

[Continued from page 183]

him give my support. If, in a school, there should be only nine or ten Protestant children, among forty Catholics, the allowing of these nine or ten Protestants to read in the Bible, to the master, by themselves, could not be either unjust or injurious to the Catholics; but the prohibition of such reading by these Protestant children, if such reading were required by their parents or guardians, would be an act of great injustice to them, even although the Catholic children were four times more than they; and, were the case the reverse, with respect to the mixed composition of scholars in a school; that is, if there were in it four Protestants for every Catholic, the injustice to the former denomination of scholars and parents, would be still greater and more manifest; yet the principle of the prohibition would be the same in both cases. There should be no compulsion either in one way or the other; nothing arbitrary or aggressive on either side; and neither would there be, if both parties would make true religion the rule of their conduct with respect to the question. With the present Catholic Bishop, I have been acquainted thirty years; and I am fully persuaded that although he is, as it well becomes him to be, duly zealous for the preservation and promotion of the real interests of his Church, he is a man of a truly liberal and enlightened mind; in no way disposed to the practice of intolerance, and by no means desirous of infringing upon the religious privileges of the members of any other Christian Communion. He condemns all strife on account of a difference of opinions on questions of religion; and, one day, freely conversing with me, touching disputes or misunderstandings, falsely called religious, he very pointedly said, "Such disputes or quarrels are never caused by religion; on the contrary, they are occasioned by the want of it." The publication of His Lordship's letter, to which allusion has just been made, has, no doubt, been productive of much misunderstanding and consequent bad feeling throughout the country; but it ought to be remembered that the publication of that letter was not an act of the Bishop's. His attention had been drawn to what had been said, by Mr. Stark, at the inauguration of the Normal School, about the reading and the expounding of the Bible in that institution, which had awakened the conscientious scruples, and aroused the jealousy, of many of the Catholic Communion throughout the Island, who positively believed that the Protestants were going to thrust the Bible down their throats, as some of them phrased it. This being the case, the Bishop, simply with a view, I believe, to remove the cause of annoyance, so largely, he never needlessly, experienced amongst his flock, addressed that letter to the Board of Education, the publication of which has, unfortunately, occasioned so much undue excitement and clamour throughout the country. Now, however, when it has been so clearly shown that the object of the Protestant petitioners, as expressed in the Resolution of the hon. member for Princetown (Hon. T. H. Haviland,) is one which, even, if carried out to its fullest extent, can in no way interfere with the religious scruples of members of the Catholic Church, I cannot see how any individual of that Communion can reasonably object to it.

(To be continued.) R. B. IRVING, Reporter.

Correspondence.

ON THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

"If you seek to find a law for this, you will find no Scripture; but tradition is the authority which presents itself to you."

[TERTULLIAN CORON. MILIT.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir,—In your paper of the 29th of last March there appeared a communication signed "Common Sense," which contained the following significant statement: "The Protestant version does not contain the whole canon of Scripture, because it is defective of some of the books which the ancient councils of the Catholic Church have ever considered as divine." Objection has been taken against this statement by one signing himself "Student of Church History," who, in the columns of the *Protector* of the 14th and 21st of April, has attempted to display his erudition, but alas! like the mountain in labour, he has only brought forth a ridiculous mouse.

I feel pity for "Student;" his vanity has placed him in an awkward plight, out of which the accumulated weight of Protestantism will not extricate him. The public will judge whether the bold assertion made by him in the *Protector* of the 14th of last April, to wit: "The Apocrypha never was authoritatively brought into the sacred canon of Scripture, nor regarded as of divine authority, even by the Church of Rome, till the 4th session of the council of Trent in the year 1546," is deserving of faith, or rather of rejection and contempt as false and opposed to historical evidence, as the following will show.

Before, however, I enter on this matter, it will not, perhaps, be out of place to mention here what are the books he, with the generality of Protestant writers, call Apocrypha. The world knows that Protestantism is indebted to the Catholic Church for whatever vestige of Christianity it possesses—that it would have no Bible itself were it not for her—the *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church*, which it so wickedly maligns.

