

years, when she gave the following demonstrations of her experience and vigour in the discharge of this arduous office. In her speech to parliament, March 29th, 1592, she says; "There be some fault-finders with the order of the Clergy, which so make a slander to myself and the Church, whose over-ruler God hath made me: whose negligence cannot be excused, if any shisms of errors heretical were suffered. Some faults and negligences may be, as in all other great changes it happeneth; and what vocation without? All which, if you my Lords of the Clergy do not amend, I mean to depose you. Look ye therefore well to your charges.—This may be amendment without heedless or open exclamations. I am supposed to have many studies, but most philosophical. I must yield this to be true, that I suppose few (that be no professors) have read more. And I need not tell you, that I am not so simple that I understand not, nor so forgetful that I remember not; and yet amidst my many volumes I hope God's book hath not been my school-lectures. . . . Take you heed . . . I see many over-bold with God Almighty, making too many subtle scannings of his blessed will, as lawyers do with human testaments. The presumption is so great as I may not suffer it (yet mind I not hereby to animate Romanists . . . nor tolerate new-fangledness: I mean to guide them both by God's holy true rule.)" (*Parliamentary History Vol IV. p. 278.*) To show how much she was in earnest, this hypocritical murderer, soon after the delivery of this speech, sent Mary Queen of Scotland to the block; and cemented her own newfangledness by the blood of a Catholic princess, and of great numbers of the Catholic clergy.

I shall at present make no remarks on the conceited vanity, the arrogant presumption, and outrageous tyranny of these regal patentees of ecclesiastical supremacy and interpretational authority; nor of the violent means which they employed to convince others that they were not to be judges themselves of their fantastic opinions, in which they might lightly err. My object is to shew, how easily your church was admonished, that in spite of your vain pretensions, the Bible alone was not a sufficient guide; and that the necessity of an Ecclesiastical Supremacy was asserted and enforced by your church from its infancy. I could easily adduce a thousand instances of the same systematic contradiction between your professions and practice, from a succession of Protestant theologians of all denominations, both at home and abroad. But these two testimonies, in conjunction with the well-pointed satire of Sir Richard Steele, are sufficient for my purpose. They prove that you do not follow the Bible alone. They prove that the cry of the Bible alone is unsincere; that it is resorted to only to divert the attention of simple Protestants from the solid grounds of Catholic truth; and to hold out

a lure to decoy the ignorant and unwary. And they distinctly prove that when you withdrew your obedience from the apostolic authority of the ancient church, you only put on your necks the galling yoke of a new and more than pontifical supremacy of your own creation. It is therefore an undeniable truth, that neither you, nor we, nor any others that I ever heard or read of, are solely guided by the Bible. All admit another conjunct authority, though we alone are sincere enough to avow it. Sincerity looks well in such circumstances.

Others read the Bible as well as you. They are equally sincere, and by no means your inferiors in penetration and learning. The result of their perusal is perhaps a conviction that your opinions, though honoured by regal and parliamentary approbation, and sanctioned by the encouragement of worldly wealth, and a formidable apparatus of penal restrictions, are unsound, erroneous, antisciptural and untenable. Perhaps for one text which you quote in favour of your opinions, they quote ten against them. This is neither impossible, nor unprecedented. What is to be done in this case, where the Bible is itself silent, and doctors disagree? Here the Bible fails you in your utmost need: and without some other expedient, religion would be anarchical, and controversy endless. In this extremity you begin to learn from experience what you ought to have learnt from the original and long continued testimony of our church; that some living authority is as necessary to decide religious controversies in the church, as it is in the state to decide suits in common law. Having swerved from the doctrine and practice of venerable antiquity, you are at last compelled either to revert to the ancient rule, or to contrive some new institutions of your own. The Bible is here quite out of the question. The meaning of the Bible is the matter in dispute. The Bible cannot speak to interpret itself. Hence you adopted as a matter of course, articles as a standard of belief, ecclesiastical courts, judges, and juries, penal enactments and coercive machinery, to enforce the adoption not of the Bible itself, but of your construction of the Bible. With these shuffling tricks you play off the biblical game.

