The Protestant

AND EVANGELICAL WITNESS.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—1 Thess., v. 21.

Vol. 2. Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Saturday, April 6, 1861. No. 40.

The Protestant,

AND EVANGELICAL WITNESS,

Is issued every Saturday from Haszard's Printing Office, South Side Queen Square,

BY

DAVID LAIRD, Editor and Proprietor.

TERMS:

Twelve Shillings if paid within the First quarter after being taken, or from the date of the last payment; Thirteen Shillings, if paid within the Second quarter; Fourteen Shillings, if paid within the Third quarter: after which, Fifteen Shillings will be charged.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. [To prevent disappointment, all advertisements should be sent to the Office before 3 o'clock on Friday.]

Assurance.

Mr Editor: A lady from England handed me the lines I have copied below. I do not know that they have ever been published in this country, nor do I know the author. If they come over your heart as they have done over mine, you will insert them in your paper with pleasure. The feelings they express when cherished in the heart, will be found the best antidote to one of the great evils of the present day. "Worldly Conformity," an evil which, having its rise in hearts not fully assured of acceptance in Christ, may be checked in some of its more offensive exhibitions by canon law, but will never be crushed out of the heart except by the joys resulting from the "Full Assurance of Faith,"—such faith as realizes Christ as a present Saviour from the dominion and power of sin, as well as from its future condemnation.

The 1st Epistle of John, v. 1—12.

Can it be right for me to go
On in this dark, uncertain way;
Say "I believe" and yet not know
Whether my sins are put away?

Not know my trespasses forgiven
Until I meet him in the air,
Not know that I shall get to Heaven
Until I wake and find me there.

Not know my state, 'till on my brow
Beams the celestial diadem:
Why surely all the world will know
That I'm a pardoned sinner then.

Must clouds and darkness veil my brow
Until I dwell with saints in light?
And must I walk in darkness now
Because I cannot walk by sight.

And shall I just begin to say
"Father, thine every word is true,"
And cast my doubts and fears away
When all the world will own it too?

Is this the way to trust the God
Who bids me love and trust Him now?
Is this the way to use the Word,
Given to guide me here below?

How can I forth to sinners go,
And tell of grace so rich and free,
If all the while I do not know
Whether that grace has smiled on me?

How can it be my joy to dwell
On the rich power of Jesu's blood
If all the while I cannot tell
That it has sealed my peace with God?

How can I be like Christ below;
How like my Lord in whiteness shine;
Unless with conscious joy I know
His Father and His God is mine?

O crush this cruel unbelief,
These needless, shameful doubts remove,
And suffer me no more to grieve
The God whom I do really love.

Father I would, and O how blest
Whilst thus I supplicate, to know
That One, of all Thy mind possessed,
Thy Spirit supplicateth too.

I would with humble gladness say
I rest on what my Lord hath done:
And ever more on earth display
The lovely image of Thy Son.

I would, whate'er the world might say,
Whate'er by flesh might be endured,
Be more and more each passing day
Made like unto my gracious Lord.

Sweet posture thus on earth to stay
And not be taken by surprise;
But catch the earliest dawn of day,
And see the "Morning Star arise!"

Southern Churchman.

Maynooth.

In reference to the late Protestant Conference in London, and the question of Maynooth, the *Record* says:—

"The only topic on which there appears to have been any difference of opinion related to the Maynooth question, or rather to the propriety of agitating the question in Parliament during the present session. The deputies from Ireland and Scotland, the Rev. Mr Potter and Mr Badenoch, were strongly in favor of prompt and uncompromising measures. Their views were strongly urged by General Alexander; but it was at last conceded that the practical difficulties in the way were apparently insuperable, seeing that the question had fallen into such disrepute in the House of Commons as to prevent any member from being willing to take it up at present. The fact that it was primarily an Irish question made it particularly desirable that it should be taken up by some Irish member, yet none seemed willing to do so. Scotland, too, seemed equally backward, as there was no Scotch member willing to represent the views of Mr Badenoch for instant action; and under such circumstances it was not wonderful that English members also hung back."

