understanding is as really tested as the heart—or rather the dispositions of the heart—the *moral* character of the man is really exhibited by his dealings with the truth. There is in the first instance no overwhelming evidence which quells opposition, silences prejudice, and conceals the native enmity of man against spiritual light. There is no resistless demonstration which compels assent, and which, by rendering us timid in indulging inclination, may make us less visibly vicious, but not less really depraved, nor more truly virtuous. There is no portentous sign from heaven which startles the skeptic in his parleys with error, and *forces* him to receive what his nature leads him to *detest*. The true evidence of the Gospel is a *growing* evidence—sufficient always to create obligation and

to produce assurance, but effectual only as the heart expands in fellowship with God and becomes assimilated to the spirits of the just. It is precisely the evidence which is suited to our moral condition. And any views of expediency which would prompt us to expect a different kind of evidence, an evidence which should stifle or repress those peculiar traits of character by which error is engendered, would be inconsistent with the state in which we are placed. Hence we are told that it must *needs be* that heresies should come, that they which are approved may be made manifest. Our real condition *requires* the possibility of error; and God consequently has made no arrangements for absolutely terminating controversies and settling questions of faith without regard to the moral sympathies of men. Upon the supposition, however, that a kind of evidence was intended to be provided by which the truth might be infallibly apprehended while the heart continued in rebellion against God; by which the possibility of cavil might be removed and no plausible pretext be afforded to the sophist; by which, in fact, the light actually vouchsafed *should* not only be *sufficient*, but wholly *irresistible*—if the object had been to extirpate error and to prevent controversy, it would have been a less circuitous method to have made *each* man personally infallible, and thus have secured the reception of the truth. The argument from expediency is certainly as strong in favor of individual infallibility as in favor of the infallibility of a special body—it is even stronger, for the end desired to be gained could be much more speedily and effectually accomplished. Errors would not only be *checked* but *prevented*, controversy would be torn up by the roots, and the whole world would be made to harmonize in symbols of faith!*

* “But it is more useful and fit,” you say, “for the deciding of controversies, to have, besides an infallible rule to go by, a living, infallible judge to determine them; and from hence *you* conclude that certainly there is such a judge. But why, then, may not another say, that it is yet more useful, for many excellent purposes, that all the patriarchs should be infallible, than that the pope only should? Another, that it would be yet more useful that all the archbishops of every province should be so, than that the patriarchs only should be so. Another, that it would be yet more useful, if all the bishops of every diocese were so. Another, that it would be yet more available that all the parsons of every

The method of reasoning, consequently, from *expediency* to *fact* is fallacious and unsafe: and if the magnificent pretensions of your sect rest upon no firmer basis than deceitful notions of utility and convenience; they are indeed built upon the *sand*. Instead of a solid and a noble fabric of imposing strength and commanding grandeur, you present us with a structure as weak and contemptible as the toy-houses of children constructed of cards.

There are no less than three different opinions entertained in your church, as to the organ through which its infallibility is exercised or manifested. This single circumstance is enough to involve the whole claim in contempt. If it be not infallibly certain where the infallible tribunal is, in case of emergency, to be found, the old logical maxim applies with undiminished force, *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*. To settle controversies, it is not enough that a judge exists, his existence must be known, and his court accessible. Uncertainty as to the *seat* of an infallible authority, is just as fatal to the legitimate exercise of its functions, as uncertainty in regard to the being of the authority in the abstract. To resolve our doubts and remove our difficulties, some of your Doctors refer us to the Pope as the vicar of Christ, the Head of the Church, the Teacher of the faithful, and plead the decisions of councils in behalf of his pretensions. As the centre of unity to the Church, and the fountain or source of ecclesiastical power, they represent him as possessed of an authority as absolute as that with which the head

parish should be so. Another, that it would be yet more excellent if all the fathers of families were so. And, lastly, another, that it were much more to be desired that every man and every woman were so: just as much as the prevention of controversies is better than the decision of them, and the prevention of heresies better than the condemnation of them; and upon this ground, conclude by your own very consequence, that not only a general council, not only the pope, but all the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, pastors, fathers, nay, all men in the world, are infallible. If you say now, as I am sure you will, that this conclusion is most gross and absurd, against sense and experience, then must also the ground be false from which it evidently and undeniably follows, viz., that the course of dealing with men seems always more fit to Divine Providence, which seems more fit to human reason."—*Chillingworth*, vol. i. p. 249. Oxford Edition of 1838.

controls the members of the body. Hence your bishops are nothing but his vicars; and, in token of their bondage, they are not content with the usual oaths of allegiance by which subjects are held in obedience to their sovereign, but they enter into a solemn obligation to appear personally before him every three years, to give an account of their stewardship, or else excuse themselves by an adequate deputy. "As in a disciplined army," says Dr. Milner, a modern writer of your sect, in a charge which, though intrinsically worthless, excited too much controversy to be speedily forgotten—"as in a disciplined army, the soldiers obey their officers, and these, other officers of superior rank, who themselves are subject to a commander-in-chief; so in the Catholic Church, extending, as it does, from the rising to the setting sun—the faithful of all nations are guided by their pastors, who, in their turns, are submissive to the prelates, *whilst the whole body is subordinate to one supreme pastor*, whose seat is the rallying-point and centre of them all." In this exquisite system of slavery, the Pope is evidently the sovereign authority—the whole body is subordinate to him, and as the centre and rallying point of the whole, whatever infallibility the church possesses must be found in the person of her supreme pastor. Under any other theory of infallibility, this, it may be well to remark, is and must be the practical working of your system. Your leading maxim is *obedience*—there must be no investigation of the right to command—no regard to the propriety of the precepts—the whole duty of the people is summed up in a single word, *obey*. This system of absolute submission runs up unchecked until it terminates in the Sovereign Pontiff at Rome, whose edicts and decrees, by necessary consequence, none can question, and who is, therefore, the absolute lord of papal faith. This seems to be the inevitable result of that slavish doctrine of passive obedience which your pastors inculcate, and without which your church would expire in a day. Hence whether you lodge infallibility with councils—with the body of the pastors at large, or give the pope an ultimate veto upon the decisions of ecumenical synods, to this complexion, under the theory of implicit obedience, it must unavoidably come at last, and the practical impression upon the people will be precisely that, which we are told by intel-

ligent travellers, prevails in Italy—"the pope is greater than God."*

It is evident that the infallibility of the pope cannot be separated from his claim to supremacy. To prove that he is not *supreme*, is, in other words, to prove that he is not infallible. Now to those who maintain that the infallible authority of the church is to be sought in the person of his Holiness, this historical difficulty arises: Where? where was that infallibility before a Supreme Pastor existed? It is a fact sustained by the amplest testimony that as late, at least, as the seventh century, the Bishops of the Church, not excepting the Bishops of Rome, whatever accidental differences prevailed among them, were regarded at least as officially *equal*. According to Jerome, every Bishop, whether of Rome, Eugubium, Constantinople, Rhegium, Alexandria, or Tanis, possessed the same merit and the same Priesthood.† "There is but one bishopric in the Church," says Cyprian—"and every bishop has an undivided portion in it,"‡ that is, it is *one* office, and the power of all who are invested with it is precisely the same. In his letter to Pope Stephen, this doctrine is still more distinctly announced, but it is fully brought out in the speech which he delivered at the opening of the great Council of Carthage. "For no one of us," says he, "makes himself bishop of bishops, and compels his colleagues, by tyrannical power, to a necessity of complying; forasmuch as every bishop, according to the liberty and power that is granted him, is free to act as he sees fit; and can no more be judged by others, than he can judge them. But let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who *only hath power* both to invest us with the government of his Church, and to pass sentence upon our actions."

* "Il papa e piu che Dio per noi altri."—For a remarkable account of the extravagant adulation which has been heaped upon the Popes, see Erasmus on 1 Tim. i. 6.

† Epist. 85, ad Evang.—Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romae, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriae, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et Sacerdotii.

‡ De Unitat. Eccles. Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.

But an authority which ought to be decisive on this question is to be found in the testimony of Gregory the Great, who was filled with horror at the arrogant pretensions of the Patriarch of Constantinople, to be treated as a universal Bishop, and in the strongest terms reprobated the idea that any such title could be lawfully applied to any person whatever.*

During these six centuries in which the Church was without a visible head, when there was neither centre of unity nor rallying-point to the whole; when, in the modern sense, there was no such thing as a pope, *where* was the infallibility of the body? Most evidently it could not have been in the Bishop of Rome—he was not then what he is now—and those who contend that he constitutes now the infallible tribunal of the Church, are reduced to the awkward necessity of maintaining, either that there was *then* no infallible tribunal at all, or that it has since been transferred from its ancient seat to the person of the pope. If the latter alternative should be assumed, upon what grounds and by what authority was the transfer made—when, where, and how? These are questions which require to be answered with absolute certainty before we can have any absolute certainty that the Bishop of Rome is not as liable to error now as he was in the days of Firmilian.†

The theory which lodges infallibility with general councils is pressed with historical difficulties just as strong as those which lie against the infallibility of the Pope. If you except the Synod at Jerusalem, in the age of the Apostles, which can hardly be called ecumenical or general, there was no such thing as a general council of the Church, until the first quarter of the fourth century. For two hundred years, consequently, after the last of the Apostles had fallen asleep, the Church had neglected to speak, though numerous and dangerous heresies had been indus-

* Epist. lib. vi. epist. 30.—Ego fidenter dico, quod quisquis se Universalem Sacerdotem vocat vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua, Antichristum praecurrit. I affirm with confidence that whosoever calls himself, or wishes to be called, *universal Bishop*, in this lifting up of himself is the forerunner of Antichrist.

† See his Epistle to Pope Stephen charging him both with error and schism.

triously circulated, through the only organ by which she could pronounce an infallible decision. During all that time she was shorn of her strength. Is it probable, is it credible, that while the most fatal errors were disseminated in regard to the person of Christ, and the wildest vagaries were indulged by the Montanists and Gnostics, there existed an authority to which the whole Church deferred as supreme, and which by a single word was competent to crush these growing delusions? Why did the Fathers ply so strenuously the strong arguments of Scriptural truth, the words and teachings of prophets and apostles, if there was indeed a stronger argument to which they might resort, and from whose decision there was no appeal? A judge that neglects to act in critical emergencies, just at the time when his authority is needed, is little to be preferred to no judge at all.

There is still another historical fact which it is difficult to reconcile with synodical supremacy. The early councils attributed the authority of the canons which they settled to the *sanction of the Emperor*. They pretended to no infallible jurisdiction; their decrees were not set forth as the word of God; the veto of the Emperor destroyed them; his favor made them obligatory, as far as his power extended.* Were the Apostles thus helpless without the imperial sanction? Did their instructions acquire the force of Divine laws from the favor of Nero, or the patronage of the Cæsars? If the councils were as infallible as the Apostles, why did they not proclaim their edicts in the *name of God*, and, whether the Emperors approved or condemned, maintain their absolute power to bind the conscience by the authority of Christ? These councils were evidently expedients of peace, adopted by the government as well as by the church, for the purpose of securing uniformity of faith, and preventing religious disturbances in the empire. They were not regarded as the *unerring representatives* of Christ—the deference paid to the writings of the Apostles was never paid to them, they were not acknowledged as the organ of the Spirit. Others again maintain that no council is infallible whose convocation and decisions have not alike received the sanction of the Pope. These per-

* See Barrow, *Suprem. Pope*, and passages referred to, *Suppos.* 6.

sons are truly in a sad dilemma; for all the early councils were confessedly convened by the mandate of the Emperor, and many were acknowledged as authoritative in their own day, whose canons were opposed by the Bishop of Rome. According to this principle, there was no such thing as infallibility in the church, until the Pope acquired the dominion of an earthly Prince, and could assemble the subjects of the realm from different quarters of the globe by his own sovereign authority.*

If, as a last desperate resort against all these historical objections, it should be asserted that the unanimous consent of all the pastors of the church, was a sufficient proof of the infallible truth of any system of doctrines—the question might still be asked, whether such unanimity has ever prevailed, and how, in reference to any given point, it can be ascertained. The idea of reaching the truth by a system of eclecticism, collecting only the doctrines which have never been disputed, is utterly unworthy of a rational understanding. It proceeds upon the wholly gratuitous assumption, that nothing important has ever been denied, or nothing evidently true has ever been questioned. The history of religion, however, affords the most abundant proof that the vanity of man, even apart from considerations of interest, may be an adequate motive for attacking the most sacred opinions and venerable institutions, while others less important are protected from insult by their acknowledged insignificance. Such is the weakness of humanity that fame is often more precious than truth, and he who cannot hope to rise to distinction by contributing to the general fund of human knowledge, is sometimes tempted to seek notoriety from the profane attempt to demolish the temple erected by the labor of years. The very grandeur of the edifice provokes the efforts of infatuated vanity. To suppose, consequently, that those doctrines of religion are alone infallibly true which have met with universal approbation, is to overlook the weakness and folly of man, and to attribute to his conduct in regard to religion, a wisdom and propriety which the history of the past by no means sustains. It is much more natural to suppose that the most important truths, should be the

* See Barrow, *Suprem. Pope*, and passages referred to, *Suppos.* 6.

subjects of the fiercest contentions—that ambitious churchmen who had been defeated in their views of personal aggrandizement, should endeavor to wreak their vengeance, and gratify their vanity, by aiming their blows at the very vitals of Christianity. Hence we find, in fact, that a large share of the distractions of Christendom, the most pestiferous and deadly errors, have owed their origin to the spleen and mortification of their authors. How much, too, ambition, the master-sin by which angels fell, has corrupted the church, and perverted the right ways of the Lord, the whole history of the Papacy abundantly attests. Arius failed in obtaining a bishopric, and vented his malignity in attacking the very foundation of the faith. The extent to which prejudice, mere prejudice, prevailed in the controversies of the Iconoclasts and Monothelites, is an amusing commentary on the harmony of priests in fundamental doctrines; and there is an instance on record of a famous interpreter, who confessedly distorted a passage of Scripture from its just and obvious meaning, because the leader of another sect had endorsed it in his commentaries. A man, consequently, who should act upon the famous maxim, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, in the formation of his creed, and resolve to admit nothing as infallible truth which had not the mark of universal consent, might condense his articles, in a very narrow compass. Not a single distinctive feature of revelation, upon this absurd hypothesis, would be regarded as an essential element of faith. The plenary inspiration of the Scriptures has been confessedly denied by distinguished divines—whole books of the Bible have been ruthlessly discarded from the canon, and even Popes themselves are said to have treated the history of Jesus as a gainful fable. It is important, therefore, to believe nothing about the inspiration of the Scriptures. The doctrine of the Trinity has been bitterly assailed, the incarnation of the Redeemer openly derided, and the work of the Spirit denounced as enthusiasm. While one council has determined that Christ was the Eternal Son of the Father, another, with equal pretensions to infallibility, has decided against his divinity. Nothing, therefore, is infallibly certain about the person of Christ, and a man may be a very good Catholic, according to the maxim in question, without any opinion of the

Saviour at all. Nay, the very being of God may be lawfully discarded from a creed collected in this way, since the successors of the Fisherman, unless they are greatly belied, have not occasionally scrupled to indulge in skeptical doubts upon this prime article of religion. This unanimous consent of the pastors of the church, therefore, is a mere phantom of the brain, always mocking our efforts to compass it, and retreating before us like the verge of the horizon. It is "vox et præterea nihil."

But suppose such an unanimous consent existed in fact in reference to all the doctrines of Christianity. Suppose that no pastors of the Church had ever been heretical, how is an Indian or negro to become acquainted with a testimony that embraces all the priests that have ever said or sung the services of the Church, from the age of the Apostles to the period of his own existence? To achieve such a task would require a critical apparatus hardly less formidable than that which you pronounce to be essential to the settlement of the canon.

I have now reviewed the leading theories in regard to the seat of the infallibility of your church which have been maintained among you, and have shown them to be encompassed with historical difficulties fatal to their truth. There is one general objection of the same kind which covers them all, and which, upon the approved principle of logic, that two contradictories cannot possibly both be true, would seem to settle the matter. It is indubitably certain that Popes have contradicted Popes, Councils have contradicted Councils, and Pastors have contradicted Pastors, and all have contradicted the Scriptures. Notwithstanding your vain boasts of the unchanging uniformity of your system, and the perfect consistency and harmony of the doctrines of faith which your church in every age has inculcated, it is still historically true, that you have exhibited at different periods such variety of tenets, as to render you wonderfully like the administration of Lord Chatham, as inimitably described by Burke. Your *syntagma confessionum* would present a scene "so checkered and speckled; a piece of joinery, so crossly indented and whimsically dovetailed; a cabinet so variously inlaid; such a piece of diversified mosaic, such a tessellated pavement with-

out cement—here a bit of black stone, and there a bit of white—that it might be indeed a very curious show, but utterly unsafe to touch, and unsure to stand on.”

In the short compass of twenty-three years, to give a specimen of your wonderful consistency, we have idolatry both abolished and established by the councils of a church, which, according to Bossuet, never varies,—the Council of Constantinople unanimously decreeing the removal of images, and the abolition of image-worship, and the Council of Nice re-establishing both, and pronouncing an anathema on all who had concurred in the previous decision. The second Council of Ephesus approved and sanctioned the impiety of Eutyches, and the Council of Chalcedon condemned it. The fourth Council of Lateran asserted the doctrine of a physical change in the eucharistic elements, in express contradiction to the teachings of the primitive church, and the evident declarations of the Apostles of the Lord. The second Council of Orange gave its sanction to some of the leading doctrines of the school of Augustine, and the Council of Trent threw the Church into the arms of Pelagius. Thus, at different periods, every type of doctrine has prevailed in the bosom of an unchangeable Church. She has been distracted with every variety of sect, tormented with every kind of controversy, convulsed with every species of heresy, and at last has settled down upon a platform which annihilates the word of God—denounces the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, and bars the gates of salvation against men.

That the *Scriptures*, and not the Priesthood or any infallible body of men, were the only channels through which an infallible knowledge of Divine truth was to be acquired, is so clearly the doctrine of the primitive Church, which was founded by the hands of the Apostles themselves, as to be absolutely fatal to any of the forms in which the pretensions of Rome are asserted. Among the host of testimonies that might be adduced to establish and corroborate this vital point, the following may be deemed a sufficient exposition of the views of the Fathers: “Look not,” says Chrysostom, “for any other teacher—you have the oracles of God, no one can teach like them. Any other instructor may, from some

erroneous principle, conceal from you many things of the greatest importance; and, therefore, I exhort you to procure for yourselves Bibles. Have them for your constant instructors, and in all your trials have recourse to them for the remedies you need."*

'It behooveth," says Basil, "that every word and every work should be accredited by the testimony of the inspired Scripture."† "It is the duty of hearers," he observes again, "when they have been instructed in the Scriptures, to try and examine by them the things spoken by their teachers, to receive whatever is consonant to those Scriptures, and to reject whatever is alien, for thus they will comply with the injunction of St. Paul, 'To prove all things and hold fast that which is good.'"‡ "Without the word," says Clemens Alexandrinus, "all religious investigation is vain—the holy prophetic Scriptures are the foundation of religious truth—the rule of life—the high road to salvation."§

"Whence," says Cyprian, "is this tradition (alluding to a pretended tradition of Stephen, Bishop of Rome)? Is it delivered down to us on the authority of the Lord, and of the Gospel, or from the precepts and writings of the Apostles? For God Himself testifies that those things which are *written* are to be observed. (Josh. i. 8.) And the Lord, sending his Apostles, commands the nations to be baptized, and to be taught to observe whatsoever He has commanded. If, therefore, it be *prescribed in the Gospel, or contained in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles*, by all means let this divine and holy tradition be observed. What obstinacy, what presumption, to prefer the tradition of men to the Divine ordinance, without considering that God is angry and provoked whenever human tradition breaks and overlooks the Divine commands"||

In the Scriptures, then, according to these venerable men, and in the Scriptures alone, we possess the charter of our faith, pure and uncorrupted as it came from the inspired breasts of the

* See also Chrysostom's 3d Hom. de Laz. The truth is, a volume might be collected from this Father in support of my position.

† Moral Reg. 26.

‡ Ibid. 72.

§ Admon. to the Gentiles.

|| Epist. 74, Pompeio.

Apostles ; and the Holy Spirit, in moving these chosen ambassadors of Christ to commit his infallible teachings to imperishable records, secured that certainty, in the transmission of Christian doctrine, which completely obviates the necessity of an infallible body of men. Here *is*, according to the Fathers, what all history shows the priesthood of Rome *is not*—a safe, wise, adequate, successful provision against the error and change-making tendency of man.

I need not add, that this appears to be the uniform doctrine of the Scriptures themselves ; not only do they assert their own sufficiency and completeness as a rule of faith, but that they were written with the design of handing down, in their integrity and purity, the doctrines which the Apostles taught, and the early Christians received. The Evangelist Luke, in recording the motives which induced him to commit his Gospel to writing, states distinctly that his object was that the *certainty* of those things which had been previously communicated by oral teaching, might be fully apprehended. He proceeds upon the just and natural principle, that *written documents* presented a safer channel for the transmission of truth than *verbal tradition*. Peter, when about to put off his mortal tabernacle, makes provision for perpetuating the faith, after his decease, by *writing his Second Epistle*. Here was the time and here was the place for the pretended founder of the Papacy to assert the prerogatives of his see. But not a word does he utter of living teachers—of any infallible tribunal composed of men. To his mind *written memorials* were the *true security* for preserving entire Apostolical instructions.* But the grand and fatal objection to the doctrine

* “The claim of infallibility, or even authority, to prescribe magisterially to the opinions and consciences of men, whether in an individual or in assemblies and collections of men, is never to be admitted. Admitted, said I? It is not to be heard with patience, unless it be supported by a miracle ; and this very text of Scripture (2 Pet. i. 20, 21) is manifestly, of all others, the most adverse to the arrogant pretensions of the Roman Pontiff. Had it been the intention of God, that Christians, after the death of the Apostles, should take the sense of Scripture, in all obscure and doubtful passages, from the mouth of an infallible interpreter, whose decisions in all points of doctrine, faith and practice, should be oracular and final, *this* was the occasion for the Apostle to have

of infallibility, in whatever form it is asserted, is, that it is totally destitute of the only kind of proof by which it can be possibly supported. To exempt a single individual, or any body of men, from the possibility of error, is the exclusive prerogative of God. It depends upon Him, therefore, and upon Him alone, to declare whether He has granted this distinction to the Popes of Rome, the Councils of the Church, or the whole body of its pastors. This is a fact which can only be substantiated by a *Divine revelation*. This is the sort of evidence which the case requires, and without this evidence all such pretensions are vain, delusive, arrogant, and blasphemous. Abstract reasoning can avail nothing; there must be a plain declaration from the Lord. Where, I ask, and ask triumphantly, is such a declaration to be found? Where has God confirmed by miracles the extravagant claims of the Papal community? To look for it in the Scriptures, would involve the supposition that the Scriptures are already known to be inspired—the proof would become destructive of the end for which it was sought. Papists tell us that we cannot be assured that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, until we are assured that the decisions of the Church are infallible. It would be, then, most preposterous in them to remand us to the Scriptures to prove their claims, when the only authenticity they ascribe to

mentioned it, to have told us plainly whither we should resort for the unerring explication of those prophecies which, it seems, so well deserve to be studied and understood. And from St. Peter, in particular, of all the Apostles, this information was in all reason to be expected, if, as the vain tradition goes, this oracular gift was to be lodged with his successors. This, too, was the time when the mention of the thing was most likely to occur to the Apostle's thoughts, when he was about to be removed from the superintendence of the church, and was composing an epistle for the direction of the flock, which he so faithfully had fed, after his departure. Yet St. Peter, at this critical season, when his mind was filled with an interested care for the welfare of the church after his decease, upon an occasion which might naturally lead him to mention all means of instruction that were likely to be provided: in these circumstances, St. Peter gives not the most distant intimation of a living oracle to be perpetually maintained in the succession of the Roman Bishops. On the contrary, he overthrows their aspiring claims by doing that which supersedes the supposed necessity of any such institution; he lays down a plain rule, which, judiciously applied, may enable every private Christian to interpret the written oracles of prophecy, in all points of general importance, for himself."—*Horsely's Sermons*, vol. i. Sermon 15.

the Scriptures is derived from these claims? Still we may safely challenge them to produce from the Bible a single passage which directly asserts, or by necessary implication involves, the proposition—either that the Pope, in his official relations, is an infallible expounder of the faith, or that general councils are unerring in their decisions, or that the whole body of pastors shall be preserved inviolably from error. On the contrary, we are distinctly told that Peter played the hypocrite and was rebuked by Paul, and the Ephesian elders are solemnly assured that from even among themselves, among the very teachers of the Church, grievous wolves should arise, not sparing the flock. And the voice of all history—though the Bible says nothing specifically about them, as never contemplating such a phenomenon—the voice of all history abundantly attests that councils *have* erred, and so dissipates the idle fiction of their infallibility. Is there, then, any other revelation, beside the sacred oracles, from which the infallibility of the Church may be gathered? What messenger has ever been commissioned to proclaim this truth, and to seal his commission by miraculous achievements? Where has the voice of God ever commanded us to submit to Rome as His representative and vicar? Where are the Divine credentials of Papal infallibility? Until these questions are satisfactorily answered, Rome must be viewed in the light of an impostor, assuming to herself that supreme deference which is due exclusively to the Spirit of God. Her pretensions must be regarded as the offspring of fraud, engendered by ambition and nurtured by interest, which none can acknowledge without treason against God, and perdition to themselves. Like the harlot in the Proverbs of Solomon, she stands arrayed in gaudy attire to beguile the simple, but her feet take hold on death, and her steps lead down to hell.

LETTER VI.

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility the Parent of Skepticism.

To abandon the exercise of private judgment, and intrust the understanding to the guidance of teachers, arrogant enough to claim infallibility, without producing the credentials of a Divine commission, is to encourage a despotism which none can sanction without the express authority of God. Private judgment, indeed, can never be wholly set aside; the pretensions of an infallible instructor must be submitted to the understandings of men, and finally determined by each man's convictions of truth and justice. The ultimate appeal must be to that very reason, which, in its independent exercise, is dreaded as the parent of so much mischief, the prolific source of so much schism. It is a circumstance, however, not sufficiently regarded, that the pretensions of Rome to that degree of inspiration which she arrogantly claims, cannot be admitted without striking at the basis of all human knowledge; confounding the distinctions of truth and falsehood, and laying the foundations of a skepticism more malignant and desolating than the worst calamities which can possibly result from the free and unhampered indulgence of private opinion. As extremes are so intimately connected, that the least touch of the pencil can translate expressions of joy into symptoms of sorrow, so those who seek to remove the occasions of difference, to terminate schism, extinguish controversy, and establish religion upon the strongest grounds of absolute certainty, by resorting to a guide that claims infallibility, without those signs and wonders, which indubitably declare that God's Spirit is in him, and God's hand upon him, pursue a course which has, in reality, a striking and inevitable tendency to conduct the mind to a dreary and hopeless Pyrrhonism. There can be no assurance of truth, without a corresponding confidence in our faculties; the light which we enjoy—the convictions of our minds—the appearances of things to the human understanding; these are to us the measures of truth and falsehood. Whoever is not content to receive the information of his senses, the reports of his

consciousness, and the evident conclusions of his own mind, deduced in conformity with those fundamental laws of belief which are presupposed in all its operations; whoever, in other words, looks upon his faculties as instruments of falsehood, and distrusts the clearest exercise of his powers; whoever refuses to take upon trust what the very constitution of his nature inclines him to believe, must rest content with the cheerless prospect of perpetual ignorance.

There can be no knowledge without previous belief, determined by the law of our nature, and liable to no suspicion of deception, because ultimately resolvable into the veracity of God. There are certain primary convictions—certain original principles, as Aristotle calls them, through which we know and believe every thing else, and which must, therefore, themselves be received with *paramount certainty*. These instinctive elements of natural faith constitute the standard of evidence, the foundation of truth—the groundwork of knowledge. Truth is the natural and necessary aliment of the soul; and the faculties of the mind in their original constitution, were evidently adjusted with a special reference to its pursuit, investigation and enjoyment. As the stability of external nature responds harmoniously to our instinctive belief of the uniformity of its laws, so all the elements of faith which enter into the essential constitution of the mind, are as admirably and unerringly adapted to their appropriate objects. Whatever, consequently, has a tendency to unsettle a man's confidence in the legitimate and natural exercise of his faculties, or to call into question what a distinguished philosopher has denominated the "fundamental laws of human belief," has an equal tendency to introduce a general skepticism, in which the distinctions of truth and falsehood are confounded, and the elements of life and death promiscuously mingled. To bring the different powers of the soul into a state of unnatural collision—to set our faculties at war—to involve their functions in suspicion—to make the deductions of the understanding contradict the original convictions of our nature, is effectually to sap the foundations of knowledge—to annihilate all certainty—to reduce truth and falsehood to a common insignificance, and expose the mind to endless perplexity, confusion, and despair. Now this is pre-

cisely the result which the Church of Rome accomplishes in the minds of those who are foolish enough to receive her as an infallible teacher, and her instructions as *infallible* truth. She subverts the original constitution of the mind—contradicts the primary and instinctive convictions of every human understanding—and pronounces that to be *absolutely certain*, which God, through the essential principles of human belief, declares to be *absolutely false*. She destroys the only foundation of evidence, extinguishes its light, surrounds her followers with an artificial darkness, and invites them to a repose from which no voice of truth can awaken them, no force of argument arouse them. He that yields his understanding to the guidance of Rome, must frequently meet with cases in which the information of his faculties is clear and unambiguous, and the constitution of his nature prompts him to one view, while the infallible authority to which he has submitted requires a contrary faith. Hence, if he be consistent, he must follow his guide, because, according to the terms of the hypothesis, the guide is infallible, and consequently, *distrust* the strongest convictions of his own understanding. If, in such clear cases, the reason of men deceives them, as deceive them it must, if the teacher be indeed incapable of error, how shall it ever be known when to trust their faculties at all? If they must regard that light which contradicts the sentiments of their pretended instructor, as a temptation of the devil, designed in the providence of God to test their fidelity, how shall they ever be able to distinguish these false appearances from the real illuminations of truth? Is it not evident that they must always be children in understanding, shrivelled up in intellectual dwarfishness by a comfortless Pyrrhonism—ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth?

It is a singular fact that, by pretending to infallibility, Rome occupies the same position in regard to religion, which Hume maintained in relation to philosophy.* She is a skeptical dog-

* " Our knowledge rests ultimately on certain facts of consciousness, which as primitive, and consequently incomprehensible, are given less in the form of *cognitions* than of *beliefs*. But if consciousness in its last analysis—in other words, if our *primary experience* be a faith, the reality of our knowledge turns on the veracity of our generative beliefs. As ultimate, the quality of these be-

matist, and by making the same principles conduce to contradictory results, she virtually pronounces truth to be impossible, and “reduces knowledge to zero.” The doctrine of transubstanti-

lies cannot be inferred; their truth, however, is in the first instance to be presumed. As given and possessed, they must stand good until refuted; *neganti incumbit probatio*. Intelligence cannot gratuitously annihilate itself; nature is not to be assumed to work in vain; nor the Author of nature to create only to deceive.

Φημη δ' ουποτε παμπαν απολλυται ηντινα παντες
Λαοι φημιζουσι. Θεου γν τι εστι και αυτη.

“But though the truth of our instinctive faiths must *originally* be admitted, their falsehood may subsequently be established: this, however, only through themselves—only on the ground of their reciprocal contradiction. Is this contradiction proved, the edifice of our knowledge is undermined; for ‘*no lie is of the truth.*’

“Consciousness is to the philosopher what the Bible is to the theologian. Both are professedly revelations of Divine truth; both exclusively supply the constitutive elements of knowledge, and the regulative standard of its construction. Each may be disproved, but disproved only by itself. If one or other reveal facts, which, as mutually repugnant, cannot but be false, the authenticity of that revelation is invalidated; and the criticism which signalizes this self-refutation, has, in either case, been able to convert assurance into skepticism—‘to turn the truth of God into a lie;—

Et violare fidem primam, et convellere tota
Fundamenta quibus nixatur vita salusque.—*Lucret.*

“As psychology is only a developed consciousness, the positive philosopher has thus a primary presumption in favor of the elements out of which his system is constructed; while the skeptic, or negative philosopher, must be content to argue back to the falsehood of those elements, from the impossibility which the dogmatist may experience, in combining them into the harmony of truth. For truth is one; and the end of philosophy is the intuition of unity. Skepticism is not an original or independent method; it is the correlative and consequent of dogmatism; and so far from being an enemy to truth, it arises only from a false philosophy, as its indication and its cure. *Alte dubitat qui altius credit.* The skeptic must not himself *establish*, but from the dogmatist *accept* his principles; and his conclusion is only a reduction of philosophy to zero, on the hypothesis of the doctrine from which his premises are borrowed. Are the principles which a peculiar system involves, convicted of contradiction; or, are these principles proved repugnant to others, which, as facts of consciousness, every positive philosophy *must* admit; then is established a *relative skepticism*, or the conclusion, that philosophy, so far as realized in this system, is groundless. Again, are the principles, which, as facts of consciousness, philosophy in general must comprehend, found exclusive of each other; there is established an

ation, for instance, cannot be admitted without involving in uncertainty the information of our senses, and rendering doubtful the only evidence upon which all our conceptions of the phenomena of matter must ultimately depend. Upon the authority of Rome we are required to believe, that what our senses pronounce to be bread—that what the minutest analysis which chemistry can institute is able to resolve into nothing but the constituent elements of bread, what every sense pronounces to be material—is yet the incarnate Son of God; soul, body, and Divinity, full and entire, perfect and complete. Here Rome and the senses are evidently at war; and here that infallible Church is made to despise one of the original principles of belief which God has impressed on the constitution of the mind. If, in reference to the magical wafer, which the juggling incantations of a Priest have transformed into the person of the Saviour of the world, our senses cannot be regarded as worthy of our confidence, how are we to know when to trust them at all? Why may not all our impressions of color, of touch, and of taste, be just as delusive as those which deceive us in reference to this bread? There can be no other evidence of any sensible phenomena than is possessed of the fact that the *wafer is bread*; and if this evi-

absolute skepticism;—the impossibility of all philosophy is involved in the negation of the one criterion of truth. Our statement may be reduced to a dilemma. Either the facts of consciousness can be reconciled, or they cannot. If they cannot, knowledge absolutely is impossible, and every system of philosophy therefore false. If they can, no system which supposes their inconsistency can pretend to truth. As a legitimate skeptic, Hume could not assail the foundations of knowledge in themselves. His reasoning is from their subsequent contradiction to their original falsehood; and his premises, not established by himself, are accepted only as principles universally conceded in the previous schools of philosophy. On the assumption, that what was thus unanimously admitted by philosophers, must be admitted of philosophy itself, his argument against the certainty of knowledge was triumphant. Philosophers agreed in rejecting certain primitive beliefs of consciousness as false, and in usurping others as true. If consciousness, however, were confessed to yield a lying evidence in one particular, it could not be adduced as a creditable witness at all;—*falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. But as the reality of our knowledge necessarily rests on the assumed veracity of consciousness, it thus rests on an assumption implicitly admitted by all systems of philosophy to be legitimate.

“Faciunt, nae, intelligendo, ut nihil intelligant.”—*Edinburgh Review*, vol. li. pp. 196, 7.

dence is fallacious and uncertain, the existence of matter may be a chimera, or the speculation of Spinoza may not be unsound, that only one substance obtains in the universe, and that substance is God. If Rome is to be believed, in opposition to the senses, the paramount authority of our primary convictions is at once overthrown; the constitution of our nature is rendered subject to suspicion; the measures of truth are involved in perplexity, and man is set afloat upon the boundless sea of speculation, without chart, compass, or rudder. The standard by which opinions must be ultimately tried, is called into question, and the only thing which can be regarded as absolutely certain, is the utter uncertainty of every thing on earth. It is intuitively clear, that if our faculties cannot be trusted in one case which falls within the sphere of their legitimate jurisdiction, they cannot be trusted in another. If they cannot be credited when, with every mark of truth, they inform us of physical phenomena, they can no more be credited when they inform us of the infallibility of the Church; if our *primary* convictions are doubtful, all other impressions must be delusive and deceitful. So far as we are able to ascertain, one thing, under such circumstances, is just as true as another; the sophist is the only philosopher; skepticism the only form of wisdom.

In conformity with what reason would lead us to expect, we find, from actual experience, that in papal countries, where the infallibility of the Church is maintained without limitation or reserve, the intelligent members of the community have no real belief in any of the distinctive doctrines of religion. Hence, too, the chair of St. Peter has been so frequently filled by those who despised every principle embraced in the noble confession of that distinguished Apostle. Leo X., John XXIII., and Clement VII., Cardinal Bembo, Ficinus, Politian, Pomponatius, Portius, Aretin, and a host of others, distinguished alike by their offices and attainments, in the very heart of the papal dominions, are as renowned in the annals of atheism, as in the history of religious hypocrisy.

The schoolmen, indeed, did not hesitate to maintain the assertion that opinions might be philosophically true, and yet theologically false, or theologically true, and at the same time

philosophically false.* In other words, they maintained that truth might consist with open contradictions, which is equivalent to saying that its existence was impossible, or, at least, inconceivable. There can be no doubt that the speculations of the schoolmen prepared the way for the extensive desolations of what has been called philosophical infidelity† in modern times,

* “The subtle doctors of the schools not only explained the mysteries of religion in a manner conformable to the principles of their presumptuous logic, and modified them according to the dictates of their imperfect reason, but also propagated the most impious sentiments and tenets concerning the Supreme Being, the material world, the origin of the universe, and the nature of the soul. And when it was objected to these sentiments and tenets that they were in direct contradiction to the genius of Christianity and to the express doctrines of Scripture, these scholastic quibblers had recourse for a reply, or rather, for a method of escape, to that perfidious distinction which has frequently been employed by modern deists, that these tenets were *philosophically true* and conformable to right reason, but that they were indeed *theologically false* and contrary to the orthodox faith.”—*Mosh. Cent. 13*, pt. ii. c. 3.

† Many valuable hints concerning the connection betwixt the scholastic philosophy, and the skepticism by which it was rapidly succeeded, may be found in Ogilvie’s Inquiry into the causes of infidelity and skepticism. The seed was evidently planted by the schoolmen of the middle ages, which subsequently bore such bitter fruit; they encouraged the spirit of captious dialectics, that absurd inattention to the fundamental laws of belief as the basis of philosophy, which, in other hands, was to subvert the foundations of all that was fair, venerable, or sacred. The reader may be pleased with the following extract from a learned and valuable work :

“Imo, unde scholastici suas quodlibeticas et frivolas questiones, nisi ex hac scepticismi lacuna, hauserunt. Hoc bene notavit Jansenius (*August. tom. ii. proem. lib. cap. 28*). Scholastici, inquit, nimio philosophiae amore quasi ebrii, arcana illa mysteria gratia sepulta, delectaque secundum humanae rationis regulas eruere, penetrare, formare, judicare, voluerant. Hinc ille ardor de quolibet disputandi, quidlibet eorum in dubium revocandi. Hinc eorum theologia innumerabilium opinionum farragine referta est, per quas fere omnia, quantumcunque contraria, facta sunt probabilia; quae secundum eorum pronuntiata, cuilibet tueri licet. Ita vix quicquam certi, praeter fidem, formandarum opinionum novarum promptitudo reliquum fecit. Praecipitii enim poena, suspendium *εποχῆ* hoc est, temeritatis omsis hesitantia et incertitudo. Nihil enim naturalius et vicinius quam ut homines ex Peripateticis fiant Academici, quorum illi, sublucente ratiuncula, sententiam extemplo precipitant; hi, temeritatis ducti, poenitentia, semper hesitant; et nunc hoc, nunc illud, animo fluctuante, displicet, placet; unde fit ut quod eis hodie probabile est, eras falsum judicetur.”—*Galæi Philos. General. par. ii. lib. i. c. 4.*

and just as little doubt that the violence which is offered by the creed of Rome to the original principles of human belief, introduced the schoolmen into those curious refinements of perverse dialects, which effectually destroyed the unity of truth, but without which they were compelled to abandon the infallible dicta of an arrogant community. Modern infidelity, in all its forms, is much more intimately connected with the influence of the papacy than seems to be generally apprehended. From the very nature of the case, Popery must be the *parent* of skepticism—and the dogmas of Rome cannot be admitted without making a double standard of truth, and destroying all its consistency and harmony. Those, however, who are not prepared for the dreary shades of unmitigated skepticism, will much prefer the legitimate conclusions of their own understanding, to the wretched tattle of the papal Priesthood. Fully assured that a standard of truth, in reality, exists, uniform and stable, they can never believe that God has subjected their minds to the control of men who can deliberately trifle with the constitution of their nature, and make its inherent propensities and instinctive faith a matter of mockery. The very fact that these miserable guides contradict the universal bias of mankind, is sufficient to show that they are blind leaders of the blind, and that instead of having a commission from heaven, they derive their claims from the father of lies. God Himself, in His acknowledged revelations, appeals to the authority of our primary convictions. The miracles of Jesus Christ were addressed to the senses—to human eyes and human ears—and in all His expostulations with the Jews, our Saviour evidently assumes the absolute certainty of sense and consciousness—the ultimate sources of all human knowledge, as well as the irresistible authority of those original principles which constitute the tests of truth. We cannot conceive, indeed, that a Divine revelation could be possibly authenticated without assuming the credibility of our faculties. To shake our confidence in them is to render belief impossible, no matter what may be the subject proposed, or the evidence submitted. It is idle, in fact, to talk of evidence, which is only the light in which the mind perceives the reality of truth, if all our perceptions are to be called into question, or involved in uncertainty. Any pre-

tended teacher, therefore, who does not authenticiate his claims to Divine authority by performing miracles, which none could achieve unless God were with him; any teacher who belies his pretensions by opening his mouth in what every law of our nature requires us to denounce as falsehood, must be regarded as a child of darkness, the enemy of light, and the foe of man. No divine revelation can be more certain than the testimony of sense, or the evidence of consciousness. Through one of these sources every idea must be conveyed to the mind—and whatever teacher undertakes to set them aside, is the father of skepticism, and requires of man a homage, which though he may profess to render, it is utterly impossible to pay. If the evidence that such a teacher were really sent from God, was equal to the evidence of sense or consciousness, the mind would then be involved in that state of contradiction in which it is impossible to form an opinion—the teacher and our nature, like two negatives in English, would destroy each other, and our real faith would be expressed by a cipher. The mind, in other words, would be a perfect blank—a stagnant pool of ignorance and doubt—a mere chaos of discordant elements—the sport of endless confusion and caprice. It is vain to pretend that we honor God, in cordially receiving what the constitution of our nature prompts us to reject—that the merit of the faith is enhanced by the difficulties which we struggle to subdue. When these difficulties arise from perverse dispositions, from stubborn prejudices, impetuous passions, or pride of understanding, there may be some foundation for the plea—but when they lie in the *very nature of the evidence*, he that commends his faith on such ground, glories in the fact that his assent is strong just in proportion as the evidence is weak, and amounts to absolute certainty when, upon the most favorable hypothesis that can be made in the case, there is, in truth, no evidence at all. The papist, for instance, may regard it as a wonderful triumph of devout respect for the authority of God, that he really believes that bread and wine are transformed into the person of his glorious Redeemer, the accidents of bread and wine remaining still unchanged.* But then it is

* Trent teaches that by the consecration of the bread and wine the whole

impossible that the evidence in favor of this supposition can ever be stronger than the evidence against it. Let us grant that it may be equal. What, then, is the real state of the case? God, in the constitution of our nature, requires us to believe the reality of the bread; through an infallible Church He requires us to believe the nature of the change. We are just as certain that He speaks through the essential constitution of the human mind, as through a general Council of the Roman Church. To say, therefore, that we honor Him by despising our nature, and being absolutely certain that the Church is right, is just to say that when the evidence is precisely on a poise, it is insulting to God not to disregard His first revelation through the reason of man. Transubstantiation is not a mystery, but an absurdity—not a difficulty, but a contradiction—not something which transcends the legitimate province of reason, but a fact which is repugnant to every principle of human belief—a fact which no man can receive without denying the paramount authority of those elementary truths which are implanted in our nature, as the germ of all subsequent knowledge and philosophy—and without which even the infallibility of a teacher cannot possibly be proved. Rome, then, in proposing this dogma as an article of faith, is the patron of skepticism, and undermines the very foundation on which alone she can rest her authority to dictate at all. In requiring us to believe this monstrous absurdity, she is guilty of the equally stupendous folly of requiring us to believe, and at the same time deny, the certainty of sense as a means of information—to believe the certainty of sense, in order to substantiate the infallibility of the Church, which ultimately rests on the divine commission of Christ, as established by miracles addressed to the senses, and acknowledged by them to be indisputable facts—to

substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood (*Sess. XIII. chap. 4*); that Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and in every particle thereof, and under the species of wine and in all its parts (*Ibid. c. 3*). Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, says the Council in chap. 1, is truly, really, and substantially contained in the pure sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, and under the species of those sensible objects.

deny the certainty of sense in order to sustain the enormous figment that all the sensible properties of the bread can remain unchanged after its substance has been physically transmuted into the complex person of the Divine Redeemer. How such egregious trifling with the intellectual nature of mankind differs from the false philosophy of Hume, in its legitimate effects and inevitable tendencies, I leave to be determined by those who are fond of a riddle or tickled with a paradox. It is enough for me to know that no one can consistently be a papist without ceasing to be a man, nor subscribe to the infallible dogmas of that apostate community, without virtually inculcating that truth is a fiction, and evidence "of all our vanities, the motliest, the merest word that ever fooled the ear from out the schoolman's jargon."

The history of Greek philosophy and the controversies on the subject of transubstantiation reveal a remarkable coincidence betwixt the ancient skeptics of Greece and the modern doctors of Rome: they are alike in the principles with which they set out, and remarkably alike in the positive but inconsistent dogmatism upon the most solemn and important subjects, with which they professed to terminate their inquiries. The distinctive features of the school of Pyrrho may be accurately ascertained from his division of philosophy, and the answers which he gives to those great questions which naturally arise from his distribution of the subject. "Whoever," says the founder of this ill-omened sect, "whoever would live happily ought to look to three things; first, how things are in themselves; secondly, in what relation man stands to them; and lastly, what will be the inevitable consequence of such relations." The followers of this blind and infatuated guide called into question the veracity of the senses, and endeavored to show that there was no unalterable standard of truth in conformity with which our judgments should be formed. They regarded mankind as walking literally in a vain show, and pronounced it to be impossible to ascribe with certainty any real existence to the objects which surround us. Hence they recommended a suspension of judgment—an entire absence from all positive assertion, as the dictate of wisdom. Their propositions were to be thrown into the form of *questions*, not that the answers could ever be determined, but that the uncertainty of

knowledge might be clearly indicated, and the vacancy of the mind distinctly acknowledged. This fluctuating state of opinion, or rather this abstinence from any thing sufficiently positive to be called opinion, was regarded by the skeptics as the true method of securing felicity. To embrace skepticism was to embrace a life of tranquillity, in which the indifference of the mind to truth and falsehood happily responded to the uncertainty of things—and as nothing was allowed to be real, the anxieties of hope, the perturbations of fear, and all the inquietude of passion, were suppressed by the removal of the causes which produce them. This was the theory, but the *rules* of life which these philosophers prescribed, (and in this matter with a strange inconsistency they were dogmatical and positive,) were completely at war with their speculative doctrines. They recommended a *moderation of desire* which evidently implied that there were *real* causes in existence to disturb the equanimity of the soul—and, like the Romanists, while in one breath they rejected the authority of the senses, in the very next they assumed their information as the basis of practical wisdom.

It will be remembered that, in the progress of opinion, the skeptics introduced the Epicureans. The true tendency of Pyrrhonism is to destroy all interest in human affairs—to bring about a state of complete indifference—to shroud the mind in a listless apathy—to produce an intellectual swoon, in which, though the powers exist, their exercise is entirely suspended. To confound the distinctions of truth and falsehood, to render knowledge impossible or certainty absurd, is to divest the mind of all motive to exertion and remove from character the stability of principle. The investigation of *truth* is the proper employment of the human understanding—the possession of truth constitutes its wealth—the love of truth its glory—and sympathy with truth its health and vigor. A greater curse cannot, consequently, be inflicted on the race than to repress the mind in its noble aspirations by pronouncing its pursuits to be vain and nugatory. Society could not exist—every faculty of the soul would wither, and pine, and die, unless something were admitted—something cherished and loved. To deny that there are *any principles* in any department of human inquiry on which

we may repose with confidence and safety, is to reduce man to a condition of torpor which nature cannot and will not tolerate. The activity of the soul must be exerted, and if debarred from the generous pursuit of truth, it will vent its inclinations in lawless pleasure, and gratify its lusts with unrestrained licentiousness. The sophists are the natural precursors of atheists and libertines. It was so in Greece—it was so in the middle ages—it is still so where the Roman hierarchy is unchecked in its influence by the warning and example of Protestant teachers. The *reality* of the passions, of pride, ambition, avarice and revenge, is a matter of feeling which the refinements of skepticism are unable to dissipate. These will exert *unlimited sway* where the sacred majesty of truth has been disrobed of its power—these will remain as *certainties* when all other things are involved in doubt; and skepticism can do no more, from the very nature of man, than to remove the checks from appetite and lust, and give the reins to the indulgence of desire. In charging, therefore, the Church of Rome with embracing the fundamental principles of skepticism, I bring an awful accusation against her. She disturbs the foundations of society—she sanctions principles which, if legitimately carried out, would obliterate all science, all morality, all regulated freedom, and all religion. Instead of being the representative of Christ, who came to bear witness to the *truth*, she stands on the same platform with Pyrrhonists, Sophists, Atheists and Epicureans. Hence we should not be surprised that Rome is now and ever has been, in every period of her history, the mortal enemy of free discussion. Those who acknowledge no invariable standard of truth must regard investigation as idle and argument as vain. And Rome, too, is just skeptic enough to discard all sense of moral obligation, and to gratify her characteristic lusts, ambition and avarice, without the annoyances of compunction and remorse. These passions, like beasts of prey, seek the cover of darkness for their crimes—and the history of the past affords the fullest authority for saying that Rome has found it convenient to envelope truth in obscurity, in order that she might promote her own aggrandizement without molestation or disturbance. Nothing, indeed, can more strikingly illustrate her indifference to truth, and the steady zeal

with which she pursues her purposes of pride, than her shameful policy in reference to books. Her expurgatory and prohibitory indexes embrace the choicest monuments of learning—her sons are debarred from holding communion with the master-spirits of the race, to whom science, philosophy, and liberty, are under the deepest obligations. Among the works which to this day are proscribed by the proper authorities at Rome are the writings of Bacon, Milton, and Locke. Even the more liberal of her own children, who have had the audacity to prefer candor to the interests of the hierarchy, have been rudely enrolled on the list of proscription. Dupin, DeThou, and Fenelon, stand side by side with Cave, Robertson, and Bingham. Rome dreads nothing so much as *liberty of thought*. Light is death to her cause—and consequently truth, philosophy, and reason—the book of God and the books of men must be suppressed, silenced, and condemned, lest the slumbers of the people should be broken—the sun of righteousness arise—and the frauds and impostures of an arrogant community exposed to the gaze of day. She can only flourish among a nation of sophists, among a people who have lost the love of truth, and seek from authority what ought to be sustained by evidence.

To the papal sect we are also indebted for the first restraints upon the freedom of the press.* Till the unhallowed usurpa-

* “ The first instances of books printed with *Imprimaturs*, or official permissions, are two printed at Cologne, and sanctioned by the University in 1479 (one of them a Bible), and another at Heidelberg, in 1480, authorized by the Patriarch of Venice; and the oldest mandate that is known for appointing a *Book-Censor* is one issued by Berthold, Archbishop of Mentz, in the year 1486, forbidding persons to translate any books out of the Latin, Greek, or other languages, into the vulgar tongue, or, when translated, to sell or dispose of them, unless admitted to be sold by certain doctors and masters of the university of Erfurt. In 1501, Pope Alexander VI. published a Bull prohibiting any books to be printed without the approbation of the Archbishops of Cologne, Mentz, Tiers, and Magdeburg, or their Vicars-General, or officials in spirituals, in those respective provinces. The year following, Ferdinand and Isabella, sovereigns of Spain, published a royal ordinance charging the Presidents of the Chancellaries of Valladolid and Ciudad Real, and the Archbishops of Toledo, Seville, and Grenada, and the Bishops of Burgos, Salamanca, and Zamora, with every thing relative to the examination, censure, impression, importation, and sale of books. In the Council of Lateran, held under Leo X., in 1515, it was

tions of Rome had devised the expedient of suppressing thought by preventing its propagation, "books," says Milton, "were ever as freely admitted into the world as any other birth—the issue of the brain was no more stifled than the issue of the womb; no envious Juno sat cross-legged over the nativity of any man's intellectual offspring; but if it proved a monster, who denies but that it was justly burnt or sunk into the sea? But that a book, in worse condition than a peccant soul, should be to stand before a jury ere it be born to the world, and undergo, yet in darkness, the judgment of Rhadamanth and his colleagues, ere it can pass the ferry backwards into light, was never heard before, till that mysterious iniquity, provoked and troubled at the first entrance of reformation, sought out new limbos and new hells wherein

decreed that no book should be printed at Rome, nor in other cities and dioceses, unless, if at Rome, it had been examined by the Vicar of his Holiness and the Master of the Palace; or, if elsewhere, by the Bishop of the diocese, or a doctor appointed by him, and had received the signature, under pain of excommunication and burning of the book."—*Townley's Essays on various subjects, &c.*

The above extract has been taken from Mendham's *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*—a work which condenses much rare and valuable information, illustrating the savage ferocity of Popes and Councils in reference to the independent productions of the human mind. The infamous decree of the Council of Lateran was confirmed by Trent, and Rome is to-day as bigoted and bitter, as much the enemy of light and knowledge, as she was three hundred years ago. The Encyclical Letter of the present Pope, dated August 15, 1832, among other precious maledictions of the rights of man, denounces the "fatal and detestable liberty of publishing whatever one chooses"—(*deterrima illa ac nunquam satis execeranda et detestabilis libertas artis librariæ ad scripta quælibet edenda in vulgus*) and the Letter of Cardinal Barthelemi Pacca, dated August 16, 1832, addressed to the Abbe de Mennais, which may be regarded as an authoritative exposition of the Encyclical Letter itself, condemns the doctrines of the Avinci—a periodical publication which exerted great influence at the time, in reference to freedom of religion, and the freedom of the press. Liberal sentiments on these subjects the Cardinal declares to be highly reprehensible, inconsistent alike with the doctrines, the maxims, and the practice of the Church. In July, 1834, the Pope issued another infernal bulletin against light, knowledge, and liberty, occasioned by a new work of Mennais, entitled the *Words of a Believer*. This document far surpasses, in the violence of its tyrannical principles, the Encyclical Letter of August 15. These facts show what *Rome now is*. I allude to them now incidentally, as I shall have occasion hereafter to notice them more fully.

they might include our books also within the number of the damned.”

How the literary policy of Rome can be reconciled with any decent regard for the authority of truth or the enlargement of the mind it is impossible to discover. If truth indeed be “strong next to the Almighty, she needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings to make her victorious—these are the shifts and defences that error uses against her power.” It is the owls and bats of the world that love to expatiate in darkness—the eagle gazes on the sun, and his flight is as lofty as his vision is clear. Truth rises from the conflicts of discussion noble and puissant—untarnished by the smoke and dust of the collision, she shakes her invincible locks, and, like a strong man, refreshed by reason of wine, rejoices to run her race. That cause which is propped by prohibitions and anathemas—which appoints spiritual midwives to slay the man-children born into the world—which, like kings, is stronger in legions than in arguments, bears a shrewd presumption on its face, that it is not the cause of the Father of lights.

It is a beautiful arrangement of infinite wisdom that they who assert so stupendous a claim as that of infallibility, without the least proof of Divine authority, should yet so completely stumble on the very threshold of philosophy as to make their stupidity much more remarkable than their pretensions to knowledge. It would be amusing, if it were not so humiliating, to see these arrogant empirics swelling with pompous promises to dispel all doubt, obscurity and confusion from the doctrines of religion, and to establish Christianity upon the firm basis of infallible truth; while the words have scarcely escaped from their lips, before they contradict every principle of human belief, and teach us to regard all certainty and evidence as mere chimeras. They promise to give us *infallible assurance*, and end by instructing us that such a thing as assurance is utterly impossible. Surely they are the men, and wisdom will die with them!—How true it is that the wicked are ensnared in the work of their own hands—how true the exclamation of the poet :

“ Oh what a tangled web we weave,
When first we practise to deceive.”

LETTER VII.

Papal Infallibility shown to be conducive to licentiousness and immorality.

ANY system of philosophy or religion which sanctions the mutability of moral distinctions, or introduces a fluctuating standard of duty, is fatal to the highest interests of man. Truth and virtue, the most important objects of sublunary pursuit, are alike unchanging and eternal. The moral and intellectual natures of men are so intimately connected, their mutual dependence so nicely adjusted, their action and reaction so perfect and complete, that confusion of understanding is always accompanied with corresponding lubricity of principle, and he whose perceptions of truth are not remarkable for clearness and precision will, most surely, be distinguished by an equal obscurity in his conceptions of rectitude. The moral duties which we are required to perform are first contemplated as speculative principles, whose *truth* must be submitted to the decision of reason before they can be received as authoritative laws whose precepts we are bound to obey. The *truth* of right is an inquiry necessarily prior in the order of nature to the *obligation* of right. The conviction of the understanding must always precede the sanction of conscience. Hence those philosophers are not to be rashly condemned who attribute to the same faculty of the mind the power of distinguishing betwixt right and wrong, which, it is confessed, distinguishes betwixt truth and falsehood. The mental processes are so nearly identical, that it seems to be an unnecessary multiplication of original powers to have a peculiar understanding conversant only about moral truth, while another understanding is admitted to exist which deals in truth of every other kind. Our faculties, which are only convenient names for the various operations of a simple and indivisible substance, derive their appellations not from the specific differences of the objects about which they are employed, but from their general nature. *The discovery of truth* is as much an end to the moral philosopher who is seeking to determine the standard of duty, and to settle what *ought to be*, as well as what *is*, as it is to the phy-

sical inquirer whose investigations cannot be legitimately pushed beyond the province of existing phenomena. The same laws of evidence, the same original principles, the same elements of human belief, and the same process of patient induction, are, or ought to be, common to both, and can no more be discarded with impunity by the one than they can by the other. Hence a variable or fluctuating standard of truth necessarily introduces a variable and fluctuating standard of morals—whatever system legitimates error, to the same extent legitimates crime—whatever blinds the understanding, corrupts the heart. The moral nature is always involved in the same ruin with the intellectual constitution. Rude and barbarous nations are as much indebted to imbecility of reason, superinduced by neglect of cultivation or false associations, for their mistaken apprehensions of good and evil, as to depravity of taste or perverseness of moral sensibility. Their deeds of darkness are performed without compunctious visitings of conscience, not because that messenger of God slumbers in the breast, or is bribed by the sinner to hold its peace, but because that light is extinguished, without which it is impossible to recognize the authority of law. The moral affections can no more expand nor take root downwards and bear fruit upwards while the understanding—the true sun of the intellectual system—is veiled in darkness, than the plants and herbage of nature can flourish in beauty and luxuriance without the genial light of the day. The sense of obligation is always just in proportion to the enlargement of the mind with liberal views of the relations of mankind; and although the *knowledge* of the right does not necessarily secure its *practice*, it *does* secure, what is of vast importance to society, remorse to the guilty, and a homage of respect to the good. He that acknowledges a legitimate standard of moral obligation will find in his conscience a check to those crimes, which, through weakness, he is unable to suppress—a restraint upon those passions, which, through frailty, cannot be subdued. The transgressor who violates rules of unquestioned authority, which his own understanding has received as right, will assuredly drive tranquillity from his bosom and repose from his couch. He sins, indeed, but without that moral hardihood which attaches to those who, in their blindness and igno-

rance, put light for darkness, and bitter for sweet. *They* are the most dangerous offenders who tamper with the principles of rectitude itself, who seek to escape the reproaches of conscience, by degrading the standard of moral obligation—who pursue peace at the expense of truth, and extinguish the light that they may not behold the calamity of their state. The abandoned condition of the Gentile world, which the Apostle so graphically describes in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, is ultimately traced to the *vanity of their thoughts, and the darkness of their minds*, and those to whom the gospel is hid, have their minds “blinded by the god of this world, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them,” and “reveal the glory of the Lord” by the contemplation of which they might be transformed “into the same image from glory to glory.” The love of speculative truth, and integrity of purpose, are graces of character so closely affiliated—they are so evidently the offspring of the same general condition of the mind, that he who aspires to the praise of honesty, must not forget the necessity of candor, and he who would adorn his heart with the highest excellence of which it is susceptible, must enrich his understanding with corresponding possessions. The love of truth is honesty of reason, as the love of virtue is honesty of heart; and so impossible is it to cultivate the moral affections at the expense of the understanding, that they who receive not the truth in the love of it, are threatened in the Scriptures with the most awful malediction that can befall a sinner in his sublunary state: an eclipse of the soul and a blight upon the heart, which are the certain forerunners of the second death. There is hope of reformation so long as the *principles* remain uncorrupted, but when the light which is in us is converted into darkness—when lies are greedily embraced and errors deliberately justified, the climax of guilt has been reached, the ruin of the character is complete, and the perdition of the soul, without a stupendous miracle of grace, seems to be inevitable. Shame and remorse, the usual channels through which amendment is produced, are always the result of consciousness of error—an affection which is utterly inconsistent with that

complete degradation of the mind to which thousands have been sunk, and in which error is neither lamented nor admitted.

From the intimate alliance which subsists betwixt the standard of truth, and the standard of morality, it follows as a necessary consequence, that skepticism is fatal to the interests of virtue. It destroys the *immutability* of moral distinctions; makes duty dependent upon *circumstances*; or rather, denies the reality of duty apart from convictions of utility or pleasure. He who trifles with the constitution of his nature in those primary convictions which lie at the foundation of all knowledge and philosophy, is cherishing a temper which shall soon rise in rebellion against the authority of conscience, and extinguish the only light that can convict him of crime. From the obscurity and confusion which have shrouded the understanding, may be anticipated a deeper gloom which is soon to settle on the heart. Speculation must ultimately end in practice, and if the waters are poisoned at the fountain, death must be expected to overspread the land. That the moral conduct of skeptics has not always been answerable to the looseness of their principles, is not to be ascribed to a redeeming virtue in the principles themselves, but to the restraints of society, and to the voice of nature, which skepticism had not been able to suppress. The *tendency* exists, though accidental hinderances have retarded its development. Doubts about *truth* and *evidence* will conduct to *doubts* about rectitude and sin; and he who shall finally conclude that *truth* is unattainable, must be a fool if he still believes that virtue is obligatory. These remarks, though they appear to me to be intuitively obvious, are felt to be necessary in order to rebuke the growing impression that speculative principles have no immediate influence in regulating conduct. We live in an age of sophists: a man may believe any thing or nothing; and yet if his *actions* are consistent with the standard of public decency, his principles are not to be condemned, his doctrines not to be assailed. If, however, there exist in the bosom of the Almighty an eternal standard of truth, from which the law of righteousness proceeds, in conformity with which the arrangements of Providence are conducted, the relations of things adjusted, and by which alone the harmony of the world can be effectually pro-

moted, the first step towards communion with the Father of lights is to recognize that standard. The mind cannot move in charity nor rest in Providence, unless it turn upon the poles of *truth*. "The inquiry of truth," says Bacon, "which is the love-making or wooing of it; the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it; and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature. The first creature of God, in the work of the days, was the light of sense; the last was the light of reason; and His Sabbath-work ever since, is the illumination of His Spirit."

In inculcating, therefore, a spirit of skepticism, and denying a permanent standard of truth, the Church of Rome impeaches the immutability of moral distinctions, and declares herself to be a child of the devil, and an enemy of all righteousness. She unsettles the foundations of right and wrong. She is as loose in her principles as she is corrupt in her practices. Consistently with her statements on the subject of transubstantiation, it is impossible to establish an unchanging standard of moral obligation; and as she evidently begins in Pyrrhonism, she must necessarily end in Epicureanism. The enormous corruptions of the clergy which provoked the indignation of Europe at the time of the Reformation; their rapacity, licentiousness, and lust, were not the occasional abuses of wicked men, foreign to the system, and abhorrent to the principles of the mass of the church. They were the legitimate, natural, necessary results of that spirit of skepticism which Romanism must engender among all who reflect upon the foundations of knowledge or the nature of evidence. They were the *bitter fruit* of her graceless pretensions to infallibility.

As the priesthood of Rome, in their mortal opposition to the natural measures of truth and certainty, have virtually claimed to be the arbiters of truth, it was not unreasonable to expect that they should likewise claim to be lords of the conscience, and the arbiters of duty. Hence we find, in fact, that by the name and pretended authority of God, they have instituted a standard of morality which completely sets aside the eternal principles of rectitude, and makes the interests of the papacy, which means nothing more than the wealth and power of the hierarchy, the

supreme object of pursuit. That is right, according to the philosophy of Rome, which enlarges the dominion of the priests, or increases the revenues of the Pope. Actions take their moral complexion, not from their influence on the relations which men sustain to society, or the relations in which they stand to their God, but from the bearing which they have upon the temporal grandeur of the Roman See. The papists, like the Scriptures, divide mankind into two great classes; but the righteous, according to Rome, are not those who are distinguished by works of faith, benevolence, and charity, these she has felt it her special vocation to pursue, in every corner of the earth, with fire and sword, with stripes and torture, imprisonment and death. Moral accomplishments are nothing, in her eye, as she acknowledges no standard of duty, which does not award to her the sublime position which reason and the Scriptures accord to the Almighty, as centre of the moral system, to whom are all things, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things. Her just ones may be polluted by every crime which humanity can perpetrate; by incest, adultery, murder, and treason—they may, like Hildebrandè, be firebrands of hell—like John, the beastly impersonations of lust; yet all is right—they are the salt of the earth, the excellent ones in whom Rome takes delight, if they prefer her interests above their chief joy. The supremacy of homage and affection which she claims for herself, places her on the throne of the Eternal, and regulates the standard of morality according to the measures which are best adapted to promote her authority, and completely sets aside the glory of God, which is and ought to be the chief end of man, and reverses all those arrangements of infinite wisdom by which the harmony of the universe has been nicely adjusted in accordance with the moral laws, which spring necessarily from the Divine perfections. He that makes the glory of God the end of his being, and the perfections of God his standard of rectitude, is certainly in unison with all that we know of that vast system of government, embracing the universe, and compassing eternity, under which we live. But such grand and magnificent conceptions of duty, the views of the Bible, of truth, and of nature, find no encouragement from the niggard politicians of Rome. They see in man but a slave for their lusts, and their

whole system of morality is a sordid calculation of interest—their duties are feudal services—and the solemn sanctions of religion are only introduced to give currency and success to their nefarious frauds. Wealth and power are the watchwords of the hierarchy. The visible and invisible worlds are alike the sources of their merchandise; souls are their spoils, and the patronage of sin the ultimate issue of their policy. The doctrine of indulgencies, the practice of auricular confession, the system of penances, the invention of purgatory, and the detestable principle of private masses, are only links in a chain of despotism, by which Rome binds the consciences of men, in order to seize the possession of their treasures. The whole scheme of papal abominations is directed with unerring sagacity to the secular aggrandizement of the clergy.* Every doc-

* “What can we think of redeeming souls out of purgatory, or preserving them from it by tricks, or some mean pageantry, but that it is a foul piece of merchandise? What is to be said of implicit obedience, the priestly dominion over consciences, the keeping the Scriptures out of the people’s hands and the worship of God in a strange tongue, but that these are so many arts to hoodwink the world, and to deliver it up into the hands of the ambitious clergy? What can we think of superstition and idolatry of images, and all the other pomp of the Roman worship, but that by these things, the people were to be kept up in a gross notion of religion, as a splendid business, and that priests have a trick of saving them, if they will but take care to humor them, and leave that matter wholly in their hands? And to sum up all, what can we think of that constellation of prodigies in the Sacrament of the Altar, but that it is an art to bring the world by wholesale to renounce their reason and sense, and to have a most wonderful veneration for a sort of men who can, with a word, perform the most astonishing thing that ever was.”—*Burnet, Hist. Ref.*

“Of all the contrivances to enthral mankind, and to usurp the entire command of them, that of auricular confession appears the most impudent and the most effectual. That one set of men could persuade all other men that it was their duty to come and reveal to them every thing which they had done, and every thing which they meant to do, would not be credible if it were not proved by the fact. This circumstance rendered the clergy masters of the secrets of every family; it rendered them, too, the universal advisers; when any person’s intentions were laid before a clergyman, it was his business to explain what was lawful and what was not, and under this pretext to give what counsel he pleased. In this manner the clergy became masters of the whole system of human life; *the two objects they chiefly pursued were, to increase the riches of the order, and to gratify their senses and pride.* By using all their arts to cajole the great and wealthy, and attacking them in moments of weak-

trine has its place in the scale of profit—power and money are the grand and decisive tests of truth and righteousness, and every principle is estimated by Rome according to its weight in the scales of ambition and avarice. Expediency, in its most enlarged acceptation, is a dangerous test of moral obligation, but when restricted to the contemptible ends which the papacy contemplates; when all the duties of mankind are measured by the interests, the secular interests, of a wicked corporation, we may rest assured that the most detestable vices will pass unrebuked, monsters of iniquity be canonized as saints, and the laws which hold the universe in order be revoked in subservience to the paltry purposes of sacerdotal intolerance. Rome claims the power of binding the conscience. She professes to wield the authority of God, and her injunctions, audacious as they are, she has the moral effrontery to proclaim in the name of the Most High. She consequently is, at once, a lawgiver and a judge. Truth is what she declares, and righteousness is what she approves. Such stupendous claims on the part of ignorant, erring, and sinful mortals as ourselves, must exert a disastrous influence on the purity of morals, and sanctify the filthy dreams of men, as the inspired revelations of the Father of truth. It is

ness, sickness, and at the hour of death, they obtained great and numerous bequests to the Church; by abusing the opportunities they enjoyed with women, they indulged their lusts; and by the direction they obtained in the management of every family and every event, they exercised their love of power, when they could not draw an accession of wealth.”—*Villers on Reform.*

The doctrine of private masses is one of the worst corruptions of the Romish Church. What Rome teaches to be Jesus Christ is actually sold in the market—and the solemn oblation of the Son of God is professed to be made for dollars and cents. We have masses for penitents, masses for the dead, masses at privileged altars, all which command a price in the shambles and increase the revenues of the grasping priesthood. To the disgrace of the hierarchy, it deserves to be mentioned, that they frequently received large sums of money for masses, which they never had the honesty to say. Llorente tells us of a Spanish priest who had been paid for 11,800 masses which he never said. We are informed of a Church in Venice, in 1743, that was in arrears for 16,400 masses. What a traffic in human souls! Cheated of their money—cheated of their liberty—cheated of their hopes—cheated of salvation—how mournful the condition of blinded, infatuated papists. What a stupendous system for accumulating power and wealth in the hands of the clergy!

impossible, under such circumstances, but that interest should be made the ultimate standard of propriety, and the whole moral order of the universe involved in corresponding confusion, by making that which ought never to be an end, the supreme object of human pursuit.

The moral system of the Jesuits, as developed in their secret instructions and the writings of their celebrated casuists, breathes the true spirit of the papacy. These men are the sworn subjects of the Roman Pontiff: to promote the interests of their sect is the single purpose of their lives; and their code of morality is based upon the principles which support the foundation of the Papal throne. In the Jesuits, consequently, we behold the legitimate effects of the Papal system—in them it is unrestrained by the voice of nature, the authority of conscience, or veneration for God. They are *Papists*—pure, genuine, unadulterated *Papists*; they have endeavored to divest themselves of every quality which is not in unison with the authority of Rome; they have made the Pope their god for whom they live, in whom they trust, and to whom they have surrendered their health and strength and all things. It is only in them, or those who breathe a kindred spirit with themselves, that the true tendencies of Romanism have ever been fully developed. Thousands in Rome have not been able to be fully of Rome, and the influence of Popery has been secretly modified by numberless restraining circumstances in their position, relations, and condition of society.

To take the doctrines of the Jesuits as the true standard of Papal authority cannot be censured as injustice by those who consider the intimate connection which subsists between licentiousness and skepticism. There is not a single distinctive feature of Jesuitism which may not be justified by the necessary tendencies of the acknowledged principles of Rome.* These men have embodied the spirit of the Church; they have digested its doctrines into order; they have reduced its enormities to

* “ One cannot condemn the Jesuits without condemning at the same time the whole ancient school of the Roman Church.”—*Claude's Defence of the Reformation*. The proofs are furnished in connection with the passage.

logical consistency, and held up before us a faithful mirror in which we may contemplate the hideous deformities of a body which claims to be the Church of God, but has inscribed in indelible characters on its front, *the synagogue of Satan*. Hence, the papal guardians of the press, in their zeal to stem the torrent of falsehood and repress the spread of dangerous speculations, while they have eviscerated the Fathers, prohibited the writings of the early reformers, and condemned the most precious monuments of philosophy and learning; have suffered the productions of Jesuitical casuists to stalk abroad into the light of day with the imprimatur of the Church upon them. These works are studied in Papal schools and colleges—systems formed in accordance with the doctrines of Molina have free circulation where Locke, Cudworth, and Bacon are not permitted to enter. If the moral system of the Jesuits was unpalatable to Rome, why has the order been revived; why has power been granted to its members to apply themselves *to the education of youth, to direct colleges and seminaries, to hear confessions, to preach and administer the sacraments*? Pius VII., in allusion to the Jesuits, and in vindication of his odious conduct in turning them loose to desolate society, states “he would deem it a great crime towards God, if, amidst the dangers of the Christian republic, he should neglect to employ the aids which the special providence of God had put in his power; and if, placed in the bark of St. Peter, and tossed by continual storms, he should refuse to employ the vigorous and experienced rowers who volunteer their services.” The peculiar services which the Jesuits have rendered to the interests of the papacy, have been owing to the lubricity of their moral principles. It is not their superior zeal, but the superior pliancy of their consciences, which have made them such “vigorous and experienced rowers,” and in condescending to accept their labors, Rome has endorsed the enormities of their system, and actually sanctioned their atrocious immoralities.

The most detestable principles of this graceless order have not only received in this way the indirect sanction of the head of the papacy, but may be found embodied in the recorded canons of general councils. That the end justifies the means—that the interests of the priesthood are superior to the claims of truth,

justice, and humanity, is necessarily implied in the decree of the Council of Lateran, that no oaths are binding—that to keep them is perjury rather than fidelity—which conflict with the advantage of the Catholic Church. What fraud have the Jesuits ever recommended or committed, that can exceed in iniquity the bloody proceedings of the Council of Constance, in reference to Huss? What spirit have they ever breathed more deeply imbued with cruelty and slaughter, than the edict of Lateran to kings and magistrates to extirpate heretics from the face of the earth? The principle on which the sixteenth canon of the third Council of Lateran proceeds, covers the doctrine of mental reservations. If the end justify the means—if we can be perjured with impunity to protect the authority of the priesthood, a good intention will certainly sanctify any other lie, and a man may be always sure that he is free from sin, if he can only be sure of his allegiance to Rome and his antipathy to heretics.

The doctrine of probability is in full accordance with the spirit of the papacy, in substituting authority for evidence and making the opinions of men the arbiters of faith. And yet these three cardinal principles—of intention, mental reservation, and probability—which are so thoroughly and completely papal—cover the whole ground of Jesuitical atrocity.* How absurd, then, to pretend that the tendencies of the Church should not be gathered from the system of the Jesuits! On the contrary, it is plain that they are the only consistent exponents of Romish doctrine; and should that Church ever rise to its former ascendancy among the nations of the earth, should it ever reclaim its ancient authority, the type which it would assume will be impressed upon it by the hands of the Jesuits. There is no standard, however, by which Rome can be judged, that can vindicate her character from flagrant immorality. Her priests, in all ages, have been the pests of the earth, and that inhuman law, which, for the purpose of wedding them more completely to the interests of the Church,

* The Jesuit, Casnedi, maintained in a published work that, at the day of judgment, God will say to many, "Come, my well-beloved, you who have committed murder, blasphemed, &c., because you believed that in so doing, you were right." For a popular exposition of the morality of the Jesuits, the reader is referred to Pascal's Provincial Letters with Nichole's Notes.

has debarred them from one of the prime institutions of God, has made them the dread of innocence and the horror of chastity. I take no pleasure in drawing the sickening picture of their depravity! The moral condition of Europe, at the time of the Reformation, superinduced by the principles and policy of the Popes, the profligacy of the clergy, the corruption of the people, the gross superstition which covered the nations—these are the fruits of *Papal infallibility*. That apostate community commenced its career by unsettling the standards of truth and knowledge. Skepticism prepared the way for licentiousness. When the standard of truth was gone, the standard of morals could not abide; and as fixed principles were removed, nothing remained but the authority of Rome, who usurped the place of God, became the arbiter of truth to the understanding, and of morals to the heart, by making her own interests, her avarice, and ambition, the standard of both.

LETTER VIII.

Papal Infallibility, proved to be the patron of Superstition and Will-worship.

WHEN our Saviour declared to the woman of Samaria, God is a spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and truth, he announced in this sublime proposition the just distinction between pure and undefiled religion and the various forms of superstition, idolatry, and will-worship. That the highest felicity of man is to be found alone in sympathetic alliance with the Author of his being, is the dictate alike of experience, philosophy, and Scripture; to restore the communion which sin had interrupted, to transform man again into the image of his Maker, and to fit his nature to receive communications of Divine love, is the scope and purpose of the Christian Revelation. Harmonious fellowship with God necessarily presupposes a knowledge of His character; [being an interchange of friendship which cannot be conceived when the parties are strangers to

each other.] Hence the foundation of religion must be laid in a just (though from the nature of the case, it must be inadequate) conception of the attributes of Deity, a proper apprehension of His moral economy and a firm belief of that amazing condescension by which He becomes conversable with men. He that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. The opposite extremes of true religion, both equally founded in ignorance of God, though under different forms of application, are superstition, and atheism. From atheism, which, as it dispenses with the sanctions of decency and morality, is a prolific fountain of bitterness and death, proceed the waters of infidelity, blasphemy, profaneness and impiety; from superstition, which distinguished philosophers,* in ancient and modern times, have pronounced to be more disastrous to the interest of man than atheism itself, flow the streams of idolatry, fanaticism and spiritual bondage. By a fatality of error, which seems to be characteristic of this grand apostacy, the Church of Rome is at once the patron of atheism and the parent of superstition.† Intent upon nothing

* Plutarch and Bacon. Both have drawn the contrast between atheism and superstition, and both have expressed the opinion that atheism is the more harmless of the two. Warburton, in his *Divine Legation*, has reviewed the sentiments of both, with his usual ability and force.

† That I am not singular in ascribing to the same cause, in different aspects, such opposite effects, will be seen from the following passages in works which have very few points of coincidence.

“For *infidelity* and *superstition* are, for the most part, near allies, as proceeding from the same weakness of judgment, or some corruption of heart. Those guilty fears and apprehensions of an avenging Deity, which drive some persons into *superstition*, do as naturally drive others of a more hard and stubborn temper into *infidelity* or *atheism*. The same causes, working differently in different persons, or in the same person at different times, produce both; and it has been a common observation, justifiable by some noted instances, that no men whatever have been more apt to exceed in *superstition*, at the sight of danger, than those who at other times have been most highly *profane*.”—*Waterland's Works*, p. 58.

“*Atheism* and *superstition* are of the same origin: they both have their rise from the same cause, the same defect in the mind of man, our want of capacity in discerning the truth, and natural ignorance of the Divine essence. Men that from their most early youth have not been imbued with the princi-

but her own aggrandizement, she asks of men only the decencies of external homage, and, so they are content to swell her train and increase her power, it is a matter of comparative indifference whether they acknowledge the existence of God, reverence His truth, love His character, or yield obedience to His laws. Her arbitrary pretensions to infallible authority disgust the intelligent; and while, like the heathen philosophers and the pagan priests, who occupied a higher form of knowledge than pertained to the vulgar, they silently acquiesce in existing institutions, they maintain in their hearts a profound contempt for the whole system of popular delusion.

That the Church of Rome encourages a mean and slavish superstition, will sufficiently appear from considering the nature of superstition itself. According to the etymology of Vossius,* it denotes religious excess. Any corruption of the true religion—every modification of its doctrines, or addition to its precepts,—comes, according to this view, under the head of superstition. In the estimation of others, its derivation imports a species of idolatry founded on the impression that the souls of the departed preserve their interest in sublunary things.† This sense is evidently embraced in the wider meaning of religious excess: and

ples of the true religion, or have not afterwards continued to be strictly educated in the same, are all in great danger of falling either into the *one* or the *other*, according to the difference there is in the temperament and complexion they are of, the circumstances they are in, the company they converse with.”—*Second part of the Fable of the Bees*, p. 374.

* “Quando in cultu ultra modum legitimum allquid *superest*, sive quando cultus modum rectum superstat atque excedit.”—*Etymologicum*.

“But the word” (superstition), says Waterland, “properly imports any *religious excesses*, either as to matter, manner, or degree. There may be a *superstitious awe*, when it is wrong-placed, or of a wrong kind, or exceeds in measure; and whenever we speak of a superstitious *belief*, or *worship*, or *practice*, we always intend some kind of religious *excess*. Any *false religion*, or false part of a true one, is a species of superstition, because it is more than it should be, and betokens excess.”—*Waterland, Second Charge* pt. ii. p. 57.

† Warburton gives a different explanation: “The Latin word, superstition, hath a reference to the love we bear to our children, in the desire that they should survive us, being formed upon the observation of certain religious practices deemed efficacious for procuring that happy event.”—*Div. Leg.* b. iii. § 6. For the view in the text, see *Taylor*, vol. v. p. 127, Heb. Edition.

we may consequently adopt with safety the more general acceptation which the first etymology naturally suggests.

The causes of superstition, as developed by illustrious writers of antiquity, as well as by modern philosophers and divines, in unison with the voice of universal experience, may be traced to the influence of zeal or fear in minds unenlightened by the knowledge of God.* Plutarch and Bacon concur in making the reproach or contumely of the Divine Being, in ascribing to Him a character which He does not deserve, of imperfection, weakness, cruelty and revenge, an essential element of this religious excess: Taylor† has copiously declaimed on fear as the fruitful source of superstitious inventions. Hooker‡ has shown that an ignorant zeal is as prolific in corruptions as servile dread; and Bentley§ has proved that a multitude of observances which first commenced in simple superstition, were turned by the artful policy of Rome into sources of profit, so that the dreams of enthusiasts and the extravagance of ascetics received the sanction of infallible authority, and were proclaimed as expressions of the will of God. From the follies of mystics, the excesses of fanatics, the legends of martyrs, and the frauds of the priesthood, whatever could be converted into materials of power, or made available to purposes of gain, has been craftily selected, and Romanism, as it now stands, is so widely removed from the simplicity of the gospel that only enough of similitude is preserved to make its deformity more clear and disgusting. It sustains, in fact, the same relations to primitive Christianity which ancient paganism sustained to the primeval revelations imparted to our race. It bears, to accommodate a simile of Bacon's, the same resemblance to the true religion which an ape bears to a man. To develop the corruptions of the papal hierarchy, which stamp that Church with the impress of superstition, would be to transcribe its distinctive doctrines and peculiar practices. The range of discussion would be too vast for a limited essay. I shall

* *Timor inanis deorum.* Cic. *de Nat. Deo.* i. 42.

† Vol. v. Sermon ix.

‡ *Ecclesiast. Polity*, b. 5, chap. 3. The reader will find it an exquisite passage, but it is too long to introduce here.

§ Sermon upon Popery, vol. iii., Works.

therefore content myself with briefly showing how completely the Church of Rome is imbued with the spirit of ancient Paganism.*

The pagan tendencies of Rome appear, in the first place, from the appeal which she makes to the assistance of the senses in aiding the conception and directing the worship of the Supreme Being. The pure and sublime idea which the Scriptures inculcate of a spiritual God, neither possessed of a corporeal figure nor capable of being represented by visible symbols, is as much a stranger to the theology of Rome as to the "elegant mythology of Greece." Hence we are told that "to represent the persons of the Holy Trinity by certain forms, under which, as we read in the Old and New Testaments, they deigned to appear is not to be deemed contrary to religion or the law of God." Accordingly the second commandment is annulled by the hierarchy—in books of popular devotion it is wholly suppressed—the windows of papal churches are frequently adorned with images of the Trinity, the breviaries and mass-books are embellished with engravings which represent God the Father as a venerable old man, the Eternal Son in human form, and the blessed Spirit in the shape of a dove. Sometimes grotesque images, hardly surpassed in the fabulous creations of heathen poets, where centaurs, gorgons, mermaids, with all manner of impossible things, hold undisputed sway, are employed to give an adequate impression of Him who dwells in majesty unapproachable, whom no man hath seen or can see. To picture the Holy Trinity with three noses, and four eyes and three faces—and in this form these Divine persons are sometimes submitted to the devout contemplation of papal idolaters—is to give an idea of God from which an ancient

* See this subject fully and elaborately discussed in Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*, part 3, book iii. chap. 3.