The books of the Old and New Testament, as in the Donay Bible, compose the canon of Scripture of the Catholic Church. Catholic divines designate a portion of these *Proto canonical*, the others *Deutero-canonical* Scripture. The former are so called because they were inserted first into the canon, the latter from their being put into it at a later period, and are considered of equal authority with the first in the church. But Protestants reject as apocrypha or uncanonical some of the *Deutero-canonical* books, namely, the books of Baruch, Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the first and second of the Maccabees, with fragments of the books of Daniel and Esther. The fragments of Daniel are, the prayer of Azarias, the canticle of the three children in the fiery furnace, the histories of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon. In the book of Esther, the seven last chapters, from the fourth verse of the tenth chapter to the twenty-fourth verse of the sixteenth chapter. In fact, they do not agree among themselves even about all the books of the New Testament. Those books of the New Testament which are ranked among the *Proto-canonical* ones they receive; but the Lutherans rejected, at one time, all the *Deutero-canonical* ones of both the Old and New Testament; at another time, they admitted, with the Calvinists, those of the New, and rejected with those of the Old, as stated. But I believe there is no dispute to-day among them with regard to the New, which they all receive as canonical Scripture.

The controversy then between them and Catholics regards the books and fragments, already mentioned, of the Old Testament. These are rejected as apocrypha by the generality of Protestant writers, because they were not contained in the canon of Esdras, who, as all agree, drew up the Jewish code of Scripture, though at what precise period it is not ascertained. As I will have to return to this again, I will leave it for the present, and betake myself to the point at issue.

During the first ages of the church, tradition, in an unbroken chain, proves the divine authority of the books termed Apocrypha, even should any portion of the New Testament be included by them under this title. The ecclesiastical writers of that period rank them in the canon of Scripture, and everywhere quote them as such. St. Clement, (A.D. 100) the fourth Pope from St. Peter, who filed the See of Rome, cites, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, the books of Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees, (see 1st. 1. cor. cap. 4, cap. 55, also epist. 2. de virginitate, cap. 13, apud Coteler. tom. 1. apud Galland. Biblioth. P. P. c. 1, sect. 2.) In the epistle attributed to St. Barnabas (A.D. 100), we find texts quoted from the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, (see Galland. tom. 1. Proleg. cap. 1, sect. 2.) The author, moreover, of the *Apostolical Constitutions* relates the history of Susanna, as told by Daniel, calls the book of Tobias the *law of God, lex Dei*, and brings forward texts from Judith and Ecclesiasticus, (lib. 2. c. 58 et 59, lib. 1. c. 7, lib. 7. c. 11, lib. 8. c. 15, lib. 9. c. 7, lib. 2. cap. 21.) Besides, Saint Ireneus (second century), in his fourth book "Contra Hæreses," the 38th chapter, takes texts from the sixth chapter, verses 19 and 20 of the book of Wisdom,—

recounts what we read in Baruch, 4, 36, under the name of Jeremiah, in book 5, c. 35; and the whole of the fifth book of Baruch we find in book 4, c. 26, n. 3; and the fragments of Daniel he ascribes to the same Prophet (lib. 3, c. 5, n. 2.) St. Clement of Alexandria quotes thrice the book of Tobias—twice the book of Judith—twenty-one times the book of Wisdom—more than fifty-times the book of Ecclesiasticus—four times the book of Baruch—here and there, in his "Elogues," the hymn of the three Hebrew children, also the book of the Maccabees. (See Scriptural index at the end of this Father's work, Io. Potteri Oxon. Venet. 1754.) Tertullian, liber de Monog. c. 17, quotes the book of Judith, and nine times the book of Wisdom as Solomon's—five times the book of Ecclesiasticus, which he terms *Scripture*—as often the book of Baruch, under the name of Jeremiah—recounts the history of Susanna, of Bel and the Dragon, and attributes it to Daniel—finally the two books, first and second, of the Maccabees. (See Script. ind. end. Camelliet Rigalt.)