We are not disposed to undervalue the difficulties in the way of dealing with the Maynooth question at present, and especially the difficulty of getting a suitable man to take up the question in the House of Commons, but still we are not very sure about the logic of our respected contemporary. Because no Scotch member was willing to move in Parliament, he says, "It was not secondarily that English members also hung back." How does this follow? The question hitherto has been in the hands of an Englishman, and the Scotch members have always exhibited a large majority in favor of his motion. Had the matter been left to be settled by Scotch votes, Maynooth would have been abolished long ago. But is it fair or reasonable to say, that in a great moral question in which the three kingdoms are interested, England with her 500 members is not to be expected to act, unless Scotland with her 53 and Ireland with her 100 shall supply both votes and a leading advocate? The idea is preposterous, and especially as the question at the meeting really was only whether some decided Parliamentary action should not be *attempted* during the present session. To make it an excuse for not even attempting to overthrow Maynooth during the present session, that no Irishman or Scotchman has hitherto taken up a question which, till now, has been in the hands of Mr Spooner, is surely rather too much, and would, in truth, form a perpetual excuse. Moreover let it be remembered that the compromise scheme, which has really paralysed our united efforts and been the greatest source of mischief, was entirely of English origin.

Had a concentrated opposition to Maynooth been maintained, that institution would most likely have been overthrown long ago. It is well known that the Romanists had made up their minds to abandon the struggle, when the announcement of the compromise scheme divided the friends of Protestantism, and gave the Romanists fresh courage. We may rest assured, on the one hand, that little good will be done until this great citadel, this Sebastopol of the enemy is battered down. It is as clear, on the other, that so long as Great Britain continues feeding, clothing, and training 500 priests from year to year, to deluge our home field and the colonies, our warfare against Rome is mere bush fighting. Moreover, it is vain to wait for a "more convenient season." We are far from undervaluing the importance of wise and prudent arrangements, but in all moral warfare, especially against the gigantic centres of evil, the best time is ever the present. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." Delay is often as bad and as impolitic as desertion.

To prove, in the meantime, what mischief is being done by the want of energy, and by the respectable paternity of the compromise scheme, we might instance what has just taken place in Aberdeenshire. In consequence of some statements reported to have been made by one of the candidates there, the Scottish Reformation Society addressed the following appeal to the electors:—

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY OF ABERDEEN—THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

The Scottish Reformation Society, standing entirely aloof from mere political parties, but being established for the protection of Protestantism, beg respectfully, but earnestly, to warn the electors of the county of Aberdeen against a proposal which is reported to have been made by one of the candidates for the representation of that county in Parliament. Mr Leslie is alleged to have said at Elion, "If the Maynooth Grant had never been made, I should have dissented from one shilling being given; but having been given, I would not disturb it. But I would give my support to any scheme for capitalizing the grant, paying it off, and so getting rid of it."

The Scottish Reformation Society regard this as a very extreme view of what has always been justly regarded as a most dangerous proposal, inconsistent with Christian duty, and the clear and unerring dictates of divine truth.

They have no means of information in regard to the views of the other candidate, and they wish to take no part in any mere political agitation, but the electors of the county ought clearly to see that such a scheme is:

1st. As erroneous in principle as the continuance of the Maynooth Grant itself,—proceeding upon the very same ideas of false expediency of "doing evil that good may come."

2d. It is a shortsighted policy. Instead of putting an end to the Maynooth establishment, it would, by handing over to the Romanists from £600,000 to a million of money (being the capital of the annual grant of £30,000), be the means of perpetuating the institution for ever in a far more obnoxious form than the present.

3d. If the Maynooth question is to be settled by "capitalizing the grant," the Romanists will naturally insist that all their other large annual grants, at present given for schools and chaplaincies at home and in the Colonies, should in like manner be bought off. Even then there would be no security against perpetual new Popish demands, fresh concessions, and fresh compromises.

It is hoped, therefore, that no professing Protestant in the county of Aberdeen will give any support to such unsound and dangerous policy.

By Order of the Committee,

Office of the Scottish Reformation Society,
6, York Place, Edinburgh, 16th January, 1861.

This circular, we have reason to believe, was not without effect. Mr Leslie, in referring to it, however, at one of his meetings, made rather a querulous complaint, that he had not been first written to on the subject. The reason of this is obvious. The object of the society is to deal with *constituencies* and not with *candidates;* to indoctrinate the public mind in right principles, and thus, without meddling with party politics, to secure the ultimate result, and we cannot doubt that if a similar process of training were carried on over the three kingdoms, that result would not be long delayed. Aberdeenshire is for many reasons rather a hopeless field of operations, but the true rule is to work in season and out of season, and leave the result to God. We repeat again that so long as we refrain from assailing Maynooth, Rome will become more and more aggressive, and all our arguments against Romish chaplains in jails and workhouses, and in the army and navy, will have little weight. Rome is an admirable logician, and makes a dexterous use of all Protestant concessions and delays. It will be found vain to strain out comparative gnats if we are prepared practically to swallow the great camel of Maynooth. The Protestants of the three kingdoms should never cease to exclaim against such a pestilent institution, and to maintain that every form of Government support to Rome is alike sinful, impolitic, and subversive of the central principle of the British constitution.—*Bulwark.*

Important Decision of the British Court of Session.

