

enough to assert, that none of those last mentioned doctrines of the Church of Rome, form any part of Scriptural and genuine Christianity.

And here may appropriately be given, the following remarks of a very eminent Christian minister, and learned Commentator, at the conclusion of his comments on St. Peter's second Epistle :

"We have now passed over all the canonical writings of St. Peter that are extant and it is worthy of remark, that in no place of the two Epistles already examined, nor in any of this Apostle's sayings in any other parts of the sacred writings, do we find any of the *peculiar* tenets of the Romish church : not one word of *his* or the *Pope's supremacy* ; not one word of those who affect to be his *successors* ; nothing of the *infallibility* claimed by those pretended successors ; nothing of *purgatory, penances, pilgrimages, auricular confession, power of the keys, indulgences, extreme unction, masses, and prayers for the dead* ; and not one word on the most essential doctrine of the Romish Church, *transubstantiation*. Now all these things have been considered by themselves, most essential to the being of that Church is it not strange that *he*, from whom they profess to derive all their power, authority and influence, in spiritual and secular matters, should have said nothing of these most necessary things ? Is it not a proof that the holy Apostle knew nothing of them ; hat they are *no part* of the doctrine of God ; and although they *distinguish the Church of Rome*, do not belong to the *Church of Christ* ?"

And now although some may think that this answer was not needed, and probably others, that its style of remark is too free and pointed, yet by every true Christian and unprejudiced person the following facts and circumstances will be considered to afford a full vindication as to both those objections. The *Express*, newspaper, in which the several doctrines and subjects contained in the lectures were given, in such a precise and fully detailed form is the organ of the Roman Catholic Church here, and it may confidently be assumed that its editor would not have ventured to publish the lectures as he has done, without the approval and sanction of the Archbishop. And further, if there had been any mistakes, or errors, in the publication of the lectures, the Archbishop would, of course, have had them corrected, but nothing of the kind has taken place. Again it is universally known, that