Bishop Horsley says—"The Church of Rome is at this day a corrupt Church—a Church corrupted with idolatry: with idolatry very much the same in kind and in degree, with the worst that ever prevailed among the Egyptians or the Canaanites, till within one or two centuries, at the most, of the time of Moses."—*Dissert. on Prophecies of the Messiah dispersed among the Heathen*; Works, vol. ii. p. 289. See also *Bp. Bull's Corruptions of the Church of Rome*.

Roman or a modern Hindoo might turn away in disgust. Such gross and extravagant symbols, however carefully explained or allegorically interpreted, involve a degradation of the Supreme Being, which it is impossible to reconcile with the sublime announcement of our Saviour, that God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. The adoration which is paid to the Deity under any corporeal figure or visible representation, cannot be vindicated from the charge of idolatry upon any principles which do not exempt from the same imputation every form, whether ancient or modern, of pagan superstition. It is quite certain, from the accounts of heathen philosophers and poets, that the images of their Gods were regarded simply as visible memorials of invisible deities—as signs by which their affections were excited and through which their worship was directed. The veneration with which it was treated was purely of that relative kind which the Romish doctors impute to the devotees of their own communion.* Pagan statues

* “Nor is it of any importance, whether they worship simply the idol, or God in the idol: it is always idolatry, when divine honors are paid to an idol, under any pretence whatsoever. And as God will not be worshipped in a superstitious or idolatrous manner, whatever is conferred on idols, is taken from Him. Let this be considered by those who seek such miserable pretexts for the defence of that execrable idolatry with which, for many ages, true religion has been overwhelmed and subverted. The images, they say, are not considered as Gods. Neither were the Jews so thoughtless as not to remember that it was God by whose hand they had been conducted out of Egypt, before they made the calf. But when Aaron said that those were the gods by whom they had been liberated from Egypt, they boldly assented: signifying, doubtless, that they would keep in remembrance, that God Himself was their deliverer, while they could see Him going before them in the calf. Nor can we believe the heathen to have been so stupid as to conceive that God was no other than wood and stone. For they changed the images at pleasure, but always retained in their minds the same gods; and there were many images for one god; nor did they imagine to themselves gods in proportion to the multitude of images: besides, they daily consecrated new images, but without supposing that they made new gods. Read the excuses which Augustine (in Psalm cxiii.) says, were alleged by the idolaters of the age in which he lived. When they were charged with idolatry, the vulgar replied, that they worshipped not the visible figure, but the Divinity that invisibly dwelt in it. But they, whose religion was, as he expresses himself, more refined, said, that they worshipped neither the image, nor the Spirit represented by it: but that in the corporeal figure

and Romish pictures are due to the operation of the same principle—an attempt to accommodate the receding majesty of a spiritual being to human sympathies, and to divest the adoration of an infinite object of some of its awful and mysterious veneration by reducing its grandeur to the feeble apprehension of human capacities. Fallen humanity, having originally apostatized from God, and lost the right as well as the power of intimate communion with the Father of spirits, seeks to gratify its religious aspirations by tangible objects around which its sympathies can readily cling. Unable to soar to the unapproachable light in which Deity dwells in mysterious sanctity—it spends its devotion upon humbler things, to which it imparts such divine associations as may seem, at least, to reconcile the worship with the acknowledged supremacy of God. When we cannot rise to God, the religious necessities of our nature will drag him down to us.

In the papal community the degradation of the Supreme Being seems to have reached its lowest point of disgusting feticism in the adoration of the bread and wine of the sacramental feast. I know of nothing in the annals of heathenism that can justly be compared with this stupendous climax of absurdity, impiety, blasphemy, and idolatry. The work of the cook, and the product of the vintage—bread and wine—the materials of food which pass through the stages of digestion and decay—are placed before us, after having been submitted to the magical process of sacerdotal enchantment, as the eternal God, in the person of the incarnate Redeemer.* The eucharistic elements are not memo-

they beheld a sign of that which they ought to worship." *Calvin's Inst.* lib. i. cap. 11, § 10. Upon this whole subject of the idolatry of the Church of Rome, the reader is referred to Archbishop Tenison's *Discourse of Idolatry*, particularly to chapters 10, 11, 12. That the heathens did not regard their images as gods, and that they worshipped them on the same principle vindicated by the papists, may be seen from Arnobius, Lactantius, Austin, and divers of the Fathers. A very interesting discussion of the nature and unlawfulness of image worship may be found in Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium* book 2. chap. ii. rule 6, § 21, ad fin. ; *Works*, vol. xii. p. 382 seq. The vain pretexts of the papists are there so ably discussed that the reader is earnestly requested to peruse it.

* The reader may be amused with the following description of the scene when the bread and wine are about to be destroyed and the person of the Saviour pro-

rials of Christ, nor visible symbols of his love—they are, after the pretended consecration of the priest, the Son of God himself. They are worshipped and adored, eaten and drunk, received into the stomach and passed into the bowels as the Creator, Preserver, and Saviour of mankind. The ancient Egyptians, in paying religious veneration to inferior animals, and to a certain class of vegetables, regarded them as sacred, as we learn from Herodotus and Cicero, on account of their subservience to purposes of utility. They were considered as *instruments* of divine Providence—not as gods themselves—by which the interests of husbandry were promoted, and noxious vermin were destroyed. But where, in the whole history of mankind, among the darkest tribes of Africa or the benighted inhabitants of the isles of the sea, is another instance to be found of a superstition so degraded, or a form of idolatry so horribly revolting, as that which is presented in the doctrine of the Mass? The infernal incantation of the witches in Macbeth, chanting their awful dirges over the boiling caldron in which are mingled the elements of death, are to my mind less insupportably disgusting, less terrifically wicked, than the priests of Rome, pretending to subject

duced. It is taken from Bishop England's preface to his translation of the Roman Missal, p. 78.

“ We are now arrived at that part which is the most solemn, important, and interesting of the entire ; every thing hitherto had reference, remotely or proximately, to the awful moment which approaches. For now the true victim is about to be produced. In a well regulated Cathedral this indeed is a moment of splendid, improving, and edifying exhibition to the well instructed Christian. The joyful hosannas of the Organ have died away in deep and solemn notes which seem to be gradually lost as they ascend to the throne of God, and solemn silence pervades the Church ; the celebrant stands bareheaded, about to perform the most awful duty in which a man could possibly be engaged.—His assistants, in profound expectation, await the performance of that duty ; taper-bearers line the sides of the Sanctuary, and with their lighted lamps await the arrival of their Lord. Incense-bearers kneel, ready to envelope the altar in a cloud of perfumes which represents the prayers of the Saints ; and at the moment of the consecration, when the celebrant elevates the host, and the tinkling of a small bell gives notice of the arrival of the Lamb, every knee is bent, every head is bowed, gratulating music bursts upon the ear, and the lights which surround the throne of Him who comes to save a world, are seen dimly blazing through the clouds of perfumed smoke, which envelopes this mystic place.”

the Saviour of the world, in cold-blood cruelty, and for purposes of hire, and that in increasing millions of instances, to the unutterable agonies of Gethsemane and Calvary.

In tracing the origin of transubstantiation and the consequent absurdity of the Mass, we are struck with another coincidence between the practices and doctrines of Rome and the rites and customs of pagan antiquity. That the terms and phrases and peculiar ceremonies which were applied to the mysteries of the heathen superstition, have been transferred to the institutions of the Christian system, and have vitiated and corrupted the sacraments of the gospel, is now generally admitted.* It is in the

* The following extract from Casaubon's 16th Exercitation on the Annals of Baronius, will sustain the assertion of the text :

“ Pii patres, quum intelligerent, quo facilius ad veritatis amorem corruptas superstitione mentes traducerent ; et verba sacrorum illorum quamplurima, in suos usus transtulerunt ; et cum doctrinæ veræ capita aliquot sic tractarunt, tum ritus etiam nonnullos ejusmodi instituerunt ; ut videantur cum Paulo dicere gentibus voluisse, *α αγνονντες εσσεβειτε, ταυτα καταγγελομεν υμιν*. Hinc igitur est, quod sacramenta patres appellarunt *mysteria*, *μνησεις*, *τελετας*, *τελειωσας*, *εποπτειας*, sive *εποψειας*, *τελεστηρια* ; interdum etiam, *οργια*, sed rarius ; peculiariter vero eucharistiam *τελετων τελετην*. Dicitur etiam antonomastice *το μυστηριον* aut numero multitudinis *τα μυστηρια*. Apud patres passim de sacra communione leges *φρικτα μυστηρια* vel *το ευπορητον μυστηριον* : Gregorio Magno, ‘ magnum et pavendum mysterium.’ *Μνεισθαι* in veterum monumentis sæpæ leges pro coenæ dominicæ fieri particeps : *μνησιν* pro ipsa actione ; *μυστης* est sacerdos, qui etiam dicitur *ο μυσταγωγων* et *ο ιεροτελεστης*. In liturgiis græcis et alibi etiam *η ιερα τελετη* et *η κρυφια και επιφωβος τελετη* et eucharistia. Quemadmodum autem gradus quidem in mysteriis paganis servati sunt, sic Dionysius universam *των τελετων την ιερουργιαν* traditionem sacramentorum distinguit in tres actiones, quæ et ritibus et temporibus erant divisæ ; prima est *purgatio* ; altera *initiatio* ; tertia *consummatio*. Spem meliorem morientibus attulisse mysteria Attica dicebat paulo ante M. Tullius. Patres, contra, certam salutem et vitam æternam Christi mysteria digne percipientibus affere, confirmabant ; qui illa contemnerent, servari non posse ; finem vero et fructum ultimum sacramentorum, *deificationem*, dicere non dubitant, quum scirent vanarum superstitionem auctores, suis *epoptesum* honorem audere spondere. Passim igitur legas apud patres, *της ιερας μυσταγωγιας τελος ειναι θειωσιν*, finem sacramentorum esse, ut qui vera fide illa perciperent, in futura vita dii evadant. Athanasius verbo, *θεοποιεισθαι* in eam rem est usus ; quod mox ab eodem explicatur, *participatione* spiritus conjungimur deitate. De symbolis sacramentorum per quæ divinæ illæ ceremoniæ celebrantur, nihil attinet hoc loco dicere ; illud vero quod est et appellatum fidei symbolum, diversi est generis et fidelibus tesserae usum præstat per quam se mutuo

teachings of heathen priests, in secret orgies of gross impiety, and flagrant indécency—and not in the instructions of Christ and

agnoscunt, qui pietati sacramento dixerunt ; cujus modi tesseræ fuisse etiam in paganorum mysteriis ostendimus. Formulæ illi in mysteriis peragendis usurpatæ, *procul este profani*, respondet in liturgia hæc per diaconos pronuntiari solita ; *omnes catechumeni, foras discedete, omnes possessi, omnes non initiati.* Noctu ritus multi in mysteriis peregebantur ; noctu etiam initiatio Christianorum inchoabatur ; Guadentio nominatur *splendidissima nox vigiliarum*. Quod autem dicebamus de silentio in sacris opertaneis servari a paginis solito, id institutum veteres Christiani sic probarunt, ut religiosa ejus observatione mystas omnes longe superarint. Quemadmodum igitur dicit Seneca, sanctiora sacrorum solis, initiatis fuisse nota, et Jamblichus de philosophia Pythagoreorum in *τα απορρητα*, quæ efferri non poterant, et *τα εκφορα*, quæ foras efferre jus erat ; ita universam doctrinam Christianam veteres, distinguebant in *τα εκφορα*, id est, ea quæ enuntiari apud omnes poterant, et *τα απορρητα* arcana temere non vulganda : inquit Basilius, *dogmata silentio premuntur, præconia publicantur*. Chrysostomus de iis qui baptizantur pro mortuis : *cupio quidem perspicue rem dicere ; sed propter non initiatos non audeo ; hi interpretationem reddunt difficiliorem ; dum nos cogunt, aut perspicue non dicere, aut arcano, quæ taceri debent, apud ipsos efferre*. Atque ut *εξορχεισθαι τα μυστηρια* dixerunt pagani, de iis qui arcana mysteriorum evulgabant ; ita dixit Dionysius, *vide ne emunties aut parum reverenter habeas sancta sanctorum*. Passim apud Augustinum leges, *sacramentum quod norunt fideles*. In Johannem tract. xi. autem sic : *Omnes catechumeni jam credunt in nomine Christi. SED JESUS NON ES CREDIT IIS. MOX, Interrogemus catechumenum, Manducas carnem filii hominis ? nescit quid dicimus. Iterum, Nescit catechumeni quid accipiant Christiani ; erubescant ergo quia nesciunt.*"

The pious fathers, perceiving that they could the more easily draw over to the love of the truth minds corrupted by superstition, both transferred to their own use a great many of the terms employed in their sacred rites, and so treated certain articles of true doctrine, and instituted such rites, that they seem to have been willing, with Paul, to say to the Gentiles : " What ye ignorantly worship, that we declare unto you." Hence it is, that the Fathers called the Sacraments *mysteriis*, sometimes even *orgies*, though more rarely, but peculiarly the *eucharist*, the festival of festivals. In the Fathers, you will every where read such terms as these, applied to the sacred communion : *The awful mysteriis, the ineffable mystery* ; in Gregory the Great, the *great and dreadful mystery*. In the language of the ancient documents, to be *initiated into the mysteriis*, is to be a *partaker of the Lord's supper*. The act itself was called *initiation*, and the officiating priest was termed a *mystagogue*. In the Greek Liturgies, as also elsewhere, the Eucharist is called the holy festival, the *secret and dreadful festival*. As there were degrees in the Pagan mysteriis, so Dionysius distinguishes the whole administration of sacraments into three actions, which were separate in rites and times :—1. Purgation ; 2. Initiation ; 3. Consum-

his Apostles, that we are to look for the mysteries which, in the papal sect, envelop the seals of the Christian covenant. As the

nation. Tully said that the Attic mysteries brought a better hope to the dying. The Fathers, on the other hand, confidently affirmed that the mysteries of Christ brought certain salvation and eternal life to those who worthily apprehended them—that those who despised them could not be saved—yea, they did not hesitate to assert, that the end and ultimate fruit of the sacraments was *deification*, since they knew that the authors of vain superstition promised this honor to those admitted to their secret rites. You may constantly read among the Fathers, that the end of the sacraments is, that those who apprehend them with a true faith, may go into the future life as *gods*. Athanasius uses the word *to be deified*, in reference to this matter, and explains it to mean, that we are united to God by the participation of His Spirit. Of the symbols of the sacraments by which those divine ceremonies were celebrated, it is not our purpose to speak here. That which was called the symbol of faith, was of different kinds, and served as a token by which the faithful could mutually recognize each other. Tokens of this kind, we have shown, were used in the pagan mysteries. To that formula of the pagans in celebrating their mysteries—*stand aloof, ye profane*—corresponded in the liturgy these words usually pronounced by the deacons,—“ All catechumens, all possessed, all uninitiated, retire out of doors.” Many of the heathen rites were performed at night; the initiation of Christians was also begun at night. It is called by Gaudentius the *most splendid night of vigils*. The silence observed by the pagans in their secret ceremonies, was so approved by the Christians, that in their religious observation of it they far excelled the heathen priests. As Seneca says that the most holy of the sacred things were known to the initiated alone, and Jamblichus divides the Pythagorean philosophy into the *secret*, which could not be uttered, and the *public*, which could be proclaimed, so the ancients distinguish the whole Christian doctrine, into the *public*, or that which might be announced to all, and the *secret*, which could not be promulgated. Basil says, doctrines are pressed in silence, things that may be preached are published. Chrysostom says, speaking of those who are baptized for the dead, “ I desire, indeed, to speak plainly, but on account of the uninitiated I dare not: these render the interpretation more difficult—since they compel us either not to speak perspicuously, or to reveal secrets which ought to be kept hid.” As those among the pagans who published their secrets were said to mock the mysteries, so Dionysius says—“ See that ye neither renounce nor lightly esteem these holy of holies.” Augustin constantly speaks of the sacrament which “ *the faithful knew*.” In tract xi. on John, he says—“ All catechumens now believe in the name of Christ, but Jesus does not trust himself to men.” Again,—“ Let us ask a catechumen, dost thou eat the flesh of the Son of Man? he knows not what we say.” Again,—“ Catechumens know not what Christians receive—let them blush at their ignorance.”

progress of corruption is always downwards, what was begun in mystery ended in absurdity—the extravagant terms in which the fathers described the Sacrament of the supper in evident rivalry of the Eleusinian mysteries—the unnatural awe with which they invested a simple institution, led in after times to this form of idolatry, which transcended the follies of their pagan guides.

But in no part of the papal system is the spirit of Heathenism more completely carried out than in the respect and veneration which are paid to the persons and relics of the saints. The deification of distinguished benefactors was perhaps the last form in which ancient idolatry corrupted the objects of worship. The canonizations of Rome differ but little in their spirit and tendency from the apotheoses of antiquity. The records of martyrdom have been explored, fabulous legends promoted into history, for the purpose of exalting to the rank and dignity of intercessors with the Father a host of obscure and worthless individuals, some of whom were the creatures of fiction, others rank and disgusting impostors, and a multitude still a disgrace to humanity. The eloquent declamation of the Fathers on the glory which attached to a crown of martyrdom—the distinguished rewards which, in a future state, they confidently promised to those who should shed their blood for religion, combined with the assurance of corresponding honors and a lasting reputation upon earth, were suited to encourage imposture and frauds, leading some to seek in the fires of persecution a full expiation for past iniquities, and hundreds more, when the storm had abated, to magnify sufferings which had only stopped short of death. It was perfectly natural that the primitive church should concede unwonted tokens of gratitude to the memories of martyred champions and the persons of living confessors. Nor are we to be astonished that their names should be commemorated with the pomp and solemnity of public festivals, among those who had witnessed the signal effects of such imposing institutions upon the zeal and energy of their pagan countrymen. What at first was extravagant admiration, finally settled into feelings of devotion—these sacred heroes became invested with supernatural perfections—from mortal men, they imperceptibly grew, in the sentiments of the multitude, to the awful dignity of demigods and saviours—and finally received

that religious homage which was due exclusively to the King Eternal. The system of Rome as it stands to-day, having confirmed the growing superstition of ages, is as completely a system of polytheism as that of ancient Egypt or Greece. The Virgin Mary is as truly regarded as divine, as her famous prototype Cybele or Ceres—and the whole rabble of Saints are as truly adored in the churches of Rome as the elegant gods of Olympus were worshipped in the temples of Greece. To say that the homage accorded to these subordinate divinities is inferior in kind and different in principle, is a feeble and worthless evasion. Magnificent temples are created to their memories, in which their worship is “adorned with the accustomed pomp of libations and festivals, altars and sacrifices,” in the solemn oblation of the Mass, which, according to the papal creed, is the most awful mystery of religion, and the highest act of supreme adoration, the honor of the saints is as conspicuous a part of the service as the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Their relics are conceived to be invested with supernatural power, their bones or nails, the remnants of their dress, or the accidental appendages of their person are beheld with awful veneration or sought with incredible avidity, being regarded as possessed of a charm like “the eye of newt and the toe of frog,” which no machinations can resist, no evil successfully assail. As the name of God sanctifies the altars consecrated to his worship, so the names of these saints sanctify the altars devoted to their memories, and vast distinctions are made in the price and value of the sacrifice, according to the spot on which the same priest offers precisely the very same victim. In

* The following prayer occurs in the Ordinary of the Mass: “Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to Thee in memory of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honor of the blessed Mary, ever a Virgin, of blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints; that it may be available to their honor and our salvation: and may they vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth. Through the same Christ our Lord.”—*England's Translation of the Rom. Miss.* p. 281. Here Christ, the eternal Son of God, is distinctly said to be offered up in honor of all the saints. What can that man withhold from them who gives them his Saviour? His *heart* surely is a small boon compared with this august oblation. And yet Trent has the audacity to declare that they are not worshipped with homage truly Divine.

the case of these privileged altars it is evidently the name of the saint which gives peculiar value to the gift, though that gift is declared to be none other than the Son of God himself. To these circumstances, which unquestionably indicate more than mortal respect, may be added the vast importance which the worship and creed of Rome attach to their pretended intercession. They execute a priestly function at the right hand of God, which it is hard to distinguish from the office of the Redeemer; in fact, their performances in heaven seem to be designed to stimulate the lazy diligence of Christ, and to remind him of the wants of his children, which the absorbing contemplation of his own glory might otherwise exclude from his thoughts. It is the saints who keep us fresh in the memory of God and sustain our cause against the careless indifference of an advocate whom Rome has discovered not to be sufficiently touched with the feeling of our infirmities, though Paul declares that he sympathizes in all points with his children, and ever liveth to make intercession for them.

To these multiplied saints, in accordance with the true spirit of ancient Paganism, different departments of nature are intrusted, different portions of the Universe assigned. Some protect their votaries from fire, and others from the power of the storm. Some guard from the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and others from the arrow that flieth at noonday. Some are gods of the hills, and others of the plains. Their worshippers, too, like the patrons of judicial astrology, have distributed among them, and allotted to their special providence and care, the different limbs and members of the human frame. It is the province of one to heal disorders of the throat, another cures diseases of the eye. One is the shield from the violence of fever, and another preserves from the horrors of the plague. In addition to this, each faithful Papist is constantly attended by a guardian angel and a guardian saint, to whom he may flee in all his troubles, whose care of his person never slumbers, whose zeal for his good is never fatigued. If this be not the Pagan system of tutelary divinities and household gods, it is hopeless to seek for resemblances among objects precisely alike—for a difference of name, where no other discrepancies are discernible, is sufficient to es-

establish a difference of things. The fatherly interest, the unceasing vigilance, the deep devotion with which these heavenly spirits superintend the affairs of the faithful, cannot be explained upon any principles which deny to them the essential attributes of God. The prayers which are offered at their shrines, the incense which is burnt before their images, the awful sanctity which invests their relics, the stupendous miracles which the very enunciation of their names is believed to have achieved, are signal proofs that they are regarded as really and truly divine.* The nice distinctions of worship which the Church of Rome artfully endeavors to draw, for the purpose of evading the dreadful imputation of idolatry, are purely fictitious and imaginary. That the language in which alone the Fathers of Trent recognized the Scriptures as authentic, is too poor to express the subtlety of these refinements, is a violent presumption against them—and that the Greek from which they are extracted does not justify these niceties of devotion, must be admitted by all who are capable of appreciating the force of words. Certain it is that no sanction is found in the Scriptures for the arbitrary gradations of worship which the Papacy is anxious to inculcate under the terms *δουλεια* (*dulia*), *υπερ-δουλεια* (*hyper-dulia*), and *λατρευει* (*latria*).†

* The following may be taken as a specimen of the honor which is ascribed to the saints. Let the reader judge whether more importance be attached to the intercession of Christ, than to the prayers of his departed servants :

“ O God, who was pleased to send blessed Patrick, thy bishop and confessor, to preach thy glory to the Gentiles, grant that by his *merits* and *intercession* we may through Thy mercy be enabled to perform what Thou commandest.” Take again the Collect for St. George’s day : “ O God, who, by the merits and prayers of blessed George, thy martyr, fillest the hearts of Thy people with joy, mercifully grant that the blessing we ask in his name (*per eum*) we may happily obtain by Thy grace.” Festival of St. Peter’s chair, at Rome, Collect : “ Oh God ! who, by delivering to Thy blessed Apostle Peter, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, didst give him the power of binding and loosing, grant that, by his intercession, we may be freed from the bonds of our sins.” In what is called the Secret it is said ; “ May the intercession, we beseech Thee, O Lord, of blessed Peter, the Apostle, render the prayers and offerings of Thy Church acceptable to Thee, that the mysteries we celebrate in his honor, may obtain for us the pardon of our sins.”

† They pretend that the reverence which they pay to images is *ειδωλονεια* (*service of images*), but deny that it is *ειδωλωλατρευει* (*worship of images*). For

Whatever forced interpretations may be put upon the language of the Romish Breviaries in the prayers which are addressed to the other saints, the worship of the Virgin is evidently in the highest

in this manner they express themselves, when they maintain that the reverence, which they call *dulia*, may be given to statues or pictures, without injury to God. They consider themselves, therefore, liable to no blame, while they are only the servants of their idols and not worshippers of them, as though worship were not rather inferior to service. And yet, while they seek to shelter themselves under a Greek term, they contradict themselves in the most childish manner. For since the Greek word *λατρευεῖν* signifies nothing else but to worship, what they say is equivalent to a confession that they adore their images, but without adoration. Nor can they justly object that I am trying to ensnare them with words: they betray their own ignorance in their endeavors to raise a mist before the eyes of the simple. But, however eloquent they may be, they will never be able, by their rhetoric, to prove one and the same thing, to be two different things. Let them point out, I say, a difference, in fact, that they may be accounted different from ancient idolaters. For as an adulterer or homicide will not escape the imputation of guilt, by giving his crime a new and arbitrary name, so it is absurd that these persons should be exculpated by the subtle invention of a name, if they really differ in no respect from those idolaters whom they themselves are constrained to condemn. But their case is so far from being different from that of former idolaters, that the source of all the evil, is a preposterous emulation, with which they have rivalled them by their minds in contriving, and their hands in forming visible symbols of the Deity."—*Calvin's Inst.*, lib. i cap. xi. § 11.

The Apostles are addressed in the following hymn, as the dispensers alike of temporal and spiritual blessings to their earthly supplicants:

" Vos Sæculorum Judices,
 Et vera mundi lumina,
 Votis precamur cordium;
 Audite voces supplicum.
 Qui templa cæli clauditis
 Serasque verbo solvitis,
 Nos a reatu noxios
 Solvi jubete, quæsumus.
 Præcepta quorum protinus
 Languor salusque sentiunt
 Sanate mente languidas;
 Augete nos virtutibus."

O you, true lights of human kind,
 And judges of the world designed,
 To you our hearty vows we show,
 Hear your petitioners below.
 The gates of heaven by your command
 Are fastened close or open stand;
 Grant, we beseech you, then, that we
 From sinful slavery may be free.

form of supreme adoration. She is not only invoked as being likely to prove a successful intercessor with the Saviour, but solemnly entreated to *command* her Son to answer the petitions of her servants.* She is exalted above all that is called God—"she

Sickness and health your power obey ;
 This comes, and that you drive away.
 Then, from our souls, all sickness chase,
 Let healing virtues take its place.

These extracts may be found in the Vespers or Evening Office of the English Papists. The Secret is from the Pocket Missal. See Bamp. Lect. for 1807, from which I have taken them, not having the original works at hand.

* This blasphemous language, which is justified by the services of the Church, was stoutly defended by Harding, in his controversy with Bishop Jewell: "If now," says he, "any spiritual man, such as St. Bernard was, deeply considering the great honor and dignity of Christ's mother, do, in excess of mind, spiritually sport with her, bidding her to remember that she is a mother, and that thereby she has a certain right to command her son, and require in a most sweet manner, that she use her right; is this either impiously or impudently spoken? Is not he, rather, most impious and impudent that findeth fault therewith?"

The following note, which occurs in the Bampton Lecture for 1807, p. 238, presents an awful view of the devotions, which, in their authorized books, the English papists render to the Virgin:

"In the common office for her, we have the hymn, Ave Maria Stella, which contains the following petitions: (*Vespers*, p. 131.)

"Solve vincla reis,
 Profer lumen cæcis,
 Mala nostra pelle,
 Bona cuncta posee.
 Monstra te esse matrem,
 Sumat per te preces
 Qui pro nobis natus
 Tulit esse tuus."

The sinner's bonds unbind,
 Our evils drive away,
 Bring light unto the blind,
 For grace and blessings pray.
 Thyself a mother show,
 May he receive thy prayer.
 Who for the debts we owe,
 From thee would breathe our air.

In the office of Matins in Advent, is the blessing, "Nos cum prole pia, benedicat Virgo Maria," which junction of the two names in this way must shock every true Christian: "May the Virgin Mary, with her pious Son, bless us."—*Primer*, p. 75. At p. 99, we have the hymn where she is called upon to "protect us at the hour of death," and she is called "Mother of Grace,"

approaches"—according to Damiani, a celebrated divine of the eleventh century—"she approaches the golden tribunal of divine majesty, not *asking*, but *commanding*, not a *handmaid*, but a *mistress*." We are taught by Albertus Magnus, that "Mary prays as a daughter, requests as a sister, and *commands* as a mother." Another writer informs us that "the blessed Virgin, for the salvation of her supplicants, can not only supplicate her son as other saints do, but also by her maternal authority *command* her son." Therefore the Church prays, 'Monstra te esse matrem;' as if saying to the Virgin—supplicate for us after the manner of a command and with a mother's authority. To her the characteristic titles of God, the peculiar offices of Christ, and the distinctive work of the Holy Spirit, are clearly and unblushingly ascribed in approved formularies of Papal devotion.* If this be

"Mother of Mercy." "Mater gratiæ, mater misericordiæ, tu nos ab noster protege et hora mortis suscipe." At p. 290, I find this recommendation to her: "O holy Mary, I recommend myself, my soul and body, to thy blessed trust and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy mercy, this day and daily, and at the hour of my death; and I commend to thee all my hope and comfort, all my distresses and miseries, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession and merits, all my works may be directed and disposed, according to thine and thy Son's will, amen." My readers will by this time be both wearied and disgusted, but I must add the prayer which immediately follows: "O Mary, Mother of God, and gracious Virgin, the true comforter of all afflicted persons, crying to thee; by that great joy wherewith thou wert comforted, when thou didst know our Lord Jesus was gloriously risen from the dead, be a comfort to my soul, and vouchsafe to help me with thine and God's only begotten Son, in that last day, when I shall rise again with body and soul, and shall give account of all my actions; to the end that I may be able by thee, O pious Mother and Virgin, to avoid the sentence of perpetual damnation, and happily come to eternal joys with all the elect of God, Amen." It must be remembered, that it is not what might be disclaimed as obsolete canons, or mere opinions of the schools, (not to any fooleries of a St. Buonaventure or Cardinal Bona,) that I am referring the reader, but to what is the actual and daily practice of the Romanists in these kingdoms. I can add even the express recommendation of one of their bishops. How just is the satire implied in the pithy remark of Bishop Bull, that "such is the worship given to the blessed Virgin by many in the Church of Rome, that they deserve to be called Mariani rather than Christiani."—*Serm. on Luke* i. 48, 49.

* In addition to the proofs of this awful accusation furnished in the preceding note, I appeal to the Encyclical Letter of the Pope, dated August 15, 1832:

not idolatry, if this be not the worship of the creature more than the Creator, it is impossible to understand the meaning of terms. If there be in this case any real distinction between *δουλεια* (*dulia*) and *λατρευια* (*latria*), the *δουλεια* (*dulia*) is rendered to God, and the *λατρευια* (*latria*) to the Virgin. She is the fountain of grace, and He is the obedient servant of her will.

There is a species of superstition extravagantly fostered by veneration for the images and relics of saints, which was severely condemned by the pagan philosophers of antiquity, though extremely common among their countrymen, and is as warmly encouraged by the bigoted Priesthood of Rome. It consists in the practical impression that there is no grand and uniform plan in the government of the world, founded in goodness, adjusted in wisdom, and accomplished by a minute and controlling providence; but that all the events of this sublunary state are single, insulated acts, arising from the humor of different beings, suggested, for the most part, by particular emergencies, and directed generally to mercenary ends. That it secured "deliverance from unnecessary terrors and exemption from false alarms," was one of the chief commendations of the lax philosophy of Epicurus, in which religion and superstition were, contrary to the opinions of the most distinguished sages of antiquity, strangely and absurdly confounded. The legitimate fear of God was involved in the same condemnation and exposed to the same severity of ridicule, with the fear of omens, prodigies and portents.* To the minds of the people, who admitted a plurality of

"We send you a letter on this most joyful day, on which we celebrate a solemn festival commemorative of the triumph of the most holy Virgin, who was taken up to heaven; that she, whom we have found our patroness and preserver in all our greatest calamities, may also be propitious to us whilst writing to you, and *guide our mind by her heavenly inspiration to such counsels as shall be most wholesome for the flock of Christ.*" In the same document, the same Pope ascribes to this same creature the glorious offices of Christ. He declares that she is his "*chief confidence,*" "*his only ground of hope.*"

§ Hence Virgil says:

"Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
Atque metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum
Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari."—*Georg.* 2, 490.

Happy the man who, studying nature's laws,
Thro' known effects can trace the secret cause—

gods, possessed of different attributes and intent upon opposite designs, it was certainly impossible to communicate those enlarged conceptions of a harmonious scheme of Providence, carried on by the power of a superintending mind, which are only consistent with such views of the supremacy of *one* being, as the philosophers themselves faintly apprehended. *Polytheism* must always be the parent of imaginary terrors. The stability and peace of a well-ordered mind, that unshaken tranquillity which is neither alarmed at the flight of birds, the coruscations of meteors nor eclipses of the moon, proceeds from a firm persuasion that there is *one* God, who sitteth in the heavens, and whose counsel none can resist.

To suppose that different portions of the universe are assigned to the care of different Divinities, possessed themselves of contradictory qualities, and ruling their departments by contradictory laws, is to maintain, if the happiness of men consists in their favor, or is at all dependent upon obedience to their will, that we must ever be the victims of dread—unable to escape the “barking waves of Scylla,” without being exposed to equal dangers from Charybdis. Such are the rivalries and jealousies among these conflicting Deities, such the variety of their views and the discordance of their plans, that the patronage of one is always likely to secure the malediction of the rest; and if one department of nature be rendered subservient to our comfort, all other elements are turned in fury against us. Under these circumstances, men’s lives must be passed in continual apprehension. They view nature, not as a connected whole, conducted by general laws, in which all the parts have a mutual relation to each other, but as broken into fragments by opposing powers—made up of the territories of hostile princes—in which every event

His mind possessing in a quiet state,
Fearless of fortune and resigned to Fate!

Speaking of religion, Lucretius says:

“Quæ caput a cœli regionibus ostendebat,
Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans.”—1, 65.

Mankind —— long the tyrant power
Of superstition swayed, uplifting proud
Her head to heaven, and with horrific limbs
Brooding o’er earth.—*Goode’s Lucretius.*

is a declaration of war, every appearance, whether common or accidental, a divine prognostic. To appease the anger, and to secure the approbation of such formidable enemies, will lead to a thousand devices of servility and ignorance. Every phenomenon will be watched with the intensest solicitude—the meteors of heaven, the thunders in the air, the prodigies of earth, will all be pressed into the service of religion, and anxiously questioned on the purposes of the gods. Charms, sorcery and witchcraft, the multiplied forms of divination and augury, servile flattery and debasing adulation, must be the abundant harvest of evils which is reaped from that ignorance of Divine Providence and the stability of nature, which is involved in the acknowledgment of a multitude of gods. Epicurus distinctly perceived the folly of imaginary terrors; but in suggesting a remedy overlooked the fact that the cause was not to be found, as he evidently thought, in the admission of Providence,* but in its virtual denial by ascribing the course of the world to the distracting counsels of innumerable agents. Just conceptions of Providence presuppose the absolute *unity* of the Supreme Being; and polytheism is no less fatal to the interests of piety than atheism itself.

That the Church of Rome encourages that form of superstition which heathen philosophers had the perspicacity to condemn, which heathen poets, such as Horace, Virgil, and Lucretius, endeavored to escape by fleeing to the opposite extreme of irreligion, and which the very constitution of our mind rebukes in its instinctive belief of the uniformity of nature, is too apparent to need much illustration. The account which Plutarch has

* “*Cætera, quæ fieri in terris cœloque tuentur
Mortales, pavidis cum pendent mentibus sæpe,
Efficiunt animos humiles formidine divum,
Depressosque premunt ad terram; propterea quod,
Ignorantia causarum conferre deorum
Cogit ad imperium res, et concedere regnum.*”—[6, 49.

— Whate'er in heaven

In earth man sees mysterious, shakes his mind,
With sacred awe o'erwhelms him, and his soul
Bows to the dust; the cause of things concealed
Once from his vision, instant to the gods
All empire he transfers, all rule supreme;
And doubtful whence they spring, with headlong haste
Calls them the workmanship of powers divine.—*Id.*

given of the religious excesses of his countrymen, may be applied with equal justice, but with intenser severity, to the countless devices of Rome. The same absurd and uncouth adorations, rollings in the mire, dippings in the sea—the same contortions of the face, and indecent postures on the earth—the same charms, sulphurations and ablutions, which he indignantly charges upon the “Greeks, inventors of barbarian ills,” are carried to a still more extravagant extent among the papal inventors of worse than barbarian enormities. The people sit in darkness and the valley of the shadow of death. The heavens to them are redundant with omens, the earth is fraught with prodigies, the church is a magazine of charms, and the priests are potent and irresistible wizards, who rule the course of nature and govern the destinies of men by the bones, images and fragments, real or fictitious, of the slumbering dead. In the *Treasure of Exorcisms*, the *Roman Ritual*, and the *Flagellum Dæmonum*, we have minute and specific directions for casting Devils out of the possessed, and for extracting from these lying spirits a veracious testimony to the distinctive doctrines of the papacy.* The holy water, the paschal wax, the consecrated oil, medals, swords, bells, and roses, hallowed upon the Sunday called *Lætare Jerusalem*, are charged with the power of conferring temporal benedictions and averting spiritual calamities. The *Agnus Dei* is a celebrated charm in the annals of Romish sorcery.† It possesses the power of ex-

* The story of the exorcising of Martha Brosser, A. D. 1599, may be found in the history of Thuanus, lib. cxiii. The reader will find it an admirable specimen of the *black art*.

† Urban V. sent three *Agnos Dei* to the Greek Emperor, with these verses:

“Balsam, pure wax and chrism-liquor clear
 Make up this precious lamb I send thee here.
 All lightening it dispels and each ill sprite;
 Remedies sin and makes the heart contrite;
 Even as the blood that Christ for us did shed.
 It helps the child-bed's pains and gives good speed
 Unto the birth. Great gifts it still doth win
 To all that wear it and that worthy bin.
 It quells the rage of fire, and cleanly bore,
 It brings from shipwreck safely to the shore.”

The forms for blessing holy water and the other implements of papal magic and blasphemy, may be found in the *Book of Holy Ceremonies*. I had marked out some of the prayers to be copied, but I have already furnished sufficient materials to establish the position of the text.

PELLING demons, securing the remission of venial sins, of healing diseases of the body and promoting the health of the soul. Holy water has also achieved stupendous wonders—broken limbs have been restored by its efficacy, and insanity itself has yielded to its power.* Whole flocks and herds are not unfrequently brought to the Priest to receive his blessing, and we have approved formularies for charming the cattle and putting a spell upon the possessions of the faithful. Rome is indeed a powerful enchantress. Even the sacraments become Circæan mixtures in her hands, dispensing mysterious effects to all who receive them from her Priestly magicians; being indeed a substitute for virtue, a complete exemption from the necessity of grace.†

The type of character and religious opinion, the pervading tone of sentiment and feeling, which any system produces on the mass of its votaries, is a just criterion of its real tendencies. The influence of a sect is not to be exclusively determined from abstract statements or controversial expositions, but from the fruits which it naturally brings forth in the hearts and lives of those who belong to it. The application of this test is particularly just in the case of Romanism, since the Priests possess unlimited control over the minds and consciences of their subjects. *They* are consequently responsible for the moral condition, the religious observances, the customs and opinions of papal communities. Hence the system of Rome, in its practical operations, can be better ascertained from the spiritual state of the mass of the people, than from the briefs of Popes, the canons of Councils, and the decisions of Doctors. It is seen among the

* See the dialogues of St. Gregory and Bede. St. Fortunatus restored a broken thigh with holy water; St. Malachias brought a madman to his senses by the same prescription; and St. Hilarion healed divers of the sick with holy bread and oil. These are only specimens, and very moderate ones, of the legends of the Saints. The magic of Rome turns the course of nature into a theatre of wonders.

† “Upon the Sacraments themselves,” says Bishop Taylor, “they are taught to rely with so little of moral and virtuous dispositions, that the efficacy of one is made to lessen the necessity of the other; and the sacraments are taught to be so effectual by an inherent virtue, that they are not so much made the instruments of virtue, as the suppletory; not so much to increase as to make amends for the want of grace.”—*Works*, vol. x. p. 241.

people embodied in the life; its legitimate tendencies are reduced to the test of actual experience; we know what it *is* by beholding what it *does*. Tried by this standard, it seems to me that Romanism cannot be regarded in any other light than as a debasing system of idolatrous superstition, in which the hopes of mankind are made to depend upon the charms of magic and the effects of sorcery, instead of the glorious principles of the doctrine of Christ. It is indeed a kingdom of darkness, in which the Prince of the power of the air sits enthroned in terror; envelopes the people in the blackness of spiritual night, and shrouds their minds in the grim repose of death. Where the raven wings of superstition and idolatry overshadow a land, the spirit of enterprise is uniformly broken, the energies of the soul are stifled and suppressed, and the noblest affections of the heart are chilled, blighted, and perverted by the malignant influence of error. The picture which Taylor draws of the papal population of Ireland,* which Townsend gives of the bigoted peasantry

* I give a single specimen of the abject superstition of the Papists, upon the authority of Jeremy Taylor. "But we have observed amongst the generality of the Irish, such a declension of Christianity, so great a credulity to believe every superstitious story, such confidence in vanity, such groundless pertinacity, such vicious lives, so little sense of true religion and the fear of God, so much care to obey the priests and so little to obey God, such intolerable ignorance, such fond oaths and manners of swearing, thinking themselves more obliged by swearing on the Mass-book than the four Gospels, and St. Patrick's Mass-book more than any new one; swearing by their father's soul, by their gossip's hand, by other things which are the product of those many tales that are told them; their not knowing upon what account they refuse to come to Church, but now they are old, and never did, or their countrymen do not, or their fathers, or grandfathers, never did, or that their ancestors were priests and they will not alter from their religion; and after all they can give no account of their religion, what it is; only they believe as their priests bid them, and go to mass, which they understand not, and reckon their beads to tell the number and the tale of their prayers, and abstain from eggs and flesh in Lent, and visit St. Patrick's well, and leave pins and ribands, yarn or thread in their holywells, and pray to God, St. Mary, St. Patrick, St. Columbanus, and St. Bridget, and desire to be buried with St. Frances' cord about them, and to fast on Saturdays, in honor of our lady. * * * I shall give one particular instance of their miserable superstition and blindness. I was lately, within a few months, very much troubled with petitions and earnest requests for restoring a bell, which a person of quality had in his hands at the time of, and

of Spain—the condition of the church in Silesia, Italy, Portugal and South America, disclose the features of the papacy in their true light, and demonstrate, beyond the possibility of doubt, that it is a system of the same sort, founded in the same principles, and aiming at the same results with the monstrous mythology of the Hindoos.

They are ennobled by none of those sublime and elevated views of the moral government of God, and the magnificent economy of His grace through the Lord Jesus Christ, which alone can impart tranquillity to the conscience, stability to the character, and consistency to the life. They recognize God in none of the operations of His hands—Priests, saints, images and relics, beads, bells, oil and water so completely engross their attention, and contract their conceptions, that they can rise to nothing higher in the scale of excellence, than the empty pageantry of ceremonial pomp, or dream of nothing better in the way of felicity than the solemn farce of sacerdotal benediction. Their hopes are vanity and their food is dust. To the true Christian,

ever since, the late rebellion. I could not guess at the reasons of their so great and violent importunity, but told the petitioners if they could prove that bell to be theirs, the gentleman was willing to pay the full value of it, though he had no obligation to do so, that I know of, but charity. But this was so far from satisfying them, that still the importunity increased, which made me diligently to inquire into the secret of it. The first cause I found, was that a dying person in the parish, desired to have it rung before him to church, and pretended he could not die in peace if it were denied him; and that the keeping of that bell did anciently belong to that family, from father to son: but because this seemed nothing but a fond and unreasonable superstition, I inquired farther, and found at last, that they believed this bell came from heaven, and that it used to be carried from place to place, and to end controveries by oath, which the worst men durst not violate if they swore upon that bell, and the best men amongst them durst not but believe him; that if this bell was rung before the corpse to the grave, it would help him out of purgatory; and that, therefore, when any one died, the friends of the deceased did, whilst the bell was in their possession, hire it for the behoof of their dead, and that by this means, that family was in part maintained. I was troubled to see under what spirit of delusion these poor souls do lie, how infinitely their credulity is abused, how certainly they believe in trifles and perfectly rely on vanity, and how little they regard the truths of God, and how not at all they drink of the waters of salvation.”—*Works*, vol. x. p. 121, seg.

they present a scene as melancholy and moving, as that which stirred the spirit of the Apostle when he beheld the citizens of Athens wholly given to idolatry; in the possession of the strong man armed, it requires something mightier than argument, stronger than the light of truth, to break the spell of spiritual enchantment which leads them on to death, to dissipate the deep delusions of priestly imposture which are sealing their souls for hell. The mind recoils at the thought of the terrible account which their blind guides who have acted the part of mad diviners, must render in the day of final retribution, when the blood of countless souls shall be required at their hands. The Priests of other superstitions may plead, to some extent, irremediable ignorance for their errors, idolatries and crimes; the way of righteousness had never been revealed to them, but the Priests of Rome have no cloak for their wickedness; they have deliberately extinguished the light of revelation—have sinned wilfully after they had received the knowledge of the truth—have insulted the Saviour and despised the Spirit; betrayed the one, like Judas, with a kiss, and reduced the other to a mere magician, and must consequently expect the severity of judgment at the hands of the Almighty Disposer of events.

The pagan tendencies of Rome appear, in the last place, from her substitution of a vain and imposing ritual, copied from the models of her heathen ancestors, for the pure and spiritual worship of the Gospel. The Saviour has told us that God requires the homage of the heart, and that all our services, in order to be accepted by Him with whom we have to do, must be rendered in the name of the Son, by the grace of the Spirit, and according to the requirements of the written word. To worship God in spirit and truth, is to bring to the employment that knowledge of His name, that profound veneration for His character, that cordial sympathy with the moral perfections of His nature, which presuppose an intimate acquaintance with the economy of His grace through Jesus Christ; the renovation of the heart by the effectual operation of the Holy Ghost, and a constant spirit of compliance with all his statutes and ordinances. It is indeed the spirit of *love* and of *obedience*, and both necessarily suppose that *knowledge* which is identified with faith, and pro-

ceeds from the disclosures of the written word. Whatever is *not required* is not *obedience*, and therefore cannot be worship, which must always be measured by the *will of God*. Upon comparing the worship which Rome prescribes, with that which the Gospel requires, they will be found to differ in every essential element of acceptable homage. The Gospel confines our worship exclusively to God—Rome scatters it upon a thousand objects whom she has exalted to the rank of Divinities. The Gospel directs that all our services should be offered exclusively in the name of Christ—Rome has as many intercessors as gods, and as many mediators as Priests. The Gospel requires the affections of the heart, purified and prompted by the Holy Ghost—Rome prescribes beads and genuflexions, scourging and pilgrimages, fasts and penances, and particularly the magic of what she calls sacraments, which are an excellent substitute for grace. The object which the Gospel proposes is to restore the sinner to communion with God, to make him, indeed, a *spiritual* man, and hence the appeals which it makes to the assistance of the senses are few and simple—the object of Rome is to awaken emotions of mysterious awe, which shall ultimately redound to the advantage of the priesthood; and hence her services are exclusively directed to the eye, the ear, and the fancy. If she succeeds in reaching the imagination, and produces a due veneration for the gorgeous solemnities which pass before us, she has compassed her design, and excited the only species of religious emotion with which she is acquainted. The difference between spiritual affections and sentimental impressions, which is indeed the difference between faith and sense, is utterly unknown to the blinded Priesthood of the papal apostacy. Imposing festivals, and magnificent processions, symbols and ceremonies, libations and sacrifices—these proclaim the poverty of her spirit, the vanity of her mind: they are sad memorials of “religion lying in state, surrounded with the silent pomp of death.”

LETTER IX.

Papal Infallibility proved to be unfriendly to civil government.

THE extravagant pretensions of the Romish sect to the Divine prerogative of infallibility, are not only fatal to the interests of truth, morality and religion, but equally destructive of the rights of magistrates, and the ends for which governments were instituted. To define the connexion which ought to subsist between church and state, to prescribe their mutual relations and subserviencies, and mark their points of separation and contact, are problems of polity which have tasked the resources of the mightiest minds, and which their highest powers have been inadequate to solve. The difficulties, however, have not arisen from the inherent nature of the subject, but from the force of ancient institutions and early prejudices to blind and enslave the understanding. The masterly abilities of Warburton were certainly competent to the discussion of this or any other subject; the zeal of eloquence and power of argument with which he has presented the importance of religion as conducing to the success and stability of the state, are, perhaps, irresistible; yet the attentive reader will perceive that none of his reasonings, however *unanswerably* they prove the value of the church and the need of its aid, establish the *necessity* of a *federal alliance*. The gratuitous assumption which vitiates the logic of this celebrated book, is the ancient opinion that *Christianity could not* contribute its influence to the peace and order of society, without being *supported* by the state. "The props and buttresses of secular authority" were conceived to be essential not only to the prosperity but also to the *being* of the church; as if, in the language of Milton, "the church were a vine in this respect, that she cannot subsist without clasping about the elm of worldly strength and felicity." It is found from experience, however, and might be deduced from the nature of its principles, that Christianity is then most powerful, and sustains the government by its strongest sanctions, when it stands alone, commending itself to every man's conscience, by truth and purity. Alliance with the state cor-

rupts and weakens spiritual authority—it debases the church into a secular institution, makes emolument and splendor more important objects than righteousness and truth,—defeats the ends for which it has been instituted—and, instead of adding weight to the laws of man, it detracts from the authority of the laws of God. Church and state, distinct as they are in their offices and ends, clothed with powers of a different species, and supported by sanctions essentially unlike, fulfil their respective courses with less confusion and disturbance, when each is restrained within its own appropriate jurisdiction. The harmony of the spheres is preserved by the regularity and order with which they revolve in their appointed orbits. The protection of life, property and person, is the leading end for which governments were instituted—the restoration of man to the image of God, through faith in the scheme of supernatural revelation, is the grand purpose for which the church was established. The state views man as a *member of society*, and deals exclusively with *external* acts—the church regards him as the *creature of God*, and demands integrity in the *inward parts*. The state secures the *interests of time*—the church provides for a *blessed immortality*; the state is concerned about the *bodies of men*—the church is solicitous for the *deathless soul*. Racks, gibbets, dungeons and tortures are the props and muniments of secular authority—truth and love, “the sword of the Spirit,” and “the cords of a man,” are the mighty weapons of the spiritual host.

To maintain, with a recent writer, whose work is far inferior in compactness and precision to the treatise of Warburton, that one of the distinctive ends of government is to propagate the truths of religion, is to destroy the *church* as a *separate* institution, and make it an appendage to the state. The administration of religion under this view, becomes as completely a *part* of the government, as courts of justice or halls of legislation. In support of this extravagant Erastianism, it is gravely maintained that the state is really and truly a *person*—the proper subject of moral obligation, and, therefore, bound like every other person, to profess a religion. The legitimate consequence would seem to be, if the state, as such, is capable of exercising religious affections, that it must also experience, in a future life, the rewards

of obedience, or the punishment of sin. Those who have been accustomed to regard religion as a matter of *personal* faith and obedience, appealing to the consciences of *private* individuals, and not to the authority of kings and rulers, are slow to comprehend the spiritual birth of nations, the salvation of organized communities, or their eternal perdition for impenitent hardness of heart.

The doctrine of Rome, on the mutual relations of the temporal and spiritual power, leads to consequences as fatal to the liberty of states, as those of Warburton or Gladstone in the independence, purity, and efficiency of the church. Three different views have been taken of this subject by distinguished writers in the papal communion. The Canonists* and Jesuits†

* For an amusing effort to evade the claims of the Canon law, vide Gibert, vol. ii. pp. 511, 12.

† The doctrine seems to be embodied in the Jesuit's oath, which the learned Archbishop Usher drew from undoubted records in Paris and published to the world. In that oath it is asserted that the Pope, by virtue of the keys given to his holiness by Jesus Christ, hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all *being illegal*, without his sacred confirmation; and consequently all allegiance is renounced to any such *rulers*. The entire document is as follows:

I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness pope Urban, is Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or universal church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may be safely destroyed; therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestant; or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare, that the doctrines of the church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of others of the name of Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all, or any of his holiness' agents, in any place wherever I shall be, in England,

for the most part, carrying out the idea that the Pope is the Vicar of God upon earth, clothe him with all the plenitude of power, in relation to sublunary things, which belongs to Deity Himself. It is his prerogative to fix the boundaries of nations, to appoint the habitations of the people, and to set over them the basest of men. From Him kings derive their authority to reign, and princes to decree justice—upon him the rulers and judges of the earth are dependent alike for the sceptre and the sword—it is his, like Jupiter, in Homer, “to shake his ambrosial curls and give the nod—the stamp of fate, the sanction of a God.” In the sentence against Frederick II., passed in the council of Lyons, which, according to Bellarmin, represented, without doubt, the universal church, this extravagant pretension to *absolute power* is assumed.* At the close of the second session of the fifth coun-

Scotland, and in Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to; and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants’ doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the mother church’s interest, to keep secret and private all her agents’ counsels from time to time, as they intrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance, whatsoever; but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which, I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed sacrament which I now am to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably: and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the eucharist: and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent, this——day of——, An. Dom., &c.”

* “Nos itaque super præmissis et compluribus aliis ejus nefandis excessibus, cum fratribus nostris, et sacro concilio deliberatione præhabita diligenti, cum Jesu Christi vices licet immeriti teneamus in terris, nobisque in beati Petri apostoli persona sit dictum: ‘Quodcumque ligaveris super terram &c.’ Memoratum principem, qui se imperio et regnis omnique honore ac dignitate reddidat tam indignum, quique propter suas iniquitates a Deo ne regnet vel imperet est abjectus, suis ligatum peccatis, et abjectum, omnique honore et dignitate privatum a Domino ostendimus, denunciamus, ac nihilo minus sententiando privamus; omnes, qui ei juramento fidelitatis tenentur adstricti, a juramento hujusmodi perpetuo absolventes; autoritate apostolica firmiter inhibendo, ne quisquam de cætero sibi tamquam imperatori vel regi pareat vel intendat, et decernendo quoslibet, qui deinceps ei velut imperatori aut regi consilium vel auxilium præstitirent seu favorem, ipso facto excommunicationis vinculo subja-

cil of Lateran, an oration was delivered by Cajetan, which abounds in fulsome adulation of the Pope, representing him as the *Vicar of the Omnipotent God*, invested alike with temporal power and ecclesiastical authority, and exhorting him, in blasphemous application of the language of the Psalmist, to “gird his sword upon his thigh and proceed to reign over all the powers of the earth.*

cere. Illi autem ad quos in eodem imperio imperatoris spectat electio, eligant libere successorem. De præfato viro Siciliæ regno providere curabimus, cun corundum fratrum nostrorum consilio, sicut viderimus expedire.”—*Labb. Concil.* t. xi. p. 645.

We, therefore, on account of the aforesaid and numerous other abominable excesses of this man, do, with our brethren, and the sacred council, after diligent deliberation (seeing we, though undeserving, hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said to us in the person of the blessed apostle Peter, “Whosoever thou shalt bind on earth, &c.”), declare the said Prince, who has proved himself so unworthy of all rule, power, and dignity, to be bound under his sins and an outcast, and deprived by the Lord of all honor and dignity; and all who are bound to him by oaths of fealty, we forever absolve from such oaths; and, by our apostolical authority, we strictly forbid any from obeying him as emperor or king; and all such as shall thus obey him, or show him any aid or favor, are rendered, by that act, excommunicate;—and they to whom the election of Emperor pertaineth, are hereby authorized freely to choose a successor, &c.

* “Assequitur autem hoc, te volente, teque imperante, si tu ipse, pater sancte omnipotentis Dei cujus vices in terris non solum honore dignitatis, sed etiam studio voluntatis gerere debes: si ipsius Dei potentiam, perfectionem sapientiamque imitaberis. Atqui ut in primis potentiam imiteris, accingere, pater sancte, gladio tuo, tuo inquam accingere: binos enim habes unum tibi reliquis que hujus mundi principibus communem: alterum tibi proprium, atque ita tuum, ut illum alius nemo nisi a te habere possit. Hoc itaque gladio tuo, qui ecclesiasticæ potestatis est, accingere potentissime, et accingere super femur tuum, id est, super universas humani generis potestatis.”—*Labb. Concil.* t. 14, p. 75.

This the church shall obtain by thy will and command, if thou thyself, holy father, wouldst imitate the power, perfection and wisdom of the omnipotent God, whose part on earth you are bound to perform, not only in dignity and honor, but also in zealous will. But in order that thou mayst imitate his power, in the first place, gird, O holy father, gird, I say, thy sword upon thy thigh; for two swords thou hast, one common to thee with the other princes of this world; the other proper and peculiar to thyself, and so specially thine, that no other can have it but from thee. This, therefore, which is the sword of ecclesiastical power, gird, O thou most mighty, upon thy thigh, that is, upon all the potencies of the human race.

The Pontiffs, in their damnatory sentences, are particularly fond of quoting the words of Jeremiah, in accommodation to themselves—"I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms," as well as the words of Christ to Peter, in the largest and most absolute sense. To be the *Vicar* of the *Omnipotent God*, is to be Lord of Lords, and King of Kings. In the famous controversy betwixt Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, the insolent Pontiff boldly asserted that "The King of France, with all other Kings and Princes whatsoever, were obliged, by a Divine command, to submit to the authority of the Popes, as well in all political and civil matters, as in those of a religious nature." These doctrines are fully brought out in the memorable Bull, "Unam Sanctam," in which it is maintained that "Jesus had granted a two-fold power to the Church, or in other words *the spiritual* and *temporal sword*, and subjected the whole human race to the authority of the Roman Pontiff," whom they were bound to obey on pain of eternal damnation.*

There is another view, which has been approved by the church in every possible way, by the voice of her Doctors, the Bulls of Popes, and the decrees of Councils, which reaches the same practical results on grounds less flagrantly wicked, or detestably blasphemous. It is the opinion maintained by Baronius, Bellarmin, Binius, Carranza, Perron, Turrecrema and Pighius, and abounding *ad nauseam* in the documents of Gregory VII. The Pope, according to these writers, is not absolute lord of the infidel world. His special jurisdiction is the guardianship and care of the church. In protecting his flock, however, from the encroachments of error and the dangers of schism, he is clothed with plenary power to disturb the government of nations, and destroy the institutions of states. He has a broad commission from Heaven to provide for the welfare and prosperity of the *church*, and whatever powers may be found subservient to the fulfilment of this delegated trust, are indirectly vested in his

* Gibert *Corpus Juris Canonici*, vol. 2, p. 513, sums up the famous bull of Boniface VIII., de majoritate et obedientia, in these pregnant words: "Definit terrenam potestatem spirituali ita subdi, ut illa possit ab ista institui et destitui."

It determines that earthly dominion is to be so subject to spiritual, that the former can be set up and pulled down by the latter.

hands. Like a Roman Dictator, his business is to see that the Republic of the faithful receives no damage; and if kings and rulers should be regarded as dangerous to the interests of the church, kings and rulers may be laid aside at his sovereign pleasure. If there be a single principle which can be called the *doctrine* of the Romish sect, to which its infallibility is solemnly pledged, and which has been exemplified in repeated *acts*, this is the principle. Thomas Aquinas distinctly teaches that the church can absolve believing subjects from the power and dominion of infidel kings. Ægideus maintains that the power of the church, which is fully embodied in the sovereign Pontiff, extends not only to spiritual interests, but also to temporal affairs. Thomas Cajetan defines the power of the Pope, almost in the very words with which I have described this general opinion.*

* “Potest tamen juste per sententiam, vel ordinationem Ecclesiæ, auctoritatem Dei habentis, tale jus dominii, vel prælationis tolli; quia infideles merito suæ infidelitatis merentur potestatem amittere super fideles, qui transferuntur in filios Dei; sed hoc quidem Ecclesia quandoque facit, quandoque non facit.”—*Bellarmin. Tract. De Potest. Summ. Pontif.* p. 11.

“Sed, inquit, diceret aliquis, quod Reges et Principes spiritualiter non temporaliter subsint Ecclesiæ. Sed hæc dicentes vim argumenti non capiunt: nam si solum spiritualiter Reges et Principes subessent Ecclesiæ, non esset gladius sub gladio: non essent temporalia sub spiritualibus; non esset ordo in potestatibus; non reducerentur infima in suprema per media. Hæc ille, qui toto illo tractatu hoc probat, potestatem Ecclesiæ, quæ plenissima est in Summo Pontifice, non ad sola spiritualia, sed etiam ad temporalia se extendere.”—*Ibid.* p. 13.

“Ideo suæ potestati duo conveniunt: primo, quod non est directe respectu temporalium: secundo, quod est respectu temporalium in ordine ad spiritualia: hoc enim habet ex eo, quod ad supremum finem omnia ordinari debent, etiam temporalia ab eo procul dubio, cujus interest ad illum finem omnes dirigere, ut est Christi Vicarius; primum autem ex natura suæ potestatis consequitur.”—*Ibid.* p. 15.

Such rights of dominion, however, may be taken away by the sentence or ordinance of the Church, having the authority of God; because infidels, by reason of their unbelief, deserve to lose their authority over the faithful, who are transferred to the sons of God; but as to this, the Church sometimes executes this, her right, and sometimes not, as she thinks fit.

But, some one may say, that Kings and Princes are subject to the Church spiritually, not temporally. Those saying this do not seize the force of the argument; for if kings and princes were only subject to the Church spiritually, there would not be a sword under a sword; temporal things would not be under spiritual; there would not be an order in powers; the lowest would not be raised

Those who wish to see a sickening list of the Popish writers who have maintained this notion of Pontifical power, will find ample satisfaction in the treatise of Bellarmin de Potestate. Private writers, however, are of little value, compared with councils and Popes themselves. Gregory VII., in a Roman synod consisting of one hundred and ten bishops, presumed, for the honor and protection of the church, to depose Henry from the Government of Germany and Italy, and transfer his dominions to another man. This sentence, as Bellarmin triumphantly boasts, was afterwards confirmed by Victor, Urban, Pascal, Gelasius, and Calixtus, in the synods of Beneventine, Placentia, Rome, Colonia, and Rheims.* I need not insist upon the cases of Boniface and Philip the Fair, Paul the third and Henry VIII., Pius V. and the Virgin Queen. The memorable Bull in Coena Domini, issued by Pius V. in 1567, should not be suffered to pass without notice. This atrocious document prostrates the power

to the highest, through the intermediate. (So far, this author, who, in this whole treatise, proves this, that the power of the Church, which is complete in the sovereign Pontiff, extends, not to spiritual things alone, but temporal.)

His (the Pope's) power has not a direct respect to temporal things, but a respect to temporal in order to spiritual. For this it has from the circumstance, that all things ought to be ordered and disposed for one supreme end, and that by him unquestionably to whom it pertains to direct all things to that end, as he is Christ's vicar, and so the temporal power is involved in the nature of his spiritual power.

* "Quapropta confidens de judicio et misericordia Dei, ejusque piissimæ matris semper virginis Mariæ, fultus vestra auctoritate, sæpe nominatum Henricum, quem regem dicunt, omnesque fautores ejus excommunicationi subjecio et anathematis vinculis alligo; et iterum regnum Teutonicorum et Italiæ, ex parte Omnipotentis Dei et vestra interdicens ei, omnem potestatem et dignitatem illi regiam tollo et ut nullus Christianorum ei sicut regi obediat interdicto, omnesque qui ei juraverunt vel jurabunt de regni dominatione, a juramenti promissione absolvi."—*Labbe*, vol. x. p. 384.

Wherefore, confiding in the justice and mercy of God, and of his most holy mother Mary, always virgin, and supported by your authority, I lay under excommunication, and bind under the chains of our anathema, the oft-named Henry, whom they style king, and all his adherents; and on the part of Almighty God and you, interdicting him the rule of Germany and Italy, I deprive him of all power and regal dignity, and I forbid every Christian to obey him as king, and all who have sworn or may swear allegiance to him, I absolve from their oath.

of kings and magistrates at the foot of the Pope, subverts the independence of states and nations, and makes the sword of monarchs and rulers the pliant tool of Pontifical despotism.* Even in the nineteenth century, the successors of the fisherman are regaled with dreams of terrestrial grandeur, and Pius VII., in the plenitude of spiritual power, poured all the vials of his wrath upon the head of Napoleon.

Directly or indirectly, more or less distinctly, *eight* general councils have endorsed the doctrine of the temporal jurisdiction of the Pope. The fourth and fifth of Lateran, those of Lyons, Vienna, Pisa, Constance, Basil and Trent. The third canon of the fourth council of Lateran, is intended to provide for the extirpation of heresy. It is there decreed, that if any temporal lord, after the admonition of the church, should neglect to purge his realm from heretical pravity, he shall be excommunicated by his metropolitan and suffragans. If he should still fail to give satisfaction for a year, his contumacy shall be announced to the Sovereign Pontiff, who shall proceed to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, and transfer his dominions to any usurper, willing and able to extirminate heretics and restore the faith."† "If this," says Bellarmin, "is not the voice of the Catholic Church—where, I pray, shall we find it?" The council of

* For a particular account of this famous bull, the reader is particularly referred to Giannone Ist. di Napoli. lib. 33, cap. 4., who may there see its audacious interference with the right of kings, magistrates and rulers, fully exposed.

† "Si vero Dominus Temporalis requisitus et monitus ab ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac hæretica fæditate, per metropolitanum et cæteros comprovinciales episcopos excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et, si satisfacere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc summo Pontifici, ut ex tunc esse vassalos ab ejus fidelitate denunciaret absolutos et terram exponat catholicis occupandam, qui eam exterminatis hæreticis sine ulla contradictione possideant et in fidei puritate conservent."—*Labbe*, vol. xi. p. 148.

But if any temporal lord, when required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his land from this heretical taint, let him be bound in the chains of excommunication by the metropolitan and other bishops. And if he disdain to give satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the sovereign Pontiff, that henceforth he may declare the vassals of such lord absolved from their allegiance, and may devote his land to be occupied by catholics, who, exterminating the heretics, may possess it without any contradiction, and may preserve it in the true faith.

Trent—that I may not occupy the reader with a tedious display of the insolence, arrogance and pride of Vienna, Constance, Pisa, and Basil—the council of Trent, in its twenty-fifth session, passed a statute in relation to duelling, which seems to assume something more definite and tangible than spiritual power. The temporal sovereign who permits a duel to take place in his dominions, is punished not only with excommunication, but *with the loss of the place* in which the combat occurred. The duellists and their seconds are condemned in the same statute, to perpetual infamy, the *forfeiture of their goods*, and deprived, if they should fall, of Christian burial, while those who were merely spectators of the scene, are sentenced to eternal malediction.*

* “Detestabilis duellorum usus fabricante diabolo introductus, ut cruenta corporum morte animarum etiam perniciem lucretur; ex Christiano orbe penitus exterminetur imperatur, reges, duces, principes, marchiones, comites, et quocumque alio nomine domini temporales, qui locum ad monomachiam in terris suis inter Christianos concesserint, eo ipso sint excommunicati ac jurisdictione et dominio civitatis, castri, aut loci, in quo vel apud quem duellum geri permiserint, quod ab ecclesia obtinent, privati intelligantur; et, si feudalia sint, directis dominis statim acquirantur. Qui vero pugnam commiserint, et qui eorem patris vocantur, excommunicationis, ac omnium honorum suorum proscriptionis, ac perpetuæ infamiæ pœnam incurrant; et ut homicidæ juxta sacros canones puniri debeant; et si in ipso conflictu decesserint, perpetuo careant ecclesiastica sepultura, illi etiam, qui, consilium in causa duelli tam in jure quam facto dederint, aut alia quacumque ratione ad id quemquam suaserint, nec non spectatores excommunicationis, ac perpetuæ maledictionis vinculo teneantur non obstante quocumque privilegio; seu prava consuetudine etiam immemorabili.”—*Labbe*, vol. xiv. p. 916.

The detestable practice of duelling, introduced by the agency of the Devil, in order that, by the bloody death of men's bodies, he may gain the destruction of their souls—let it be utterly exterminated from the Christian world. Let the Emperor, king, duke, marquis, count or temporal lord of whatever name, who shall allow single combat to Christians within his territories, be by that act excommunicated, and be understood as deprived of the jurisdiction of such city, fort, or place where such duel has been permitted; and if feudal possessors, let them revert to their direct owners. As for the principals and seconds in such contest, let them incur the penalty of excommunication, deprivation of all their honors, and be doomed to perpetual infamy, and let them be punished as murderers according to the sacred canons; and if they have fallen in the conflict, let them be forever deprived of ecclesiastical burial. And let all who have in any

The inevitable tendency of these arbitrary claims to secular authority is to merge the *State in the Church*. Kings and Emperors, nations and communities become merely the instruments, the pliant tools, of spiritual dominion. The kingdoms of the earth are inferior principalities to a magnificent hierarchy, the first places of which are reserved for ecclesiastical dignities. The higher commands the lower; and so the Pope can set his feet upon the neck of kings, and bind their nobles in fetters of iron. The Church *includes* the State, as the greater includes the less, as a bishop includes a priest, and a priest includes a deacon. The natural consequence is, that the *supreme* allegiance of the faithful is due primarily to the head of the Church. In a conflict of power between princes and popes—the first and highest duty of all the vassals of Rome, is to maintain *her* honor and support *her* claims. Hence the Jesuit, in his secret oath, renounces allegiance to all earthly powers which have not been confirmed by the Holy See, and devotes his life and soul to the undivided services of the Pope. The Romish Church, too, sets her face like a flint against the subjection of her spiritual officers to the legal tribunals of the state, and has positively prohibited the intolerable presumption in laymen, though kings and magistrates, of demanding oaths of allegiance from the lofty members of her hierarchy.* They are specially and emphatically *her* subjects, and

way authorized or advised such duel, and even spectators be bound under excommunication and everlasting curse, any privilege or depraved usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

* “*Nimis de jure Divino quidam laici usurpare conantur, cum viros ecclesiasticos, nihil temporale destinantes ab eis, ad præstandum fidelitates juramenta compellunt. Quia vero, secundum Apostolum, servius suo Domino stat aut cadat; sacri auctoritate concilii prohibemus, ne tales clerici personis sæcularibus præstare cogantur hujusmodi juramentum.*”—*IV. Lateran, Can. 43. Labbe*, vol. xi. p. 191.

Some laics attempt to usurp too much of divine right, when they compel ecclesiastics, holding nothing temporal of them, to take oaths of allegiance. But, inasmuch as the apostle says, “to his own master the servant stands or falls,” we prohibit, on the authority of the sacred council, that such clerics be compelled to take oaths of this kind to secular persons.

That ecclesiastical officers should be tried only in ecclesiastical courts, is the standing doctrine of the Canon Law. I select a few extracts from Gibert's *Corpus Juris Canonici*, vol. iii. p. 530:

she cannot consent that their fealty should be transferred to others. Such principles are fatal to the independence of nations; and just in proportion as the doctrines of Rome gain the ascendancy among *any people*, just in the same proportion a secret enemy is cherished, slowly but surely plotting the destruction of all institutions, however noble or sublime, that may happen to contradict the humor of a bigoted Italian prince, or be inconsistent with decrees passed in ages of darkness, superstition, and despotism. The slaves of the papacy are taught to conceal their weapons until they are ready to strike—to disguise their hemlock and nightshade until they can prepare the deadly potato, with the certain prospect of success. But when once they become master of the sceptre and the sword, they are to strike for Rome, sell the liberties of the country to their spiritual lord, raise the banner of inhuman persecution, and purge the land from the damning stain of heretical pravity with the blood of its noblest sons.

La Fayette is reported to have said, that if ever the liberties of this country should be destroyed, it would be by the machinations of Romish priests. They are all, in fact, the sworn subjects of a *foreign potentate*—they acknowledge an earthly king who has repeatedly denounced every distinctive principle for which our fathers bled—who, in the dark hour of their trial, when the sons of Poland rose up in the majesty of insulted nature, and demanded that freedom which is the birthright of nations, interposed his spiritual thunder to crush the rights of man. The

“ Ut nullus judicum neque Presbyterium, neque diaconum vel clericum ullum aut juniore ecclesiæ sine scientia Pontificis per se distingat aut damnare præsumat. Clericus de omni crimina coram judice ecclesiastico debet conveniri. In sacris canonibus generaliter traditur ut de omni crimine clericus debeat coram ecclesiastico judico conveniri.

“ A sæculari potestate nec ligari, nec solvi sacerdotem posse, manifestum est.”

No judge shall presume, of himself, without the knowledge of the Pontiff, to distress or condemn either priest or deacon, or any clergyman or younger members of the Church. A clerk must, on every charge, be brought before an ecclesiastical judge. In sacred canon, it is uniformly ordered that for every crime a cleric ought to come before a clerical judge. It is clear that a priest cannot be bound or lposed by a secular power,

priesthood of Rome is a *formidable body*. The moral elements which bind the human family together in the ties of truth, fidelity, and honor, are feeble to them as Samson's withes, or pointless as Priam's darts. To the outward eye all may be *fair* and *seemly*—but the *country* which they *truly* love, is that which is prepared to bow the knee to the authority of Rome, and lick the pontiff's feet. All other lands are *accursed* of God, and their vocation is to reclaim them from their ruin, to bring them into the holy fold, to overturn and overturn and overturn, until the Man of Sin is prepared to pronounce his magic benediction.

The immortal Milton, "the champion and martyr of English liberty," as well as the "glory of English literature," the bold defender of the freedom of the press, the rights of conscience, and the rights of man, gave it as his deliberate opinion, that a Christian commonwealth, in consequence of the Pope's pretensions to political power, and the idolatrous nature of his religious rites, *ought not to tolerate his dangerous sect*.* When destitute of power or forming only a fraction of the community, papists may do no serious harm, but the serpent in the fable had lost nothing of its venom, though it had lost its muscular activity. They whose eyes, night and day, are turned to the eternal city, whose prayers are hourly ascending for its glory, and whose zeal is devoted to its highest prosperity; they who are persuaded that the ark of God is there, and that the hopes of man are centred in the favor of the monarch who sits upon the seven hills; they who are bound, under an awful curse, to maintain the princely and divine prerogatives which superstition, fanaticism, pride, and ambition have attributed to this august and venerable mortal, are not the men to *love a land* which is darkened by his frown, or blasted by his bitter execrations. They may take the usual oath of allegiance, but Lateran has taught them that *oaths are breath*, when the interests of the Church demand their violation. There is but *one* tie which is stronger than death: the tie which binds them to Rome. Living or dying, in all states and conditions, in poverty or wealth, at home or abroad, wherever they are, or whatever they do, *Rome*

* See the question discussed, "How far the religion of the Church of Rome is tolerable?" in Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*, § xx.

must never be forgotten. The claims of brotherhood, friendship, patriotism, and honor—all that is dear on earth, in private relations or public institutions, all must be sacrificed when the voice of Rome commands it. She holds in her hands the dread retributions of eternity; heaven or hell depends upon her nod; and when she brings to bear her terrific sanctions, her faithful children throughout the world, to avoid the impending storm, nestle beneath her wings. Where is the state, community, or nation on the whole face of the earth, that can thunder with a voice like Rome? What are laws, statutes, ordinances and oaths, when a single word from the eternal city can turn them, in the eyes of papists, to vanity and wind? When was it ever known that a faithful son of the Church respected the *laws* as much as his priest, his country as much as Rome, the highest tribunal of the land as much as the Pope? It is idle to attempt to disguise the fact, that the religion of the Pope is essentially seditious. In its grasping ambition it tramples upon thrones, principalities and powers, subverts the liberty of nations, destroys the independence of states, and makes the sword and the sceptre alike subservient to its own relentless despotism. These results so obviously follow from the claims to temporal authority, which have already been considered, that many papists have been disposed to restrict the power of the Pope wholly within spiritual bounds. Hence a third view, that maintained by the Parliament of Paris and endorsed by the Gallican clergy, remains to be considered.

According to this view, kings and rulers are not subject to the Sovereign Pontiff in the conduct of their secular affairs. Their jurisdiction is distinct from his: he moves in the orbit of spiritual dominion, and they in the orbit of temporal authority; he deals in matters of supernatural faith, and they in matters of civil obedience. This theory is beautiful, and the distinction is just, but the doctrine of *infallibility* renders them practically worthless. The Pope has power to define *articles of faith*, and to instruct the faithful in the *will of God*. Whatever he proposes as an *article of faith* must, of course, be received with *undoubting faith*. To admit the right of the people to determine what *are* articles of faith, and what are *not*, would be to introduce the odious principle of the right of private judgment.

Then if the Pope has plenary power to define the articles of Catholic faith, and if every thing is to be received as an article of faith which he proposes *as such*, he can easily introduce his arbitrary claims to temporal jurisdiction, under the convenient disguise of supernatural revelation. He will not *directly* assert that he possesses the power of deposing kings, or subverting nations, but it is the will of God that heretical magistrates should not be encouraged, and obedience to their laws is a sanction of their crimes. He might caution the faithful not to be partakers in other men's sins, and guard them especially from encouraging the great in rebellion against God. The nice distinctions of the Gallican Church are mere dust and ashes, unless the doctrine of infallibility is denied, and the right of private judgment maintained. If the people are *bound* to believe whatever the Pope may prescribe as an *article of faith*, the door is thrown wide open—as open as Hildebrand himself could wish it—for the introduction of all manner of treason. It is an idle evasion to say that although men are not judges of spiritual matters, yet they are judges of *temporal matters*, and therefore capable of deciding when the Sovereign Pontiff invades the territory of *temporal* jurisdiction. This plea would be good if the Sovereign Pontiff were *fallible*. They might then oppose *their* judgments to *his* decision. But if he be *infallible*, and pronounces a principle to be an *article of faith*, which they beforehand would have viewed as belonging to the *sphere* of the civil magistrate, they must, of course, yield their fallible opinion to an *infallible* decision. A crust of bread is mutton, wine, and beef; the sacred wafer is the Redeemer of men, soul, body, and divinity, if Rome pronounces them to be so. It is not more unreasonable that we should abandon our judgments about political rights at the bidding of his holiness, than that we should renounce our confidence—instantive though it be—in the report of our senses. *Practically*, therefore, the theory of the Gallican clergy is no security from the encroachments of Rome: So long as infallibility is maintained, it will poison the purest principles, and corrupt the fairest schemes. It affords an abundant entrance for that *indirect power* over states, nations and empires, for which doctors have pleaded, councils decreed, and Popes intrigued.

It is a pungent saying of Passavan, that "Satan tendered the earth and all its glory to Immanuel, and met with a peremptory rejection—he afterwards made the same overture to the Pope, who accepted the offer with thanks, and with the annexed condition of worshipping the Prince of Darkness." The subtle arts and crafty machinations by which, from small beginnings, the Popes have usurped, under various pretexts, the right of universal dominion, are a pregnant proof of an intimate alliance with the father of lies. Their first interferences in the affairs of states were slow and gradual; they were content to use their spiritual authority in instigating subjects to rebellion, or embroiling nations in war. Encouraged by success, they rose higher and higher in their claims until the summit of pontifical arrogance was reached in the person of Hildebrand. What a chasm between Gregory II. and Gregory VII., filled up with gins, snares, and nets, fraud, hypocrisy, and lies! While the successors of St. Peter have pretended to labor for the salvation of souls, it is plain that nations have been their game, kings their victims, and diadems their hope. The golden vision of universal empire, which encouraged the zeal, quickened the efforts and soothed the anxieties of Gregory VII., has never ceased to float before the minds of his successors, and make them at once the enemies of man, and the objects of abhorrence to God. Their eyes are fixed upon the *earth*, and the cup of their ambition will never be full, until, from east to west, from north to south, every kindred, tongue and language, all the tribes and families of man, shall acknowledge the Pope, as king of kings and lord of lords. To accomplish this grand and magnificent purpose, Jesuits are found in every country, plying their labors with untiring zeal. Their voice is heard amid the roar of the cataract in the forests of the savage, or it charms the circles of the giddy and the gay in the saloons of refinement and elegance—their shadows are seen in the dusky light of the convict's cell, and their persons are found in the halls of the great, and the palaces of kings. They stoop to instruct the child in its alphabet, and the young in philosophy, and delight to discuss with senators and statesmen the policy of states. Hunger, cold, and all the inclemencies of the sky are cheerfully endured in their exhausting journeys—the

frosts of winter consume them by night, and sleep departs from their eyes, and yet their zeal is invincible, and their industry untiring. There is *one glorious object* which animates their hopes—which lifts them above the ordinary passions of man—and renders them insensible to danger and fearless of death. That object is the *triumph of Rome*. For *her* they have sacrificed moral character, personal comforts, the delight of patriotism, and the endearments of home. To *her* they are devoted with a terrible enthusiasm—which is cool and collected, because too intense to be vented in passion, or wasted in extravagance; and if Rome should ever triumph, they are the men whose principles shall be lord of the ascendant, and dictate law to all the nations of the earth. In their diligence, industry, zeal and enthusiasm, let the people of this country learn their danger and provide for their safety.

There are peculiar principles in the constitution of the polity of Rome which render it an *engine* of tremendous *power*. The *doctrine of auricular confession* establishes a system of espionage which is absolutely fatal to personal independence; and, from the intimate connexion between Priests and Bishops, and Bishops and the Pope, all the important secrets of the earth can easily be transmitted to the Vatican. What can be more alarming than a whole army, scattered through the length and breadth of the land, in close and secret correspondence with a tyrant who detests every principle that makes life dear, or a country glorious? The ingenuity of earth and hell, could not devise a more successful expedient for prostrating liberty, enslaving the conscience, and introducing the Pope to an intimate acquaintance with all the purposes and interests of man, than the scheme of auricular confession. It opens a window into the chambers of the heart, and permits a mortal to read those secrets which it is the sole prerogative of God to know.

I have now, I apprehend, sufficiently shown that, according to the principles of Rome, the civil power is subservient to the spiritual—the state is a tool of the church. It will be seen at a glance, that such an assumption is not only fatal to the independence of states, but equally fatal to liberty of conscience and toleration of dissenters. The right to persecute is a legitimate

deduction from the relative position in which the church and state, on the pontifical hypothesis, stand to each other. It is the *business* of the magistrate to propagate religion, and as his weapons are exclusively carnal, the dungeon, pillory, and rack, he has a right to employ them in exacting uniformity of faith. Bossuet was able to boast, that on one point all Christians had long been unanimous—the right of the civil magistrate to propagate truth by the sword. In every form and shape, by the writings of private individuals, the bulls of Popes, the canons of councils, and above all by public, flagrant, inhuman acts of murder, rapine, and violence, the Holy See has asserted its claim to mould the faith of men, through the arm of the magistrate, to its own detestable model. I need not insist on the ruthless crusades against the innocent victims of Languedoc and Provence—on the infernal atrocities of the Inquisition, or the awful massacre of St. Bartholomews; the annals of the papacy are written in blood. From almost every quarter of the globe, the victims of its cruelties shall send their cries to heaven for vengeance on their destroyers. It is enough to know that if the infallibility of Rome were not pledged, through her Pope and councils, to the ferocious principles of persecution, it results *necessarily* from the views which she takes of the state. In her eyes, want of conformity with her own faith is an *act of rebellion*, a *contumacious rejection* of civil authority, and should, therefore, be punished by the temporal power, on the same ground by which punishment for incest, rape, or murder is justified. It is, first, according to her, the *duty of governments, as such*, to be nursing-fathers to her faith, and then to spread it at the point of the bayonet, and with garments rolled in blood. The truth is, the only principle which can secure an equal toleration, and uphold the liberty of conscience, is the absolute *separation* of church and state. They cannot contract an alliance without engendering the monster *intolerance*. Cæsar and God must be kept distinct; the state, *as such*, is *not* a religious institution, though all the people who compose it may be devoutly religious; and when it assumes the propagation of religion as one of its distinctive ends, it is travelling beyond its limits, and laying the foundation of bigotry, intolerance, and despotism. No govern-

ment on earth has a right to establish Christianity or any other system of religion by law, and no church on earth has a right to commend its doctrines or enforce its discipline by pains, penalties, or civil disabilities. To keep the state within the bounds of its appropriate jurisdiction, is the secret of civil liberty, and to restrain the church within its own department of spiritual instruction, is the secret of religious liberty. When these two grand organizations of God cross the orbits of each other, they menace the earth with anarchy, confusion and blood. They can never coalesce; and all arbitrary unions, like the converse of the sons of God with the daughters of men, are productive only of giants, famous for rebellion, and full of cruelty.