The Scottish Court of Session has decided that the Presbytery of the Established Church has control over all the Public Schools within its bounds, and that the Schoolmasters must belong to the Established Church. The case arose in Elgin; the Burgh school of that town being supported by the Magistrates, and by fees from the pupils, it was thought that the parties supporting the school should have the superintendence of it. The magistrates disputed the right of the Presbytery to interfere.—The Presbytery summoned them before the Court of Session, and there it has been decided that all teachers of Public Schools (not, be it remembered, Parish Schools) are bound "to practice and confine themselves to the worship of the Established Church of Scotland, and to submit themselves to the Government and discipline thereof, and never, directly nor indirectly, to endeavor the prejudice or subversion of the same." The result of this judgment, were it to be followed up, would be, that every free churchman, or other dissenter, who is at present a teacher in the High School of Edinburgh, in the High School of Glasgow, in the Grammar School of Perth, or in any of the other burgh schools throughout Scotland, must immediately adhere to the Established Church, or resign his office.

Says the *Edinburgh Witness:*—

Thus the burgh schools, which have hitherto been regarded as free from sectarianism, are now made the mere appanage of the Established Church.—The judgment of the Court declares that the Presbytery are henceforth to have the control over them, and the masters are to submit themselves to the government and discipline of the Established Presbytery.

The law of the case is thus explained:—

In the year 1693, an act of Parliament was passed upon which the judgment of the Court is placed. It is declared to be "An act for settling the quiet and peace of the Church." It confirms the Confession of Faith, requires ministers to subscribe it, and to take the oath of allegiance; orders uniformity of worship to be observed; and concludes, after a number of other ordinances, with this clause:—"And it is hereby declared that all Schoolmasters and Teachers of Youth in Schools, are and shall be liable to the trial, judgment, and censure of the Presbyteries of the bounds, for their sufficiency, qualifications, and deportment in the said office.

It is upon this clause that the judgment of the First Division of the Court of Session is rested. The words employed are wide enough, certainly, to include burgh schools; but they are wide enough also to include private schools. The argument maintained to the Court was, that the statute, being so general in its language, required construction, and that it could only legitimately apply to the schools established by law—namely, the parish schools which were called into existence by act of Parliament in the year 1696. The Court, however, rejected this construction; but still they would not give the literal meaning to the words. They held "all schoolmasters" to mean "all public schoolmasters," but not all private schoolmasters. It is needless to follow the reasoning upon which this result was arrived at. It was necessary for the Court to come to this conclusion, in order not to make absolute nonsense of their judgment: and a private teacher who is a Dissenter has the consolation of knowing that he is at least saved from the necessity of proving his qualifications before an Established Presbytery, and from domiciliary visits by them.

We have said that this judgment in the Court of Session is the beginning of the agitation for a national system of education. When the First Division of the Court formerly held in the case of Mr M'Dowall that every Professor in a University was subject to the tests, the tests were abolished in the next session of Parliament *quoad* the Universities. Of course, it cannot be tolerated, that the teachers of our public burgh schools must be taken from a limited class in the community, any more than the professors in our universities; and this decision has just come in time, on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, so as to enable the Lord Advocate once more to introduce his bill for the purpose of putting public instruction in Scotland upon a thoroughly unsectarian basis.—*Ex. Witness.*

Sabbath Meditations.

NATHANAEL.

"Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.—John i. 47.

Nathanael, usually believed to be the son of Tolmai, that is to say, the same as Bartholomew, was a disciple of John the Baptist, and he had lately returned from the banks of the Jordan to his quiet home at Cana in Galilee.

