stance of the *omission* of these doctrines in the Creed is not sufficient to overthrow their truth, surely it must be allowed, that the same omission forms no valid objection to other doctrines, which have been always held in the Catholic Church, though not explicitly enumerated in the Apostles' Creed.

With respect to the peculiar veneration and devotion paid by Catholics to the Blessed Virgin, a few remarks will be sufficient, though I have already alluded to the subject of the Immaculate Conception, in a former part of this Letter. You profess to regard this practice, and the whole system of "modern Romanism" involved in it, as "thoroughly uncatholic and unscriptural". only objection is the silence of the Epistles of the New Testament on this point. But this silence really proves nothing, whether we regard the New Testament as an historical record, or as a divine revelation. No one, surely, will assert that the New Testament professes to give a complete account of all the details of Christian worship, or to exhibit a systematic view of Christian doctrine and practice. Every existing denomination of Protestants, who hold that the Bible is the only rule of faith, must admit that they have some difficulty to get over, in order to reconcile every part of their own system with the statements of the Bible, and they have each some conjectural theory, by which they endeavor to account for the omissions, apparent inconsistencies, and other peculiarities in the structure and contents of the New Testament. These are, indeed, insurmountable objections to the Protestant principles; but they are no objections at all to the Catholic principles, according to which the Bible is regarded as only one part of divine revelation, and to be interpreted by the authority of the

to ch; s of ine eds ex-

to ose the ere olic in ted, oirit

all
y of
tles'
now
will
nree
an-

s or l at any hich uts?

to ines

in y of cum-