Open your eyes, Mr. Hardman, and consider this matter with the coolness of reason, and not with the delusion of prejudice or passion. Perhaps you will then perceive that, authority being admitted on all sides, the real difference between a Protestant and a Catholic consists not in this, that the former follows the Bible, and the latter the authority of his Church; but is reduced to this simple question: Whether the Catholic or the Protestant follows the best and most competent authority? Whether the opinions of the minority ought to preponderate over the faith of the majority of Christians; the modern authority over the ancient; the changeable over the unchangeable; the insular over the catholic; the local over the universal; and, as we judge, the human over the divine? Whether the Dutchman follows the best authority who bows to the decisions of the Synod of Dort; the Scotchman who adopts the confession of Cromwell's divines, and the determinations of the General Assembly at Edinburgh; the Quaker who follows his own private spirit, under the direction of the meeting; the Methodist who obeys the conference at Leeds or Manchester; the Englishman who appeals to the Sunday of the Cross, resting on the head of a man, woman, or child; or the catholic, who with the majority of christians, of all ages and countries, despising the conceits and innovating experiments of unauthoris-

ed individuals, prefers the fixed, unchangeable, and divinely appointed authority of Christ's one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. You have taken your choice; and we have taken ours. Which of us is most justified in his preference, by the rule of wisdom, humility, faith and piety? We can give the most substantial reasons for preferring the authority of him who said, before a page of the New Testament was written: "Hear the Church;" to that of a wicked tyrant who chooses to usurp the infallibility of apostleship, and set forth his own new-fangled system of doctrine as a standard of Christian belief. The instructed Catholic has surer grounds for his belief; and better motives for his practice. The authority which he followed in matters of faith is not illusory, but infallible; not human, but divine.

Gentlemen, the additional reflections of Mr. Cardwell shall form the subject of my next letter.

I am, your's, &c. &c.

JOHN HARDMAN.

From the Boston Trumpet.

DR. ELY.

THIS divine has just returned to Philadelphia from a two month's tour, in which he has been collecting funds for the American Sunday School Union. In one of his letters, written his friends during his absence, he says: "So far as I go, it is my wish to make charitable concerns a *CASH business.*"

The following is a paragraph from one of his letters—

"Last night I returned home, having completed two months of my volunteer agency; during which I have visited two Congregational Churches, three Baptist Churches, eighteen Presbyterian Churches, and eighteen Reformed Dutch Churches. During my absence from home I have delivered *fifty-one sermons*, and received in donations for the American Sunday School Union, 2181 dollars and 49 cents; which sum includes 5 dollars obtained for two gold rings, and two dollars for a key and seal, before reported to you."

Some of this money was collected from little children—some from black washer-women, and some probably from those who, however pious, never had the honesty to pay their debts.

The Dr. follows up the new practice of making the *dead* life members of orthodox societies.—Paying money to the clergy for the benefit of the dead has long been a practice in the Roman Catholic Church.

"My expenses for supplying my pulpit during my agency; and for other necessary things, have amounted to 166 dollars 96 cents. This sum I give to the Union; wishing that 30 dollars of it may enrol the name of my deceased father, the Rev'd. Zebulon Ely, of Lebanon, Connecticut, on the list of Life Members, marked with a star, while 30 dollars for each are to confer the like honour on my departed son Ezra Stiles Ely, Jr. on my departed son Ezra S. Duffield Ely; and on my daughter Mary Ann Ely, who, at the age of nearly three years, was taken from the earth by flames of fire.—There will remain 46 dollars 96 cents to constitute my wife, Mrs. Mary Ann Ely, a life member."

[How happens it that we see no further accounts of deceased persons being made "*everlasting life members*" of the American Sunday School Union?

coldly. For of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you, and virtuous and godly living was never less used, nor God himself, amongst Christians, was never less revered, honoured, and served. Therefore as I said before, be in charity one with another, like brother and brother love; dread and fear God; to which I as your Supreme Head, and Sovereign Lord, exhort and require you." (*Hall's Chronicle Pol. cclxi.*)