I shall now close what I intended to suggest on the infallibility of the Romish church. It will be remembered that you, sir, made this the medium of your triumphant proof of the inspiration of the Apocrypha. I have met and refuted all your arguments—and shown, in addition, that every theory of papal infallibility, whether that of councils, popes, or the body of the church, is compassed with historical difficulties fatal to its truth. I have proved, moreover, that such extravagant pretensions are utterly inconsistent with truth, morality, religion, and liberty—the highest and noblest interests of man. The state of the argument then is just this: 1st. Infallibility is a *fiction*, resting upon no authority of Scripture, upon no principles of reason, and contradicted by the testimony of the best and purest ages of the church. Therefore any argument which is based upon this “worthless coinage of the brain” may be safely given to the winds—and therefore, *your proof* of the inspiration of the Apocrypha would have been just as conclusive, if you had appealed to the testimony of the man in the moon. 2d. If infallibility be admitted, then truth, morality, religion, and liberty must fall to the ground—for it is absolutely inconsistent with all these distinguished blessings. Here, then, is a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*. So that infallibility destroys itself, and leaves us in quiet possession of private judgment, with all the benefits that follow in its train.

LETTER X.

Apocrypha not quoted in the New Testament.

BEFORE proceeding to the third general division of your letters, I shall pause for a moment to discuss a point which would detain me too long in its proper place, and which may be taken as a fair illustration of your deplorable incompetency to resolve any question involving the laws of literary criticism. When I read your effort to prove that Christ and the apostles, in their recorded instruction actually quoted or referred to passages of the Apocrypha, I was forcibly reminded of those ingenious and discriminating authors who have been able to discover what they supposed to be unquestionable traces of the doctrines of the Cabbala in the Lord's prayer and the Epistles of Paul. Those who are silly enough to be convinced by the empty parade of texts which you have strung together in your second letter, ought not to withhold their assent from the learned speculations of Knorrius, confirmed as they are by the authority of so laborious a writer as Buddæus. That a man of sufficient perspicacity to find the Cabbala in the memorable declaration of Paul, "It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," should also detect in the New Testament traces of Apocryphal lore, would be only to exercise, in a different way, the same faculty of critical second sight. He that can discern disembodied spirits, requires, perhaps, no additional organs to perceive a devil. The passage which you have adduced as genuine quotations from the Apocrypha, or rather, which you have followed Huetius in treating as such, I am sure will strike no one in the same light, but those who are previously persuaded that if these books are not, they ought to have been, quoted by Christ and his apostles. The strongest evidence, I apprehend, upon which your position can be made to rest, will be found in an appeal to a General Council. If you could induce some such body as that of Trent (and a conviction of interest is all the inducement which needs to be urged)

to decree that these passages are quotations why then quotations they would have to be considered.*

* I will lay before you some of the texts of the New Testament, in which the passages of those works are quoted or referred to.

1. "See thou never do to another what thou wouldst hate to have done to thee by another." Tob. iv. 16. "All things, therefore, whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do ye also unto them." Matt. vii. 12. "And as you would that men should do to you, do ye also to them in like manner." Luke vi. 31.

2. "Happy shall I be, if there shall remain of my seed, to see the glory of Jerusalem. The gates of Jerusalem shall be built of Sapphire and Emerald, and all the walls thereof round about of precious stones. All its streets shall be paved with white and clean stones; and Alleluia shall be sung in its streets. Blessed be the Lord who hath exalted it, and may He reign in it for ever, and ever, Amen." Tobias xiii. 20-23.

"And the building of the wall thereof was of Jasper stones, but the city itself pure gold, like to clear glass.—And the foundation of the walls of the city were adorned with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was Jasper, the second, Sapphire . . . the twelfth, an Amethyst. And the twelve gates are twelve pearls, one to each: and every several gate was of one several pearl.—And the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass." Apocalypse or Rev. xxi. 18-21.

3. "But they that did not receive the trials with the fear of the Lord, but uttered their impatience, and the reproach of their murmuring against the Lord, were destroyed by the destroyer; and perished by serpents." Judith viii. 24, 25.

"Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them tempted and perished by the serpents. Neither do you murmur: as some of them murmured, and were destroyed by the destroyer." 1 Cor. x. 9, 10.

4. "The just shall shine, and shall run to and fro like sparks among the reeds." Wisdom iii. 7. "Then shall the just shine as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father." Matt. xiii. 43.

5. "They (the just) shall judge nations and rule over people, and their Lord shall reign for ever." Wisdom iii. 8. "Know you not that the saints shall judge the world? 1 Cor. vi. 2.

6. "He pleased God and was beloved, and living among sinners he was translated." Wisdom iv. 10. "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and he was not found, because God had translated him. For before his translation, he had testimony that he pleased God." Heb. xi. 5.

7. "For she (Wisdom) is the brightness of Eternal Light, and the unspotted mirror of God's Majesty, and the image of His goodness." Wisdom vii. 26. "Who (the Son of God) being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance, &c." Heb. i. 3. See also 2 Cor. iv. 4, and Col. i. 5.

The first text which you give us as a quotation from the Apocrypha, is the golden rule of our Saviour: "Therefore all

8. "For who among men is he that can know the counsel of God? or who can think what the will of God is?" Wisdom, ix. 13. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" Rom. xi. 34.

9. "The potter also tempering soft earth, with labor fashioneth every vessel for our service; and of the same clay he maketh both vessels that are for clean uses, and likewise such as serve to the contrary; but what is the use of these vessels the potter is the judge." Wisdom xv. 7. "Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor." Rom ix. 21.

10. "Or if they admired their power and their effects, let them understand by them, that he who made them is mightier than they; for by the greatness of the beauty and the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby." Wisdom xiii. 4, 5. "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." Rom. i. 20.

11. "And his zeal will take armor and he will arm the creature for the revenge of his enemies. He will put on justice as a breastplate, and will take true judgment instead of a helmet. He will take equity for an invincible shield: and he will sharpen his severe wrath for a spear." Wisdom v. 18-21. "Therefore take unto you the armor of God, that you may be able to resist in the evil day and to stand in all things perfect. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of justice . . . in all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. And take unto you the helmet of salvation; and the sword of the Spirit (which is the word of God)." Eph. vi. 13-17.

12. "They that fear the Lord, will not be incredulous to his word; and they that love him will keep his way.—They that fear the Lord will seek after the things that are well pleasing to him: and they that love him shall be filled with his law . . . They that fear the Lord, keep his commandments, and will have patience, even until his visitation." Ecclesiasticus ii. 18-21. "If any one love me, he will keep my word." Jno. xiv. 23.

13. "My son, meddle not with many matters: and if thou be rich, thou shalt not be free from sin." Eccle. xi. 10. "For they that will become rich, fall into temptation, and into the snare of the devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which drown men in destruction and perdition." 1 Tim. vi. 9.

14. "There is one that is enriched by living sparingly, and this is the portion of his reward. In that he saith: I have found me rest, and now I will eat my goods alone; and he knoweth not what time shall pass, and that death approacheth, and that he must leave all to others and shall die." Eccle.

things, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them : for this is the law and the prophets."* Matt. vii. 12 ; Luke vi. 31. This you would have us to believe was suggested to the Saviour by Tobit iv. 15, which in the Douay version is rendered, " See thou never do to another what thou wouldest hate to have done to thee by another." The reader, however, will observe that this is not a *translation* but a *paraphrase*. The original is : ο μισεις μηδεν ποιησης. " *What thou hatest, do to no one.*" Now the question is, whether the *four* words that constitute the substance of the Apocryphal passage, suggested to our Lord the *fifteen words* which, in the original, embody the golden rule, as found in the memorable sermon on the mount. There is evidently no *quotation* in the case, since there is but a single word which they have in common. Neither, on the other hand, is there any such coincidence of thought as to warrant the supposition that our Saviour had in his mind the passage from Tobit, when he announced the principle recorded in Matthew. Our Saviour's precept, as Grotius has very properly observed, is *positive*, while that in Tobit is *negative*. In the sermon on the mount our Saviour tells us what to perform, and Tobit, in his instructions to his son, what to avoid ; the one resolves us in the things that are *right*, and the other in the things that are wrong. One, in short, is a *command*, the

xi. 18, 19, 20. " And I (the rich man in the parable) will say to my soul : Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thy rest ; eat, drink, make good cheer. But God said to him : Thou fool, this night do they require thy soul of thee ; and whose shall those things be which thou hast provided ?" Luke xii. 19, 20.

15. " If thou wilt keep the commandments and perform acceptable fidelity for ever, they shall preserve thee." Eccle. xv. 16. " If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. xix. 17.

16. The passage of St. Paul : " But others were racked, not accepting deliverance, that they might find a better resurrection (Heb. xi. 35)," has been acknowledged, even by Protestant commentators, to be, and evidently is, a reference to the account of the martyrdom of Eleazer, given in the second book of Maccabees, vi. 18-31.

* Huetius, who also gives the golden rule as a quotation from this passage of Tobit, admits, at the same time, that it might have been suggested as a dictate of nature. *Demonstratio Evangel.* vol. i. p. 307. *De Libro Tobie.*

other a *prohibition*. There is no more coincidence of thought betwixt these two passages, than between Exod. xx. 15, "*Thou shalt not steal*," and Rom. xiii. 7, "*Render therefore to all their dues*." And yet, who would dream of maintaining that the precept of Paul is either a literal quotation of the eighth commandment, or was necessarily suggested by the form in which it is recorded in the book of Exodus? "What thou hatest," says Tobit, "do to none;" "What thou *lovest*," says our Saviour substantially, "do to *all*." If, now, our Saviour quoted from Tobit, upon the same principle of criticism every positive, contrary to the usual order of thought, must be suggested by its corresponding negative. But our Saviour himself has put the matter beyond the possibility of doubt. The rule which he gave us was a compendious expression of the moral instructions of the *law* and the *prophets*. As you have freely acknowledged that the Apocryphal writings were not to be found in the canon of the Jewish Church, you will hardly contend that the "*law* and the *prophets*" embraced any of those books which Josephus mentions as not being possessed of equal authority with the twenty-two which he had previously enumerated. You will also admit, for it would certainly be useless to deny, that the canonical books of the Old Testament were divided into three classes: the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Hagiographa*. Now, if the Saviour himself is to be trusted, his memorable *rule* must have been suggested by something which is found, *not in any Apocryphal writer*, but in the *law* and the *prophets*—in the *acknowledged canon* of the Jewish Church. His sermon on the mount is in fact a divine *exposition* of the ethical code which is contained in the Old Testament, with special reference to the corruptions and abuses which ignorant and wicked teachers had introduced and fostered. He explains the *moral law*, and maintains its strictness, purity, and extent, in opposition to the destructive glosses of the Scribes, Pharisees, and Doctors.

‡ The golden rule itself is evidently nothing but a statement, in another form, of the principle of *universal love*. Our own expectations from others are made the standard of our conduct towards them—that is, our *love* to ourselves is to be the exact measure of our love to other men. The passage in Matt. xxii.

35-40, will throw additional light upon this whole subject. Our Saviour there condenses the law into two great commandments, love to God and love to man, and then adds, that "on these two commandments hang all the *Law* and the *Prophets*." It is evident, therefore, that Matt. vii. 12 teaches precisely the same thing as Matt. xxii. 39—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and this passage is a *literal quotation*, not from Tobit, but from the book of *Leviticus* (xix. 18). This was the text upon which our Saviour's mind was unquestionably fixed when he announced his celebrated maxim; it was, in fact, constantly before his eyes, and so frequently explained, as well as earnestly inculcated and enforced by so many new and peculiar sanctions, as to be almost entitled to the name of a new commandment. Between the rule in *Leviticus*, and the precept of our Saviour, there is an exact coincidence of thought. Both are positive—and both make our regard for ourselves the standard of our treatment to others. One is the text and the other a faithful commentary. "Love thy neighbor as thyself," says the *Law*. "What you would *love* to have done to you, do to others," says the Saviour. How it could fail to strike your attention that the passage in *Leviticus* was especially before the mind of our Redeemer, when he refers you so distinctly to the *Law*, surpasses my comprehension. Can it be, sir, that your Biblical reading is confined exclusively, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, to books which possess no other authority but that of man? I can well conceive that the book of Tobit would be peculiarly a favorite with the votaries of Rome. It is pervaded with such a tinge of superstition, nonsense, heresy, and will-worship, as to give it a powerful charm in the eyes of those who bear the image of the beast.

"A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind."

You are hardly more successful in your attempt to deduce the magnificent description of the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Apocalypse of John, from what you suppose to be a corresponding passage in the same Book of Tobit.* You have again followed the Douay version, which, however it may agree with the Vulgate, does not precisely render the original. The English

* Vide Huetii Demonstratio, vol. i. p. 307. Libro Tobiae.

reader will find the passage to which you refer in Tobit xiii. 15-18, of the authorized translation.

There can be evidently no quotation in this passage, since John is describing a *vision, just as he saw it*. He saw the *jasper, gold, and precious stones* which adorned the foundations of the holy city, and testifies what he had *seen*. He does not pretend to give us a picture of the fancy, but a *real view*; and of course his language must be suggested by the things themselves. In such descriptions, quotations may be introduced to embellish or adorn, but most assuredly the *names of things themselves must be suggested by the objects before the mind*. Again, the whole description is so strikingly analogous to several passages in Isaiah and Ezekiel, that if there be any allusion to other writers at all, it is to these venerable prophets. The twelve gates in the vision of John correspond precisely to the twelve gates in the vision of Ezekiel (xlvi. 31-34). The golden reed with which the angel measured the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall thereof, may be in allusion to the measuring reed and the line of flax in Ezekiel xl. 3. The garnishing of the foundations of the wall with all manner of precious stones, corresponds with the promise of Isaiah (liv. 11, 12); "I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundation with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones." The brilliant illumination of the city by the presence of God, is in exact accordance with Isaiah xxiv. 23; lx. 19, 20. The truth is, these precious stones with which the city was adorned, as seen by John, are the common and familiar figures by which the glory of the church is constantly depicted in the sacred writers. The splendid decorations of Solomon's temple, independently of any other cause, would naturally suggest these symbolical embellishments. That they occur, consequently, in different writers, and in the same connection, is no proof whatever of quotation or reference, it only shows a *familiar and common* method of illustration. If the church, for instance, be compared to a kingdom, two or a dozen writers might describe its peculiarities in conformity with this scriptural metaphor, and yet be ignorant of each other's compositions. The *metaphor itself* would suggest analogous trains of thought. So

when the church is compared to a city, to a splendid and magnificent city, the usual appendages of walls, gates, and ornaments will be obviously presented to the mind; or if it be compared to a *temple*, the splendor and pomp of Solomon's unparalleled edifice would probably be the first association in a Jewish understanding.

It manifests, therefore, nothing but consummate ignorance of the laws of thought, to suppose that the description of the holy city in the Apocalypse of John must needs be taken from the rhapsody of Tobit, because both speak of walls and foundations, jasper, amethyst, and gold. It is much more probable that Tobit borrowed from Chronicles, Ezekiel, and Isaiah.

Your attempt to make I Cor. x. 9, 10, a quotation from Judith, is too ridiculous to need refutation.* Paul is appealing to the recorded history of the "fathers," as furnishing salutary examples of practical instruction. He gives us, consequently, a brief summary of the leading events connected with their removal from Egypt, and their ultimate settlement in Canaan. This summary, of course, is taken from the *history itself*. It is just an epitome of what may be found fully recorded in the *books of Moses*. The passage in Judith, therefore, is just as much a quotation from the Pentateuch as that of Paul. Strictly, how-

* "Thirdly, in favor of the book of Judith, they bring two citations, one made by St. Paul when he said—*they were destroyed by the destroyer*—and another by St. James, who said, *the Scripture was fulfilled, and Abraham was called the friend of God*; both which passages (if there were any credit to be given to Serarius) are borrowed out of the eighth chapter of Judith, as we read them in the Latin paraphrase of that book: for in the *Greek copies*, there is never a word like them to be found. But whom shall the Jesuit persuade that the apostles quoted a *Latin paraphrase*, which was not extant in their time? Or if we should grant that the Greek or Chaldean copies had as much in them of old, as the Latin hath now, yet who would believe that St. Paul and St. James alluded rather to the book of Judith than to the book of Numbers,¹ where they *that were destroyed by the destroyer*, are upon record at large, and to the book of Genesis,² where the story of Abraham is recited, together with the second book of the Chronicles³ where Abraham is called the *Friend of God*, and the book of Esay⁴ where God himself saith of him, "*Abraham my friend.*" *Cosin, Scholast. Hist. Can.* p. 25.

1) Numbers xiv. 16. 2) Gen. xv. 16. 3) 2 Chron. xx. 7. 4) Isaiah xli. 8.

ever, neither passage is a quotation. Both writers have simply availed themselves of the same facts, to inculcate lessons of piety and wisdom.

Your fourth passage is equally unfortunate. Matthew xiii. 43, is not a quotation from the book of Wisdom, but is a palpable allusion to Daniel xi. 3, and Proverbs iv. 18. The passage in Matthew is, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." The passage in Wisdom is, "In the time of their visitation, they shall shine and run to and fro like sparks among the stubble."

Now how is it possible that "running to and fro like sparks among the stubble," could ever suggest the idea of the brilliancy of the sun in the firmament of heaven? If in the book of Wisdom it had been written, that the righteous should be like glow-worms or fire-flies, there would have been just as solid foundations for saying that this gave rise to the magnificent image of the Saviour in depicting the fate of the just at the end of the world. The expression in Daniel is suited to the dignity of the subject—"They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament;" or as it is in Proverbs, "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

Equally futile is your attempt to make 1 Cor. vi. 2, a quotation from Wisdom iii. 8. It is, in fact, only another form of stating the promise that the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High God. Paul had before his mind the ultimate triumphs of the kingdom of God, which is the burden of prophetic inspiration, and the constant subject of believing prayer. We have precisely the same idea in Psalms xlix. 14—"Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; and *the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning.*" And in Daniel vii. 32—"Judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

Wisdom* iv. 10, and Hebrews xi. 15, are both in pointed

* "In the first place, for the canonizing of the Book of Wisdom, they pro-

reference to Genesis v. 22–24, and therefore neither is a quotation from the other. Paul was not in the habit of dealing with second-hand authorities. He therefore goes to the original record for the history of Enoch, and not to a doubtful and obscure writer some centuries afterwards.

On comparing Heb. i. 3, with Wisdom vii. 26, there is but a single word which they possess in common. The *ideas* are evidently not the same; Paul is treating of a *person* and the author of Wisdom of an *attribute*. How the use of a *solitary word* can establish a coincidence in the passages themselves, I am utterly unable to comprehend. To make out a *quotation* or a

duce St. Paul, and say that Rom. xi. 34 (Who hath made known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor?) is taken out of Wisdom ix. 13. (For what man is he that can know the counsel of God, or who can think what the will of the Lord is?) But Gretser is somewhat ashamed of this instance; and our answer to it is, that the sentence which St. Paul citeth is clearly taken out of Esay xl. 13, where both the sense and the words (in that translation which the Apostle followed) are altogether the *same*, as in the book of Wisdom they are not. Secondly, as much may we say to what they note upon Heb. i. 3. where Christ is called the *brightness of his Father's glory*, alluding to Sap. vii. 26, where Wisdom is called *the brightness of everlasting light*. For as it is not certain whether St. Paul ever saw that Book of Wisdom or no, which, for aught we know, was not extant before his time, nor compiled by any other author than Philo, the Hellenist Jew of Alexandria, so there be several expressions in the *undoubted Scriptures*, concerning the *representation*, the *splendor*, the *wisdom* and the *glory* of God, whereunto he might allude in this his Epistle to the Hebrews, as he had done before in his Epistle to the Colossians, and in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, setting forth Christ there to be the *image of the invisible God* and the *first-born of every creature, by whom all things were created and do still consist*; the substance and ground whereof may be found in Ezekiel i. 28; Isaiah ix. 6, and lx. 1; Psalms ii. 7, and cxxxvi. 5; 2 Samuel vii. 14; Jeremiah li. 15, and x. 12, to some of which places the Apostle himself refers in this place to the Hebrews. Thirdly, that which is said of Enoch (Heb. xi. 5) needs not the Book of Wisdom to confirm it, for the story is clear in Genesis, and in the translation of the Septuagint (which St. Paul followed) the words are alike. Fourthly, that *the powers which be are ordained of God* was said by the wisdom of God itself in Solomon (Prov. viii. 15, 16); and, fifthly, *that God is no accepter of persons* is taken out of the words of Moses in Deuteronomy (x. 7). And yet there are, that refer both these maxims to the Book of Wisdom, as if St. Paul had found them nowhere else."—*Cosin, Scholast. Hist. Can. p. 23, 24.*

reference, there must be either identity of expression or identity of thought, and where neither is found, no quotation exists.

Romans xi. 34, if quoted at all, is quoted from *Isaiah* and not from *Wisdom*. The prominent idea of the passage frequently occurs both in *Job* and the *Prophet*: *Job* xv. 8, *Isaiah* lx. 13, &c. The analogy in *Rom.* ix. 21, occurs in *Jeremiah* and *Proverbs* as well as the book of *Wisdom*: *Jer.* xviii. 6, *Prov.* xvi. 4. *Romans* i. 20 is a plain allusion to the nineteenth *Psalm*. The passage in *Ephes.* vi. 13-20, is much more analogous to *Isaiah* lix. 17, than to any thing that occurs in the book of *Wisdom*. It is evidently, however, an *original* passage. The preceding train of thought naturally and obviously suggested this beautiful account of Christian armor; it grew almost unavoidably out of the metaphor employed.

Romans i. 20, is in evident allusion to *Psalm* xix. 1, and not, as you pretend, to *Wisdom* xiii. 4-5.

The connection between love and obedience is one of the most familiar and common ideas in the whole *Pentateuch*. You will find it in *Deut.* vi. 5, 6; x. 12, &c.; and it is just this connection which our Saviour insists on in *John* xiv. 15-22

Proverbs xv. 27, xx. 21, are much more analogous to *1 Tim.* vi. 9, than the passage which you have extracted from *Ecclesiasticus*. The train of thought in the parable of the rich fool in the gospel, might have been more readily discovered in the *Psalms* of *David* than the obscure authority to which you have referred us. (See *Ps.* lxxix. 10 seq.)

Matthew xix. 17, is plainly a reference to *Levit.* xviii. 5. That *Hebrews* xi. 35, contains a reference to *2 Maccabees* vi. 18-31, in which an account is given of the martyrdom of *Eleazar*, is not so certain as you seem to apprehend; even if it were certain, nothing is proved but the historical fidelity of the narrative, which is far from being identical with inspiration.*

* Where for the *persons*, the matter is not so sure. For other men are of another mind; and *Paulus Burgensis* (whose additions have the honor, even among the Romanists themselves, to be printed with *Lyra's* Notes and the ordinary gloss upon the Bible) understands not *St. Paul* here to have spoken of *Eleazar* and his brethren in the time of the *Maccabees*, but of the saints and martyrs of God that had been tortured in his own time, under the *New Tes-*

I have now noticed the several instances in which you profess to have discovered traces of the Apocrypha in the writers of the New Testament; and I think that any candid reader must be fully convinced that in every case in which an allusion exists at all, it is to the Jewish *canon*, and not to the corrupt additions of the Council of Trent. But still nothing would be gained by satisfactory proof that Christ and his apostles made use of the Apocrypha. Mere quotations prove nothing but the *existence* of the books from which they are made. Paul introduces lines from the heathen poets in various parts of his writings, and many have supposed that a striking analogy subsists between portions of the gospel of John and the speculations of Philo. Nothing is gained, therefore, in behalf of the *inspiration* of the Apocryphal books, by proving that quotations were made from them by Christ and his apostles. This may have been done and yet the books themselves be entitled to no more reverence than Tully's Offices or Seneca's Epistles.*

In the progress of this discussion, your profound ignorance of the word of God has struck me with painful and humiliating force. The only books in the whole Bible which you seem to have studied at all, are those which the Church of God, in ancient and modern times, has *unanimously* excluded from the sacred canon. The Law and the Prophets, to which our Saviour so often alludes, seem to be utterly unknown to you; and how-

tament. And for the canonical authority of the book (if any book be here cited), whatever it was, the reference here made to it gave it no more authority of authentic Scripture, than the words immediately following gave to another received story among the Hebrews, that Esay the Prophet *was sawn asunder to death*. Whereunto, though the Apostle might have reference, when he said (*they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword, they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented,*) yet whoever made all these instances, before St. Paul wrote them, to be authentic and canonical Scripture? or who can with reason deny (if Monsieur Perron's reason were good) but that the story of Esay's death ought to be *canonized*, as well as the story of Eleazar and his seven brethren in the Maccabees; seeing there is as much reason for the one as can be given for the other."—*Cosin. Scholast. Hist. Can.* p. 27, 28.

* Vide, on this subject of quotations, Rainoldi Censura Librorum Apoc. vol. i. p. 77, Prælectio 7.

ever clear his references to these venerable documents, your sagacity can seize upon nothing but Tobit, Judith, and Wisdom. The instinct of superstition is too strong for argument or critical skill. If you find a single phrase which can be tortured into a remote approximation to coincidence of thought, you instantly leap for joy, like Archimedes from his bath, and expose your literary nakedness in the ecstasy of your foolish delight. In a clumsy paraphrase of a passage in Tobit, you scent out the golden rule of the Son of God, though that rule had been revealed centuries before Tobit was born or blind, in the law of the Lord. In that same precious compound of superstition and folly you meet with something about the city of the Jews adorned with gold, jasper, and precious stones, and behold! the magnificent description of the entranced apostle dwindles down into a puerile plagiarism; sparks and stubble give you the clue to the glorious picture which our Saviour has drawn of the final condition of the blessed, and Paul cannot allude to the ultimate triumphs of the kingdom of God, without being indebted to a feeble passage in the book of Wisdom. Sir, these are the *fooleries* of criticism. They show *any* thing but the hand of a master or the pen of a scholar. There was an effort to destroy the fame of the author of Paradise Lost, by robbing him of the praise of original invention, in his noble production. The immortal bard was denounced as a *plagiarist*. Permit me to say that your folly is as great, although your ingenuity is not so acute as that displayed by the wretched slanderer of the greatest, brightest, most glorious name that adorns the annals of English literature. The case was much more plausibly made out that Milton borrowed from obscurer men, than that Christ and his apostles have quoted from the Apocrypha.

LETTER XI.

Exclusion of the Apocrypha from the Jewish canon.—Definition of the term canon; account of the manner in which it was formed.—The evidence necessary to make a book canonical.—The distinction between not receiving and rejecting a book shown to be false.

I HAVE now reached the third partition of your letters, in which you attempt, whether successfully or not remains yet to be determined, to refute my arguments against the inspiration of the Apocrypha. You have undertaken to show that the authors of these books wrote “as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” and that their productions are, by consequence, entitled to *equal* veneration and authority with the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms. Your *great* argument, based upon the fiction of papal infallibility, has been already “shorn of its beams,” and if it should appear to *your* mind, as it does to mine, in “dim eclipse, scattering disastrous twilight” around it, I hope that your failure in presenting it will teach you a lesson of modesty, hereafter, and guard you effectually from undertaking a subject too high for your abilities.

As your refutation begins with a desultory notice of my first argument, it will be necessary to present the argument itself distinctly but briefly, and then discuss the validity of your reply. I assumed as true what is capable of being proved by abundant testimony, and what you yourself have freely admitted, that these books are *not to be found in the Jewish canon*. The question naturally arises why they were excluded, or, what is substantially the same, why they were not introduced: my answer was, because *they were not inspired*. That their exclusion from the Jewish canon is satisfactory evidence to us that they were destitute of divine authority, was made to appear from a very simple and conclusive process of reasoning. *If they were inspired*, the canon of the Jews was evidently defective, as it failed to present the *whole rule of faith* which God had revealed to the church. But that no such defect existed in their sacred library, was made to appear from the silence of our Saviour, who nowhere insinuates that their standard of faith was incomplete, and, what is still more conclusive, from his *recorded* approbation of the Jewish

canon just as it stood. Their canon, then, could not possibly have *been defective*, and, therefore, the Apocrypha could not possibly have been inspired. The leading proposition of my argument was of that peculiar species in which the destruction or removal of the consequent is, by logical necessity, the destruction or removal of the antecedent. The only points, therefore, in which the schoolmen would have informed you, this argument could have been successfully assailed, were in the connection of the two propositions which constitute the hypothesis on which it rests, or the validity of the process by which the consequent was denied. To give a complete and satisfactory refutation, you would be required to show, either that the rejection of the Apocrypha from the canon of the Jews, though written by inspiration of God, did *not* render it defective, or that the canon was not sanctioned as complete by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

As to the first, you have entirely mistaken the point of my argument, in supposing that it turned essentially upon the proof of moral delinquency in the Jews in excluding the Apocrypha from their sacred library. It is true, sir, that I cannot conceive how the writers of those books could possibly have been *prophets*, and yet no evidence of the fact be made to appear until centuries after they were dead. If they had been sent of God as teachers to their own generation, or to generations which were then unborn, *some credentials* of their divine commission would seem to be essential. They would either have been charged with the power of performing wonders which none could achieve unless God were with him, or their heavenly vocation would have been attested by those who were *known* to be possessed of the Holy Ghost. There would surely have been *some* evidence, enough to constitute an adequate foundation of faith, that these writers were messengers of God, declaring the things which they had received from him. In conformity with the old logical maxim "*de non existentibus et non apparentibus eadem est ratio*," they might just as well not be inspired at all, as not be able to authenticate the fact. *Unproved* inspiration is to the reader *no* inspiration. Hence I did not regard it as a violent assumption, that if these men were *really* inspired, there *must* have existed satisfactory

evidence of their divine illumination. You yourself have told us that "when Almighty God designed to inspire the works contained in the Holy Scriptures, he *intended they should be held and believed to be inspired.*" Accordingly, sir, the authors of the Apocrypha must have presented to their cotemporaries such attestations of their commission from heaven as to have rendered obedience imperative, and faith indispensable. The Jews, therefore, in rejecting their productions from the sacred canon, must have resisted the authority of God, and, in pronouncing them not to be inspired, must have been guilty of a flagrant fraud.

The charge of fraud, however, which, of course, is hypothetically made, is only incidentally introduced, and does not constitute, as in your reply you seem to have supposed, the essence of the argument. It was urged chiefly for the purpose of setting in a strong light, the *moral* necessity, which to my mind seemed to rest upon the Saviour, of vindicating the authority of these books, if, as you pretend, they were really the word of God.

The real difficulty which the Romanist is required to explain is, how a document could be perfect and complete, when one fifth of its pages were actually omitted. Every book which God had given to the Jews, through the divine inspiration of his prophets, was entitled to be a part of their rule of faith; and a complete collection of such books would constitute their *canon*, or entire rule of faith. Now, if the Apocrypha were inspired productions, even Trent being witness, they *were canonical*, and, therefore, their presence was indispensably essential to the integrity of the *canon*. They were a *part* of the rule which God had given, and yet our Saviour treats the rule as *perfect* when it is miserably cheated of its fair proportions—that is, upon this new system of papal mathematics, *some* of the parts are made equal to the whole. Such, sir, is the substance of the argument which you were required to answer. Every step was so plainly stated in my original essay, that I do not see how you failed to understand it. Now, sir, what is your answer? To what you conceive to be the leading proposition of my argument, you have nothing to reply but that the Jews might possibly have been ignorant of the supernatural character of the books, or that no public tribunal existed, possessed of legitimate authority to intro-

duce them into the canon.* Your answer consists, in other words, of nothing more nor less than a pitiful defence of the *honesty* of the Jews! The ancient people of God were guilty of no fraud, in rejecting a host of canonical books because they had not the means of ascertaining that the books were inspired! They were not to blame. God had furnished them with no satisfactory proofs that the Apocryphal authors were his prophets, and, therefore, they were not at liberty to treat their compositions as clothed with divine authority! Your answer, sir, is such a wonderful specimen of reasoning, that you must excuse me for presenting it and my argument in the form of conditional syllogisms. (My argument was, if the Apocrypha were inspired, the canon of the Jews was defective, but the canon of the Jews was *not* defective, therefore the Apocrypha were not inspired.) Now the reader will observe that the validity of the argument does not depend upon the causes which induced the Jews to exclude the Apocrypha, but simply upon the fact, that they *were* excluded. The causes might have been *ignorance* or *fraud*; as I intimated in the original essay, the *fact* is all that is essential. Your answer is: If there is not satisfactory evidence that a book is inspired, there is no fraud in excluding it from the canon. There was not satisfactory evidence that the Apocrypha were inspired, therefore there was no fraud in excluding them from the canon. What now is the conclusion of this resistless logic? What end is answered, or what point is gained? It follows, we are told, for we have to receive it on authority, that my "argument is valueless and crumbles under its own irresistible weight."

Unquestionably, sir, your readers must admit your unrivalled ability in reasoning, and I have no doubt the unanimous voice of posterity will accord to your extraordinary skill, a distinction hardly inferior to his who concentrated all the powers of his mind

* "With these prefatory observations, I take up your argument as simply stated above, and meet it by answering, that when the Jewish synagogue did not admit those works into the canon, it was because of the want of proof of their inspiration, and perhaps want of authority to amend an already duly established canon, and that, therefore, they were not guilty of the heinous sin you lay at their door."—*Letter II.*

upon the recondite process of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers. You exhibit the tact of a practised logician in evading the point of my argument, and like an artful pupil, when the question proposed by the master is too hard, you *answer another*.

You are aware, sir, that the very existence of your cause depends upon the truth of my consequent, and accordingly whatever of reasoning there is in your essay, is devoted to the proofs by which my minor proposition was established. You deny, in other words, that Jesus Christ or his Apostles *ever treated the Jewish canon* as possessed of divine authority, *or even referred to it at all*. In refuting this extravagant assertion, I must correct a series of errors, (into one of which you were led by Du Pin,) which tinge your whole performance, and which, when once detected, leave in a pitiable plight nine-tenths of your second epistle. Your fundamental error consists in your restricted application of the term canon to a mere *catalogue* or *list*. The common metaphorical meaning of the Greek word *kanon*, as I have already had occasion to remark, is a *rule* or *measure*. In this sense it is used by the classical writers of antiquity, as well as by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. The subordinate meanings which we find attached to it in Suicer and Du Fresne may be easily deduced from its original application to a *rule* or *measure*.

In the early ecclesiastical writers, it is sometimes employed, as Eichhorn properly observes, to designate simply a *book*, and particularly a book that served in general for the use of the church. The collection of hymns which was to be sung on festivals, and the list of members who were connected with the church, received alike this common appellation. Again it was applied to the approved catalogue of books, that might be read in the public assemblies of the faithful, for instruction and edification; and in modern times it is used to designate those *inspired* writings which constitute the *rule* of faith.* The Scriptures, therefore, are said to be *canonical*, not because their various books are numbered in a list, or digested into any particular order, but because they are *authoritative standards of divine truth*;

* Eichhorn's Einleitung, vol. i. cap. 1, § 15, pp. 102-3. The text is almost a literal translation of the passage.

and the whole collection of sacred writings is called by pre-eminence, *the canon*, not because it is a *collection*, but because, in embodied form, it presents the *entire rule of faith*.* It is *inspiration*, therefore, and *that alone* which entitles a book to be regarded as canonical, because it is *inspiration* alone that invests it with authority to command our faith. If there were but *one* inspired book on the face of the earth, that book would be the *canon*—though it would be perfectly absurd to talk of a *catalogue* or *list* of *one* book. Accordingly, the distinguished German critic to whom I have already referred treats canonical and inspired as synonymous terms. The Jews, it is important to state, did not apply the term canon to the collection of their sacred writings. They described the books themselves in terms

* “The infinitely good God, having favored mankind with a revelation of his will, has thereby obliged all those who are blessed with the knowledge thereof, to regard it as the unerring rule of their faith and practice. Under this character, the Prophets, Apostles, and other writers of the sacred books, published and delivered them to the world; and on this account they were dignified above all others with the titles of the *canon* and the *canonical*. The word canon is originally Greek, and did, in that language, as well as in the Latin afterwards, commonly denote *that which was a rule or standard, by which other things were to be examined and judged*. And inasmuch as the books of inspiration contained the most remarkable rules, and the most important directions of all others, the collection of them in time obtained the name of the *canon*, and each book was called *canonical*.”—*Jones' new and full Method for settling the Canon*, &c. pt. 1, c. 1, p. 19, vol. i.

See also Lardner's Supple. chap. 1, § 3, vol. v. p. 257 of Works. See also Chalmers' Evidences of Christianity, Book iv. chap. 1. Owen on Hebrews, Exercit. i. § 2. That the definition which has been given in the text is abundantly confirmed by approved Papal authorities, the following extracts will place beyond question. Ferus says—*Scriptura dicitur canonica, id est, regularis, quia a Deo nobis data vitæ et veritatis regula, qua omnia probamus et juxta quam vivamus*. Jacobus Andradius says—*Minime sibi displicere eorum sententiam, qui canonicos ideo appellari dicunt (Scripturæ) libros quia pietatis et fidei et religionis canonem, hoc est, regulam atque normam e cœlis summo Dei beneficio ad nos delatam continent amplissimam. Nam cum omnipotentis Dei incorruptissima et integerrima voluntas humanarum esse debeat actionum et voluntatum norma: merito sana a canone et regula nomen accipere ii codices debuere, quibus Divina mysteria atque voluntas comprehensa*. And Bellarmine, whom Raynold styles the Prince of Jesuits, affirms—*Remnitiū recte deduxisse ex Augustino, libros sacros Scripturæ ideo dictos canonicos, quod sint instar regulæ*. These extracts may be found in Raynol. Censura. vol. i. p. 61.

expressive of their divine origin—arranged them in convenient general divisions, but did not confine themselves to any one specific enumeration. The books were computed indiscriminately so as to suit the number of letters either in the Hebrew or Greek alphabets. The Jews knew nothing of the magic of a list. Philo and Josephus, for instance, never speak of the *canon*—but of the “compositions of their prophets”—their “sacred books”—“the oracles of God,” using such terms as denoted *inspiration*. This was the only canonical authority of which they dreamed. This it was that distinguished their books from the works of the Gentiles, and exalted their faith above the deductions of a fallible philosophy. If, then, canonical and inspired, as applied to the Scriptures, are synonymous terms, to insert a book in the canon, is simply *to be convinced of its divine inspiration*. The very evidence which proves it to come from God, makes it canonical. In other words, the proofs of inspiration and the proofs of canonical authority are *one* and the *same thing*. Hence instead of requiring some great and imposing assembly, like the *cheneseth hagadolah* of the Jews, or your own favorite Council of Trent, to settle the canon of Scripture, it is a work which every one must achieve for himself. The *external* proofs of inspiration, which consist in the signs of an apostle or a prophet, found either in the writer himself, or some one commissioned to vouch for his production, are as easy and obvious as the *external* proof that any body of men are supernaturally guarded from error.*

The contemporaries of Moses would know, from the miraculous credentials by which his commission was sustained, that his compositions were the supernatural dictates of God. They would consequently be a *canon* to his countrymen. As other prophets successively arose, their instructions, supported by simi-

* “The inspiration of a writer,” says Jahn, “can only be proved by Divine testimony. Nevertheless nothing more can be required than that a man who has proved his Divine miracles or prophecies should assert that the book or books in question are free from error.” *Introduct. O. T.* cap. 2, p. 35, *Turner’s Translation*.

The reader will find this subject very clearly presented in Sermon xxiii. of Van Mildert’s Boyle Lectures.

lar credentials, would receive a similar distinction. The canon in this way would be gradually enlarged. Writers might be found who gave no external proofs themselves that they wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and yet their writings might be authenticated by those who were unquestionably possessed of the prophetic spirit, and on this account these compositions would also be added to the existing canon. We read in the Scriptures that "all Israel, from Dan even to Beersheba, knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord." (1 Sam. iv. 20.) How did they know it? There was no great synagogue to publish the fact or authenticate its truth. There was no great council to settle the matter by an infallible canon—but there was something better and higher: "The Lord was with him," and attested by miracles the supernatural character of his servant. Now precisely in the same way could the claims of every other prophet be established; and the evidences of divine inspiration be speedily and extensively diffused. The sacred books, circulated among the people, as well as preserved in the Library of the Temple* by the Priests, would have every moral protection from corruption, forgery, or frauds. The innovations of the Priests would be speedily detected by the people, and the changes of the people just as readily exposed by the Priests. In the multitude of copies, as in the multitude of counsellors, there would be *safety*.† To this must be added the sleepless providence of God, which would preserve his word, which he hath exalted above every other manifestation of his name, amid all the assaults of its enemies, and transmit it to future generations unimpaired by the fires of persecution, as the burning bush was protected from the flame.‡

* The existence of such a Temple Library will hardly be disputed by any sober critic. Traces of it may be found before the captivity in Deut. xxxi. 26, Joshua xxiv. 26, 1 Samuel x. 25. After the captivity, the evidence is complete. Josephus Antiq. l. iii. c. i. § 7; l. v. c. i. § 17. De Bello. Jud. l. vii. c. 5, § 5. See also Eichhorn Einleit. vol. i. § 3.

† This subject is ably discussed by Abbadie in a short compass. See Christ. Relig. vol. i. § 3, c. 6.

‡ Upon the manner in which the canon was gradually formed, and for a full and satisfactory explanation of the doubts which existed in the primitive church in reference to some of the books of the New Testament, see Lancaster's Bampton Lectures.

It is a favorite scheme of the papists to represent the settling of the Canon as a work of gigantic toil and formidable mystery. It evidently, however, reduces itself to a simple question of fact—what *books* were written by men whose claims to inspiration were either directly or remotely established by miracles? It is a question, therefore, of no more difficulty than the *authenticity* of the sacred books. To illustrate the matter in the case of the New Testament. The churches that received the Epistles from Paul could have had no doubts of their canonical *authority*, because they *knew* that the Apostle was supernaturally inspired as a teacher of the faith. He produced in abundance the signs of an apostle. So also the writings of the other apostles would be recognized by their cotemporary brethren as the Word of the Lord. The *books* actually written by the Apostles, or approved by their sanction, would be known by having witnesses of the fact. The historical proofs of this fact, that is, the testimony of credible witnesses, would be sufficient, in all future time, to attest the inspiration of any given work. If a man, for example, in the third century, is doubtful of the Epistle to the Romans, all that is necessary to settle his mind is to convince him that Paul *actually* wrote it. This being done, its inspiration follows as a matter of course. If a book, on the other hand, which pretended to be inspired, could produce no adequate proofs of apostolic origin or apostolic sanction, its claims would have to be rejected, unless its author could exhibit, in his own person, the signs of a heavenly messenger. The congregations in possession of inspired records were accustomed, as we gather from the apostles themselves, to transmit their treasures to the rest of their brethren, so that, in process of time, this free circulation of the sacred books would put them in the hands of all the portions of the church; and as each *church* became satisfied of their apostolic origin, it received them likewise as canonical and divine, and, in this way, a common canon was *gradually settled*. The idea that a *council*, or any mere ecclesiastical body, could *settle* the canon, is perfectly preposterous. To settle the *canon*, is to settle the inspiration of the sacred books—to settle the inspiration of the sacred books is to prove that they were written by divine prophets—and to prove this fact, is to prove either that the prophets themselves

established their pretensions by miraculous achievements, or were sanctioned by those who were already in possession of supernatural credentials. Now what can a council do in a matter of this sort, but give the *testimony* of the men who compose it? Its *authority* as a council is nothing—it may be entitled to deference and respect as embodying the testimony of credible witnesses. Every thing, however, will depend upon the honesty, accuracy, fidelity, and opportunities of the *individual members* who constitute the Synod.

Having now shown what a canon is, how a book is determined to be canonical, and how the canon was gradually collected, little need be said in refutation of your extravagant account of the origin and settlement of the canon of the Jews.

I could have predicted beforehand, from your known partiality for Synods and Councils, that you would have found in the *great synagogue* of Ezra, an adequate tribunal for adjusting the rule of faith. You would never, at least, have rested in your inquiries, until you had met with *some body of men* in whose decision your papal proclivity to confide in the authority of man, might be humored or indulged. As to the wolf in the fable, no possible combination of letters could be made to spell any thing but agnus, so your inherent love for a *Council* would lead you to embrace any floating tradition by which you could construct a plausible story, that such a tribunal had settled the canon of the Jews. But, sir, where is the proof that this great synagogue ever existed? The first notice which we have of it, is contained in the Talmud, a book which began about *five hundred years* after this synagogue is said to have perished. You are more modest, however, than some of your predecessors. Genebrard, not content, like yourself, with a single Council, has fabricated *two* other Synods to complete the work which Ezra had begun.* By one of these imaginary bodies the books of Tobias and Ecclesiasticus were added to the canon, and by the other, the remaining works of the Apocrypha. The great synagogue, which you have endorsed, was a regular ecclesiastical body, in which might be discerned, to use your own words, “*a general council of the church,*

* Hottinger, Thesaur. Phil. lib. i. c. i. quest. 1, p. 110.

in the old law, claiming and exercising by the authority of God the power of teaching the faithful what were the inspired books." Beyond the traditions of the Rabbins, what evidence are you able to produce, that a body, so evidently extraordinary as this is reported to have been, is any thing more than a *fiction*? You are probably aware, sir, that Jahn pronounces the story to be a fable, in which he is confirmed by what in a question of literary criticism is still higher authority, the opinion of Eichhorn.* We are not wanting in Jewish writers from the period of Ezra, to the advent of Christ, and the compilation of the Talmud, and it is certainly astonishing, if the synagogue had been a historical entity of so much importance as the traditions of the Rabbins ascribe to it, that some authentic notice has not been taken of its history, organization, and proceedings. How, sir, will you explain this wonderful phenomenon? Then, again, the one hundred and twenty men who composed this assembly, are said all to have flourished at the same time, and so Daniel and Simon the Just are made cotemporaries, although there could have been, according to Prideaux, little less than two hundred and fifty years between them. The whole story is so ridiculous and absurd as to carry the stamp of falsehood upon its face. It no doubt arose from the fact that Ezra was assisted in restoring the constitution of the Jewish state, and publishing a correct edition of the Scriptures, (*of the canon as already existing,*) by the "principal elders, who lived in a continual succession from the first return

* The Jews attribute the establishment of their canon, to what they call the Great Synagogue, which during more than two hundred years, from Zerubabel down to Simon the Just, was composed of the prophets and most eminent men of the nation. But the whole story respecting this synagogue, which first occurs in the Talmud, is utterly unworthy of credit. It is evidently a fictitious representation of the historic truth, that the men who are said to have constituted the synagogue, were chiefly instrumental in the new regulation of the state, and in the constitution of the Jewish church, and consequently, in the collecting and fixing the holy books upon which this constitution was established." — *Jahn's Introd., Turner's Trans.* p. 45.

See also Eichhorn's *Einleit.* vol. i. § 5. An account of this great synagogue may be found in Bartolucci *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, vol. iv. p. 2, on the word "Cheneseth Hagadolah." Buxtorf *Tiberias*, c. x. xi. Leusden, *Philol. Heb.* Dissert. ix. § 4, p. 73.

of the Jews after the Babylonish captivity, to the death of Simon the Just."* That Ezra could not have settled the canon of Scripture, is clear from the fact, that most of the books already existed, and were *known* to be the compositions of prophets. There is no evidence that he furnished additional proof of the inspiration of Moses, David, or Isaiah, and yet this he must have done if he made them canonical.† The truth is, he did nothing more in reference to existing books than discharge the duties of a *critical editor*. His labors were precisely of the *same kind* as those of Griesbach, Knapp, and Mill. He might have been guided by inspiration in executing these functions, for he was confessedly an inspired man, but the ancient books which he published were just as canonical before he was born, as they were after he was dead.

"What authority," you state with ineffable simplicity, "they (the Jews) thought necessary and sufficient to amend the canon, I have never met laid down by any of them. Nor do they treat of the evidence sufficient to establish the inspiration of a book." The *authority*, it is plain, is the evidence of inspiration, and that, in its external division, is the exhibition of miraculous credentials. Whoever claimed to be inspired, and sustained his pretensions by signs and wonders, which none could do unless God were with him, was in fact inspired, and whatever he wrote under the influence of inspiration, belonged of necessity to the *canon*.‡

* In addition to the authority of Jahn, see also Prideaux, vol. i. p. 359. Knapp's Lectures, vol. i. art. i. §4, p. 81.

† "But the great work of Ezra, was his collecting together and setting forth a correct edition of the Holy Scriptures, which he labored much in, and went a great way in the perfecting of it. This both Christians and Jews give him the honor of, and many of the ancient Fathers attribute more to him, in this particular, than the Jews themselves. For they hold that all the Scriptures were lost and destroyed in the Babylonish captivity, and that Ezra restored them all again by Divine inspiration. Thus saith Irenæus, and thus say Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Basil, and others. But they had no other foundation for it, than that fabulous relation which we have of it in the 14th chapter of the second Apocryphal book of Esdras, a book too absurd for the Romanists themselves to receive into their canon."—*Prideaux*, vol. i. p. 368.

‡ "In the case of a person, claiming to be commissioned with a message

Your distinction, accordingly, between not inserting a book really inspired in a canon, and rejecting it from a canon through defect of proof or want of authority, is wholly gratuitous and absurd. As the only way in which a book can be inserted into the canon, is to acknowledge its Divine authority as a rule of faith; that is, to receive it as inspired, so the only way of rejecting it, is to *deny* or not be *convinced of its inspiration*. A book cannot be *rejected after* its inspiration is established; we may refuse to obey its instructions, but if we *know* it to be inspired, it must be regarded as speaking with authority. Whether we hear, or whether we forbear, *it* still is entitled to be considered as a *rule*. Those that would not submit to the government of Christ, were still treated and punished as his subjects. His right of dominion was not at all impaired by their disobedience.

You are quite mistaken, therefore, in supposing that the charge of rejecting the Apocrypha from the canon cannot be sustained against the Jews, unless they had proof that these

from God, the only proof which ought to be admitted is miraculous attestation of some sort. It should be required that either the person himself should work a miracle, or that a miracle should be so wrought in connection with his ministry, as to remove all doubt of its reference to him and his message. The miracle, in these cases, is, in fact, a specimen of that violation of the ordinary course of nature which the person inspired is asserting to have taken place in his appointment and ministry; and corresponds to the exhibition of *specimens* and *experiments* which we should require of a geologist, mineralogist, or chemist, if he asserted his discovery of any natural phenomena, especially of any at variance with received theories.—*Hinds on Inspiration*, pp. 9, 10. “The Bible is said to be inspired in no other sense than the government of the Israelites might be termed inspired—that is, the *persons* who wrote the Bible. and those who were appointed to govern God’s people of old, were divinely commissioned and miraculously qualified, as far as was needful, for their respective employments. This being so, the inspiration of Scripture is not, by the strict rule of division, opposed to the inspiration of persons, but forms one branch of that multifarious ministry in which those persons were engaged. * * *. The proof requisite for establishing the divine authority of any writings, when, as in the case of the Bible, the testimonial miracles of the authors can be no longer witnessed, is either 1, That some miracle be implied in the authorship, or 2, That there be satisfactory testimony that the writers were persons who performed miracles, or 3, That there be satisfactory testimony that the writings were recognised as works of inspiration by persons who must have been assured of this on the evidence of miracles.”—*Ibid.* p. 27, 28.

books were inspired, and possessed a tribunal whose function it was to insert them into the canon. They were rejected from the canon, from *the very nature of the case*, if they were *not believed to be inspired*.*

* I find that Raynold in his admirable work, *Censura Librorum Apocryphorum*, has taken the same view. In rebutting the very distinction of A. P. F. which, in the days of this great scholar, was urged by Canus and Sixtus Senensis, he thus proceeds: "Concidit ergo alterum exceptionis Sixti membrum: nunc ad alterum, quod ita habet: *Etsi non receperunt in canonem, tamen non rejecerunt; aliud enim non recipere, aliud rejicere*. At idem plane est ad id de quo agimus, non accipere et rejicere. Nam mutemus verba prioris ratiocinationis nostrae, et dicamus: *Si quae unquam ecclesia verum et certum testimonium dare potuit de Libris canonicis Sacrae Scripturae, de Libris certe Veteris Testamenti vetus Ecclesia Judaica potuit. At ea hos, qui sunt in controversia, libros in canonem non recepit. Ergo recipiendi non sunt*. Quid jam lucratus est Canus? Nobis satis probasse non esse recipiendo, quod enim Christus apud Matthaeum dicit, *qui vos recipit, me recipit*, id apud Lucam sic effertur, *qui vos rejicit, me rejicit*, et alibi *qui non colligit mecum spargit*: hic *non recipi est rejici*, ut in virtutis via regreditur, quicumque non progreditur, in Apocalypsi, *foris erunt canes, et venefici, et scortatores, et homicidae, et idolatrae, et quisquis amat, et committit mendacium*. Quid his proderit *non rejici*, si non recipiantur? Verum est ista distinctio adhuc plenius refutetur, ego non modo hos receptos, hos libros sed et rejectos fuisse docebo. Quid est enim rejicere, nisi negare esse canonicos? Quid non recipere, quam (ut levius in Cani gratiam interpreter) dubitare num sint recipiendi?"—*Cens. Lib. Ap.* vol. i. p. 86. Praelect ix.

"One member of the exception of Sixtus has fallen; now for the other, which is this; 'although they (the Jews) did not receive these books into the canon, they did not reject them:—not to receive and to reject, are different things. They are evidently the same, however, in the matter of which we are treating. For let us change the form of expressing our first argument, and say if any Church could give a true and certain testimony concerning the canonical books of Holy Scripture, particularly the books of the Old Testament, it was the ancient Church of the Jews. But this Church did not receive into its canon the disputed books, therefore they ought not to be received. What, now, has Canus gained? It is enough, to prove that they *ought not* to be received. Christ, in Matthew, says, *whoso receiveth you, receiveth me*; the same idea is expressed in Luke, *whoso rejecteth you, rejecteth me*, and elsewhere, *he that gathereth not with me, scattereth*. In these passages, not to be received and to be rejected, are the same thing, as he who goes backward in the path of virtue does not go forward; and, as in the Apocalypse, without are dogs, and sorcerers, and adulterers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. What will it profit these not to be rejected if

All your blunders upon this subject have arisen from the ambiguity of the word canon, and from the preposterous idea, that there is something peculiarly mysterious and profound in making a collection of sacred works. It seems never to have entered your head that there is nothing more wonderful or abstruse in gathering together the accredited writings of the Holy Ghost, than in making a collection of the acknowledged publications of a human author. The difficulty of the subject is not in the collection, but in the *proof* that the separate pieces, in either case, are genuine. *Inspiration* is the mark of a genuine work of the *Spirit*, and miracles are the infallible marks of inspiration.

These preliminary suggestions in reference to the nature and authority of the canon, furnish the keys to a satisfactory solution of all your difficulties. Your refutation of the minor propositions of my argument, will be found so essentially wanting in every element of strength, that it may safely be pronounced as worthless as you have represented my own to be, and will assuredly "crumble under its own irresistible weight."

LETTER XII.

Our Saviour approved the Jewish canon and treated it as complete. Sadducees vindicated from the charge of rejecting all the Old Testament but the Pentateuch. The real point which Papists must prove, in order to establish the inspiration of the Apocrypha.

THAT the Jewish canon was *not* defective, was made to appear from the *silence* of Christ, in reference to any omission impairing its integrity; from His recorded conversations, in which he evidently sanctioned it as complete; and from the instructions of His apostles, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

they are not received? But that this distinction may be yet more fully refuted, I will not only show that these books were not received, but that they were positively rejected. For what is it to reject but to deny that they are canonical? And what not to receive, but to doubt whether they should be received?"

Your reply to these several distinct proofs of my minor proposition, I shall now examine in the order which seems to me to be most convenient for fully presenting the subject.

First, then, you deny that our Saviour, or His apostles, *ever referred* to the canon of the Jews at all, and, in order to give some semblance of truth to this gross and palpable falsehood, you avail yourself of the ambiguity of a term, and endeavor to “embosk in the dark, bushy, and tangled forest” of verbal technicalities.* It is freely conceded that our Saviour nowhere enumerates, by their specific names or titles, all the books which compose the Jewish Scriptures. He never pretended, so far as it appears from the sacred records, to give an accurate list or formal catalogue of all the inspired writings which the Jews received as the infallible standard of supernatural truth. But what is this to the point? Even if we take *canon* in your own arbitrary sense of it, you have grossly failed to sustain your monstrous hypothesis. It is certainly *one* thing to *refer* to a canon, and quite a different thing to *enumerate* all the books which compose it. Such general terms as the Works of Homer, the Works of Plato, or the Works of Cicero, evidently embrace a complete collection of their various performances; and to *refer* to them *under these titles*, is to refer to the *catalogue* or *list* of their literary labors. If the question were asked, what *were* the works of Homer, could it be answered in any other way than by *enumerating* the specific books of which he was supposed to be the author?

Now if the Jews applied any *general and comprehensive titles* to the whole body of their sacred writings, and if our Saviour referred to these documents, *under those titles*, he referred, unquestionably, to the catalogue or list of their divine compositions, that is, in your own sense, he referred unquestionably to the

* “You have entirely forgotten or omitted to allege, or even by note to refer to a single passage of the New Testament, wherein the Saviour or the Apostles speak at all of the *canon* of the Jews. They refer to the Scriptures generally, and to particular books, they quote from them, but there is not in the whole New Testament a single passage showing that Christ and His Apostles ever referred to the *canon catalogue* or *list* of inspired books held among the Jews, much less treated that catalogue *as complete* and containing the whole of God’s revelation as far as then made.—*Letter II.*”

canon of his countrymen. Have you yet to learn, sir, that the phrases "Scriptures," "Holy Scriptures," "Sacred Books," and such like expressions, which are continually occurring in Philo and Josephus, were the common and familiar designations of those works which were believed to have proceeded from the Spirit of God? * Have you further to learn that the division of their sacred books into three parts, the Law, the Prophets, and the rest of the books, was an ancient classification? † Certainly, sir, there is as much evidence of these facts, as of the existence of an infallible "council of the church in the old law," in the days of Ezra. If, now, our Saviour or his apostles ever referred to the inspired documents of the Jewish faith, under the general and comprehensive title of the "Scriptures," or under the three-fold division of their books which ancient usage had sanctioned, he *referred*, beyond all question, to their *canon*, in the sense of a catalogue or list of their divine compositions. That they *did* refer, however, to the Scriptures generally, you yourself admit. How, then, can you deny the obvious conclusion, without maintaining that the general does not include the particulars, the whole is not composed of its parts? Homer sometimes nodded; and you, too, in a moment of unlucky forgetfulness, have virtually acknowledged that there *can be* a reference to a *canon*, when the name itself is not mentioned, and when there is no complete enumeration of the specific books which constitute the list. You have appealed to a writer, who, from the passage quoted, would evidently appear to be *Flavius Josephus*, though, in the plenitude of papal authority and sacerdotal learning, you have *reversed his name*, for the purpose of showing "what were the ideas of the Jews," on the subject of their *national canon*. What evidence have you, sir, that will not as clearly apply to the case of Christ and his apostles, that Josephus, in the cele-

* Hottinger, Thesaur. Phil. lib. i. c. 2, § 3. Leusden, Phil. Heb. dissert. i. § 1. Eichhorn, Einleit. c. i. § 6. Jahn, Introd. Prelim. Observ. § 1.

† That this was an ancient division may be gathered from the fact that it appears to have been of long standing in the time of Jesus the Son of Sirach. We find it in his Prologue. See Leusden. Phil. Heb. Dissert. ii. § 1. Hottinger, Thesaur. Phil. lib. ii. c. i. § 1. Eichhorn, Einleit. c. i. § 6. Jahn, pt. i. § 103.

brated passage to which you allude, *refers* to the *canon*, since he only mentions the general division of the sacred books into three leading parts, and mentions the *number*, not the *names* of the works that belong to each division? * The same divisions are mentioned by our Saviour (Luke xxiv. 44), "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me," and yet you deny that in this passage of Luke, or in any other passage of the New Testament, there is *any reference* at all to the canon of the Jews. I am at a loss to understand how a *reference* to a *general classification*, when found in *Josephus*, should be a *reference* to the canon, but when found in the mouth of our Saviour, should be entirely different. It is vain to allege that because *Josephus* mentions the *number* of books in each department, that this is equivalent to the mention of a *canon*. The *number* of books may be gathered from the catalogue, but it is no more the catalogue itself, than the general heads under which the list is arranged. If I should say that there are twenty thousand volumes in the library of the South Carolina College, would that be the same as a list of the books? If I should say that the books which it contains might be conveniently arranged under the four departments of Law, Divinity, Philosophy, and Belles Lettres, and that each department contained five thousand volumes, would that be equivalent to a *catalogue* of the Library? It is perfectly plain, sir, that *Josephus* no more gives us a list of the sacred writings of the Jews, which, with you, is the only

* This passage occurs in *Josephus contra Ap. lib. i. § 8.* It may be thus rendered: "For we have not innumerable books which contradict each other; but only twenty-two, which comprise the history of all times past, and are justly held to be divine. Five of these books proceed from Moses; they contain laws and accounts of the origin of men, and extend to his death. Accordingly they include not much less than a period of three thousand years. From the death of Moses to the death of Artaxerxes, who, after Xerxes, reigned over the Persians, the prophets who lived after Moses, have recorded, in thirteen books, what happened in their time. The other four books contain songs of praise to God, and rules of life for man.—Since Artaxerxes up to our time, every thing has been recorded; but these writings are not held to be so worthy of credit as those written earlier, because after that time there was no regular succession of prophets!"

way of referring to their canon, than Christ and his apostles,—and there is no line of argument by which you can show that *he refers* to the canon, in the passage which you have extracted from his works, that will not also show that Christ himself refers to it in the passage recorded by Luke. You yourself, then, being judge, your broad and unqualified assertions, that “there is not in the whole New Testament a single passage, showing that Christ and his apostles ever referred to the *canon*, *catlaogue*, or *list* of inspired books held among the Jews,” is a pure fabrication of the brain.—Your imagination was evidently commencing that grand process of unreal formations, which finally resulted in the stupendous creation of a “general council of the church in the Old Law, claiming and exercising, by the authority of God, the power of teaching the faithful what were the inspired books.” I tremble for history when your mind is in travail. Laboring *mountains* produce a mouse, but laboring priests bring forth *facts* from the womb of fancy—are delivered of *gods* in the shape of bread, and produce Redeemers in the form of saints.

If, upon your own hypothesis, that a canon and list of inspired books are synonymous terms, your position is grossly and palpably false, how triumphant becomes its refutation upon the true view of the case, that the canon of the Jews was *their authoritative standard of faith!* What Philo and Josephus denoted by the terms “Scriptures,” “Holy Scriptures,” “Sacred Books,” “Oracles of God,” and such like expressions, was precisely the same thing which is now denoted by the compendious appellation *canon*. This word was not, at that time, in use in reference to the sacred books; but in those connections in which we would naturally use it, they always employed some phraseology which indicated the divine authority of the books. *All* books which were written by prophets or inspired men belonged to the class of Holy Scriptures, and those which were destitute of any satisfactory claims to a supernatural origin were ranked in a different category. As then the Jews evidently meant by the *Scriptures* precisely what we mean by the canon or canonical books, our Saviour’s references, as also those of his apostles, to the Jewish rule of faith under this general designation, *were* references to

the national canon. Wherever the word occurs in allusion to the sacred books, the corresponding term *canon* may be safely substituted and not the slightest change will be made in the meaning. With these explanations I now proceed to show that our Saviour did quote, approve, and sanction as complete, the inspired rule of faith which the Jews in his own day professed to acknowledge.*

1. First he appealed to it under its ancient division into three general departments, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, Luke xxiv. 44. This, according to Leusden, was the first general partition of the sacred books. What in this category is called Psalms, the first book of a class being put for the whole class, was subsequently denominated Hagiographa—the phrase employed by the Jews (Ketubim) being less definite and precise. The books of this third division, as would appear from the term Ketubim itself, were usually described by a periphrasis, as there was no general name which exactly comprehended them all. Hence in the former Prologue of Jesus the grandson of Sirach, they are simply mentioned under the vague title of the “rest of the books.” Josephus also applies to them a similar appellation. The Psalms being the first in order under the general class of Hagiographa, our Saviour in conformity with the Jewish method of citation, mentions them as including the rest of the Ketubim.† It appears, too, that Jesus was accustomed to introduce repeated allusions to the books of the Old Testament under a two-fold division—which not unfrequently occurs in the remains of the Fathers—the Law and the Prophets.‡ (Matt. v. 17, vii. 12, xi. 13, xxii. 40. Luke xvi. 16.)

Not only did Christ and his apostles appeal to the canon of

* In my original essay, I made no special references to show that Christ and his Apostles had quoted and approved the Jewish canon, because I never dreamed that any human being would think of denying so plain a proposition. It appeared to me like proving that the sun shines at noonday.

† The Psalms of our Saviour’s arrangement and the Hagiographa of later classifications are evidently the same. There being no single word by which all the books of this class could be denoted, led, necessarily, to a periphrastic description, or to the mention of a *single* book as a reference to the series.

‡ Suicer on the word γράφη, § 7.

the Jews in a general way, but they appealed to it as possessed of divine authority. They made a broad distinction between it and all the writings of man. Paul says expressly, in evident allusion to the sacred books of his nation, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." (2 Tim. iii. 16.)

Peter declares that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Our Saviour refers the Jews to the Scriptures which they were in the habit of reading as containing the words of everlasting life, for a satisfactory defence of his own supernatural commission. Then, again, particular passages are repeatedly introduced as the *ipsissima verba* of the Holy Ghost.* These facts incontestably prove that the Jewish canon was sanctioned by Christ, approved by his apostles, and commended to the church as the lively oracles of God.

The estimate which Christ and his apostles put upon the Scriptures of the Old Testament, may be gathered from the fact that they uniformly treat Christianity as only a development of Judaism. It was a *new* dispensation of an *old* religion. Hence, in their arguments with Jews and Gentiles, in their instructions to all classes and conditions of men, they refer to the Scriptures, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, for a divine confirmation of all the doctrines which they taught. The New Testament is only an inspired *exposition* of the principles contained in the Old. Every *doctrine* which Christ or his Apostles announced may be found in the existing canon of their day. Whatever changes they made, or novelties they taught, *respected* the *organization* and not the essence of the church. Hence the primitive Christians, even before a single gospel or epistle had been indited, had a written rule of faith. They were never for a moment, as

* The following passages show the light in which the Jewish canon was held by the writers of the New Testament. I have before me a list of *direct* quotations made from the Old Testament by the writers of the New, amounting to about 272. Yet there is no *reference* to the Jewish canon!

Matt. xi. 13, xv. 3-6, xix. 2-6, xxii. 31-43, xxvi. 54. Luke xvi. 16, 29, 31, xviii. 31, xxiv. 25-27, 44-46. Mark vii. 9, 13. John v. 39, 46, x. 34. Acts iii. 18, xxviii. 25. Rom. i. 2, iv. 2-24. Gal. iii. 8, 16. Heb. iii. 7, xii. 27. 1 Pet. i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 21.

the papists pretend, left to *oral tradition* for the doctrines of their creed.

But the Jewish canon was also held to be *complete*. In the original essay this point was presented as a legitimate and obvious inference from the *silence* of the Saviour in reference to any defects in the sacred library of his countrymen. Now the strength of this argument must depend on the strength of the presumption, that, if such defects in reality existed, the Messiah would have felt himself bound to correct and remove them. According to the hypothesis of Rome one fifth of the revelation of God was deprived of that *equal* veneration and authority to which it was justly entitled with the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Now the question is, whether that great Prophet of the church, "who was clad with zeal as a cloak"—who came to magnify "the Law and make it honorable," and who expressly declared that he had "not refrained his lips" from speaking righteousness in the great congregation, nor concealed from it the *truth* and loving-kindness of the Lord; the question is whether such a prophet would suffer so large a part of the light of revelation to be extinguished without uttering a single word in its defence. Upwards of fourteen hundred years before he was born, his Father had distinctly announced, "I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them *all* that I shall command him." He came then, not only as a Priest and King, but also as a teacher—a teacher of God's truth—and yet permitted a body of that truth almost equal in bulk to the whole New Testament to be "buried in the dust of death." If he raised no warning voice, no cry of expostulation—if he stood silent by when such violence was done to the sacred records of the faith, how could he say, "Thy law is within my heart, lo, I have not refrained my lips, Oh Lord, thou knowest"? The Jews had excluded the Apocrypha, either wilfully or ignorantly—if wilfully, they were guilty of a fraud, and that fraud ought to have been rebuked—if ignorantly, they were involved in a great calamity, and their illustrious prophet would not have left them in their darkness and error. So that upon every view of the subject the silence of Christ is wholly unaccountable, if these books were really inspired. It becomes simple and natural upon the supposition that they were merely human produc-

tions. He would have, in that case, no more occasion to mention them than to mention the writings of the Greek philosophers.

Now, sir, what is your answer to this plain argument from the silence of Christ? Why, you tell us, in your third distinction, that it is not so perfectly certain that Christ observed any such silence as I have attributed to him. You inform us—in conformity with the testimony of John, for that is the only passage which bears upon the point—that Jesus *did* a great many things which are not recorded; therefore he must also have *said* a great many things which have not been preserved. I confess that I do not exactly perceive the consequence. But let that pass. Let us admit that he may have *said* as well as *done* a great many things which have never been written, is it likely that the Apostles and Evangelists would have *omitted* what their master had taught in reference to a subject so vastly important as the very *constitution* of his church? No history perhaps records *all* the sayings and doings of the continental congress—but that certainly would not deserve the name of a history that should neglect to make the most distant reference to the Declaration of Independence? Whatever other things the sacred writers have passed in silence and neglect, we may feel perfectly certain that they have not concealed or suppressed the instructions of their master in regard to so fundamental a matter as the rule of faith. The very same arguments that render it *improbable* that our Saviour would have failed to correct the defects of the Jewish canon, if any defects had existed, render it also improbable that his biographers would have neglected to record the substance, at least, of what he had taught upon the subject. If we grant, however, that their silence is no proof of their master's silence, you have gained nothing. You have only avoided one difficulty by plunging into another. You would have the silence of the Apostles and Evangelists to explain, instead of the silence of Christ.—For this and all other difficulties, however, you have a stereotyped solution at hand. What Christ did not choose to do in person upon earth, and what his apostles failed to perform, however clearly within the compass of their sacred commission, may yet be accomplished by a standing tribunal—a general council of the church, like the fictitious synagogue of Ezra, “claiming and

exercising, by the authority of God, the power of teaching the faithful what were the inspired works." But as every falsehood accumulates additions in its progress—*vires acquirit eundo*—so your infallible body possesses some larger powers in your second letter than it was represented to possess in your first. You have brought it so often before the public, and exposed it to view in such tattered apparel, that it has finally lost its modesty, and begins to speak more "swelling words of vanity" than it dared to utter at its first appearance. In your first letter, councils could do no more, on the head of doctrine, than merely declare and define what had always been the faith of the church. They possessed no power to make *new* articles of faith, they could only announce with infallible certainty what had always been the *old*. In your second letter, these councils rise a step higher, and become prophets themselves, intrusted with *new revelations* which neither Christ nor his Apostles had ever communicated to the church. It seems that it is a matter of no sort of consequence whether Christ or his Apostles in their own persons had ever testified to the inspiration of the Apocrypha—that is, had ever taught that the Apocrypha were inspired—an infallible council could subsequently teach it for them. How? If Christ and his Apostles had never *taught* it, the members of the council could not receive it from *tradition*—they must therefore ascertain the fact by *immediate revelation*.* What your councils will become next, it is impossible to augur—they already claim to be the voice of the Lord—they will perhaps aspire to be God himself. I shall add nothing here to what I have already said touching your pretensions to infallibility. My previous numbers are a full refutation of this stupendous folly.

You are extremely unfortunate in your attempt to refute from *analogy* my obvious inference from the silence of the Sa-

* "Suppose those works inspired, as I contend they are, but not admitted at the Saviour's time into the Jewish canon, it was not, strictly speaking, necessary that either Christ or his apostles should testify personally to their inspiration. If the Saviour established a body of men, who, by his authority, and under the guidance of his Holy Spirit of truth, were to decide that question, which, as I showed in Letter I, we are necessarily bound to admit, the decision of such a body at any subsequent period would be amply sufficient."—*Letter II.*

viour. You appeal to the case of the Sadducees and Samaritans, who, according to you, denied all the books of the Jewish canon, but the five books of Moses, and yet were not rebuked by the Saviour for their wicked infidelity.

Now, sir, that the Sadducees denied the divine authority of the prophets and Ketubim, I think it will be difficult for you or any other man to *prove*. It has been supposed that because our Saviour refutes their skeptical opinions in regard to the resurrection of the dead, by a passage extracted from the Pentateuch, *therefore* they denied the inspiration of any other books. But it will be seen, by inspecting the context, that they had drawn their cavils from a distinctive provision of the Jewish law. They had virtually asserted that the Pentateuch denied the resurrection, since, in a given case, its peculiar requisitions, according to their view, would introduce confusion and discord into the future state. Their difficulties were met, by correcting their misapprehensions in regard to the nature of the future life, and by distinctly showing that Moses had taught the doctrine which they supposed he had condemned. Among the fathers, Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, and Athanasius, have endorsed this calumny upon the faith of the Sadducees. It was first called in question by Drusius, and subsequently refuted with such triumphant success by Joseph Scaliger, that Bishop Bull pronounces his argument to be decisive of the question. That must be a bad cause, in a matter of literary criticism, which such men as Scaliger, Spanheim, Pearson, Bull, Jortin, Waterland, and Eichhorn, to say nothing of Brucker, Buddaeus, and Basnage, unite to condemn; and yet all these men are found arrayed against the patristic opinion, that the Sadducees rejected the Prophets and the Psalms.*

It is universally acknowledged that the Samaritans denied the divine authority of the whole Jewish canon, with the exception of the Pentateuch, but it is not so clear that the Saviour failed to rebuke them. You are probably aware, sir, that distinguished commentators, both in ancient and modern times, have

* Brucker, vol. ii. p. 721. Pearson, *Vindicut. Ignat.* pt. 1, c. 7, p. 467. Bull, *Harm. Apost. Diss. Post.* 10, 14.

regarded John iv. 22, as a pointed *reproof* of Samaritan infidelity; and it was incumbent upon you to prove that this common interpretation was erroneous before you could confidently assume, that the whole matter was permitted to pass sub silentio by Christ.* Again, it was hardly necessary to rebuke the Samaritans, as our Saviour's notorious concurrence in the faith of the Jews was an open, public, and sufficient condemnation of the errors and defects of this remarkable people.

The inconsistency of the various solutions which you have suggested to the palpable difficulty arising from the silence of Christ, affords an amusing illustration of human imbecility and folly. First, it was not so absolutely certain that Christ was silent, since he performed many signs and wonders, which have never been committed to written records. Then, again, he could afford to be silent, as he had established an infallible tribunal, abundantly competent to supply all his deficiencies, and teach the faithful to the end of time. In an analogous case, that of the Sadducees and Samaritans, he probably *was silent*, as there is no evidence whatever that he rebuked the former for a sin which they never committed, and very strong evidence that he reproved the latter for an omission of which they were undoubtedly guilty. So you seem to oscillate between a denial and admission of the silence of Christ. Like a man walking upon ice, you tread with wary steps, lest your next movement should engulf you. Finally, however, after all your vibrations, you "screw your courage to the sticking place," and settle down in grim despair upon a probable solution, by which you seem determined to abide. You stoutly deny that Christ was silent in the matter, and promise to prove, though papal promises are seldom redeemed, "that Christ and his apostles *did* take some steps, not indeed to insert those books in the Jewish canon, but to give them to the Christians as divinely inspired works." Apart from the lying testimony of an infallible church, the only proof which you present, in your second letter, of this miserable fiction, is drawn from the assumption, that, in the New Testa-

* Such is the interpretation put upon this passage by Ammonius, Grotius, Lampe, Tholuck, and others. Tholuck's comment is specially deserving of notice.

ment, quotations are made from the Apocryphal writers, and from the admitted fact, that these books were early embodied in the Septuagint. The first position you have entirely failed to substantiate. There is no proof whatever, that a *single passage from any of the books of the Apocrypha, is introduced into the documents which compose the New Testament.* The passage, Rom. xi. 34, which of all others seems to be most analogous to a corresponding text in the book of Wisdom, (ix. 31,) is confessed by several of the Fathers, Tertullian, Basil and Ambrose, as well as by modern authors of the papal sect, to have been borrowed from the canonical prophet Isaiah,* xl. 13. If, however, it could be proved that the Apocrypha were quoted by Christ and his apostles, this would not establish their divine inspiration, unless it could also be shown that *every* book quoted in the New Testament, was, on that account, inspired. I can conceive of no other major proposition which would answer the ends of the argument. But surely, sir, you would not hazard a statement like this! It is more than Trent would dare to assert, that the heathen poets, whose verses are found in the epistles of Paul, were holy men of Greece, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It is an old logical maxim that an argument which proves too much, proves in reality nothing.

Your reasoning from the second fact is easily set aside. You proceed on the assumption, for which you quote the authority of Walton, that in the time of Christ and his apostles, the Septuagint contained the Apocrypha.† You then infer, that “if those

* See No. X. of this series of Letters.

† I have seen no reason, since writing my original essay, to change the opinion which I *then* expressed, that the Septuagint, in the time of Christ, did *not* contain the Apocrypha. If these documents were in the hands of the apostles, why were they *never* quoted? How does it happen that not a single allusion is made to them, nor a single passage extracted from them? But the subject is too unimportant to spend much time upon it. I shall just observe, that I am sustained in my opinion by Eichhorn, as well as Schmidius. The passage from Walton proves nothing as to the *time* when the union betwixt the Septuagint and Apocrypha took place. A. P. F.'s eulogy upon Walton's competency to settle a question of this sort, is not a little amusing, since, probably, the most exceptionable part of his famous Prolegomena is in relation to the origin of the

books were uninspired, the Saviour and his apostles were certainly bound *positively to reject them.*" Now, as I have already shown from the very nature of the case, to insert a book into the canon is to receive it as inspired; to reject a book is not to be persuaded or convinced of its divine inspiration, or to pronounce it uninspired. As there is no evidence that a single man, woman or child, in the whole land of Judea, looked upon the Apocrypha as inspired productions, what need was there that Christ should positively assert what no one thought of denying? His *silence* was conclusive proof that he acquiesced in the popular opinion. It was, beyond all controversy, the *positive* rejection, for which you so earnestly plead.

You have admitted that the Jews had no satisfactory evidence that the Apocrypha were inspired; that they were *excluded* from the Jewish canon, and, of course, a complete separation, as to authority, was made between them and the sacred books! Every end was consequently answered which could have been effected by the most pointed denunciation of these books. There was no need for Christ to speak, unless he intended to *add* these works to the sacred canon. Then it would have been necessary to show the Jews their error in refusing to admit the divine authority of Tobit, Judith, and Wisdom. The truth is, you have been led into this foolish argument by the ambiguity of the sentence, that the *Septuagint contained the Apocrypha*. You evidently treat the phrase as conveying the idea, that whatever books were inserted in that version, were possessed of equal authority. The only meaning, however, which the words can consistently bear, is, that wherever there were copies of the Greek version of the Old Testament, there were also copies of the Greek documents which we now style the Apocrypha. They usually went together, and that, for the purpose of presenting in regular series, the *remarkable history of God's chosen people*. In this way a complete collection was made of Jewish literature, inspired and uninspired. The line was clearly drawn between the divine and human; but as they both met in the common point of Jewish

Septuagint. He ought not to be read upon this point, without Hody at hand to correct his partiality for the fable of Aristæus.

history, they were united together in one collection. Thus much might have been gathered from the famous passage of Josephus, which was evidently before your eyes. "We have not," says he, "innumerable books which contradict each other, but only twenty-two which comprise the *history* of all times past." * * * "Since Artaxerxes, up to our time, *every thing has been recorded.*" In the eyes of Josephus, then, both the canonical and Apocryphal books contained the *history* of his nation, and therefore, had a common quality, which might serve as a bond of union, but the difference between them lay in this: the twenty-two books were "*justly held to be divine*"—those composed since the time of Artaxerxes, "*were not so worthy of credit, because, after that time, there was no regular succession of prophets*" or inspired writers. Another circumstance which undoubtedly contributed in no small degree to the popularity of those works, was their singular adaptation to the religious spirit of the age. The Jews, like the papists, had obscured the revelation of God, and trusting in the vain traditions of man, had mistaken superstition for piety, and sentiment for grace. Hence they would be likely to regard (particularly the Hellenist) these Apocryphal documents with the same sort of veneration with which we now contemplate the monuments of illustrious teachers of the truth.

It is, certainly, no commendation of these books, to say that they were written with that subordinate degree of inspiration, which the Jews denominate the "*daughter of the voice.*"* The stories of the Rabbins concerning this singular method of supernatural communication, reveal a degree of superstition, and betray a fondness for magical delusion, which sufficiently illustrate the *real source* of their famous "*bath quol.*" In attributing to the writings of the Apocrypha this peculiar species of inspiration, a suspicion is naturally awakened, that much of the esteem in which they were held, may be ultimately traced to their own patronage of something not very remote from the *black art*. A strong inclination to credulity and magic was, according to Lightfoot, a characteristic of the Jews under the second temple, and I

* For an account of this species of inspiration, see *Witsii Opera*, vol. i. lib. i. c. 3. Lightfoot on Matt. iii. 17.

know of nothing better suited to a humor of this sort, than the book of Tobit, unless it be the Arabian Nights.

You seem to think that if these books were not admitted into the Septuagint until *after* the time of Christ, it must have been done with the sanction of the apostles, in such a way as to imply that they were divinely inspired.* This would follow only upon the hypothesis, that when admitted they were admitted *as inspired*. If they were introduced into connection with the Septuagint, simply as historical works, covering an interesting period of the Jewish annals, or as moral compositions pervaded by an elevated tone of religious sentiment, there would be no more objection to incorporating them with the Septuagint, than to placing them on the same shelf in a book-case. The apostles, I presume, would not have objected to their followers, that they studied the writings of the heathen philosophers, provided they did not make Plato and Aristotle arbiters of their faith. It was not the perusal of the books, or the *places* in which they were found, that could make a matter of exception. So long as they were treated simply *as human compositions*, possessed of no divine authority, and to be ultimately tried in all their doctrines by the sacred canon, the apostles would hardly object to the study of them. It was no part of their creed to denounce freedom of inquiry; on the other hand, they inculcated the noble and generous maxim, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Paul did not hesitate

* "I believe with Walton, that the Septuagint, as that collection was called, contained those books before the coming of the Saviour. You think this, if true, strengthens your argument. I think not. If those books, thus united, were uninspired, the Saviour and the apostles were certainly bound positively to reject them, not to suffer the unnatural union to pass into the church." * * But you do not believe that the Septuagint, at the Saviour's time, contained the Apocrypha. Rev. sir, a more disastrous avowal you could not have made. The union, then, took place in the church, necessarily under the eyes and with the approbation of the apostles, and their immediate, most faithful disciples. These books are quoted and referred to as divinely inspired Scripture. I could not desire a stronger case. Before the apostles, the contested books were not inserted. Immediately afterwards we find them already inserted. A change has taken place. It could only be effected by, it could only be attributed to, the Saviour and his apostles. Therefore they DID leave these works to the Christian world as INSPIRED."—*Letter II.*

to quote the heathen poets; and if the Hellenistic Jews and the early Christians could not place the Apocrypha by the side of their canonical books without sanctioning the inspiration of the former, how could Paul weave whole sentences of heathen poetry into his own divine compositions, without, at the same time, endorsing the supernatural inspiration of Aratus, Menander, and Euripides? The argument from the Septuagint's containing the Apocrypha, is so evidently preposterous, that it need be pressed no farther. Let it lie in its glory, and let peace be with it.

The whole matter in dispute betwixt us, is brought down at last to this plain issue. The Apocrypha must be rejected from the sacred canon, and treated simply as human compositions, unless it can be shown, that Christ and his apostles *did sanction* their divine inspiration, and authorize their use as standards of faith. Up to the time of Christ, there was no satisfactory proof that they constituted any part of the oracles of God. Whatever evidence, therefore, *now* exists of their supernatural character, must have been developed in the age of the Apostles. Their inspiration must have been approved by men who gave unquestionable evidence that they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. This is the proof which the case demands; and if you fail to produce it, you are only spending your strength for that which is not bread, and your labor for that which satisfieth not.

