

REMARKS

170X

A PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

“AN INQUIRY INTO THE VALIDITY

OF

METHODIST EPISCOPACY.”

DEDICATED TO THE “RIGHT REVEREND FATHERS IN GOD,”

TO MR. KEIFLEY, &c.

BY ARMAGEDDON.

Second Edition.

BALTIMORE:

PRINTED BY GEO. DOBBIN AND MURPHY,

FOR JOHN HAGERTY.

1857.

8231
B77

COPY-RIGHT SECURED.

P R E F A C E.

THE author of an "Inquiry into the validity of Methodist Episcopacy," having strenuously asserted the divine authority of the Episcopal church formerly obedient to the church of England, whilst the civil authority of the British was extended throughout these states—I am induced to offer a few remarks upon that interesting subject, and shall intersperse such observations concerning American Methodism, as will I hope convince those who are not so bigotted as he appears to be, that "divine right," "uninterrupted succession," and some other points upon which he so vehemently insists, are a mere ignis fatuus, and the delusions of a fanciful imagination—Indeed I am induced to believe that "the arts of plausibility, persuasions and promises, are now an overmatch for his childish ignorance and inexperience, that he is fallen an easy prey into the snares of Episcopal not christian enthusiasm, that he is full of specious professions, and confident assertions, and that he has been drawn into error." One word in this quotation I must notice—"enthusiasm"—this has with the Roman Catholics and their first born sons the Episcopalians been always used to designate the genuine spirit of christianity; and no sooner does a rational being begin to feel the importance of the gospel, the necessity of salvation by Christ, the indispensable obligation which there is that all men should be regenerated and sanctified by the holy spirit of God—than he is branded with every epithet which we would attach to those who have lost their reasoning powers.—Instances of this kind are frequent even in this country and at this time; but I would ask *N. L.* why is it that the Episcopal churches with all the influence which arises

PREFACE.

from their riches are so empty whilst the Methodist meetings are so full?—Because a dry essay on the most unimportant and uninteresting topic, with the same round of devotional service, which the minister often manifests he feels to be a burden—is substituted for the genuine intrinsic invaluable truths of the gospel of Christ: hence the soul truly devoted to God, is dissatisfied, until at length he attends where the want of brilliant talents and extensive learning is compensated by purity of motive, spirituality in publick exercises, and the supply through the presence of the Holy Ghost, of that food which strengthens the soul, even the “bread which cometh down from heaven.”

The haste with which the following remarks were written, one week only having elapsed from the time in which the pamphlet was first transmitted to the author, until the day of its publication, will be an apology for the cursory manner in which the primitive fathers of the church are quoted. However, should N. L. wish for a little more information upon this subject, he shall be supplied with it, either from the Syriac Testament, or from the Greek Testament, or from the earliest Oriental, Greek and Latin Fathers in their respective languages, or from the primitive English Reformers, in any quantity, great or small, according as it may suit the capaciousness of his brains, and the present very “debilitated state of his mental powers.”

May 28th, 1807.

REMARKS, &c.

IT is astonishing that in this age of the world, and especially in the only country in which religious and civil liberty are fully enjoyed ; men should continue to manifest every disposition to enslave the minds of their fellow citizens, and to “ lord it over Christ’s flock.”—There are some men so tenacious of that superiority which they vainly arrogate to themselves, that they affect to despise all those who have not the same distinctive marks which they have assumed : and their claim to pre-eminence which is generally founded either on the virtues or the talents of our predecessors, is of all others the most contemptible. Such however is the sandy basis upon which a considerable part of our modern church governors rest their pretensions to the right of power among christian professors. Because the apostles of christianity were the ornament of human nature, they proudly demand homage from their brethren ; and because the reformers were men of exalted piety and learning, they fancy that they are endowed with the privilege of directing the consciences of men, and of imposing upon their credulity any opinions which may promote their sinister and selfish designs.—This is the real foundation of the Episcopal church : all its vaunted excellence of government, sole validity of ordination, higher authority to administer the sacraments, and submissions of heresy against all those who dare to “ make a schism,” as they presumptuously call it, are equally ridiculous ; and both the gospel and sound reason have inscribed upon them, ‘ *Totum, ye are weighed in the balance, and are found wanting.*’

A cursory elucidation of this subject is indispensibly requisite, to correct the intemperate virulent attack, which

an Episcopalian in "inquiring into the validity of Methodist Episcopacy" has made upon the Methodist societies. I shall not follow him through his mass of incongruities; but shall select his "specious professions and confident assertions," with a view to encourage those who may not be acquainted with this controversy, to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

The object of this writer is to restore the "straying, deluded, mistaken Methodists" to the fold of the only true church: and the mode by which he has tried to effect it, will produce consequences the very reverse from that which he intended.

