

authors seem to teach the reader the avoidance of one error; they lead him imperceptibly into the other.

*"Incidit in Scyllam, cupiens vitare Charybdim."*

An *a posteriori* view, when rightly used, is good in argument; thus, *a priori*, we assume that God necessarily exists as a first cause, and author of everything, but, *a posteriori*, we prove His existence by His works—

*"Agnosceamus Deum ex operibus ejus."*

The Provost very properly combines cause and effect in the same category, but he does not begin *a priori* with the first principle, and say, when I necessarily treat of the intercession of saints in our behalf, so long must I refer to our invoking the prayers of the saints on our behalf; that would be bringing cause and effect into too consecutive a proximity to suit his doctrine, and therefore he removes the cause to the background in his sentence and brings the effect to the front, and by giving to the one the character of error, and the other the character of truth—(there being no necessary connection between error and truth)—we do not at first sight perceive the fallacy; but when he reasons *a posteriori* he radiates the effect, and therefore his proposition is a nullity, the only conclusion which it produces being, that, to think differently would be "against his conscience, and setting at nought the authorities of his great divines."

In the following pages I have endeavoured to give the reader a brief sketch of the origin of the dogmas of intercession and invocation of saints, and in so doing to demonstrate that these doctrines, as now entertained in the Romish church, still retain their former pagan characteristics; and also to demonstrate that the doctrine of intercession of saints, as taught by Provost Whitaker, and affirmed in the pamphlet, is in principle repugnant to the Word of God.

There are three points of doctrine in the seventh article of the creed of Pope Pius IV., only two of which I shall make the subject of argument.