St. Hippolytus, (tom. 2. p. 442, seqq. in Susanna, apud Galland,) in his "Fragment" (9) on the canticle of canticles, praises the book of Wisdom, and ascribes it to Solomon. In his "Demonstrat. advers. Judæos," S. S. 9. 10, he cites the same book thrice, and calls its author a Prophet (ibid. p. 450.) In his work "De Charism. Tradit. Apostol." S. 2, he ranks among the Prophetesses Judith, from the 8th chapter of her book, (ibid. p. 503); in his comments on Susanna, recounts what we read in the book of Tobias, (3, 24, ibid. p. 446.)

St. Cyprian cites the same books which Tertullian calls *Scripture*; besides, the book of Tobias, (see Script. ind. at end, Maur. ed.) St. Dionysius Alexandrinus quotes Tobias, Wisdom, Baruch and Ecclesiasticus as divine Scripture, (see Script. ind. end of his works De Magistris Romæ.)

Origen, in his celebrated epistle to Africanus, not only vindicates the history of Susanna as sacred, but also the fragments and other books not contained in the Jewish canon, (see tom. 1. n. 4, ed. Maur. opp.) ibid. n. 13 testifies that Tobias is read in the churches. Finally quotes (Exhortat. ad Martyr. n. 22, seqq.) the authority of the Maccabees, (in lib. 3. contr. Celsum, n. 60, and here and there) the book of Wisdom, (lib. 4, 28—see Script. ind. at end, &c.) the book of Ecclesiasticus, to establish dogmas of faith. All these Fathers, then, and a host of others whom it is needless to refer your readers to, call these books *divine Scripture*. The express tradition, therefore, of the three first centuries of the church bears witness against the statement of "Student of Church History."

But let us proceed. In the 27th canon of the council of Hyppo, they are reckoned among the number of sacred books; and four years later, 397, this canon of the council of Hyppo was adopted by the Fathers of the third council of Carthage. These venerable witnesses of *Apostolical Traditions* and Catholic truth, having enumerated the books which compose the canon of Scripture (the so-called Apocrypha among them), say: "It has pleased us also to decree that nothing be read in the church, under the name of divine Scripture, but the canonical Scriptures, because," they add, "we have received them from the Fathers to be read in the church." This canon was afterwards approved of, in the name of the whole Western Church, by Pope Innocent the First, in his epistle to Exuperius, bishop of Tolosa, bearing the date 405; in it the holy Pontiff says that he has drawn in this doctrine from tradition.

St. Augustine, who was one of the forty-four bishops who assisted at the third council of Carthage, first beautifully lays down Rules to Discern Sacred Scripture, and then subscribes the canon, which is in all the same as the one of the council, (lib. 2. De Doctrina Christiana, cap. 8, n. 13.) I would recommend this work of the great Father to the attentive perusal of "Student;" he will gather from its pages sound and venerable doctrines, which as yet he sadly lacks or impudently rejects.

Over and above all these solid testimonies, there is still another which places the canonicity of the books referred to beyond all dispute. I mean the authority of the *Vetus Itala*, or *Ancient Italic* version, which was used in the Latin churches from Apostolic days down to the times of St. Jerome, A. D. 392. In this version they are ranked among *divine Scripture*. In the year 494 Pope Gelasius held a council at Rome, in which they are also declared canonical, and of divine authority, (tom. 4. Anastasii Biblioth. cariæ de vitis Rom. Pontificum.)

To all these proofs, let us add the unanimous consent of all the Eastern Churches; and though some of them separated from the See of Rome as early as the fifth century, yet all held, in common with it, the same canon of Scripture. In the decree of Pope Eugenius the Fourth, in the year 1439, to the Armenians, they are numbered as canonical Scripture, (Harduin. Act. Concil. tom. col. 1023.)