LETTER XIII.

Rejection of the Apocrypha by the Jews.—Faith of the Primitive Church not a standard to us.

To you and all your predecessors in this field of controversy, the conduct of the Jewish Church to whom were committed the oracles of God in regard to the Apocrypha, has been so seriously embarrassing that your efforts to explain it in consistency with your own views of their divine original, are a powerful illustration of the desperate expedients to which men may be driven by

extremity of circumstances, who are resolved not to receive the truth. The rule of Augustine is so palpably just, that the authority of a book must depend on the testimony of contemporary witnesses, that the absence of all such testimony, in the present case, or of any testimony at all for a long series not of years alone, but of centuries, is felt to be a huge impediment to your cause. As you cannot suborn the ancient people of God to give the least countenance to your vain and arrogant pretensions, you expend all your ingenuity upon fruitless and abortive efforts to reconcile the exclusion of the Apocryphal books from the Jewish canon with your modern hypothesis of their divine inspiration. The Jesuits cannot disguise their spleen at the stubborn and intractable conduct of the sons of Abraham. In the true spirit of some of the venerable Fathers of Trent, Bellarmin speaks of the Jewish synagogue with great contempt, representing it to be, from its very name, a collection of cattle rather than men. And Campianus, his inferior in learning, though his superior in elegance, treats its canon as a mere grammatical affair, dependent upon the characters of the Hebrew alphabet, and incapable of being increased after the books had reached the charmed number of the letters. Others again have endeavored to show that the Jews, as a body, always entertained a profound respect for these disputed documents, and that some of the nation actually received them as divinely inspired.† But of all the theories which have ever been invented, that which you have borrowed and endorsed from Mel-

* The spirit of the Fathers of Trent may be gathered from the following extract :

“To these reasons, which the major part applauded, others added also, that if the Providence of God hath given an authentical Scripture to the Synagogue, and an authentical New Testament to the Grecians, it cannot be said without derogation, that the Church of Rome, more beloved than the rest, hath wanted this great benefit, and therefore, that the same Holy Ghost who did dictate the holy Books, hath dictated also that translation which ought to be accepted by the Church of Rome.”—*Father Paul*, p. 147. For a full and able refutation of Campianus and Bellarmin upon this subject, see Rainold. Cens. Lib. Apoc. Tom. i. p. 96, &c.

† This opinion is attributed by Melchior Canus to Cochilæus, but the *persons* among the Jews who *did* receive these books have never been brought to light.

chior Canus is beyond controversy the most unfortunate.* It turns upon a distinction which I have already shown to be false, which Bellarmin himself saw to be untenable, and consequently passed without discussion, and which, as presented by you, is absolutely *fatal* to your cause. You deny that the Jews *rejected* the Apocrypha, because they had no satisfactory evidence that the books were inspired, or possessed no tribunal competent to enlarge the extent of the canon. They did not *receive* them, you admit, but as no body commissioned to pronounce an authoritative judgment, probably existed, there could be no *rejection* in the case. You lay great stress upon the arbitrary distinction of Canus, that there is a vast difference between *not receiving* a book as divine, and positively *rejecting* it as a human composition.

Now, sir, you have only to turn to your second letter to perceive what you regarded as satisfactory proof, that in the days of Ezra an infallible tribunal existed, a council of the church, in the Old Law commissioned by God for the express purpose of teaching the faithful what were the inspired books. In your first and subsequent letters, conclusive evidence is furnished of your firm conviction, that many of these Apocryphal books were written *before* the time of the great synagogue, and consequently must have been in existence at the period of Ezra. You attribute, for instance, the book of Wisdom to Solomon; Baruch, according to you, was originally an integral portion of Jeremiah, and the internal evidence is strong, that the book of Tobit was written some six or seven hundred years before the advent of Christ. Then again, the song of the three children, the history of Susannah, together with the story of Bel and the Dragon, you represent as having been originally parts of Daniel. The additions, too, to the book of Esther you make to be a portion of the book itself. From these statements it is evident that when the Jewish canon was settled, some of the Apocryphal books were in being. Here,

* "Aliud est enim non accipere, aliud rejicere. Certe Judæi intra suum canonem hos libros publica autoritate minime receperunt, tametsi non nulli ex illis, sacros et Divinos esse crediderint."—Lib. ii. cap. x.

It is one thing not to receive, and another to reject. Certainly the Jews did not receive these books into their canon, and yet some of them believed them to be sacred and divine.

then, is a curious question; if a body specially commissioned to teach the faithful what where the inspired books, should omit to enumerate among them any that were truly inspired, would not such omission be exactly tantamount to positive rejection? It would be vain to say that no sufficient evidence existed that the omitted books were really inspired. The very object of appointing such a body is to afford that evidence; neither can it be pretended that the books, though in being at the time, might be unknown to the tribunal, since according to the very terms of its commission, it was authorized to pronounce with infallible certainty what books *were* inspired. Hence, such a body must have known *all* the inspired books that were extant at the time, and its failure to insert any book in the canon, becomes, by consequence, a damning proof of its human and earthly origin. Now if an infallible council settled the canon of the Jewish Church, and such, we have seen, is your hypothesis; if at the time when the canon was settled, Baruch, Wisdom, and Tobit, the additions to Daniel and the additions to Esther, were extant; if it is undeniably certain that these compositions *were not inserted*, is not the conclusion irresistible that they *were rejected* by a body competent to determine their character? Will you be pleased to explain upon any other hypothesis how it happened that if Baruch was an integral portion of Jeremiah, the great synagogue separated it from the rest of the book? Let me ask you again, if Wisdom were written by Solomon, and was, as you say, truly inspired, why did it not receive at the hands of the council the same treatment with Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles? How comes it that the song of the three children, and the story of Bel and the Dragon, did not pass into the canon with the rest of Daniel? Why were the additions to the book of Esther excluded, and why was Tobias, your darling Tobias, prevented from being enrolled among the authoritative documents of faith?

One of two things is intuitively evident, either the tribunal which settled the canon of the Jews was not competent to teach the faithful what were the inspired books, or Baruch, Wisdom, and Tobit, were *rejected*. If you accede to the first proposition, you contradict your repeated declarations that the Jews *did not reject* the Apocrypha, since, according to this view, they must

have rejected *some* of them. So that self-contradiction awaits you whichever horn of the dilemma you choose to adopt. If, however, you admit what upon the preceding statement of the case cannot be consistently denied, that any portion of the Apocrypha was rejected, then, according to your own hypothesis, you have the testimony of an infallible body against the inspiration of the rejected portion. This reduces you to a still more deplorable dilemma; and how you will extricate yourself, it is impossible for me to determine: On the one hand, the great synagogue of Ezra stares you in the face, pronouncing with infallible certainty that certain books are not inspired; on the other, you are damned by the Council of Trent, if you do not receive it as infallible truth that these same books are inspired. "When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war."

My object in exposing the suicidal character of your argument, is simply to show, that upon every view of the case the testimony of the Jewish Church is clear and decided against the inspiration of the books whose divine authority you have undertaken to defend. That testimony you cannot evade. Your nice distinctions are wholly ineffectual, and if you cannot rebut the decision of the Jewish Church by the authoritative instructions of Christ or his apostles, your cause is hopeless. Let the reader, then, bear distinctly in mind, that what you are required to prove is the historical fact, that our blessed Saviour, or his inspired Apostles, committed the Apocrypha to the Christian Church as infallible standards of faith. Up to the time of Christ, we find them treated as human compositions; and we must continue to regard them in the same light, unless it can be shown that our great prophet has otherwise instructed the church.

In your pretended refutation of the second argument of my original essay, you undertake the hopeless task of proving that the Primitive Church received these books from the hands of the apostles, as *inspired productions*. Your reasoning, if a series of assumptions can be called reasoning, may be reduced to the following syllogism: Whatever books the Primitive Church received as inspired, *must have* been received upon the authority

of Christ and his apostles. The Apocrypha were received by the Primitive Church as inspired; therefore, they *must* have been received upon the authority of Christ and his apostles. The testimony of the Primitive Church is consequently your medium of proof; a testimony, in this case, which, as we shall subsequently see, is not pointed and direct, but only mediate and inferential.

This argument or syllogism is grossly at fault in two particulars. In the first place, the major proposition is not logically necessary, and you have not attempted to show the connection between the subject and predicate. For aught that appears to the contrary, the primitive Christians *might* have received books as *inspired without* the sanction of Christ or his apostles. Certain it is that you have nowhere proved that they *could* not have done it. You tell us that, "if they united in receiving those works as inspired, then is our (the Papal) cause fully sustained; for they would not have thus united unless they had been taught by the apostles that these books formed a part of the word of God." How does it appear that they *would* not have united except upon the specified condition? All that I can find in the shape of proof is, "that they were tried in the furnace of persecution, and laid down their lives by thousands, rather than swerve one jot or tittle from the truth handed down to them!" That they were exposed to dangers, sufferings, and death, is evident, but that this proves *any thing* more than the *sincerity* of their convictions, I am utterly unable to perceive. We may grant that they would not have added to the sacred canon books which they did not *believe* to be inspired; but then the question is, whether their belief was always founded on apostolic teaching? Might they not be mistaken as to what Christ and his apostles had actually taught? If they were fallible, liable to be misled by designing men, the crafts of the devil, or the deceitful workings of their own hearts, they might have been perfectly sincere, and yet have received error in the place of truth. Even in the days of the apostles, and among the congregations collected by their labors, the mystery of iniquity had begun to work; and none can read the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians without being deeply convinced that the faith of professing Christians was not always

adjusted to the standard of inspired instruction. Paul admonishes the Ephesian Elders, that even among themselves should men arise speaking perverse things to draw disciples after them; and the exhortations to the seven churches of Asia reveal any thing but a *necessary* connection between the actual belief of the people, and the lessons which they had received from inspired teachers. The faith, consequently, of the primitive Christians, is an exceedingly uncertain medium through which to arrive at the doctrines of Christ and his apostles; and yet, unless there be an exact correspondence between them—unless the one answers to the other, as an image corresponds to its original, the seal to its impression, the purpose of your argument is not answered. You infer that such *must* have been the doctrine of Christ, because such was the faith of the church. Now if there be any possibility of error or deception on the part of the church, the force of your conclusion is proportionably weakened. It may be true, as a matter of fact, that the primitive church *did* not receive any other canon but that of Christ and his apostles; but then, in order to determine this point, it must be previously known what books our Saviour received, and what books the primitive church received. When the documents included in their respective canons are fully ascertained, and each canon becomes consequently known, we can then compare them, and pronounce upon their mutual agreement or discrepancy. But if one of the canons be *unknown*, I see no clew by which a knowledge of the other will enable us to resolve our difficulties. It is true that the canon of Christ and his apostles *ought* to be the canon of the Christian Church, but he who could reason from right to reality, from what should be to what is, will find himself halting on many a lame conclusion. Now in the present case, your professed object is to ascertain *what books* Christ and his apostles delivered to the church as the word of God: this is the *unknown* fact to be settled. You attempt to settle it by appealing to the faith of the primitive Christians. Your argument, of course, depends on the assumption that the primitive Christians *believed nothing* but what Christ and his apostles actually taught; and of this assumption, the only proof which you furnish, goes no further than to establish the *sincerity* of the primitive disciples;

a point which can answer your purpose only on the gratuitous hypothesis, that none can be in error and at the same time sincere, or that none can be deceived without being also necessarily hypocrites. When you shall have succeeded in proving that *honesty* and *mistake* are incompatible terms, mutually contradictory and destructive of each other, then, and not till then, your argument will have something of logical coherence. To put the weakness of your reasoning in a clearer light: if it were admitted, which, however, cannot be done consistently with truth, that the early Christians did, in fact, believe that the Apocryphal books were inspired, this would be a moral phenomenon demanding explanation. In all reasoning upon testimony, the principle of cause and effect lies at the basis of the process. A witness simply puts us in possession of the *convictions of his own mind*. These convictions are an *effect*, for which the constitution of our nature prompts us to seek an adequate cause, and when no other satisfactory solution can be given but the *reality of the facts* to which he himself ascribes his impressions, then we admit the *existence* of the facts. But if any other cause can be assigned, the testimony should not command our assent. If a man afflicted with the jaundice should testify that the walls of a house were yellow, we might be fully persuaded of the sincerity of *his own belief*; but as an adequate cause, apart from the reality of the fact, could be assigned for his conviction, we should not feel bound to receive his statement. Two questions, consequently, must always arise in estimating the value of testimony; the first respects the *sincerity* of the witnesses: do they, or do they not express the real impressions that have been made upon their own minds? The second respects the cause of these convictions: are there any known principles which can account for them without an admission of the facts to which the witnesses attribute them? When we are satisfied that the witnesses are sincere, and that no causes apart from the reality of the facts can be assigned in the case, then the testimony is entitled to be received without hesitation. Such being the laws which regulate the value of testimony, you were bound, after having shown that the primitive Christians believed the Apocrypha to be inspired—you were bound to show, in addition, that *no other as-*

signable cause could satisfactorily account for this belief, this moral effect, but the *authority of Christ and his apostles*.

In the mean time, it may be well to apprize you of the fact, that the *actual faith* of the *primitive church, as such*, is not received by Protestants as an authoritative standard of truth. There is always a previous *inquiry* into the *grounds* of that faith, and if they should be found weak, futile, or insufficient, thinking men feel no more obligation to reason badly, because good men before them have done so, than to disregard any of the sacred principles of justice, because distinguished saints have fallen into grievous sins. The Church of Jesus Christ, in the present day, does not believe in the Divine authority of those books which it admits to be canonical, *because* the ancient church regarded them in the same light; but *because* there is satisfactory evidence that they were composed by men who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The *esteem* in which they were held by the first Christians, amounts to nothing more than a *presumption* that there was sufficient proof of their supernatural origin; but that *proof itself*, and not the *effect* which it had on the minds of others, must be the ultimate historical grounds of faith. Historical testimony puts us in possession of this proof; it lays before us the *facts* upon which the primitive Christians formed their judgment, and puts us as nearly as possible in the same relative situation with themselves, so that we can form an opinion upon the same evidence which was first submitted to their understandings. History bridges over the chasm of time, and makes us contemporary with the events which it sets in order before us. Hence it is absolutely false to say that the church now receives any document as inspired, because the church anciently received it; the church now has the *same facts* in history, which the church anciently *saw* and *heard*, and consequently founds its judgment upon the same data. The only difference is in regard to the *medium* through which the knowledge of the facts is reached; but the ultimate ground of faith is the same in both cases. If, for example, I were asked, why I received the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, as an inspired composition, I would answer, *not* because the primitive church received it—that would only create a presump-

tion in its favor ; but because there is satisfactory proof that Paul wrote it, and equally conclusive evidence that Paul attested by miracles his supernatural commission as a teacher of the faithful. Now, sir, if you could adduce any adequate historical testimony that Christ and his apostles *gave their sanction* to the Apocrypha as inspired compositions, you would then be able to adduce a sufficient ground of faith. I have already admitted, that wherever a document can be shown to have been written by persons empowered to achieve miracles as the proofs of their commission, or wherever a document can be shown to have received the approbation and sanction of those who were supernaturally commissioned, the historical evidence of its inspiration is complete. If you could, therefore, produce from the sacred Scriptures, or from any contemporary writers worthy of credit, direct statements of the fact, or of other facts necessarily involving it, that Christ and his apostles delivered to the Church the documents in question as the word of God, you would then allege something to the purpose. But, sir, not a particle of such testimony have you been able to adduce. You have simply inquired what the primitive Church *believed* ; and without pausing to investigate the grounds of its belief, or the possibility of mistake, you have boldly assumed that it *could* believe nothing but what it had received upon inspired authority.

But, in the second place, your syllogism is just as faulty in the minor, as it is in the major proposition. It so happens, as a matter of fact, that the primitive Christians did not receive any other canon but that of the Jews, which was also the canon of Christ and his apostles. They *might* have received another, so that their endorsement of a book is no *necessary* proof of its Divine authority ; but as it is historically true that they *did* not, your minor proposition is utterly without support, and my original assertion, that the unbroken testimony of the Church for four centuries is against the inspiration of the Apocrypha, remains unshaken, notwithstanding your multiplied quotations and elaborate trifling in attempting to refute it.

LETTER XIV.

The existence of the Apocrypha in ancient versions of the Scriptures, no proof of inspiration.
—Not quoted by the Apostolic Fathers.

THAT the primitive church ascribed to the Apocrypha the same canonical authority which they were accustomed to attribute to Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, you endeavor to collect from the facts, that these books were embodied in all the ancient versions of the Bible, and quoted by the fathers, and not only quoted, but quoted distinctly as sacred Scripture. "The manner," you inform us, "in which the Christians of the first four centuries acted in regard to these writings, shows that they were left to them by the apostles as inspired." The first *peculiarity* in their manner of acting which discloses the sentiments of the primitive disciples, is to be found in the circumstance, which you have gratuitously assumed, that "*all these books, or parts of books, were contained in the Old Testament as used by the early Christians in the infancy of the church.*"

I shall not here interrupt the tenor of the argument to expose the rashness of your inferences on the subject of some of these ancient versions. It is enough for my present purpose to observe, that, upon the supposition that the facts are precisely as you have stated them to be, the conclusion by no means follows which you were anxious to deduce. You have already expressed the opinion, that antecedently to the advent of the Saviour, when there was no satisfactory proof of their Divine inspiration, and no tribunal commissioned to enlarge the dimensions of the canon, and when, of course, they *could* not have been received as any portion of the rule of faith, these very books were yet embodied in the version of the Seventy. How does it happen that the Hellenistic Jews could incorporate into their translation of the canonical books, others which they were known not to receive as inspired, while the same privilege is denied to the Christian church? What is there in the change of dispensation that shall make it a certain proof *after* the advent of Christ, that a work is believed to be inspired if found in juxtaposition to those which are confessed to be Divine, when the same collocation, under

the previous economy carried no such inference along with it? I had always supposed that the major proposition of an argument should be *universally* true, and that when *any* particular case was adduced which proved an exception to its general application, the argument ceased to be conclusive. Reasoning is only a felicitous method of applying to the parts, that which is confessed to be true of the whole, and when it is found from experience, or any other source of information, that the process of arrangement has been wrong, and that the separate elements do not possess the properties which *constitute* the class, the leading proposition becomes false, and the argument is said to be refuted. In the present case, you evidently reason on the principle that whatever books are embraced in the same volume with those which are confessedly inspired, must be believed by those who sanction the combination, to be inspired also. Now, to assert that there are numerous instances in which such a mixture of the human and Divine *has been* sanctioned, as the proposition supposes to be impossible, is to accumulate refutations on each other. In addition to the case of the Jews, which has already been adduced, the Greeks to this day reject the Apocrypha from the canon, although they give them a place in their copies of the Scriptures. Who believes that because these books are found in the authorized English translation of the Bible, therefore the Church of England receives them as inspired? or that the large body of Protestant churches who adopt that translation, defer to their authority as supreme? There can be little doubt that the incorporation of the Apocrypha with the Septuagint, was the real cause of their being subsequently embraced in the later translations of the Scriptures. The old Italic version was made from that of the Seventy, and, of course, contained precisely the same books with the original from which it was made. The Hebrew Scriptures were "quite inaccessible," says Bishop Marsh, "to Latin translators in Europe and Africa, during the first three centuries. In those ages the Jews themselves who inhabited Greece, Italy, and Africa, read the Old Testament in the Greek version. Thus the *Greek* Bible became to the *Latin* Christians a kind of *original*, from which they derived their *own*

translations of the Scriptures.”* If the Peschito version was, as it is said to have been, made directly from the Hebrew, it could not originally have contained the Apocrypha; these books must have been subsequently added from the Greek copies in which they were circulated. Whatever currency, consequently, these spurious documents obtained among the early Christians, is due to the *Septuagint*; and as upon your own hypothesis their insertion in that version took place previously to the advent of Christ, when the books were confessed *not* to be inspired, we must look for other motives besides an appeal to Divine authority for the amalgamation of human and Divine in the same volume. If, however, you prefer the hypothesis, that the mixture in question was made subsequently to the incarnation of the Saviour, after the apostles and apostolic fathers had fallen asleep, the phenomenon can be satisfactorily explained, without resorting to the fiction of inspiration.

There are obvious considerations, apart from any convictions of Divine authority, that would lead the Christians, especially of the third century, as well as the Jews, to a diligent study of these books. They do not seem to have been much in vogue in the Christian church for the first two centuries after Christ. We find scarcely any allusion to them in the Apostolic Fathers, no quotations in Justin Martyr, and no certain proof that they were generally read. But a mystic spirit soon corrupted the piety of the church; a spirit of dreamy superstition, similar to that which Lightfoot attributes to the Jews of the second Temple, which these books were well adapted to foster, and which, as it gained ground, would prompt its victims to regard their follies as signal illustrations of *piety*. This congeniality with a false spirit of religion, coupled with their relations to the history of God’s ancient people, would give them a popularity which some of them certainly did not deserve; they would be regarded with that sort of religious veneration with which the Christians of the present day contemplate the works of distinguished Divines, and would be bound up in the same volume with their Bibles, for convenience of reference, just as the Scotch combine in the same

* Marsh, *Comp. View*, p. 99.

book, the Scriptures of God and the metrical version of the Psalms by Rous.

It may be well to observe, moreover, that this argument from ancient versions proves entirely too much; it proves, if it prove any thing, that the books which Rome herself rejects as Apocryphal, must be a part of the canon. The third and fourth books of Esdras, together with the prayer of Manasses, are actually embodied in that very translation of the Bible, which the Council of Trent pronounces to be authentic.* The fourth book of Esdras, though not found in the Septuagint, is found in existing manuscripts of the Vulgate. The third book of Esdras occurs in the principal copies of the Septuagint, with the exception of the Complutensian edition and those which are derived from it. The prayer of Manasses is inserted in manuscripts of the Vulgate, at the end of Chronicles, and is certainly found in some editions of the Septuagint. The third book of Maccabees, too, is to be found in the most ancient manuscripts of the Septuagint *now* extant. Why, then, are not these books canonical? They are introduced into approved copies of the Bible; they occur in translations which the early Christians were accustomed to consult; and if they could be embodied in the same volume with the canonical Scriptures, without being received as inspired, I see not why the same privilege might not be extended to Wisdom, Tobit, and Judith. Dismissing, therefore, your argument from the case of the ancient versions, as less than nothing and altogether lighter than vanity, I proceed to that upon which Belarmin rests the strength of your cause: *the quotations from the Christian fathers*. It is to be regretted that you have not, like this distinguished Jesuit, precisely specified the *point* upon which the discussion should be made to turn. I am at a loss to understand whether you regard a *quotation*, though unaccompanied with any expressions of respect that would seem to imply inspiration, as sufficient proof, or whether you design to confine the argument to those allusions in which the Apocrypha are said to be *Divine*. You are just as profuse in bringing forward instances in which there is nothing stronger than a mere accommodation of

* Marsh, *Comp. View*, pp. 108, 9 (note).

the words of the Apocrypha, as in adducing passages which seem to invest them with a sacred authority. Bellarmin, on the other hand, restricted the argument to those quotations in which these works are cited as *Divine*.* I have already shown that mere quotations can prove nothing but the existence of a book, and to accommodate a passage is only to endorse the particular sentiment which it contains, without any necessary approbation of the work itself.

To prove that the Fathers *quoted* the Apocrypha, is a very different thing from proving that they believed these documents to be infallible standards of faith. Paul *quoted* the heathen poets, and the ancient infidels *quoted*, in scorn, the canonical Scriptures. It is, therefore, truly unfortunate for your cause that you have loaded your articles with numerous extracts which, if they were faithfully given, which in many cases they are not, from the original works of the Fathers, would prove nothing more than that they had *read* the books which Rome pronounces to be inspired, and adopted from them sentiments and opinions which they deemed to be applicable to their own purposes. By the same method of reasoning, there is hardly a Protestant writer of any note, who might not be convicted of acceding to the authority of the Romish canon. If you will turn to the works of Bishop Butler, and consult his fourth sermon upon the government of the tongue, in the very small compass of that single discourse, you will find more extracts from the Apocryphal books than you have been able to collect from all the writings of the apostolic Fathers. The fifth sermon concludes as the fourth had done, with a passage from the son of Sirach; and the sixth almost opens with one. In the sermons of Donne, Barrow, and Jeremy Taylor, we find all classes of books, heathen and Christian, gay and grave, lively and severe, indiscriminately quoted in the margin; and yet these men would have thought it a most preposterous conclusion, that because they enriched their own

* Disputat. de cont. lib. i. c. x. vol. i. p. 42. His words are, "Apostoli enim poterant sine aliis testimoniis declarare libros illos esse canonicos, quod et fecerunt: alio qui numquam Cyprianus et Clemens et alii quos citabimus, tam constanter dixissent eos esse Divinos."

compositions, *plenis manibus*, with the spoils of others, therefore they believed in the Divine inspiration of Aristotle and Tully, Lactantius and Origen, Euripides and Horace. Even the humble writer of these lines could not escape the imputation of Romanism, if to *quote* a book and to believe it inspired are necessarily connected. In my own published sermons upon the Vanity and Glory of Man, written long after my essay on the Apocrypha had been anonymously committed to the press, an extract is made from the book of Wisdom; and in my unpublished lectures upon the Origin and Progress of Idolatry, the splendid Apocryphal passage on the same subject is introduced with commendation and applause. If bare quotations are to be regarded as satisfactory proofs of a supernatural origin, the cause of Rome can be sustained by "reasons as plentiful as blackberries." It is evident, however, that *quotations* themselves can prove nothing to the purpose; it is the *manner* in which the quotations are made, and the *ends* to which they are applied. If the Apocrypha are not quoted as infallible standards of faith, of equal authority with Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, or if there are not circumstances attending the quotations which show indisputably that the writers regarded them as the word of God, from whose decision there was no appeal, nothing can be gathered from the fact, in behalf of these works, which could not also be collected from similar quotations in behalf of the heathen philosophers and poets. Why the ancient Fathers should be denied the privilege conceded to all writers, of adorning their compositions with elegant expressions or judicious sentiments, which might chance to strike them in the compass of their reading, it is difficult for me to comprehend. It is certainly ridiculous to say that because a man writes upon religious subjects, he shall not lay all the resources of his knowledge under tribute to supply him with apt similitudes, or fitting illustrations. Surely he is permitted to bring the treasures of his learning to the feet of his Redeemer, and to honor his master with the spoils which he has gathered in his literary excursions.

From the apostolic fathers you have pretended to present us with nothing but *quotations*, unaccompanied with a single expression that indicates the light in which the original works were

regarded. If, therefore, your extracts had been accurate, you would have gained nothing but the gratification of an idle vanity in the display of your learning. But by some strange fatality of blundering, which seems like an evil genius to attend you, you have only exhibited your ignorance of the Fathers and the tongues in which their works were written. That the reader may be able to form an adequate estimate of the nature and value of your services as a literary critic, I shall examine your extracts from the apostolic Fathers with a degree of attention which they do not deserve. And first from Barnabas :

Λεγει γαρ ο προφητης επι τον Ισραηλ· ουαι τη ψυχη αυτων οτι βεβουλενται βουλην πονηραν καθ' εαυτων ειποντες· δησωμεν τον δικαιον, οτι δυσχρηστος ημιν εστι. But what saith the Prophet against Israel: Woe be to their sons, because they have taken wicked counsel against themselves, saying, let us, therefore, lie in wait for the just, because he is not for our turn.—*Barnab. Epist. § 6.*

“This passage,” you tell us, “is composed of two texts, Isaias iii. 9, ‘*Woe to their soul, for evils are rendered to them,*’ and Wisdom ii. 12, ‘*Let us, therefore, lie in wait for the just, because he is not for our turn.*’ Here St. Barnabas quotes in the same sentence, and as of equal inspired authority, the book of Isaias contained in the canon of the Jews, and that of Wisdom; one of those you boldly declare to be of no more authority than Seneca’s letters or Tully’s Offices.” Will the reader believe, after this confident statement, that the *whole passage* as quoted by Barnabas occurs almost *verbatim* in the book of Isaiah as found in the version of the Seventy? This, as we have already seen, at a very early period supplanted the Hebrew originals, and became itself the source of appeal and the fountain of authority. This venerable translation Barnabas used, and from it has introduced the text which you have attributed to the book of Wisdom, but which is not there to be found. In your fourth letter you seem to be sensible that you had gone a little too far in relation to this passage; and if you had generously and magnanimously confessed your fault, I should have passed the matter over without any notice. If you had not obliquely insinuated a doubt whether Barnabas drew from the Septuagint or not, when the thing is as plain as any thing of that sort can possibly be made,

I should have given you credit for an honesty and candor to which I am afraid your lame apology shows you not to be entitled. "Candor," you tell us, with a ludicrous gravity, when you were about to act with a very questionable regard to its precepts, "requires that I should make a remark on a passage in my last letter." The passage to which you refer is the one before us—now what is the remark? "I did not at that moment (when writing the letter) recollect that the passage from *Isaias* was one in which the translation of the *Septuagint* varies from the Hebrew as we have it now. *St. Barnabas* does not quote the *Septuagint* exactly, but he approaches so nearly as to make it possible, nay, probable, that the difference resulted from a varying reading of the Text." I shall now give the passage as found in the *Septuagint*:

Ουαι τη ψυχη αυτων, διοτι βεβουλευνται βουλην πονησαν καθ' εαυτων, ειποντες· δησωμεν τον δικαιον, οτι δυσχηριστος ημιν εστι.—*Isaiah* iii. 9, 10.

Now the only difference in the passage as quoted by *Barnabas*, and as found in *Isaiah*, is in the fifth word, the causal particle *διοτι*—of which, in *Barnabas*, the first syllable is wanting. But the part of the sentence which you ascribe, in your third letter, to *Wisdom*, is, *verbatim et literatim*, the same in the *Father* and *Prophet*. But the beauty of the whole matter lies in this: in your *third* letter, you were absolutely certain that a text was quoted from *Wisdom*, when the principal word in the text was not to be found in the passage to which you referred us. *Barnabas* says *δησωμεν τον δικαιον*. In *Wisdom* it is written, *εδωκενσωμεν δε τον δικαιον*. But in your fourth letter the omission of a single syllable is sufficient to raise a doubt—makes it only probable that a quotation is intended. You were quite confident that a sentence is taken from *Wisdom* when the leading word is changed, another word added, and the sense materially altered; you are not so sure that it can be from *Isaiah*, when the sense, words, and every thing but one poor harmless syllable, are exactly preserved. If, sir, you could find passages in the *Fathers* so nearly corresponding to passages in the *Apocrypha*, as those of *Barnabas* and *Isaiah*, we should not be troubled with your doubts: it would be no longer a "possible, nay a probable" mat-

ter that they were genuine quotations; we should hear the yell of triumph, the chuckle of delight, and the insulting tones of defiance. If, however, there be the least hesitation in admitting that Barnabas quoted from Isaiah, it is irresistibly evident that he *could not* have quoted from Wisdom. Instead then of its being so very clear that the good father “quotes in the same sentence, and as of equal inspired authority, the book of Isaiah contained in the canon of the Jews, and that of Wisdom, one of those you boldly declare to be of no more authority than Seneca’s Letters or Tully’s Offices,” it is absolutely certain that no allusion is made whatever to the Apocryphal production. So much for your first effort to find the Apocrypha in the fathers. You have begun your career under inauspicious omens, and I apprehend that you will be satisfied, before this discussion is concluded, that an evil genius attends you, whom all your sacerdotal enchantments will prove unavailing to exorcise.

Your second attempt is like unto your first. In xix* of this same Epistle of Barnabas, a passage occurs which you have discovered to be a quotation from the book of Ecclesiasticus, (iv. 28, 31,) though you have not been at the pains in this particular instance to account for the manifest discrepancies between the son of Sirach and the Father, by a “*varying reading*” of the text. It is *never* doubtful whether the *Apocrypha* were quoted; but as Papists have a cordial abhorrence of the Bible, they are

* The translation of Barnabas is as follows: “Thou shalt not be forward to speak; for the mouth is the snare of death; strive with thy soul for all thy might. Reach not out thy hand to receive, and withhold it not when thou shouldst give.” The originals are as follows:

Barnabas—Θυκ εση προγλωσπος· παγισ γαρ στομα θανατον. Οσον δυνασαι υπερ την ψυχην σου αγρευσεις. Μη γινου προ μεν το λαβειν εκτεινον τας χειρας. προς δε το ιουσαι συσπων.

Ecclesiasticus—Εως του θανατου περι της αληθειας, και Κυριος ο Θεος πολεμησει υπερ σου. Μη γινου τραχος εν γλωσση σου, και νωθρος και παρειμενος εν ταις εργασις σου. Μη εστω η χειρ σου εκτεταμενη εις το λαβειν, και εν τω αποδιδουαι συνεσταλμειη.

The version of Ecclesiasticus is in these words: “*Strive for justice for thy soul, and even unto death fight for justice, and God will overthrow thy enemies for thee. Be not hasty in thy tongue; and slack and remiss in thy works. Let not thy hand be stretched out to receive, and shut when thou shouldst give*” I have given the Italics as found in A. P. F.’s citation.

slow to discern quotations from the canon among those whom they honor.

It will be perceived, upon consulting the original, that *your* translation of Barnabas and the Doway version of Ecclesiasticus, which you have copied without change, are neither of them consistent with the original text. According to you there are *three* coincidences in these passages, which show that the one must have been taken from the other. The first, which you have italicized, is the exhortation to *strive*; but unfortunately *no such exhortation* is found in Barnabas. The good Father is insisting upon the duties of benevolence, charity, and temperance, and in the passage before us exhorts his readers to *cultivate chastity*, even beyond the resources of their natural strength. There is nothing in the Greek that can, by any possibility, be made to correspond with the sentence in your version: "*strive with thy soul for all thy might.*"

The conjectural reading of Cotelerius, which you seem to have followed, *πρεσ της ψυχης σου αγωνευσεις*, is liable to serious objections. In the first place, the word *αγωνευσεις*, which that critic would substitute for the received reading, *αγνευσεις*, belongs to no language under the sun—most certainly it is not Greek—it is justified neither by the usage of the classics, the authors of the Septuagint, nor the writers of the New Testament. The legitimaate word to express the idea of *striving*, is *αγωνιζω*. In the second place, the new reading gives a sense wholly unsuited to the connection in which the passage is found. It occurs among a series of earnest exhortations to *specific duties*. It is preceded by solemn admonitions against severity to servants, avarice and volubility, and succeeded by directions equally definite and precise. Now to introduce an abstract proposition, which covers a multitude of duties, in the midst of specific, definite and precise instructions, is, to say the least of it, exceedingly awkward. The old reading, which makes the passage an exhortation to the practice of chastity, suits the nature of the context, and, on that account, is to be decidedly preferred. In the third place, there is no need of emendation. The preposition seems to be used in its common acceptance, when followed by the accusative, of excess, and *ψυχην* may be regarded as a com-

pendious expression for the powers of the man. This word is frequently used to designate the whole man, and in such connections is equivalent to *ανθρωπος*, and every Greek scholar knows that *πρεσ ανθρωπον* may be properly rendered “*beyond human strength.*” (Viger De Idiotismis, c. 9, § 9, Reg. 1.

Turned into English, and substituting the imperative for the future, the passage in Barnabas, upon which you found your first coincidence, is simply this: “As far as you are able, beyond your strength, cultivate chastity.” Employ not only your natural resources—these alone are not to be trusted, but seek a strength beyond your own, even the all-sufficient grace of God. What now in the corresponding passage says Jesus the son of Sirach? “Strive for *truth* even unto death:” a marvellous coincidence with the exhortation to purity; an extraordinary quotation, when there is not a single word in the two clauses alike. One is exhorting to stability of opinion, and the other to innocence of life. The next coincidence is the exhortation in relation to the *tongue*. In the clauses containing this advice, the principal words, as found in Greek, are widely different in their meaning. Barnabas uses a word (*προγλωσσοσ*) which denotes excessive volubility, and he gives advice, therefore, precisely similar to that recorded in the first chapter and nineteenth verse of the epistle of James: “Be slow to speak.” The son of Sirach, on the other hand, is exhorting to *civility* of speech, and uses expressions which, when literally translated, amount to this: “Be not *rough* with your tongue.” The Latin version surely should not supersede the Greek, and I know of no copies of the Septuagint that give the reading *ταζυς* which the Latin translators seem to have followed,* though some copies do give *θρασυς*. Either of these readings harmonizes exactly with the succeeding verse: “Be not as a *lion in thy house* nor *frantic among thy servants.*” This sentence illustrates what he means by being “*rough-tongued*,” it is to betray the fury and ferocity of the lion among those who are dependent upon us. The coincidence, then, in this passage

* I say, *seem to have followed*, because the phrase adopted by the Vulgate *citatus in lingua*, is evidently susceptible of a rendering consistent with the common reading: “Be not *violently excited* in thy tongue or speech.”

between Barnabas and Ecclesiasticus, is just the coincidence between an admonition not to be loquacious or excessively talkative, and an admonition to overcome acerbity of speech. One says, in effect, "*be silent*," the other says, "*be gentle*." It is very obvious that the sentiment in Barnabas was suggested by the passage in James upon the same subject.

The last coincidence which you notice, is in reference to what is said of illiberality or avarice; and here I freely admit that there *is* a coincidence both of expression and sentiment, but a coincidence just of that sort which betrays no marks of design. It is a repetition in both cases of one of those common maxims which are to be found in all writers upon morals. The sentiment is evidently the same with that which Paul attributes to the Saviour, in Acts xx. 35, and which is likewise suggested by numerous passages in the heathen pages of antiquity. Barnabas says, "Extend not thy hand to receive—close it not to give." Our Saviour says, it is more blessed to give than to receive. In almost precisely the same words, Artemidorus says, "To give is better than to receive" (Oneirocr. iv. 3). Ælian says, "It is better to enrich others than to be rich ourselves" (H. V. xix. 13), and a similar sentiment occurs in Aristotle, Nichom. iv. 1.* Coincidences of this sort, evidently show, that such aphorisms must be regarded as the spontaneous suggestions of the mind to those who observe, with the eye of the moralist, the vicissitudes of men and manners. The same process of thought by which they become the property of one understanding, renders them the possession of others. They belong to those common topics which, whoever attempts to discuss, will, according to Johnson, "find unexpected coincidences of his thoughts with those of other writers," growing out of the very nature of the subject, and implying no design to imitate or adopt.

The next passage with which you favor us, is taken from a part of the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, which is now preserved only in a Latin translation. We cannot consequently

* For many striking illustrations of the same sentiment to be found in various authors, the reader is referred to Kuinoel, Wolfius and Wetstein, on Acts xx. 35.

determine with certainty, what precisely were the words which the Father employed. You seem to be quite certain that he had his eye upon Tobit xii. 9—"For alms delivereth from death." The whole passage to which you refer in Polycarp, is in these words: "Quum notestis benefacere polite deferre: quia *elemosyna de morte liberat*. Omnes vobis invicem subjecti estote: *conversationem vestram irreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus.*"* In commenting upon this extract, you inform us that "St. Polycarp, like St. Barnabas, quotes in the same breath an author," whom all admit to be inspired (1 Peter ii. 12), and another whom Protestants reject (Tob. xii. 9).

If we admit, in the first place, that Polycarp quoted from Tobias, it will by no means follow that he regarded the book as inspired or canonical. He simply accommodates a sentence which suited his present purpose, just as Paul adopted from Menander the memorable aphorism, "evil communications corrupt good manners." But, in the second place, the passage in Tobit is itself a quotation—a *literal quotation* from the tenth chapter and second verse of the book of Proverbs, where it is rendered in our English version, "righteousness delivereth from death." The coincidence of the sentiment in the contexts, creates a presumption that the one passage was suggested by the other. Solomon's context is, "*treasures of wickedness profit nothing;*" and that of Tobit is, "*it is better to give alms than to lay up gold.*" Solomon adds, "*righteousness delivereth from death;*" and Tobit adds that "*alms deliver from death.*" Now the Hebrew word which Solomon employs for righteousness (הַקְדָּוָה) is not unfrequently rendered by the Seventy, *ελεημοσυνη* (*alms*), the very word which is found in the Greek translation of this passage of Tobit. If, then, Tobit was originally written in Hebrew, as was doubtless the case, there being Hebrew copies extant in the time of Origen, the probability is that the same word which occurs in Proverbs, was used in this place. The Jews were accustomed to interpret the passage in Solomon precisely as it has

* The passage may be thus translated: "When it is in your power to do good, defer it not, for *alms delivereth from death*. Be all of you subject one to another, *having your conversation honest among the Gentiles.*"

been rendered by the Greek translators of Tobit (Rosenmuller in Prov. x. 2). Hence, in the original, this text of Tobit was in all probability *an exact quotation* from the corresponding text in Proverbs. It is worthy of remark, that there are several Hebrew copies of Tobit extant at this day, translated, it is generally supposed, from the Greek. Two of these have been published, one by Sebastian Munster, and another by Paul Fagius. Huetius possessed another, in manuscript, differing somewhat from both, but according more closely with that of Munster. The editions of Munster and Fagius were reprinted in the London Polyglott, and may be found in the fourth volume of Walton, with the Latin translations of these distinguished scholars annexed. Both these copies, in the passage before us, concur, *literatim et punctuatim*, with the passage in Proverbs, which is certainly a strong presumption that Solomon's Hebrew and Tobit's Greek (or rather his translator's) are precisely equivalent.

Now the question is, which did the Father quote, the Septuagint translation of Solomon, or the Greek translation of Tobit, since both were versions of the same original? Your answer is, that he quoted Tobit. How can that be known? His own Greek is lost, and we have no means of ascertaining what word he used. If he employed the term *δικαιοσυνη* (righteousness), then Solomon, as found in the LXX, was quoted; if he employed *ελεημοσυνη* (*alms*), then the Greek version of Tobit was quoted. How shall we determine which word was employed? The Latin translation affords no certain clew, since either term might be rendered eleemosyne, both corresponding as they do to the Hebrew, and the one always, and the other frequently, meaning the same thing as eleemosyne.

Your next passage is from the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which, you say, is compounded of Wisdom xi. 22 and xii. 12.

There is, however, an exact agreement in *sense*, although not a verbal correspondence, between this passage and Daniel iv. 35, (32 in LXX) and Burton is of opinion that Clement had specially in his eye, Isaiah xlv. 9, and Rom. ix. 19, 20. The idea is one continually occurring in the canonical Scriptures, and I think it doubtful whether the Father had any *particular passage* in his

mind; for his words exactly tally with no one text or combination of texts in the Scriptures. I shall present, however, Clement, Wisdom, and Daniel, that the reader may judge for himself whether the Father had not as much reference to Daniel as to Wisdom; and as, in this case, I do not object to your translation, I shall dispense with the original.

Clement says: "Who shall say to Him, what dost thou, or who shall resist the power of His strength?"

Wisdom: "For who shall say to thee, what hast thou done; and who shall resist the strength of thy arm."

Daniel says: "He doeth according to His will, in the army of Heaven and among the inhabitants of earth, and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, what dost thou?"

The coincidence with Daniel is more striking from the succeeding sentence in Clement—"When He wills and as He wills, He has done all things, and none of His decrees shall pass away."

Your last reference to the Apostolic Fathers is peculiarly unfortunate. You appeal to the abstract which Clement has given us of the history of Judith in the fifty-fifth section of his epistle, and would insinuate the belief that there was something in the passage to favor the idea that the book was inspired. But what is the fact? The *history of Judith* is commended as a laudable example in the *same connection* with the *story of Ædipus*, and the *heathen* accounts of such devoted men as Codrus, Lycurgus, and Scipio Africanus. A wonderful proof of inspiration, truly! Clement, no doubt, believed the authenticity of the book, but that is a very different matter from its divine inspiration. The only passage in the reference of Clement upon which you fasten as a *quotation* from Judith, happens very strangely *not* to be one.* If you will turn to the originals, you will find

* I shall give the whole passage as it appears in Archbishop Wake's translation:

"Nay, and even the Gentiles themselves have given us examples of this kind: for we read how many Kings and Princes, in times of pestilence, being warned by their oracles, have given up themselves unto death, that by their own blood they might deliver their country from destruction. Others have forsaken their cities that so they might put an end to the seditions of them. We know

that the words translated "*deliver*," are very different in Judith and Clement, and the epithet with which Judith distinguished the Lord is omitted by the Father, and the name of Holofernes is not mentioned in Judith, though it is in Clement. There is nothing, I may add, in the account which Clement gives of Esther, that can be remotely tortured into proof that he deemed the Apocryphal portions to be inspired. He appeals to her history simply as *true*, and intimates nothing of the *origin* of the book.

Such then are your abortive efforts to find a tradition in the Apostolic Fathers that Christ and his apostles delivered the *Apocrypha* to the Christian church as the oracles of God. If the apostles, in their own writings, said nothing on the subject, this is the age and these the men upon whom, according to Bellarmine himself, we must rely. Contemporary writers or the next generation, this wily Jesuit admits, are the legitimate witnesses of the authenticity of facts. Here, after the apostles had fallen asleep, and the last of those who had seen or been taught by them is gathered to his fathers, there remains not a single intimation, not a distant hint, not even a remote insinuation, that these spurious documents which Rome has canonized, are part and parcel of our faith. Who now shall tell us what Christ and his apostles had taught? Who shall be able to penetrate the past, when the only light which could guide us, is withdrawn forever? What witnesses shall we evoke, when those alone who

how many among ourselves, have given up themselves unto bonds, that thereby they might free others from them; others have sold themselves into bondage, that they might feed their brethren with the price of themselves; and even many women, being strengthened by the grace of God, have done many glorious and manly things on such occasions. The blessed Judith, when her city was besieged, desired the Elders that they would suffer her to go into the camp of their enemies, and she went out exposing herself to danger for the love she bare to her country and her people that were besieged; and the Lord delivered Holofernes into the hands of a woman. Nor did Esther, being perfect in faith, expose herself to any less hazard, for the delivery of the twelve tribes of Israel in danger of being destroyed; for by fasting and humbling herself, she entreated the great Maker of all things, the God of spirits, so that beholding the humility of her soul, he delivered the people for whose sake she was in peril."—*Wake's Apostol. Fathers*, pp. 202-3.

were competent to testify, have kept the silence of the grave? It is perfectly plain that if, up to the commencement of the second century, nothing is known about any such instructions on the subject of the Apocrypha, as you attribute to Christ, *nothing* can be satisfactorily ascertained afterwards. The witnesses are too far removed from the *facts*. That nothing was known, however, when the last of the Apostolic Fathers was called to his reward, must be assumed as true, until it is proved to be false. The *silence* of these men is death to your cause. In vain have you endeavored to make them break that silence; your feeble efforts have only recoiled in deep and indelible disgrace upon your own character as a scholar and a critic.

LETTER XV.

The application of such expressions as 'Scripture,' 'Divine Scripture,' by ancient writers to the Apocrypha, no proof of inspiration.

THE only plausible argument, in support of your proposition that the primitive church received the Apocrypha as inspired, is derived from the fact that the early Fathers, in introducing quotations from these disputed books, not unfrequently applied to them the same expressions with which they were accustomed to distinguish the canonical records. Upon this point, as I have hinted already, Bellarmin principally dwelt. He refers, as you have done in your fourth and succeeding letters, to passages of the ancient writers in which they not only accommodate the language of the Apocrypha, but also denominate it *scripture*, sometimes without any qualifying epithet, and sometimes with the titles, in addition, *sacred*, *holy*, or *divine*. To infer from a circumstance, like this, that they regarded these works as possessed of the same authority with Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, or the acknowledged compositions of the Apostles and Evangelists, is to be guilty of a gross paralogism. Those who reason in this way, manifestly take for granted, that the term

scripture is *exclusively* applicable to inspired compositions; but where is the evidence of this fact? It is freely conceded that this is a common and familiar designation of the canonical books, but it by no means follows, that it is restricted in its usage *exclusively* to them. To say that because all inspired writings are scripture, therefore all scripture must also be necessarily inspired, is to assume as true, what will be found, with a single exception, to be invariably false, that the simple converse of an universal affirmative proposition is equivalent to the original statement. Your reasoning, if I understand it, is this: the primitive church believed the Apocrypha to be inspired, because the Fathers quoted them as scripture,—and all scripture must be inspired, because all books confessedly inspired, are denominated scripture. This burlesque upon logic cannot be more happily illustrated than by a parallel case. He who should ascribe to the beasts of the field the distinctive excellences of men, because beasts and men are alike said to be subject to decay, would reason precisely as you do in deducing the Divine authority of the books in question, from the application to them of the same titles which are given to the sacred canon. When your argument is stated in the form of syllogism—which, after all, is the real test of conclusive reasoning—it will be found to contain the miserable fallacy of an undistributed middle.

The inspired books are called scripture; the Apocrypha are called scripture; therefore the Apocrypha are inspired. Before you were at liberty to draw the triumphant conclusion, which you seem to think you have legitimately reached, it was evidently incumbent upon you to prove, (for this was the major proposition which the case required,) that whatever is called scripture, or Divine scripture, must have been written under the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit. This is unquestionably the basis of your argument; and in pity to the cause which you had undertaken to sustain, you should have placed it upon grounds less treacherous and deceitful than its being the converse of a statement universally acknowledged to be true. Why, therefore, did you not manfully meet the point, and prepare the way for your multiplied quotations, by showing, at the outset, what is certainly far from evident, that scripture and inspiration

were coextensive in their import? It is not a little remarkable that you should have expended so much labor in evincing that the Apocrypha were often characterized by this appellation, and yet have passed in profound silence the other proposition which was equally important, that *all* books so denominated must be *inspired*. Believe me, sir, it was a most unfortunate oversight; it leaves your conclusion halting upon a single premiss: about as good a support as a solitary crutch to a man destitute of legs. All that your extracts are capable of proving, may be fully granted; that the books in question were often distinguished by the title of scripture; but it is a broad leap from an ambiguous expression of this sort, to the conclusion which you have collected. There are several considerations which indisputably show that such appellations as scripture, divine scripture, &c., were generic terms, as used among the Fathers, having a much larger extension than your argument seems to suppose. While they included as a part of their meaning those works which were acknowledged to be the offspring of the Holy Ghost, they were also applied to other departments of composition, in which no other spirit was conceived to predominate but the spirit of devotion. Scripture itself is synonymous with *writing*, and is, consequently, an appropriate term for designating any thing recorded with the pen. The epithets, sacred, holy, and divine, not unfrequently imply what is suited to produce, to stimulate or quicken the devout affections of the heart; and the whole phrase, divine scripture, was employed among the ancients to denote that peculiar class of composition, which we denominate *religious*, in opposition to *profane*. Even in our own tongue, the word scripture, contrary to its present acceptance, was used among the earlier writers with a latitude of meaning analogous to that which obtained in the language from which it was derived. It was not only applied to any written document whatever, whether sacred or profane, but was even extended to *inscriptions on a tomb*.* The Greek word *γραφή* was, perhaps, more general than the English term *writing*, as it embraced not only the work of the scribe, but the per-

* See Richardson's Dictionary, word Scripture.

formance of the painter. We are so accustomed, however, to the definite and restricted application of the word scripture, and particularly the plural, scriptures, to the inspired records of our faith, that we experience no little difficulty in divesting ourselves of this association, when the term is mentioned, and in going back to the thoughts and feelings of an age when it suggested nothing so peculiar, emphatic, and precise. The Christian Fathers themselves seem to have labored under a measure of embarrassment in selecting, from the general and extensive phrases which were best adapted to the purpose, appropriate titles of distinction and respect for the sacred volume. If there had been any one phrase which the usage of the language would have authorized them to adopt as a specific and exclusive name for their inspired documents, they would hardly have accumulated so many titles as are found scattered through their writings. The *definite* word would have been uniformly, at least generally, adopted. But no such definite appellation existed, and they were obliged to employ generic terms in a peculiar and emphatic sense, when they appealed to their rule of faith. Sometimes the sacred canon was denominated the Holy Scriptures; sometimes the Oracles of the Lord; sometimes Divine Scriptures, Divine Oracles, Divinely Inspired Scriptures, Scriptures of the Lord, the True Evangelical Canon, the Old and New Testament, the Ancient and New Scriptures, the Ancient and New Oracles, Books of the Spirit, Divine Fountains, Fountains of the Divine Fulness.* In this abundance of phrases, and only a part is given, there is an obvious effort to convey a precise idea by terms which were felt to be general; a constant endeavor to limit, in a particular case, what, according to the laws of the language, was susceptible of a larger extension. Hence, while it is true that such phrases were *pre-eminently* applied to the word of God, we must know that a given book is the word of God before we can determine whether these titles are bestowed on it in the restricted and emphatic sense, or in their usual and wider signification. That the Fathers were accustomed to use them in

* See a collection of these titles in Paley's Evidences of Christianity, pt. i. chap. 9.

both applications, it requires but little acquaintance with their writings to be assured.

Eusebius testifies that Irenæus, whom you have represented as endorsing the Apocrypha, cited as *scripture* one of the weakest performances of ecclesiastical antiquity—the Shepherd of Hermas. His words are worthy of being fully exhibited: “Nor did he (Irenæus) only know, but he also receives the scripture of the shepherd, saying: Well therefore spake the *scripture*, which says: ‘First of all, believe there is one God, who created and formed all things, and what follows.’”* Here it is evident, that scripture means only a written document, and has no reference whatever to any impression of supernatural origin. The meaning of Irenæus, as Lardner very justly expounds it,† is exactly this: “Well spake that writing, work or book, which says.” “It is certain,” continues the author of the credibility, “that Irenæus himself had so used this word *γραφή* or scripture.” Giving an account of the Epistle of Clement, written to the Corinthians in the name of the church of Rome, he says: “The church of Rome sent a most excellent *scripture* (that is, Epistle) to the Corinthians.” And afterwards, “from that *scripture* one may learn the Apostolical tradition of the church.” Eusebius himself uses the term *επιστολή* as synonymous with *γραφή*. “Polycarp,” says he, “in his *scripture* to the Philippians, still extant, has made use of certain testimonies taken from the first Epistle of Peter.”‡ Among the Apocryphal books of the New Testament, which he utterly rejects from any reasonable claim to inspired authority, he mentions the *scripture* of the acts of Paul. Clemens of Alexandria,§ who figures largely in your pages, applies the term scriptures to the compositions of the heathen authors, with which Ptolemy adorned his library, as well as to the sacred and canonical books.||

If the word were not confessedly general and indefinite, nothing could be inferred from it as a term of reference, after the Apocrypha had become incorporated into the sacred volume, and but few references were made to them before, and had begun to

* H. E. lib. v. c. 8.

† Works, vol. ii. p. 186 (London Ed. 1831).

‡ H. E. lib. iv. c. 14.

§ H. E. lib. iii. c. 25.

|| Strom. 1.

be used as a means of instruction in the congregations of the faithful. They would naturally receive the same titles which belonged to the collection as a whole. The name of the volume would be adopted for the convenience of citation, and nothing could be deduced from a quotation of this sort, but the existence of the book in the specified volume.

Nothing is added to the strength of the argument by citing passages from the Fathers in which the Apocrypha are denominated sacred or divine scripture. To say nothing of the fact that such quotations occur, for the most part, after the custom to which allusion has just been made obtained extensive prevalence, there is abundant evidence that this, and equivalent phraseology, were often employed to convey the idea of *religious literature*. Divine scripture, in numerous instances, means precisely the same thing as an "*edifying book*," or a composition upon religious subjects. Dionysius, surnamed the Areopagite, quoting a passage from the Epistles of Ignatius, styles him the *Divine Ignatius*.* Polycrates, the metropolitan Bishop of Ephesus, said of Melito, that "he was governed in all things by the Holy Ghost."† Cyril, appealing to a decree of the Council of Nice, calls it a *divine* and *most holy oracle*, and speaks of its decisions as divinely inspired.‡ Melchior Canus admits that Innocent III. pronounced the words of Augustine to be holy scripture, just as the Pontifical laws are called holy to distinguish them from the statutes of Princes.§ So, too, the decrees of councils and the decisions of the church were called holy and divine, because they related to the subject of religion.

But what places it beyond all doubt, that the honorable epithets with which the Fathers adorn the Apocrypha were not intended to convey the idea of inspiration, is, that in some instances those very writers who reject them from the canon, yet quote them under the same titles. Origen, who in professedly enumerating the books which constituted the rule of faith, excluded the Apocrypha from the canon, did not scruple to refer to the Wisdom of Solomon and of Sirach, to the books of Maccabees, Tobit,

* De Div. Nom. cap. iv. lect. 9.

† Euseb. H. E. lib. v. c. 24.

‡ De Trinitat. lib. 1.

§ Rainold, Censura Librorum Apocry. vol. i. p. 67.

and Judith, as scriptures or the divine word (*θειος λογος*).^{*} Jerome, whose testimony is as explicit as language can make it, cites a passage from the book of Ecclesiasticus, and calls it *divine scripture*.[†] Now when we compare his statement concerning this book and that of Wisdom, that they should be read for popular edification in life and manners, and not for the establishing of any doctrine in the church, we understand at once what meaning to attach to his laudatory notice of Ecclesiasticus. Epiphanius, as Bellarmin admits, acknowledged no books but those which were found in the Hebrew canon, and Rome herself does not pretend that the apostolical constitutions are the inspired word of God. Yet, Epiphanius quotes them as *Divine scripture*,[‡] a clear and triumphant proof that this phrase was by no means equivalent to inspired writings. One of the clearest passages for illustrating the meaning of this phrase, is found in his disputation against Ætius.[§] He there enumerates the books which constitute the Hebrew canon, then the writings of the New Testament; and having completed his account of the books that were *inspired*, he mentions Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and such like books as *Divine scriptures*. His object was to show that Ætius could defend his heresies neither from the books which the church admitted as inspired, nor from those other writings upon religious subjects which were allowed to be read for the purpose of personal improvement. The very structure of the passage shows that he made a marked distinction between the Apocrypha and canonical books, though both were equally denominated *Divine scripture*. Cyprian, too, quotes the Apocrypha as sacred scripture, but at the same time he shows unequivocally that he did not regard them as an authoritative standard of faith. Having on one occasion cited a sentence from the book of Tobit, he proceeds to *confirm* it by the "*testimony of truth*," that is, by a passage from the Acts of the Apostles, a canonical book, evidently implying, that though the Apocrypha were Divine scripture, they were not on that account, the word of God.|| This same Father also cites the third and fourth books of

* De Princip. ii. 1, opp. 1, p. 79. Cont. Cels. viii. opp. 1, p. 778, &c.

† Epist. 34 ad Julian.

‡ Hæres 80.

§ Hæres 75. Cont. Æt.

|| De Oper. et Eleemos.

Esdras; and the argument is just as strong that he regarded them as inspired, though Rome rejects them, as it is in favor of the books in question.

There is another circumstance which, to my mind, settles the matter, that the ancients used the expressions which they apply to the Apocrypha, without intending to commend those documents as *inspired*. They make a distinction in the authority which was due to books that they expressly honored as Divine. It is evident, that all truly inspired writings, Trent itself being witness, must be received with *equal* veneration and piety. There may be a difference in the *value* of the *truths* which are communicated in different books, but there can be no difference in *authority* when all proceed from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning. Inspiration secures a complete exemption from error, and the Divine testimony is entitled to the same consideration whether it be interposed to establish a *primary* or a *secondary* principle. Whenever God speaks, no matter what may be the subject on which He chooses to address us, His voice is entitled to absolute obedience, and we are as much bound to believe what seems in itself to be of subordinate importance when He proclaims it, as we are to receive the weightier matters of the law. All inspired scripture, therefore, stands on the same footing of authority.* When, there-

* This is well expressed by Bishop Marsh, *Comp. View*, p. 90. His words are as follows:

“But it is really absurd to talk of a *medium* between canonical and uncanonical, or of *degrees* of canonicity. Let us ask, what the church of England *understands* by a canonical book. This question is answered in the sixth article. It is a book to which we may appeal in confirmation of *doctrines*. It belongs to the *canon*, or to the *rule* of faith. And the very same explanation is given in the corresponding decree of the council of Trent, namely: that which passed at the fourth session. For, after an enumeration of the books called sacred and canonical, (*sacri et canonici*), the decree concludes with the observation, that the authorities above stated are those which the council proposes to use in confirmation of *doctrines* (*in confirmandis dogmatibus*). Every book, therefore, must either *be*, or *not be*, acknowledged as a work of authority for the establishment of doctrines. Between its absolute rejection and its absolute admission, there is no medium. When the question relates to the establishment of *doctrines*, a book must have *full* authority for that purpose, or its

fore, a writer treats one book as of less authority than another, it is equivalent to saying that the subordinate book is *not* inspired. Now the Fathers *did* treat books which they pronounced to be *sacred* and *Divine*, as of inferior authority, and, therefore, sacred and Divine with them must have been something very different from inspiration. Junilius, in his Treatise de Partibus Divinæ Legis, in speaking of the "*authority of the Divine books*," expressly declares that "some are possessed of perfect authority, some middle, and some, of *none at all*." It is impossible that any Christian man, who had the least reverence for the testimony of God, could say of what He had revealed by His Spirit, that it possessed no authority at all. And yet Junilius, a Christian bishop in the sixth century, asserts this of books, which, in his day, were received as *holy* and *Divine*. The conclusion is unavoidable, that in such connections, these words mean something very different from inspired.

The testimony of Augustine is equally explicit in the matter. He was a member of that council of Carthage which is supposed to have canonized the Apocryphal books, and of course received them as Divine scripture. Speaking of the books of Maccabees, however, he justifies their reception by the church, *chiefly* on account of the moral tendency of the history.* It is plain

authority is worth *nothing*. And hence, the council of Trent, very consistently, ascribed *equal* authority to them all. No writer, therefore, belonging to the church of *Rome*, could represent their authority as *unequal*, without impugning that decree of the council of Trent."

To the same purport is the following declaration of Lindanus in Panoplia Evang. as quoted by Rainold, Cens. Lib. Apoc. vol. i. p. 203.

"Eos impio se sacrilegio contaminare, qui in Scripturarum Christianarum corpore, quosdam quasi gradus autoritatis conantur locare quod unam, eandemque spiritus sancti vocem impio humanæ stultitiæ discerniculo audent in varias impares discernere ac distribuere autoritatis classes."

They pollute themselves with impious sacrilege, who attempt to establish, in the body of the Christian Scriptures, certain different degrees of authority. That one and the same voice of the Holy Spirit they dare, by impious, petty distinctions of human folly, to distribute into various and unequal classes of authority.

* Augustine says: "Hanc Scripturam quæ appellatur Macchabæorum, non habent Judæi sicut Legem et Prophetas et Psalmos quibus Dominus testimonium perhibet. Sed recepta est ab ecclesia non inutiliter, si sobrie legatur et audiatur,

that he could not have regarded them as *inspired*, since their inspiration would have been the strongest of all possible reasons for receiving them. He receives them only because they might be profitably *read* and *heard*, and they were *Divine* in no other sense than as being subservient to the purpose of edification and improvement.

As, now, such phrases as Divine scripture are confessedly ambiguous, as a meaning may be put upon them justified by the nature of the words and by ancient usage, quite distinct from that of inspiration; it certainly devolves upon those who adduce the adoption of such expressions by the ancient Fathers as sustaining the decision of the council of Trent, to prove unanswerably that Divine scripture and inspired scripture are uniformly used as synonymous terms by the early writers, or their whole argument falls to the ground. It is one thing to assert that books are Divine, in the sense that they may be profitably read or devoutly studied; it is quite another to affirm that their authors wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

The issue betwixt us and Rome is on the point of *inspiration*. She affirms that *God* is the author of these books, and we deny it. The question is not whether the primitive churches read them or not, whether the early Fathers quoted them or not, or whether they regarded them as instructive or not, or whether they pronounced them *Divine* or not; the question is, was God their author? And while this is the issue, the Romanist only exposes himself and his cause to contempt, by elaborate proofs of what no Protestant would deem it of any importance to dispute with him.

It would be well for you to bear in mind, what you will find strikingly illustrated in the offices of Tully,* the marked difference between the looseness of popular language and the accuracy of scientific disquisition. As the primitive church entertained no doubts of the exclusive claims of the Hebrew canon, as

maxime propter illos Macchabæos qui pro Dei lege sicut veri martyres a persecutoribus tam indigna atque horrenda perpassi sunt."—*Cont. Gaudent. Donat. Lib. i. c. 31.*

* De Off. lib. ii. c. 10.

this was a settled matter, there was no danger of being misunderstood in employing words in a *general* sense, which had a peculiar and emphatic application only to a particular class of books. They were not likely to mislead, any more than to cite the Apocrypha now as belonging to the Old Testament, would be construed into a recognition of their Divine authority, or to speak of Watts, Hervey, Owen and Newton as *holy* men, illustrious divines and spiritual writers, would be regarded as tantamount to the assertion that they were supernaturally inspired. All the epithets with which we distinguish the sacred scriptures have a loose and popular as well as a strict and scientific sense; and hence, the mere use of the words determines nothing as to the character of the writings. An argument constructed upon this foundation, would prove too much even for Rome: it would authorize Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, the Apocryphal book of Isaiah, the book of Henoch, and the third and fourth books of Esdras, the writings of Augustine, the canons of councils and the decrees of Popes, to claim a place in the same category with Moses, the Prophets, the Psalms, Evangelists and Apostles. All these rejected documents were *quoted* by the Fathers, quoted distinctly as scripture, in some instances, as Divine scripture, and what is still more remarkable as Divinely inspired scripture. This is the language which Nicholas* employs in regard to the Fathers, and which Cyril† applies to the council of Nice.

It may be, therefore, regarded as indisputably settled, that Divine scripture, and such like expressions, were not equivalent to a *proper* name for the canonical books.

If, therefore, we wish to ascertain what were the sentiments of the primitive church in relation to the extent of the canon, we must appeal to more definite sources of information, than a collection of passages which may be just as accurately interpreted to mean that the disputed books were *religious* in opposition to profane, as that they were *inspired* in opposition to human. Loose and popular expressions are not the proper materials for an argument of this sort. Incidental statements, occasionally

* Epist. ad Michæl. Imp. (Rainold. vol. i. p. 201.)

† De Trinitate, Lib. i. (Rainold. vol. i. p. 201.)

dropped in the midst of discourses upon other matters, do not constitute the *testimony* of the primitive church. *That* should, manifestly, be sought in those places of the ancient writers, in which they were *professedly* treating of the standard of faith, and avow it as *their design* to set forth the books which were received as supernaturally inspired. We have numerous passages in which these books are the subject of discussion; we have divers catalogues, made by different writers and at different times, during the first four centuries, of all the documents which the church received as the rule of faith, in different forms and under different circumstances; the whole matter is repeatedly brought before us, we have line upon line, precept on precept, here a little and there a little; and in such passages, and such passages alone, I insist upon it, is the testimony of the primitive church to be sought. In those parts of the Patristical remains where it is the express purpose of the writer to declare what books were believed to be of God, we may expect precision, accuracy and care. The witness is put upon the stand, answers, as it were, under oath, and guards his phraseology, provided he be honest, so as to convey an adequate impression of the truth. The astronomer speaks in popular language of the sun's rising and setting, and pursuing his course through the heavens, and yet it would be preposterous to charge him with denying the elementary principles of his science or teaching a system that has long been exploded, because he had employed expressions, which, though sufficiently exact for the ordinary intercourse of life, were not philosophically precise. So, in a loose and familiar acceptance, the primitive Fathers speak of the Apocrypha, as Divine scripture, intending to convey no other idea but that they belonged to a class of religious literature, and might be profitably studied for personal improvement, and it is equally preposterous from such general expressions, to infer that they taught the supernatural inspiration of the books. For the *real* opinions of the astronomer, you would appeal to his language when he was professedly treating of the heavenly bodies; then you would expect him to weigh his words, to avoid the looseness of popular discourse, and to employ no terms which were not sufficiently just. So for the *real* opinions of the Fathers upon the subject of

the canon, we should appeal to their statements when they professedly give us an accurate account or formal catalogue of the inspired works. Then we should expect them to use terms in a strictly scientific sense; and if, *in such connections*, the Apocrypha were ever introduced as a part of the word of God, there would be something like testimony in behalf of the pretensions of Rome. But it is worthy of remark, that, in every case in which the ancient writers used the terms scripture, and Divine scripture, in their restricted and emphatic application, in all instances in which they are professedly treating of the canon of inspiration, they never extend them to the Apocrypha. In none of the catalogues which they have given us of the books which God has graciously imparted as the rule of faith, are these spurious records to be found. The voice of Christian antiquity accords with the voice of the Jewish church, and both combine to condemn the arrogance and blasphemy of Trent.

Nothing, sir, can reveal more clearly the desperate extremities to which you are driven in support of a sinking cause, than that, instead of giving those plain, pointed and direct statements which the Fathers themselves *intended* to be, and which common sense suggests *must* be, their testimony upon the subject, you hunt up and down through all the remains of antiquity, and preserve your soul from absolute despair by seizing, here and there, upon a few popular expressions, which, by being tortured into a special and restricted sense, may be made to look with some degree of favor on your claims. You never seem to be aware of the egregious absurdity of bending the accurate to the loose, instead of the loose to the accurate. Upon the same principle, if you should meet with a passage in the private and confidential letter of a man of science, in which he employed the language of the vulgar, you would at once construe it into the true exposition of his system, and make his philosophical treatises succumb to his popular expressions.

There is an apparent discrepancy, and that must be reconciled by *torturing* philosophy and *dignifying* the dialect of the vulgar.

If, sir, there existed an *apparent* inconsistency between the statements of a witness, publicly given, when he stood forth in the face of the world to make his deposition, and incidental ex-

pressions, touching the matter in dispute, dropped from him in the course of conversation upon other subjects, would you feel bound, if you regarded him as a man of veracity who would not *really* contradict himself, to explain his *professed* testimony by his loose conversation, or to reconcile his loose conversation with his professed testimony? Which would you regard as the *standard* by which the other was to be measured? Which, in other words, would be what might be properly called his *testimony*? It is certainly the dictate of common sense to explain the loose by the accurate.

Cicero, in one of his philosophical treatises, in conformity with the example of illustrious predecessors, maintained that he who possessed one of the virtues must necessarily possess them all. In a popular work, he subsequently remarked that a man might be just without being prudent. Here appeared to be a discrepancy, and upon your principles of criticism, the true method of explaining it was to deny that he held prudence to be a *virtue*. The philosopher, however, has solved the difficulty himself, by assuring us that there was no real inconsistency, since, in the one case, the terms were employed with precision and accuracy, and in the other, with popular laxness. “*Alia est illa,*” says he, and it would be well for you to remember the remark, “*cum veritas ipsa limatur in disputatione, subtilitas: alia, cum ad opinionem communem omnis accommodatur oratio.*”

If the plain and obvious principles, which I have briefly suggested, be applied to the criticism of the ancient documents which have survived the ravages of time, we shall find that there is not a single record of the first four centuries, which sustains the decision of Trent. The unbroken testimony of that whole period is clearly, decidedly, unanswerably, against that unparalleled deed of atrocity and guilt. And how else can it be regarded but as a downright insult to the understandings of men, when the formal catalogues of the primitive church are produced, when the passages are brought forward in which the best and noblest champions of the faith undertake professedly to recount the books of the canon, when they come forward for the express purpose of bearing testimony in the matter before us, how else can it be regarded but as a downright insult to the understand-

ings of men, to tell us that this is not the voice of antiquity, that these recorded statements are not the *true* statements of the case, because it so happens that *other* books besides those included in the lists of inspiration, were not treated as absolutely *heathenish* and *profane*. For this, as we have seen, when fairly interpreted, is the real amount of the testimony in favor of the Apocrypha. The ancient church treated them as religious and edifying books, just precisely as the modern church regards the compositions of Howe, Owen and Scott. Therefore, we are gravely told, they must be inspired.

When I reflect upon your whole course of argument upon this subject, I can hardly persuade myself that you are able to peruse your own lucubrations without losing your gravity.

You set out with the purpose of proving that Christ and his apostles had delivered the Apocrypha to the Christian church as inspired documents. This was a perfectly plain and intelligible proposition; it respected a simple matter of fact, the legitimate proof of which was credible testimony, and we had a right to expect that you would produce some record of the apostles, in which it was directly stated, or some authentic evidence from those who were cotemporary with them, that such was the case. But these reasonable expectations are excited only to be blasted. Nothing of the sort appears in any part of your letters; but as if in mockery of our hopes, you put us off with a series of quotations, which, allowing them all the weight that can possibly be given to them, prove nothing more than the *existence* of the books in the apostolic age. Then we are to infer, it would seem, that Christ and his apostles delivered the Apocrypha to the Christian church as inspired, *because* the books *existed* in the apostolic age. But hold! You have, perhaps, some stronger reasons in reserve. The primitive church *believed* them to be *inspired*; therefore, beyond all question, they *must* be inspired. Now, granting what I am unable to perceive, the legitimacy of your *therefore*, in the present case, how does it appear that such was the faith of the primitive church? This point, you inform us, is as clear as noonday, for the Fathers of the ancient church *actually quoted* these very books, and pronounced them to be *useful* and *edifying* compositions. This is demonstration plain

and irrefragable as holy writ, and he who cannot see the proofs of inspiration in conduct of this kind, must be a stubborn and refractory spirit that deserves the damnation which Trent has denounced. The substance of your letters may be embodied in the following beautiful sorites :

The Apocrypha were quoted by the primitive church.

Whatever it quoted it believed to be inspired.

Whatever it believed to be inspired, it had received from the hands of Christ and his apostles.

Therefore the Apocrypha were delivered to the church by Christ and his apostles as inspired documents.

LETTER XVI.

Examination of Testimonies.

THAT the reader may distinctly apprehend how slender is the basis upon which the church of Rome has erected her portentous additions to the Scriptures, I proceed to examine, in detail, the various testimonies upon which you have relied to prove the inspiration of the Apocrypha. This task, it is true, is, in a great degree, unnecessary, since it has already been conclusively demonstrated that your method of procedure is deceitful and fallacious. But as in the weakness of your attempted refutation, you have only shown the strength of the position, that within the period embraced in this discussion, the first four centuries of the Christian era, not a single writer can be found who regarded these documents as the word of God, it may be of service to the interests of righteousness to cross-examine your witnesses one by one, and to show, as the result, that upon the subject of the books of the canon, the voice of antiquity is harmonious and clear. Still, however, it deserves to be remarked, that if you had been as successful as you evidently hoped to be, in establishing the fact that the primitive Fathers, to whom you have appealed, co-

incided upon this point with the Council of Trent, your original proposition would not have been sustained. Your purpose was to prove that Christ or his apostles had given to the Christian church the authority, of which, according to you, the Jews were not possessed, to insert these books into the sacred canon. It was testimony in behalf of this fact, of which you were in quest, and such testimony you cannot surely pretend to have produced in the beggarly quotations with which you have amused us. Since, however, you have failed, signally failed, as a slight investigation will render indubitable, in your laborious endeavors to prove that the canon of the Fathers was the same with the canon of Rome, how disgraceful and overwhelming must be your defeat whenever you shall condescend to undertake the discussion of the other, your main and leading proposition!

I. The first writer of the second century to whom you have appealed, is JUSTIN MARTYR. You produce a passage from the first Apology, which Justin himself professes to have borrowed from the books of *Moses*, but which you are certain, in defiance of his own unequivocal assertion, must have been condensed from a corresponding passage in the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach. It is not, therefore, a question between *you* and *me*, but a question between *you* and the *father himself*, whether or not he has quoted the Apocrypha. In the midst of proof of the moral agency of man and a consequent refutation of the dangerous and absurd pretensions of libertines and fatalists, Justin observes: "The Holy Prophetic Spirit taught us these things, having said through *Moses*, that God spoke thus to the first formed man: Behold, before you are good and evil, choose the good."* "It might seem," you inform us in your curious and amusing criticism upon this passage, "that St. Justin thought that Moses declares God spoke thus to Adam; but in his writings he appears too well acquainted with the Scriptures and to have studied the account of the creation too accurately, to commit such a mistake. I have not the means," you continue, "of discovering whether

* Εδίδαξε και ημας ταυτα το ἅγιον προφητικον πνευμα δια Μωσεως φησαν τω πρωτω πλισθεντι ανθρωπω ειρησθαι απο του θεου ουτως, ιδου προ προσωπου σου το αγαθον και το κακον· εκλεξαι το αγαθον. Apol. i. § 44. p. 69. Paris edition, 1742.

there be any grounds for supposing some error of the manuscript in recording the name, or whether we are forced to say that he meant that Moses gives us an account of the creation and of the facts, though he does not record the words which elsewhere the Holy and Prophetic Spirit testifies were spoken, or that St. Justin, in fine, erred in memory, confounding one part of Scripture with another. This much is certain, that the words attributed by him to the Holy and Prophetic Spirit, are found in Ecclesiasticus xv., from which they are evidently condensed.

It is not a little singular that the holy Father should have been too accurately acquainted with the Scriptures to commit the mistake, if indeed a mistake it can be called, which his words most obviously seem to imply, and yet, at the same time, have possessed a memory so treacherous and erring as to confound one part of Scripture with another. The question, too, might naturally be asked, why, if the memory only were in fault, it is not just as likely that Justin has confounded what Moses is recorded to have said in the fifteenth and nineteenth verses of the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy to his assembled countrymen, with what God announced to the progenitor of the race, as that he has mistaken the son of Sirach for the author of the Pentateuch. As there exists not a particle of evidence that the name of Moses has been corruptly foisted into the text, we are compelled to acknowledge that the good father, even if he had really, though unconsciously, condensed the passage in question from the corresponding passage in the Wisdom of Jesus, treats it as inspired, and ascribes it to the Holy Prophetic Spirit, not because it is found in Ecclesiasticus, but because he supposed it had been written by the Jewish Legislator. The words are certainly contained in the Pentateuch, though not in the connection in which they are quoted by Justin. Moses nowhere says, *totidem verbis*, that God employed such language to the father of the race, but he distinctly teaches what is equivalent to it: that Adam was placed under a legal dispensation, in which life was promised as the reward of obedience, and death threatened as the penalty of transgression. As such a dispensation might be conveniently described in the very words which Justin has quoted, and as Moses actually employed them in the thirtieth

chapter of the book of Deuteronomy,* it is no rash presumption to suppose that they were simply accommodated, in the passage before us, to express the condition in which man was placed, as Paul accommodates a portion of the same chapter in his beautiful description of the economy of grace.† The point which Justin had in view, was to prove the freedom of the human will, a point necessarily involved in a state of probation, and which, therefore, would be sufficiently established by showing what Moses had unquestionably taught, that man was made the subject of law. “It appears from the Scriptures,”—he would say, if I may be allowed to paraphrase his meaning—“it appears from the Scriptures, that man is a responsible, voluntary agent, because, when originally formed by God, it was made to depend upon his own choice, upon the free decisions of his own will, whether he should be eternally happy or miserable—life and death were set before him—an easy probation was assigned him—and hence it follows that the power of election necessarily belonged to him. The very language which Moses employed in a different connection, so exactly describes the nature of the trial to which our first Father was subjected, that it may fitly be considered as the terms in which God addressed him, when he set before him the blessing and the curse, in the garden of Eden.”‡ If this view of the passage be correct, there is evidently no necessity of contradicting the statements of Justin himself, and of making him quote from one book when he professes to have borrowed from another. You have consequently not succeeded, and I may venture to assert that you will never succeed in bringing up a single exception to the sweeping remark of Bishop Cosin, that Justin Martyr, “*in all his works, citeth not so much as any one passage out of the Apocryphal books, nor maketh the least mention of them at all.*” This is certainly astonishing, since in his Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, the subject invited him to incidental notices of the conduct and temper of the Jewish people in regard to the Scriptures. Though you are right in supposing that quotations

* Verses 15 and 19.

† Vide Romans x. 6, 7, 8.

‡ The Editor of Justin has accordingly remarked, in a note upon the passage—“*Si sensus consideretur, satis haec congruunt cum iis quae Deus Adamo dixit.*”

in that conference from the Apocryphal works, as authoritative decisions of the matters in dispute, would have been inadmissible, yet it was manifestly not out of place to expose the hardness of heart and blindness of mind which persevered in the rejection of inspired documents, after satisfactory proof had been furnished that they proceeded from God. Justin reproaches the Jews with their obduracy and malice, with their deliberate contempt of the light of truth, and their fraudulent suppression of Messianic texts in the Prophets and the Psalms,* but not a syllable does he whisper of what would have been still more conclusive proof of their terrible fatuity, not a syllable does he whisper of their suppressing, in addition to single passages and isolated texts, whole books of the Bible. This is strange, if the Jews indeed had been guilty of such an atrocity. So much for the testimony of Justin.

2. Your next witness is Irenæus of Lyons. You produce passages from him in which it is conceded that he quotes the Apocryphal books of Wisdom, and of Baruch, and the corrupt additions to the prophecy of Daniel.†

As, however, he introduces his quotations with no expressions of peculiar respect or religious veneration which show that the sentiment is not simply accommodated because it accords with the judgment of the writer, but is received with deference and reverential submission as an authoritative statement of divine truth; as Irenæus drops no hint of any uncommon or extraordinary regard for the documents in question, beyond what he felt for other works, and works confessedly of human composition, of which he has also availed himself; I am wholly at a loss to determine what use you can possibly make of his testimony. Where does he say that these books are supernaturally inspired—that they constitute a part of the Rule of Faith—an integral portion of the written revelation which God has given of his will? What language does he apply to them, from which it can be gathered that he looked upon them as possessed of equal author-

* Vide Conference with Trypho, § 72, 73, for a specimen of these charges of fraudulent dealing with the Scriptures.

† Wisdom vi. 20 is quoted *Contra Haeres*, Lib. iv. cap. 33. Baruch iv. 36, 37, is quoted, Lib. v. cap. 35. Baruch v. entire is quoted, Lib. v. cap. 36. The story of Susannah is quoted, Lib. iv. cap. 26. Bell and the Dragon, Lib. iv. cap. 5.

ity and entitled to equal veneration with the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms? If the mere fact that Irenæus has *quoted* them, is sufficient to canonize Wisdom, Baruch, and the additions to Daniel, Rome must considerably enlarge her canon, since the same argument would embrace in its sweeping conclusion divers other books, which have never been esteemed as supernaturally inspired. In the sixth chapter of his book against heresies, he quotes a passage from Justin Martyr, and endorses the sentiment as fully and completely as in any of the cases in which he appeals to the Apocrypha.* In the twenty-eighth chapter of the fifth book of the same great work, a sentence is introduced from Ignatius's epistle to the Romans,† and in the fourth chapter of the fourth book, a nameless author is commended,‡ who is probably the same that Eusebius denominates an apostolical Presbyter. But what is most striking and remarkable of all, in the twentieth chapter of the fourth book, the Shepherd of Hermas is not only quoted, but quoted distinctively as *Scripture*.§ Now are we to infer that Justin, Ignatius and Hermas, all wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; or shall we not rather conclude that the argument from Irenæus, proves too much, and therefore, upon logical principles, is absolutely worthless?

* Καὶ καλῶς Ἰουστῖνος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα συνταγματικῇ φησὶν· ὅτι αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ οὐδ' ἂν ἐπισθεῖεν, ἄλλον θεὸν καταγγέλλοντι παρα τὸν δημιουργόν. . . We cannot complete the passage from Justin, since his own work has suffered more terribly from the ravages of time than even that of Irenæus. The Latin is as follows: Et bene Justinus in eo libro qui est ad Marcionem ait: Quoniam ipsi quoque Domino non credidissent, alterum Deum annuntianti, præter fabricatorem et factorem et nutritorem nostrum. Beautifully says Justin in his Treatise against Marcion, "I would not believe even the Lord Himself announcing another God beside our Maker, Architect and Preserver."

† Ὡς εἶπε τις τῶν ἡμετέρων, διὰ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν μαρτυρίαν κατακρίθεις πρὸς θηρία· ὅτι σίτος εἰμι θεὸν, καὶ δι' ὀδόντων ληθίων ἀληθῆμαι, ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος ἐνρεθῶ. As said one of ours, condemned to the wild beasts on account of his testimony for God, "I am the bread of God, and am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread."

‡ Et bene qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio mensuratum; mensura enim Patris, Filius, quoniam et capit eum. Well has one observed, that the Immense Father is measured in the Son—the Son is the measure of the Father, since he contains him.

§ Καλῶς οὖν εἶπεν ἡ γραφή ἡ λεγομένη πρῶτον πάντων πιστεύσον, ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τῶν μὴ ὄντων εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα.

