

ts, as so many argu-
grounded on Oates's
in particular, I pro-
ore no barrier to the
oner passed than the
ional conformity; and
corporations, and the
indiscriminately filled
practical dispensation
a purpose, is found to
bers of the established
nd of whom ever take
army and navy. I
qualifying law on ac-
count of persecution. The
from him against both
ore I say, it is not my
ake Protestant writers
now, for example, how
es between the esta-
his account of the two
her about the practice
or the *little end*: yet
a *big-endians* and the
violent a *big-endian* as

ose disgraceful monu-
s barriers of the esta-
vise some means, if he
believe and support the
y the fundamental arti-
cinity and the *incarna-*
in stopping the course
ly and rapidly sapping
dreads the influence of
e is of the victorious
patrons (instead of en-
work, as they did the
else *The End of Con-*
allel letters with it: for

having asked his minister,
ified himself for office, as a
ered, that he was a deacon
main so.

what chance has ignorance in a combat with truth; bigotry
with reasoning; idolatry and blasphemy with pure Chris-
ianity! I am, &c. JOHN MILNER.

CLERICAL CONTINENCY.

LETTER LXVIII.—To JAMES BROWN, Jun. Esq.

DEAR SIR,—BEFORE the closing of what the vicar calls a
reply, he is pleased to start a fresh subject of debate, which
is not treated of in my letters. True it is, that their author, in
speaking of the still remaining errors in the common bible,
mentions the words of our Saviour in commendation of con-
tinence: Οὐ παντες χωροῦσι λεγον τούτοις: *all men DO NOT*
receive this saying, Matt. xix. 11, which he maintained were
erroneously translated, *All men CANNOT receive this say-*
ing, by Luther, Tyndal, Coverdale, and Cranmer, in excuse
for their common violation of the law of continence, by which
they were bound. (1) It is also true that the author, in men-
tioning this error, has stated that "the Rev. Mr. Grier and
Dr. Ryan have the confidence to deny this and another
glaring error, where AND is placed for OR; 1 Cor. xi. 27,
because they pretend to prove that the *cup is necessary*, and
that *continence is not necessary*." The vicar's pretence that
DO NOT and CANNOT mean the same thing is a perversi-
on of language and common sense, which is only heigh-
tened by his attempt to excuse it where he denies that "con-
tinence proceeds from man's free will," because, says he, "it
were superfluous for the best men to ask it as a divine
favour, if they could impart it to themselves." I do not stop
to draw the conclusions which follow from these alarming
principles of the vicar. Let it suffice to say, that they are the
same with, or nearly allied to, those of his parent reformer
quoted above.

(1) The first-mentioned reformer, and the father of the rest, Luther,
was not ashamed to preach as follows: "As it is not in my power to cease
to be a man, so it is not in my power to be without a woman; it is as ne-
cessary as to eat, drink, blow the nose, &c. Serm. de Matrim. tom. v.
Wittenb. "He that resolves to be without a woman, let him lay aside
the nature of a man and make himself an angel or spirit." Epist. ad
Wolfgang. And yet he elsewhere acknowledges that when he was a Ca-
tholic and lived in his monastery, he observed chastity, punishing his body
with watching, fasting, and prayer. Luth. in Ep. Ad. Galat.