The Fathers of the Council of Trent, therefore, when they, in 1546, issued their decree containing them in the canon of sacred books, did nothing more than declare what had been the constant belief of Christian antiquity, from Apostolic times down to their own days, with respect to them, to wit: that they were canonical Scripture, and as such must be received by all, otherwise the gainsayers would draw down upon their own heads the anger of Him who said, "If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican," (Math. ch. 18, v. 17.) Again, "Who hears you, hears me; and who despises you, despises me; but he who despises me, despises him who sent me," (Luke ch. 10, v. 16.) They followed the rule laid down by St. Augustine, (de Baptism. contr. Donatist. lib. 4, c. 24), "That which the church observes, and what is not decreed by councils, but always retained, is of Apostolic origin." Therefore, the statement of "Student" is false; therefore, too, the one of "Common Sense" stands good, and is based upon the irrefragable testimonies of 1500 years.

I must not omit here to mention another important historical fact referring to this matter, to wit: the reply of the Greek Schismatic Council, held at Jerusalem in the year 1672, under the Patriarch Dositheus, to the Reformers of Germany and France, who solicited them to a union to make common cause against the Church of Rome. "We regard," they replied, "these books—the so-called Apocrypha—as canonical; we acknowledge them to be holy Scripture, because they have been handed down by an ancient usage, or rather by the Catholic Church." (Perpetuite de la foi, tom. 5, ch. 7.) Because the reformers mangled the canon of Scripture to suit their own unholy ends, this made the Greeks spurn all idea of a union with such sacrilegious murderers; and hence the above significant reply, which closed further correspondence on the subject of a union, at least on the side of the Greeks. This fact alone speaks volumes.

To return now, as I promised, to the grounds on which they are rejected as apocrypha, it will suffice to state that Esdras could not enumerate them in his canon, since it is certain that some, if not all of them, were not penned till after the death of that zealous Israelite. Yet, though they were not in the Jewish canon, they were held in high esteem by the Jews, as Josephus (liber 1, contr. Apion.) testifies. Their canon was already drawn up; they dared not increase or diminish it, because the chain of Prophets was broken; but a Prophet was expected by them to arise, who would decide on the divinity of these books, and insert them in the canon. No Prophet, however, arose till he, who was foretold by the Prophets, came into the world. From his divine lips then—from the lips of the Apostles delegated by him to teach all nations, all truths—the church received those books as divine. And does "Student" presume to maintain that Esdras and the Synagogue were invested with greater authority than the Apostles? Does he presume to maintain that the Church of Moses and the Jewish Councils have more claim on our confidence and obedience than the Church founded on the Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief

corner-stone? On what authority does he receive the twenty-two books of the canon of Esdras? Is it not on the authority of the church? Why not receive the so-called apocrypha on the same authority also? Why receive the former from her and reject the latter, which, with the same breath, she declares to be equally divine Scripture? Is "Student" consistent in this line of conduct?