If you should object that Baruch is quoted under the name of Jeremiah, and the additions to Daniel, under the name of that prophet, you yourself have supplied us with the materials of solving the difficulty. "The book of Baruch was at that time joined to the book of Jeremiah," and consequently, the name of the prophet must have been used in reference to the book. It was the *title* of the work in the Alexandrine versions which were then in use. Those, therefore, who appealed to it, under that title, no more expressed the belief that Jeremiah composed it, than those who refer to the preaching of Peter, imply the conviction that Peter was its author. Huetius informs us that in the ancient list of the books of the Bible, which served as a guide to the copyists in their labor of transcription, the name of *Baruch* was not introduced, but that his work was embraced under the *title of Jeremiah*.* The stories of Susannah, and of Bel and the Dragon, in the same way, were joined to the prophecy of Daniel, and were consequently quoted under the general name of the book. As we cannot for a moment suppose that Irenæus was so stupid as really to believe that Jeremiah was the author of a work which in its very first sentence professed to be written by another man, it is indisputably clear that the name of the prophet is no otherwise employed than as the distinctive designation of the book, and consequently the use of it determines nothing in reference to the question whether or not Baruch was regarded as an inspired production. Jeremiah and Daniel, in the quotations of Irenæus, being used only in a titular sense, the quotations themselves afford not a particle of proof touching the point which you introduced them to establish.

3. You next entertain us with a series of passages from Clement of Alexandria; and the number might have been greatly increased—in which, because he cites Ecclesiasticus and Tobias under the title of Scripture; appeals to Wisdom as the work of Solomon, and distinguishes it, moreover, by the epithet Divine; quotes Baruch under the name of Jeremiah, and honors it, in ad-

* Librarii volumina sacra enscribentes, in eorum indice Baruchi nomen non reperient qui sub Jeremiæ titulo continebatur. *Demonstratio de Prophet. Baruch.*

dition, as Divine scripture, you would have us infer that he regarded these works as an integral portion of the canon of Faith. The number and variety of the quotations occurring in Clement from the apocryphal documents should be no matter of surprise, when we call to mind the peculiar esteem in which they were held by the Jews in the city of his residence and labors, surrounded as he was by those who revered them as monuments of their national history—the history of a people whom God had distinguished as his chosen inheritance, and who had prepared the way for that glorious dispensation in which Clement rejoiced—it was not to be presumed that he would be entirely exempt from the general sentiment, especially when he found that *some* of these books, in the midst of many defects, were largely impregnated with the spirit of devotion. He would naturally be led to treat them with the same partiality which the Jews entertained for them. As to them had been committed the oracles of God, and the canon of inspiration had been received at their hands, his feeling in regard to other books preserved among this same extraordinary people, would obviously take its complexion from them. He would consequently be led—not to regard the apocrypha as inspired, for the Jews never did it—but to treat them as religious and devout compositions, to study them for the purpose of personal improvement, to read them in the same way in which Baxter and Owen and Howe are perused in the modern church, and to adorn his writings with contributions levied from their stores, as Protestant Divines appeal to the works of standard though uninspired authors. The ambiguous titles of commendation and respect which Clement applies to them, it has already been demonstrated, do not involve the belief of inspiration—epithets equally distinctive and laudatory he does not scruple to bestow upon divers other books* which make no pretensions to a place in the canon—some of which indeed were genuine—others grossly spurious—others still absolutely heathenish—books, which, though Clement has quoted and commended, he distinctly intimates were possessed of no authority as an inspired rule of faith.

* *Eusebius*, H. E. Lib. vi. c. 13.

If, now, it can be shown that the principle upon which you have made this father endorse the inspiration of Wisdom and Tobias, Ecclesiasticus and Baruch, will also canonize Barnabas and Hermas, Clement of Rome, and, if not the Gospels according to the Hebrews and Egyptians, yet certainly the preaching of Peter, the fourth book of Esdras, and even the pretended verses of the Sibyl, every candid mind must acknowledge that your argument is worthless, and that the same titles which are commonly employed, in introducing quotations from the canonical books, may also be applied to other works which are confessedly destitute of any claim to a supernatural origin.

1. Barnabas is repeatedly cited * in the books of the *Stromata*, and in three distinct instances receives the very appellation of authority which Clement usually bestows upon Paul. He is not only called the APOSTLE BARNABAS, but, in one remarkable passage, seems to be treated, like the oath of confirmation, as an end of strife. † “For this,” says Clement, “I need not use many words, but only to allege the testimony of the apostolic Barnabas, who was one of the seventy and fellow-laborer of Paul.” Now, if there ever was an officer in the Christian Church entitled to command the faith and to bind the consciences of men, that officer was the *Apostle*. Paul usually commences his Epistles with a distinct assertion of his Apostolic office, and the church itself is erected “on the foundation of the prophets and *apostles*, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief-corner stone.” To the *apostles* the promise was originally made that the Holy Spirit should be imparted as a Divine Teacher, who should guide them into all truth, and bring to their remembrance the instructions of the Son. To call a man an *apostle*, therefore, would

* *Stromat.* Lib. ii. cap. 6 (sub fine), Εικοτως ονν ὁ Αποστολος Βαρναβας φησιν—“Rightly, therefore, says the Apostle Barnabas.” This is precisely the form in which Clement sometimes quotes the inspired writers. For example, a passage from the Psalms is thus introduced, *Strom.* Lib. ii. c. 15: Εικοτως ονν φησιν ὁ Προφητης—“Rightly, therefore, says the Prophet.” For other quotations from Barnabas, see *Strom.* ii. 18, v. 10, ii. 15.

† *Strom.* ii. 20: Ον μοι δει πλειονων λογων, παραθεμενυ μαρτυν τον αποστολικον Βαρναβαν, &c. It is remarkable that in this passage, as the context will show, Barnabas seems to be quoted to prove a doctrine.

seem to be equivalent to pronouncing him *inspired*. It was an office furnished with the gift of supernatural wisdom and infallible knowledge; and yet Clement does not scruple to distinguish "the fellow-laborer of Paul" with this high title of authority. Did Clement believe that Barnabas was actually inspired? Let a single fact answer the question. He *contradicts** the exposition which Barnabas had given of the Mosaic prohibition—"thou shalt not eat of the hyena nor the hare,"—which, says Coteleirius, "he would by no means have done, if he had believed that Barnabas was entitled to a place in the canon."

The epithet *apostle*—the distinguishing title of the inspired founders of the church—must consequently have been applied to him in an inferior and subordinate sense. To me it seems self-evident, that to call a book *scripture*, is no stronger proof of inspiration than to affirm that it was written by an *apostle*. In fact, it is much more likely that such a general term as *scripture*, in its own nature applicable to every variety of composition, should be promiscuously employed, than that an official designation of the highest rank should be attributed to those who possessed none of the extraordinary endowments that give a right to the title. As then uninspired *men* among the ancient writers were unquestionably denominated *apostles*, it is not incredible that uninspired books should have been in like manner denominated *scripture*.

* "There is no inconsiderable proof to be made out of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus himself, that *he did not look upon this Epistle (Barnabas's) as having any manner of authority, but on the contrary took the liberty to contradict and oppose it.* One instance will be sufficient. In *Paedag.* Lib. ii. c. 10, p. 188, he cites the explication of Barnabas on that law of Moses—*thou shalt not eat of the hyena nor the hare*—that is, not be like those animals in their lascivious qualities. He does not, indeed, name Barnabas as in other places; but nothing can be more evident than that he refers to the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. x. After which he adds, that though he doubted not but Moses designed a prohibition of adultery by prohibiting these animals, *ου μιν τα τηδε εξηγησει των συμβολικως ειρημενων συγκοιθεμαι, yet he could not agree with the symbolical explication some gave of the place, viz., that the hyena changes its sex yearly, and is sometimes male, and sometimes female, as Barnabas.* After which he largely disputes the fact." *Jones on Can.* Part iii. c. 40.

2. Clement of Rome is also quoted* in the Stromata, and quoted as an *apostle*. Upon your principle of reasoning, accordingly, his Epistle to the Corinthians ought to be inserted in the sacred library of the church.

3. But how will you dispose of the Shepherd of Hermas? It was evidently a favorite with Clement, and is sometimes described in language which, if you had found it in connection with Wisdom, and Tobias, Ecclesiasticus and Baruch, you would perhaps have paraded as triumphant proof of their Divine authority. Let me call your attention to two remarkable passages. In the twenty-ninth chapter of the first book of Stromata, a quotation is introduced from the Shepherd in these words:† “*Divinely, therefore, says the power which speaks to Hermas by revelation.*” Again, at the close of the first chapter of the second book,‡ another quotation is introduced in terms almost as strong: “*The power that appeared in vision to Hermas, says.*” Now here is a power which speaks *divinely*, reveals things in *visions*, and performs the offices in regard to Hermas which are described in the same words with the supernatural communications of the Holy Ghost to the prophets. Did Clement mean to assert that the Pastor of Hermas was an *inspired* production? Most unquestionably not;§ and yet he has employed no language in reference to any of the books of the Apocrypha, which is more explicit, more pointed, or more decided than the commendations lavished on the Shepherd. You say that Wisdom must be inspired, because Clement calls it *divine* Wisdom, but Hermas, also, according to him, speaks *divinely*. Nay the argument for Hermas is far more powerful. He not only speaks *divinely*, he speaks by *revelation*,

* *Strom.* Lib. i. c. 7: *Αυτικα ὁ Κλημενς εν τη προς Κορινθιους επιστολη, κατα λεξιν, φησι*—“As Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians says.” Again, *Strom.* iv. c. 17: *Ναι μην εν τη προς Κορινθιους επιστολη ὁ Αποστολος Κλημενς*—“the apostle Clement in the Epistle to the Corinthians.”

† *Θειως τοινυν η δυναμις η τω Ερμα κατα αποκαλυψιν λαλουσα.*

‡ *Φησι γαρ εν τω οραματι τω Ερμα η δυναμις, η φανεισα.*

§ That the Shepherd of Hermas never was received as canonical, may be gathered from the following testimonies: Euseb. H. E. Lib. iii. c. 3, 25; Tertull. de Oratione c. 12; Origen Hom. viii. in Numeros, x. in Jos., i. in Psalm. 37; Athanasius de Decret. Nicaenae Synod. in Epistola Pasch.

he declares things which have been opened in *visions*, and receives communications from the lips of an angel, like Daniel in his prophecy and John in the Apocalypse.

4. The Preaching of Peter, a document which Clement must have known to be apocryphal, he not only cites, but cites distinctly under the name of the Apostle. His most usual form of quotation is, "Peter says in the Preachings," or simply, "Peter says," when there had been a previous mention of the book.* Now upon the same principles of criticism from which you have inferred that Clement received Wisdom as the work of Solomon, it must also be maintained that he regarded the Preaching as a genuine production of the Apostle. The argument is just as strong in the one case as it is in the other. Because a passage is introduced from Wisdom, and treated without scruple as a saying of Solomon, you boldly conclude that Solomon was declared to be the author of the book, but precisely the same is done in reference to Peter and the apocryphal work which bears the title of his Preaching. I presume, however, that you will not think of contending that the holy Father looked upon the Preaching as a part of the canon, which he certainly must have done if he believed it to be composed by one of the original Apostles. His meaning, you would probably inform us, is evidently nothing more than this, "Peter is represented as saying" in a book which is known by the title of his Preaching. On the same ground it may be said, that in similar quotations from Wisdom all that the father intended to assert was, that Solomon is represented to have said in a book which is distinguished by his name. In other words, in both instances the documents are quoted according to their titles.

5. If the principle be true which you have assumed as the basis of your argument throughout this discussion—if the principle be true that whatever books are quoted by the Fathers in the same way with the canonical Scriptures, must themselves be inspired, then the FOURTH BOOK OF ESDRAS, which Rome rejects,

* Πετρος εν τω κηρυγματι ληγει. *Strom.* vi. c. 5. Again, in the same chapter, referring to the same book—αυτος διασαφησει Πετρος. Two other references are in the same chapter, besides various others in the first and second books.

and Bellarmin declares to be disfigured with fables, the dreams of Rabbins and Talmudists, deserves to be inserted in the Sacred Library. In the sixteenth chapter of the third book of Stromata, you will find a passage from this miserable work, standing, in your view, upon consecrated ground, (for you frequently insist on it as a matter of some moment, when a text from the Apocrypha is introduced in connection with one from the canon,) with Jeremy on one hand and Job on the other. Nay, it would seem, if we confine ourselves simply to the language, that Esdras was regarded as a fit companion for these venerable men. His book is quoted as the work of a *prophet*—"SAYS the PROPHET ESDRAS." I shall present the reader with a free translation of the whole passage:*

* "Cursed be the day wherein I was born, let it not be blessed," says Jeremiah. He does not mean absolutely to say that his generation should be cursed, but to express his affliction on account of the sins and disobedience of the people. He adds, therefore: 'Wherefore was I born to see labors and sorrows, my days have been in perpetual reproach.' In fact, all faithful preachers of the truth, on account of the disobedience of their hearers, have been exposed to persecution and to peril. 'Why was not my mother's womb my sepulchre, that I might not have seen the travail of Jacob and the toil of the stock of Israel?' says the prophet Esdras." The text may be found in the fourth book of Esdras, chapter v. 35.

Now, sir, is the fourth book of Esdras inspired? Listen to Cardinal Bellarmin: "The third and fourth books of Esdras are *apocryphal*; and although they are cited by the Fathers, yet, without doubt, they are not canonical, since no council has ever referred them to the canon. The fourth book is found neither in Hebrew nor Greek, and contains (chap. vi.) certain

* The original is as follows: *Επικαταρατος δε η ημερα, εν η ετεχθην. και μη ιστω επευκτηα, ο Ιερεμιας φησιν. ου την γενεσιν απλως επικαταρατον λεγων, αλλ' αποδυσπετων επι τοις αμαρτημισι του λαου και τη απειθεια' επιφερει γουν' δια τι γαρ εγεννηθην, του βλεπειν κοπους και πονους και διετελεσαν εν αισχυνη αι ημεραι μου' αυτικα παντες ου κηρυσσοντες την αληθειαν, δια την απειθειαν των ακουοντων εδωκοντο τε και εκινδευνον. Δια τι γαρ ουκ εγενετο η μητρα της μητρος μου ταφος, ινα μη ιδω τον μοχθον του Ιακωβ, και τον κοπον του γενους Ισραηλ' Εσδρας ο προφητης λεγει. Strom. iii. c. 16.*

fabulous things concerning the fish Henoah and Leviathan, which were too large for the seas to hold. These stories are the dreams of Rabbins and Talmudists.”* And yet a work which is thus summarily condemned by one of the brightest ornaments of your church, is quoted by a Christian Father, in connection with Jeremiah and Job, as the production of a Prophet! What a commentary upon your principles of criticism!

6. Let me now call your attention to the manner in which Clement has treated the verses of the Sibyl. I shall not stop to inquire whether the collection which Justin, Theophilus and himself commended, were the genuine verses of the ancient Sibyl, or an impudent forgery of a later date. It is enough for my purpose to observe that the book extant in the second century under the well-known name of the Heathen Prophetess, is not only quoted by Clement, but, what is much more remarkable, distinguished as PROPHETIC and DIVINE SCRIPTURE.† What

* Apocryphi sunt liber tertius et quartus Esdrae. Quartus autem Esdrae citatur quidem ab Ambrosio. . . . tamen sine dubio non est canonicus, cum a nullo concilio referatur in canonem, et non inveniatur neque Hebraice neque Graece, ac demum contineat (cap. 6) quaedam fabulosa de pisce Henoah et Leviathan quos maria capere non poterant, quae Rabbitorum, Talmudistarum somnia sunt. *Bellarmin. de Verb. Dei.* i. 20.

† As a specimen of his treatment of the Sybilline verses, take the following passage, *Cohort ad Gentes*, c. 8:

Ωρα τοιωνν, των αλλων ημιν τη ταξει προδιηνησμενων επι τας προφητικας ιεναι γραφας. ναι γαρ οι χρησμοι, τας εις την θεοσεβειαν εμη αφορμας εναργεστατα προτεινοντες, θεμελιουσι την αληθειαν· γραφαι δε αι θειαι, και πολιτειαι σωφρονες, συντομοι σωτηριας οδοι· γυμναι κορμωτιης, και της κητος καλλιφωνιας και στρωμυλιας, και κολακειας υπαρχουσαι, ανιστωσιν αλχομενον υπο κακιαις τον ανθρωπον, υπεριδουσαι τον ολισθον τον βροτικον, μι και τη αυτη φωνη πολλα θεραπενουσαι, αποτρεπουσαι μεν ημας τε επιζημιου απατης, προτρεπουσαι δε εμφανως εις προυπτον σωτηριαν. αυτικα γων η προφητες ημιν ασαω πρωτη Σιβυλλα, το ασμα το σωτηριον. Then follows an extract from the book. This remarkable passage may be thus rendered: “Other things having been despatched in their order, it is time to proceed to the *Prophetic Scriptures* (i. e. the Sybilline verses). For, indeed, these oracular responses, setting most clearly before us the means and method of Divine Worship, lie at the foundation of truth. These *Divine Scriptures* and wise institutions are compendious ways of salvation. Free from meretricious ornament, the intrinsic embellishment of speech, from flippancy and adulation, they elevate the man who is depressed by evil—having taught to despise the casualties of life, and with the same voice they heal many disorders, turn us away from dangerous delusion, and direct our

will you say to this astounding fact? Are you prepared to assert that he esteemed the Sibyl of equal authority with Isaiah, Jeremiah and David, or regarded her verses as entitled to equal veneration with the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms? And yet, if the names *Scripture*, *Divine Scripture*, and such like expressions, are sufficient to prove inspiration—and upon these you have chiefly relied in urging the testimony of Clement, in behalf of the Apocrypha—the books of the Sibyl have the same claims to a place in the canon as Wisdom, Tobias and Baruch. The “two passages,”* upon which you insist with peculiar emphasis, will

attention to that salvation which is before our eyes. Let then the Sibyl-Prophetess first sing to us the song of salvation.” Where can any thing be produced so strong in favor of the Apocrypha?

* “Let me now call your attention to two passages from the first and the fourth books of his Stromaton, from which we may learn something of the contents of the Scripture, as it was in the hands of this writer:

“During this (the Babylonian) captivity, lived Esther and Mordecai, whose book is had, as also that of the Maccabees. During the same captivity, Misael, Ananias, and Agarias, unwilling to adore the statue, were cast into the furnace of fire and were saved by an angel that appeared to them. Then, too, David having been cast into a pit of lions, because of Dagon, and nourished by Abacum through the Providence of God, was saved after seven days. In this time, too, happened the sign of Jonah. And Tobias, because of the angel Raphael, takes Sara to wife, whose first seven husbands Satan had slain; and after his marriage his father Tobit recovers his sight. Then Zorobabel, having conquered his rivals in wisdom, obtained from Darius the rebuilding of Jerusalem.”

The next passage is: “How great is the perfection of Moses, who preferred to die with his people rather than to remain alone in life. But Judith, too, made perfect among women, when the city was besieged, having besought the elders, went into the camp of the strangers, despising every danger for sake of her country, delivering herself to her enemies with faith in God. And soon she received the reward of that faith when she, a woman, acted manfully against the enemy and obtained the head of Holophernes. And Esther, also, was perfect in faith, freeing Israel from tyrannical power and the cruelty of a satrap. She, a single woman, resisted the innumerable armed forces, annulling through faith the tyrant’s decree. Him she rendered meek and crushed Aman; and by her perfect prayer to God, preserved Israel unhurt. I mention not Susannah, and the sister of Moses; how this one led the hosts with the Prophet the chief of all the women among the Hebrews, renowned for wisdom; and the other being led forth even to death for her high purity, when she was condemned by her incontinent lovers, remained an unshaken martyr of chastity.”

be found, when carefully examined, to afford no sort of countenance to your cause. The first is taken from the twenty-first chapter of the first book of Stromata, and occurs in the midst of an argument to prove what was notoriously a favorite dogma with the Fathers, that heathen literature was derived from the Jews. Clement shows that Moses was earlier than the Greek philosophers, theologians and poets, and that, consequently, whatever was valuable in Gentile learning, might be historically traced to the pure fountains of Hebrew theology. He, accordingly, after having given a synoptical statement of Greek chronologies, presents us with a compendious recital of Jewish history. He fixes, in the first place, the age of Moses, then exhibits in rapid review the leading events between Moses and David, and David and the Captivity, and finally mentions the most remarkable facts that occurred during the period of the Exile. In this connection your first passage is introduced. Now all that Clement's argument required was that the statements which he gathered from the Apocrypha should be *historically* true. It was not important that they should be confirmed by Divine inspiration, or delivered only by writers who were guided by the Spirit of God. It was enough that *he believed them to be true*. Historical credibility and supernatural inspiration are not terms of the same extension. The histories of Herodotus and Livy are, without doubt, to be received as authentic. Does it follow that they must also be regarded as inspired or Divine? Why then may not the history of the Maccabees, the narrative of Tobit, and the story of Susannah, be received as a faithful exhibition of the facts which they record, without being clothed with supernatural authority? Clement simply informs us, "that during this period lived Esther and Mordecai, whose book is had, as also that of the Maccabees." But is there a single syllable which indicates that either book was inspired? We know, in fact, that Esther was, but if we had not other information, we should never be able to collect it from this passage. Again, he says, "Tobias, because of the angel Raphæl, takes Sarah to wife, whose first seven husbands, Satan had slain; and after their marriage, his father Tobit recovers his sight." In other words, Clement simply abridges a well known narrative

without the slightest expression of opinion as to the source from which it originated. The book of Tobit was a part of the general body of Jewish literature, and as such is introduced by the father. But what puts it beyond all doubt that Clement did not confine himself, in this passage, as you would have us to suppose, to the canonical books, the very *next sentence* to the last which you have quoted refers to the *fourth book of Esdras*, (which Rome declares to be apocryphal,) and mentions a fact which is recorded in the fourteenth chapter of that fabulous production. Clement attributes to Esdras a *renovation* of the sacred oracles, in evident allusion to the story that the books of the law had been burnt and were miraculously restored after the captivity. "Esdras afterwards"—these are the words of the Father*—"Esdras afterwards returned to his country and by him we achieved the redemption of the people and the recension and *renewal* of the inspired oracles."

Your second passage, which may be found in the nineteenth chapter of the fourth book of the *Stromata*, is little more than a quotation from Clement of Rome's Epistle to the Corinthians; and as you have already insisted upon it as found in the apostolic father, I need not here repeat the answer which has already been given. That Susannah—a fact to which you attach no small degree of importance—should be named in connection with Moses, Miriam, and Esther, is no more surprising than that Socrates should have been lauded as a martyr and honored as a prophet of the Logos of God.†

4. I see nothing in any of the extracts which you have given from Tertullian, that can possibly be tortured into the semblance of an argument. Without insisting on the point which, I think, is susceptible of an easy demonstration, that some of the passages in which you represent him as quoting the Apocrypha, are, in fact, citations from the canonical books, it is sufficient to observe that he drops not a single expression from which it

* Και μετα Εσδρα εις την πατρωαν γην αναξενγνυσι. δι ον γινεται η απολυτρωσις εσραου και ο των θεοπνευστων αναγνωρισμος και ανακαινισμος λογιων. I. 16. Irenæus also endorsed the same story. *Contra Heres*, Lib. iii. c. 21. Cf. *Euseb. H. E.* v. 8.

† *Strom.* i. *Justin Martyr*, *Apol.* i. 5.

can be necessarily inferred that he believed these works, however freely he might use them, to be entitled to equal veneration and respect with the undisputed canon of the Jews. If he appeals to Wisdom and Baruch under the names respectively of Solomon and Jeremiah, it is only in consequence of the title of the books. There is, in fact, as much evidence that he deferred to the fourth book of Esdras as canonical authority, as you have been able to adduce in favor of the documents which Rome has appended to the word of God. In the Treatise *De Cultu Feminarum*, there occurs in the third chapter an evident allusion to the apocryphal story, which the fathers seem to have received without suspicion, of the miraculous restoration of the Jewish books, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, by the agency of Esdras. "Omne instrumentum" is the language of Tertullian, "omne instrumentum Judaicæ Literaturæ per Esdram constant restauratum." *Every instrument of Jewish Literature was restored by Esdras.*

The expressions, *oculi Domini alti*, which may be found near the beginning of the Tract *De Prescriptione Hæreticorum*, seem to have been suggested by a corresponding phrase in the eighth chapter of the fourth book of Esdras, *Domine cujus oculi elevati* (v. 20). Very nearly an exact quotation from this same fabulous production, is introduced again in the sixteenth section of the fourth book of the Work against Marcion, *Loquere in aures audientium*.

It is susceptible of the clearest proof, that Tertullian did not scruple to refer to a book as *scripture*, which he knew at the time not to be inspired. So that if your argument had been even stronger than it is—if you had produced, as you have not, citations from his writings, in which this distinguished father applies to the Apocrypha the usual appellations of the canonical books, your conclusion could not have followed from your premises. On two separate occasions, Tertullian denominates the Pastor of Hermas *scripture*, and yet, in one of the instances, in the very connection in which he refers to it under this honorable title, he distinctly testifies that it possessed no Divine authority, but was universally rejected as apocryphal and spurious.* So, again,

* The second passage from Tertullian I shall insert entire: Sed cederem tibi,

in the seventeenth chapter of his Dissertation upon Baptism, he speaks of a composition which he declares to be spurious, as the *scripture* which an Asiatic Presbyter had forged under the name of Paul.*

The author of the Poetical Books against Marcion, which pass under the name of Tertullian, seems to have entertained not the slighted suspicion that this "Prince of the Latin Church" called into question the integrity or completeness of the Hebrew canon. He informs us that the twenty-four wings of the Elders in the Apocalypse, were symbolical representations of the twenty-four books which compose the Old Testament. The number twenty-four being doubtless made, as we learn from Jerome that it was sometimes done, by separating Lamentations from the prophecy of Jeremiah, and Ruth from the book of Judges."

" Alarum numerus antiqua volumina signat,
Esse satis certa viginti quatuor ista
Quæ Domini cecinere vias et tempora pacis."

Carm. Advers. Marc. lib. iv.

It may be gathered as an important inference from the examination which has just been instituted into the leading documents

si Scriptura Pastoris, quæ sola mœchos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum vestrarum inter apocrypha et falso judicaretur.—*De Pudicit. c. 10.* Tertullian wrote this when he was a Montanist. That, however, is of no importance, since the critical purpose for which it is adduced is to show that he may call a book *scripture* and yet believe it to be *apocryphal*. The passage may be thus turned into English :

" But I would yield the point to you, if the scripture of the Shepherd, which is favorable to adulterers, deserved to be placed in the Divine Testament ; if it were not reckoned apocryphal and spurious by every assembly even of your own churches."

* Quod si Pauli perperam Scriptura legitur, exemplum Theclæ ad licentiam mulierum docendi tingendique defendunt, sciant in Asia Presbyterum, qui eam *Scripturam* construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum, id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco discessisse: But if any read the writings falsely attributed to Paul, and defend the right of women to preach and baptize by the example of Thecla, let them know that the Asiatic Presbyter who forged *that scripture*, adorning his performance with the title of Paul, having been convicted of the thing, and having confessed that he did it out of love to Paul, left his place."

of the second century—that all writings, professedly religious, whether human or supernatural in their origin, were referred by the fathers to a common class, and embraced under a common appellation. This was done in order that a broad line might be drawn between the monuments of pagan literature and the productions of those who sought to be governed by the fear of God. The sacred and profane were not to be promiscuously blended or confounded—the acknowledged compositions of the sons of light, uninspired though they might be, were not to be included in the same category with the vain discussions and false philosophy of the children of darkness. They belonged to a different department of thought—a department possessing much in common with those Divine books which the Spirit had given as a rule of faith. Whatever was written with a pious attention and promised to promote holiness of life, was consequently ranked in the same class with the inspired Scriptures to distinguish them effectually from the whole body of heathen literature. When the fathers, therefore, use such terms as you have insisted to be a proof of inspiration, they meant no more than that the writings which they quote were suited to develop the graces of the Spirit, and to quicken diligence and zeal. They were *religious* books, religious in opposition to profane, books which might not only be perused without detriment, but studied with positive advantage. Divine Scripture and such like expressions, were terms, to speak in logical language, denoting a subaltern genus which embraced under it two distinct species, *inspired* and *uninspired* productions. These species were distinguished from each other by the difference of their origin; but as they agreed in the common property of being subservient to the interests of piety, and by this common property were alike removed from all other works, they received, in consequence, a common name. There must have been some phraseology by which even an uninspired literature that the faithful might commend, could be discriminated from heathen letters; and as the leading difference between them was, that one was Divine in its tendencies and objects, while the other was sensual, earthly, and devilish, no terms could possibly have been selected more appropriate, than those which were actually applied by the early fathers to Hermas, Bar

nabas, and Clement, as well as to Wisdom, Tobit, and Baruch. Let the reader then bear in mind that, according to the usage of the primitive church, Divine Scripture was a *generic* term, including in its meaning whatever might be profitably read—whatever was fitted to foster devotion, and to inspire diligence in the Christian life, and the language of the fathers will present no difficulty.

LETTER XVII.

Testimony of the writers of the third century considered—Cyprian, Hippolytus, Apostolical Constitutions.

THE same erroneous principles of criticism, which betrayed at once the weakness of the cause and the ignorance of the advocate, in your appeal to the writings of the second century, have signally misled you in the inferences which you have drawn from what you call the testimony of the third century. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, with whom you commence your account of this period, and to whom you seem willing to defer with absolute submission, will be found, I apprehend, when so interpreted as to be consistent with himself, to afford no more countenance to the adulterated canon of Rome than his celebrated master, Tertullian.* It deserves to be remarked, though I shall not insist upon the fact in the argument, that several of the passages which you have culled from the writings of this distinguished father, are taken from a treatise upon which, in the judgment of scholars, no certain reliance can be placed. The Testimonies against the Jews to Quirinus, even by those who allow it to be genuine, is yet acknowledged to be so largely corrupted, that it is impossible to distinguish what is truly Cyprian's from what has been subsequently added by others.† A work of this sort

* Nunquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unam diem præterisse, ac sibi crebre dicere solitum; Da magistrum Tertullianum significans.—*Vita per Jac. Pamilius*.

* Stephen Baluze had paid great attention to the study of Cyprian, and

should evidently "be quoted," as Lardner has justly observed, "with some particular caution;" you, however, have used it as freely, certainly with as little appearance of suspicion, as if you had been perfectly assured that every sentence, line, and word, stood precisely as they came from the hands of the venerable bishop of Carthage.

I. Your favorite Tobias is the first book which you attempt to canonize by the assistance of this father, and verily, you could not, in the whole range of the Apocrypha, have selected a work more admirably adapted to furnish a complete refutation of your whole process of argument. It is admitted that Cyprian has repeatedly quoted this document, and, in some instances, quoted it as *Divine Scripture*. But that this does not amount to an admission of its canonical authority—that it implies no more than that the work was historically true in its statements, and suited to promote the purposes of piety, is plain from the fact, that while he acknowledges it to be *Divine Scripture*, he virtually asserts that it was not *inspired*. He draws a broad

possessed twenty-one manuscripts of this particular treatise. His opinion, therefore is entitled to great weight. "If," says he, "there are any passages in the writings of Cyprian, of which it cannot be certainly said that they belong to him, that can be chiefly asserted of the books of Testimonies to Quirinus. Several manuscripts have more than the common editions, some less. Since, therefore, it is impossible to distinguish what is truly Cyprian's from what has been subsequently added by his admirers, we have retained what we found in ancient manuscript copies. Only the two first books exist in the Spirensian edition, the old Venetian, and in that which Reibold edited. Erasmus published the third from a written codex of the monastery of Gamblour. I have twenty-one ancient copies of these books, of which, however, only five have the two first books."

Si qua sunt loca in operibus sancti Cypriani, de quibus pronuntiari non possit ea certe illius esse, id vero in primis asseri potest de libris Testimoniorum ad Quirinum. Plures enim codices plus habent quam vulgatæ editionis, alii minus. Itaque, quoniam impossibile est discernere ea quæ vere Cypriani sunt ab iis quæ post illum a studiosis addita sunt, nos retinimus ea quæ reperta nobis sunt in antiquis exemplaribus manuscriptis. Porro duo tantum priores libri extant in editione Spirensi, in veteri Venetâ, et in eâ quam Reiboldus procuravit. Erasmus tertiam emisit ex codice scripto monasterii Gemblacensis. Habui autem unum et viginti exemplaria vetera horum librorum, quorum tamen quinque habent tantum libros duos priores.—*Baluz. Not. ad Cyprian.* p. 596, as quoted in Lardner, vol. iii. pp. 17, 18. (inarg.)

distinction between it and the unerring testimony of revealed truth; and although he was willing to accommodate its sentiments, breath its devotion, and commend its morality, he was too well acquainted with its nature and origin, to depend upon it for a proof of doctrine. Accordingly in the *Treatise de Opere et Eleemosynis*, having cited and briefly expounded the passage, "prayer is good with fasting and alms" (Tob. xii. 8), he proceeds.* "The angel Raphael reveals, and manifests, and confirms the truth that our petitions are rendered effectual by alms—that our lives are redeemed from peril by alms—and that by alms our souls are delivered from death. Nor do we allege these things, dearest brethren, so as not to prove what the angel Gabriel has said by the testimony of truth. In the Acts of the Apostles the truth of the fact is established; and that souls are delivered by alms, not only from the second, but also from the first death, is confirmed alike by fact and experience." He then appeals to the history of Tabitha, and to divers passages in the canonical Scriptures, as the *proof* of what he had cited from the book of Tobit. What is this but a virtual declaration that this document, however valuable on other accounts, was no part of the rule of faith, and could not be adduced to bind the conscience with the authority of God? Cyprian appeals to it, but instead of relying upon it, as he does upon the Acts, Gospels, Genesis, and Proverbs, proceeds to confirm the sentiment which he had quoted, by what he denominated the *testimony of truth*. This phrase, if we may judge from the connection, evidently means the testimony of Him who cannot lie; who, embracing the past, the present, and the future in a single glance of unerring intuition, is emphatically the Father of lights. His law, according to the Psalmist, is the fountain of truth, and His testimony must be regarded as the seal of truth.* When Cyprian, therefore, applies this expression, as he unquestionably does in the

* Revelat angelus et manifestat, et firmat eleemosynis vitam de periculis redemi: eleemosynis a morte animos liberari. Nec sic, fratres charissimi, ista profferimus, ut non quod Raphaël angelus dixit veritatis testimonio comprobemus. In Actibus Apostolorum facti fides posita est, et quod eleemosynis non tantum a secunda, sed a priora morte animae liberentur, gestae et impletae rei probatione compertum est.—*Dicei Cypriani, de Opere et Eleemosynis.*

present instance, to the plain declarations of the Acts, the Gospels, Genesis, and Proverbs, he can mean nothing less than that these books are to be received as authoritative standards of faith; and when he distinguishes the teaching of Tobit, as we see that he has done, from the testimony of truth, what other idea can be conveyed but that this work is not entitled to a place in the category of inspired Scriptures? We have, consequently, *his own* statements against *your* inference. You maintained that he deferred to Tobit with the same submission, veneration, and respect which he awarded to the books that are not disputed; he, on the other hand, assures us that while he believed it to be *Divine Scripture*, a godly and edifying book, he still regarded it merely as a human production, which, so far from being competent to regulate our faith, needed itself to be confirmed by a higher sanction than the authority of its author—even the testimony of essential truth.

2. You next attempt to show that Cyprian received Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus as inspired compositions; and your proof is derived from the fact that he repeatedly quotes them under the name of Solomon, and through Solomon attributes them to the Holy Spirit. He seldom speaks of them absolutely and without qualification (as the testimony of God, but whenever he alludes to them as the work of the Spirit, it is plainly on the supposition that they were actually written by Solomon. In other words, the evidence is precisely the same that he held them to be Solomon's, as that he held them to be supernaturally inspired. He introduces, for instance, a passage from the third chapter of Wisdom—the first upon your list—in these words: * “By Solomon the Holy Spirit hath shown and forecautioned us, saying”—and again, † “Thus also the Holy Spirit teaches us.” So too Ecclesiasticus is quoted in these words: ‡ “Solomon also, guided by the Holy Ghost, testifies and teaches.”

It is evident from these passages—and they are the strongest

* Per Salomonem spiritus sanctus ostendit et precat, dicens.—*De Exhort. Mars.* c. 12.

† Sed et per Salomonem docet spiritus sanctus.—*De Mortalitate*

‡ Sed et Salomon in spiritu sancto constitutus testatur et docet.—*Epist.* 64.

which can be produced—that it is only a *conditional* inspiration which Cyprian attributes to Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. If he believed that they were written by Solomon, then he unquestionably received them as inspired. Now you have confidently asserted the consequent of this proposition, but have nowhere condescended to furnish us with any portion of the evidence by which the antecedent is established. Every Protestant is willing to concede that if these books were the productions of Solomon, they deserve to be inserted in the sacred canon. But the real question is, whether or not Solomon was their author. If there is no satisfactory evidence that Cyprian believed them to be his, then there is no satisfactory evidence that he believed them to be inspired. They came from God, in the view of this father, only on the supposition that they came from Solomon. But where is the proof that Cyprian believed them to have been written by him? On this point, which is vital to your argument, you have left us completely in the dark. If it can be shown, however, that he did not believe that Solomon was their author, then he furnishes no testimony whatever in behalf of their inspiration; since we can never reason in hypothetical propositions, from the removal of the antecedent to the establishment or removal of the consequent. Cyprian says that they were inspired *if* Solomon wrote them; but where does he say that Solomon wrote them? Unless he has said so, your conclusion is drawn from no premises which he has supplied. Now I maintain that there is satisfactory evidence that neither Cyprian nor any other intelligent father really believed that Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were the compositions of Solomon. Augustine has distinctly informed us that, though they were usually ascribed to him, it was not because they were reputed to be his, but because they were imitations of his style. In the twentieth chapter of the seventeenth book of the *Treatise de Civitate Dei*, after having mentioned the three books, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Canticles, which were universally acknowledged to have been written by Solomon, he adds:* “Two

* Prophetasse etiam ipse reperitur in suis libris, qui tres recepti sunt in auctoritatem canonicam, Proverba, Ecclesiastes, et Canticum Canticorum. Alii vero duo, quorum unus Sapientia, alter Ecclesiasticus dicitur, propter eloquii nonnullum similitudinem, ut Salomonis dicantur; obtinuit consuetudo: non

other books, one of which is called Wisdom, the other Ecclesiasticus, have also from custom, on account of some similarity of style, received their titles from the name of Solomon. That they are not his, however, the more learned entertain no doubt." So also in his *Speculum de Libro Sapientia* :* "Among these," that is, the books written before the advent of Christ which the Jews rejected from the canon, but which the Christian church treated with respect," "among these are two, which by many are called by the name of Solomon, on account, as I suppose, of a certain similarity of style. For that they are not Solomon's, admits of no question among the more learned. It does not indeed appear who was the author of the book of Wisdom, but that the other, which we call Ecclesiasticus, was written by a Jesus who was surnamed Sirach, must be acknowledged by all who have read the book through."

If now Cyprian were among the more learned doctors of the church—and you have given him a distinguished place in your introductory eulogium on his character—he did not believe, according to the testimony of Augustine, that these disputed books were written by Solomon; and, therefore, there is not a particle of evidence that he held them to be inspired. In fact, it is altogether incredible that any critic of ordinary intelligence could be persuaded that an inspired man was the author of a work which not only bore upon its face the name of another individual, but contained in its preface a satisfactory account of its original composition in one language and its subsequent translation into another. Here is a book which professes to have been written by one Jesus. The proof of its inspiration turns upon

autem esse ipsius, non dubitant doctiores.—*S. Augustini Episcopi de Civitate Dei*, liber xvii. cap. 20.

* Sed non sunt omittendi hi, quos quidem ante Salvatoris adventum constat esse conscriptos, sed eos non receptos à Judæis, recipit tamen ejusdem Salvatoris Ecclesia. In his sunt duo quis Salomonis a pluribus appellatur, propter quamdam, sicut existimo eloquii similitudinem. Nam Salomonis non esse, nihil dubitant quique doctiores. Nec tamen ejus qui Sapientiae dicitur, quisnam sit auctor apparet. Illum vero alterum, quem vocamus Ecclesiasticum, quod Jesus quidam scripserit, qui cognominatur Sirach, constat inter eos qui eundem librum totum legerunt.—*S. Augustini Episcopi Speculum de libro Ezechielis*.

the fact that it was *not* written, as it professes to be, by Jesus, but by Solomon—that is, it can only be proved to be inspired, by being proved to open with a lie—in other words, it is shown to be the testimony of infallible truth by being shown to contain a palpable falsehood. The ridiculous evasion of Bellarmin, that Jesus diligently collected and reduced into a volume the maxims of Solomon, so that Ecclesiasticus might with propriety be attributed to each,* is refuted by the Prologue which is prefixed to the book. It is there stated that the original author, “when he had much given himself to the reading of the Law and the Prophets and other books of our (Jewish) fathers, and had gotten therein good judgment, was drawn on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom.” This looks very little like collecting and digesting the maxims of Solomon. Ecclesiasticus evidently purports to be an original work, suggested, not by the study of Solomon alone, but by the whole canon of the Jews. It is true that it is an imitation, and in many instances a very successful imitation, of the pointed and sententious style of the wise monarch of Israel.

Besides the similarity of style, which was perhaps the original ground for attributing this work to Solomon, two other reasons may be assigned for quoting both it and Wisdom under his name, as we see that Cyprian has done. In the first place it was a rapid and convenient mode of reference. The name of Solomon was a part of the professed title of the book of Wisdom, but as it was notorious that he was not the author of it, it would have been silly hypercritical nicety always to have resorted, in referring to it, to the awkward periphrasis—the author of the book called the Wisdom of Solomon. To quote it by its title implied no belief that its title was just. Clemens Alexandrinus appealed to the fourth book of Esdras under the name of the Prophet Ezra. Baruch is frequently cited under the name of Jeremiah: and the Preaching of Peter was accommodated by Clement under the name of the Apostle.

* At Epiphanius in hæresi Anomatorum, et alii nonnulli auctorem libri hujus Jesum Sirach esse volunt. Respondeo, facile potuisse fieri, ut Jesus Sirach sententias Salomonis a se diligenter collectas in unum volumen redegerit, ita uterque, auctor dici poterit.—*De Verbo Dei*, lib. i. cap. 14.

As the book of Ecclesiasticus, on account of its striking analogy to the compositions of Solomon, was in all probability designated by his name—just as we call a great poet a Homer, or a great conqueror another Alexander—the fathers would feel no hesitation in adopting a common and popular title, especially when the work itself contained an effectual antidote against all erroneous impressions. “In the gospel of Luke,” says Rainold,* “Christ is called the son of Joseph, as likewise in the gospel of John. Luke, however, elsewhere explains it, saying that Christ was the son of Joseph, *as it was supposed*, and Philip says to Nathanael, we have found Jesus the son of Joseph of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets have written. Yet Moses in the Law adumbrated Christ by Melchisedec, without father as a man, without mother as God: and Isaiah, the prince of prophets says, Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a son. Hence it is evident that Christ as a man had no father; and so Philip might have known that Joseph was not, in reality, the father of Jesus. If he did know it, he used the phrase only for convenience of reference. But if Philip were ignorant of the fact, the blessed Virgin certainly knew that Jesus had been conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, and yet she says, in the gospel of Luke: Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. Though she knew that Joseph was not the father of Christ, yet she calls him his father: in the first place, because

* Apud Lucam Christus Josephi filius dicitur, similiter et apud Johannem: Quanquam Lucas alibi id explicat, dicens Christum fuisse filium Josephi ut putabatur, et Philippus ad Nathanælem invenimus (inquit) Jesum filium Joseph, de quo scripsit Moses in lege adumbravit Christu per Melchisedecum sine patre ut hominem, sine matre ut Deum. Et prophetarum princeps Esaias, Ecce, (inquit) virgo concipiet et pariet filium, unde patet Christum ut hominem non habuisse patrem, adeoque poterat Phillipus prius intellexisse. Josephum non fuisse vere patrem Jesu. Si intellexerit ergo ad commoditatem significationis sic loquutus est, sed ignoravit id Philippus, sciebat certe beata virgo eum a spiritu sancto conceptum esse ipsa, tamen apud Lucam, Ecce (inquit) pater tuus ego cruciati quærebamus te. Cum sciret non fuisse Josephum Christi patre, appellat tunc Josephum patrem, primo quia sic putabatur esse, secundo propter reverentiam, qua usus est Christus erga Josephum, tanquam patrem, eodem modo verisimile est patres, cum citarint libros Sapientiæ et Ecclesiastici sub nomine Salomonis, usos esse eo nomine, non quod Salomonis esse putarint, sed significandi commoditatem sequutos, appellationem vulgo usitatam retinuisse.—*De Libris Apocryphis, Prælectio xix.*

he was reputed to be so, and in the second, on account of the filial reverence with which Christ uniformly treated Joseph. In the same way it is likely that the fathers, in citing the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus under the name of Solomon, did so, not because they imputed them to him, but for convenience of reference they retained a common and popular designation." To this may be added, as the same learned writer has intimated, that they used the name of Solomon to conciliate greater reverence and esteem for the sentiments which they had chosen to accommodate. These books were so strikingly analogous to those of Solomon, that they might be studied, in the opinion of the fathers, with safety and advantage. Their authors, whoever they were, breathed the spirit of devotion, and hence their productions were applauded, as the modern church warmly commends Owen, Charnock, and Scott. Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, and Judith, were regarded as good elementary works of religion, which might be placed with success in the hands of novices, to prepare them for the higher mysteries of the faith. Such, at least, is the testimony of Athanasius.* In his famous Festal Epistle, after having given a catalogue of the inspired books of the Old and New Testament, he adds: "There are also other books beside these, not indeed admitted to the canon, but ordained by the Fathers to be read by such as have recently come over (to Christianity), and who wish to receive instruction in the doctrine of piety—the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit, the Doctrine of the Apostle, as it is called, and the Shepherd."

But whether the explanations which have been given of the manner in which the Fathers quote Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus be satisfactory or not, one thing is absolutely certain—that their ascribing them to Solomon, in incidental references, is no proof whatever that they really believed them to be his. Bellarmin appeals to Basil as having cited Ecclesiasticus in this way, and

* Εστι και ἕτερα βιβλια τουτων εξωθεν, ον κανονιζομενα μεν, τετυπωμενα δε παρα των πατερων αναγιγνωσκεισθαι τοις αρτι προσερχομενοις και βουλομενοις κατηχεισθαι τον της ευσεβειας λογον· Σοφια Σολομωντος, και σοφια Σιραχ, και Εσθηρ, και Ιουδεθ, και Τοβιας, και διδαχη καλουμενη των Αποστολων, και ο ποιμην. *Athanasius, Epistola Festalis*, Opp. i. p. 961, ed. Bened.

yet Basil unequivocally asserts that only *three books*, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, were written by Solomon: Jerome, too, has been guilty of the same method of citation, and has just as strongly affirmed that no other books can be properly ascribed to Solomon, but those which are found in the Jewish canon.* It is unnecessary to adduce more examples. One single instance is sufficient to maim a conclusion drawn from the only circumstance which can be tortured into any thing like evidence that Cyprian or any other Father imputed the documents in question to the pen of Solomon. It will now be remembered that the leading proposition of your argument was this—if Cyprian believed that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, he believed them to be inspired. It was incumbent on you to prove the antecedent, which you have not so much as attempted to do. I, on the other hand, have shown that it is false; or, at least, that there is not a particle of evidence in its favor. The argument then stands in this way: If Cyprian believed that Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom were written by Solomon, he believed them to be inspired. But *he did not believe* that they were written by Solomon. Here in my opinion the syllogism halts—claudicat consecutio—and Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are left precisely where they were before you appealed to the testimony of Cyprian.

The claims of Baruch and the additions to Daniel, to a place in the canon, you endeavor to vindicate by the same process of argument which we have seen to be worthless in the case of

* Ita videtis judicia cani posse negati consequutionem illius argumenti: *patres hos libros a Salomone scriptos putarunt ergo sunt ab eo scripti*. Nunc istius enthymematis antecedens examinemus. *Patres existimarunt hos libros a Salomone scriptos*, ad quod confirmandum primum enthymema pertinet, *patres citarunt hos libros sub nomine Salomonis, ergo existimarunt ab eo scriptos*, hic quoque claudit consequutio, in illis enim qui librum Sapientiae sub Salomonis nomine citarunt, fuit Basilus, qui tamen aperte inficiatur eum a Salomone scriptum. Ubi tres oranino sacros libros Salomoni adscribit, *τρεις πασας γνωμεν ἃ Εαλομωντος τας πραγματειας*. Hieronymus etiam ex eorum numero est, qui ecclesiasticum sub nomine Salomonis citant. At alius est idem Hieronymus, ubi tres libros a Salomone scriptos decit Fertur (inquit) alius qui a Siracide scriptus est, Salomonis; adhuc alius *ψευδεπιγραφος*, qui Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur. *De Libris Apocryphis, Prælectio xviii.*

Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. Because Cyprian has quoted the one under the name of Jeremiah, and the other under the name of Daniel; that is, because he has referred to the books by their notorious and ordinary titles, you would have us to believe that he really looked upon these venerable prophets as the authors of the documents in question. The futility of such reasoning has already been sufficiently exposed: and, therefore, without farther ceremony, we may dismiss the testimony of Cyprian in behalf of these works, as having no existence but in your own mind.

4. His quotations from the Maccabees are no more remarkable than a quotation which he has made from the third book of Esdras: and if his conviction of the historical credibility of the narrative in the one case is sufficient to canonize the books, his full and cordial accommodation of a sentiment in the other, must be equally valid for the same purpose. The truth is, the argument is stronger in behalf of Esdras, since Cyprian not only quotes it, but quotes it in the very same form in which Christ and his Apostles were accustomed to cite the writings of the Old Testament. "Custom without truth," says he, * "is only antiquity of error: wherefore, having abandoned error, let us follow truth, knowing that truth says in Esdras—as it is written—'truth endureth and is always strong: it liveth and conquereth for evermore.'"

II. In what you call the testimony of Hippolytus and Dionysius, you have presented us with nothing which requires an answer. They quote and comment on passages contained in the disputed books; but I have yet to learn that any thing can be gathered from a fact of this sort, but the existence of the works in the age of the writers, and the knowledge and probable approbation of their contents. But you were truly bold to insist on what is called the Apostolical Constitutions as evidence in your favor. It is true, that the Apocrypha are quoted in this collection, but it is not true that the citations which occur imply that there was

* Nam consuetudo sine veritate, vetustas erroris est: propterea quod relicto errore sequamur veritatem, scientes quia et apud Esdras veritas dicit, sicut scriptum est: veritas et manet et invalescit in æternum, et vincit et obtinet in sæcula sæculorum. Epistola 74.

any Divine authority in the writings from which they were made. On the contrary, we have in the fifty-seventh chapter of the second book a catalogue or list of the books which were directed to be read in the churches: and not a syllable is whispered concerning Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, or any of the works which Rome has added to the canon—a pregnant proof that to quote a book and to believe it inspired are two very different things. The only books which are mentioned in connection with the Old Testament, are the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles—the return from Babylon by Ezra—that is, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, David, Solomon, Job and the sixteen Prophets.* Here, then, is the canon of the Apostolical Constitutions; and though it is a document which is notoriously spurious,† yet as you have chosen to appeal to its authority, I hope that, in this matter, you will abide by its decision.

LETTER XVIII.

Testimony of the Fourth Century considered.—Council of Nice.—Councils of Hippo and Carthage.—Testimony of Augustine—Ephrem the Syrian—Basil—Chrysostom—Ambrose.

You open the testimony of the fourth century with the Council of Nice. It is wholly immaterial to the argument whether I despise its decisions‡ or reverence its decrees, since the only ques-

* *Αναγιγνωσκειτω τα Μωσσεως και Ιησου του Νανη· τα των κριτων και των βασιλεων· τα των παραλειπομενων και της επανοδου· προς τουτοις τα του Ιωβ και του Σολομωνος και τα των εκκαιδεκα προφατων· ανα δυο δε γενομενων αναγνωσματος, ετερος τις του Δαβιδ ψαλλετω υμνους.* “Let him (the reader) read the books of Moses, and of Joshua the son of Nun, the books of Judges, Kings, and Chronicles, and those concerning the return from the captivity; and beside these, the books of Job, Solomon, and the sixteen prophets; and two readings having been made, let another chant the Psalms of David.”

† For a clear and satisfactory dissertation upon the value of the Apostolical Constitutions, see *Lardner*, vol. iv. p. 194, et seq.

‡ “As this may be one of the Councils you so unremittingly despise.” *A. P. F.*, Letter VII.

tion before us has reference to the canon, which, whether right or wrong, it believed to be Divine. I may observe, however, that while I embrace its admirable creed with cordial acquiescence, I cannot but regret that so distinguished and venerable a body should have sanctioned the principle of religious persecution, and indirectly, if not positively, endorsed the odious doctrine, that pains, penalties, and civil disabilities were appropriate instruments for promoting uniformity of faith. The age of Constantine is, no doubt, a period in the history of the church upon which Romanists love to linger. Then were laid the foundations of that secular authority and that joyous and imposing pomp of ceremonial which subsequently enabled the Man of Sin to tread upon the necks of kings, to bind their nobles with fetters of iron, and to banish all that was pure and spiritual from the temple of God.

“ Ah, Constantine ! of how much ill was cause,
Not thy conversion, but those rich domains
That the first wealthy pope received of thee.”

1. But discarding all discussion of the merits of the Council, and of the peculiar corruptions of the age in which it was convened, let us confine ourselves to the matter in hand ; and endeavor to ascertain whether the wickedness and folly, in reference to the Scriptures, were perpetrated at Nice, which, upwards of twelve hundred years afterwards, formed a fit introduction to the atrocities of Trent. To discover the opinions of a council, the simplest method is to appeal to the acts, the authentic proceedings of the body itself : but as in the creed, canons, and synodical epistle, the only clear and unquestionable monuments of the doings of Nice that have survived the ravages of time, not a single hint is given touching the books which the Fathers received as inspired, you have been obliged to resort to collateral and indirect evidence, and that of the vaguest kind. The testimony upon which you have relied, is a passage of Jerome, and a few quotations found in the work of an obscure scribbler, Gelasius Cyzicenus. In replying to your arguments, I shall reverse the order in which you have marshalled your witnesses, and begin with Gelasius.

This writer has given us a history of the Council of Nice, written a hundred and fifty years after the body had been dissolved, collected from documents of which nothing is known with certainty, and consequently nothing can be pronounced with confidence. He pretends to have preserved the discussions and debates which transpired in the Synod betwixt the orthodox and the Arians; but speeches reported under such circumstances are evidently entitled to small consideration.* Worthless, however, as his history is, you have appealed to it as possessing, upon this subject, "some value." "At the time," you inform us, "when Gelasius wrote, there were many monuments of the Council of Nice still extant, which have since perished. The sentiments of the Fathers could be easily ascertained, and it is utterly incredible that if they were unanimously opposed to the inspiration of any books of the Old Testament save those in the Jewish canon, he would have dared them to assert the contrary, or to put in their mouths expressions directly opposed to what they would have used." Let this be granted, and where is the proof that Gelasius attributed to the orthodox any sentiments, or "put into their mouths" any speeches inconsistent with a cordial rejection of the whole Apocrypha from the list of inspired compositions? In the passages which you have adduced, he simply represents the Fathers as quoting the book of Baruch under the name of Jeremiah, and the book of Wisdom under the name of Solomon. Now it is perfectly conceivable that they might have appealed to these works, in their arguments against the Arians, as setting forth the sentiments of God's ancient and chosen people, upon the matter in dispute, without implying, or intending to imply, that their declarations were to be received as authoritative statements of truth. Their object might have been to show that the church, under the former dispensation, was as far removed from Arianism, as under the latter. These books were legitimate sources of proof as to the actual creed of the Jews, or at least a part of the nation, in the age of the writers, and there was

* The reader may form some conception of the value of this historian from the "admonitio ad Lectorem" prefixed to his work in *Labbaeus and Copart*, vol. ii. p. 103.

consequently no impropriety in using them, as a probable exposition of the national faith. In fact, they have been used in modern times for precisely the same purpose, in the able work of Allix, entitled *The Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians*. “We make use of their authority,” says he, “not to prove any doctrine which is in dispute, as if they contained a Divine Revelation, and a decision of an inspired writer, but to witness what was the faith of the Jewish Church in the time when the authors of those Apocryphal books did flourish.”*

It is hence, by no means, certain that the Fathers of Nice, if indeed they quoted the Apocrypha at all, intended to sanction the inspiration of the works. That they referred to Baruch under the name of Jeremiah, and to Wisdom under the name of Solomon, proves no more than that these were the ordinary and familiar titles of the books. If, however, you insist on the proposition that nothing was quoted against the Arians which was not regarded by the council as inspired, and admit that Gelasius is a fit witness of what was quoted, your argument will prove a little too much. This writer testifies that the Fathers cited two grossly spurious documents—not only cited them, but cited them as *Scripture*, and cited them apparently to prove a doctrine. In the eighteenth chapter of the second book of his history, he exhibits at length the reply of the bishops to the Arian exposition of Proverbs viii. 22 : “The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old.” In the course of the reply, which was intrusted to Eusebius, these words occur.* “Enough has been said, as it appears to me; and the proofs have clearly

* See Allix's *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, &c., c. v. p. 53.

* Ικανα ειναι μοι δοκει τα λεχθεντα. και αι αποδειξεις παρεστησαν, ω φιλοσοφε, οτι ο υιος του Θεου εστιν, ο και την εν Σολομωντι τι λογιστικην σοφιαν κτισας, και παντα τα κτιστα, και ουκ εργαλειον, ινα δε σοι σαφεστεραν την αληθη των πραγματων αποδειξιν παραστησωμεν, και ταχιον ελθωμεν επι τον νομον του πραγματος, και της θεωριας αυτου, τα εκ της γραφης λεζωμεν. μελλων ο προφητης Μωσης εξιεναι τον βιον, ως γεγραπται εν βιβλω αναληψεως Μωσεως, προσκαλεσαμενος Ιησουν υιον Ναυη, και διαλεγομενος προς αυτον, εφη* και προειθεασαι το με ο Θεος προ καταβολης κοσμου, ειναι με της διαθηκης αυτου μεσιτην. και εν βιβλω λογων μυστικων Μωσεως, αυτος Μωσης προειπε περι του Δαβιδ και Σολομωντος. *Gelasii Historia*, lib. ii. c. 18. For a particular account of the apocryphal book called Assumption of Moses, see Fabricius *Cod. Pseud.* V. T. tom. i. p. 839.

shown, O philosopher, that the Son of God was the former of the rational wisdom spoken of by Solomon, and of all the creatures, and was not a mere instrument. But in order to exhibit the exposition of this matter in a clearer light, and to come more speedily to the sense of the passage, we will declare certain things from the Scriptures. Moses, the prophet, when about to die, as it is written in the book of the Assumption of Moses, called to him Joshua, the son of Nun, and thus addressed him : ‘ God foresaw, before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of his testament, and in the book of the mystic speeches of Moses, Moses himself spake beforehand of David and Solomon.’ ”

Here are two books, both of them confessedly apocryphal, one called the assumption of Moses, the other his mystic speeches, which the historian Eusebius, in the name of all the bishops, is represented by Gelasius as employing under the title of Scripture against the anonymous champion of Arianism. Now, you must either admit that Nice held these works to be inspired, or deny that their citation of a book as Scripture is any proof that the Fathers received it as inspired. If you take the first proposition, and maintain that Nice canonized these books, why has Rome rejected them ? Upon what authority is the decision of the first general council set at naught and despised ? Upon what grounds do you concur with Nice in receiving Judith, Baruch, and Wisdom, and refuse your assent when you have precisely the same evidence that it sanctioned the inspiration of these legends of Moses ? But you cannot, as a consistent Romanist, admit that the assumption of Moses was treated as canonical at Nice. If not, then its quotation of a book is no proof that the work was held to be inspired, and you have consequently lost your labor in proving that it quoted Baruch, Judith, and Wisdom. It deserves, however, to be remarked, that if you had succeeded in your design, you would have sapped the foundation of the principal excuse which Bellarmin offers for the heresy of Jerome, in rejecting all of the Apocrypha, with the exception of Judith, from the canon. * “ I admit,” says he, “ that Jerome

* Admitto igitur Hieronymum in ea fuisse opinione. quia nondum generale

was of this opinion, because as yet no general Council had determined any thing concerning any of these books, with the exception of Judith, which Jerome afterwards received." And yet, according to you, a general Council *had determined something*. Baruch and Wisdom were put upon the same footing with Judith. Thus Priest contradicts Priest and Jesuit devours Jesuit.

2. Let us now turn to the testimony of Jerome. In his preface to the Book of Judith, he observes: "But because the Council of Nice is read to have counted this book in the number of Sacred Scriptures, I have complied with your request or rather demand."* It will be observed here that Jerome does not state the fact upon his own authority, he was not even born when the Council of Nice was assembled; but upon the authority of a *nameless writer*, whose book it does not appear had ever been seen by himself. "It is read," says he; but where and by whom? To these questions the Father furnishes no manner of reply. We have then *not Jerome*, but an anonymous scribbler, of whom nothing is known but his obscurity, testifying to the reception on the part of Nice of the book of Judith. Completely, therefore, without foundation is the bold statement of Bellarmin, that Jerome opposed the authority of Nice to the opinion of the Jewish Church, and was himself a witness that the Nicene Synod had received the book of Judith into the Canon of Scripture.† That *somebody*, no one knows who, had somewhere, no one knows where, read or heard that this was the case,

concilium de his libris aliquid statuerat, excepto libro Judith, quem etiam Hieronymus postea recepit.—*Bellar. de Verbo Dei*, lib. i. cap. 10.

* Sed quia hunc Librum synodus Nicæna in numero S. Scripturarum legitur computasse acquievi postulationi vestræ, immo exactioni.—*S. Hier. Præf. in Libr. Judith*.

† Librum Judith egregium testimonium habere a synodo Nicæna 1. Omnium synodorum generalium prima et celeberrima, testatur S. Hieronymus præfatione in Judith. Ac ne forte Kenilius dicat librum Judith sanctum esse, sed non plenæ auctoritatis ad fidei dogmata confirmanda notanda sunt verba S. Hieronymi: asserit enim sanctissimus Doctor, apud Hebræos librum Judith numerari in sanctis libris, qui tamen non sint idonei ad dogmata fidei comprobanda: deinde huic Hebræorum sententiæ opponit Nicænæ synodi auctoritatem: igitur teste Hieronymo, Nicæna synodus librum Judith ita retulit in numerum sacrorum librorum, ut eum idoneum esse consuerit ad fidei dogmata confirmanda.—*Bellar. de Verbo Dei*, lib. i. cap. 12.

is the sum and substance of what Jerome asserts—a precious testimony truly!

1. That Jerome himself did not believe his anonymous witness—that he referred to the matter simply as a *rumor* and not as a fact, * may be gathered from his own account of the book of Judith. In his preface to the books of Solomon he says, “The church indeed reads the book of Judith, but does not receive it among the canonical Scriptures.”† Again, in the Prologus Galeatus—“the book of Judith is not in the canon.”‡ If he believed that the Council of Nice truly represented the faith of the church, and yet believed that, according to the faith of the church, the book of Judith was *not* canonical, he must have believed that the nameless author to whom he alludes had either ignorantly or wilfully lied. There was no alternative. If this author told the truth, Judith *was* canonical, and the church received it as such; but Judith was *not* canonical, says Jerome, and the church did not receive it as such: therefore, this author, could not have spoken the truth. This reasoning can be evaded, only by saying, that Nice did not represent the faith of the church, that is, that the 318 Bishops who were assembled there, did not know the books which were generally received as inspired—a supposition too absurd to receive a moment’s attention.

2. It is susceptible of the clearest demonstration, that the prominent actors in the Synod of Nice, received neither Judith, nor any of the books which Protestants reject, as a part of the canon; a fact which is wholly inexplicable, if Jerome’s witness is worthy of credit. Eusebius, who, according to Gelasius, was more than once the organ of the Council, and who certainly

* Erasmus and Stapleton so understood the matter. Erasmus says:—Non affirmat Hieronymus approbatum fuisse hunc librum Judith in synodo Nicæna, sed ait, in numero est literarum Legitur computasse.—*Erasm. in Cens. Præfat. Hieron.* Stapleton says:—Hieronymus hoc de synodo Nicæna tantum exæma referre videtur. Synodus, inquit, Legitur computasse, nam alibi aperte dubitat.—*Lib. ix. Princip. c. 12.*

† Librum Judith legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eum inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit.—*S. Hier. Præf. in Libr. Salom.*

‡ Liber Judith non est in canon.e.—*S. Hier. in prol. gal.*

must have known all of importance that transpired in the body, has not only left no intimations, in any of his writings, that Judith was so conspicuously honored, but uniformly treats the whole Apocrypha as disputed and uninspired compositions. In the twelfth chapter of the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History, he speaks of the Wisdom of Solomon and of Jesus the Son of Sirach, as works which were not admitted into the canon.* In the second book of his Chronicles,† according to the version of Jerome, he distinguishes betwixt the Maccabees and the inspired records of the Jews, and places the former in the same category with the writings of Josephus and Julius Africanus; and expressly states that they were not received among Sacred Scriptures. “From the time of Zerubbabel,” he states in the eighth book of the *Demonstratio Evangelica*,‡ “to the time of the Saviour, no Divine book was published.” And Jerome informs us that he pronounced the additions to Daniel to be totally destitute of Divine authority.§

Athanasius, another prominent member of the Council of Nice, expressly rejects the Apocrypha from any claim to inspiration. He speaks of Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Tobit, the additions to Esther, and Judith, as valuable books for beginners and those who were recently converted to Christianity, but as forming no part of the Canon of Scripture. It was the peculiar prerogative of the twenty-two books which the Jews admitted and which Protestants receive, according to him, to be the fountains of salvation—the infallible source of religious truth.||

* *Κεχρηται δ' εν αυτοις και ταις απο των αντιλεγμενων γραφων μαρτυριας. της τε λεγομενης Σολομωντος σοφιας, και της Ιησου του Σιραχ, και της προς Εβραιους επιστολης, της τε Βαρναβα και Κλεμεντος και Ιουδα. Eusebii Pamphili Historiae Eccles. lib. vi. 13.*

† *Huc usque Divinæ Scripturæ Hebræorum Annales temporum continent. Ea vero quæ posthæc apud eos gesta sunt, exhibeo de Libro Maccabæorum, et Josephi, et Africani scriptis.—Euseb. Chron. 1, 2, juxta versionem S. Hieron.*

‡ *Ων ου καθ' ημιν δυνατων εξακριβαζεσθαι τα γινητω, μηδε φερεσθαι θειαν βιβλον εξ εκεινου. και μεχρι των τοι Σωτηρος χρονων. Euseb. Demon. Evang. Lib. viii.*

§ *Et miror quosdam, &c., cum et origines et Eusebius et Apollinarius alii- que Ecclesiastici viri et Doctores Græciæ has visiones non haberi apud Hebræos fateantur, nec de debere respondere Porphyrio pro his quæ nullam scripturæ sacræ auctoritatem præbeant.—S. Hier. Præm. Com. in Daniel.*

|| Athanasius as above.

Betwixt the Synod of Nice and Jerome, we have a succession of distinguished writers, Epiphanius, Hilary, Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, and Amphilochius, together with the Council of Laodicea, all, as we shall subsequently see, concurring, not in the rejection of Judith only, but of the whole Apocrypha, from any pretensions to canonical authority. None seem to have known or ever to have heard that any such event took place at Nice as Jerome says had been somewhere read to have happened. Is it credible, that if Nice had canonized Judith, all of these writers, some of whom were members of the body, should have been profoundly ignorant of the fact? How comes it that not one of them has alluded to it, but that all have spoken as if no such event had ever taken place? I cannot better express this argument than in the words of a distinguished papist, Lindanus, the Bishop of Rurmonde:* “If the Nicene Council held the book of Judith and the other books of that rank to be canonical, why did the Council of Laodicea, eighty years afterwards, omit it? And why did Nazianzen make no mention of it? St. Hierome seems to me to speak as one that *doubted* of it, unless a man might think

* Si enim Nicena synodus librum Judith cum aliis in canonem redegerat, cur annis 80, post eum non accensit Laodicea? Cur Nazianzenus ejus non meminit? sed legitur computasse (ait Hieronymus) qui mihi dubitantis suspicionem subindicare videtur. Nisi fortasse quis opinetur hunc de libris canonicis Nicenum canonem una cum plurimis aliis, minimum (uti equidem arbitror) 47. Teste Divo Julio primo Romano; hæreticorum fraude fuisse accisum, atque subiectum Ecclesiæ. Cui ne suffragemur, cogit pia de sanctissimis patribus in concilio Laodiceno congregatis, existimatio. Non illos ea ætate, qua canonum scientia imprimis ornabat Episcopos, tam fuisse sui et nominis et officii oblitos, ut illos aut nescierint, aut desideratos non requisierint. Ad hæc si vere legitur quod ait Hieronymus legi, librum Judith, concilium Nicænum inter canonicas computasse; quid sibi vult quod idem præfatione in libris salomonis scribit. Ecclesiam libros Judith, Tobix, Maccæbeorum legere quidem, sed inter canonicas scripturas non recipere, huc usque Lindanus dubitantes instar, subjungit definientes more, verum nihil hac de re in concilio Niceno fuisse definitum, ut existimem invitat quod hunc Laodicenum de scripturis canonicis canonem, una cum reliquis, synodus Constantinopolitana sexta in Trullo approbarit, quod minime videtur fuisse factura, si designatum à 318, illis patribus Nicenis doctissimus juxta ac sanctissimis Laodicensi aut non recipissent, aut decurtassent sacrarum scripturarum canonem.—*Rainoldus de Libris Apocryphis, Prælectio. xv.*

that this and many more decrees besides, which the Council of Nice made, were afterwards pared away from it by fraudulent heretics: whereunto I cannot give my consent for the religious honor that I bear to the fathers of Laodicea, who in that age, when Bishops knew the canons of the church best, and when it was their great commendation to be skilful in them, could not be so far negligent, both of their credit and their duty, as neither to know them if they were extant, nor to seek after them if they were lost. Besides, if that were true, which, St. Hierome says, was read of the Book of Judith, that the Nicene Fathers took it into the canon, how shall we construe that which he writes in his preface before the books of Solomon, ‘that though the church indeeds reads the history of Judith and Tobit, &c., yet it doth not receive them into the number of Canonical Scripture?’ But that the Nicene Council determined nothing in this matter, I am the rather induced to believe, for the Sixth General Council at Constantinople approved the canon of Laodicea, which it would never have done, if the Fathers that met there had either rejected or mutilated the canon of Nice.”

The reasoning of the Bishop, coupled with the considerations which have already been adduced, seems to be conclusive. The first General Synod of the Christian church, whatever other folies it was permitted to perpetrate, was kept, in the merciful providence of God, from corrupting those records of eternal truth from which its sublime and memorable creed may be most triumphantly deduced. A pure faith has nothing to apprehend from unadulterated Scriptures.

II. It is unnecessary to notice what you have said of the Provincial Synod at Alexandria, held in the year 339, or of the General Council at Constantinople, convened in 381. The principles of criticism, which have been repeatedly developed in the course of this discussion, furnish an abundant explanation of the real value of the quotations on which you have relied. In regard to Gregory Nazianzen, in particular, through whom you have represented the Council of Constantinople as endorsing the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, I shall have occasion, hereafter, to show, that you have been grossly seduced into error. His testimony is clear and explicit, for the Jewish canon; and if he

has quoted—as I am willing to admit that he has done—if he has quoted the Apocrypha as Scripture, or Divine Scripture, this fact only strengthens the position that such expressions were generic terms, comprehending the entire department of religious literature whether inspired or not.

III. I come now to the Councils of Hippo and Carthage, which, as their testimony on this subject is one, I shall treat as one; and as my object is not to puzzle but convince, I shall take no advantage of the difficulties which press the Roman Doctors in determining which of the Carthaginian Councils it was that enacted the famous decree touching the canonical books of Scripture. That decree is usually printed in the collections, as the forty-seventh canon of the third Council of Carthage, held in the year 397, and, so far as the writings of the Old Testament are concerned, is in these words: * “Moreover it is ordained that nothing beside the canonical Scriptures be read in the church under the name of Divine Scripture; and the canonical Scriptures are these: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua the Son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Four Books of the Kingdoms, two Books of Chronicles, Job, David’s Psalter, Five Books of Solomon, the Books of the Twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Two Books of Esdras, Two Books of the Maccabees.”

Now the question is, what are we to understand by the phrase, “canonical Scriptures,” as used in this decree? If it is synonymous with *inspired* Scriptures, then indeed you have produced a witness that the Apocrypha are entitled to Divine authority. If, on the other hand, it means something else, something quite distinct from *inspired* Scripture, then

* Item placuit, ut præter scripturas canonicas, nihil in ecclesia legitur sub nomine divinarum scripturarum. Sunt autem canonicæ scripturæ, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, Jesus Nave, Judicum, Ruth, Regnorum libri quatuor, Paralipomenoni libri duo, Job, Psalterium Davidicum, Salomonis libri quinque, libri duodecim Prophetarum, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Esdræ libri duo, Machabæorum libri duo. Novi autem Testamenti Evangeliorum libri quatuor, Actuum Apostolorum liber unus, Pauli apostoli epistolæ tredecim, ejusdem ad Hebræos una, Petri apostoli duæ, Joannis apostoli tres, Judæ apostoli una, Jacobi una, Apocalypsis Joannis liber unus.—*Concilium Carthagin.* iii. cap. 48.

your cause, condemned by the voice of three centuries, is left without even the African protection which you had vainly hoped to find in the close of the fourth. Nay, if it could be proved that the Council of Carthage intended in this canon, to enumerate the books which were held to be inspired, the only protection which Rome could receive from it is the "protection which vultures give to lambs." It is as much the interest of Papists as of Protestants to find a meaning which, without doing violence to the terms that are employed, shall be consistent with itself, and with the known opinions of the age, and at the same time exonerate the fathers from the charge of ignorance, folly, and wickedness, to which, if it was their purpose to draw up a list of the writings that had been given by inspiration of God, they are in some degree exposed. It cannot be denied that they were foolish, ignorant, and wicked, if they pronounced any book to be inspired without sufficient evidence; and it is equally indisputable that no such evidence could have been possessed in behalf of any work which the Church, in every age before and after this provincial Synod, has concurred in rejecting as Apocryphal. And yet a book which, in the papal editions of the Bible, is placed, by authority, *extra seriem canonicorum librorum*, which has evidently no claims to inspiration, and which the Christian world, according to the showing of Romanists themselves, has never received as the word of God, is inserted by Carthage in its list of canonical books. Who can believe, who can even conceive, that it was the intention of the Fathers to outrage the sentiments of the rest of Christendom, and to incur the awful malediction of those who add to the words of Divine Revelation? To have perpetrated a deed of this sort, amid the light with which they were surrounded, a light so bright, that it has penetrated even to the darkened chambers of the papacy, would have manifested a degree of impiety and blasphemy, which we cannot attribute to a body of which Augustine was a member. You, however, in the interpretation which you have given of their forty-seventh canon, have charged it upon them. It is susceptible of the clearest proof, that the two books of Esdras, which they have mentioned in their list, include the *third*. What, in the

Latin, Bellarmin himself admits,* is denominated the *third* book of Esdras, is, in the Greek copies of the Bible, entitled the first. What is, in the Latin, the *first* and *second*, constitute in Greek but *one* volume, and are styled the *second* book of Esdras. So that, according to the Greek numeration, the first and second books of Esdras comprehend the *Apocryphal third*. Bellarmin has again informed us,† that at the time when the Council of Carthage was convened, the universal Church used that translation of the Bible which Jerome was accustomed to call the Vulgate, and which was made from copies of the Septuagint, including the additions of the Hellenistic Jews. Hence, the Bibles of the Fathers at Carthage, under the name of *two books* of Esdras, embraced not only Nehemiah and Ezra, but that very *third* book of Esdras which Rome declares to be Apocryphal.‡ Now

* Nec minor est difficultas de lib. iii. Esdræ ; nam in Græcis codicibus ipse est, qui dicitur primus Esdræ, et qui apud nos dicuntur primus et secundus, in Græco dicuntur secundus Esdræ. Quo eirea versimile est, antiqua concilia et patres, cum ponunt in canone duos libros Esdræ, intelligere nomine duorum librorum omnes tres. Sequebantur enim versionem septuaginta interpretum, apud quos tres nostri duo libri Esdræ nominantur.—*Bellar. de Verbo Dei*, lib. i. cap. 20.

† Utebatur autem eo tempore universa Ecclesia libris sacris juxta eam editionem, quam S. Hieronymus præsertim in librum Esther, et sæpe alibi, vulgatam appellare solet, quæ, ut ipse ait, Græcorum lingua et literis continetur.—*Bellar. de Verbo Dei*, lib. i. cap. 7.

‡ As the following extract so ably refutes Bellarmin's evasions, the reader, I hope, will excuse its length :—

Potest autem id videri falsum, Augustinum scilicet et Carthaginensi concilium adnumerasse tertium Esdræ canonicis, cum duos tantum ejus libros in canone consignando nominent, sed si penitus introspicere volueritis, sub duorum nomine tertium quoque comprehendi intelligeris. Quod ut vobis planum fiat, principio notandum secus collocari libros Esdræ in Græca editione quam in Latina. Qui enim Latinis tertius, is est Græcis primus, qui Latinis primus et secundus, ii Græcis in unum volumen compinguntur, cui nomen Esdræ quod vero primum et secundum Esdræ unum Græci numerent, ut Hieronymus docet, inde fieri id potuit, quia Hebræi sic numerant. Quod tertium Esdræ præfigant, inde videtur effectum, quia ille liber historiam paulo alius repetit. Fuisse autem primum Græcis, qui est Latinis tertius, manifestum est, quod si teste opus sit, fidem faciat Athanasius, qui in enumeratione librorum duos Esdræ nominat, priorem cujus initium est, et obtulit Josias Pascha, etc., et posteriorem, cujus initium esse dicit in anno primo Cyri, Regis Persarum, etc., quæ duo cum sint

my argument is briefly this: if the Carthaginian Fathers intended to settle the canon of inspiration, they were guilty of great folly and wickedness; but the character of the men, particularly of Augustine, shows that they were not liable to such a

initia terti et primi libri, clarissimum inde est, tertium ab eo primum numeratum, secundum et primum ut secundum. Nam in quod Latinis Athanasii exemplaribus in margine adscripsit nescio quis (atqui hoc principium est capituli trigesimi quinti paralipomenon) per imperitatem factum est. Non enim animadvertit ille quisquis fuit, eadem verba exordiri tertium Esdræ, sed animadvertere id debuerat, atque errorem suum corrigere ex eodem capite, ubi Athanasius agens de primo Esdræ, enumerat ea prope omnia, quæ sunt in tertio Esdræ, adscripsit autem ille idem (ut videtur) hæc haberi capite tertio et quarto libri secundi.

Id eo modo observatum est in Græcis Bibliorum editionibus; nominatum in ea quæ Venetiis ex Aldi officina exivit, ubi cum duo tantum habeantur libri Esdræ, primus exorditur, quomodo noster tertius, secundus iisdem plane verbis, quibus Latina editio primum Esdræ inchoat. Ita manifestum est et antiquitas Athanasii tempore, et ab ejus seculo in Græcis editionibus veteris. Testamenti duobus Esdræ libris tertium comprehendit. In quo obiter notandum, doctissimos viros Franciscum Vatablum, Franciscum Junium, et Franciscum Lucam, eo parum animadverto, existimavisse tertium Esdræ Græce non extare. Vatablus quidem tertium Esdræ Græce nec sibi contigisse dicit videre, nec cuiquam quod sciat alteri. Quomodo etiam Junius, Heræ libros duos, neque Hebræice, neque Græce vidi (inquit ille) aut fuisse visos memini legere. Franciscus Lucas, paulo asseverantius tertium Esdræ nullo alio sermone extare ait præterquam Latino. In quam ille opinione inductus erat eo, quod neque in complutensibus exemplaribus, neque in Bibliis sequitur Nehemiam, sed in eam partem rejicitur, ubi Apocryphi ponentur. Hoc tandem Lucas vidit, et agnovit, et confessus est se deceptum, etc., sed quod ad rem præsentem facit, affirmat ibi Lucas, tertium Esdræ Latinorum, esse primum Græcis. Atque hoc est, quod primum observatum volui, proximo loco animadvertere deletis Augustinum et patres Carthaginenses in canone consignando, et alios in disputationibus fuit translatione Latina e Græca 70, editione versa, uti consuevisse, quod ipse planum facit ubi citato illo loco. Et formavit Deus hominem pulverem de terra: subjungit, sicut Græci codices habent, unde in Latinam linguam scriptura ipsa conversa est. Manifestius autem id dicit, ubi rem ex professo disputat. Nam cum fuerint (inquit Augustinus) et alii interpretes, etc., hanc tamen, quæ septuaginta est, tanquam sola esset, sic recipit Ecclesia, eaque utuntur Græci populi Christiani, quorum plerique utrum alia sit aliqua ignorant. Ex hac 70, interpretatione etiam in Latinam linguam interpretatum est, quod Ecclesiæ Latinæ tenent, quamvis non defuerit temporibus nostris presbyter Hieronymus homo doctissimus, et omnium trium linguarum peritus, qui non ex Græco, sed ex Hebræo in Latinum eloquium easdem scripturas convertit, ac qui sequuntur. Ex ut disertis verbis Augustinus

charge; therefore, they *did not intend* to determine the canon of inspired books.

This conclusion is confirmed by the fact, that the decree itself was conditional; the church beyond the sea, as we gather

tinus non solum se usum illa Septuaginta interpretum versione significat, sed et eam perinde quasi sola esset, ab Ecclesia receptam, et Ecclesiam Latinam, quod tenet id ex illa interpretatione tenere, adeo ut quamvis, Augustini temporibus Hieronymus summa fide ex Hebraicis fontibus converteret, Ecclesia tamen præferret eam editionem, quæ ex Græca 70. Latina facta est. Id quod et loco superiore docuit Augustinus, et præcipue in Epistolis, ubi ad Hieronymum sic scribit. Ego sane te malle Græcas potius canonicas nobis interpretari scripturas, quæ 70, interpretum autoritate perhibentur. Perdurum erit enim, si tua interpretatio per multas Ecclesias frequentius ceperit lectitari, quod à Græcis Ecclesiis Latinæ Ecclesiæ dissonabunt, etc., et alibi petit a Hieronymo, ut interpretationem suam Bibliorum e 70, mittat. Ideo autem (inquit) desidero interpretationem tuam de 70, ut et tanta Latinorum, qui qualescunque hoc ausi sunt, quantum possumus imperitia careamus: et hi qui me invidere putant utilibus laboribus tuis, eandem aliquando si fieri potest, intelligant, propterea me nolle tuam ex Hebræo interpretationem in Ecclesiis legi. Ne contra Septuaginta auctoritatem, tanquam novum aliquid proferentes, magno scandalo perturbemus plebes Christi, quarum aures et corda illam interpretationem audire consueverunt, quæ ab apostolis approbata est. Denique in libris de Doctrina Christiana, vult ille Latinos codices veteris testamenti, si necesse fuerit, Græcorum auctoritate emendandos et eorum potissimum, qui cum 70 essent, ore uno interpretate esse perhibentur, etc., locus consulatur. Neque vero hæc Augustinus solum luculente testatur, sed et reliqui scriptores, qui in eum commentarios scripserunt, vel de eo loquuti sunt. In quibus Ludovicus vires in præfatione comment, ait Augustinum versionem 70, interpretum ubique adducere. Et in ipsis commetariis ostendit (inquit) olim Ecclesias Latinas usas interpretatione Latina ex 70, versa, non hac Hieronymi, ut mirer esse qui tantum nefas existiment translationes attingi, modo sobrie ac prudenter fiat.