"The calm retreat, the silent shade,
With prayer and praise agree;"

and just as the Bard of Olney had his arbour, so many of the old Hebrew rabbis had their shady trees, which served them for at once oratory and study. There, with mellifluous murmurs overhead, and with a soft air now and then stirring the sycamore leaves, they read and meditated and worshipped. And from the exclamation into which Jesus surprised this simple-hearted recluse, it seems natural to infer that he was occupied in some such way. Most likely he was musing on the tidings which he had just received from Philip, along with what he had lately heard at Bethabara about the approach of Messiah, and the nearness of Heaven's kingdom; when the salutation of the heart-searching stranger suddenly dropping into the full pitcher of his spirit, it overflowed in "Rabbi, Thou art the son of God! Thou art the King of Israel!"—the impromptu response to what instinctively felt was a Divine intuition, and a joyful conclusion to the faith and patience with which he had looked for the promised redemption.

"In whom is no guile." To be open with our neighbors; to be frank without offensiveness, and complaisant without flattery; to have such a fund of general good will, and such an absence of acrimony and envy and ill-nature, as to be perfectly sincere, whilst obliging and urbane, is a rare felicity; and still rarer, perhaps, in that meek ingenuousness which receives as they are given the kind words and acts of others, and in so doing does not err; for, by truth's transmuting magic, its own sincerity changes others into its likeness. "It would be a shame to tell a lie to Arnold, for he believes everybody," as the boys at Rigby used to say; till at last he could see in others' faces mirrored the manliness, the courage, the straightforwardness which were radiated from his own.

But is it not strange how apt we are to practice guile on God himself? For what else are complimentary thanksgivings, conventional prayers, unfelt confessions of sin?

In public worship we cannot help a certain generality. We must sing such stanzas, and we must offer up such supplications as may be reasonably expected to carry a large concurrence; but in secret devotion we should try to be more specific. We should seek to confess the very sins which beset ourselves, so as to obtain the blessedness of the man "whose transgression is forgiven, and in whose spirit there is no guile."

How would this do? The next time you kneel in your quiet chamber, remembering that it is the truth-loving and all-seeing Jehovah whom you are about to worship, suppose you were to say to yourself, "Whatsoever I now utter shall be genuine. Even if I should not be able to bring out a single syllable, I shall say nothing which I do not think; I shall ask for nothing which I do not really wish;" it might be long before you could begin, and after you did begin the entire utterance might be very brief; but we venture to say, it would be a profitable exercise and a prevailing prayer.

"Well, you try it, and are dreadfully dismayed. "At this rate I must give up praying altogether. The blessing which I know I most do covet is the one I durst not ask; for I find I do not earnestly desire it. The sin which I should most abhor is the very one to which I feel myself so wedded that it would be a mockery of God to ask deliverance from its power."

This is sad, but it is best to know the truth. This is the first result of your effort after guilelessness. It shows you that in the petition, "deliver us from evil," you have been either deceiving or deluded; for, if God had offered to deliver you from your besetting sin, your giant "evil," you would have been terribly alarmed. This is the first result, and it seems sufficiently frightful; but what are you to do? Will you skulk back again, and hide among the trees of the garden? Will you try to hide once more from God, and from yourself in a thicket of vague verbiage—in meaningless phrases and hollow generalities? Would it not be better to persist in the experiment, which must be an effort in the right direction, because an effort after reality? Would it not be better to confess this very iniquity, this past guilefulness by which you have tried to conceal from the great physician, and so to keep back from a cure the special plague of your own soul?

Nay, as you persist, you say it grows all abyss together. The tiny scrap of *terra firma* is gone; the few words which you could once utter honestly have vanished in general scepticism, in a weltering chaos of unbelief, and you doubt whether there be any Mediator, and whether prayer is of any use. This, again, is terrible; but whatsoever you do, do not cease to be truthful. Tell it all to God. All your doubt and difficulties—your misgivings, or reasons for disbelief—it may be long before you get rid of them, if you merely tell them to a minister, or other fellow-mortal. Tell them all to God. Tell them to the God of Truth, and tell them exactly as you feel them; and if you are guileless, we undertake that they will not long harass you; as He sends forth His light and truth, like the merest phantom they will flee away. Sincerity is strong. An elaborate devotional exercise may never get higher than the ceiling; but a cry—a cry from the very depths,—we know the ear which it never misses—the arm which it never fails to set in motion; and in the very midst of your anxious musings, *apropos* of your present doubt or perplexity. He who sees you under the fig-tree may have already come to your Cana, and as the solution of the long problem breaks in on your startled spirit, you too will find the Christ, and hail the Son of God your Saviour and your King.

Monachism in Italy.