Leaving him to get out of this difficulty, if he can, I will betake myself to notice some of the authorities he has produced in support of his statement. Among them is Bi-hop Burnet, from whom "Student" quotes as follows: "The Christian Church was for some ages an utter stranger to these books;" and yet St. Clement, in the very first age of the church, quotes some of them in his epistles to the Corinthians, as already noticed. St. Barnabas takes a text from the eleventh chapter of Wisdom, verse the twelfth, and places it alongside with one from Isaias, (epist. cap. 6, apud Galland.) The truth-speaking bishop then relates the journey of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, to the East, to gather a perfect catalogue of the books of the Old Testament from Onesimus, but conceals Melito's omission of the book of Esther, a portion of which was contained in the canon of Esdras. This catalogue of the Bishop of Sardis raised the first controversy in the East respecting the books not included in it; and advantage was taken of it by some to doubt of their canonicity. It did not, however, prevent them from being read in the Eastern Churches as before. I may as well observe here as elsewhere, that the Greek and Latin Fathers, who have recounted only the books contained in the Jewish canon, related and wished only to relate a fact, from which it cannot be legitimately concluded that (admitting few among them wavered for a time about the canonicity of the books not contained in it) they considered them deserving of exclusion; for they quote them everywhere as authoritative Scripture. When Rufinus charged St. Jerome with seeming to reject the *Deutero-canonical* fragments of Daniel, the holy Doctor defended himself in these weighty words: "What I relate against the history of Susanna, the canticle of the three children, Bel and the Dragon, which are not in the Hebrew canon, is what the Jews are wont to say. He who accuses me, proves himself a trepanner; for I have not expressed my own sentiments, but what they are wont to say against us," (lib. 2, n. 33, contr. Rufin.) Are not these words of the great St. Jerome sufficiently expressive of what I stated above? Do they not also indicate clearly what both he and Rufinus thought in this matter? But the enemies of the Catholic Church, who seem to have barred every avenue to conviction lest wisdom should enter into their souls, are not satisfied with it. Hence they stop at nothing to make their views appear right in the public estimation. Even Bi-hop Burnet is not ashamed to walk in this dishonourable path. Even he would fain make the public believe that Origen and Athanasius favour his opinion. We have already referred to the works of the former, who, it is true, mentions the Jewish canon as containing only twenty-two books, yet thus writes of the so-called apocrypha: "Though the Church of the Jews place them among the apocrypha, yet the Church of Christ teaches them and honours them as divine," (lib. 2, contr. Oels.) As for St. Athanasius, he not only quotes them to prove what things are of faith, but uses besides the formula, common to ancient writers, to wit: "as it is written," to denote divine Scripture, (see epist. 3. ad Serapion. n. 4, also Apolog. ad imp. Constant. n. 17, tom. 2, opp. S. Athanasii, p. 126, seqq. Maur. ed.) The work entitled "Synopsis Athanasii," critics agree, is not the work of the Saint, who was one of the great lights of the fourth century, but of some obscure writer, who assumed the name of the Saint to get readers, (see Cf. Maurin. ed. tom. 2, p. 124 seq.) Thus it is that great men are slandered by hungry scribblers. But the unscrupulous Scotch bishop goes on to cite, in the same way, St. Cyril of Jerusalem (348), and St. Gregory Nazianzen (370), to support his bad cause, but in vain; for St. Cyril (catech. 9, n. 2, edit. Tontei et alibi) adduces texts from Wisdom which he calls the work of Solomon; from Ecclesiasticus, (catech. 6, n. 4, also catech. 11, n. 19, &c.); from Baruch, whom he styles a Prophet, (c. 11, n. 15); and from the last chapters of Daniel as from divine Scripture, (catech. 16, n. 31.) St. Gregory quotes them everywhere as Scripture, and explains the passages taken from them by the heretics of his day, without ever calling their authority in doubt. (Orat. 34, n. 13, Orat. 59, p. 730, tom. 1, Orat. 35, p. 585.)

"The Council of Laodicea," continues Burnet, "should determine the whole matter, as it, by an express canon, delivers the catalogue of the canonical books as we do, decreeing that these only should be read in the Churches. Now the canons of this Council were afterwards received into the code of the canons of the Universal Church; so that we have the concurring sense of the whole Church of God in the matter. Here we have four centuries clear for our canon, in exclusion to all additions." Good Bishop Burnet tells a god story! Now, *audi alteram partem*. The Council of Laodicea, held about the years 361 or 372, was only a particular Council; and though it published admirable canons concerning discipline, yet it is not of such authority as to stand in the way of the tradition of the Universal Church. Why it omitted the so-called apocrypha is not known. But it nowhere rejected them; and *onus* of proving that it has impugned their divine authority still rests on good Bishop Burnet, and on his Lordship's admirer, "Student;" for they maintain the negative—Catholic divines the positive side of the question. The omission, however, need not cause surprise, when we remember that the bloody persecutions inflicted on the Church, during the first centuries, prevented the free communication of her numerous and widely-separated members. This hindrance caused the apostolical traditions relating to these books from being clearly authentic in some particular Church or Churches; but, on peace being restored, as these traditions in their favor became more minutely ascertained, they were, without hesitation, considered as the genuine and divinely-inspired Word of God. Hence the Fathers of the Council of Laodicea, or their successors, did not raise their voice against those of the Council of Carthage, who, about thirty years later, pronounced them divine Scripture. On our side, therefore, and not on Bishop Burnet's, is the "concurring sense of the whole Church of God in the matter." We have the four first centuries proclaiming them to be the divinely-inspired Word of God.