Sixtus Senensis duas fuisse docet in Ecclesia Latinas editiones V. T. novam scilicet ac veterem. Vetus decidem (inquit ille) vulgatæ et communis nomen accepit, tum quia nullum certum haberet auctorem, tum quia non de Hebræo fonte, sed de *κοινη*, vel de Septuaginta interpretatione sumpta esset, quem admodum August 18, De Civit. Dei, c. 43, et Hieronymus in præfatione Evangeliorum testantur, cujus lectione usa est Ecclesia longe ante tempora Hieronymi, ac etiam multo post, usque ad tempora Gregorii Papæ. Nova vero a Hieronymo non de Græca, sed de Hebraica veritate in Latinum eloquium versa est: qua Ecclesia usque, ab ipsis Gregorii temporibus, una cum veteri editione usa est. Utriusque enim Gregorius in præfatione moralium meminit, inquit: Novam translationem deferro, sed cum probationis causa me exigit, nunc veterem, novam pro testimonio assumo: ut quia sedes Apost. cui aut hore Deo præ-

from an ancient note, was to be consulted for its confirmation. The Council of Carthage, then, received the books mentioned in its list as canonical, provided the transmarine churches would

fideo utraque utitur, mei quoque labor studii ex utroque fulciatur. Hæc apud Sixtum, unde liquet longe ante tempora Hieronymi, ad usque Gregorium, (quasi ad 600 annos) in usu fuisse translatione Latinam e Græca 70. Adeoque recte colligi Augustinum et Carthageniensis concilii patres editionem illam Græcam 70, sequutos esse. Quid quod Bellarminus ipse hoc agnoscit, veteres sequutos esse versionem septuaginta? apud quos (inquit) qui nobis Esdræ tertius est, fuit primus, siccine? quomodo ergo te expedies e laqueo rationis nostræ? conatur ille quidem expedire se, sed hæret ut mus in pisa. Majorem revera ait esse difficultatem de tertio, Esdræ quam de quarto. Sed respondet, etsi duo libri Græcorum sint nostris tertius, non tamen sequi patres antiquos cum duos Esdræ in canone ponant, nostras tres intellexisse, quid ita? quatuor nimirum rationes adhibet e quibus pleræque non attingunt nostram sententiam, certe nullæ labe factant.

Prima ratio hæc est. Quia Melito, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Hieronymus, Ruffinus, aperte sequuti sunt Hebræos, qui tertium Esdræ non agnoscunt, quid tum? Ergone Augustinus cum duos Esdræ accenseat, non intellexit nostras tres? quia scilicet. Melito, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Hieronymus, Ruffinus, aperte sequuti sunt Hebræos. Ergo Augustinus non est sequutus editionem Græcam Septuaginta? perinde ratiocinatur ac si quis diceret Socrates, Plato, veteres academici vocarunt Deum ideam boni, etc. Ergo ac Aristoteles et Peripateticorum schola sic vocavit, si nondum appareat hujus rationis infirmitas, at facimile apparebit in ratione simtli quam adjungam. Melito, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Hieronymus et Ruffinus rejecerunt e canone sacrarum Scripturarum libros Sapientiæ, Ecclesiastici, Tobiaë, Judith, etc., ergo et Augustinus hos rejecit, et concilium Carthaginensi, hæc nisi ratio firma sit, videtis quam infirma sit altera.

Secunda Bellarmini ratio ea est a precibus publicis et usu Ecclesiastico officii. Quia jam diu nihil legitur ex illo libro in officio Ecclesiastico, quid inde? An ergo Augustinus cum duos Esdræ libros in canone numeraret, non intellexit nostras tres? aut Augustini tempore a patribus Carthaginensibus non habebatur tertius Esdræ in canonicis? perinde hoc est ac si quis ita ratiocinetur. Exulat jam diu papatus ex Anglia, ergo Henrici VI. tempore exulavit. Imo absurdior illa ratio quam hæc, quo proprius abfuit ab ætate nostra Henrici VI. Regnum, quam Augustini temporæ, cum ille ab hinc non ultra 100 annos floruerit, ab Augustino ultra 1000 effluerint, quo temporis decursu multa mutari poterant, Bellarminus enim ipse fatetur, Augustini tempore monachos tonderi solitos fuisse, suo vadi, potuit tamen simili ratione uti. Jamdiu in usu fuit, ut rede-rentur monachi, ergo August. tempore non solebam tonderi.

Sed fortasse tertia ratio subtilior, que ab auctoritate Gelasii ducitur. Is namque unum tantum Esdræ librum in canone ponit, id est (inquit Bellar.) nostros uos, optime, conceditur enim, postea rem penitus introspicimus, et videbi-

consent. Surely it could not mean that these books are *inspired*, provided the transmarine churches will agree that they are so. The evidence of their inspiration was either complete to the Council, or it was not. If it was complete, they were bound, as faithful ministers of Christ, to say unconditionally and absolutely that these books belong to the rule of faith. Under such circumstances, to have enacted a conditional decree, was treason against truth, and impiety to God. Why consult the church beyond the sea, in regard to a matter which was unquestioned and notorious? If, on the other hand, the evidence was not complete or satisfactory, in regard to the inspiration of the books, why make a canon, until doubts were settled, and difficulties resolved? If the object of appealing to the transmarine churches was to obtain more light, why did the Fathers undertake to act until the light had been supplied? It cannot be pretended that their intention was to procure the confirmation of the Holy See. It is not the Pope alone, nor a general Council that they proposed to consult—it was the *church* beyond the sea—*transmarina ecclesia*—the Bishop of Rome, or the other Bishops of those parts, and if every Bishop and Doctor connected with this church, with Boniface himself at their head, had been assembled in council, and had given their decision, their voice would have been only the voice of a *Provincial Synod*, and, therefore not entitled to be received, according to your doctrine, as the infallible dic-

mus utrum unum ille tantum numeret. Interim concedant Gelasium, qui vixit centum annos post Aug. et Carthag. Conc. unum tantum Esdræ lib. in canone posuisse, quid vero hoc ad August. et Carthag. patres? An deinde illi non numerarunt duos? an duorum nomine nostros tres non significarunt? Quid ni ergo sic ratiocinent M. Crassus partib. optimatum favit, ergo C. Marius non fuit popularis? Hæc argumenta si in nostris scholis supponerentur, credo viderentur a pueris, verum cum superuntur á Jesuitis, quodam ni fallor κρυψέως artificio insolubilia habebuntur.

Verum enim vero fortassis artificio Rhetorum firmissimam rationem postremo loco reservavit. Ea erit palmaria. Namque Hieronymus (inquit Bellarminus) aperte docet, tertium Esdræ non modo non apud Hebræos haberi, sed neque apud Septuaginta. An id aperte docet Hier.? eo certe delapsus esse Bell. miror, consulite Hieron, (videbitis eum non modo aperte docere, quæ ei affingit Bellar.: sed nec omnino, imo contrarium statuere, qui consensu antiquorum, qui testimoniis, e tertio Esdræ persæpe usi, postea mihi pluribus erit confirmandum.)—*Rainoldus, de Libris Apocryphis, Prælectio xxviii.*

tate of the Holy Ghost. The conduct of the Carthaginian Fathers, in passing a conditional decree, if their design was to settle the canon of inspiration, is wholly inexplicable. They virtually say, we have satisfactory evidence that these books are inspired, and yet it is not satisfactory. Such egregious trifling cannot be imputed to them, and therefore, some interpretation must be evidently put upon the canon, which shall justify their appeal to a foreign church.

No better way is left us of arriving at a just conception of this matter, than by considering the testimony of Augustine, who was himself a member of the Council, and who may be presumed to have known the real intentions of the body. His opinions may be taken as a true exponent of the opinions of the African church. This illustrious advocate of the doctrines of grace, has given us a list of the canonical Scriptures which coincides precisely with the catalogue of Carthage;* and yet there is abundant proof that several of the books which are mentioned in his list, Augustine *did not believe* to be inspired.

* Totus autem canon Scripturarum, in quo istam considerationem versandum dicimus, his libris continetur. Quinque Moyseos, id est Genesi, Exodo, Levitico, Numeris, Deuteronomio; ac uno libro Jesu Nave, uno Judicum, uno libello qui appellatur Ruth, qui magis ad Regnorum principium videtur pertinere; deinde quatuor Regnorum et duobus Paralipomenon, non consequentibus, sed quasi a latere adjunctis simulque pergentibus. Hæc est historia, quæ sibimet annexa tempora continet, atque ordinem rerum: sunt aliæ tamquam ex diverso ordine, quæ neque huic ordine, neque inter se connectuntur, sicut est Job, et Tobias, et Esther, et Judith, et Machabæorum libri duo, et Esdræ duo, qui magis subsequi videntur ordinatam illam historiam usque ad Regnorum vel Paralipomenon terminatam deinde prophetæ, in quibus David unus liber Psalmorum, et Salmonis tres, Proverbiorum, Cantica Canticorum, et Ecclesiastes. Nam illi duo libri, unus qui Sapientia, quæ alius qui Ecclesiasticus inscribitur, de quodam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur: nam Jesus Sirach eos conscripsisse constantissime perhibetur, quoniam in auctoritatem recipi meruerunt, inter propheticos numerandi sunt. Reliqui sunt eorum libri, qui proprie prophetæ appellantur, duodecim prophetarum libri singuli, qui connexi subinet, quoniam nunquam sejuncti sunt, pro uno habentur: quorum prophetarum nomina sunt hæc, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michæas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachias: deinde quatuor prophetæ sunt majorum voluminum, Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Ezechiel; his quadraginta quatuor libris; Testamenti veteris terminatur auctoritas.—*S. Augustini Episcopi de Doctrina Christiana*, lib. ii. cap. 8.

In the twenty fourth chapter of the seventeenth book of his *City of God*, he remarks* “that in all the time after their return from Babylon, till the days of our Saviour, the Jews had no prophets after Malachi, Haggai, and Zechariah, who prophesied at that time, and Ezra; except another Zachariah, father of John, and his wife Elizabeth, just before the birth of Christ; and after his birth, old Simeon and Anna, a widow of a great age; and John last of all.” Again,† “From Samuel the prophet to the Babylonish Captivity, and then to their return from it, and the rebuilding of the Temple after seventy years, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah, is the whole time of the Prophets.” To ascertain his idea of a prophet and of a prophetic composition, let us turn to the thirty-eighth chapter of the eighteenth book of the same treatise.‡ It is there stated as a probable explanation of the fact, that some books which were written by prophets were excluded from the canon, “that those to whom the Holy Spirit was accustomed to reveal what ought to be received as authoritative in religion, wrote some things as *men* of historic investigation, and others as Prophets, of Divine inspiration: the two were kept distinct that the former might be attributed to the men themselves, the latter to God, who spoke through the prophets.” A prophet, then, is a person “to whom

* *Toto autem illo tempore, ex quo redierunt de Babylonia, post Malachiam, Aggorum et Zachariam, qui tum prophetarunt et Esdras, non habuerunt prophetas usque ad Salvatoris adventum, nisi aliam Zachariam patrem Johannis, que Elisabet ejus uxorem, Christi nativitate jam proxima; et eo jam nato, Simeonem senem, et Annam viduam jamque grandævam et ipsam Johannem novissimum.—S. Augustini Episcopi de Civitate Dei, lib. xvii. cap. 24.*

† *Hoc itaque tempus, ex quo sanctus Samuël prophetare cœpit, et deinceps donec populus Israël captivus in Babyloniâ duceretur, atque inde secundum sancti Jeremiæ prophetiam post septuaginta annos reversis Israëlitis Dei domus instauraretur, totum tempus est Prophetarum.—Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. xvii. c. 1.*

‡ *Cujus rei, fateor causa me latet; nisi quod estimo, etiam ipsos, quibus ea quæ in auctoritate religionis esse debent, sanctus utique spiritus revelabat, alia sicut homines historica diligentia, alia sicut prophetas inspiratione divina scribere potuisse; atque hæc ita fuisse distincta, ut illa tanquam ipsis, ista vero tanquam Deo per ipsos loquenti, judicarentur esse tribuenda ac sic illa pertinerent ad ubertatem cognitionis, hæc ad religionis auctoritatem.—Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. c. 38.*

the Holy Spirit is accustomed to reveal what ought to be received as authoritative in religion"—he is a man who speaks by "Divine inspiration," and does not depend upon his diligence and industry for the truths which he communicates. He is not merely an individual who foretells the future,—he may write a history, but he must depend for his facts, not upon historical research, but the instructions of the Spirit. In other words, Augustine plainly treats prophet and inspired man as terms of equivalent extension. When, therefore, he says, that from Ezra to Christ, no prophet appeared among the Jews, he unquestionably means that the gift of inspiration was withdrawn, and that, consequently, no works written during that period were entitled to be received as of authority in religion. Now it is notorious that a large portion, if not all, of the Apocrypha was written during this very period, in which, as it is piteously lamented in the Maccabees, "a prophet was not seen among them." Therefore, according to Augustine, *a large portion of the Apocrypha is not inspired.*

In addition to this, there are several passages in his works, in which he evidently treats the Hebrew canon as complete. In his commentary on the fifty-sixth Psalm,* he observes, "that *all the books* in which Christ is the subject of prophecy, were in the possession of the Jews: we bring our documents from the Jews that we may put other enemies to confutation: the Jew carries the book from which the Christian derives his faith. The Jews are our librarians." Again, he says, in another dissertation: † "The Jews are the escritoirs of Christians, containing the law and the prophets, which prove the doctrines of the church." And in another place he expressly says that the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms comprehended "all the canonical authorities

* Propterea adhuc Judæi sunt, ut libros nostros portent ad confusionem suam. Quando enim volumus ostendere paganis prophetatum Christum, proferimus paganis istas litteras. Quia omnes ipsæ litteræ, quibus Christus prophetatus est, Judæos sunt, omnes ipsas literas habent Judæi, proferimus codices ab inimicis, ut confundamus alios inimicos. Codicem portat Judæus, unde credat Christianus librarii nostri facti sunt.—*Aug. in Psa. lvi.*

† Et quid est aliud hodie que gens ipsa Judæorum, nisi quædam seriniaria Christianorum, bajulans legem et prophetas ad testimonium assertiones Ecclesiæ.—*Aug. lib. xii. contra Faust, cap. 13.*

of the sacred books.”* It is notorious however, that the Jews rejected the Apocrypha—that these were documents which they refused to carry, and if Augustine received as inspired no other works but those which were acknowledged by the Hebrew nation, it is demonstrably certain, that he could not have admitted any part of the Apocrypha into the sacred canon. We may come down, accordingly, to particular books, and show that some of them are, by him, expressly and unequivocally excluded. The book of Judith, he informs us, possessed no canonical authority among the Jews.† Of the Maccabees he says,‡ “The Jews do not receive the Scripture of the Maccabees, as they do the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to which our Lord bears testimony. But it is received by the Church not unprofitably, if it be read and heard soberly, especially for the sake of the history of the Maccabees, who suffered so much from the hand of persecutors, for the sake of the Law of God.” Whatever the reception was, which the church gave to these books, Augustine justifies it, not on account of their Divine authority, but chiefly or especially on account of the moral tendency of the history. It is plain that he could not have regarded them as inspired, since their inspiration would have been the strongest of all possible reasons for receiving them. We defer to the instructions of an inspired composition, not because its lessons are useful, but we know that its lessons must be useful because it is inspired. Speaking, in another place, of these same books, he says,§ “The account of these

* Demonstrant Ecclesiam suam in prescripto Legis, in Prophetarum predictis, in Psalmorum Cantibus, hoc est, in omnibus canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus.—*Aug. de Unit. Eccl.* c. 15.

† Per idem tempus etiam illa sunt gesta, quæ conscripta sunt in libro Judith, quem sane in canone Scripturarum Judæi non recepisse dicuntur.—*Aug. de Civ. Dei.* lib. xviii. c. 26.

‡ Et hanc Scripturam, quæ appellatur Macchabæorum, non habent Judæi, sicut Legem et Prophetas et Psalmos, quibus Dominus testimonium perhibet; sed recepta est ab ecclesia non inutiliter, si sobrie legatur et audiatur, maxime propter illos Macchabæos, qui pro Dei lege, sicut veri martyres, a persecutoribus tam indigna atque horrenda perpessi sunt, &c.—*Contr. Gaudent. Donat.* 1, i. cap. 31, n. 38. T. ix.

§ Quorum supputatio temporum non in scripturis sanctis, quæ canonicæ appellantur, sed in aliis invenitur, in quibus sunt et Macchabæorum libri, quos non Judæi, sed Ecclesia pro canonicis habet, propter quorundam Martyrum pas-

times is not found in those *holy Scriptures which are called canonical*, but in other works, among which also are the books of the Maccabees which the Jews do not, but which the church does, esteem to be canonical, on account of the violent and extraordinary sufferings of certain Martyrs, who, previously to the advent of Christ in the flesh, contended even unto death for the Law of God, and endured grievous and horrible calamities." Here again these books are canonical among Christians, *not because they are inspired*, but on account of the examples of heroic martyrdom with which they are adorned. The language of this passage is remarkable. The Maccabees are first carefully distinguished from those Divine Scriptures which are called canonical, and then it is immediately added that the church receives them as canonical. Here, then, is either a contradiction, (for it is preposterous to limit the first clause so as to make Augustine assert that these books did not belong to the Scriptures called canonical by the Jews—his words are absolute and general,) or the term canonical is used in two distinct and separate senses, in one of which it might be universally affirmed that the Maccabees were not canonical; in the other, that they were canonical in the Christian, though not in the Jewish Church. I might also show, but I do not wish to protract the argument, that Augustine rejected Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom from the list of inspired compositions.*

If, as we have seen, Augustine did not receive the Apocrypha as any part of the Word of God, what did he mean by *canonical Scriptures* in the catalogue to which we have already referred? I answer, without hesitation, *books which might be profitably read in the churches for the public instruction of the faithful*.

That *some* of the ancient churches had a canon of reading distinct from the canon of inspired writings, may be gathered from the testimony of Athanasius, Jerome, and Ruffinus. The passage from Athanasius is quoted in another part of this discussion. Jerome says,† "As, therefore, the church reads the books *siones vehementes atque mirabiles, qui ante quam Christus venisset in carnem usque ad mortem pro Dei lege certaverunt, et mala gravissima atque horribilia pertulerunt.*—*Aug. de Civ. Dei*, lib. xviii. c. 36.

* See Cosin's Scholastical Hist. Canon under Augustine.

† Sicut ergo Judith, et Tobie, et Macchabæorum libros legit quidem Ec-

of Judith, Tobias, and Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so also it reads these two volumes (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus) for the edification of the people, but not for authority to prove the doctrines of religion." Ruffin says,* "It ought, however, to be known, that there are also other books which are not canonical, but have been called by our forefathers, ecclesiastical; as the Wisdom of Solomon, and another which is called the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, and among the Latins is called by the general name of Ecclesiasticus: by which title is denoted, not the author of the book, but the quality of the writing. In the same rank is the book of Tobit and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees. In the New Testament is the book of the Shepherd, or of Hermas, which is called the Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter. All which they would have to be read in the churches, but not to be alleged by way of authority, for proving articles of faith."

Now the preface to Augustine's catalogue shows conclusively that he was not answering the question, what books were inspired, but another question, what books might be read.† He first di-

clesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit, sic et hæc duo volumina (Sapientiam et Ecclesiasticum) legit ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.—*Hieron. Præfat. in. Libros Salomonis.*

* Secundum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt, qui non canonici, sed Ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt, ut est sapientia Salomonis, et alia sapientia, quæ dicitur filii Sirach. Ejusdem ordinis est libellus Tobix, et Judith, et Maccabæorum libri. In Novo vero Testamento libellus, qui dicitur Pastoris sine Hermatis, qui appellatur Duæ Viæ, vel judicium Petri; quæ omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam.—*Ruffin. in Symbolo ad Calcem Cypriani. Oxon. p. 26.*

† Erit igitur Divinarum Scripturarum solertissimus indagator, qui primo totas legerit, notasque habuerit, et si nondum intellectu, jam tamen lectione, dum laxat eas quæ appellantur canonicæ. Nam ceteras securius leget fide veritatis instructis, ne præoccupent imbecillum animum, et periculosas mendaciis atque phantasmatis eludentes, præjudicent aliquid contra sanam intelligentiam. In canonicis autem Scripturis Ecclæsiarum Catholicarum quam plurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illæ sint, quæ Apostolicas sedes habere et Epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in Scripturis canonicis, ut eas quæ ab omnibus accipiuntur Ecclesiis Catholicis præponat eis quas quædam non accipiunt: in eis vero quæ non accipiuntur ab omnibus præponat eas quas plures graviioresque accipiunt, eis quas pauciores minorisque auctori-

vides the Divine Scriptures into two general classes : those which were, and those which were *not* canonical, and gives the general advice, that he who would make himself skilful in the Scriptures, should confine his reading to those which were canonical. Then *he draws a distinction between the canonical books themselves*, and shows that some, even of this class, were entitled to much more deference and respect than others. He directs his diligent inquirer, “to prefer such as are received by all catholic churches, to those which some do not receive ;” and with regard to such as are not received by all, he advises him “to prefer those which are received by many and eminent churches, to those which are received by few churches, and of less authority.” Now, Trent itself being witness, *all* inspired Scripture is entitled to equal veneration and respect. No matter if every church under heaven should agree to reject it, the obligation, supposing its inspiration to be known, would still be perfect to receive and obey it. Its authority does not depend upon the numbers who submit to it, but upon the proofs that it came from God. These proofs can neither be increased nor diminished by the multitude or paucity of those who are convinced by them. If they should be confined to a *single* church, and that church should proclaim them to a faithless world, the world would be as strongly bound to listen and believe, as though a thousand sees had joined in the act. From the nature of the case, evidence perfectly conclusive of their Divine inspiration must, in regard to some of the Epistles, have existed, at first, only in a single congregation ; and even while other churches had not yet received them, their authority was just as perfect and complete as it afterwards became, when all Christendom confessed them to be Divine. It is consequently preposterous to measure the authority of inspired Scripture by the number, dignity, and importance of the churches that acknowledge its claims. But if the question be, what books, in the estimation of those who are competent to judge, may be safely read for practical improvement, then the rule of Augustine

tis Ecclesiæ tenent. Si autem alias invenerit a pluribus, alias a gravioribus haberi, quamquam hoc facile invenire non possit, æqualis tamen auctoritatis habendas puto.—*Aug. de Doctrina Christ.* lib. ii. c. 8.

is just and natural. You must inquire into the experience of the Christian world, if you wish to ascertain the works which God has eminently blessed to the comfort, holiness, stability, and peace of his chosen children. It seems, as we gather from Augustine's Preface, that there were works in circulation under the title of Divine Scriptures, abounding in falsehoods perilous to the soul, which could not, therefore, be read with safety or with profit. In contradistinction from these *dangerous* books, those which might be read with security and advantage, were pronounced to be canonical, and his whole purpose was to furnish a catalogue of *safe religious* works, in order to guard against the hazard and detriment to which the minds of the ignorant and unskilful would be otherwise exposed. By canonical, therefore, he means nothing more than useful or expedient as a *rule* of life. The word will evidently bear this meaning. It is a general term, and, in itself considered, expresses no more than what is fit to be a rule, without any reference to the authority which prescribes it, or the end to which it is directed. In its application to the inspired Scriptures, it conveys the idea of an authoritative rule or standard of faith, simply because they *can* be a rule of no other kind. But there is nothing in the nature of the term itself, which prevents it from being used to signify a *rule* for the conduct of life, collected either from the experience of the good, the observation of the wise, or the reasoning of the learned. In this sense, an uninspired composition may be eminently canonical—it may supply maxims of prudence for the judicious regulation of life, which, though they are commended by no divine authority, are yet the dictates of truth and philosophy, and will be eagerly embraced by those who are anxious to walk circumspectly, and not as fools. We do no violence, then, to the language of Augustine, when we assert that by canonical books, which he opposes to those that were dangerous and deceptive, he meant books which were calculated to edify by the useful rules which they furnished, without any reference to the sources, whether supernatural or human, from which they were derived.

This interposition is strikingly confirmed by the grounds on which, as we have already seen, Augustine admitted the Maccabees to be canonical. It also reconciles the apparent contradiction, when

in the same sentence he declares them to be and not to be canonical. They are not canonical in the same sense in which the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms were canonical, but they were canonical in a subordinate sense, as stimulating piety by praise-worthy examples.

Having ascertained the opinions of Augustine, we are now prepared to inquire into the meaning of the Council of Carthage. It seems from the testimony of Ruffinus, that the African Churches were accustomed to read other books for the public instruction of the faithful, such for instance, as the Shepherd of Hermas, beside those which were held to be inspired. As many works were published under fallacious and deceitful titles, and were current under the name of Divine Scriptures, it was thought proper, in order to guard the Churches against every composition of this kind, to draw up a list containing all the works which might be safely and profitably read. To furnish a catalogue of this sort was, I apprehend, the sole design of the forty seventh canon. And for the purpose of securing uniformity in the public worship of God, it was wise and judicious to consult the churches beyond the sea. This interpretation, which the language will obviously bear, saves the council from the folly, wickedness and disgrace of pronouncing the third book of Ezra to be inspired, and of contradicting the testimony of all the past ages of the Church on the subject of the sacred canon. That this was the meaning, is distinctly intimated in the very phraseology of the Council itself. "It is ordained that nothing but the canonical Scriptures be *read* in the church, under the name of Divine Scriptures." It is not said, nothing shall be received as *inspired* by the faithful, but nothing shall be *read*. Then in the close of the canon, as if to put the matter beyond the possibility of doubt, it is added: "For the confirmation of this canon, our brother and fellow priest Boniface, or the other bishops of those parts, will take notice *that we have received from our fathers these books to be read in the churches. The sufferings of the martyrs may also be read when their anniversaries are celebrated.*"* This paragraph

* Item placuit, ut præter Scripturas canonicas, nihil in Ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum, sunt autem canonicæ Scripturæ, Genesis, Ex-

explains the decree. We see from Athanasius, Jerome, and Rufinus *what* they received from the fathers: and they expressly incorporate uninspired legends, the sufferings of the martyrs, among the books that may be read, showing that their object was to regulate the public reading of the church, and not to determine the canon of inspiration.

This, accordingly, is the interpretation which distinguished Romanists have themselves put upon the language of the Council. Cardinal Cajetan, at the close of his commentary on the historical books of the Old Testament, observes: * “ And here we close our commentaries of the historical books of the Old Testament. For the others (Judith Tobit and Maccabees) are not reckoned by St. Jerome among the canonical books, but are placed among the Apocryphal, together with Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, as is plain from the Prologus Galeatus. Let not the novice be disturbed if, in other

odus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, Jesus Nave, Judicum, Ruth, Regnorum libri quatuor, Paralipomenon libri duo, Job, Psalterium Davidicum, Salomonis libri quinque, libri duodecim Prophetarum, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Esdræ libri duo, Maccabæorum libri duo. Novi autem Testamenti, Evangelicorum libri quatuor, Actuum Apostolorum liber unus, Pauli Apostoli Epistolæ tredecim, ejusdem ad Hæbreos una, Petri Apostoli duæ, Johannis Apostoli tres, Judæ Apostoli una, et Jacobi una, Apocalypsis Joannis liber unus.

Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro Bonifacio, vel aliis earum partium Episcopis pro confirmando isto canone, innotescat, quia a patribus ista accipimus in Ecclesia legenda. Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur.—*Coun. Carth.* iii. c. 47.

* Et hoc in loco terminamus commentaria Librorum Historialium V. T. Nam reliqui (viz., Judith, Tobia, et Maccab. libri,) a S. Hieronymo extra canonicos libros supputantur, et inter Apocrypha locantur, cum libro Sapientiæ, Ecclesiastico, ut patet in prologo Galeato. Nec turberis, Novitie, si alicubi repereris libros istos inter canonicos supputari, vel in sacris conciliis, vel in sacris Doctoribus. Nam ad Hieronymi limam reducenda sunt tam verba conciliorum, quam Doctorum; et juxta illius sententiam ad Chrom. et Heliod. Episcopos, libri isti (et si qui alii sunt in canone Bibliæ similes) non sunt canonici, hoc est, non sunt Regulares ad firmandum ea quæ sunt Fidei; possunt tamen dici canonici, hoc est, Regulares ad ædificationem fidelium, utpote in canone Bibliæ ad hoc recepti et authorati. Cum hoc enim distinctione discernere poteris et dicta Augustini in 2 de Doctr. Christiana, que scripta in Conc. Flor. sub Eug. 4, scripta que in provincialibus Conciliis Carthag. et Laodic. et ab Innocentio, ac Gelasio Pontificibus.—*Cajetan in lib. Esther*, sub finem.

places, he should find that these books were counted among the canonical, either by holy councils or holy doctors. For to the rule of Jerome, the words as well of councils as of doctors must be reduced. And according to his opinion, these books and all similar ones in the canon of the Bible, are not canonical, that is, are not regular (or to be used as a rule) for confirming articles of faith: though they may be called *canonical*, that is, regular (or may be used as a rule) for the edification of the faithful, and are received and authorized in the canon of the Bible only for this end:" and with this distinction, he informs us, we are to understand St. Austin and the Council of Carthage. So that, upon the showing of one of the Trent doctors—a man who was reputed to be the very prince of Theologians—the Council of Carthage makes nothing in your favor. It was not treating of the canon of inspiration, but of the canon for public reading.*

III. Passing over your citations from Pope Siricius and Julius Firmicus Maternus as presenting nothing worthy of a reply, I shall make a few remarks upon Ephrem the Syrian, † *the Prophet of the whole world and the Lyre of the Holy Ghost*. That he has *quoted* the Apocrypha, admits of no question—that he believed them to be inspired, is quite a different matter, and one, in reference to which you have produced not a particle of proof. There are two facts, however, which you have thought proper to pass without notice, that create a very strong presumption, if they do not amount to a positive proof, against the position which you have undertaken to sustain. 1. Ephrem repeatedly asserts that Malachi was the *last of the prophets*. † Therefore no books written subsequently to his time, could have been inspired; and therefore nearly the whole of the Apocrypha must be excluded from the canon.

* See Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiast.* lib. xiv. c. 3, § 16.

† *Judæorum sacrificia prophetæ declarant immunda fuisse. Quæ ergo Esaias hoc loco hominum canumve cadaveribus æquiparat, Malachias, Prophetarum ultimus, animalium retrimenta vocat, non offerenda Deo, sed offerentium in ora cum approbatione rejicienda.* (Malach. ii. 3.)—*Comment. in Es.* lxvi. 3, T. ii. Syr. p. 94. C. D. Malachias, omnium Prophetarum postremus, populo commendat legem, et legis coronidem Joannem, quem Eliam cognominat.—*Comm. in Malach.* iv. 4, *ib.* p. 315, c.

2. Ephrem, though he commented upon *all* of the canonical, wrote no commentary upon *any* of the Apocryphal books.* Why does he omit Baruch, in commenting upon Jeremiah; and why omit the Song of the Three Children, the story of Susannah, and the story of Bel and the Dragon, if he believed that these works were *parts* respectively of Jeremiah and Daniel, and entitled to equal authority with the rest of the books? Asseman informs us † that the corrupt additions to Daniel were not contained in the vulgar Syriac Bible, though they were subsequently added from Greek copies, and your own citations abundantly prove that they were known to Ephrem. He must, therefore, have passed them over by *design*. His references to them show that he held them to be historically true, and practically useful. Why, then, sever them, in his commentaries, from the books to which they were generally attached, and of

* Hebedjesu Chaldæus, e Nestorianorum secta Episcopus Solensis, in catalogo Scriptorum Syrorum, num. 51. Ephræmi opera enumerat, his verbis: Ephræm magnus, qui Syrorum Propheta cognominatus est, edidit commentaria in libros Genesis, Exodi, Sacerdotum, (Levitici,) Josui filii Nun, Judicum, Samuelis, (primum et secundum Regum), in Librum Regum (tertium et quartum), Davidis, (Psalmorum), Isaïæ, Duodecim, (minorium Prophetarum, Jeremiæ, Ezechielis, et Beati Danielis. Habet etiam Libros, et Epistolas de Fidei, et Ecclesia. Edidit quoque Orationes Metricas, Hymnos, et Cantica: Cantusque omnes Defunctorum: et Lucubrationes ordine Alphabeticæ: et Disputationem adversus Judæos: nec non adversus Simonem, et Bardesanem, et contra Marcionem, atque Aphitas: demum solutionem impietatis Juliani. Ubi Hebedjesu ea dumtaxat Ephræmi opera recenset, quæ ipse legit, vel ad manus habuit. Nam Ephræmum alia plura edidisse, quam quæ hic numerantur, certum est ex auctoribus supra relatis, et ex codice nostro Syriaco iii. in quo habentur commentaria ejusdem in numeros, in Deuteronomium.—*Assem. Biblio. Orien.* vol. i. p. 58.

† Quæ D. Hieronymus ex Theodotione transtulit Danielis capita, nimirum Canticum trium puerorum, cap. 3, a vers. 24, ad vers. 91, Historiam Susannæ, Bel idol, et Draconis, atque Danielis in locum leonum missi, cap. 14, ea et Ephræm Hebræcum Textum sequutus, in hisce commentariis tacitus præterit. Hæc enim in vulgata Syrorum versione haud extabant; licet postea ex Græcis exemplaribus in sermone Syriacum a recentioribus Interpretatibus conversa fuerint.—*Assem. Biblio. Orien.* vol. i. pp. 72.

And yet Gregory Nyssen, as cited by Asseman, tom. i. pp. 56, says that Ephrem commented upon the *whole Bible!* Could these additions to Daniel, then, have been a part of it?

which they were supposed to be a part? I know of but one answer that can be given, and that is, *that he followed the Hebrew canon.*

IV. Your appeal is just as unfortunate to the great Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea. Several of your citations are taken from that portion of the Treatise against Cunomius which is not universally admitted to be genuine. The last two books have been called into question. Still, upon the principles which have been repeatedly explained, the strongest quotations which you have been able to extract from the writings of this father, do not establish the divine authority of those books of the Apocrypha which he chose to accommodate. We have, however, positive evidence that he admitted as inspired only the books which were acknowledged by the Jews. In the Philocalia, or hard places of Scripture, collected by him and Gregory Nazianzen, out of Origen's works, he proposes the question,* "Why were only twenty-two books divinely inspired?" He then goes on to tell us that, "as twenty-two letters (the number of the Hebrew alphabet) form the introduction to Wisdom, so twenty-two books of Scripture are the basis and introduction of Divine wisdom and the knowledge of things."

Again, in the second book against Cunomius, having quoted the passage in the eighth chapter of Proverbs, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his days," Basil observes † that, "It is *but once* found in all the Bible," as Eusebius had done before. And yet, if Ecclesiasticus is a part of the Bible, the statement is false, for substantially the very same thing is declared in the ninth verse of the twenty-fourth chapter of Ecclesiasticus. In fact, Bellarmin has represented Basil ‡ as quoting it in the fifth book against Eunomius, from Ecclesiasticus, and

* Quare 22 Libri Divinitus inspirati? Respondeo, quoniam in numerorum loco, &c. Neque enim ignorandum est quod V. T. libri (ut Hebræi tradunt) viginti et duo, quibus æqualis est numerus Elementorum Hebræorum, non absint ut enim 22 Literæ introductio ad sapientiam, etc., ita ad sapientiam Dei, et rerum notitiam fundamentum sunt et Introductio Libri Scripturæ duo et viginti.—*Philoc.* c. 3, as quoted by Cosin.

† *Ἀπαξ ἐν πᾶσις ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰρηται· Κύριος ἐκτίσε με.* *S. Bas. Adv. Eunom.*

‡ Bellar. de Ver. Dei. lib. i. c. 14.

because the Father there attributes it to Solomon, the Jesuit has inferred that he ascribed the Wisdom of Sirach to the Monarch of Israel. It is plain, however, that Basil had reference to Proverbs, and Proverbs only.

V. Your next witness is Chrysostom, who, you have succeeded in proving, held the Apocrypha to be Scripture, and, if you please, Divine Scripture; but you have nowhere shown that he believed them to be inspired. On the contrary, he himself affirms in his homilies on Genesis,* that “all the inspired books of the Old Testament were originally written in the *Hebrew tongue*.” How many of those in dispute were written in this language? Again, in another place,† he acknowledges no other books but those which Ezra was said to have collected, and which were subsequently translated by the seventy-two Elders, acknowledged by Christ, and spread by his apostles. But, according to your own account of the matter, Ezra collected only the books which the Jews received. Therefore Chrysostom admitted none but the *Hebrew canon*. If he sometimes quoted Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, or any other books of the Apocrypha, as the word of God, it is evidently in the same loose way, and on the same principle on which these works were ascribed to Solomon or others of the ancient prophets. Their sentiments were approved, and their doctrine supposed to be consistent with Scripture.

VI. In regard to Ambrose, bishop of Milan, all that I shall say is, that the same process of argument by which you would make him canonize the books that Rome acknowledges, will also make him canonize a book which Rome rejects, which, according to Sixtus of Sienna, no father had ever received, and which, according to Bellarmin, is disfigured with idle fables—the dreams of Rabbins and Talmudists.

* Πασαι αι θειαι βιβλοι της παλαιας Διαθηκης τη Εβραιων γλωττη εξ αρχης εσαν συντεθειμεναι, και τιστο παντες αν ημιν συνομολογησαιεν. *Chrys. in Genes. Hom. 4.*

† Ετερις παλιν ανδρι θαυμαστιη ενεπνευσεν, ωστε αυτας εκθεσθαι, τω Εσδρα λεγω, και απο λειψανων συντεθηνηι εποιητε. Μετα δε τουτο ωκονομησεν ερμηνευθηναι αυτας επι των εβδομηκ ν-α' ηρμηνευταν εκεινοι. Πυργενοτο ο Χριστος, δεχεται αυτας, οι αποστολοι εις παντας αυτας διασπειρουσι, σημεια εποιητε και θαυματα ο Χριστος. *Chrys. in Hebr. Hom. 8.*

His language is just as strong, pointed, and precise, in reference to the fourth book of Esdras, as it is in reference to Tobit, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, or Judith. In his book *de Bono Mortis*, having quoted the thirty-second verse of the seventh chapter of the fourth book of Esdras, Ambrose adds in the next chapter ;* “ We do not fear that end due to all, in which Esdras finds the reward of his devotion—God saying to him, &c.,” and again, “ Esdras *revealed* according to the *revelation imparted* to him,” and still again, “ Who was the elder, Esdras or Plato? For Paul followed the sayings of Esdras and not of Plato.” Now if Ambrose could treat Esdras as a prophet, who received a revelation to be communicated to others, and yet not really believe him to be inspired—if his language, in this case, must be understood in a subordinate and modified sense, why not understand him in the same way when he applies a similar phraseology to the other books of the Apocrypha? Ambrose, if *strictly* interpreted, proves too much even for the Jesuits. They are obliged to soften his expressions, and in doing so, they completely destroy the argument by which they would make him canonize the books which Trent has inserted in the Sacred Library. As to his quoting Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus under the name of Solomon, that proves nothing, since he has distinctly informed us † that Solomon was the author of only three books, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles.

VII. It is unnecessary to dwell upon your citations from Paulinus of Nola, as they involve only the same argument which has been so frequently refuted, and the testimony of Augustine, your last witness, has been abundantly considered already.

* Non vereamur illum debitum omnibus finem, in quo Esdras remunerationem suæ devotionis invenit, dicente ei Domino. Quis utique prior, Esdras, an Plato? nam Paulus Esdræ, non Platonis sequutus est dicta. Esdræ revelavit secundum collatam in se revelationem, justos futuros cum Christo, futuros et cum sanctis.

† Unde et Salomonis tres libri ex plurimis videntur electi: Ecclesiastes de naturalibus, Cantica Canticorum de mysticis, Proverbia de moralibus. *In Ps.* xxxvi. pr. t. i. p. 777. Quid etiam tres libri Salomonis, unus de Proverbiis alius Ecclesiastes, tertius de Canticis Canticorum, nisi trinæ hujus ostendunt nobis Sapientiæ sanctum Salomonem fuisse solertem?—*In Lucam*, pr. t. i. p. 1262, A.

It now remains to sum up the result of this whole investigation. You undertook to prove that Rome was not guilty of arrogance and blasphemy in adding to the word of God—in other words, you undertook to prove that the Apocrypha *were inspired*. For this purpose you brought forward *four* arguments, which I shall collect in the syllogistic form.

1. The first was, Whatsoever Rome, being infallible, declares to be inspired, must be inspired.

Rome declares that the Apocrypha are so.

Therefore, the Apocrypha must be inspired.

In a series of Essays I completely and triumphantly refuted the major, so that this argument, which was the key-stone of the arch, fell to the ground.

2. Your second was, Whatsoever books Christ and his apostles quoted, must be inspired.

Christ and his apostles quoted the Apocrypha.

Therefore the Apocrypha must be inspired.

Both premises of this syllogism were proved to be false, so that *it* is not only dead, but *twice* dead, plucked up by the roots.

3. Your third was, Whatever books were incorporated in the ancient versions of the Bible, must be inspired.

The Apocrypha were so incorporated.

Therefore the Apocrypha must be inspired.

The major was shown to be without foundation, and contradicted by notorious facts.

4. Your fourth and last was, Whatever the Fathers have quoted as Scripture, Divine Scripture, &c., must be inspired.

They have so quoted the Apocrypha.

Therefore the Apocrypha must be inspired.

Here again the major was shown to be false, as these were only general expressions for religious literature, whether inspired or human. The result, then, of the whole matter is, that in three instances your conclusion is drawn from a single premiss, and in one case from no premises at all. Upon this foundation stand the claims of the Apocryphal books to a place in the canon.

LETTER XIX.

The real Testimony of the Primitive Church.—The Canons of Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Gregory Naz., Jerome, Ruffinus, Council of Laodicea.

HAVING now shown that Rome has utterly failed in producing a particle of proof in favor of her adulterated canon, I proceed to vindicate my original assertion, that, for four centuries, the unbroken testimony of the Christian church is against the inspiration of the Apocryphal books. During all that period there is not only no intimation of what you have asserted to be true, that Christ and his apostles delivered them to the faithful as a part of the divine Rule of Faith, but there is a large amount of clear, positive, and satisfactory evidence that no such event could possibly have taken place.

The testimony of the primitive church presents itself to us under two aspects: It is either negative, consisting in the exclusion of the disputed books from professed catalogues of Scripture; or positive, consisting in explicit declarations on the part of distinguished Fathers, that they were not regarded as inspired. These two classes of proof I shall treat promiscuously, and adduce them both in the order of time.

I. Little more than half a century after the death of the last of the apostles, flourished MELITO, bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches to which John, in the Apocalypse, was directed to write. Such was the distinguished reputation which this good man enjoyed, that Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, says of him that he was guided in all things by the Holy Ghost; and Tertullian not only praises "his elegant and oratorical genius," but adds that "he was esteemed by many as a prophet." The recorded opinions of such a man, living near enough to the times of the apostles to have conversed with those who had listened to the divine instructions of John, though not to be received as authority, are certainly evidence of a very high character. It so happens, in the providence of God, that we have a catalogue of the sacred books drawn up by him for his friend Onesimus, which he professes to have made with the utmost accuracy,

after a full investigation of the subject. I shall suffer him to speak for himself. “Melito sends greeting to his brother Onesimus. Since in thy zeal for the word, thou hast often desired to have selections from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and the whole of our faith, and hast also wished to obtain an *exact statement* of the ancient books, how many they were in number, and what was their arrangement, I *took pains to effect this*, understanding thy zeal for the faith, and thy desire of knowledge in respect to the word, and that, in thy devotion to God, thou esteemest these things above all others, striving after eternal salvation. Therefore, having come to the East and arrived at the place where these things were preached and done, and *having accurately learned the books of the Old Testament*, I have subjoined a list of them and sent it to thee. The names are as follows: of Moses, five books: namely, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy: Joshua, son of Nun, Judges, Ruth: four books of kings, two of Chronicles, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, and Job: of Prophets, the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, writings of the twelve prophets in one book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra, from which I have made selections, distributing them into six books.”*

This testimony, you inform us,† “corroborates the fact,”

* Μελιτων Ονησιμῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαιρεῖν· ἐπειδὴ πολλακίς ἐξίσσας σπουδῇ τῇ πρὸς τὸν λόγον χρωμένος γενεσθαι σοὶ ἐκλογάς, ἐκ τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ σωτήρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν. ἐτι δε καὶ μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλιῶν ἐβουλήθης ἀκριβείαν, ποσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ ἔργια τὴν ταξίν εἶεν, ἐσπουδάσα το τοιαυτὸ πράξαι, ἐπισταμένος σοὺ το σπουδαῖον περὶ τὴν πίστιν, καὶ φιλομαθὲς περὶ τὸν λόγον. οὐτι τε μάλιστα πάντων ποθεῖ τῷ πρὸς θεὸν ταῦτα προκρίνεις, περὶ τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας ἀγωνιζόμενος· ἀνελθὼν οὖν εἰς τὴν ἐνατολήν, καὶ εἰς τοῦ τοποῦ γενομένος· ἐνθα ἐκηρυχθῆ καὶ ἐπραχθῆ, καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τα τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία ὑποτάξας ἐπέμψα σοὶ· ὧν ἐστί τα ὀνόματα· Μωϋσῆως πεντε· Γενεσίς, Ἐξόδος, Λευιτικόν, Ἀριθμὸν, Δευτερονόμιον· Ἰησοῦς Νῆψ, Κριταί, Ρουθ· Βασιλείων τεσσαρά, Παρალიπομένων δύο. Ψαλμῶν Δαβὶδ, Σολομῶνος Πυροίμια, ἠ καὶ Σοφία, Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἄσμα Ἄσματων, Ἰωβ· Προφητῶν, Ἡσαίου, Ἰερμεῖον· τῶν δώδεκα ἐν μονοβιβλίῳ, Δανιηλ, Ἰεζεκιηλ, Ἐσδρας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ ἐκλογῶς ἐποιήσαμην, εἰς ἐκ βιβλία διελών. *Melito's Letter to Onesimus*, Euseb. B. iv. c. 26.

† “His testimony corroborates the fact, otherwise clearly proven, that at his day the practice of the Christian world was at variance with the opinion which he advanced.”—A. P. F., Lett. xiii.

that in the age of Melito, "the practice of the Christian world was at variance with the opinion which he advanced." In other words, I understand you to assert, that the Epistle itself furnishes satisfactory proof, that at the period in which it was written, a different canon of the Old Testament was generally received from that which is presented in it. But, sir, in what part of the letter can this corroborating evidence be found? Melito evidently writes with the confidence of a man who knew that he was possessed of the truth. He professes to give an exact statement of the names, number, and arrangement of the sacred books, and nowhere does he drop the most distant hint that opposing sentiments were held upon the subject, or that any other works had ever been commended by any portion of Christendom as entitled to equal veneration with those which he had enumerated. How then does "his testimony corroborate the fact, that at his day the practice of the Christian world was different from the opinion which he advanced?" Will the reader believe it? * Because he investigated the subject and formed his conclusion from personal examination, it is confidently inferred that the whole matter must previously have been involved in uncertainty or doubt. Sir, you have forgotten your chronology. That was an age of private judgment: the Son of Perdition had not then enslaved the understandings of men. Priestly authority was not received as a substitute for light, and the mere dicta of ghostly confessors were not regarded as the oracles of God. The easy art of believing by proxy, which must always result in personal damnation, was then wholly unknown. Tremblingly alive to the importance of truth, and deeply impressed with the dangers of delusion, the faithful of that day felt the responsibility that rested upon them to "try the spirits, to prove all things, and hold fast that which was good." Hence Melito determined to be guided

* "Melito, according to his own statement, came to the conclusion set forth in his letter, after he had travelled into Palestine, and had there investigated the question. From this we are forced to infer, that he had not been taught in his youth at Sardis, and that it had not been made known to him, even in his maturer years, while he was a priest, and perhaps the Bishop of that church. It was precisely by his inquiries in Judea that he was led to the opinion which he finally adopted."—*A. P. F.*, Lett. xiii.

only by evidence ; and, acting in obedience to the apostolic injunction, wisely resolved to investigate the subject, and to form his opinions upon accurate research. He accordingly visits the country whence the Gospel had sprung, traverses the region where Jesus had labored, converses with the churches in which apostles had taught, and ascertained the books on which they were relying for the words of life.

As you are perfectly confident, however, that the testimony of Melito, commended as it is by his diligence and care, must be worthless because it is unfavorable to the interests of Rome, you invent three hypotheses,* by means of one of which you hope to obviate its natural result. It was either his object, according to you, to publish the canon of the churches in Palestine, or to give that of the Jewish Synagogue, or to express his own private opinion that Christians should receive no other books of the Old Testament but those which were acknowledged by the Jews. If mere conjecture is to settle the matter, it is just as easy to make a fourth supposition ; that his real design was to compare the faith of Asia and Palestine, and to give the canon of the Christian world, so far as he was able to ascertain what it was. Let us, however, test the value of your three evasions.

1. If it were the object of Melito to state the books which the churches of Palestine believed to be inspired, we may regard it as settled that they received none but those which are contained in his list. Then, of course, *they* rejected the Apocrypha. Now these churches were planted by the hands of the Apostles, they were the first fruits of the Christian ministry, and here, if any where, we should expect to find an accurate knowledge of the books which the Apostles had prescribed as the rule of faith. Strange, very strange, if within sixty years after the last of the sacred college had fallen asleep, so little regard was paid to their instructions in the scene of their earliest labors, that six entire works, together with divers fragments of others,

* " If on the other hand, Melito, disregarding the practice of the church, even in Palestine, and, seduced by peculiar views on the authority and sanctions of the Jewish canon, as opposed to the usage of the church, intended in his letter to give us the Books contained in the Jewish canon, manifestly his testimony does not touch the point before us at all."—*A. P. F.*, Lett. xiii.

had been ruthlessly torn from the inspired volume, as delivered to these churches by their venerable founders! To say, as you have done, * that the Apostles, in tenderness to their early prejudices, permitted the Hebrew Christians to retain the canon of the Jewish church, to the exclusion of the Apocrypha, is to contradict what you have elsewhere said, that the Jews themselves entertained a profound respect for the disputed books, and would have admitted them into their sacred library, if they had had the authority of a prophet. These Jewish *prejudices*, consequently, are a desperate expedient, invented solely for the purpose of reconciling the notorious faith of the churches in Judea, with what Rome chooses to represent as Apostolic teaching. You tell us in one breath that the Apostles delivered the Apocrypha to the primitive Christians as inspired, and then in the very next, declare that they did not deliver them to the churches in Judea, because the stiff-necked children of Abraham would not receive them. But when the question was, Did the Jewish Church reject the Apocrypha, from the sacred canon, we were then informed that this was not the case—that it was a great admirer of the contested books, and would cheerfully have received them, if it had been commissioned by a proper tribunal. It is certainly not a little singular that the Jews should be so warmly attached to the books as to be willing to canonize them upon sufficient authority, and yet so violently prejudiced against them, that the whole College of Apostles could not subdue their opposition. I have no knack at explaining riddles, and must therefore leave these high mysteries to those who can swallow transubstantiation. In the meantime I may be permitted to remark that the Apostles were not in the habit of surrendering truth to prejudice; and if the churches of Palestine knew nothing of their having endorsed the Apocrypha as inspired, the presumption is irresistible, that no such thing ever took place. What

* “The fact that a small portion of the universal church, converts from Judaism, should cling to the observances of those ancestors whom they revered, and whom every hill and dale recalled to their minds, does not condemn other churches which, untrammelled by any such restrictions, unswayed by any such motives, walked boldly under the guidance of the Apostles.”—*A. P. F.*, Lett. xiii.

they preached to the Gentiles, they preached first to the Jews; and as to all the world they had proclaimed one Lord and one baptism, so they had likewise proclaimed only one faith.

2. Your second hypothesis, that Melito intended to state the canon of the Jewish synagogue, and not of the Christian churches, is contradicted by his own words. How could the zeal of Onesimus in the faith be an inducement to give him only a part of its standard; and how would he be assisted in acquiring knowledge, by being led into serious error? Onesimus desired an *exact statement* of the Books of the Old Testament. But according to you, Melito furnishes him only with those books which the Jews received, and consequently omitted an important portion of the whole Old Testament. Yet Melito himself says that he had fully complied with the request of his friend. So that either your supposition must be false, or the good Bishop, who, Polycrates says, was guided in all things by the Holy Ghost, was guilty of a falsehood.

3. Your third hypothesis, that he only intended to express his private opinion in opposition to the prevailing practice of the church, as to the books which *ought* to be received, hardly deserves a serious notice. That a man should travel from Sardis to Jerusalem, to ascertain the documents which the Apostolic churches held to be inspired; then give the result of his inquiries with the strongest expression of confidence, when his conclusions were notoriously at variance with the faith of the churches on which he had relied—in other words, that he should entertain so much respect for the opinion of the Hebrew and Eastern churches, as to make a long journey for the purpose of consulting them, and after all pay no attention to their opinions at all, is a proposition too monstrous to be deliberately maintained. I do not deny that Melito has given us his private opinion, but I do deny that he has given an opinion peculiar to himself. His own statement is certainly worthy of credit—his object was to give, (and he professes to have done it,) an exact account of the names, number, and arrangement of the books of the Old Testament. He fabricated no new canon for himself, but recorded the books, and all the books, which the churches of the East believed to be inspired. From Jerusalem to Sardis, consequent-

ly, in all the churches planted by Apostles, there was but one voice, about the middle of the second century, as to the documents which compose the Old Testament; and that voice which may almost be regarded as a distant echo of the preaching of the twelve, condemns the canon of Trent.

As to the objection that Melito has omitted the Book of Esther, I reply in the words of Eichhorn :* “ It is true,” says he, “ that in this catalogue Nehemiah and Esther are not mentioned; but whoever reads the passage and understands it, will here discover both of them. Melito here arranges the books of the Old Testament manifestly according to the time in which they were written, or in which the facts which they record, occurred. Hence he places Ruth after the book of Judges, Daniel and Ezekiel towards the end of his catalogue, and Ezra last of all, because he wrote after the Babylonian captivity; and accordingly as he comprehended the Books of Samuel and Kings under the general appellation Books of Kings, because they related to the history of the Hebrew kingdom from Saul to Zedekiah, or until the Babylonian captivity, in the same manner he appears to comprise under the name of Ezra all historical books, the subjects of which occur in the times subsequent to the Babylonian captivity. As it is very common to include Ezra and Nehemiah in one book, why might not even Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, also have been regarded as a whole? If we add to this conjecture, that Nehemiah and Esther, according to Josephus, must have been parts of the canon, and that Fathers of authority, such as Origen and Jerome, expressly ennumerate both in it, no impartial inquirer can well doubt that even Melito does not reject from the canon of the Old Testament the two books mentioned.”

To this it may be added that, according to any of your three hypotheses which have just been considered, Esther must have been included. If Melito intended to state the canon of the Hebrew Christians, and that, as you have said, coincided with the canon of the Jewish church, this book was confessedly a part. It was also acknowledged by the Jewish Synagogue, and any pri-

* Vide Eich. Einleit. xli.

† Vide Cosin, Scholast. Hist. Can. pp. 33.

vate opinions in opposition to the practice of the Christian church, which Melito might have been induced to form from his intercourse with the Jews, could not have led him to reject its authority. Your conjecture that he forgot to mention it, is, when we consider his pretensions to accuracy, wholly incredible. As therefore it must have been included, the account which Eichhorn has given of the matter is probably the true explanation. In this opinion he is sustained by Cosin, a man as learned as himself.

II. The next writer to whom I shall appeal, and you have pronounced his eulogy, is Origen. Eusebius says of him, that, “in expounding the first Psalm, he has given a catalogue of the sacred Books in the Old Testament, writing as follows.* “Let it not be unknown that the canonical books, as the Hebrews transmit them, are twenty-two; for such is the number of letters among them.” A little further on, he adds, “These are the twenty-two books of the Hebrews: the Book called Genesis with us, but among the Hebrews, from the beginning of the Book, Bereshith, which means, In the Beginning: Exodus, Valmoth, that is, These are the Names: Leviticus, Vaikra, And he Called: Numbers, Ammisphekodeum: Deuteronomy, Ellahhaddebarim, These are the Words: Jesus, the Son of Nave: Joshua Ben Nun: Judges, Ruth, with them united in one book called So-

* Τον μὲν τοιγε πρῶτον ἐξηγουμένος Ψαλμῶν, ἐκθεσιν πεποιηται (Ὠριγενῆς) τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης καταλογόν, ὡς πῶς γραφῶν κατὰ λέξιν· οὐκ ἀγνοητέον δ' εἶναι τὰς ἐνδιαθηκοὺς βιβλοὺς, ὡς Ἑβραῖοι παραδίδουσιν, δύο καὶ εἰκοσι· ὅσος ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς συγχεῖων ἐστίν· εἴτα μετὰ τινα, ἐπιφέρει λέγων. εἰσι δὲ αἱ εἰκοσι δύο βιβλοὶ κατ' Ἑβραίους αἰδέ· ἡ πύρα ἡμῶν Γενεσίς ἐπιγεγραμμένη. παρὰ δὲ Ἑβραίοις ἀπο τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς βιβλοῦ βρησιθ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀρχῇ· Ἐξόδος, οὐαλεσμῶθ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ ταῦτα τὰ ὀνοματὰ· Λευιτικόν, οὐιρι, καὶ ἐκαλεσῖν· Ἀριθμοὶ ἡμμεσφεκοδεῖμ Δευτερονόμιον, ἐλλε ἀδδεβαριμ. οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι· Ἰησοὺς υἱὸς Ναυη, Ἰωσὺε βεν Νουν· Κριταί, Ρουθ, παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐνὶ σῶφετιμ. βασιλείων πρῶτη, δευτερι, παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν Σαμουηλ, ὁ θεοκλήτος· βασιλείων τρίτη, τετάρτη, ἐν ἐνὶ οὐαμμελεχ Δαβιδ. ὅπερ ἐστὶ βασιλεία Δαβιδ. Παραλειπομένων πρῶτη, δευτέρα, ἐν ἐνὶ, διβρη αἰαμιμ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ λόγοι ἡμερῶν· Ἐσδρας πρῶτος καὶ δευτερός ἐν νι, Ἐζρα, ὁ ἐστὶ βοηθός· βιβλος Ψαλμῶν σέφερ θιλλιμ. Σολομῶντος Παροιμίαι μισλωθ, Ἐκκλησιαστής, κωελεθ· Ἄσμα Ἀσματων, σιρ ἄσσιριμ. Ἡσαιας, Ἰεσαια, Ἰερμίας συν Ἰερμιοῖς καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἐνὶ, Ἰερμια. Δανιηλ, Δανιηλ. Ἰεζεκιηλ, Ἰεζεκηλ. Ἰωβ. Ἐσθηρ, Ἐσθηρ. ἐξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκα, ἀπερ ἐπιγεγραπταὶ Σαρβηθ σαρβανε ἐλ. *Origen. Can. fr. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. vi. 25.*

phetim : Kings, first and second, with them, in one called Samuel, the Called of God : the third and fourth of Kings, in one book, Vahammelech Dabid, that is, the Kingdom of David : the first and second of Chronicles, in one book called, Dibre Hiamim, that is, the Records of Days : the first and second of Esdras, in one book, called Ezra, that is The Assistant : the Book of Psalms, Sopher Tehillim : the Proverbs of Solomon, Misloth : Ecclesiastes, Koheleth : the Song of Songs, Sir Hasirim : Esaias, Jesair : Jeremiah with the Lamentations and his Epistle, in one volume, Jeremiah : Daniel, Daniel : Ezekiel, Iesekell : Job, Job : Esther, Esther : beside these, there are also the Maccabees, which are inscribed Sarbeth Sarbaneel." In this catalogue the book of the twelve minor Prophets is omitted through a mistake of the transcriber. It is supplied both by Nicephorus and Ruffinus. By the Epistle of Jeremiah we are not to understand the apocryphal letter, for the Jews never received that as canonical, but the one which occurs in the twenty-ninth chapter of the book of his Prophecy.

Such then is Origen's catalogue, in which, although he has followed the Jews, for they are the only safe guides on this subject, he has given, according to Eusebius, "*the books in the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament.*" It is expressly stated that the Maccabees are *out of the Canon*; and of the other works in the Apocrypha, not a syllable is mentioned.

The Epistle to Julius Africanus upon which you have relied to make Origen contradict himself, does not assert the *Divine inspiration* of the story of Susannah, but vindicates it simply as a *historical narrative* from the charge of being a *fabulous imposture*. Africanus had asserted the book to be a fiction, grossly spurious, and utterly unworthy of credit. It was from this accusation that Origen defended it, and showed conclusively that some of the reasoning which his friend adopted, if carried out into its legitimate results, would sadly mutilate even the records which the Jews acknowledged. The church had permitted this story *to be read*, and Origen maintains its substantial authenticity, in order that the church might not be subject to the odious imputa-

* Vide Opera Origen, vol. i. pp. 10, seq.

tion of having given to her children fables for truth. Such books were recommended to the faithful, as valuable helps to their personal improvement. This was evidently done upon the supposition that the facts which they contained were worthy of credit ; and as this was, perhaps, the general belief, in which Africanus could not concur, Origen merely intended to prove that it was not at least without some foundation.

It is true that this Father has freely quoted the Apocryphal books under the same titles which are usually bestowed on the canonical Scriptures. So also has he quoted in the same way the spurious prophecy of Enoch, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Acts of Paul, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He has even gone so far, in reference to the Shepherd, as to say that this Scripture was, as he supposed, *divinely inspired*.* I cannot believe, however, that Origen intended to convey the idea that this mystical medley should be entitled to equal veneration with the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists. He simply meant to commend the heavenly and holy impulses under which, as he conceived, the work had been written. From incidental expressions of this sort, which are often nothing but terms of respect, we are not to gather the real position which, in the opinions of those who use them, a book is to occupy in relation to the canon of supernatural inspiration. There is nothing, consequently, to diminish the value or obviate the force of the plain and pointed testimony which Origen has given to the books of the Old Testament, in a formal catalogue in which they are professedly numbered and arranged.

III. I shall now give the canon of Athanasius, which may be found in his Festal Epistle.† “For I fear,” says he, “lest some

* Puto tamen, quod Hermas ista sit scriptor libelli illius, qui Pastor appellatur: quæ scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et ut puto, divinitus inspirata.—*Explan. Rom.* xvi. 14.

† Ἐπειδὴ περὶ τινῶν ἐπεχειρήσαν ἀναταξίσθαι ἑαυτοῖς τὰ λεγόμενα Ἀποκρυφὰ καὶ ἐπιμιξαι τὰυτὰ τῇ θεοπνευστῷ γραφῇ περὶ ἧς ἐπληροφόρηθῆμεν, καθὼς παρεδούσαν τοῖς πατράσιν οἱ ἀπ’ ἡμῶν αὐτοπαῖ καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενομένοι τοῦ λόγου· ἐδοξε ἡμῶν προτραπευτὶ παραγνησιῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαθοντῶν ἀνωθεν, ἐξῆς ἐκθεσθαι τὰ Κανὼν ἰκομένα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευσθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία· ἵνα ἕκαστος, εἰ μὲν ἠπατήθη, καταγνώσῃ τῶν πλανησαντων· οὐ δὲ καθαρὸς διαιμεῖνας χαιρῆ παλιν ὑπομιμησκομένος. Ἐτι τοίνυν τῆς μὲν παλαιᾶς διαθη-

few of the weaker sort should be seduced from their simplicity and purity, by the cunning of some men, and at last be led to make use of other books called Apocryphal, being deceived by the similarity of their names, which are like those of the true books. I therefore entreat you to forbear, if I write to remind you of what you already know, because it is necessary and profitable to the church. Now, while I am about to remind you of these things, to excuse my undertaking, I will make use of the example of Luke the Evangelist, saying also myself—' Forasmuch as some have taken in hand to set forth writings called Apocryphal, and to write them with the God-inspired Scripture in which we have full confidence, as they, who from the first were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, delivered them to the Fathers, it has seemed good to me, after consulting with the true brethren, and inquiring from the beginning, to set forth those books which are canonical, which have been handed down to us, and are believed to be Divine, so that every one who has been deceived may condemn his deceivers, and that he who remains pure may rejoice when again put in remembrance of these. All the books of the Old Testament are two and twenty in number; for, as I have heard, that is the order and number of the Hebrew letters. To name them, they are as follows: the first Genesis, the next Exodus, then Leviticus, after that the Numbers, and then Deuteronomy; after that Ruth; and again, the next in order, are the four books of the Kingdoms, of these the first and second are reckoned one book, and, in like manner, the third and fourth are one book; after them the first and

κης βιβλια τῷ ἀριθμῷ τὰ πάντα Εἰκοσιδύο. Ὅσαυτα γὰρ, ὡς ἤκουσα, καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα τὰ παρ' Ἑβραίοις εἶναι παραδέδοται. τῇ δὲ τάξει καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐστὶν ἕκαστον οὕτως· Πρῶτον Γενεσίς, εἶτα Ἐξόδος, εἶτα Λευιτικόν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο Ἀριθμοί, καὶ λοιπὸν τὴ Δευτερονομίον· ἐξῆς δὲ τούτοις ἐστὶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν Νανῆ, καὶ Κριταί. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ Ρουθ. Καὶ πάλιν ἐξῆς βασιλείων τεσσαρὰ βιβλία· καὶ τούτων τὸ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ δευτερον εἰς ἓν βιβλίον ἀριθμεῖ· τὸ δὲ τρίτον καὶ τετάρτον ὁμοίως εἰς ἓν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Παραλειπομένα α' καὶ β' ὁμοίως εἰς ἓν βιβλίον πάλιν ἀριθμουμένα· εἶτα Ἐσδρας α' καὶ β' ὁμοίως εἰς ἓν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα βιβλίος Ψαλμῶν, καὶ ἐξῆς Παροιμίαι. εἶτα Ἐκκλησιαστής καὶ Ἀσμα Ἀσμάτων. Πρὸς τούτοις ἐστὶ καὶ Ἰωβ, καὶ λοιπὸν Προφῆται οἱ μὲν δώδεκα εἰς ἓν βιβλίον ἀριθμουμένοι. εἶτα Ἡσαίας, Ἰερემίας καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Βαρουχ, Θρηνοί, καὶ Ἐπιστολὴ, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Ἐζεκὴλ καὶ Δανιὴλ. Ἀχρὶ τούτων τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης ἵσταται. *Athanas. Opp. tom. ii. p. 38.*

second of the Remains, or Chronicles, are in like manner accounted one book; then the first and second of Esdras, also reckoned one book; after them the book of the Psalms; then the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs; beside these there is Job, and at length the Prophets; the twelve are reckoned one book; then Isaiah and Jeremiah, and with him, Baruch, the Lamentations, the Epistle; and after them Ezekiel and Daniel. Thus far the books of the Old Testament." Having given the Canon of the New Testament, he proceeds: "For the sake of greater accuracy, I will add—and the addition is necessary—that there are also other books, beside these, not indeed admitted into the canon, but ordained by the Fathers to be read by such as have recently come over to us, and who wish to receive instruction in the doctrine of piety—the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and Tobit, the Doctrine of the Apostles, as it is called, and the Shepherd."

To the same purpose is the account which is given in the Synopsis of Scripture, which is usually quoted under the name of Athanasius.* "All the Scripture of us Christians is divinely inspired. It contains not indefinite, but rather determined and canonized books. These belong to the Old Testament." Then follows the same enumeration which has just been extracted from the Paschal Epistle. It is afterwards added: "But beside these, there are other books of the same Old Testament, *not canonical*, but only read by (or to) the Catechumens. Such are the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. *These are not canonical.*"

The canonical book of Esther, though not particularly numbered in these catalogues, is included under the general name of Ezra. The additions to it, however, are expressly mentioned

* Παστι γριψη ημων χριστιανων θεοπνευστος εστιν, ουκ αοριστα δε, αλλα μαλλον ωρισμενα και κεκανονισμενα εχει τα βιβλια. Και εστι της μεν παλαιας διαθηκης ταυτα. Εκτος δε τωτων εισι παλιν ετερα βιβλια της αυτης παλαιας διαθηκης. ου κανονιζομενα μεν. αναγιγνωσκουμενα δε μονον τοις κατηχομενοις ταυται. Σοφια Σολομωντος, Σοφια Ιησου υιου Σιραχ, Εσθηρ, Ιουδιθ, Τωβιτ. Ταυτα και τα μη κανονιζομενα. Τινες μεντοι των παλαιων εισηκασι κανονιζεσθαι παρ' Εβραιοις και την Εσθηρ και την μεν Ρουθ, μετα των Κριτων ενουμεινην, εις εν βιβλιον αριθμεισθαι την δε Εσθηρ εις ετερον εν. και ουτω παλιν εις εικοσι δυο συμπληρουσθαι τον αριθμον των κανονιζομενων παρα αυτοις βιβλιων — *Athan. Opp.* ii. p. 126, seq.

and repudiated. For the Esther which is proscribed by name, is not the book which the Jews received, but the one which opens with the dream of Mordecai. In this Synopsis, Athanasius not only gives a *list* of the books, but inserts the sentence with which each of them begins, in order that they might be easily identified, and he expressly tells us that the Esther which he means, commences in the manner which has just been specified. We are, therefore, at no loss to determine what he intended to condemn and repudiate under the title of Esther. The name of Baruch occurs in these catalogues, as it does also in those of Cyril and the Council of Laodicea, but it is only a fuller expression for *the book* of Jeremiah. "For Baruch's name," says Bishop Cosin,* "is famous in Jeremy, whose disciple and scribe he was, suffering the same persecution and banishment that Jeremy did, and publishing the same words and prophecies that Jeremy had required him to write, so that in several relations a great part of the book may be attributed to them both. And very probable it is, that for this reason the Fathers that followed Origen, did not only, after his example, join the Lamentations and the Epistle to Jeremy, but the name of Baruch besides; whereby they intended nothing else (as by keeping themselves precisely to the number of twenty-two books only is clear) than what was inserted concerning Baruch in the book of Jeremy itself."†

IV. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in France, thus enumerates the

* Vide Cosin. Scholast. Hist. pp. 59.

† Et ea causa est, ut in viginti duos libros lex Testamenti veteris deputatur, ut cum literatum numero convenirent. Qui ita secundum traditiones veterum deputantur, ut Mosis sint libri quinque; Jesu Naue sextus; Judicum et Ruth septimus; primus et secundus Regnorum in octavum, tertius et quartus in nonum; Paralipomenon duo in decimum sint, sermones dierum. Esdræ in undecimum; Liber Psalmorum in duodecimum; Salomonis Proverbia; Ecclesiastes; Canticum Cantorum in tertium decimum, et quartum decimum, et quintum decimum; duodecim autem Prophetæ in sextum decimum; Esaias deinde et Jeremias cum Lamentatione et Epistola; sed et Daniel, et Ezechiel, et Job, et Hester, viginti et duum librorum numerum consumment. Quibusdam autem visum est, additis Tobia et Judith viginti quatuor libros secundum numerum Græcarum literarum connumerare.—*Hilari. Prologo in Psalmos*, n. xv. p. m. 9.

books of the Old Testament, which he assures us, according to the tradition of the ancients, amounted to twenty-two. "Five of Moses; Joshua the son of Nun, the sixth; Judges and Ruth, the seventh; first and second Kings, the eighth; third and fourth Kings, the ninth; two books of Chronicles, the tenth; Ezra, the eleventh; Psalms, the twelfth; Ecclesiastes and Canticles, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth; the Twelve Prophets, the sixteenth; then Isaiah, and Jeremiah together with his Lamentations and his Epistle: Daniel, and Ezekiel, and Job, and Esther make up the full number of twenty-two books."

V. Contemporary with Athanasius and Hilary was Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, a prominent member of the second general council of Constantinople. His opinions of the canon may be gathered from the following passage:* "Learn diligently from the Church what are the books of the Old Testament, and what of the New, but read me none of the Apocryphal. For if you do not know the books acknowledged by all, why do you vainly trouble yourself about the disputed books? Read then the Divine Scriptures, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, which have been translated by the seventy-two interpreters. Of the Law, the first are the five books of Moses: then Jesus the son of Nave; and the book of Judges with Ruth which is numbered the seventh: then follow other historical books, the first and second

* Φιλομαθως επιγνοιθι παρα της εκκλησιαις, ποιαι μεν εισιν αι της παλαιας διαθηκης βιβλοι, ποιαι δε της καινης και μοι μηδεν των αποκρυφων αναγιωσκε. Ο γαρ τα παρα πασιν ομολογουμενα μη ειδως, τι περι τα αμφιβαλλομενα τυλαιπωρεις ματην; Αναγιγνωσκε τας θειας γραφας, τας εικοσι δυο βιβλους της παλαιας διαθηκης, τας υπο των εβδομηκοντα δυο ερμηνευτων ερμηνευθεισας . . . του νομου μεν γαρ εισιν αι Μωσεως πρωται πεντε βιβλοι . . . εξης δε, Ιησους υιος Ναυη, και των Κριτων μετα της Ρουθ βιβλιον εβδομον αριθμουμενον, των δε λοιπων ιστορικων βιβλιων. πρωτη και δευτερα των Βασιλειων μια παρ' Εβραιους εστι βιβλος · μια δε και η τριτη και η τεταρτη · ομοιως δε παρ' αυτοις και των Παραλειπομενων η πρωτη και η δευτερα μια τυγχουει βιβλος, και του Εσδρα η πρωτη και η δευτερα μια λελογισται. δωδεκατη βιβλος η Εσθηρ. Και τα μεν ιστορικη ταυτα. Τα δε στοιχηρα τυγχουει πεντη · Ιωβ, και βιβλος Ψαλμων, και Παροιμιαι, και Εκκλησιαστης, και Ασμη Ασματων, επτακαιδεκατον βιβλιον. Επι δε τουτοις τα προφητικα πεντε · των δωδεκα προφητων μια βιβλος, και Ησαιου μια, και Ιερειου μετα Βισουχ και Ορηων και επιστολης · ειτα Ιεζεκιηλ · και η του Δανιηλ εικοστη δευτερα βιβλος της παλ. διαθ. Cyril. Hierosol. Cateches. iv. 33-36, pp. 67-69, ed. Tutlei.

of the Kingdoms (one book according to the Hebrews): the third and fourth are also one book: the first and second of the Chronicles are, in like manner, reckoned as one book by them: the first and second of Ezra are counted as one book. The twelfth is Esther. These are the historical books. The books written in verse are five, Job and the book of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs: making the seventeenth book. After these are the five prophetic books, one of the twelve Prophets, one of Isaiah, one of Jeremiah, with Baruch, Lamentations and an Epistle: then Ezekiel, and the book of Daniel the twenty-second book of the Old Testament.”

VI. In the writings of Epiphanius we have no less than three catalogues of the books of the Old Testament, which, as they are all essentially the same, I shall trouble the reader with only one.* “Twenty-seven books acknowledged and received into the Old Testament, which, according to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet are counted as twenty-two, have been interpreted. For there

* Εικοσι επτα βιβλοι αι ρηται και ενδιαθετοι, εικοσι δε και δυο κατα την του Αλφαιβητου παρ' Εβραιοις στοιχειωσιν αριθμουμεναι ημνηνευθησαν. Εικοσι γαρ και δυο εχουσι στοιχειως νοηματα. πεντε δε εισιν εξ αυτων διπλουμενα. το γαρ Καθ εστι διπλον, και το Μεν, και το Νουν, και το Φι, και το Ζαδε. Διο και αι βιβλοι κατα τουτον τον τροπον εικοσι δυο μεν αριθμουνται, εικοσιεπτα δε ενρισκονται. δια το πεντε εξ αυτων διπλουθαι. Συναπτεται γαρ η Ρουθ τοις Κριταις. και αριθμειται παρ' Εβραιοις μια βιβλος. Συναπτεται η πρωτη των Παραλειπομενων τη δευτερα, και λεγεται μια βιβλος. Συναπτεται η τριτη τη τεταρτη, και λεγεται μια βιβλος. Ουτως γων συγκεινται αι βιβλοι εν Πεντατευχοις τεταρσι. και μενουσιν αλλα δυο υστερουσαι· ως ειναι τας ενδιαθετους βιβλους ουτως. Πεντε μεν νομικας, Γενεσιν, Εξοδον, Δευτικον, Αριθμους, Δευτερονομιον. αυτη η Πεντατευχος και η Νομοθεσια. Πεντε γαρ στιχηρεις. η των Ιωβ βιβλος. ειτα το Ψαλτηριον, Παροιμιαι Σολομωντος, Εκκλησιαστης, Ασμα Ασματων. Ειτα αλλη Πεντατευχος τι καλουμεν Γραφεια, παρα τισι δε Αγιογραφα λεγομενα, αυτα εστιν ουτως· Ιησου του Ναυη βιβλος. Κριτων μετα της Ρουθ. Παραλειπομενων πρωτη μετα της δευτερας, Βασιλειων πρωτη μετα της τεταρτης. αυτη τριτη Πεντατευχος. Αλλη Πεντατευχος το Δωδεκαπροφητον, Ησαιας, Ιερειας, Ιεζεκιηλ. Δανιηλ. Και αυτη η Προφητικη Πεντατευχος. Εμειναν δε αλλαι δυο, αιτινες εισι τον Εσδρα μια και αυτη λογιζομενη, και αλλη βιβλος, η της Εσθηρ καλειται. Επληρωθησαν ουν αι εικοσιδυο βιβλοι κατα τον αριθμον των εικοσιδυο στοιχειων παρ' Εβραιοις. Αι γαρ στιχηρεις δυο βιβλοι, ητε του Σολομωντος η Παναρετος λεγομενη, και η του Ιησου του νιου Σιραχ, εκγονου δε του Ιησου, του και την Σοφιαν, εβραιοστι γραψαντος ην ο εκγονος αυτου Ιησους ερμηνευσαι ελληνιστι εγραψε, και αυται χρησιμοι μεν εισι, και ωφελιμοι, αλλ' εις αριθμον ρητων ουκ αναφερονται. *Epipha. de Ponderibus et Mens.* 3. 4. pp. 161, 162.

are twenty-two letters among the Hebrews, five of which have a double form. For Caph is double, so also are Mem and Nun, and Phi and Zade. But since five letters among them are doubled, and therefore, there are really twenty-seven letters, which are reduced to twenty-two, so, for this reason, they enumerate their books as twenty-two, though in reality twenty-seven. For the book of Ruth is joined to the book of Judges and the two together are counted as one by the Hebrews. The first and second Kings are also counted as one book : and in like manner, the third and fourth of Kings are reckoned as one. And in this way all the books of the Old Testament are comprehended in five pentateuchs, with two other books not included in these divisions. Five pertain to the Law, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. This is the pentateuch in which the Law is contained. Five are poetical ; Job, Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes and Canticles. Then another pentateuch embraces the Hagiographa, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, first and second Chronicles, first and second Kings, and third and fourth of Kings. This is the third pentateuch. Another pentateuch contains the twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. Beside these there remain the two books of Ezra which are counted as one, and the book of Esther. In this way the twenty-two books are made out according to the number of the Hebrew letters. As for those two books, the Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, written by the grandfather in Hebrew, and translated by the grandson into Greek, they are profitable and useful, but not counted in the number of the received books."

VII. The following is the canon of Gregory Nazianzen.*

- * *Ιστορικαι μεν εισι βιβλοι δυοκαιδεκα πασαι,
 Της αρχαιοτερης εβραϊκης σοφιας.
 Πρωτιστη Γενεσις, ειτ' Εξυδος Δευτικον τε.
 Επειτ' Αριθμοι· ειτα Δευτερος νομος.
 Επειτ' Ιησους και Κριται· Ρουθ ογδοη.
 Η δ' εννητη δεκατη τε βιβλοι πραξεις Βασιληων,
 Και Παραλειπομεναι. Εσχατον Εσδραν εχεις.
 Αι δε στιχηραι πεντε, ων πρωτος γ' Ιωβ,
 Επειτα Δαυιδ· ειτα τρεις Σολομωντιαι,
 Εκκλησιαστης, Ασμα, και Πιροιμιι.
 Και πενθ' ομοιως πνευματος προφητικον.*

There are twelve historical books of the most ancient Hebrew wisdom: the first Genesis; then Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; the next Joshua, the Judges, Ruth, the eighth; ninth and tenth the acts of the Kings, and then the Remains and Esdras the last. Then the five books in verse, the first Job, next David, then the three books of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, the Song, and the Proverbs. The prophetic books are five; the twelve Prophets are one book, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Jonah, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, all these make one book: the second is Isaiah, then Jeremiah, Eze-kiel and Daniel: which make twenty-two books, according to the number of the Hebrew letters.”

VIII. To the same purport is the Poetical canon of Amphi-lochius, the intimate friend of Gregory and Basil, given in a let-ter which he wrote to Zeleuchus, exhorting him to the study of piety and learning.

IX. The testimony of Jerome is clear, pointed and explicit. In his famous Prologus Galeatus, he says: * “The language of

Μίαν μὲν εἰσὶν ἐς γραφὴν οἱ δώδεκα,
 Ὡση κ' Ἀμωσ, καὶ Μιχαίας ὁ τρίτος·
 Ἐπειτ' Ἰωηλ· εἰτ' Ἰωνᾶς, Ἀβδίας,
 Ναουμ τε, Ἀββακουμ τε, καὶ Σοφονίας,
 Ἀγγαῖος, εἶτα Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας.
 Μία μὲν οἶδε. Δευτέρα δ' Ἡσαίας.
 Ἐπειθ' ὁ κληθεὶς Ἰερεμίας ἐκβρεφούς.
 Εἰτ' Ἐζεκιηλ, καὶ Δανιηλὸν χάρις.
 Ἀρχαῖος μὲν εἴηκα δύο καὶ εἰκοσὶ βιβλούς,
 Τοῖς τῶν Ἐβραίων γραμμασίῳ ἀντιθετοῦς.

Greg. Naz. Opp. tom. ii. p. 98.

* Viginti et duas literas (says he in the Prologus Galeatus) esse apud Hebræos, Syrorum quoque lingua Chaldæorum testatur que Hebræos magna est parte confinis est. Nam et ipsi viginti duo elementa habent eodem sono et diversis characteribus. Porro quinque litteræ duplices apud Hebræos sunt: Caph. mem. nun. pe. sade. Unde et quinque a plerisque libri duplices existimantur, Samuel, Melachim, Dibre Hajamim, Esdras, Jeremias cum Cinoth, id est lamentationibus suis. Quomodo igitur viginti duo elementa sunt, per quæ scribimus Hebræice omne quod loquimur, et eorum initiis vox humana comprehenditur: ita viginti duo volumina supputantur, quibus quasi literis et exordiis in Dei doctrina, tenera adhuc et lactens viri justi eruditur infantia.

Primus apud eos liber vocatur Beresith, quem nos Genesin dicimus. Secundus Veelle Semoth. Tertius Vajjera, id est, Leviticus. Quartus Vajedabber.

the Syrians and the Chaldees is a standing proof that there are two and twenty letters among the Hebrews. But among the Hebrews five letters are double, Caph, Mem, Nun, Pe, Sade. Hence by most men, five books are considered as double; viz. Samuel, Melachim (Kings), Dibri Hajamin (Chronicles), Ezra, Jeremiah with Kinoth, that is, the Lamentations. Therefore, as there are twenty-two letters, so twenty-two volumes are reckoned. The first book is called by them, Bresith, by us Genesis; the second is called Exodus; the third, Leviticus; the fourth, Num-

quem Numeros vocamus. Quintus Elle Haddebarim, qui Deuteronomium prænotatur. Hi sunt quinque libri Mosis, quos proprie Thora, id est Legem, appellant.

Secundum Prophetarum ordinem faciunt, et incipiunt ab Jesu filio Nave, que apud eos Josui Ben Nun dicitur. Deinde subtexunt Sophetim, id est Judicium librum; et in eundam compingunt Ruth, quia in diebus Judicum facta ejus narratur historia. Tertius sequitur Samuel, quem nos Regum primum et secundum dicimus. Quartus Melachim, id est Regum qui tertio et quarto Regum et volumine continetur. Melius que multo est Melachim, id est Regum, quam Melachoth, id est Regnorum dicere. Non enim multarum gentium describit regna, sed unius Israelitici populi, qui tribus duodecim continetur. Quintus est Esais, sextus Jeremeas, septimus Ezechiel, octavus liber duodecim Prophetarum, qui apud illos vocatur Thereasæ.

Tertius ordo Hagiographa possidet. Et primus liber incipit a Job, secundus a David, quem quinque incisionibus et uno Psalmorum volumine comprehendunt. Tertius est Salomon, tres libros habens, Proverbia, quæ illi Misle, id est Parabolas, appellant. Quartus Ecclesiastes, id est Coheleth. Quintus Canticum Canticorum, quem titulo Sir Hassirim prænotant. Sextus est Daniel, septimus Dibre Hajammim, id est, verba dierum, quod significantius chronicon totius divinæ historiæ possunt appellare, qui liber apud nos Paralipomenon primus et secundus inscribitur. Octavus Esdras, qui et ipse similiter apud Græcos et Latinos in duos libros divisus est. Nonus Esther.

Atque ita fiunt pariter veteris Legis libri viginti duo, id est, Mosis quinque, et Prophetarum octo, Hagiographorum novem.

Quanquam nonnulli Ruth et Cinoth inter Hagiographa scribebant, et hos libros in suo putent numero supputandos, ac per hoc esse prisæ Legis libros viginti quatuor.