In replying to the opinions scattered through this crude pamphlet, and which it is scarcely possible to collect into one focus, I shall advert to the following particulars. —

1. I shall prove that an uninterrupted episcopal succession from the days of the apostles, is a mere imposture, at first artfully contrived and still asserted by interested men for their own emolument.

In the preface we find the following specimen of "childish ignorance and inexperience;" "A succession from the apostles in the order of bishops, as an order superior to, and distinct from the presbyters is requisite, without which a valid christian ministry cannot be preserved, and such bishops alone possess the power of ordaining and commissioning ministers to feed the flock of Christ.

"No true church can exist without a true episcopacy, and no episcopacy can be a true one, but that which is derived from the holy apostles in the order of bishops, as superior to, and distinct from the order of presbyters."

In page 23d, we have the following logick: "Had Rome, Alexandria, Corinth, Philippi, or any other see, been without a bishop for 500 years together, the uninterrupted line of

succession would certainly be broken and interrupted in such see, during that time ; but the very instant that a bishop was consecrated by any true bishop in any part of the world for that see, the uninterrupted line of succession of bishops from the apostles, would be restored to it. And on the other hand, had there been in each of the above cities, fifty or more truly consecrated bishops contending for the possession of those sees, each of them was competent to transmit the succession. For it is an uninterrupted line of succession in the order of bishops, and not an uninterrupted line of bishops in peaceable possession of any see, particularly that episcopalians contend for. And this succession cannot be lost, so long as there remains one true bishop, in any see whatever, to preserve it."

In the same page, he asks for a little information, which he shall receive during this discussion.—“ Those who say that the succession from the apostles in the order of bishops, is lost, in any church, which professes the necessity and possession of it, are bound to shew, that the persons who began the present dynasty of bishops, in that church, were never truly and validly consecrated to their work and office, by other truly and validly consecrated bishops. Till this is done, the claim of such church to an apostolic succession in the order of bishops, must remain in full force.”

Page 49. Another specimen “ of childish ignorance and inexperience.”—“ Bishops succeeded to the apostles in the government of the church, and transmitted their authority down to those who at present hold that office, and who as successors of the apostles, are superior to, and distinct from presbyters ; or even those, who are said to have been called, in the apostolic age, bishops or presbyters, indiscriminately.”

He who can avow these opinions and sentiments, manifestly proves that the arts of plausibility, flattering persuasions

and promises, and a season of corporeal and mental affliction have so debilitated him that he has become, "an easy prey to the snares of error;" for every man who has studied the ecclesiastical history of the primitive church, or who knows the language in which the New Testament was written, must deny these "confident assertions." Let us examine this point at large: and to elucidate the subject it will be necessary—to shew what is meant by the church of Christ in the Gospel to evince that the power of directing the important affairs of the church belonged to the whole body of Christians: to demonstrate that there was no distinction between the authority committed to the elders: and to develope the unfounded nature of those arguments, and the absurdity of their belief, who build their doctrines upon an uninterrupted episcopal succession.

