

of them will assert its truthfulness. The Mohammedans do it, and so do the Mormonites, and they insist on their Bible being a *genuine* book. The Hindoos and the disciples of Confucius do the same, and their systems are of much more ancient origin than that of the Papacy. In reality, this claim of infallibility has no better support than those false systems. The Romanists merely *assert*, but do not and cannot prove this Papal infallibility. All Protestants deny it, and there have always been those in the Christian Church who denied it, and contended against it, even unto the *rack* and the *death*. And, therefore, the assertion that Mr. Maturin has repeatedly made in depreciation and contempt of the Protestant faith, that it is "a new system of religion," and "introduced only about 300 years ago," is, to use the least discourteous expression, not founded in fact. From the very commencement of the Papacy, or rather the apostasy of the Roman Church from the *true* Christian faith, there were numbers of faithful persons, and in various countries, who, by their conduct, if not in words, protested and contended against her various corruptions, and especially the doctrine of "infallibility." Some evangelical dissenting bodies in early ages did it, so did the early British Churches, and the Lollards, the Albigenes, and Waldenses, the Wickliffites, and others; and in all ages, indeed, down to the time of the great and general Reformation, which began with Luther. As far as assertions go, Romanists declare that theirs alone is the true Church, but all Protestants deny it. The Papal Church asserts her infallibility, and her right to absolute rule; all Protestants deny both, and that either of those powers belong to any visible Church upon earth. There is this extreme difference, however, between these opposite assertions, that the Papal claim has not a shadow of *Scriptural* proof to support it, but Protestants can point to those marks belonging to the Papal system, and which its advocates even boldly avow as denoting its purity and perfection, but which, in reality, are the *Scriptural brand-marks* of a profane