Hic prologus Scripturarum quasi Galeatum principium omnibus libris, quos de Hebræo vertimus in Latinum, convenire potest: ut scire valeamus, quicquid extra hos est, inter apocrypha esse ponendum. Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Sirach liber, et Judith, et Tobias, et Pastor non sunt in canone. Macchabæorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Græcus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasi probari potest.

bers; the fifth, Deuteronomy. These are the five books of Moses, which they call Thora, the law. The second class contains the prophets, which they begin with the book of Joshua, the son of Nun. The next is the book of the Judges, with which they join Ruth, her history happening in the time of the Judges. The third is Samuel, which we call the first and second book of the Kingdoms. The fourth is the book of the Kings, or the third and fourth book of the Kingdoms, or rather of the Kings; for they do not contain the history of many nations, but of the people of Israel only—consisting of twelve tribes. The fifth is Isaiah; the sixth, Jeremiah; the seventh, Ezekiel; the eighth, the book of the twelve Prophets. The third class, is that of Hagiographa, or sacred writings; the first of which is Job; the second, David, of which they make one volume, called the Psalms, divided into five parts; the third is Solomon, of which there are three books—the Proverbs, or Parables, as they call them—the Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs; the sixth is Daniel, the seventh is the Chronicles, consisting with us of two books, called the first and second of the Remains; the eighth is Ezra, which among the Greeks and Latins makes two books; the ninth is Esther. Thus there are in all two and twenty books of the old law; that is, five books of Moses, eight of the prophets, and nine of the Hagiographa. But some reckon Ruth and the Lamentations among the Hagiographa; so there will be four and twenty. This prologue I write as a preface to all the books to be translated by me from the Hebrew into Latin, that we may know that all the books which are not of this number, are to be reckoned Apocryphal; therefore, Wisdom, which is commonly called Solomon's, and the book of Jesus the son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobit, and the Shepherd, are not in the canon. The first book of Maccabees I have found in Hebrew; the second is Greek, as is evident from the style." We have two other catalogues furnished by Jerome, one in the *Bibliotheca Divina*, and the other in a letter to Paulinus, both exactly according with this.

To these testimonies may be added a passage which occurs in the Preface to his translations of the books of Solomon;* "I

* Tres libros Salomonis, id est, Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, Canticum Canti-

have translated," says he, "the three books of Solomon, that is, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, from the ancient version of the Seventy. As for the book called by many the Wisdom of Solomon, and Ecclesiasticus, which all know to be written by Jesus the Son of Sirach, I have forborne to translate them; for it was my intention to send you a correct edition of the canonical Scriptures, and not to bestow labor upon others." In the Prologue to his translation of Jeremiah, he says,* "he does not translate the book of Baruch, because it was neither in the Hebrew, nor received by the Jews." He also condemns the Apocryphal additions to Daniel, as not found in the Hebrew, and as having exposed Christians to ridicule, for the respect which they paid to them.† Although he translated Tobit and Judith, from Chaldee into Latin, yet he pronounces each of them to be Apocryphal. Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees, he never translated at all.

It is perfectly plain from these testimonies, that Jerome acknowledged no other books of the Old Testament to be inspired, but those which were received by the Jews; and it deserves to

corum, veteri Septuaginta interpretum auctoritate reddidi. Porro in eo libro, qui a plerisque sapientia Salomonis inscribitur, et in ecclesiastico, quem esse Jesu filii Sirach nullus ignorat, calamo temperavi; tantummodo canonicas Scripturas vobis emendare desiderans, et studium meum certis magis quam dubiis commendare.—*Pr. in Libr. Salom. juxta Septuag. Interp.* t. i. p. 1419.

* Librum autem Baruch, notarii ejus, qui apud Hebræos nec legitur, nec habetur, prætermisimus.—*Prol. in Germ.* t. i. p. 554.

† Hoc ideo, ut difficultatem vobis Danielis ostenderem; qui apud Hebræos nec Susannæ habet historiam, nec Hymnum trium puerorum, nec Belis Draconisque fabulas; quas nos, quia in toto orbe dispersæ sunt, vero auteposito easque jugulante, subjecimus; ne videremur apud imperitos magnam partem voluminis detruncasse. Audivi ego quendam de præceptoribus Judæorum, quum Susannæ derideret historiam, et a Græco nescio quo diceret esse confectam, illud opponere quod Origeni quoque Africanus opposuit, etymologias has, ἀπο τοῦ οὐχίνου σχίσαι, καὶ ἀπο τοῦ πρῖνου πρῖσαι, de Græco sermone descendere. Deinde tantum fuisse otii tribus pueris cavillabatur, ut in camino æstuantis incendii metro luderent, et per ordinem et laudem Dei omnia elementa provocarent. Aut quod miraculum divinæque aspirationis judicium, vel draconem interfectum offa picis, vel sacerdotum Belis machinas deprehensas? Quæ magis prudentia solertes viri quam prophetati spiritu perpetrata.—*Pr. in Dan.* t. i. p. 990.

be remarked that he characterized the Hebrew canon as emphatically the "canon of Hebrew verity." It was alone the infallible testimony of truth.

The testimony of Jerome is felt to be so important and conclusive, that Romanists have resorted to various expedients for the purpose of obviating its force. In the first place it has been contended that he was not treating of the canon of the Christian Church, nor of the books which, in his own opinion, ought to be received as inspired, but only of those which the Jews acknowledged. This objection, however, is so plainly inconsistent with the language which Jerome employs, that Bellarmin, too wise to defend it, frankly confesses that it is utterly without foundation. It is amazing how Cocceius, Catharinus and Canus could gravely have proposed an explanation of this sort, when it was clearly written before them that "the *Church reads* such and such books, but does not receive them as *canonical*."

Cardinal Perron, who admits, however, that Jerome was treating of the Christian canon, resorts to a solution so exceedingly ridiculous, that one cannot but conjecture that the Cardinal himself was laboring under just the opposite infirmity. In his opinion, Jerome had not reached, when he wrote his memorable prologue, the ripeness of his studies. It is hard to fix any precise and definite period for the development and maturity of the intellectual powers. But to be an infant at fifty—and such was the age, according to the lowest calculation, which the venerable Father had then attained*—is an infirmity so closely approximating to absolute idiocy, that the Cardinal, I apprehend, will find it much more easy to convince his readers that he himself was on the borders of dotage, than that the author of such a composition as the Prologus Galeatus, was either a victim of imbecility of mind, or the extravagance and rashness of youth.

It has also been attempted to destroy the force of this testimony, by asserting that he rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews. This, however, is so far from being true, that he actually cites the Epistle under the name of Paul, and distinctly declares that

* Jerome wrote his Prologue about the year 392. He was born according to Baronius about the year 340; according to others he was born still earlier.

he received it as authentic.* He says, to be sure, that *others* doubted of it, but that is very different from calling it into question himself.

It is finally contended that he subsequently changed his opinions. But of this fact no evidence can be produced. The Jesuits, indeed, tell us that in his Apology against Ruffin, he retracted the censure which he had formerly pronounced upon the spurious additions to Daniel—that in his Preface to Tobit, he impugns the integrity of the Hebrew canon—in his Preface to Judith, and his exposition of the Psalms, he revokes what he had said of the book of Judith, and in his commentary upon Isaiah, retracts his assertions in relation to the Maccabees. Such are the grounds upon which it is contended he changed his opinions. It would be very easy, by a particular examination of the passages which are cited, to show that there is no foundation whatever for any of these assumptions.

In reference to the Apocryphal additions to Daniel, Ruffinus was as far from admitting their inspiration, as Jerome himself. He could not, therefore, with the least degree of propriety or consistency, censure his former friend for opinions which they held in common. But Jerome was understood to say, in his Preface to Daniel, that the stories of Susannah, and of Bel and the Dragon, were mere *fabulous narrations*. This is what he explains in his Apology against Ruffinus.† He asserts that he had been misunderstood, and that when he used such language in reference to these tales, he was not giving *his own* opinion of their value, but the sentiments of the Jews. He was willing to admit that they might be usefully and profitably read, but, so far was he from subscribing to their Divine inspiration, that he reiterates the approbation which he had formerly given of the Reply of Origen to Porphyry, who had quoted these works—“that they were not possessed of the authority of Scripture, and therefore Christians were not bound to defend them.” There is, consequently, but one principle on which Jerome can be made to en-

* Nos et Apoc. et *Epistolam Pauli ad Hebræos recipimus*.—*Epist. ad Dardanum*.

† Apol. 2 advs. Ruffin.

dorse the claims of these wretched fictions, and that is, whatever he did not believe to be *fabulous*, he must have believed to be *inspired*.

In his Preface to Tobit, there is no retraction whatever. He simply states that he had yielded to the desire of the Bishops who had urged him to translate it, although in so doing he was aware that he had exposed himself to the reproach of the Jews. He adds, however, that he judged it better to displease the Pharisees, than to disregard the injunctions of the Bishops.* But surely to translate a book—a book which was allowed to be read in the church, and was commended as a fit introduction to piety, (for so, many of the ancients regarded it,) does not necessarily imply that it was held to be inspired. And yet Jerome's expressions of willingness to displease the Jews, and to translate Tobit at the earnest request of his friends, is all the proof upon which it is asserted that he changed his mind in regard to it. I pay no attention to the obviously corrupted passage in which he represents the Jews as ranking this book in the class of Hagiographa. The word Hagiographa is an evident mistake of the copyist for Apocrypha—and so the ablest doctors among the Romanists themselves have agreed.† The glaring falsehood of the assertion, upon any other supposition, is enough to show that the text is vitiated.

So again it is contended that he changed his opinion in reference to Judith, because he yielded to the entreaty of his friends, and consented to translate it. He was the more induced to do so, because the book itself presented an eminent example of chastity, and was suited to edify the people, and because the story went that the Council of Nice had inserted it in the canon.‡ On these grounds he translated the work, but not a hint does he drop that he received it as inspired. We may therefore conclude in the words of Bishop Cosin: "And thus have we made it to appear that St. Jerome was always *constat* herein to him-

* Prefat. in Tobiam.

† Comestor, Hugo the Cardinal, Tortatus, Driedo, Catharin, have all pronounced it to be a corrupt reading.

‡ Prefat. in Judith.

self. For in the year 392 he avowed his translation of the Bible, before which he placed his Prologus Galeatus, as a helmet of defence against the introduction of any other books that should pretend to be of equal authority with it. Not many years after, he wrote his Preface upon Tobit and Judith, and therein he changed not his mind. About the same time he wrote his Commentary upon the Prophet Haggai and his Epistle to Turia, wherein the book of Judith remaineth uncanonized. In the year 396 he wrote his Epistle to Læta, and therein he is still constant to his Prologue. About the same year he wrote upon the Prophet Jonas, where the book of Tobit is kept out of the canon. In the year 400 (or somewhat after) he wrote upon Daniel, and there Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, have no authority of Divine Scripture. And at the same time he wrote his Apologie against Ruffin, where he referreth to his former Prologues, and expressly denieth any retraction of them. About the year 409 he wrote upon Esay, where he revoketh nothing. And in the latter end of his age, he set forth his Commentary upon Ezechiel, wherein he acknowledged no more books of the Old Testament than he had counted before, but continued his belief and judgment herein to the day of his death, which followed not long after."

X. I shall next give the testimony of Ruffinus,* once the beloved

* Hic igitur spiritus sanctus est, qui in veteri testamento legem et prophetas, in novo evangelica et apostolos inspiravit. Unde apostolus dicit: omnis Scriptura inspirata utilis est ad docendum. Et ideo quæ sunt novi ac veteris Testamenti volumina, quæ secundum majorum traditionem per ipsum spiritum sanctum inspirata creduntur, et ecclesiis Christi tradita, competens videtur hoc in loco evidenti numero, sicut ex patrum monumentis accepimus, designare. Itaque veteris Testamenti omnium primo Moysi quinque libri sunt traditi, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numerus, Deuteronomium; post hæc Jesus Nave, et Judicum, simul cum Ruth. Quatuor post hæc Regnorum libri, quos Hebræi duos numerant. Paralipomena, qui Dierum dicitur Liber, et Esdræ duo, quia apud illos singuli computantur, et Hester. Prophetarum vero Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, et Daniel, præterea duodecim Prophetarum, liber unus. Job quoque, et Psalmi David singuli sunt libri. Salomon vero tres ecclesiæ tradidit, Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, Canticum Canticorum. In his concluderunt numerum librorum veteris Testamenti. Sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt, qui ne sunt canonici, sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt; ut est sapientia Salomonis, et alia Sapientia, quæ dicitur filii Sirach, qui liber apud Latinos, hoc ipso generali vocabulo, Ecclesiasticus appellatur. Duræ Viæ, vel Judicium Petri. Quæ omnia

friend, and afterwards the open and avowed adversary of Jerome. In his Exposition of the Apostles' Creed, he says, "This, then, is the Holy Spirit who, in the Old Testament, inspired the Law and the Prophets, and in the New, the Gospels and Epistles. Wherefore the Apostle says, that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine.' It will not, therefore, be improper to enumerate here the books of the New and the Old Testament, which we find by the monuments of the Fathers to have been delivered to the churches as inspired by the Holy Spirit. And of the Old Testament, in the first place, are the five books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. After these are Joshua the Son of Nun, and the Judges, together with Ruth. Next, the four books of the Kingdoms, (which the Hebrews reckon two,) the book of the Remains which is called the Chronicles, and two books of Ezra, which by them are reckoned one, and Esther. The Prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and besides, one book of the twelve Prophets. Job, also, and the Psalms of David. Solomon has left three books to the churches: the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs; with these they include the number of the books of the Old Testament. However, it ought to be observed that there are also other books which are not canonical, but have been called by our forefathers, ecclesiastical: as the Wisdom of Solomon, and another, which is called the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach; and, among the Latins, is called by the general name of Ecclesiasticus. By which title is denoted, not the author of the book, but the quality of the writing. In the same rank is the book of Tobit, and the books of the Maccabees. In the New Testament is the book of the Shepherd or of Hermas, which is called the Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter. All which they would have to be read in the churches, but not

legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Cæteras vero scripturas apocryphas nominarunt quas in ecclesiis legi noluerunt. Hæc nobis a patribus, ut dixi, tradita, opportunum visum est hoc in loco designare, ad instructionem eorum, qui prima sibi ecclesiæ ac fidei elementa suscipiunt, ut sciant ex quibus sibi fontibus verbi Dei haurienda sint pocula.—*Ruffin. in Symb. ap Cyprian in App.* pp. 26. 27, et *ap Hier.* t. v. pp. 141. 142.

to be alleged by way of authority for proving articles of faith. Other Scriptures they called Apocryphal, which they would not have to be read in the churches.”

XI. I shall close this list of testimonies with the canon of the Council of Laodicea, which was afterwards confirmed at Constantinople in the close of the seventh century. The closing decrees are in these words :* “ Private Psalms should not be read in the church, nor any books which are not canonical, but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testament. The books of the Old Testament which ought to be read are these : 1, The Genesis, or generation of the World ; 2, The Exodus out of Egypt ; 3, Leviticus ; 4, Numbers ; 5, Deuteronomy ; 6, Joshua the son of Nun ; 7, Judges with Ruth ; 8, Esther ; 9, The first and second books of Kings ; 10, The third and fourth books of Kings ; 11, The first and second books of Chronicles ; 12, The first and second books of Esdras ; 13, The book of 150 Psalms ; 14, The Proverbs of Solomon ; 15, The Ecclesiastes ; 16, The Song of Songs ; 17, Job ; 18, The twelve Prophets ; 19, Isaiah ; 20, Jeremiah and Baruch, the Lamentations and Epistle ; 21, Ezekiel ; 22, Daniel.”

The only serious exception which can be taken to the testimony of this Council, is the fact that in the canon of the New Testament the Apocalypse of John is omitted. There are three hypotheses upon which this difficulty may be removed, each of which is fatal to the inspiration of the books in question.

In the first place, it might have been the design of the Fathers simply to prescribe the books which should be *read* ; and as the Apocalypse was of an abstruse and mystical character, they might have thought it expedient to leave it out in the public services of the church. But no such objections could have been alleged

* Οτι ου λει ιδιωτικους Ψαλμους λεγεσθαι εν τη εκκλησια, ουδε ακανονιστα βιβλια, αλλα μονα τα κανονικα της παλαιας και καινης διαθηκης.

Οσα δει βιβλια αναγιγνωσκεισθαι της παλαιας διαθηκης · α' Γενεσις Κοσμων. β' Εξοδος εξ Αιγυπτου. γ' Λευιτικον. δ' Αριθροι. ε' Δευτερονομιον. ς' Ιησους Ναη. ζ' Κριται, Ρουθ. η' Εσθηρ. θ' Βασιλειων α' και β'. ιβ' Εσδρας α' και β'. ιγ' βιβλος Ψαλμων. ιδ' Παροιμιαι Σολομωντος. ιε' Εκκλησιαστης. ις' Ασμη Ασμητων. ιζ' Ιωβ. ιη' δωδεκα Προφηται. ιθ' Ησαιας. ικ' Ιερειας, και Βυρουχ, Θρηνοι και Επιστολαι. κα' Ιεζεκιηλ. κβ' Δαυιηλ. *Canon of the Council of Laodicea.—Labbeus et Copart, tom. i. p. 5007.*

against Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees. These books were held to be eminently useful, and specially adapted to the instruction and improvement of recent converts. Their omission, therefore, cannot be explained upon the same principle with the omission of the Apocalypse. Why then were they not admitted into the canon? But one answer can be given, and that is, they were not canonical. Though upon this hypothesis, the decree of Laodicea did not require *all* canonical books to be read, yet it permitted *none* to be used which were not *canonical*.

In the second place, the Fathers might not have been satisfied that the Apocalypse was really the work of John. It was the last of the sacred books, and the evidences of its inspiration might not have been fully known to the bishops at Laodicea. The primitive Christians guarded the Scriptures with diligence and care, and were willing to admit no book into the canon of inspiration until they had thoroughly examined its credentials. This very caution gives us greater confidence in their opinions, as it is a strong security that nothing was done rashly or without adequate foundation. But if the Apocrypha had been delivered by Christ and his apostles to the Christian church as inspired compositions, the evidence of the fact must have been as extensive as the Gospel itself. To doubt of them, therefore, is to condemn them. If the evidence of their inspiration was unknown in the middle of the fourth century, it must forever remain in obscurity. The authors of the books had been dead for centuries—their names and memorials had vanished from the earth: there was no possibility of directly proving that they had confirmed their commission by signs and wonders. The only evidence which the church could enjoy was the testimony of men who were known to be inspired, and the only men to whom they could appeal were the apostles of Christ, and if for four centuries no traces are found of any testimony borne by those chosen heralds of the truth to the divine authority of these books, their claims must be abandoned as totally incapable of proof.

The Revelation of John and the Apocryphal books did not stand upon the same footing. There were abundant means of proving that the one was written by the disciple whom Jesus loved, while there were no means whatever of attesting the other

to be the word of God. The fathers, therefore, might have been subsequently satisfied in reference to the one, which they never could have been in reference to the other.

Finally, the Apocalypse may have been omitted in transcribing the canon, by the negligence of copyists. This, I take to be the true solution of the difficulty. In some editions, the Epistle to Philemon is left out and in others inserted. But it would have been an extraordinary blunder to have omitted through mistake such a collection of books as those which compose the Apocrypha. Whichever, therefore, of these hypotheses we may choose to adopt to explain the difficulty in reference to Revelation, the Apocrypha *must be rejected*.

The testimony of the Christian church for four hundred years has now been briefly reviewed, and we find an universal concurrence in the canon of the Jews. North and south, east and west, in Europe, Asia and Africa, the most learned and distinguished defenders of the faith, however widely they differed or warmly disputed upon other points, are cordially at one whenever they treat of the documents which constitute the Rule of Faith. In all their catalogues the Apocrypha are excluded; and in some instances it is expressly added that they were not to be received, as Trent assures us they should be, with the same piety and veneration which are due to the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms. How, if Christ and His apostles had delivered these books to the Christian church as inspired and authoritative records, how can we explain the amazing unanimity of the primitive fathers in rejecting them from the sacred canon? How comes it that, in no quarter of the earth, the injunctions of apostles were respected, but that even in the churches which had been planted by their hand and bedewed by their blood, in sixty years after the last of their number had retired to his long repose, these books were excluded from a place in the list of inspired compositions? The fact is utterly inexplicable; and if with the mass of historical testimony which has already been arrayed against their pretensions to Divine authority, they are after all a veritable part of the Word of God, truth and fiction are confounded, moral reasoning is at an end—and all responsibility for conduct or opinions must for ever cease.

In the first place, they were confessedly rejected by the

Jewish church. The writers themselves were Jews; and if they had been able to attest their inspiration by signs and wonders and mighty works, the only credentials of a messenger from heaven, their own nation must have known the fact. Yet the Jews with one voice repudiate these books. In the next place, they were rejected by the Son of God. For he approved and confirmed the Hebrew canon. And finally, they were rejected for four hundred years by the whole body of the Christian church. And yet, with all this amount of historical evidence against them, Trent has the audacity to declare that they are entitled to equal veneration with Moses, the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles; and when every other argument fails her, she only adds to her arrogance and blasphemy by pretending to “thunder with a voice like God”—to imitate the very style of Jehovah, and to command the nations to receive her canon, *because she says* it is Divine.

APPENDIX .

From the Spirit of the Nineteenth Century.

THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

BY PROFESSOR THORNWELL.

IN nothing is the intolerable arrogance of the Church of Rome more strikingly displayed, than in the authority which, if she does not formally claim, she yet pretends to exercise, of dispensing the Holy Ghost not merely to men themselves, but also to their writings. Thus the famous Council of Trent has attempted to make that divine which is notoriously human, and that inspired which, in the sense of the Apostle, is notoriously of "private interpretation." We allude, of course, to the conduct of Rome in placing the *Apocrypha* upon an equal footing with the sacred oracles of God. Among the books which the "holy œcumenical and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit," has declared should be received with equal piety and veneration with the unquestioned word of God, and which indeed have God for their author, are *Tobit*, *Judith*, *the additions to the Book of Esther*, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah*, *the Song of the Three Children*, *the story of Susannah*, *the story of Bel and the Dragon*, and *the first and second books of Maccabees*.

Having by its own authority constituted these books a part of the Word of God, the Holy Council proceeded to pronounce its usual malediction upon all who would not receive them as sacred and canonical. Now in direct opposition to this wicked and blasphemous sentence of Rome, we assert most unhesitatingly, and shall endeavor triumphantly to prove, that these books, commonly called the *Apocrypha*, are neither "sacred nor canonical,"

and of course, have no more authority in the Church of God than Seneca's Letters, or Tully's Offices.

Let it be remarked, however, that the onus probandi rests upon the Papists. The presumption is against them until they adduce satisfactory testimony in behalf of their extravagant pretensions. Nay, even defect of proof is fatal to their cause. They bring us certain documents and declare that they were given by inspiration of God. We are bound to treat these documents, as we treat all other writings, merely as human productions, until clear and cogent arguments for the Divine original are submitted to our understandings. Hence, the Protestant cause is fully made out by failure of proof on the Part of the Romanists. We are not required in justification of our position, to advance a single argument against the inspiration of these books. Our course is a righteous, a necessary one, until they are *proved* to be inspired. We think it important that this high vantage ground of Protestantism, in the argument upon this subject, should be fully apprehended. Not because we are unable to prove that these books are not inspired, but in order that it may be distinctly understood that all our positive arguments against them are *ex abundantia*—are over and above what is actually required of us in the case. If our position is justified by failure on the part of Rome to establish her assertion, it is more than justified—it is doubly fortified and rendered wholly impregnable by the irresistible arguments which we are able to allege against the inspiration of the Apocryphal books. With the distinct understanding, then, that we are doing a work which justice to our own cause does not absolutely require, but which only exposes in a stronger light the arrogance and blasphemy of Rome, we proceed to show by a few positive considerations, that these books have not the shadow of a claim to Divine inspiration.

I. Our first argument is drawn from the indisputable fact that these books were not found in the canon of the Jews in the time of our Saviour and his Apostles. It is even doubted by learned men whether some of them existed at all, until some time after the last of the Apostles had fallen asleep. But be this as it may, they were not in the sacred canon of the Jews or the catalogue of books which the whole nation received as coming from God,

We have very clear testimony upon the subject of the Jewish canon, in JOSEPHUS, *Philo*, the *Talmud*, and the early Christian Fathers. It is unnecessary to quote these testimonies at full length. Those who have not access to the original works, may find them faithfully collated in *Schmidius De Canone Sacro*, and in *Eichhorn's Einleitung*. We would particularly commend to the reader's attention *Hernemann's* book *De Canone Philonis*. Augustine again and again confesses that the Apocrypha formed no part of the Jewish canon. He declares that Solomon was not the author of the books of Ecclesiasticus and of Wisdom, and assures us, moreover, that these books were chiefly respected by the Western Christians. He informs us that Judith was not received by the Jews; and his testimony in relation to Maccabees is equally decisive. We insist upon the testimony of Augustin, which may be found in his Treatise *De Civ. Dei*, lib. i. c. 17, because he had evidently a very great respect for these books, for he frequently quotes them; and because he was a member of the bodies whose decisions in their favor have been strongly and earnestly pleaded. We take it then to be a fact which no scholar would think of calling into question, sustained by the concurring testimony of Jews and Christians for four hundred years after Christ, that the Jews rejected the Apocrypha from their canon. For the purpose of our present argument it is not necessary to show what books they did receive, nor how they classed and arranged them. It is enough that they had a canon which they believed to be inspired, and that in it the Apocrypha were not included.

Now our argument is this: Jesus Christ and his Apostles approved of the Jewish canon, whatever it was, appealed to it as possessing divine authority, and evidently treated it as at that time complete, or as containing the whole of God's revelation as far as it was then made. If the Apocrypha had been really a part of that revelation, and the Jews had either ignorantly or wickedly suppressed it, how comes it that Christ nowhere rebukes them for their error? We find him severely inveighing against the Pharisees for adding to the Word of God by their *vain traditions*, but not a syllable do we hear in regard to what was equally culpable, their taking from it, which they certainly

had done if the Apocrypha were inspired. Here was confessedly a great teacher and prophet in Israel—their long-expected Messiah, who constituted the burden of their Scriptures, according to his own testimony; and yet while he quotes and approves the canon of the Jews, and remands the Jews themselves to their own Scriptures, he nowhere insinuates that their sacred library was defective. If the Jews had done wrong in rejecting the Apocrypha, is it credible that he who came in the name of God, a teacher sent from God to reveal fully the Divine will, would have passed over without noticing such a flagrant fraud? We find him reproving his countrymen for every other corruption in regard to sacred things of which they are known to have been guilty, but not a whisper escapes his lips or the lips of his Apostles touching this gross suppression of a large portion of the Word of God. The conclusion is irresistible, that neither Jesus nor his Apostles believed in the Divine authority of the Apocrypha; they knew that *they were not inspired*. We will grant the Romanist what *he cannot* prove, and what *we can disprove*, that these books are quoted in the New Testament. This will not remove the difficulty. According to his views of the canon, the Jews were guilty of an outrageous fraud in regard to the Sacred Oracles, and yet neither Christ nor his Apostles, whose business it was to give us the *whole* revelation of God, ever charged them with this fraud, or took any steps to restore the rejected books to their proper places. Christ, as the great Prophet of the Church, was unfaithful to his high and solemn trust, if he stood silently by when the Word of God was trampled in the dust, or buried in obscurity, or even robbed of its full authority. To the Jews were committed the Oracles of God (Rom. iii. 2.); if they betrayed their trust, we ought to have been informed of it before the lapse of sixteen centuries.

It is in vain to allege that Christ and his Apostles used the Septuagint, and that this version contained the Apocrypha. In the first place, it cannot be proved that the Septuagint at that time did contain the Apocrypha; in the second place, if it did contain them, the difficulty is rather increased than lessened. The question is, What books did the Jews, to whom were committed the Oracles of God, receive as *inspired*? Did Christ

know that they *rejected* the Apocrypha from the list of *inspired writings*? If so, and the Septuagint version was in his hands, and really contained these rejected books, what more natural than that Christ should have told his apostles that here are books which the Jews reject, but which you must receive; they are of equal authority with the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms? His total silence both before the Jews and his own disciples becomes more unaccountable than ever, if the books were actually before him and almost forced upon his notice by the version of the Scriptures which he used. But we do not insist upon this, because we do not believe that the Septuagint, at that time, contained the Apocrypha.* If it should be said that the Jews received these books as inspired but did not insert them in the canon, because they had not the authority of a prophet for doing so, why is it that Christ did not give the requisite authority, if not to the Popish priests and rulers, at least to his own Apostles?

Upon every view of the subject, then, the silence of Christ is wholly unaccountable, if these writings are really inspired. It becomes simple and natural upon the supposition that they were merely human productions. The Jews had done right in rejecting them; they stood upon a footing with other literary works, and our Saviour had no more occasion to mention them, than he had to mention the writings of the Greek Philosophers.

2. If it should be pretended that Christ did give his Apostles authority to receive these books, though no record was made of the fact, we ask how it comes to pass—and we mention this as our second argument against them—that for four centuries the unbroken testimony of the Christian church is against their inspiration? They are not included in the catalogues given by Melito,† Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the second century, of Origen,‡ Athanasius,§ Hilary,|| Cyril of Jerusalem,¶ Epiphanius,** Gregory Nazianzen,†† Rufinus,‡‡ and others; neither are they

* Vid. Schmidius de Canone.

† Euseb lib. iv. c. 26.

‡ Expos. Psal. i. Opp. tom, ii. Euseb. vi. 25.

§ Pasch. Epist.

|| Prolog. in Psalmos.

¶ 4th Cate. Exer.

** Hæres. i. 6.

†† Can. 23.

‡‡ Expos. ad symb. apost.

mentioned among the canonical books recognized by the council of Laodicea. As a sample of the testimonies referred to in the margin, we will give a few passages from *Jerome*, the author of the *authentic* version commonly called the *Vulgate*. In the preface concerning all the books of the Old Testament which he prefixed to his Latin translation of Samuel and Kings, after having given us the Jewish canon, he says, "Hic prologus scripturarum, quasi Galeatum principium omnibus libris quas de Hebraeo vertimus in Latinum convenire potest: ut scire valeamus quicquid extra hoc est, inter *Apocrypha* esse ponendum." "Therefore," he adds, "*Wisdom*, which is vulgarly attributed to Solomon, and the *book of Jesus, the son of Sirach*, and *Judith*, and *Tobias*, and *Pastor*, are not in the canon." His testimony in relation to the Maccabees, is equally divided. In the prologue to his Commentary on Jeremiah, he declines explaining the book of *Baruch*, which in the edition of the LXX is commonly joined with it, because the Jews rejected it from the canon, and he of course knew of no authority for inserting it. In the preface to his translation of *Daniel*, he assures us that the *story of Susannah*, the *Song of the Three Children*, and the *Fables of Bel and the Dragon*, are not only not in the Jewish copies, but had exposed Christians to ridicule for the respect which they paid to them. In his preface to *Tobit* and *Judith* he pronounces them *Apocryphal*!

Here, then, about the close of the fourth century, we find no remnant of any unwritten tradition from Christ and his apostles, authorizing the Church to receive these books. The early fathers followed in the footsteps of the Jews, and unanimously concurred in receiving no other canon of the Old Testament as inspired, but that which came down to them through the Jewish Church. In this opinion, learned men in every age have concurred, up to the very meeting of the Council of Trent. We refer to such men as Cardinal Ximenes, Ludovicus Vives, the accomplished Erasmus, and Cardinal Cajetan. How could there have been such a general concurrence in an error so deplorable, if Christ and his apostles had ever treated these books as the lively oracles of God? Surely there would have been some record—some hint—of a fact so remarkable. We ask the

Romanist to reconcile the testimonies of the Fathers with the decree of Trent. In the language of Bishop Burnet: "Here we have four centuries clear for our canon, in exclusion of all additions. It were easy to carry this much further down, and to show that these books (the Apocrypha) were never by any express definition received into the canon, till it was done at Trent, and that in all ages of the church, even after they came to be much esteemed, there were divers writers, and those generally the most learned of their time, who denied them to be a part of the canon.

3. The third argument which we shall bring forward is drawn from the books themselves. In reading them we not only are struck with the absence of that "heavenliness of matter, efficacy of doctrine, majesty of style, concert of all the parts, and general scope of the whole to give glory to God," by which the sacred Scriptures abundantly evidence themselves to be the word of God, but we are as forcibly struck with defects utterly inconsistent with these excellences. To say nothing of their silly and ridiculous stories, these books notoriously contain palpable lies, gross anachronisms, flat contradictions, and doctrinal statements, wholly irreconcilable with what we are taught in the unquestioned oracles of God. Such things are totally inconsistent with the idea of inspiration.

It would be easy to make good these charges by citations from the books, but it is unnecessary to protract our article by quotations which have again and again been made for the same purpose.

What, under the present head, we wish particularly to remark, is, that these books, or at least several of them, virtually disclaim all pretensions to inspiration. They do not profess to be the word of God, and why should Protestants be blamed for not conceding to them an authority which they themselves do not claim? They come to us from their authors merely as human productions—we treat them as such, and yet we are consigned to the damnation of hell, because we do not believe that a writer was inspired, when he did not believe it himself!

The author of the second book of Maccabees professes to have abridged a work of Jason of Cyrene, and concerning his perform-

ance, he holds the following language, which can be reconciled with a belief on his part that he was inspired, when light is made to have fellowship with darkness, and God with Belial, and not till then:—"Therefore, to us that have taken upon us this painful labor of abridging, it was not easy, but a matter of sweat and watching, even as it is no ease to him that prepareth a banquet, and seeketh the benefit of others; yet for the pleasing of many, we will undertake gladly this great pains, leaving to the author the exact handling of every particular, and laboring to follow the rules of an abridgment," &c. (2 Mac. ii. 26, seq.) Here his motives, as assigned by himself, are such as induce ordinary men to write, and his method is taken from the common rules of criticism. In other words, it is obviously a human composition, and was intended to have no more authority than any other historical document. To the same purport is the following sentence near the close of the book: "And if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto." Is this the language of a man who "spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost?" Does he seem to have drawn from the inexhaustible fountain of Divine truth, or from the shallow resources of his own mind? Verily, none but a madman could speak on this wise, and yet believe that he was inspired of God. The prologue to Ecclesiasticus—a production of Jesus the Son of Sirach—is just as decisive in reference to it. As it is too long to quote, we shall content ourselves by simply referring to it. The writer asks pardon for a defective interpretation of a Hebrew document, and declares that his whole performance was the result of diligence and travail, of great watchfulness and skill. And yet, according to the Romanist, instead of being the product of human thought and labor, it was the supernatural dictation of the Holy Ghost. The pretence in this case is too absurd for argument. In the first book of Maccabees, we are assured that there was not a prophet or inspired man in Israel to direct them what to do with the altar which had been profaned. (1 Mac. iv. 46.) The same declaration is repeated in the course of the book again, and yet, contrary to his own testimony, we are required to believe that the writer himself was inspired. In fact, it was the universal opin-

ion of the Jewish nation, that inspiration ceased with Malachi, not to be revived until the dawn of the new dispensation, and that, consequently, no books which were written after the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus were worthy of any credit as inspired records.

We might go over each of the Apocryphal books, one by one, and produce such numerous instances of falsehood, error, contradiction, and absurdity, as to render it utterly impossible that any should attribute them to God but those whose credulity is enormous enough to swallow down the nonsense and blasphemy of transubstantiation, and to believe that God can be multiplied by the million without disturbing His unity, and made at will, out of cakes and wine, without detracting from His glory. Such men can believe any thing, and to such men it is useless to urge the authority of Christ and his apostles—vain to allege the concurring testimony of the leading writers of the primitive church—vainer still to plead absurdity, contradiction and lies, and even implied disclaimers from the writings in question; they have an authority higher than all these. The Council of Trent has spoken—the man of sin and the son of perdition, who has given out that *he* is God, has spoken from his throne of blasphemy and abominations; and the voice of a general council and the Pope is enough to silence reason, to sanctify blasphemy, and to canonize falsehood.

But to those who are not yet fastened as captives to the car of Rome, we appeal in the confident expectation of success. Can any candid and unprejudiced mind believe that these books proceeded from God, when there is not a particle of evidence to establish the fact—when the Jewish church, to which were committed the Oracles of God, rejected them—when Christ and his Apostles rejected them—when for four centuries united Christendom rejected them—when up to the very time of the meeting of Trent, the most enlightened members of the church of Rome rejected them—when, in addition to all this, the books themselves do not profess to be inspired, and abound in absurdity, contradiction and lies? Despising the authority of Popes and Councils, we bring the matter to the bar of sober reason and sound argument, and we challenge Rome to vindicate herself from the charge of intolerable arrogance and blasphemy in her

corrupt additions to the word of God. The argument which she uses with her own vassals will not do among thinking men. Until she can adduce clear, decided, unanswerable proof of the inspiration of the Apocrypha, all who reverence God or love their race, are solemnly bound to reject these books, and to treat them precisely as all Protestant churches always have treated them. Rome may denounce her anathema against us, but we know full well that the terrible malediction of God rests upon her. It is not a light matter whether we receive or reject these writings. If they are not inspired, those who receive them run the risk of everlasting damnation—if they are, those who reject them are exposed to the same danger.

That Protestants reject them because they contain unpalatable doctrines, is a fiction of the Roman Priesthood to divert attention from the real state of the argument. Light is death to their cause, and therefore they resort to every trick of sophistry and of falsehood to obscure the question at issue, and to escape unexposed in their frauds and impostures. We reject them because *they are not inspired*, and we shall continue to do so until the contrary is clearly proved, as well as boldly asserted. Let the Romanist come up manfully to the point of *inspiration*—that is the issue between us, and upon that issue we are always ready to meet them.

LETTER I.

To the Reverend JAMES H. THORNWELL, Professor of the Evidences of Christianity, &c.

Reverend Sir, I need offer no apology for thus publicly addressing you. The Columbia Chronicle of the 15th ult., forwarded to me a few weeks ago by a friend, contains an article under your name on what you term the Apocryphal Books, which at my request the Editors of the Miscellany republish together with this letter. The character of that article is such as to render it no longer an intrusion either on you or on the public thus to vindicate the Catholic church from your attacks.

Permit me to take this occasion of expressing, once for all, my regret at finding an essay from you so plentifully interspersed

with the vulgar epithets *papist*, *Romanist*, and such manifestations of ill feeling as the expressions *vassals of Rome and captives to the car of Rome*, the assertion that 'our credulity is enormous,' and your mocking language concerning the awful mystery of transubstantiation and the church, with which even in quotation I am unwilling to sully my pen. Believe me, Reverend Sir, such invectives contain no argument. They are unbecoming the subject, and, may I presume to add, the dignified station you occupy. Your essay would have lost none of its weight, and to Catholics would have been infinitely less revolting, had they been omitted. Catholics are neither outcasts from society nor devoid of feeling; they are neither insensible to, nor think they deserve, such words of opprobrium. It is true we have often to draw on our patience, for the rules of courtesy are frequently violated in our regard. Still it is painful to see a Professor descending from calm, gentlemanly and enlightened argument, to mingle with the crowd of those whose weapons are misrepresentations and abuse. To me it is doubly painful when such language obliges me not to respect as highly as I would desire those whom I address. I will not recur to this disagreeable topic, but will endeavor to write as if your arguments were unaccompanied by what Catholics must consider as insults.

I cordially agree with you that 'it is not a light matter whether we receive or reject those writings' which are contained in the canon of the holy Scriptures as received by the Catholic church, and are excluded from that generally adopted by the different denominations of Protestantism. Still I am not prepared to unite unconditionally in your denunciatory clauses. Undoubtedly all who know the truth, are bound to believe and profess it; otherwise they 'run the risk of eternal damnation.' All too are bound, according to their ability, sincerely, earnestly, and perseveringly to seek the truths of revelation on this as on all other points; and those who, having the means, neglect to do so, 'are exposed to the same danger.' Still there may be others to whom Divine Providence has not vouchsafed such means; and they assuredly will not be punished for not performing an impossibility.

Your essay contains some preliminary remarks on the authority of the church to declare what books are sacred and canonical,

and on the state of the question ; and lays down three arguments to prove that the books in question are not inspired. I shall take up these different heads in order, and trust, by a few remarks in this and perhaps two or three other letters, to convince a ‘ candid and unprejudiced mind by sound argument and sober reason,’ that the Catholic church has not been guilty of the heinous crime you lay at her door, that of making corrupt additions to the word of God.

You commence with the following remarks :

“ In nothing is the intolerable arrogance of the church of Rome more strikingly displayed, than in the authority, which if she does not formally claim, yet she pretends to exercise, of dispensing the Holy Ghost not merely to men themselves but also to their writings. Thus the famous Council of Trent has attempted to make that divine which is notoriously human, and that inspired which, in the sense of the apostle, is notoriously of ‘ private interpretation.’ We allude, of course, to the conduct of Rome in placing the *Apocrypha* upon an equal footing with the sacred oracles of God. Among the books which the ‘ holy œcumenical and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit’ has declared should be received with equal piety and veneration with the unquestioned word of God, and which indeed have God for their author, are *Tobit*, *Judith*, *the additions to the book of Esther*, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah*, *the songs of the three children*, *the story of Susannah*, *the story of Bel and the Dragon*, and *the first and second books of Maccabees*.

“ Having by its own authority constituted these books a part of the word of God, the Holy Council proceeded to pronounce its usual malediction upon all who would not receive them as sacred and canonical.”

I doubt not, Reverend Sir, you here accurately express your conception of what the Council of Trent did in regard to the Scriptures. But your terms express neither the belief of Catholics nor the action of the Council. A *Canon* I have always understood to be a list or a catalogue, *setting forth* what books are inspired, not giving or dispensing inspiration to uninspired books. A work to be entitled to place in a canon must be be-

lieved already inspired; and if believed to be inspired at any one period it must be believed to have been always inspired. Until a canon is formed, a catalogue of inspired works drawn up, manifestly though many works may be *sacred* because inspired, none can be *canonical*, because none can be inserted in a catalogue which does not yet exist. He who forms a canon must naturally first decide what books are and what are not inspired. Did the council of Trent in making such a decision ‘display intolerable arrogance?’ Reverend Sir, your essay claims to contain a decision on that point, which according to the rules and maxims of Protestantism proceeds from your own authority to decide for yourself, and for which you alone are responsible. If you alone, and the fathers of Trent together, are equally qualified to make that decision, then must the same terms which you apply to them, be applicable to yourself. If on the contrary any one should think you personally inferior to them in the qualifications of learning and research on this point, then, unless charity and courtesy forbid him, as certainly they do me, must he look for expressions, if possible, more bitter and harsh than your own. I presume, however, that the ardor with which you engaged in the contest, blinded your eyes to the fact, that while you made your very first thrust at the Council, you fatally exposed yourself to the retort.

We believe that the church of Christ will ever know, and believe, and teach his doctrines and precepts; that He has secured to her the possession of the truths of his revelation through the ministry of that body of pastors, of which the apostles were the first members, and whom he appointed his delegates and sent forth to ‘baptize all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he had taught them,’ guaranteeing at the same time that he would be with them in the performance of this duty ALL DAYS, even to the consummation of the world. He promised them the Spirit of truth who should teach them all truth. Hence we hold that the apostles and their successors in the ministry in the first and second, and in every succeeding century, *have* taught and *will* continue to the end of the world to teach all things that He taught them originally; and when they testify that any doctrine is one of those originally taught by the Saviour, and hand-

ed down to them by their predecessors in the ministry, we feel bound to hear them, His delegated teachers, as we would hear Him, from whom they received their authority, and we, the assurance that He is with them, and teaches through them.

I will not, Reverend Sir, enter at large on the general proofs on this point. I might show that our doctrine is fully sustained by the words of the Saviour himself, that it has ever been recognized and acted on from the earliest days of Christianity, that the contrary is opposed to reason and the infinite wisdom of God, inasmuch as it would ever leave us in doubt and indecision, and as only through it can *all* learn, with that certainty which is required for an unhesitating assent of reason, what doctrines have been in truth revealed by the Saviour. To attempt to establish all this would be to depart too far from the subject I have undertaken to treat. I will consider it simply in reference to the canon of Scripture, and hope to show that the authority claimed by the Catholic Church of determining the canon, that is, of authoritatively declaring what books have been committed to her care by the apostles as inspired, and have ever been revered as such, so far from being a 'striking display of intolerable arrogance,' must be admitted, if the Christian world generally is to possess any certainty of divine inspiration.

In the first place it seems strange to me that you should so severely condemn the Catholic church for having presumed to draw up a canon. It is nothing more than many denominations of Protestants, your own, Rev. sir, included, have done. In the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, in the Articles of the Methodist Episcopal church, and in the Westminster Confession of the Presbyterians, we find canons of the Scriptures. Nothing is more natural than that several Ecclesiastical bodies, as these denominations are, should give forth to its members and the world, through what each according to its peculiar polity recognizes as its proper tribunal, decisions on this all-important point. In the Catholic church, a general council is deemed a proper tribunal, and when circumstances required it, the Catholic church through such a tribunal gave her declaration. I am not now speaking of the *accuracy* of the decision, but of the 'author-

ity exercised' in making it. In styling it 'a striking display of intolerable arrogance,' you strike a blow which harms us not, but recoils with tenfold force on your own denomination. Surely, if the persons assembled at Westminster could draw up a canon or catalogue of what they were of opinion should be received and acknowledged by all as inspired books, the Catholic church could through her bishops assembled in council declare too what books had ever been handed down in her bosom as the word of God. If it was no arrogance in the first to put forth a decree, which was valueless, because on their own principles it bound no one and which every member of your communion has a right to reform, and which some to my own knowledge do reform; it was certainly none in the Catholic church to pronounce a decree which circumstances required, and which her children throughout the world felt had some weight. You might contend that the Catholic church has no *commission* from God to make such decisions, that Catholics err, when they believe them to possess some value. That would be attacking our doctrine. But it strikes me as strange that this particular *exercise* of authority should be singled out for condemnation by a divine of a church which, without even claiming this commission or this authority for its decrees, has nevertheless performed the same act. One who rejects as uninspired the Canticle of Canticles, and if we may believe a recent writer in the Magnolia, there are many biblical scholars in this country who do, must look on the declaration of the Westminster Confession, that that book is inspired, as at least an equally striking display of intolerable arrogance, as the declaration of the Council of Trent, that the books you mention, were ever preserved in the church, and must still be held as divinely inspired. I might also say that it is not more arrogant to declare that a contested book is divinely inspired, than that a contested doctrine or precept is contained in the Scripture. And yet we need not go back many months to find your Assembly declaring this last, and enforcing its declaration under penalty of suspension from the ministry and exclusion from your sacrament. I press this view farther than perhaps seems necessary; but your article, like most articles written against us, breathes a spirit, which I will not qualify, but which

would exclude the Catholic church from that right Protestants boast God has given to all men,—to believe in religious matters, according to our own judgment, and to declare what she holds true.

With these remarks on the *performance* of the act, let us pass on to the decision itself and its truth. I have taken exception to the idea of the decision conveyed by your words. Let the Fathers speak for themselves.

“Sacrosancta œcumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, præidentibus in ea iisdem tribus Apostolicæ Sedis legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo anto oculos proponens, ut, sublatis erroribus, puritas ipsa évangelii in ecclesia conservetur; quod promissum ante per prophetas in Scripturis sanctis, Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei filius proprio ore primum promulgavit; deinde per suos apostolos tanquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinæ omni creaturæ prædicari jussit: perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur. Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto adscribendum censuit; ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint, qui ab ipsa synodo suscipiuntur. Sunt vero infra scripti, (*here follows the list containing the books you object to.*) Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contempserit; anathema sit.”

“The holy œcumenical and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the three aforesaid Legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein; having this always in view, that errors being taken away, the purity of that gospel should be preserved in the church, which, promised by the

prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with his own mouth, and afterwards commanded should be preached by his apostles to every creature, as the source of every saving truth and moral discipline; and clearly seeing that this truth and discipline is contained in the written books, and in the unwritten traditions, which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, dictated by the Holy Ghost to them, have come down even to us, delivered as it were from hand to hand; following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives with due piety and reverence, and venerates, *all the books*, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since one God is the author of both, and also those traditions appertaining to faith and morals, which have been held in the Catholic church in continued succession, as coming from the mouth of Christ, or dictated by the Holy Ghost. It has moreover thought proper to annex to this decree a catalogue of the Sacred Books, lest any doubt might arise, which are the books received by this Council. They are the following (*here follows the list, containing the books to which entirely or in part you object*). Now, if any one does not receive as sacred and canonical those books, entire with all their parts, as they have been usually read in the Catholic church, and are found in the old Latin vulgate edition; and shall knowingly and industriously contemn the aforesaid traditions, let him be anathema." *Sessio quarta celebrata die viii. Mens April, MDXLVI.*

This decree, you perceive, Rev. Sir, treats of the inspired Scriptures and the unwritten traditions. Your essay takes up the first topic: I leave the second, then, without any remark.

From this document it appears at first glance that the Council desired to draw up for the use of the faithful a canon or catalogue of the inspired Books, and that they inserted therein those works which they were convinced had ever been looked upon by the universal church as sacred and inspired. It is a doctrine of our church, sustained by the arguments at which I have hinted above, that Almighty God has promised never to permit error, under such circumstances, to be taught instead of truth. Hence the Council looked upon that decree as decisive, and as

such it has been and is received by the Catholic church throughout the world. Were any Catholic to refuse, he would be separated from her communion. She would no longer recognise in him a sheep of her own true fold: before the tribunal of God, he would stand or fall, according as in his own conscience he was really more or less guilty or innocent of a violation of His supreme commands. This is the meaning of the phrase borrowed from the Scripture, *anathema sit*, let him be anathema, and used in every age of Christianity. You yourself, Rev. sir, have gone as far as you charge the Fathers with going, when you say, that if the books in question are uninspired, those who receive them "run the risk of eternal damnation." In your essay you declare that they are uninspired. The application is obvious.

Hallam, a Protestant writer, in his *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, has the following passage. "No general council ever contained so many persons of eminent learning and ability as that of Trent: nor is there ground for believing that any other investigated the questions before it with so much patience, acuteness, temper, and desire of truth." I might quote from Roscoe and other Protestants, who were somewhat *au fait* with the continental Catholic literature of that period, similar, if not stronger, testimonies in their favor. Considering their decree concerning the Scriptures, apart from the religious value with which the doctrine of the Catholic church invests it, I cannot think it deserves to be treated with such unceremonious disrespect as your essay exhibits. Hundreds of the most learned men in Europe, after patient examination and a thorough investigation of all the evidence they could find on the subject, decide unanimously that a certain fact took place; for, on their own showing, the decree is based on such a decision. You, Rev. sir, think they were mistaken. Still, as literary opponents, you should feel they are no despicable adversaries. If it pleases you, as a divine, to consider them as a religious body, you see the most venerable, learned, and zealous pastors of a church, numbering 150,000,000 in the fold, assembling together, that by mutual advice, after due consultation, and earnest, persevering prayer, they may be enlightened by Him, whose ministers

they hold themselves to be, so as faithfully to instruct on a most important point, the multitudes that look to them for guidance in the way of eternal salvation. If I could believe that, notwithstanding, they fell into error; while I lamented it, I would still respect, revere them. I would often turn to that assembly, as a scene on which a Christian soul should love to dwell, and learn from them earnest zeal and fervent piety.

The question between us is, did they fall into error or not?

You remark that the *onus probandi* lies on us, and that the presumption is against the inspiration of those books you combat, until satisfactory evidence be brought forward to prove that point. This, Rev. Sir, is true, not only in reference to those books, but to all others, which it may be contended are inspired. Defect of such proof would be fatal to the cause of *any* book.

Now I 'assert and shall endeavor to prove,' that the only arguments which establish the inspiration of those books which you admit are inspired, in that manner, and to the extent which common sense and the nature of Christianity require that it should be proved, will also establish the inspiration of the books you repudiate; and that if these are to be rejected, because of the insufficiency of those arguments in their support, the others must be at least generally rejected; the conclusive arguments, at least, for the generality of Christians, being, as I shall show, identically the same in both cases.

I need not say that the question, what writings are divinely inspired, has not been debated only within this and the last two centuries. There has ever been great difference on this head among those who professed to hold a revelation from Almighty God. The Sadducees and the Samaritans rejected all the books of the Old Testament, except those of Moses. The Nazarenes, on the other hand, rejected the Pentateuch. The Simonians, the Basilidians, the Marcionists, with the Manicheans, the Patricians, the Severians, the Albigenses, and some others, rejected the entire Old Testament. Many others have rejected various books. Nor has the New Testament escaped a similar fate. The four gospels were rejected by the Manicheans; each book had its impugners, down to the Apocalypse or book of Revelations, which you well know was rejected by many, who were, and are

still, accounted to have been orthodox. The Rationalists of Germany would smile with contempt and pity on the delusion, which in the effulgence of their philosophical Christianity would believe in any supernatural aid given to the scriptural writers. The deist among ourselves denies altogether the inspiration of the Bible. Nay, according to the principles you lay down, there is a time when *every Protestant must doubt it*. You are not, you say, at 'liberty to believe,' the books you attack, to be inspired, 'until clear and decided proofs of the fact are brought forward.' Neither on the same ground is any Protestant 'at liberty to believe any documents to be inspired,' but is solemnly bound to 'treat them as he treats all other writings, merely as human productions, until clear and cogent arguments for their divine origin are submitted to his understanding.' I think it important that this high 'vantage ground,' to use your own expression in the argument on this subject, 'should be fully apprehended;' for in order to meet your preamble more directly, I will base on it the following remarks, which I offer to your serious consideration and that of those whose sense of equity or whose curiosity may lead them to examine what a Catholic *can* say on the subject.

We cannot be called on to believe any proposition not sustained by adequate proof. When Almighty God deigned to inspire the works contained in the Holy Scriptures, he intended they should be held and believed to be inspired. Therefore there *does* exist some adequate proof of their inspiration. The nature and scheme of Christianity requires that not one only in a thousand, but all those to whom Christianity is properly announced, of whatsoever age or condition they be, should believe it. Therefore, that proof of inspiration is adapted to all those ages and conditions, must be one which will strike the understanding of the wandering Indian and the unlettered negro slave, as clearly and as cogently as that of the enlightened Professor.

Now, Rev. Sir, there may be many ways of seeking to ascertain the fact of the inspiration of any writer or writers. They may, however, be all reduced to the four following methods:—

1. Is every man, no matter what be his condition, to investigate by his own labor and research, and duly examine the argu-

ments that have been or can be alleged for and against the several books, which it is asserted are inspired; and on the strength of that examination to decide for himself with absolute certainty what books are and what are not inspired?

2. Is every individual to receive books as inspired, or to reject them as uninspired, according to the decision of persons he esteems duly qualified by erudition and sound judgment to determine that question accurately?

3. Must we learn the inspiration of the Scriptures from some individual, whom God commissioned to announce this fact to the world?

4. Must he learn it from a body of individuals, to whom in their collective capacity, God has given authority to make an unerring decision on this subject?

I might perhaps add a fifth method; that each one be informed what books are divinely inspired by his *private spirit*. But I omit it as, were it true, it would be superfluous, if not a criminal intrusion on the province God would have reserved to himself, to attempt to prove or disapprove, when our duty would be simply to await in patience this revelation to every particular individual. You are not a member of the Society of Friends, and your essay is not an *exposé* of the teaching of your *private spirit*, but an effort to appeal to argument.

To some one of those four methods, every plan of proving the inspiration of the Scriptures can be reduced. You for yourself use the first; appealing to the testimonies of antiquity in support of your proposition, and to arguments from seeming internal imperfections. One who would rest satisfied with your dissertation, believing that your erudition and judgment must lead you to a sufficient acquaintance with those testimonies and to the proper decision thereon, and who would consequently seek nothing more, but unhesitatingly embrace your conclusion, would be using the second. The third is plain of itself. The fourth, that sustained by Catholics, "you despise."

Rev. Sir, you admit that there *do* exist divinely inspired writings, and that Almighty God requires individuals of every nation, clime, and condition to receive them as inspired. Those individuals are "solemnly bound" to reject that inspiration, to

“treat those works as they treat all other writings, merely as human productions,—“of no more authority than Seneca’s Letters or Tully’s Offices”—(if they ever heard of them)—“until clear and cogent arguments for their divine origin are submitted to their understandings”—“until they are proved to be inspired.” You are forced, therefore, to allow that God has provided such proof, suited to the capacity of all those individuals; and which, when within their reach, He requires them to use. *That proof must be found in the use of some one of the four above-mentioned methods.*

Let us examine them severally, and see which is in truth suited to the means and intelligence of men of every condition.

I Is every man, no matter what be his condition and means, capable of investigating by his own labor and research, and duly examining the arguments, that have been or can be alleged for and against the several books which it is asserted are inspired; and on the strength of that examination, of deciding for himself, with absolute certainty and unerring accuracy, what books are, and what are not inspired? This question, methinks, need not be asked a second time.

The arguments in this course would be of two classes, external and internal; either or both of which would form matter for investigation. He might seek, as you have endeavored to do, whether there exists a sufficient mass of testimony to establish the fact or facts, that God did at certain times, and on certain occasions, exercise over particular writers the supernatural influence of inspiration; or, from a consideration of the perfection of the Scriptures, he might conclude that they were above the power of unaided men, and therefore must be of divine origin. To perform the first properly, he must be deeply versed in the Latin, the Greek, and the Hebrew, perhaps too, in several modern languages; must have at his command a more extensive library than, I believe, Charleston can boast of; must spend consequently many long years of study in acquiring those languages and obtaining authors, in searching out the thousand and one testimonies scattered through a hundred musty tomes, and in acquiring that thorough knowledge of times, of men, of writings, which will enable him to judge of the credibility of those witnesses—must finally possess an unrivalled, almost super-

natural accuracy of judgment, to reconcile this mass of conflicting statements, and distinguishing which are worthy and which unworthy of credit—to conclude confidently and evidently in favor of or against the inspiration of the books examined. The second requires a thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures in the original Hebrew, Greek, and Chaldean, and in the ancient versions in Samaritan, Copht, Arabic, Syriac, Greek, and Latin, and with the ancient manuscripts; and the ability to apply to all this the subtle rules of refined criticism, in order to determine, in the first place, as far as can be ascertained, the exact language and meaning of the sacred writers; a thorough knowledge of the abilities and acquirements of each writer and the state of science, and already revealed religion in his country and age, in order to see to what extent of perfection his own powers with such aids could naturally carry him; the faculty also of duly appreciating the beauties of the sacred writings, and that knowledge of chemistry, of natural history, of geology, of the history of nations, and of almost every science, which may enable him fully and satisfactorily to refute all the objections brought from these different sources against the intrinsic truth, and consequently internal evidence, of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Need I say, it is all important he should be able to possess and peruse the books on whose inspiration he is thus to decide?

Whether any investigation in either or both classes, carried on even under the most favorable circumstances, will unerringly prove the inspiration of any books of the Scripture, I leave to be mooted by those who choose to undertake the task. The Editors of the *Miscellany* have lately published several articles on the subject, under the head, *Protestant evidence of the inspiration of Scripture*. For my immediate purpose, it is enough to ask you and my readers to reflect for one moment on the past and present condition of the vast majority of those millions who call themselves Christians; whom God *requires* to receive the Scriptures, and who consequently have “clear and cogent arguments for their Divine origin.” Is it not notorious, the great, the overwhelming majority of Christians have ever been and must continue incapacitated by their position in the world, their want of

time, of learning, of means, from even attempting such an investigation? Was it not, for ages before the discovery of the art of printing, morally impossible, on account of the labor and tediousness of copying such volumes with the pen, their consequent scarcity, and the enormous price at which alone they could be procured, for most individuals to obtain even copies of the Holy Scriptures themselves, much more of those works necessary for such an examination? Not to leave our own state, are not more than one-half of her population debarred by law from learning to read? Of the 550,000 souls in South Carolina, think you there are 550 or even 50, who have time, the means, the ability, the opportunity of devoting themselves to this laborious task?

If every individual is bound to reject the inspiration of a book, until it is clearly and evidently proved to his mind to be inspired, and if such proof can only be obtained through that personal examination, then must the negro and the Indian, and the poor and the unlettered, and the daily laborer toiling from sun-rise to sun-set for his bread, then must the **OVERWHELMING MAJORITY** of Christians reject the Scriptures; then were all those, who, deprived of worldly learning, looked in their simplicity to God for saving wisdom, and fondly believed they possessed it in those sacred oracles of truth—I tremble to follow the awful train of thought. Rev. Sir, the *first* CANNOT be the method appointed by Almighty God, whereby all should learn with unerring accuracy the inspiration of the Scriptures. Let us take up the second.

II. Is every individual to receive books as inspired, or to reject them as uninspired, according to the decision of persons he esteems sufficiently qualified by erudition and sound judgment to determine that question accurately? I apprehend a candid mind can easily answer this question.

Is such a course adapted to *all* Christians? Would it lead them with unerring accuracy to the truth? If it be the means appointed by Almighty God, both questions must be answered in the affirmative. If common sense and experience show that either or both must be answered negatively, it is not.

Those who possess not learning themselves, can seldom or never form a proper estimate of the learning and critical judgment of a truly erudite person whom perhaps they have scarcely

looked on. Whole communities may be deceived on this point. Need I cite the case of Voltaire, once extolled by France and the soi-disant Philosophers of Europe as a very Briareus of Erudition, and now that in France Religion and Science happily go hand in hand, and execrations of *l'infame* are no longer passports to celebrity, justly derided as a puny puffed-up smatterer? The individual thus seeking the light of others, (besides surrendering his Protestant privilege of judging for himself, and pinning his faith to their sleeves,) is in most cases unable to judge with certainty and accuracy on the sufficiency of the qualifications of those learned persons, frequently of that single individual, within his limited circle of knowledge. Of the learned in other lands, and of their decisions, he knows nothing. Even did he, you are aware every variety of decisions would be offered him. I cannot be brought to believe, and I am sure you will not ask me to believe, that all erudition and sound judgment is confined to Germany, Holland, Great Britain, the United States, Denmark, and Sweden, and is there parcelled out among those who may chance to agree with you in your list of inspired books. I cannot believe, for example, that our lamented Bishop, for whom our tears yet flow, was either unsound in judgment or deficient in erudition. Not to speak of esteemed friends, who, if I err not, are yet unwilling to admit *any* inspired work, I know many Catholics in the United States, whose talents and years of study render them, as they rendered him, the ornaments of the community in which they move. I believe that "La belle France" and sunny Italy produce many champions who press forward to the van in the cause of science. I know it is the custom of some to rail against those countries as buried in ignorance and darkness, at least in matters of religion. But such language ever recalls forcibly to my mind the fable of the ant, who, till perchance she wandered forth from her hill, thought nothing could be perfect on earth but what met her limited vision within a few yards of her home. Were you, Rev. Sir, to devote a leisure hour or so to examining the biography of those prelates who assisted at the Council of Trent, and whose authority and decisions you so heartily "despise," you would find them eminent and worthy of respect for their sincere piety and vast erudition, albeit their decision on the books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, &c., was different from yours.

If in receiving books as inspired, or not, the ignorant and unlearned are, according to the will of God, to abide by the decisions of those learned individuals to whom they have access, or whom in their simplicity they deem qualified to act as their guides, then must we be content to say that God requires some to receive as inspired, and others to reject as uninspired, the same books. The second course seems impracticable. Were it not, it would lead to contradictory conclusions; and therefore, to *error*. Such cannot be the means appointed by Divine wisdom, whereby all the faithful shall truly learn what books of the Scripture are really inspired. Pass we on to the third.

III. Did God ordain that all Christians should learn what Scriptures were divinely inspired, from some individual, whom He commissioned to announce this truth to the world? This is the next inquiry which awaits us. If He did, then will the proofs of that commission, and the declaration so made, be such as the mind of every Christian of whatsoever condition can seize.

Our Divine Saviour, taking him simply in his historical character, proved his commission from Heaven by miracles. But He left no canon or catalogue of inspired works. The Apostles, too, proved their Divine commission. There might be some discussion respecting the works attributed to them; but neither did they leave a canon in their writings. But did not the Saviour or the Apostles leave such a canon, though unrecorded, to their followers, to be by them transmitted to future generations, and which all are bound to receive? This supposition, besides overturning another fundamental axiom of Protestants, that *all things* necessary to be believed are recorded in the Scriptures, turns over the question to method the first, which I have already disposed of.

After the time of the Apostles, we know of no one who claimed and proved an extraordinary commission from God to establish a canon of Scripture.

Before the coming of Christ, Esdras is said to have established a canon for the use of the Jewish nation. It has been disputed whether he did so or not; whether he did so by his own authority, or by the authority of God; whether alone, or in conjunction with, and as member of, the Sanhedrim. It has been asserted,

too, that in that catalogue were originally contained books, which in the vicissitudes of that nation, perished in the Hebrew, and are consequently no longer in the Jewish canon, which consists only of books preserved in that language. I need not trouble you with my opinions on those different points. More veteran scholars than I, have found some of them insoluble enigmas. I apprehend a *certain* and *accurate* answer to them all would, at least, be far beyond the capacity of the majority of Christians, and yet this much would be indispensably necessary, if they are to have any Divine authority even for the Jewish canon. At all events, that decision of Esdras would not bear on the inspiration of books then unwritten, as were all the books of the New Testament, so important to Christians, and nearly all the works, the inspiration of which your essay controverts.

The third method, then, cannot be admitted; because no such clear unequivocal testimony of the entire number of inspired books, proceeding from an individual, who is evidently and undoubtedly commissioned of God, exists; and because in the case of Esdras, the most we can say is, that the substance of the declaration is tinged with doubt, while the fact that he made it, and his authority for doing so, cannot be ascertained by the vast majority of Christians.

IV. The fourth method alone now remains, namely, that God has ordained that each Christian shall learn what books are inspired, from a body of individuals, to whom in their collective capacity He has given authority to make an unerring decision on that point; and we find ourselves reduced to the alternative of either admitting this, or of saying, that while God *requires* all to believe the inspiration of the Scripture, and binds them to reject it unless it be clearly proved, He has left them without any such proof.

Would such a method, *if established*, be adapted to all Christians? Would it lead them to truth?

One of such a body presenting himself to instruct a Christian or an infidel, would first inform him that, a number of years ago, a person, known by the name of Jesus Christ, appeared in Judea, and established a new religion. Sufficient motives of credibility can easily be brought forward to induce the novice to believe

this. He proceeds to state that Christ proved His heavenly commission to do so, by frequent, public, and manifest miracles. It will not require much to establish in those works certain striking characteristics of themselves, clearly indicative of a miraculous nature. Hence common sense is forced to conclude that the religion established by Christ was *divine*, springing from God and binding on man. So far we find nothing above or contrary to the means and understanding even of an Indian or a negro. Our instructor then states that Christ, in order to secure the extension of his religion to every people, and its perpetuation to the end of time, selected from among his followers certain persons, who, with their successors, were, in his name, and by the same authority he possessed, to go forth and teach all nations all that he had himself taught in Judea.* Such a delegation is by means unnatural or strange, and there could be found no novice, however rude and uncultivated, whose mind could not grasp it, and who would not be led to believe it on sufficiently credible testimony. The next lesson will be that the Saviour assured them that they would be opposed, that others would rise up to teach errors, whom he sent not, and that some of their own number would fall away; but that God would recall to their minds all things he had taught them,† that He would send them the Spirit of Truth, who should abide with them forever,‡ and should teach them all truth,§ that He himself would be with them while fulfilling that commission, all days, even to the consummation of the world,|| and that the gates of hell, the fiercest conflicts of enemies, should never prevail against that church¶ which he sent them to found and ever to instruct. For stronger and more explicit evidence of this, he might, if necessary and convenient, recur to certain histories written by persons who lived at the same time with the Saviour, and were for years in daily and intimate intercourse with him, who could not mistake such simple points, and the accuracy of whose reports is universally acknowledged and can easily be substantiated.

“All this,” replies the novice, “my own common sense

* Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

† John xiv. 26.

‡ John xiv. 16, 17.

§ John xiv. 26 : xvi. 13.

|| Matt. xxviii. 20.

¶ Matt. xvi. 18.

would lead me to expect. The persecutions and errors you refer to, are but the natural workings of the passions of men, such as experience shows them in every-day life. It would be strange, indeed, that while men change and contradict every thing else, they should not seek to change and contradict God's doctrines and precepts too. If He willed that the religion of Christ should endure always, that is, that the doctrines He revealed should be ever preached and believed, the precepts He gave ever announced and obeyed, it was necessary to make some adequate provision against this error and change-seeking tendency of man. If those doctrines and precepts are to be learned from persons he appointed to teach in his name and by his authority, as delegates whom, in virtue of the power given him, He sent as He was sent by the Father, that provision must evidently and necessarily be directed to preserve the purity of their teaching, to preserve that body of teachers, by the power of God, from error, and to make them, in fact, 'teach all things whatsoever he had taught them.' Unaided reason almost assures me, this is the course the Saviour would adopt. The evidence you lay before me is satisfactory and worthy of credit. I assent."

The missionary would then inform his pupil, that the body of teachers, thus guaranteed to teach all truth, 'for ever,' 'to all nations,' and 'all days, even to the consummation of the world,' and consequently ever to *exist* and to teach, does in fact exist, claiming and exercising that power; that at the present day it consists of such individuals, of whom he is a commissioned teacher. If asked, he would probably be able to point out the predecessors of those persons in the last, and every preceding age; for a line of succession would have come down from the days of the Apostles, claiming and exercising that authority. He *might* state that 175,000,000 of every nation, from New Zealand to China, from Van Diemen's land to the Canadian *Indians*, from the Cape of Good Hope to Siberia, admit and *subject* themselves to this authority; that this immense *multitude* is owing to no sudden increase, but that millions on *millions* in every age have done the same. The novice *might* inquire, whether the predictions concerning persecutions and error had yet been fulfilled. In answer, the *past* and present persecutions might be

laid before him, and the long list of those who in various ages opposed the teaching of that body by every imaginable shade of error, but with all their efforts could never overturn or suppress it.

“Truly,” exclaims the pupil, “the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church of Christ. The existence of that body, its history, its claims recognized by such multitudes, would of themselves, had I no other motive for believing, convince me of all the facts I have just admitted. Were they not true, this claim would be unfounded, this body, subject to the fate of all human bodies, would have long since perished. I see whatever Christ taught must be true. I recognize you as his commissioned teacher. I believe him for his miracles ; I believe you for his authority. What are his doctrines, that I may receive them ? His precepts, that I may obey them ?”

In all this there is nothing opposed to the nature or the powers of any man, or to the nature of religion. The facts to which assent is asked, are as simple, and may be readily made as clear and as certain, as that there lived such a Roman as Julius Cæsar, that he warred in Gaul, afterwards turned his arms against his country, overcame Pompey, and finally met his death from assassination. An appeal is made to that principle implanted in the human mind by its Creator, and among the earliest to be developed, confiding reliance on the statements of others, while he guarantees that through his Almighty Providence, TRUTH shall be stated. An infant would believe by force of that nature which God has given it, all I have proposed and the doctrines delivered in consequence, long before it would dream of asking evidence for authority to teach ; and when reason is sufficiently developed to receive motives of credibility, they are already at hand. We should ever bear in mind, too, that if this be the method adopted by Almighty God, if in reality, as the hypothesis requires, he speaks to that individual through this teacher, his divine grace will influence the mind of the novice to yield a more ready and firm assent than the tendency of our nature and the unaided motives of human authority would produce. In this system, there is no room for that awful, but necessary, inevitable consequence of the axioms of Protestants, and of your own principles, that in

the life of every individual, there should be a dark void of infidelity and unbelief; from the time when, having attained the use of reason, he is able, and most solemnly bound before his Maker, to judge for himself, until the time when clear and cogent arguments for the inspiration of, at least, some one of the scriptural books have been laid before his mind. During that interval, be it long or short, an hour, a day, a month, a year, entire lustres, or a whole life, their inspiration is *unproved* to his mind, 'clear and cogent arguments for their divine origin are not yet submitted to his understanding,' and hence he is 'solemnly bound' to 'treat them, as he treats all other writings, merely as human productions,' 'having no more authority than Seneca's Letters, or Tully's Offices.' In this interval he is without an inspired Bible, and consequently cannot believe the truths of Divine Revelation, which, on the broad ground of Protestantism, are to be learned from the Scriptures alone as the inspired word of God; in one word, during that period, he is 'solemnly bound' (shall I say, unless 'he runs the risk of everlasting damnation?') to live a perfect INFIDEL! I know that this statement will startle many of my readers—that you will disavow it. I do not charge Protestants with holding the absurdity; for none, as far as I know, have avowed it *totidem verbis*. I see, however, a partial admission in the practice of many Protestants to let their children grow up without much religious instruction, because in future years they have to examine and judge for themselves. Still this conclusion, however absurd and awful, (as you have not advanced it, I may without infringing the rules of courtesy, add) however *blasphemous*, is the necessary, unavoidable consequence of your premises. Such an inference cannot follow from TRUTH.

This fourth method is not repugnant to the nature of religion: for all true religion is based on submission of the understanding and the will to God, when He speaks to *us* himself; to his authorized delegates, when through them He deigns to teach. Had He appointed it, that body of individuals so commissioned, would evidently teach TRUTH.

The fourth method alone is therefore both practicable in the ordinary condition of the Christian world, and efficient.

Does there exist a body of men clothed with this authority

guaranteed by such a divine promise from error? Has it made a declaration setting forth, in pursuance of that authority, what works are truly inspired?

You, Rev. Sir, are forced to the alternative of either answering both questions in the affirmative, or of saying that the overwhelming majority of Christians are "solemnly bound" to reject the Scriptures; and if they have admitted them, it was in violation of the will of God, and of their solemn duty. From this dilemma there is no escape.

Were I not unwilling to take too wide a range, I might here develop those arguments on the subject which I referred to in the beginning of this letter. Those who are desirous of investigating this question of vital importance to every sincere Christian, I refer to *Wiseman's Lectures*, an *English* work, and one easily obtained. I trust that I have said enough to show that such a tribunal, at least for proving the inspiration of the Scriptures, does, and must exist, unless we presume to tax the infinite wisdom of God with absurdity and contradiction.

Which then is that body? The Pastors of the Catholic church claim to compose it. No other body claims that commission. Leaving aside an appeal to the historical evidence of continued succession from the Apostles, and other arguments bearing on the subject, common sense tells us, that if God has invested any body of individuals with such authority, that body cannot either be ignorant of its powers, nor disclaim them. The Catholic church, then, is that body. In the decree of the Council of Trent, the Christian world has its authorized declaration.

But why delay for fifteen centuries and a half this necessary, all important proof? Why leave the world for such a length of time without this evidence of the inspiration of the Scripture? I deny that the delay took place. In order that the sentiments of a community be known by those who move within its bosom, or have intercourse with its members, it is not necessary that these should assemble in a public meeting and set forth their opinions in a preamble and resolutions. So, too, the doctrines of the Catholic church can be known by the universal and concordant teaching of her pastors, even when her bishops have not assembled in a general council and embodied those doctrines in

a list of decrees. When general councils are held, it is, on the head of doctrine, merely to declare and define what doctrines have ever been taught and believed in the church. This is what the Council of Trent did on the canon of Scriptures.

The Apostles left to the infant church those inspired works which Catholics now hold. They were universally used, excepting perhaps in a few churches, for whose variations I shall account when treating of your second argument. After a number of years, circumstances arose which led some persons to doubt whether the Universal Church, though she ever had and still continued to use them, did so, because she looked on all as inspired, or some merely as pious and instructive works. Other works, too, were protruded as inspired, and some seemed to obtain partial circulation. An expression of the belief of the body of pastors was required. It was again and again given in the councils of Carthage and Hippo, and the decisions of Innocent I. and Gelasius. In these the whole body of pastors acquiesced; and for a thousand years no objection of any importance was made. After that period arose Protestantism. Luther and his followers denounced many books, not those alone you controvert, but others also which you revere as inspired, in terms compared to which even your essay is courteous. Some Catholics, too, seemed to think the former decision had not been sufficiently explicit; and therefore the Bishops at Trent, assisted by the most learned divines, canonists and scholars, after every possible research and the fullest investigation, decided again, that all those books in the Catholic Bible had been handed down from the Apostles, had ever been held in the church as inspired, and should therefore be still revered as sacred and canonical. These different assertions I shall sustain by due authority when I answer your second argument.

But many objections have been urged against the truth of that decision. I ask you, Rev. Sir, is there *any* doctrine of revelation against which many arguments have not been urged? Have not the very existence of God and his Unity been assailed? Have not the mysteries of the Trinity, of the Incarnation of the Son, and every doctrine of Christianity been attacked? The fact therefore of opposition is no disproof. Nor is it ne-

cessary for the true believer to be able to answer every cavil or sophism. Surely the negro cannot answer, cannot even comprehend, the arguments brought against the existence of God. Is he therefore doomed to remain an Atheist? When we know positively and clearly that God requires us to believe a certain doctrine because he declares it to be true, we are bound to obey unconditionally. Common sense tells us that every objection to it must be based on error, even though we be unable to point it out. And so too a Catholic relies on the authorized decision of his church concerning the inspired writings with surety, classing all the objections urged thereagainst, with the numberless other objections urged in like manner against every truth of Divine revelation, against the Deity himself, which, according to his degree of knowledge, he may or may not be able to refute, but which he knows by *a priori* evidence of the strongest character *must* be false.

I trust that "a candid and unprejudiced mind" will, upon a mature consideration of the arguments I have brought forward, see that the act of the Council of Trent, so far from being a "striking display of intolerable arrogance," was a decision, with the divine authority for which, and therefore its *truth*, the inspiration of the Scriptures for the vast majority of Christians, and consequently on Protestant principles, Christianity itself must stand or fall.

After thus establishing the absolute necessity of admitting that authority, which you impugn, and showing the frightful consequences of a contrary course—consequences, from which, I am certain, you will shrink—I might rest satisfied that I have fully answered your essay and proved by clear and cogent arguments the inspiration of those works against which it is directed.—Whatever else I may say will be "over and above what is actually required." "With the distinct understanding, then, that I am doing a work, which justice to our cause does not absolutely require," but which places the TRUTH, not in a former position but in a stronger light, I will proceed in my next to notice those arguments you so confidently term "irresistible." Meanwhile

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Yours, &c.

A. P. F.

LETTER II.

To the Rev. JAMES H. THORNWELL, Professor of the Evidences of Christianity, &c.

Rev. Sir:—In the introductory remarks to your essay, you said you were not required to advance a single argument against the books of “*Tobit, Judith, the additions to the Book of Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah, the Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susannah, the Story of Bel and the Dragon, and the first and second books of Maccabees.*” It would, at first sight, appear from your article that Catholics urge only the authority of the Council of Trent in behalf of the inspiration of those books and parts of books. You have scarcely given us the credit of advancing a single argument in corroboration of the truth of that decree. “A candid and unprejudiced mind” would, methinks, have desired from you at least a full and fair statement of what reasons we do bring forward. Your position forbids my supposing you ignorant of at least some of them. Still I cannot say I regret the course you have taken, though it is not the one I would have chosen. Every impartial, “thinking mind,” even though he knew nothing of the Catholic view of the question, would see that yours is completely an *ultra* party exposition of the case, and that, before forming his decision, common prudence requires him to hear the other side. I trust that my letters may fall into the hands of some such.

In my first, I treated of the authority of the decree of the Council of Trent, which declared those works “sacred and canonical;” and showed by a line of argument, which, although not conclusive to an infidel, must be so to every Christian, because based on the very nature of Christianity, that in the decree itself we had clear and cogent proof of their inspiration. I argued thus: No man can be called on to believe what is not sustained by adequate proof. Hence, when God proposes any truth for the belief of man, he sustains it by adequate proof. His own Divine veracity would fully constitute that proof for the individual to whom he speaks. For others it is necessary that the additional fact, that God did reveal his truth to that individual,

be also sustained by adequate proof. Nothing deserves that name, which cannot be learned or understood, or which, if learned and understood, would lead to error, or leave room for reasonable doubt.

You hold that one of the truths proposed by Almighty God for the belief of all Christians, to whom Christianity is duly announced, is, that certain works are inspired. Unless we betake ourselves to the tenets of the Society of Friends, and say that He declares by a special revelation or teaching of the *Private Spirit* to every individual, what books are and what are not inspired, (which neither of us is willing to do,) we must confess that this truth is one communicated to man many ages ago, and which is now to be believed by all those Christians of every class and condition and clime, because of that communication. Of this communication there does, therefore, there must exist adequate proof for all such persons. There can be but four methods of obtaining that proof, three of which we saw must be rejected, and the fourth consequently admitted.

The *first*, a personal examination by each individual of the arguments, historical or intrinsic, in favor and against the inspiration of the Scripture, even if such an examination would ever lead to a certain result, could not be admitted, because the overwhelming majority of Christians are prevented from instituting that examination, by the duties and the circumstances of that condition in which Divine Providence has placed them. The *second*, that the learned should decide for and be followed by the unlearned, would lead some to error, as some of the learned thus to be followed have decided erroneously. The *third*, that all Christians should learn what books are in reality inspired from some individual commissioned by Almighty God to announce this truth to the world, was, as we saw, untenable, for the simple reason that no such declaration from an individual thus commissioned, exists. We were forced, therefore, to admit the *fourth*, that all Christians should learn what books compose the divinely inspired Scripture from a body of individuals whom God has authorized to decide on that point, and guarantees from error in so deciding. We saw that this method was feasible, adapted to the capacity and condition of every Christian, and consonant with

the essence of religion. *If* adopted, it would certainly lead to truth. In one word, it alone was feasible and effective. It *must*, therefore, be admitted, unless we say that the overwhelming majority of Christians are “solemnly bound,” unless “they run the risk of everlasting damnation,” to reject the inspiration of the Scriptures, and be, on Protestant principles, perfect infidels—unless we overturn Christianity itself. The Pastors of the Catholic Church ALONE claim to compose that body. They, therefore, DO compose it. Their decisions on the question of inspiration are guaranteed by Almighty God from error. They have numbered the books you controvert among the inspired Scriptures. Therefore those books ARE “*sacred and canonical.*”

I conceive that I have thus satisfactorily discharged the *onus probandi*. As I said above, Catholics corroborate this decree by many other arguments, improbable as this may appear to those who look on your essay as a fair and candid exposition of the state of this controversy. This might be the most proper place for introducing them. But as, in order to develop them fully, I would have to say much which I should again repeat in answering your “irresistible” arguments, I will defer doing so just now; and will proceed to test the force of those same “irresistible” arguments.

The first you state in the following words:—

“I. Our first argument is drawn from the indisputable fact that these books were not found in the canon of the Jews in the time of our Saviour and his Apostles. It is even doubted by learned men, whether some of them existed at all until some time after the Apostles had fallen asleep. But be this as it may, they were not in the sacred canon of the Jews, or the catalogue of books which the whole nation received as coming from God. We have very clear testimony upon the subject of the Jewish canon, in JOSEPHUS, *Philo*, the *Talmud* and the early Christian Fathers. It is unnecessary to quote these testimonies at full length. Those who have not access to the original works, may find them faithfully collated in *Schmidius de Canone Sacro*, and the *Eichhorn's Einleitung*. We would particularly commend to the reader's attention *Hornemann's* book *de Canone Philonis*. Augustine again and again confesses that the Apocrypha formed

no part of the Jewish canon. He declares that Solomon was not the author of the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, and assures us, moreover, that those books were chiefly respected by the Western Christians. He informs us that Judith was not received by the Jews; and his testimony in relation to Maccabees is equally decisive. We insist upon the testimony of Augustine, which may be found in his Treatise De Civ. Dei, lib. i. c. 17, because he had evidently a very great respect for these books—for he frequently quotes them, and because he was a member of the body whose decisions in their favor have been strongly and earnestly pleaded. We take it, then, to be a fact which no scholar would think of calling into question, sustained by the concurring testimony of Jews and Christians for four hundred years after Christ, that the Jews rejected the Apocrypha from their canon. For the purpose of our present argument it is not necessary to show what books they did receive, nor how they classed and arranged them. It is enough that they had a canon which they believed to be inspired, and that in it the Apocrypha were not included.

