

ANSWER TO ERRORS, &c.

SEVERAL portions of the lectures on religious doctrines, recently delivered in a church in this city, by Archbishop Connolly as reported in the *Express*, newspaper, are of such an important character, and so contrary to Scripture, and primitive Christianity, as to require a public refutation. True Christians are required, and feel it their grateful duty to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the Saints." An inspired Apostle has said, "it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing." Most especially does this apply where the interests of Divine truth are concerned. On the right understanding and belief of that truth, depends in a great degree all individual and social duty and happiness. I therefore neither make, or claim, any apology for the free remarks I shall here offer regarding the most material and erroneous parts of these lectures.

To take the errors in the order in which they appear in the journal, the first passages for remark are in the following words: "The necessity of a revelation and of a sure rule of faith, which he contended the Bible was not, and went on to elaborate this last. He said that the Bible could not be the rule of faith, because the best part of the New Testament was not written, till the Christian religion had become spread over the earth."

It must be concluded that by the word Bible, the Lecturer meant the inspired Scriptures contained in the book we call the Bible. Now here it may first be asked, is it either pious or reasonable to suppose, that an infinitely wise and gracious being, who has given us a revelation to be an *enlightener* and a *guide*, would leave it so imperfect as to require to be supplemented and perfected by fallible human beings, by nature mentally and morally ignorant as to spiritual and eternal truths? Every truly enlightened and unprejudiced person will at once reject such a profane