

priests. On this subject I know you will maintain a profound silence, for you dare not forfeit your reputation as a scholar by attempting to refute these historical facts. Call upon me for my proofs if you doubt any one of them, and if I cannot produce them let the blame and the disgrace of the failure attend me for ever.

Now, Rt. Rev. Sir, permit me again to inquire of you how you and your clergy can claim to receive your ministerial authority from Christ through the Popes, when neither Popes nor Popery existed for nearly six hundred years after Christ? They surely were not present when he gave us *our ministry*, and could not, therefore, have received it from him at the time; and I need hardly add you have had no opportunity of receiving your authority from him since his ascension into heaven; and from the character of your Popish gospel, it is more than unlikely he would not give you his authority nineteen hundred years after he clothed the Protestant clergy with theirs. You may, Rt. Rev. sir, smile at this last statement, and yet it deserves your most serious attention, for if the Pope's clergy were not in existence at the time when the commission was given, they could not have received it then, but some persons must have received it. If the present Roman church did not receive it, that one now known as Protestant must have been the recipient; for, by joining hands with their predecessors, the chain will be formed, until it reaches to Christ himself, who is over all God and blessed forever.

It is very true, Rt. Rev. Sir, and we cheerfully acknowledge the fact, that our church was not called "Protestant" until after she *protested* against the idolatry, and superstition, and degrading tyranny of Rome, at the period of the blessed reformation; but it is equally true she must have existed antecedent to the protest or she could not have protested at all; and this proposition we prove with the precision of a mathe-

matical and logical demonstration. Now if the present Romish clergy, who derive their authority from the Pope, had no existence when Christ instituted his ministry, the commission could not have been given to them, and as the Turks or Pagans can lay no claim to it, the only ones left to receive it were the predecessors of the present Protestant clergy. And surely the Bishops that denounced the first Pope, in claiming the popedom or supremacy, were not Papists themselves, nor were those primitive churches who worshipped in their vernacular tongue, nor those clergymen who are known to have been married men and men of families. Not one of these could have been Papists; and every ecclesiastical scholar in the world knows that St. Patrick himself—the great Apostle of Ireland—was son of a deacon and grandson to a presbyter or priest! Evidently, therefore, neither this holy man nor his ancestors were Papists; and these were the predecessors of the clergy who so nobly protested at the period of the glorious Reformation.

You need not refer me, Rt. Rev. Sir, to the divisions that exist among Protestants, for Romanists, as you well know, are divided on *ten* points for our one, while on the great vitals of religion the whole Protestant world, who have any reasonable claim to the title, speak the same evangelical language; but your Church is hardly united on one solitary thing except the supremacy. On the infallibility you are divided, some maintaining, as the Jesuits do, that it resides in the Popes, others in the Council, and a third party in the Pope and Council united; one sect among you teaches Arminianism, another Calvinism; one advocates the Immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, others reject it; in fact your Church is hardly united in any one truth, or on any single