“ Now our argument is this : Jesus Christ and his Apostles approved of the Jewish canon, whatever it was; appealed to it as possessing Divine authority; and evidently treated it as at that time complete, or as containing the whole of God’s revelation as far as it was then made. If the Apocrypha had been really a part of that revelation, and the Jews had either ignorantly or wickedly suppressed it, how comes it that Christ nowhere rebukes them for their error? We find him severely inveighing against the Pharisees for adding to the Word of God by their *vain traditions*, but not a syllable do we hear in regard to what was equally culpable, their taking from it, which they certainly had done if the Apocrypha were inspired. Here was confessedly a great teacher and prophet in Israel—their long-expected Messiah, who constituted the burden of their Scriptures according to his own testimony: and yet, while he quotes and approves the canon of the Jews, and remands the Jews themselves to their own Scriptures, he nowhere insinuates that their sacred library was defective. If the Jews had done wrong in rejecting the Apocrypha, is it credible that he who came in the name of

God—a teacher sent from God to reveal fully the Divine will, would have passed over without noticing such a flagrant fraud? We find him reproving his countrymen for every other corruption in regard to sacred things of which they are known to have been guilty, but not a whisper escapes his lips or the lips of his Apostles touching this gross suppression of a large portion of the Word of God. The conclusion is irresistible, that neither Jesus nor his Apostles believed in the Divine authority of the Apocrypha—they knew that *they were not inspired*. We will grant the Romanist what *he cannot* prove, and what *we can disprove*, that these books are quoted in the New Testament. This will not remove the difficulty. According to his views of the canon, the Jews were guilty of an outrageous fraud in regard to the Sacred Oracles, and yet neither Christ nor his Apostles, whose business it was to give us the *whole* revelation of God, ever charged them with this fraud, or took any steps to restore the rejected books to their proper places. Christ, as the great Prophet of the church, was unfaithful to his high and solemn trust, if he stood silently by when the Word of God was trampled in the dust or buried in obscurity, or even robbed of its full authority. To the Jews were committed the Oracles of God (Rom. iii. 2); if they betrayed their trust, we ought to have been informed of it before the lapse of sixteen centuries.

“It is vain to allege that Christ and his Apostles used the Septuagint, and that this version contained the Apocrypha. In the first place, it cannot be proved that the Septuagint at that time did contain the Apocrypha; in the second place, if it did contain them, the difficulty is rather increased than lessened. The question is, What books did the Jews, to whom were committed the Oracles of God, receive as *inspired*? Did Christ know that they *rejected* the Apocrypha from the list of *inspired writings*? If so, and the Septuagint version was in his hands and really contained these rejected books, what more natural than that Christ should have told his Apostles that here are books which the Jews reject, but which you must receive—they are of equal authority with the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms? His total silence both before the Jews and his own disciples, becomes more unaccountable than ever, if the books were actually

before him and almost forced upon his notice by the version of the Scriptures which he used. But we do not insist upon this, because we do not believe that the Septuagint, at that time, contained the Apocrypha.* If it should be said that the Jews received these books as inspired, but did not insert them in the canon because they had not the authority of a prophet for doing so, why is it that Christ did not give the requisite authority, if not to the Jewish Priests and Rulers, at least to his own Apostles?

“Upon every view of the subject, then, the silence of Christ is wholly unaccountable, if these writings are really inspired. It becomes simple and natural upon the supposition that they were merely human productions. The Jews had done right in rejecting them—they stood upon a footing with other literary works, and our Saviour had no more occasion to mention them than he had to mention the writings of the Greek Philosophers.”

Now, Rev. Sir, you say that a Canon is not an inspired book, but a list or catalogue of inspired works. You lay down the proposition, which I admit, that at the time of the Saviour the Jewish Synagogue had such a canon, and that the books you controvert were not included therein. There might be some discussion as to part of what you exclude, but I will not argue the point. Even be it, if you will, that during the preaching of the Saviour, not one of the books or parts of books, the inspiration of which you deny, was included in the canon of the Synagogue of Jerusalem.

You then make the four following assertions :

1. That the Jews “rejected” those books from their canon in such a manner as, were they in truth inspired, to be guilty of an outrageous fraud in regard to the “Sacred Oracles.”

2. That “the Saviour and his Apostles approved of the Jewish canon.”

3. That they “appealed to it as possessing divine authority.”

4. That they “evidently treated it as complete, or as containing the whole of God’s revelation, as far as it was then made.”

Now, Rev. Sir, in regard to the last three points I notice a very serious oversight in your essay. You have entirely forgotten

* Vid. Schmidius de Canone.

or omitted to allege, or even by note to refer to, a single passage of the New Testament, wherein the Saviour or the Apostles speaks at all of the *canon* of the Jews. They refer to the Scriptures generally and to particular books, they quote from them, but there is not in the whole New Testament a single passage showing that Christ and his Apostles ever referred to the *canon*, *catalogue*, or *list* of inspired books held among the Jews, much less treated that catalogue as *complete*, and “containing the whole of God’s Revelation, as far as then made.”

But what you cannot sustain by an appeal to the words of the Saviour or of the Apostles, you seek to establish by inference. If those works are, as the Council of Trent declared them to be, in reality divinely inspired, the Jewish nation, in not admitting them into their canon, “betrayed their trust,” were guilty of “fraud,” “trampled in the dust, or buried in obscurity, or even robbed of its full authority” the word of God, were “guilty of an outrageous fraud in regard to the Sacred Oracles.” “It was the business of Christ and his Apostles to give us the *whole* revelation of God.” Consequently, in that case they “would have charged the Jews with this fraud, or taken some steps to restore the rejected books to their proper places.” He did not; neither did his Apostles. Therefore those books are not inspired, are of “no more authority than Seneca’s Letters or Tully’s Offices,” and the Jewish canon, which did not contain them, was then “complete,” and was treated as such by the Saviour and Apostles. This, if I understand you, is the pith of your argument; in which, by the by, your third assertion is still left entirely unsupported.

Before answering this argument, allow me to make a few preliminary observations.

1st. That there is great difference between not inserting a work really inspired, in a Canon, because there is not requisite proof to establish its inspiration, or sufficient authority to insert it; and rejecting it, when that proof and authority both exist. The first course is proper—to insert a book under such circumstances would be criminal. The second deserves all the terms you use. The first was the case of the Jews. Without a shadow of proof therefor, you charge them with the second, if those

works are inspired. In your argument this distinction seems not to have struck you, or you have kept it out of sight until the end. You admit it, however, towards the close, when you say: "If it should be said that the Jews received those books as inspired, but did not insert them in the canon, because they had not the authority of a prophet for doing so," etc.

2d. In case those books were in reality inspired, though not inserted in the Jewish canon, it would have been sufficient for the Saviour or the Apostles to place them among the divinely inspired books of the church. This I think evident to every Christian. You seem to admit it, also, when you ask: "Why is it that Christ did not give the requisite authority, if not to the Jewish Rulers and Priests, at least to his own Apostles?"

3d. Christ and his Apostles might have said much in regard to the Scriptures and inspired books, which is not recorded in the New Testament. I cannot quote higher and fuller authority than the New Testament itself. "But there are also many other things which Jesus did; which if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written." John xxi. 25. "To whom (*the Apostles*) also he (*Jesus*) showed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them, and speaking of the kingdom of God." Acts i. 3. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have received, whether by word or by our Epistle." 2 Thess. ii. 14. I might quote other texts, but my remark is evidently true. Did not the Apostles change the Jewish Sabbath for the Lord's day, making this a day of rest consecrated to God, and abrogating the first? Where will you find that in the New Testament? This, too, you seem to allow is possible, as you begin your second argument with the following words: "If it should be pretended that Christ did give his Apostles authority to receive these books, though no record was made of the fact, we ask," etc.

4th. I might also make another remark. Supposing those works inspired, as I contend they are, but not admitted at the Saviour's time into the Jewish canon, it was not, strictly speaking, necessary that either Christ or the Apostles should testify personally to their inspiration. If the Saviour established a body of

men, who, by his authority and under the guidance of His Holy Spirit of Truth, were to decide that question, which, as I showed in Letter I., we are necessarily bound to admit, the decision of such a body at any subsequent period would be amply sufficient. The Christian world would have had, in the mean time, many other divinely inspired works. If God was not pleased to give any inspired works to the children of Israel before Moses, nor to inspire the prophets till a far later period, surely it would be the height of presumption in us now to lay down rules to Him, prescribing *when* he should inspire a work or establish its inspiration. This is more evident, when we consider that the Jews had, and the Christians must still have, some method of truly and satisfactorily ascertaining the truths of Revelation, other than the simple perusal of all the inspired works. In regard to the Jews, this is evident, and is allowed by themselves. That Christians, too, have such a mode, (a doctrine you are aware Catholics hold,) is shown to be necessarily true by a train of argument similar to that of my preceding letter, and equally cogent.' Surely the 300,000 negroes in South Carolina prohibited by law from being taught to read, cannot learn much from the perusal of the Scriptures. Must they therefore remain ignorant of the truths of Christianity? Again, has God ever declared that he will never inspire another work? And if He has not limited his omnipotence, shall we dare to place bounds to it? Now, in point of fact, as far as the Christian world is concerned, there would be little if any difference between His inspiring a work 500, 1,000, or 2,000 years after Christ, and His then making known, in any way He thinks proper, that a work written any number of years before, is inspired. I make this remark, not because I intend to use it in my argument, but because it is highly improper to bind down the Providence of God, in regard to the inspired writings, to certain laws and times, as you seem to do, that have no foundation in truth. The Saviour came, if you will, to give us the whole Revelation of God, that is, all the *doctrinal truths* of that revelation, but not all the inspired works; for not one of the books of the New Testament was written until years after his crucifixion. St. John wrote the last after the year 90. Many early Christians thought that the *Pastor* of Hermes, written many years

still later, was inspired. They were mistaken; but even that error shows that they, at that early age, knew of no declaration of the Saviour or Apostles that there should be no more inspired books.

With these prefatory observations, I take up your argument as simply stated above, and meet it by answering, that when the Jewish synagogue did not admit those works into the canon, it was because of the want of proof of their inspiration, and perhaps want of authority to amend an already duly established canon; and that therefore they were not guilty of the heinous sin you lay at their door: and, secondly, that Christ and his Apostles *did* take some steps, not indeed to insert those books in the Jewish canon, but to give them to the Christians as divinely inspired works; and it is in consequence of those steps, that the Catholic church has ever held them as inspired, and the Council of Trent enumerated them in the list of "Sacred and Canonical" works.

The distinction laid down in my first remark, completely nullifies your argument. In order to convict the Jews of an "outrageous fraud in regard to the sacred oracles," if those works are inspired, you should show, not only that those works were not inserted in the national canon, but also that when a work was inspired, sufficient proof thereof was ever offered under the synagogue, and that there also ever existed some individual or body of men who had authority to act on such proof, and to amend accordingly that national canon. Need I say that in your dissertation we look in vain for any thing establishing either of those points? The only remark bearing on them is that already referred to: "If it should be said that the Jews received those books as inspired, but did not insert them in the canon, because they had not the authority of a prophet for doing so, why is it that Christ did not give the requisite authority, if not to the Jewish priests and rulers, at least to his own Apostles?" I assert that the Saviour did give to His Apostles and their successors every power that was necessary. This follows as a necessary consequence from the argument laid down in my previous letter, and I will further sustain it by historical evidence. But even had He done nothing directly or indirectly, recorded or unrecorded, on the matter, the only

legitimate consequence would be that He was not pleased ever to prove authoritatively the inspiration of those books. I confess it would be highly probable they were uninspired, but their want of inspiration would not be an inevitable consequence. Were not the vision of Addo, and other works I will mention below, inspired, though now lost, and known only by name? Who can say that the other prophets of those days did not write works, even whose names are unknown? They doubtless served the particular end for which God designed them. But even had the Saviour acted in such a matter as to show evidently that those works were uninspired, this would not touch either of two points so important to the validity of your argument. These, Rev. Sir, you have assumed without any show of reason or authority. Your argument is valueless, and crumbles under its own "irresistible" weight.

I might here dismiss this part of your essay, as the *onus* was certainly on you to prove every thing necessary to make your argument conclusive. However, even though it be something "over and above" what justice to my cause "absolutely required," I will lay before our readers a few remarks on the national canon of the Jews.

The earliest notice of an authoritative sanction of any work among the Israelites, is found in the command of Moses to the Levites, (Deut. xxxi. 24, 26,) to place in the side, or by the side of the Ark, the volume in which he had written the words of the law. This would appear to designate the book of Deuteronomy alone, and certainly it does not follow from the words used, that Moses, in *writing* that volume, received the supernatural assistance of Divine Inspiration. But I am willing to admit that the entire Pentateuch was even in that early period known to be inspired, and was used in the public services, though this last, I think, cannot be proved. Moses died in the year 1447 before Christ, according to Calmet. Esdras returned to Jerusalem from the Babylonian captivity, 462, B. C. During this period of nearly 1000 years, many inspired works were written. We have a number of them in the Old Testament. Others, too, were written which no longer exist. I might mention the book of Samuel the Seer, that of Nathan the prophet, and of Gad the

Seer,* containing accounts not found in our Bible, the books of Ahias the Silonite, and the vision of Addo the Seer,† the books of Semeias the Prophet,‡ and the words of Hozai;§ and might easily swell the catalogue. All those works, extant or lost, were in all probability known to be inspired by the cotemporaries of the several writers, but we have nothing to lead us to suppose that during all this time an exact catalogue or canon of them was formed by national or Divine authority. In the year 970 B. C., after many of them were written, the ten tribes separated from the kingdom of Judah, not a few of the Israelites retaining the true faith. After they were borne into captivity, and other nations introduced into their country, these new comers were instructed by an Israelite priest how they should worship the Lord: but for some time they joined therewith heathen profanities and idolatry. These, however, we know they afterwards abandoned. You are aware they still exist, and that they have always publicly recognized only the five books of Moses as inspired. It would appear, then, that at the time of the separation of the children of Israel under Balaam, no canon had been yet drawn up by due authority.

This is more evident if we advert to the fact that all the Jewish writers attribute the formation of their canon to the *Cheneseth Ghedolah*, or great Synagogue, after the captivity of Babylon, of which Esdras was a principal member. According to the testimony of the Rabbins generally, this synagogue commenced under Darius Hystaspes, and ended in Simon, surnamed the Just, high priest under Seleucus Nicanor. All agree in placing it between those two extremes, and some restrict it, at least in its flourishing condition, to a much shorter space. It seems generally to be allowed that the greater part of the duty in regard to the Sacred writings devolved on Esdras himself, who expurgated the Sacred works from the various faults into which copyists had fallen, and collected them all into one body, introduced

* 1 Paralip. or 1 Chron. xxix. 30.

† 2 Paralip. or 2 Chron ix. 29; xii. 15; xiii. 22.

‡ 2 Paralip. or 2 Chron. xii. 15.

§ 2 Paralip. or 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19.

the Jewish divisions of *Perishot*, *Sedarim*, and *Peshuot*, and arranged the whole into books. It would seem, too, and it is generally admitted, that various additions were made; such as the conclusion of the books of Deuteronomy concerning the death of Moses. Grotius thought that the inscriptions and dates at the beginning of the prophecies, originated here too. But I do not see why we need go so far, as it was natural that the original writers should place them there, and they elsewhere occur under such circumstances as show them to be evidently the work of the Prophets themselves. In speaking of this recension of the Scripture and formation of the canon, the Jews generally attributed it to the *Cheneseth Ghedolah*, or great synagogue, as in the treatise *Meghillah*, third chapter of the Ghemara, they say this synagogue restored the pristine purity of the Scriptures, and in *Baba bathra*, chap. 1, that the men of the great synagogue wrote the book of the twelve prophets, and the books of Daniel and Esther. Elias the Levite, and other learned Rabbins, treat the whole work as that of the synagogue. Perhaps we would not be far from the truth in saying that Esdras, as member of the Sanhedrin, revised the copies of the sacred writings, restored the true reading, collected the scattered parts of the Psalms, as the author of the Synopsis of Scripture, sometimes attributed to St. Athanasius, and St. Hilary (Prol. in Psalm.) say, the detached Proverbs, and the other scattered parts, and arranged the whole in a body; and that the synagogue itself authoritatively sanctioned the work, thus establishing a national canon. In this plan we must admit that some other books were superadded at a posterior date, by the same synagogue. In arriving at a decision on the formation of this canon, we have to guide ourselves, not by the infallible unvarying statements of inspired writers, but by the perplexed, sometimes contradictory, and often nearly valueless statements of historians who wrote long afterwards. One thing is certain, the canon was closed after the admission of the book of Nehemiah. No evidence whatever exists to prove the existence of a national canon before the Babylonian captivity. The Jewish and the early Christian writers speak of this alone, and their testimonies, carefully weighed, would lead to the opinion I have stated.

What were the ideas of the Jews on this subject at the time of the Saviour, may be learned from the following passage of Josephus Flavius, in his first book against Appion. After stating in the sixth chapter that the ancient Jews took great care about writing records of their history, and that they committed that matter to their high priests and their prophets, and that those records had been written all along down to his own times with the utmost accuracy: and in the seventh, that the best of the priests and those who attended upon the divine worship, were appointed from the beginning for that design, and that great care was taken that the race of the priests should continue unmixed and pure, he continues:

“And this is justly or rather necessarily done, because every one is not permitted of his own accord to be a writer, nor is there any disagreement in what is written; they being only prophets that have written the original and earliest accounts of things, as they learned them of God himself by inspiration; and others have written what hath happened in their own times, and that in a very distinct manner also. ^e

“For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from, and contradicting one another, [as the Greeks have,] but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past time; which are justly believed to be divine. And of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time. And how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation, is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one hath been so bold as either to add any thing to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them.”

From this it appears that there were among the Jews at our Saviour's time two classes of books which were deemed worthy of respect, their canonical works and others "not esteemed of the like authority." In the Jewish writers we find two degrees of inspiration designated, which they term *barrahh haqqadosh* and *bebet qol*. In both they recognise an assistance of God, and say that the books of their canon attained the first rank, while the second degree only was attained by writers after it was completed. I may refer you to the Talmud, *Baba Cama*, chap. *Hachobel*, where the work of *Ben Sirah*, as they style *Ecclesiasticus*, is declared thus inspired. St. Jerome in his preface to *Judith* expressly states that the work is classed by the Jews among the *Hagiographa*,* or sacred writings, not of the first class, for he elsewhere states that they were not in the Jewish canon, but consequently in the second. The books of Tobias, Judith and the Maccabees evidently fall under the class specially mentioned by Josephus.

I do not feel it necessary, Rev. Sir, to dwell at length on this topic, as you have merely *assumed*, without any proof, that the Jews rejected as uninspired, mere human productions, all books not contained in their canon.

The Jewish writers declare that their national canon was closed and sealed by the Great Synagogue; and that books written afterwards attained a lower degree of inspiration. What authority they thought necessary and sufficient to amend that canon, I have never met laid down by any one of them. They seem to presuppose that no such authority existed in fact. Nor do they treat of the evidence sufficient to establish the inspiration of a work. We must conclude, then, that those works were never brought before a competent tribunal of the Jewish nation, with sufficient evidence, if they were inspired, to prove it, and yet were rejected. Nevertheless, all this must be proved: it must be established that such a tribunal did exist; that those works whose inspiration you controvert, were laid before it;

* Some copies have *Apocrypha*, but Jahn, after a critical examination of the authorities, decides that *Hagiographa* is the true original reading, and the other a posterior change.

that if they were inspired, sufficient evidence to prove the fact was and must have been brought forward; and finally that the tribunal rejected the evidence, condemned the books, and refused to admit them into the canon. This you have not endeavored to establish. Had you endeavored, you would have failed, for you would have found the monuments of history arrayed against you. And yet it should have been established before you could reasonably assert that in regard to these books, if they are inspired, the Jewish nation had been "guilty of an outrageous fraud on the Sacred Oracles," and that consequently they would have merited and received a severe rebuke from the Saviour, which rebuke the Evangelists were bound to insert in their Gospels.

But, Rev. Sir, even had the Jews been in reality thus heinously guilty, was the Saviour bound to rebuke them? Did not the Sadducees and Samaritans criminally reject as uninspired, treat merely as human productions, all the inspired works except the Pentateuch or five books of Moses? We know that He and His Apostles conversed with them, opposed and condemned their errors; but where did He charge them with this heinous fraud? Or even had He rebuked the Jews, I cannot see why the Evangelists were bound to record it more than "all the other things that Jesus did," or all his discourses with his apostles for forty days after his resurrection. It surely would have been enough to condemn and correct the outrageous fraud of the Jews, had any been committed, to leave the books they omitted to the church which He founded; and for us it would be enough, if we can know this with certainty. This leads me to the second part of my answer to your argument. Did the Saviour and his Apostles leave those books and parts of books to the early Christians, as inspired works?

My first reply would be based on the principles of my last letter. There must be a sure method whereby the wearied little sweep, who now cries under my window, who has trudged the streets since early dawn, and ere another hour will bury his limbs in balmy sleep, preparing for to-morrow's task, can answer that question as confidently and as accurately as you, Rev. Sir, whom years of study have made conversant with ancient lan-

guages, and who have libraries at hand and leisure to pore over the tomes of other days. That method is the teaching of the Catholic church, divinely guaranteed from error. Were he to ask me, to that church and her testimony I would refer him; and if reason and common sense prove aught, you must admit that the answer he would receive at her hands would be unerring.

You require positive proofs from history of the fact, and I am ready to bring them forward. We have, as I stated—and your argument is based on the acknowledgment—no record in the New Testament of the books the Apostles or the Saviour did leave to their followers as inspired. They refer to the Scriptures in general, and quote or allude to particular passages, but have nowhere drawn up a list of the Scriptural works. The evidence must manifestly be drawn from the history of the church, whence too you in your second argument have endeavoured to extract proofs for your cause. As I intend following the divisions of your essay, I will reserve the testimonies of the early Christian writers for my next letter.

Now that the difficulty you imagined so unconquerable, the fraud of the Jews and the necessity for its recorded condemnation, has vanished, you will probably retract your concession: “We will grant” *the Catholic* “what *he cannot* prove, and what *we can disprove*, that these books are quoted in the New Testament.” It was certainly easier and more prudent to pass by this argument in the manner you have done, than to *disprove* it, as you assert you can. I will lay before you some of the texts of the New Testament, in which the passages of those works are quoted or referred to.

1. “See thou never do to another what thou wouldst hate to have done to thee by another.” Tob. iv. 16. “All things, therefore, whatsoever, you would that men should do to you, do you also to them.” Matt. vii. 12. “And as you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner.” Luke vi. 31.

2. “Happy shall I be, if there shall remain of my seed, to see the glory of Jerusalem. The gates of Jerusalem shall be built of sapphire and emerald, and all the walls thereof round about

of precious stones. All its streets shall be paved with white and clean stones: and Alleluia shall be sung in its streets. Blessed be the Lord who hath exalted it, and may he reign in it for ever and ever, Amen." Tobias xiii. 20, 23.

"And the building of the wall thereof was of jasper stone, but the city itself pure gold, like to clear glass. And the foundation of the walls of the city were adorned with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper, the second, sapphire . . . the twelfth, an amethyst. And the twelve gates are twelve pearls, one to each: and every several gate was of one several pearl. And the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass." Apocalypse or Rev. xxi. 18, 21.

3. "But they that did not receive the trials with the fear of the Lord, but uttered their impatience, and the reproach of their murmuring against the Lord, were destroyed by the destroyer, and perished by serpents." Judith viii. 24, 25.

"Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted and perished by the serpents. Neither do you murmur, as some of them murmured, and were destroyed by the destroyer." 1. Cor. x. 9, 10.

4. "The just shall shine, and shall run to and fro like sparks among the reeds." Wisdom iii. 7. "Then shall the just shine as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father." Matt. xiii. 43.

5. "They (the just) shall judge nations and rule over people, and their Lord shall reign forever." Wisdom iii. 8. "Know you not that the Saints shall judge this world?" 1 Cor. vi. 2.

6. "He pleased God and was beloved, and living among sinners he was translated." Wisdom iv. 10. "By faith, Henoah was translated that he should not see death, and he was not found, because God had translated him. For before his translation, he had testimony that he pleased God." Heb. xi. 5.

7. "For she (Wisdom) is the brightness of Eternal Light and the unspotted mirror of God's Majesty, and the image of his goodness." Wisdom vii. 26. "Who (the Son of God) being the brightness of his glory and the figure of his substance, &c." Heb. i. 3. See also 2 Cor. iv. 4, and Col. i. v.

8. "For who among men is he that can know the counsel of God? or who can think what the will of God is?" Wisdom ix.

13. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" Rom. xi. 34.

9. "The potter, also, tempering soft earth, with labor fashioneth every vessel for our service; and of the same clay he maketh such vessels as are for clean uses, and likewise such as serve to the contrary; but what is the use of these vessels, the potter is the judge." Wisdom xv. 7. "Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" Rom. ix. 21.

10. "Or if they admired their power and their effects, let them understand by them, that he who made them is mightier than they; for by the greatness of the beauty and the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby." Wisdom xiii. 4, 5. "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." Rom. i. 20.

11. "And his zeal will take armor, and he will arm the creature for the revenge of his enemies. He will put on justice as a breast-plate, and will take true judgment instead of a helmet. He will take equity for an invincible shield: and he will sharpen his severe wrath for a spear." Wisdom v. 18, 21. "Therefore take unto you the armor of God, that you may be able to resist in the evil day and to stand in all things perfect. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of justice.....in all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. And take unto you the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, (which is the word of God.)" Eph. vi. 13, 17.

12. "They that fear the Lord, will not be incredulous to his word; and they that love him will keep his way. They that fear the Lord will seek after the things that are well pleasing to him; and they that love him, shall be filled with his law. . . They that fear the Lord, keep his commandments, and will have patience, even until his visitation." Ecclesiasticus ii. 18, 21. "If any one love me, he will keep my word." Jno. xiv. 23.

13. "My son, meddle not with many matters: and if thou be rich, thou shalt not be free from sin." Ecclus. xi. 10. "For

they that will become rich, fall into temptation, and into the snare of the devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which drown men into destruction and perdition." 1 Tim. vi. 9.

14. "There is one that is enriched by living sparingly, and this is the portion of his reward. In that he saith: I have found me rest, and now I will eat my goods alone; and he knoweth not what time shall pass, and that death approacheth, and that he must leave all to others and shall die." *Ecclus. xi. 18, 19, 20.* "And I (the rich man in the parable) will say to my soul: Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thy rest; eat, drink, make good cheer. But God said to him: Thou fool, this night do they require thy soul of thee; and whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" *Luke xii. 19, 20.*

15. If thou wilt keep the commandments and perform acceptable fidelity for ever, they shall preserve thee." *Ecclus. xv.*

16. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." *Matthew xix. 17.*

16. The passage of St. Paul: "But others were racked, not accepting deliverance, that they might find a better resurrection," (*Heb. xi. 35,*) has been acknowledged, even by Protestant commentators, to be, and evidently is, a reference to the account of the martyrdom of Eleazer given in the second book of *Maccabees*, vi. 18-31.

I might cite many such passages, but these will be sufficient for my purpose. Any "candid and unprejudiced mind," at all versed in the rules of criticism, must see that in the New Testament, the passages I have brought forward are alluded to and were had in view. The identity of thought and the similarity, often striking coincidence, of expression, absolutely require this, else there is no such thing as one writer's using the thought and expression of another. You say, though you do not maintain their opinion, that some "learned men have doubted whether some of them existed at all until some time after the last of the Apostles had fallen asleep." You yourself do not "believe that the Septuagint contained them, at the time of the Saviour and the Apostles." I have not taken the pains to see who were those learned men, or what books they thought were posterior to the Apostles. I have before me, and, had your adopting their opin-

ion rendered it necessary, or did the space of this letter permit, might produce testimony in abundance to prove those works anterior to the Saviour. One of the authors you quote, Eichhorn, and Jahn, one of the most acute of German critics, declare that Philo has drawn much from the earlier of those works; so much so as to have been sometimes deemed the author of the book of Wisdom. To your own "belief," and if you please, the authority of Schmidius, I will oppose the express declaration of Origen, the highest authority we can find or could desire on this question of fact. In his epistle to Julius Africanus, *De Historia Susannæ*, he says: "In nostro Greco sermone feruntur in omni ecclesia Christi," that these passages of Daniel "are found in our Greek tongue throughout the entire church;" and further on: "Apud utrumque, (the Septuagint and Theodotion,) erat de Susanna ut tu dicis figmentum, et extremæ partes in Daniele:" "in both (the Septuagint and the version of Theodotion) are contained what you call the fiction of Susannah, and the last parts of the book of Daniel;" and immediately afterwards, enumerating what you term the additions to the book of Esther, emphatically declares that though not found in the Hebrew in his day, "Apud Septuaginta autem et Theodotionem ea sunt;" "they are found, nevertheless, in the Septuagint and Theodotion." I do not pretend to say that the Seventy translated into Greek works written in that language, as were some of the books in question, or not composed until they were in their graves. It is generally allowed that they translated at most only the canonical works of the Jews, shortly after that canon was formed. Other works, however, existed in the Jewish nation, which were revered and used, and looked on as written in *Bath quol*, or the second degree of inspiration, and were added, if you please, as an appendix, to the collection of works translated by the Seventy; the whole collection, containing both classes of books, still retaining, at least among Christians, the name of the *Septuagint version*. Not to multiply quotations on this point, I will merely bring forward the testimony of Walton, the Editor of the Polyglott, whom I respect as the most learned of Protestants in such matters, and eminently qualified by his vast researches on the different versions, to decide authoritatively. His Protestantism effectually prevented

any *partiality* in favor of those books. In his Prol. cap. v., he says: "Libri itaque apocryphi, ut a variis auctoribus ita variis temporibus scripti sunt, quidam Hebraice, quidam Græce; et licet apud Hellenistas primum recepti fuerint, tempus tamen præcise assignari non potest, quando cum reliquis libris sacris in unum volumen compacti fuerint. Hoc tamen clarum est, a Judeis Hellenistis cum reliqua Scriptura Ecclesiam eos recepisse." "Wherefore the Apocryphal books were written as well by different authors, as at different times; some in Hebrew and some in Greek; and although they were first received by the Hellenists, yet the precise time cannot be assigned when they were united in one volume with the other sacred works. This much, however, is evident, that the church received them from the Hellenist Jews."

Whether this transfer was made with or without the consent of the Apostles, may, I think, be learned from a glance at the texts I have quoted above. What are the facts of the case? There existed a certain collection of books well known to the Apostolic writers, and to the faithful to whom their Epistles were sent, as many, if not most of them, were converts from the number of those same Hellenist Jews. In that collection were comprised not only the canonical books of the Jews, but also those styled by the Protestants apocryphal. The Apostles quote frequently by name books of that collection, sometimes extract verbatim or with a partial change of words entire sentences, but more frequently adopting and appealing as it were to some passage, incorporate its sentiment, and more or less of its wording, into their own train of thought. This is most frequently done by the Saviour, as may be seen by any of my readers who disdains not, in his love of the Bible *alone*, to use one with accurate marginal references. The passage from Tobias is as striking and as well defined a quotation as any other, and as such must have struck his hearers. The change of the original negative into the positive is not so striking as that of Micheas v. 2: "And thou Bethel Ephrata, art a little one among the thousands of Judah," quoted thus by St. Matthew, ii. 6: "And thou, Bethel the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Juda." Protestants find not the least

difficulty in admitting such passages of the New Testament to contain allusions to the Old, as long as their canonical books alone are concerned ; but when a passage of the works whose inspiration they deny is laid before them, the thought and *tour-nure* of expression of which an Apostle has adopted into his own Epistle, so evidently as would now-a-days suffice to convict a poet of plagiary, oh ! then that cannot be a quotation. Truly, Rev. Sir, to use your own words: "Light is death to their cause"

I have thus, Rev. Sir, examined your first argument. You state that at the Saviour's time the Jews had a national canon, in which the works you impugn were not contained. I am willing to admit this in regard to all the books except *Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah, the addition to the Book of Esther*, and the parts of Daniel which you style *the Story of Susannah, the Story of Bel and the Dragon, and the Song of the three Children*. I know that they had the books, of which these were considered parts : it is allowed that those parts once existed in the original language of those books, and that at the time of Origen they no longer existed in those languages. Before I admit that they perished in those languages, not after, but before the time of the Saviour, I must have proof positive, which I do not recollect having ever met, and I am of opinion, does not exist. However, I waived all controversy on this point, allowing your argument all the force it could receive from the fact, did it take place.

You then said that the Jews excluded them from their canon under such circumstances as, were they in reality inspired, to render themselves "guilty of an outrageous fraud in regard to the sacred oracles." This was a mere assumption unsupported by any proof. It could not be the case, unless there existed a tribunal in their nation capable of adding to the canon already established ; and the books were laid before this tribunal. You seem to think that the Jewish canon was established by Divine authority. This would at once take off all responsibility from the Jewish nation, and defeat your own argument. I have not taken advantage of it, however ; as the Jews themselves attribute the formation of their canon, not to an immediate Revelation of God, but to their *Cheneseth Ghedolah, or Great Synagogue*. I, who see therein a

general Council of the Church in the Old Law, claiming and exercising by the authority of God the power of teaching the faithful what were their inspired works, will readily admit its Divine authority, as far as the decree can be evidently shown to have gone, that is, that *those* books were inspired. It cannot be proved that it determined any thing in regard to books either lost, as probably many were, or yet unwritten, or not in their possession. It would seem that it was with great difficulty they obtained even those whose inspiration they testified to. I question much whether in this view you will admit the *Divine authority* of the Jewish Canon; and yet you say the Saviour did. History informs us that this Great Synagogue ended, and was not revived or succeeded by any other of equal authority, to act on the canon of Scripture. Hence, even were there noonday evidence of the inspiration of those books, the Jews could not, at least according to their own writers, place them in the Canon. It was not necessary that such full evidence should exist. We have no proof that it did exist; though that *some* evidence was in possession of the Jews, may be gathered from the facts that, as Walton says, they were united in the same volume, and that the Rabbins hold some of them as inferiorly inspired. At all events it is evident the Jews were not "guilty of an outrageous fraud in regard to the Sacred Oracles," in not inserting those works, even though they be inspired, in their national canon.

Your next assertions were that "the Saviour and his Apostles approved of the *Jewish Canon*, whatever it was, and appealed to it as possessing Divine authority." Had they gone no farther, this would not have militated against us. I might on the contrary appeal to it as a positive Divine sanction of the fourth method of my preceding letter. Still you have not in their words the least support for your assertions. The circumstances from which you would *infer* it, exist simply in your own ardent imagination, and are not such as historical evidence sustains.

These you follow up with another statement equally unsupported by their words or the facts of the case; that "the Saviour and his Apostles evidently treated the Jewish Canon as complete, and containing the whole of God's revelation as far as it was then made." For this, precisely, you offer no proof. You view it as

the evident consequence of the other items of argument. They fall to the ground, and this must fall with them.

You think that had the Jews been guilty of the heinous crime with which, in case these books are inspired, you tax them, the Saviour and his Apostles were bound to denounce this particular offence. I think it would have been sufficient to condemn them in general, and to state some of their errors, without being *bound* to go over the whole list. He proposed the truth of Christianity in general, for their acceptance. If they embraced this, the acceptance of those books would have followed, as I will show it *did* follow for the early Christians. We know that, as a people, they 'received him not.' He came not to reform the Jewish Religion, but to establish another; that which it foreshadowed. He might, as he did, condemn particular errors and abuses, but the end, the grand aim of his preaching, was to bring them to believe in Him, and all those things which He taught his Apostles personally for forty days after his resurrection, or by the Spirit of truth afterwards, concerning his Church, the Kingdom of God. He never declared that he would, and we see no reason why he should, enumerate and condemn *every* abuse, or that he was bound to single out this particular error. We have two parallel cases: that of the Samaritans, whose schism or error he condemned in John iv. 22, and of the Sadducees whom both He and St. Paul condemned. Both were heinously guilty of rejecting inspired writings as mere human productions, and yet we have no evidence that they charged them with this particular error or sin. Why then bind them to do so in regard to the Pharisees?

You finally state that Christ and his Apostles did nothing in regard to those books: and this you sustain in your first argument by saying there is not in the New Testament any record of the fact; and in your second, by endeavoring to show that the Christians of the first four centuries acted in such a manner in regard to those books, as they certainly would not have done if the Saviour or his Apostles had given any testimony of their inspiration.

I might answer, that though the Saviour did not establish evidently the inspiration of those books then, He could have done

it after four centuries with equal facility, either through such a body of individuals as I have often referred to, or by any other means he thought proper to use. The only questions for us would be, Did he adopt those means? What are the books the inspiration of which is thus declared?

But I meet your assertion directly. In my next, I will show that the early Christians acted in regard to these books in such a manner as they would not have done *unless* they had been received from the Saviour or the Apostles as inspired. We find nothing in the gospels or epistles to show that they do or must contain all that the Saviour or Apostles taught or did. St Paul taught many things by word, as we learn from himself. The Saviour's discourse to the disciples on the road to Emmaus, and a full account of all his conversations with the apostles after his resurrection, would be very valuable. Among these last you might, reverend sir, find something bearing on the number of inspired books. However, until you have *all* he said to the Jews and his Apostles, or an assurance from Him or them that this was not contained among the things omitted, venture not to assert that because He did not, as far as you can learn, say it on certain occasions to certain persons, he never said it to any one at all. That the Saviour and Apostles did do something in regard to those books, I opine, is evident from the texts I have quoted; else plagiary among authors is an imaginary crime. The identity of thought and the similarity, sometimes copied turn of expression, prove this evidently. The circumstances of the case support it. According to Walton, the collection containing these, with the canonical books of the Jews, was in the hands both of the writers and those who read their books. The subjects were the same. In their writings they avowedly quote, adopt, and allude to the language and thoughts of that collection. Those instances show that such allusions were made, not only to the canonical works, but also to those you deem uninspired. I believe with Walton, that the *Septuagint*, as that collection was called, contained those books before the coming of the Saviour, You think this, if true, strengthens your argument. I think not. If those books thus united were uninspired, the Saviour and the apostles were certainly bound positively to reject them, and not to

suffer the unnatural union to pass into the church. Now I shall show, that as far back as the remnants of those early ages will carry us, we find Christians uniting them both in the Septuagint, and revering both as divinely inspired. This very omission of excluding them, taken especially with the decided belief of the early Christians, is a strong proof in favor of the inspiration of those books. But you do not "believe that the Septuagint at the Saviour's time contained the Apocrypha." Reverend Sir, a more disastrous avowal you could not have made. The union then took place in the church; necessarily under the eyes and with the approbation of the Apostles and their immediate, most faithful disciples. These books are quoted and referred to as divinely inspired Scripture. I could not desire a stronger case. Before the Apostles, the contested books were not inserted. Immediately afterwards we find them already inserted. A change has taken place. It could only be effected by, it can only be attributed to, the Saviour and his Apostles. Therefore they DID leave works to the Christian world as INSPIRED.

I remain Rev. Sir, yours, &c.

A. P. F.

LETTER III.

To the Rev. JAMES H. THORNWELL, Professor of the Evidences of Christianity, &c.

REV. SIR,—We are now arrived at the most important point in the examination of the Historical Evidences in favor of those books, for revering which as "Sacred and Canonical," you charge the Catholic church with blasphemously adding to the word of God.

Before I enter on the task of laying before you the evidence of that character in favor of the truth of the decree passed by the Council of Trent, let me again urge on you the absolute necessity of admitting the divine authority on which the church based it; and its consequent truth. By denying that authority, you at once overthrow the only means whereby the overwhelming majority of Christians can learn with certainty, and on which they can be *required* to believe unhesitatingly, the inspiration of

the Scriptural books. Even did there exist no historical testimony whatever to prove the truth set forth in that decree, as long as we have reasons for admitting, and are forced by necessity to admit, the authority of the tribunal from which it emanates, the inspiration of those books is proved to our understanding by an *a priori* argument of the strongest character.

In point of fact, millions on millions of Christians in every age have believed, and must still hold, the Scriptures to be divinely inspired, simply on authority. How many are there, think you, even among Protestants in South Carolina, who believe it; not because their parents or instructors have so taught them; not because it is the general belief of persons whom they esteem, of the community of which they are members, of the denomination to which they are attached; nor yet because they have read some dissertation like yours, wherein a few names are quoted, some books in Latin or German referred to, some extracts inserted, and then a sweeping conclusion drawn, set off with a tirade of hard names and denunciations, but scarcely warranted by the premises and wholly unsupported by facts; how many, I ask, are there even among Protestants, who believe the Scriptures to be inspired, not on motives like these, but because clear and cogent and *really valid* arguments have been submitted to their understandings? I have amused myself at times by asking those who assail me with texts against what they believe are our doctrines, to prove the books they quote from to be inspired, and I very rarely found any one who knew even how to set about the task. They believed them to be inspired, not because any valid argument from historical or internal evidence had been laid before them, but because they had been brought up and led by education and authority to do so. Whether by acting thus, notwithstanding the want of the aforesaid arguments, they followed a course that was not "righteous and holy" and "ran the risk of everlasting damnation," I leave you, Rev. Sir, to decide. To me such cases are but particular examples of a general truth taught alike by common sense and experience: that not one in ten thousand Christians has the time, the means and the ability to qualify himself properly for that arduous research, and to prosecute the investigation of that mass of evidence, with success.

Any system which would require *all* to do so, must be absurd, for it supposes that possible which is morally impossible; and false, because it contradicts the infinite wisdom of God, as displayed in his apportionment of men in the various conditions of life. Both among Catholics and Protestants there ever will be, there *must* be, many to whose understandings no valid arguments from reason or from historical evidence for the inspiration of the Scripture, will ever be submitted—whose condition in life prohibits it. Some may *think* they have them, whose reasons nevertheless for belief are any thing but valid, and would only provoke a smile from those who are qualified to estimate their value. If God requires those millions to believe that inspiration at all, He requires them to believe it on authority; for in no other manner can they learn it. And unless his works be imperfect, He has given an authority to teach them this doctrine, whose teaching constitutes the necessary, clear, cogent and valid argument which is to be laid before their understandings. Now in the Protestant system, there is no such authority to teach this truth, none which any one is *bound* to hear, or at least none which may not lead to error, and none therefore whose teaching necessarily gives truth with unerring accuracy, and leaves no room for reasonable doubt and hesitation. In this system God would not have provided any means whereby those can learn certainly and unerringly the inspiration of the Scripture, who are, by their circumstances, unavoidably restricted to the use of authority alone on this question. In the Catholic system, on the contrary, this hiatus in the works of God does not exist. An authority is established by Him to teach this truth, and in fulfilling that commission, is guarded by his Omnipotence from falling into error. The evidence of the commission itself and of the guaranty from error, is before the world. Christians are required to believe the Scriptures to be inspired on that authority; and in believing, they have an assurance from Divine Truth and Omnipotence that they err not. Historical evidence may or may not exist to corroborate the declaration of that authority. Those who believe may or may not possess it. To them it is a secondary collateral proof, placing the doctrine, not in a firmer position, but, if you will, in a stronger light. A practical illustration adds nothing to

the certainty of a theorem established by mathematical demonstration. If this collateral testimony were not in the possession of the person whose belief is required, or even were it not in existence, the truth of the doctrine taught would remain unchanged and the obligation of believing it equally strong.

Nay more, a person is still bound to believe, even when seeming arguments which he cannot refute are urged to the contrary. Common sense tells him that what is known and *proved* to be true by one method of demonstration, cannot be shown to be really false by another: that truth is never opposed to truth. Experience would tell him that there is no doctrine against which words cannot be arrayed. He may find objections, the fallacy or falsehood of which he cannot point out, brought against the inspiration of any or of all the books so declared to be inspired. But he knows that the authority which proclaims them inspired, teaches TRUTH; and that whatever contradicts truth must be erroneous. He is bound still to believe. Men act thus every day in matters of life; and they are forced to carry out the principles also in doctrines of Christianity. Let me illustrate it by an example.

You hold, Rev. Sir, that God has declared and requires every one, even the unlettered negro, to believe unhesitatingly that there are three Divine Persons in one God. Now the negro, debarred by law from learning to read, cannot peruse his Bible; cannot (leaving aside the question of inspiration) decide whether certain texts (among them the strongest, perhaps the only decisive one on the Trinity) be interpolations, as most Protestant critics have determined that of 1 John v. 7 to be; cannot collate all the texts on the subject, and pronounce unerringly that in them God has made such a declaration. He must learn the doctrine of the Trinity from authority. He is bound to believe it unhesitatingly, because God, who cannot declare an untruth, has declared it, and the Catholic would add, common sense requires, because the authority which communicates to him that declaration of God is prevented by Divine Omnipotence from teaching that He declared what in fact He did not. An Unitarian might say to the negro: "You are told that the Father is distinct from the Son, and the Holy Ghost from both; they are

three distinct Persons. Now, if the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God they must, therefore be three Gods and not one God, and to say that three distinct Persons form only one God, is as absurd as to say that three men form one individual. God could not have said so, for he cannot say any thing absurd, and any body that tells you He did say so, leads you into an error." Even a negro would see the force of this objection. Can he lay bare the sophism? In the Catholic system his answer would be clear and satisfactory. "My mind is feeble, I cannot by reasoning reply to what you say; but here is a tribunal which God has appointed to teach me what doctrines he has declared, and which He will not permit to mistake. That tribunal tells me that He has declared this doctrine, and when He declares it, it must be true and not absurd, and therefore I believe it, though I cannot refute your arguments." If, on the Protestant principle, he believed that the authority which had taught him the Trinity *could* propose doctrines which were false, and could assert that God had taught what in truth he did not teach, I confess that I do not see what answer the negro could make, or how he could *reasonably* continue in an unhesitating belief of the Trinity.

I opine, too, that even the most learned theologian would find himself in the same predicament. It would puzzle him to explain *how* three Divine Persons, each of them God, can only constitute one God; while three human persons must constitute, not one, but three beings. He can only seek to establish the fact, that God did declare this to be the case. Now I certainly believe the doctrine of the Trinity as firmly as I do my own existence. But could I leave aside the authority of the Catholic church, could I believe that it was possible for her to declare that God has revealed a doctrine which he has not, I, for one, would not admit this mystery; for the simple reason that, except through her, I have no positive assurance that it is one of the doctrines revealed by Almighty God. The strongest text, as I said above, is rejected by most Protestant critics as supposititious. Were it not, it is susceptible of another and very different sense. So too are all the other texts urged in favor of this dogma. The Unitarians strongly and earnestly urge these views. And in perusing several Protestant treatises on the

subject, I have not met a Trinitarian who, in my opinion at least, could, without some one-sided appeal to the authority of the church to decide the question, overthrow their positions, or make out for himself more than a plausible, perhaps a probable case. Deprived of the authoritative teaching of the Catholic church, I would not, on mere plausible or probable evidence, yield an unhesitating belief in so astounding a mystery as this, or expose myself to the danger of IDOLATRY by adoring as God one who might *perhaps* be after all a mere creature. I thank Heaven I am not left in this perplexity or unbelief. Though I cannot refute metaphysically all the metaphysical objections against the august mystery of the Trinity, though my researches of mere historical testimony or simple examination of the Scripture would not lead me to the *certain* and *evident* conclusion that God did reveal it, I have his Revelation unerringly preserved by those the Saviour sent to teach all that He had taught, even as He was sent by the Father. Them I hear, as I would hear Him. On His authority, and their testimony, I believe the doctrine of the Trinity firmly and unhesitatingly despite of unsolved sophisms, and bend the knee to adore Jesus Christ as the Eternal God, no dark horrific doubt flashing the while through my mind, that *perhaps* He is but a creature, and I am staining my soul with the damning sin of Idolatry.

To apply this to the subject of my letter. *If* Almighty God has been pleased to establish a tribunal, with authority to declare unerringly, in His name, what books are sacred and canonical, we are bound to receive unhesitatingly, as the word of God, the books designated as such by that tribunal, even though we possess not collateral proof from historical or intrinsic evidence to sustain it. We would be equally bound to receive them, did no historical evidence whatever exist; nay, even if objections, which we have not the means of solving, could be urged against the inspiration of some or of all of those books.

I have shown in my first letter that every Christian at least must admit that God *did* establish such a tribunal. When that is established, collateral testimony is of secondary importance. Had the flood of time swept away every record of the early church, as it has swept away many, the decree of the Council of Trent would still stand.

I have made these prefatory, perhaps discursive remarks, that our readers may see the nature, the bearing, and the value of historical testimony in favor of the inspiration of the books which Catholics admit as inspired, and you reject as of no more authority than Seneca's Letters, or Tully's Offices.

I will now proceed to redeem the promise made towards the close of my last letter, and to show that the early Christians acted in such a manner in regard to those books and parts of books, as they would not have done, UNLESS the Saviour and his Apostles had left them to the early church as inspired. Here, Rev. Sir, we are fairly at variance. I will give your second argument in your own words:—

2. "If it should be pretended that Christ did give his Apostles authority to receive these books, though no record was made of the fact, we ask how it comes to pass—and we mention this as our second argument against them—that for four centuries the unbroken testimony of the Christian church is against their inspiration? They are not included in the catalogues given by Melito, * Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the second century—of Origen, † Athanasius, ‡ Hilary, § Cyril of Jerusalem, || Epiphanius, ¶ Gregory Nazianzen, ** Ruffinus †† and others; neither are they mentioned among the canonical books recognized by the Council of Laodicea. As a sample of the testimonies referred to in the margin, we will give a few passages from *Jerome*, the author of the *authentic* version commonly called the *Vulgate*. In the preface concerning all the books of the Old Testament which he prefixed to his Latin translation of Samuel and Kings, after having given us the Jewish canon, he says: 'Hic prologus scripturarum, quasi Galeatum principium omnibus libris quos de Hebraeo vertimus in Latinum convenire potest: ut scire valeamus quicquid extra hos est inter *Apocrypha* esse ponendum.' 'Therefore,' he adds, '*Wisdom*, which is vulgarly attributed to Solomon, and the *book of Jesus the Son of Sirach*, and *Judith*, *Tobias*, and *Pastor*, are not in

* Euseb. lib. iv. c. 26.

† Expos. Psal. i. Opp. tom. ii. Euseb. vi. 25.

‡ Pasch. Epist.

§ Prolog. in Psalmos.

|| 4th Cate. Exer.

¶ Hæres. i. 6.

** Can. 33.

†† Exposit. ad symb. apost.

the canon.' His testimony in relation to the Maccabees, is equally decided. In the prologue to his Commentary on Jeremiah, he declines explaining the book of *Baruch*, which in the edition of the LXX is commonly joined with it, because the Jews rejected it from the canon, and he of course knew no authority for inserting it. In the preface to his translation of *Daniel*, he assures us that the *story of Susannah, the song of the Three Children, and the fables of Bel and the Dragon*, are not only not in the Jewish copies, but had exposed Christians to ridicule for the respect which they paid to them! In his preface to *Tobit* and *Judith* he pronounces them *Apocryphal!*

“Here, then, about the close of the fourth century, we find no remnant of any unwritten tradition from Christ and his Apostles authorizing the church to receive these books. The early fathers followed in the footsteps of the Jews, and unanimously concurred in receiving no other canon of the Old Testament as inspired, but that which came down to them through the Jewish church. In this opinion learned men in every age have concurred up to the very meeting of the Council of Trent. We refer to such men as Cardinal Ximenes, Ludovicus Vives, the accomplished Erasmus and Cardinal Cajetan. How could there have been such a general concurrence in an error so deplorable, if Christ and his Apostles had ever treated these books as the lively Oracles of God! Surely there would have been some record, some hint of a fact so remarkable. We ask the Romanist to reconcile the testimonies of the Fathers with the decree of Trent. In the language of Bishop Burnet: “Here we have four centuries clear for our canon in exclusion of all additions. It were easy to carry this much further down, and to show that these books (the Apocrypha) were never by any express definition received into the canon till it was done at Trent, and that in all ages of the church, even after they came to be much esteemed, there were divers writers, and those generally the most learned of their time, who denied them to be a part of the canon.’”

This, Rev. Sir, might strike a reader altogether unacquainted with those early times, as very forcible, and nearly if not quite “irresistible.” A second perusal of your essay would show him, that much as you seem to have kept the matter out of

sight, even in those first four ages there were at least two sides to the question, whereas your argument is grounded on the assertion that the unbroken testimony of the church during all this time was against the inspiration of those books. St. Jerome, you state, informs us that the Christians were exposed to ridicule from the Jews for the respect in which they held one part of what your arguments affirm uninspired writings. Now, St. Jerome wrote before the year 400, and that respect might, for aught you say, be some remnant of a tradition from the Apostles regarding their inspiration. Those decisions, too, which you spoke of, made in their favour by bodies of which St. Augustine was a member, occurred also before the year 400. Might they not be other remnants? But, Rev. Sir, to one who is acquainted with those early days of the church, it must be a matter of astonishment, how, if you had read five authors of those times, (and if you had not, you should not make your second argument so boldly,) you could assert unqualifiedly and emphatically "that for four centuries the unbroken testimony of the Christian church is against their inspiration."

I assert that, on the contrary, the manner in which the Christians of the first four centuries acted in regard to those writings, shows that they were left to them by the Apostles as inspired. I presume you will admit that while these early Christians were tried in the furnace of persecution, and laid down their lives by thousands rather than swerve one jot or tittle from the truth handed down to them, they would not throughout the world unite in "blasphemously adding to the word of God." If they united in receiving those works as inspired, then is our cause fully sustained; for they would not have thus united unless they had been taught by the Apostles that those books formed part of the word of God. You have appealed to the testimony of the church for the first four centuries. You shall have it. Would that you may abide by its award.

In the first place, *all those books or parts of books were contained in the Old Testament as used by the early Christians in the infancy of the Church.* That they all existed at the time of St. Jerome, and at his day formed part of the Old Testament, cannot be denied. At the proper place, I will speak of his views on

their inspiration. At present let us investigate facts. The Latin Vulgate as used then contained them. Now, Rev. Sir, if it be made evident that those works were received universally and from the earliest day into the body of the Old Testament, your assertion that there is no remnant of any tradition, does not coincide with the fact. At what time were those works joined to the canonical works of the synagogue? All the works, except perhaps Wisdom and the second book of Maccabees, were originally written in Hebrew or Chaldaic; as their frequent Semitic idioms evidently show. St. Jerome translated Tobias and Judith from the Chaldaic, and declares that he saw Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees in the original Hebrew. Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah bear the indelible impress of their Hebrew origin. Origen declares emphatically that the parts of Esther and Daniel you reject were in the versions of the Septuagint and of Theodotion. We know that Theodotion, whom St. Jerome calls a *Judaizing Heretic*, translated from the Hebrew into Greek, and his version of Daniel containing those parts, is that anciently adopted by the Greek and Latin churches, and still followed entirely by the first, and in those parts by the latter. This clearly ascertained origin at once shows that the works were prior to the Saviour. If the Christians had written them afterward, which this general adoption forbids, they would have done it in Greek or Latin, their languages. The book of Wisdom and the second book of Maccabees are allowed by all sane critics to be incontestably anterior to the Saviour. The translation of the Hebrew works into the Greek for the use of the Hellenist Jews, is also allowed to have taken place before the Saviour's time. Without attempting now to prove this at length in regard to every book, especially as you have not denied it, I will again content myself with referring to Walton, who declares that those works were first received by the Hellenist Jews, although it cannot be ascertained at what time they were joined in one volume with the Jewish canonical works; but that this much is certain, that the church received them with the rest of the Scripture from those Hellenist Jews. I said the transfer was made with the approbation of the Apostles, who in writing their inspired epistles had manifestly used those works. I will now prove it by the versions of

the Old Testament among the Christians. Taking the Septuagint or Greek version alone, I cannot see what valid arguments can be adduced to prove that it did not contain those works in the beginning. Not the omission of them in copies, for the oldest entire manuscripts contain them. Not any testimony of some ancient writer, for as far as they bear witness it did, and, as I will show farther on, they quote those identical works. But there is another insurmountable objection to your opinion, and an irrefragable proof of my proposition. Two versions were made of the Scriptures immediately after the death of the Apostles, the Latin for the use of the Western Christians, from the Greek; and the Syriac from the Hebrew and Greek, for those of the east. Both contain those works.

We are informed that many versions or amended versions existed among the Latins, but that there was one called the *vetus Itala vulgata*, the ancient Italian, and commonly adopted one, the first of all and probably the groundwork of the others. As far back as manuscripts and notices of this version in writers will carry us, we find it containing those books. Blanchini has published part of it, but the work is not in Charleston. The book of Psalms, both books of the Maccabees, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus and the parts of Esther, as now used in the western church, are of this original version.

The *Peshito*, or ancient simple Syriac version, contained those works. Walton has inserted in the fourth volume of his Polyglott the whole of them, except the portions of Esther; and part at least of these has been since found.

This version, made, as is allowed by all oriental scholars, if not in the first, at least in the beginning of the second century, a few years after the death of St. John, is taken from the Hebrew and Greek. Theodotion, who translated passages of Daniel from the Hebrew, now lost in that language, executed his versions at a later period than that assigned by the learned to the Syriac translation. At his day those parts existed in Hebrew. St. Jerome saw several of the other books you contest in Hebrew or Chaldaic, and the word he uses, *reperi*, shows that copies of them were then extremely rare: they have since perished. Now in looking over the Syriac version of those works, you will

see that some are taken from the Hebrew, where probably it could be found, and others from the Greek, where the work was written originally in that language or the Hebrew might not probably have been at hand. The Syriac version of *Tobias* and *Judith* apparently follows the Septuagint; or possibly both may be directly translated from the original, which is now lost. The version of St. Jerome, also from the original, follows avowedly the sense, not the words of the Chaldaic or Hebrew, and cannot guide us in determining which. The portions of *Esther* in Syriac were not in the possession of Walton. They are found in the Septuagint and the Vulgate. I said, however, that part of them at least have since been discovered in the Syriac. In *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus* the Syriac agrees with the Septuagint, and appears to have been translated from it. On the contrary, *Baruch* with the Epistle of *Jeremiah* appear to have been translated into Syriac, not from the Greek of the Septuagint, but from the Hebrew original now no longer extant. So, too, the *Peshito* Syriac version of the contested parts of Daniel is taken, not from the Septuagint, but from the original Hebrew, whence Theodotion at a later period took them. There are many evidences of this. For example, in the History of Susannah, the Greek says that two *ancients* were appointed judges, while the Syriac has two *priests*. Now the original Hebrew word was undoubtedly *cohenim*, which signifies both priest, and prince, or ancient. The Syriac translator took the Hebrew word in one sense, and the Greek in another. This difference would not have happened, had the Syriac been taken simply from the Greek. On a comparison of the first and second books of Maccabees in the Greek and in the Syriac version, it will be evident, that the second book in Syriac is taken from the Greek, while it seems more probable that the first is from the kindred Hebrew.

It appears, therefore, that immediately after the days of the Apostles, in the first or beginning of the second century, when, according to Walton, Wiseman, and the best scholars, the Syriac and Latin versions were made, the Christians did not think that no books were contained in their Old Testament, except those inserted by the Synagogue in the Jewish canon. Whether the whole Christian world could have united in embodying the books

you object to in their body of Scriptures, without some testimony from the Apostles to that effect, I leave you and my readers to judge. I believe, as I said, with Walton, that those books were united to the Jewish canonical books by the Hellenist Jews, before the days of Christianity, and that they came already united into the church. The Apostles, as I showed in my last, allude to and incorporate passages and phrases from these works into their own writings. We have just seen that the early Septuagint and the two other versions made by Christians, in what you will allow were the purest and palmiest days of Christianity, contained them. Even were I to give, that these books were not united to the others before the time of Christ, this concession would but increase your difficulty, and display more strikingly the difference between the Jewish and the Christian Old Testament, a difference which could only arise from the teaching of Christ and his Apostles.

But, you may say, if this be so, the early Christian writers would quote those books. It is natural, Rev. Sir, that if they wrote much they should sometimes do so, and that, if their works be preserved in any quantity, we should find such quotations therein. *And we do find them.*

We have a portion of the authentic writings of four Christians before the year 100; St. Barnabas the Apostle's catholic Epistle; St. Polycap's Epistle to the Philippians; St. Ignatius's Epistles; and a considerable portion of St. Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians, and a fragment of his second Epistle to the same.

Now in this small collection, the earliest of the Christian writings, we have several quotations from those books.

1. St. Barnabas, in § 6 of his Epistle, has the following passage: "But what saith the Prophet against Israel: Woe be to their soul, because they have taken wicked counsel against themselves, saying: Let us lay snares for the righteous, because he is unprofitable to us." This passage is composed of the two texts, *Isaias* iii. 9, "*Woe to their soul, for evils are rendered to them,*" and *WISDOM* ii. 12, "Let us therefore lie in wait for the just, because he is not for our turn." Here St. Barnabas quotes in the same sentence, and as of equal inspired authority,

the book of Isaias, contained in the canon of the Jews, and that of Wisdom, one of those you boldly declare to be of no more authority than Seneca's Letters or Tully's Offices.

2. Towards the end of the same Epistle, the apostolical writer says: "Thou shalt not be forward to speak; for the mouth is the snare of death. Strive with thy soul for all thy might. Reach not out thy hand to receive, and withhold it not, when thou shouldst give." What is this but a quotation of *Ecclesiasticus* (iv. 33, 34, 36), another of the books of your heathen category? "*Strive for justice for thy soul, and even unto death fight for justice, and God will overthrow thy enemies for thee. Be not hasty in thy tongue: and slack and remiss in thy works. Let not thy hand be stretched out to receive, and shut when thou shouldst give.*"

3. St. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians comes next. In the tenth section he has the following passage: "When it is in your power to do good, defer it not, for charity delivereth from death. Be all of you subject to one another, having your conversations honest (or irreproachable) among the Gentiles." St. Polycarp, like St. Barnabas, quotes in the same breath an author whom you admit as inspired, and one whom you reject and condemn Catholics for revering with him. "For alms delivereth from death." Tobias xii. 9. "Having your conversation good among the Gentiles." 1 Pet. ii. 12.

There are one or two passages in the Epistles of St. Ignatius which seem to me to imply quotations from the books in question. But as they are not so clear and striking, I omit them. I find too that several authors refer to a passage speaking of Daniel and Susannah. But as it is not in the copy before me, I consider it most probably one of the interpolations foisted into the saint's writings in after years. We will leave him then and take up the other writer.

4. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, § 27, St. Clement, fourth bishop of Rome, has the following passage: "Who shall say to Him, what dost thou? or who shall resist the power of His strength?" These words are taken from *Wisdom* xi. 52, and xli. 12: "For who shall say to thee, what hast thou done?" "And who shall resist the strength of thy arm?"

5. In § 55, he writes thus : “ And even many women, being strengthened by the grace of God, have done many glorious and manly things. The blessed Judith, when her city was besieged, desired the elders that they would suffer her to go to the camp of the strangers ; and she went out, exposing herself to danger for the love she bore to her country and her people that were besieged. And the *Lord delivered Holofernes into the hands of a woman*. Nor did Esther, being perfect in faith, expose herself to any less hazard for the delivery of the twelve tribes of Israel, in danger of being destroyed. For by fasting and humbling herself, she intreated the great Maker of all things, the God of ages ; who, beholding the humility of her soul, delivered the people for whose sake she was in peril.” The passage speaks for itself. I may say that the words marked in italics are extracted from the sublime canticle of *Judith* (xvi. 7). In his account of Esther, too, St. Clement evidently had in his mind, not only the passage in Hebrews iv. 16, v. 2, but the prayer of Esther (xiv.), one of those portions which you reject, with which every word he uses admirably tallies.

I have been admonished not to encroach too much on the columns of the *Miscellany*, and must conclude here for the present.

We have seen that the Old Testament, in the infancy of the church, and from one extremity of the Christian world to the other, whether in Syriac, in Greek, or in Latin, contained the books which the Catholic canon now contains, and which you would have us exclude. We have seen three out of the four first Christian writers quoting them unequivocally, precisely as they quote the other books of the Scripture—making no distinction whatever. Add to this, if you please, the passages enumerated in my last letter, wherein the inspired writers of the New Testament have evidently used those works ; and then withdraw your thoughtless assertion that “ the unbroken testimony of the Christian church is against their inspiration.”

I will in my next take up some Christian writers of the second century, and shall show that they also quoted those works as parts of the Scripture. Meanwhile,

I remain, Rev. Sir,
Yours, &c.,

A. P. F.

COLLECTION OF THE PASSAGES IN WHICH DR. LYNCH HAS REPRESENTED
THE FATHERS AS QUOTING THE APOCRYPHA.

N. B. The first column gives the name of the author and the book; the second, the passages which are simply quoted or accommodated; the third, those which are quoted with some mark of distinction, as Scripture, Divine Scripture, or under the name of a prophet; the fourth gives merely allusions to the contents of the book, or assumes its history to be true. Some few passages may have been omitted, as the syllabus has been prepared in great haste.

Name and Works of the Fathers.	Apocryphal passages which are simply quoted.	Those quoted as Scripture, or Divine Scripture.	Allusions to Apocry. Scripture.
JUSTIN MARTYR.			
1 Apol. § 44.	Ecclus. xv. 14-18.		
IRENÆUS.			
Contra Hæres l. iv. c. 37	Wisdom vi. 20.		
“ lib. v. c. 35.	Baruch iv. 36. 37.		
“ lib. iv. c. 26.	Daniel xiii. 56, 52, 53.		
“ lib. iv. c. 5.	“ xiv. 3, 4, 24.		
CLEMENS ALEX.			
Pædag. lib. i. c. 7.	Ecclus. xi. 7. i. 27, 28.	
“ lib. i. c. 9.	Ecclus. xxx. 8.		
“ lib. ii. c. 5.	Ecclus. xxi. 23.	
“ lib. ii. c. 8.	“ xxxviii. 1.	
“ lib. ii. c. 8.	“ xxxix. 31.	
“ lib. iii. c. 3.	“ xxv. 8.	
Stromat. lib. iv.	Wisdom iii. 2-8. (as Divine Wisdom.)	
“ lib. vi.	Wisdom v. 2-5. (under name of Solomon.)	
“ lib. vi.	Wisdom iii. 14. as Sol.	
Pædag. lib. i. c. 10.	Bar. iv. 4. iii. 4. as Jer.	
“ lib. ii. c. 3.	“ iii. 16-19.	
Strom. lib. vi.	Tobias xii. 8.	
TERTULLIAN.			
Monog. c. 17.	Judith viii. 1.
Præscrip. c. 7.	Wisdom i. 1. as Sol.	
Cont. Valent. c. 2.	“ i. 1. as Sol.	
De anima c. 15.	Wisdom i. 6.		
De virg. vel. c. 13.	“ viii. 21,		
Cont. marc. c. 5.	Ecclus. xv. 18.		
De exhort. cast. c. 2.	Ecclus. xv. 18.	
Scorpiæum	Bar. vi. 3, 4, 5. as Jer.	
De coron. milit. c. 4.	Daniel xiii. 32.		
De Idol. c. 18	Daniel xiv.
De Jejun. c. 9.	“ xiv. 32, 33.
Adv. Jud. c. 4.	1 Mal. ii. 41.
De præscrip. c. 13.	2 Mal. ii. 28.
CYPRIAN.			
Test. ad Quir. l. iii. c. 1	Tobias ii. 2. iv. 6-12.		
“ “ l. iii. c. 7.	“ ii. 16.		
De Mortali c. 7.	“ xii. 15.		

Name and Works of the Fathers.	Apocryphal passages which are simply quoted.	Those quoted as Scripture, or Divine Scripture.	Allusions to Apocry.
CYPRIAN.			
De Orat. Dom. c. 21.	Tobit. xii. 8.	
De Op. et Eleemos. c. 4.	Tobit xii. 8.		
Exhort. Mart. c. 12.	Wisdom iii 4-8.	
De Mortal. c. 17.	“ iv. 11-14.	
Ad Demet. c. 13.	Wisdom v. 1-8.		
De habit. Virg c. 7.	“ v. 8.	
Ad Rogat.	“ iii. 4-8.	
De Mortal. c. 5.	Ecclus ii. 1-4.	
De Op. et Eleemos. c. 2.	“ iii. 33.	
De Unit. Eccles. c. 19.	“ xxviii. 28.	
Ad Rogat.	“ vii. 31-33.	
De Laps. c. 19.	Daniel xxv. 34.	
De Unit. Eccles. c. 11.	Daniel iii. 49-50.
De Orat Dom. c. 4.	Daniel iii 51.	
Exhort. ad Mort. c. 11.	“ xiv. 4.	
De Orat Dom. c. 14.	“ xiv.
De Op. et Eleemos. c. 8.	“ xiv.
Epist. 40.	“ xiii.
Test. ad Quir. I. ii. c. 6.	Bar. iii. 36-38, as Jer.	
De Orat. Dom. c. 2.	“ vi. 5.	
Test. ad Quir. I. iii. c. 4.	2 Mac. ix. 12. ii. 62, 63.		
“ lib. iii. c. 17.	2 Mac. vi. 30. vii. 9, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19.		
“ lib iii. c. 3.	1 Mac. ii. 60.		
Exhort ad Mort. c. 12.	2 Mac. vi. and vii.
HIPPOLYTUS.			
Cont. Noët. c. 2.	Baruch iii. 36-38.	
DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA.			
Epist. ad Germ.	Tobit xiii. 7.	
Cont. Paul. Samosat	Wisdom i. 5, 6.	
APOST. CONSTITUTIONS.			
Lib. ii. c. 37, 49, 51.	Daniel xiii.
Lib. viii. c. 1.	“ xiv.
Lib. vi. c. 19.	Baruch iii. 36-38.		
Lib. vii. c. 23.	“ iv. 4.		
Lib. vi. c. 29.	Wisdom iii. 1.		Judith.
Lib. iii. c. 7.	“
Lib. v. c. 19.	
POPE SIRICIUS.			
Epist. ad Himmer. c. 7.	Wisdom i. 4.		
JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS.			
“	Wisdom xv. 15-17 as Solomon's.	
“	Baruch vi. 5-9. as Jer.	
“	“ vi 21, 25, 30, 31, 64, 50, and 57.	
EPHREM, THE SYRIAN.			
De Evers. superb.	Daniel ix. 7.		

Name and Works of the Fathers.	Apocryphal passages which are simply quoted.	Those quoted as Scripture, or Divine Scripture.	Allusions to Apocry.
EPHREM, THE SYRIAN.			
De virtut. c. 3.	Daniel iii. 40.		
De Humil. c. 9.	" iii. 39.		
Paræns. 9.	" iii. 50.		
De orat.	" iii. 33.		
De pœnit. c. 23.	Daniel iii.
Paræn. ad monegit, c. 14, 11.	Daniel xiii. 52.		
Epist. ad Joan.	Daniel xiii.
De muliere.	" xiii.
De Rect. viv. Nat. c. 85	" iv. 32-36.
De Patient. &c.	" iv. 32-36.
In D Basylium.	Tobit xii. 7.		
Serm. Cont. Jude.	Baruch ix. 4 & 20. iii. 38		
De Timore Dei.	Wisdom iv. 12.	
De Certam. &c. c. 8.	Wis. iv. 7, 8, 9. v. 1-16	
Advs. Levit.	" iii. 1, 6, 9.	
De Humil. c. 94.	" ii. 21, 22.	
Paræn. 39.	Wisdom vi. 9.		
Exhort 40.	" i. 12.		
" 46.	Wisdom xv. 12.	
De Patient.	" v. 18-24.	
De virt. et. vit. c. 8.	Ecclus. ii. 15.	
De Timore Dei.	Ecclus. xxxii. 1. viii.	" xxv. 13 iii.	
"	6, 7. xxxi. 5.	7. xviii. 30 and 31.	
"	Ecclus. vi. 18.	Eccl. xi. 5. iv. 7. vii. 40.	
De Panop. &c.	" vi. 30.	
De cast.	Ecclus. iv. 25, 26.		
Neerosima. can. 15.	2d Mac. vi.
Testamentum.	" vi.
BASIL THE GREAT			
Cont. Eunom. lib. 5, c. 15, § 2.	Wisd. i. 4.		
Cont. Eunom. c. 14, § 2.	Wisdom i. 7.	
" c. 2.	Wis. ix. 1, 2, as Sol.	
Epist. 8, § 12, and 11.	Wisdom i. 7.		
Hom. 12.	Wis. i. 4, 7.	
" 14.	" i. 4, as Solomon's	
" 14.	" vi. 7.	
De Sanc. Spir. c. 23, § 54.	Wisdom i. 7.		
Hom. 12, § 13.	Daniel xiii. 50.		
Hom. in 40 mart. § 6.	" iii. 40.		
Epist. 243, § 43.	" iii. 38, 39.		
Cont. Unam. lib. 2. § 19	Esther xiv. 11.		
" " " 4. c. 3.	Baruch iii. 32, as Jer.	
De Sanc. Spir. c. 8. § 19	Judith ix. 4.		
Epist 6.	2d Mac. vii.
Hom. Dent. c. 5, 9.	Ecclus. ix. 20.		
Hexaem. Hom. 6, 910.	" xxvii. 12.		
Capit. Ques. 104.	Ecclus. xxxii. 22.	
CHRYSOSTOM.			
Ad Viduam Jun.	Ecclus. xviii. 26. xi. 5.	
Hom. de Lat.	" xix. 16.	
Serm. 8. Cont. Jude.	" ii. 1-5.	
Serm. de Lat.	Ecclus. ii. 1, 2.		
Exhort. 2 ad. Theod.	" v. 8.		
Hom. 18. ad pop. anth.	" xiv. 2.		

Name and Works of the Fathers.	Apocryphal passages which are simply quoted.	Those quoted as Scripture, or Divine Scriptures.	Allusions to Apocry.
CHRYSOSTOM.			
De Fato.	Ecclus. xv. 17 and 15.	
Hom. 15. ad pop. anth.	Ec. i. 20. ix. 10, as Sol.	
Serm. 1 in Act. Apost.	Ecclus. xvi. 3.	
De virginitat. c. 22.	Wisdom v. 36.		
Serm. in Calendas.	“ iii. 1.		
Hom. in Gen. 11.	Wisdom xiv. 3.	
Psalms 109.	“ xvi. 28.	
Hom. in Matt. 27.	“ vi. 7.	
Hom. in Ept. Heb. 7.	“ iv. 8, 9.	
Nous. Anom. 5.	Baruch iii. 36, 37, 38.	
Cont. Jude et Gent.	“ iii. 36, 37, 38.	
Hom. 3. ad pop. anth.	Esther xiv. 13.	
Hom. 60. in Joan.	Judith mentioned.
Hom. 13. in Epis. Heb.	Tobit iv. 7.	
Hom. 9. do	“ iv. 11.	
Hom. 5. Nous. Anom.	Daniel iii. 23.		
Cont. Jude et Gent.	“ iii. 38.		
Hom. in Pentecost. 1.	“ iii. 38.		
Hom. 15. in 1st Cor.	Daniel xiii. 52.	
Hom. 18. do	Daniel iii. 29, 30.		
Hom. 2. in Philem.	“ iii. 29, 30, 39, 32. xiv. 37.		
AMBROSE.			
Hexaem. Lib. 4. c. 8.	Ecclus. xxvi. 12.	
In Noach. &c. c. 35.	“ xxxii. 13.	
In Naboth. c. 8.	“ iv. 8.	
Tract. de 42.	“ ii. 5.	
Psalms 118.	Wisdom i. 6.	
Jacob. c. 8.	Wis. iv. 8, 9. xiv. 7, 8.	
Joseph.	Wis. ii. 12, as Sol.	
Psalms 43.	Wis. vii. 7, do	
Hexaem. Lib. 3. c. 14'	Baruch iv. 26. v. 27, as Jeremiah.	
In Tobit.	Baruch iii. 24, 25.	
Cain et Abel, c. 9.	“ iii. 1.	
42 Mans.	“ iii. 29, 30.	
Hexaem. Lib. ii. c. 4.	Dan. iii. 56, 68, 67, 74.	
De officiis. Lib. ii. c. 9.	Ref to story of Susann.
Joseph c. 5.	“ “
Jacob. Lib. i. c. 8.	Ref. to Bel and Dragon
do Lib. ii. c. 9.	“ “
Elias. c. 9.	Judith viii. 6.	
De officiis, c. 13 & 14.	Ref to Judith.
Jacob. Lib. ii. c. 9.	2d Mac. 6 and 7 cap.
De officiis, Lib. ii. o. 29	“ 3.
PAULINAS OF NOLA.			
Exhort. ad celant.	Eccl. iv. 25—23. xxviii. 28, 29.—3 ch. 20 v.	
Epist. ad pamach. 37.	Ec. xxxviii. 16. xvii. 18	
do 30.	Ec. vii. 16. Wis. viii. 1	
do 32.	Ec. xix. 15.	
do 39.	Ec. v. 8.	
do 37.	Wisdom iv. 7. Baruch iii. 18, 19.	

✚ The somewhat numerous errata noted below, are to be accounted for partly from the author's distant residence from the place of printing, which prevented him from revising the proofs; but mainly, from the obscurity and incorrectness of the manuscript. They occur mostly in the Latin and Greek quotations in the Notes, many of which it was impossible to verify on the spot, and have seldom any important bearing on the sense.

ERRATA.

- Page 12, last line in note, read *Remonst.* for *Demonst.*
 " 21, fifth line of note, read *super ea re* for *superare*.
 " " first line of note, read *discuterentur* for *discutiuntur*.
 " " fourteenth line of note, dele *facta*
 " " " " " insert *Sanctum* after *apud*.
 " " seventeenth line of note, read *expenderentur* for *experentur*.
 " " twenty-eighth line of note read *detested* for *detected*.
 " 40, first line of note read A. P. F., for A. P. P.
 " 41, Note, for Westminster Conf. chap. i. 55, read chap. i. § 5.
 " 44, first line of note, for *αυταποφαινεθαι* read *αυταποφαινεσθαι*.
 " 55, fifth line of note, read *tout* for *tous*.
 " " eighth line of note, read *constitue* for *constitutē*.
 " " tenth line of note, read *appartient exclusivement* for *appartiens exclusivement*.
 " " thirteenth line of note, read *manière par* for *manière pas*.
 " " fourteenth line of note, read *elle* for *cette*.
 " " fifteenth line of note, read *dans* for *sans*.
 " " twenty-sixth line of note, read *cet* for *ses*.
 " " thirtieth line of note, read *n'en* for *y en*.
 " " thirty-second line of note, read *primaute* for *primantē*.
 " " fourth line from bottom, read *celle-ci* for *celle cē*.
 " " " " " read *rejeter* for *rejeter*.
 " " third line from bottom, insert *nier* after *sans*.
 " " second line from bottom, read *qui* for *que*.
 " 63, line 22, dele the last word, *their*.
 " 95, second note, thirteenth line from bottom, read *gratiæ* for *gratia*.
 " " twelfth line from bottom, read *volverunt* for *voluerant*.
 " " sixth line from bottom, read *omnis* for *omsis*.
 " 96, fourth line, read *dialectics* for *dialects*.
 " 118, first Latin note at star, read *aliquid* for *allquid*.
 " 124, seventh line of note, read *αγνοουντες* for *αγνοουντες*.
 " " " " " *καταγγελλομεν* for *καταγελομεν*.
 " " eighth line, read *τελειωσεις* for *τελειωσας*.
 " " fourteenth line, read *est eucharistia* for *et eucharistia*.
 " " eighth line from bottom, read *dubitarunt* for *dubitant*.
 " " " " " *superstitionum* for *supersitionem*.
 " " " " " *epoptis* for *epoptes*.
 " " seventh line from bottom, read *cum* for *sum*.
 " " third line from bottom, read *deitati* for *deitate*.
 " 125, second line of note, read *mysteriis* for *mysteries*.
 " " seventeenth line of note, read *arcana* for *arcano*.
 " " twenty-second line of note, read *se* for *es*.
 " 130, the first note there should have embraced the one which follows the extract from Calvin's Institutes on page 131, beginning, "The Apostles are addressed," &c.
 " 133, note, sixth line from bottom, there should be quotation marks after the word *Bishops*, thus, bishops," and the next sentence should begin a paragraph.
 " 134, the star in the text should be a section, as it does not correspond to the note.
 " 145, note at star, dele *to effort*.
 " 146, note, eighth line from bottom, read *reddidit* for *reddidat*.
 " " last line, read *prastiterint* for *prastitirent*.
 " 147, second line of note, read *vero* for *viro*.
 " " note at star, first word, for *assequitur* read *assequatur*.
 " " same note, last word, for *potestatis*, read *potestates*.
 " 149 that note exhibits the opinions of Aquinas, Agidius and Cajetan, as given by Bellarmin.
 " 152, note, third line, read *imperator* for *imperatur*, and put a comma between it and the preceding word.
 " " note, seventh line, read *feri permiserint* for *geri permiscerint*.
 " " read *feudalia* for *fudalia*.
 " " note, thirteenth line, read *suaserint* for *suasderint*.
 " 153, note at star, second line, read *detinentes* for *destinentes*.
 " " " " " read *fidelitatis* for *fidelitates*.
 " " third line, read *servus* for *servius*.
 " " fourth line, read *cadit* for *cadat*.
 " 154, note, first line, read *Presbyterum*, for *Presbyterium*.

ERRATA.

- Page 154, third line, read *crimine* for *crimina*.
 " 180, note, third line from bottom, read *Kemnitium* for *Remnitium*.
 " 188, note, twelfth line, read *recipiendos*, for *recipiendo*.
 " 223, note beginning Ecclesiasticus, fill the blank with *αγωνισαι*.
 " 252, note, first line, read *exscribentes*, for *enscribentes*.
 " 259, Greek note, fourth line, read *κομμωτικης* for *κομμωτιης*.
 " " " " " read *εκτος* for *κητος*.
 " " fifth line, read *αγχομενον* for *αλχομενον*.
 " " " " " read *βιωτικον* for *βροτικον*.
 " " sixth line, read *της* for *τες*, and *προφητης* for *προφητες*.
 " " seventh line, read *ασατω* for *ασαεω*.
 " 262, note, first line, read *του* for *εσι*.
 " " text, fourteenth line, last word, read *were* for *we*.
 " " note, second line from bottom, read *priore* for *priora*.
 " 269, last note, read *sancto* for *sancte*.
 " 274, Greek note, first line, read *ου* for *ον*.
 " 275, note eighth line, read *omnino* for *oraino*.
 " 282, last note third line, read *Kemnitius* for *Kenilius*, and last line but one, *consuerit* for *consuerit*.
 " 283, note, fourth line, read *ex fama* for *ezeama*.
 " 284, third note, second line, read *του* for *τοι*.
 " " fourth note, first line, read *Origines* for *origines*.
 " 285, note, second line, read *accenset* for *accensit*.
 " " fourteenth line, read *Lindanus dubitantis* for *Lindamus dubitantes*.
 " " fifteenth line, read *dcinientis* for *definientes*, and in the same note there should be only a comma at 47.
 " 287, note, first line, read *legatur* for *legitur*.
 " 289, note second, second line, read *prafatione* for *prasetionc*.
 " " last note, first line, read *Carthaginiense* for *Carthaginensi*.
 " " fourth line, read *intelligetis* for *intelligeris*.
 " " seventh line, insert 2 before *Esdrae* and a period after, and read *Hebraei* for *Hebrari*.
 " " tenth line, read *altius* for *alius*.
 " 290, note, first line, insert *ut* before *primum*.
 " " fourth line, insert 2 before *paralipomenon*, and read *imperitiam* for *imperitatem*.
 " " seventeenth line, read *animadverso* for *animadverto*.
 " " nineteenth line, read *Heræ* for *Heræ*.
 " " twenty-second line, read *opinionem* for *opinioue*.
 " " twenty-third line, after *Bibliis* insert *regiis habeater Tertii Esdrae Græce ; ne in Germanicis quidem Bibliis*.
 " " twenty-seventh line, read *debetis* for *deletis*.
 " " twenty-eighth line, read *alias* for *alios*.
 " " last line, read *et quæ* for *ac qui*, and for *ex* read *en*.
 " 291, twenty-first line, read *interpretati* for *interpretate*.
 " " twenty-third line, read *vives* for *vires*.
 " " twenty-eighth line, read *novam* for *noram*.
 " " twenty-ninth line, read *quidem* for *decidem*.
 " " last line, insert *nunc* before *novam*, and read *authore* for *aut hore*.
 " 292, note, first line, read *præsideo* for *prafideo*.
 " " third line, read *translationem* for *translatione*.
 " " eleventh line, read *nostros* for *nostras*.
 " " twenty-second line, read *facillime* for *facimile*, also *simili* for *simtli*.
 " " twenty-fifth line, read *Carthaginiense* for *Carthaginensi*.
 " 294, note, eighth line, read *ordini* for *ordine*.
 " " eleventh line, period at *terminatam*.
 " " seventh line from bottom, dele *qui connezi subimet*.
 " 295, note, second line, read *prophetaverunt* for *prophereareunt*.
 " 296, first note, last line, put a colon at *christianus*.
 " " second note, first line, read *scriniaria* for *seriniaria*.
 " 299, note at star, fifth line, read *sive* for *sine*.
 " " note at dagger, third line, read *duntaxat* for *dum laxat*.
 " 311, note, first line, read *ηξιωσας* for *εξιωσας*.
 " " fifth line, read *σου* for *σον*.
 " " seventh line, read *ανατολην* for *ενατολην*.
 " " twelfth line, read *εκλογας* for *εκλογωας*.
 " " last line, read *εξ* for *εκ*.
 " 317, note, first line, read *ψαλμον* for *ψαλμων*.

BS1135 .T51
The arguments of Romanists from the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00011 7814