The Italian Reformation has already begun. We cannot, indeed, claim that the work of proselytism has as yet made much progress among the people, but it is quite evident that the whole relations of Church and State in Italy have in the last two years undergone a great and most salutary modification. The more theologian may think this of little moment unless attended by a radical change of dogma, by the substitution of the Bible for the authority of an infallible Church, and of private judgment for tame and absolute submission. In a jewish legend, however, not admitted into our *Apocrypha*, a story is told of a Jew at the Court of Ptolemy Philopater, who, being told to put off a journey on account of some evil omen connected with the flight of a bird, shot it on the spot, with the remark, "How can that miserable bird predict my destiny when it could not foresee its own?" We can easily imagine that the days are not far distant when some such arguments will be applied to the Papacy,—when mankind, reading the long indictment preferred against the Pope and his Ministers by M. Laguerronniere, will begin to ask themselves—Can this Government, so full of ignorance, obstinacy, and stolid indifference, so utterly unable to understand its own position, to measure the forces arrayed against it with its own powers of resistance, the name of which has become synonymous with blundering, incapacity, and reckless perversity,—can this Government be, on the one side of the line which separates spiritual things from temporal, absolutely infallible, and on the other not only fallible, but the most signal failure on record? This will doubtless come in its own season; in the meanwhile we have to take note of a change not wrought by the opinion of the masses, not by the wisdom of the Government, but which, nevertheless, deserves the name not only of Reform, but of Reformation.

Perhaps the saddest legacy which the old Roman world has bequeathed to the Roman Catholic Church, and, through it, to modern society, is the institution of Monachism. It was not unnatural at a time when everything seemed hastening to complete destruction, when the end of the world was a matter of hourly expectation, that men should fly from the pollution and disorder of a society buried under its own ruins, and seek in the deserts of the Thebaid a solace for their despair in meditation and asceticism. Nor was it unnatural that, in the Middle Ages, men averse to care or to pleasure by temperament and conviction should form themselves into religious societies, and, shut out from an odious and repulsive world, seek peace and ease even at the expense of weariness and monotony. Nor is it surprising that in ages of blood and violence the Church should consider it her highest and most cherished privileges to be free from the jurisdiction of the secular Courts, and alone able to try the delinquencies of her members. Every petty baron had the right of being judge in his own cause, and why not the great spiritual corporation which set its foot on the necks of princes, and which in the crusade against the Albigenses solemnly awarded execution against a whole people! But it is most astonishing that in the days in which we live there should be found any country in Europe where laws are required to prevent the labour which should till the land from being wasted in the listless and often flagitious indolence of monasteries, and to place ecclesiastical persons accused of crime at the bar of the ordinary tribunals.

By a decree of the present active and intelligent Government of Naples the two Concordats wrung from the necessities of an unstable tyranny by the Court of Rome are solemnly annulled and declared void. All persons, of whatever creed, are declared equal before the law, and ecclesiastics have no longer any peculiar exemption. All monastic orders for either sex cease to be recognized by the Government. The same fate has fallen on benefices of all kinds without cure of souls, and on all chapters of collegiate churches. The property of these religious houses is taken into the hands of the Government, and is to be charged, first with popular education, next with the augmentation of the salaries of parish priests and with the relief of the most needy members of the clerical body. The fabrics are to be employed for school purposes, among which infant and evening schools are not forgotten. But large and sweeping as is the change, the interests of the present inmates of these houses have been cared for. Those who wish to continue a monastic life are to receive a pension, which is to be augmented by one-sixth if they reside out of the cloister. No more novices are to be admitted.