The Bishop concludes with charging the Council of Trent with the monstrosity of first inserting them in the canon; but I have shown this canon of the Fathers of Trent to be the same with the canons of the Councils of Florence, under Pope Eugenius the Fourth, in 1439; of Rome, under Gelasius, in 494; and of Carthage, St. Siricius filling the chair of Peter, in 397. It is not a new canon, then; nor was it issued to reconcile differences between Catholics in the matter; for one and invariable was the sense of the Catholic Churches on it; but it was published only to establish, against the Reformers, the ancient and general doctrine of the whole Church relative to the canon of Scripture.

Another authority brought forward by "Student" is Dr. Angus, who, in his "Bible Hand-book," as "Student" quotes him says: "The New Testament, which is really authoritative, refers to all Scripture under the threefold division of *Law, Prophets and Writings*." We do not dispute this with Dr. Angus or "Student," but we call upon them to show us where in the New Testament the so-called Apocrypha are rejected. On the contrary, frequent allusions are made to these books by the writers of the New—e. g. Luke 12, 19; Ecce est, 11, 19; Rom. 1, 20; Wisd. 13, 1; Hebr. 11, 34; 1st Maccab. 2, 39; Hebr. 2, 1; Eccles. 42, &c.—which manifestly proves what these holy writers thought of them. But let us hear F. Molinæ, a Protestant, speak on this matter. "But whatever be the accidental causes that prevented the

adding of new books to the canon drawn up in the time of Esdras, * * * it appears to us that the Synagogue of Judea, such as it had become, was not more alone competent in this subject, and that the Christian Church, which succeeded it, had also this competency, as the Synagogue in the time of Esdras had, when it judged of the writings, very many ages, anterior to it. Now we have seen what importance the Doctors of the primitive Church have attached to these books, which we now regard as Apocrypha. * * * and we have seen also, that the Apostles, in their writings, make frequent allusions to them, even when they do not name them, as they do not name all the books of the Old Testament when they cite them." (Notice sur les livres apocryphes de l'ancien Testament, Geneve, 1828.) Moreover, Dr. Angus appeals to the Fathers, who, as I have already stated when referring to their works, are altogether opposed to him. I may here remark both of Dr. Angus and of Bishop Burnet, that they huddle together authorities from whom they neither quote nor give reference to—a mode of proceeding, to say the least of it, highly discreditable. On this I meet with a flat denial all Dr. Angus asserts against their external and internal evidence. We have already seen that they possess the external evidence of the four first centuries. Let him not, therefore, tell us that our Lord or his Apostles never mentioned them; he ought rather show us where they have rejected them; which is more than he or "Student" can do. Consequently of their internal evidence there can be no doubt. The Church of the first ages, by numbering them among her canon, has put it beyond dispute. It is silly, therefore, to say that they nowhere claim to themselves divine authority; for what portion of Scripture does? It is easy to enquire—to allege imaginary contradictions, and load with absurdities other portions of the sacred books, as well as the so-called Apocrypha. The Manicheans ridiculed as gross the Jewish ceremonial prescribed in the Old Testament. They severely censured the conduct and example of some of the Patriarchs; and objected to many portions of the Bible, on the plea that they furnished unbecoming notions of the Deity, who was there represented as a corporeal being, subject to the emotions of anger, jealousy and revenge. Thus it is easy to raise objections against portions of the Bible, when guided only by the ever-changing sands of human opinions. I cannot, however, let this matter drop without drawing attention to the following remarkable sentences. Here they are: "These books contain statements at variance with history, self-contradictory, and opposed to the doctrines and precepts of Scripture." Immediately afterwards comes: "For historical purposes, and for instruction of manners, so far as they exemplify the spirit and precepts of the Gospel, the books are of value." Such a contradiction cannot but disgrace Dr. Angus's "Bible Hand-book," and bring besides discredit on him who quotes him as an authority to support him.