Thus at one blow has fallen a system the most pernicious to the interests of a civilized country that can possibly be imagined. It is a fearful thing to substract a large proportion of the population from the duties of civilized life, to cover their laziness and pauperism with the veil of an assumed sanctity, and suffer them to prey like locus on the very vitals of the land. No heavier scourge can be invented for a nation than the creation within her of another nation of men and women, vowed to celibacy, to idleness, and to uselessness, who inflict upon her a double injury, not only by what they consume without producing, but by gathering around them a crowd of beggars more lazy, more useless, and more hypocritical even than themselves. In the days in which we live, whatever be a man's religious feelings or aspirations, there is also work for him to do, and the demand for labour, physical and intellectual, still outstrips the supply. If asceticism and seclusion were legitimate inferences from the doctrines of Christianity, we might well tremble for the destinies of a faith which sets itself thus in opposition to the social tendencies and progressive instincts of mankind. If men are taught to regard the life of a monk or a nun as the highest of which human nature is capable, their own sense will reject the conclusion, and the result will be an indisposition to religion altogether. We regard the mendicant friars and inmates of religious houses in Italy as a standing mission against Christianity—a mission all the more perilous because, instead of openly attacking its doctrines, it seems to reduce them to an absurdity. We rejoice to see that the greater mildness of the times in which we live, and the greater respect now paid to the rights and feelings of individuals, have secured for the inmates of religious houses in Naples a very different treatment from that which was accorded to such persons in England three centuries ago. A cruel King and a greedy nobility could not afford to wait for their prey, and turned out helpless and homeless on the mercies of a world of which they had become ignorant the aged inmates of the nunnery and the monastery. History has little to tell of their sufferings; but they were not the less real nor the less deplorable. Nothing, as we understand them, can be fairer than the propositions of the Piedmontese Government with regard to those who have once taken upon themselves monastic vows. They cannot, for obvious reasons, be permitted to remain in their present residence; but others are provided for them, and a pension sufficient to meet the wants of the life to which they have devoted themselves. The Church of Rome ought to be infinitely indebted to the King of Naples for relieving her of one of her most grievous and crying scandals; and happy will be the day when the same measure can be applied to the swarm of ecclesiastical vermin—white, black, and gray, with all their trumpery—which infest the streets of Rome, and, indeed, of every town of the Papal States.

The first lesson which Southern Italy needs is to be set to work, and the best example she can receive is the emphatic discouragement of idleness, let it cloak itself under whatever pretext it will. We hope that our own Ecclesiastical Commission will carefully peruse and inwardly digest these Neapolitan decrees. They will observe, no doubt, with much surprise, that sums realized by the suppression of monasteries are appropriated to purposes very different from those which they have been in the habit of regarding as sound and canonical. We do not find that a single ducat is devoted to raising the salary of a Bishop, nor even of a Dean, nor that the construction of new palaces absorbs any part of the fund. These, which we all know too well to be the chief cares of our Ecclesiastical Commission, have been unaccountably neglected in Italy, and, instead of them, money is to be spent on improving the incomes and relieving the wants of the poorer clergy. What a pity that M. Cavour during his many visits to England did not place himself in communication with some of our Bishops, from whom perhaps he might have learnt the true principles of ecclesiastical appropriation, and thus spared us the pain of seeing the reputation of the first liberal Government in Italy tarished by practices which must of course be wrong, since they are in such marked and total contradiction to our own!—*London Times.*

The Reformed Religion no Novelty.

The Reformed Religion is no novelty; if it can be proved a day younger than Christ and his Apostles, away with it from the earth as a pernicious delusion. It was no invention of Luther and his fellow-laborers. The Roman Catholics indeed would taunt us with the recent origin of our faith, as though it had sprung up in the sixteenth century, whilst their own is hallowed by all the suffrages of antiquity. There was never a more insolent taunt, and never a more unwarranted boast. *Ours* is the old religion, *theirs* is the new. Ours is, at least, as old as the Bible; for it has not a single tenet which we do not prove from the Bible. But theirs must be younger than the Bible; for where in the Bible is the Bible said to be insufficient, and where is the Pope declared supreme and infallible, and where is sin divided into mortal and venial, and where are the clergy forbidden to marry, and where are images directed to be worshipped, and where is the Church entrusted with the granting indulgences? There is not a solitary article of Protestantism, in support of which we are not ready to appeal to the Canonical Scriptures, and the writings of the early fathers; there are a hundred of Popery, which Papists themselves are too wise to rest on such an appeal. They may ask us, where was your religion before Luther? and our reply is, in the word of the living God, in the creeds of Apostles and Apostolical men, and in the practice of those witnesses, who, in every age, refused to participate in the abominations of Rome. But we ask them, where was your religion before such or such an aspiring pontiff put forth such or such a doctrine or claim? We challenge the documents. We fix the doctrine of the Papal supremacy to the sixth century—let them prove it older if they can; of the seven sacraments to the twelfth century—let them prove it older if they can; of transubstantiation to the thirteenth century—let them prove it older if they can.

The Protestantism for which we contend as irreconcilable with Popery, is nothing else but the Protestantism of Christ and his apostles. And the Protestantism of Christ and his Apostles can have no peace with Popery. We would, if possible "live peaceably with all men," and, therefore, with the Roman Church. But it is not possible. We cannot surrender justification by faith. We cannot multiply mediators. We cannot bow down before images. We cannot believe