I pass over other authorities cited by "Student," because noticing them I would only go over the ground already travelled by me. This would neither be agreeable to myself, nor to your readers, on whose patience I have already, at a greater length than I wished, trespassed. Still they will excuse me thus far. Had "Student" not presumed to present the public with the indecorous outpourings of the spirit of the religious fanaticism and Bible-mania of these days, I would not have intruded myself on their notice. As I have come before them, I hope there is no harm done; at least I intend none.

From all that has been said, then, it is clear that "Student," rejecting the authority of the Catholic Church, cannot establish the divinity of any book of Scripture received by him as such; because Scripture cannot bear testimony to itself. He may say the Old Testament was written by Moses and the Prophets—the New by the Apostles of Jesus Christ; but does this prove that they were written under the influence of divine inspiration? These writers were by nature fallible, and from what source can he draw that they became infallible? Let him listen to what the arch-Reformer, Luther himself, says on the point: "We are," says he, "obliged to yield many things to the Papists—that with them is the Word of God, which we received from them; otherwise we should know nothing at all about it." (Comment. on John, c. 16.) St. Augustine, in still stronger language, declares the same thing: "I would not believe," says the great Doctor, "the Gospel itself, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not oblige me to do so." (Contr. Ep. Fund.)

What can "Student" say to this? Let him first prove to the world the fallibility of the authority of the Church before he writes against her canon of Scripture; when he does prove it, he may then ridicule her doctrine of Tradition and Purgatory, which, it appears, has disordered stomach at present loathes; but which, if he continues to study history, he will be forced to acknowledge, have at least historical evidence, or else the testimony of history must be rejected altogether as not to be relied upon, and, with it, the divinity of the Scriptures.

I would suppose "Student's" knowledge of history rather meagre yet, and, therefore, would recommend him to read the following works:—Spineto's Lectures on the Elements of Hieroglyphics and Egyptian Antiquities, page 142, &c.; Stromata or the Miscellany, by St. Clement of Alexandria, fifth book; Strabo, lib. 4; Mela, lib. 3, c. 2; and Virgil, lib. 6, 325, Æneid. If he will not find himself, whilst perusing these works, in the Purgatory or middle state of the Catholic Church, he will at least be among the "Amenti" of Egyptian Mythology, the "Hades" of the Greeks, and the "Tartarus" of the Latins.

I have done now with "Student," and hope he will for the future remain silent on matters he knows nothing of; nor suffer himself to be led any more by vanity, to appear before the public as the doughty opponent of Popery, particularly when supported only by trash taken from the "maggots of corrupted texts," and defective Scripture; since they cannot afford him help to prop up his tottering edifice, but rather expose more and more its sad state of decay, as beyond support, divine or human.

This communication might have appeared sooner, but I waited to let "Student" say all he had to say on the subject, which, as the public now sees, is valueless, and tending only to make still more valuable what he has been laboring to undervalue. I am, Mr. Editor, your obdt. servt.,

COMMON SENSE

Queen's County, Viewfield, May 19, 1858.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir,—What a very satisfactory reason the Rev. Andrew Lochhead, of Georgetown, has given for his soiling his cloth by dabbling in politics? He "wished, as an admirer of Mr. Haviland, to bear public testimony to his noble and bold defence of the Bible and its cause in the House of Assembly;" yet, full of this Biblical admiration, he proposed Mr. A. McDonald "as a proper person to represent Georgetown in the next Assembly;" and this same Mr. McDonald a Roman Catholic, and one of those who opposed the introduction of the Bible into the Academy and Normal School! Very consistent indeed, Mr. Lochhead, very. But the reverend gentleman's admiration of Mr. Haviland does not terminate here. He referred to "the nice way he (the Col. Sec'y) continues to keep things going for his family interest and personal ends," just in admiration of Mr. Haviland; and said something about "smuggling," also in admiration of Mr. Haviland. But not to Mr. Lochhead's letter did I intend to refer. In the same issue of the *Protector* is a letter signed "M. C. D.," evidently a new contributor to the Sanctified Press. M. C. D.'s letter is characterised by more energy than usually pervades the superior articles of that journal, besides being something smarter and worse natured. M. C. D. is no doubt a man