What is the Church of Christ? "The Saviour of the world himself hath given us," says one of the most pious episcopalian divines of the last century, "an infallible definition of a Gospel church. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.*" The church of christ is a society of those who believe in him as a teacher sent from God, and who form their worship and conduct according to their judgment of his institutions. The Greek word, *ecclesia*, is always used in Scripture, to denote a *single congregation of worshipping Christians, who assembled in one place*, when it adverts to the church militant—but it also signifies the whole body of the faithful in heaven—"the general assembly and church of the first born." 1. Cor. 14. 23. The place in which the congregation met is also called a church: 1 Cor. 11. 18. 20. Where there were more than one church, the substantive is used in the plural number, *en tais ecclesiis*, in the churches, 1 Cor. 11. 18. The whole nation of Israel was also called *church*, but they possessed one place only for public worship, the tabernacle, and subsequent-

ly the temple. To argue from scripture, that the church means all the disciples of Christ scattered throughout a large district of country, and that they must have a diocesan to rule them is insuperable weakness. It suits the object of those who wish to rule, thus to introduce scripture as sanctioning their selfish purposes. Previous to the dispersion of the disciples of Jerusalem, by the persecution of which Paul was chief—their number was very large ; yet they never formed distinct assemblies—but worshipped with the elders in one place. After that event, and when they could no more unite in prayer and praise, they are always addressed as distinct bodies named after their places of residence : the *churches* of Judea, Samaria and Galilee. Acts 9, 31. Gal. 1, 32.

The apostles when referring to the christian societies in different provinces or nations never call them the *church* ; but the *churches* of Galatia, Gal. 1. 2, Cor. 16, 2 ; the churches of Macedonia : 2. Cor. 8, 1 ; the churches of Asia ; 1 Cor. 16, 19 ; but speaking of the body of christians who inhabited the same city or town, they always use the word in the singular, the church of Antioch, the church at Corinth, the church at Ephesus, &c.

That our Lord never intended that any individual should usurp a judicial authority over the members of his mystical body, unless to effect some important purpose for which he was to receive supernatural energy to convince unbelievers, is evident, not from his example only, but from his practice, and that of the apostles. His express injunctions are that those who dispense the gospel of peace, should be more than all others, patterns of humility and servants to the meanest of the flock. An affecting example of his own stupendous condescension was exhibited when he washed

his disciples' feet ; and if the Lord of life and glory could thus stoop to the meanest office, what duties can be too servile for his ministers ? If this be the true character and these dispositions be the genuine marks of a gospel minister ; it is not wrong to say, that episcopacy is not generally governed by christian bishops. Bishop Burnet thus laments the state of religion among the Episcopal clergy. " I have lamented during my whole life, that I saw so little true zeal among our clergy. I saw much zeal throughout the foreign churches. The Dissenters have a great deal among them ; but the main body of our clergy is dead and lifeless, and instead of animating, lay one another asleep ;" they are the most remiss of all men in their labours in private, and the least severe in their lives."—Dr. Hartley says, " The superior clergy are ambitious and eager in the pursuit of riches ; negligent of their charges and of the inferior clergy and their charges. The inferior clergy imitate their superiors. And the clergy of all ranks are ignorant, or if they do apply, it is to profane learning, rather than to the study of the scriptures, of the oriental languages, and of the writings of devout men."—Mr. Simpson, an Episcopalian says ; " Let a man take a survey of the clergy, let him attend the dissenting ordinations, and clerical meetings : the Methodist conferences, and district meetings ; let him next proceed to our confirmations, ordinations and visitations, and then let him say on which side is the greatest appearance of evangelical religion. Our confirmations are a burlesque, our ordinations are disorderly, and our visitations are riotous and intemperate." These are the concessions of distinguished Episcopalian—can it be for one moment admitted that to men such as these, our Lord committed the arduous and highly responsible duty of governing the church and of feeding the flock of God ? Are these the men to whom we should implicitly submit our consciences in

points of faith, doctrine and practice ? Undoubtedly not.

Christ is the sole governor of the church, and the authority which he possesses he never has delegated either to Pope, King, or Bishop—it would be inconsistent with his mediatorial office so to act—hence we cannot find a solitary instance in the New Testament in which the apostles “lorded it over God’s heritage ;” upon what ground therefore do modern spiritual tyrants assert a right which the apostles never claimed ; and anathematize all those who will not implicitly believe their contradictory tenets ?

The apostles themselves never exercised their extraordinary miraculous powers in tyrannizing over the multitude of their fellow christians, Acts 6, 1—6. Acts 15. 22—29. 1 Cor. 5. 3. 4. 5. These were all cases of discipline which the apostles who were filled with the Holy Spirit, considered it evangelical that the whole church should judge and determine. Absolution and excommunication were positively delegated to the whole body of members—1 Cor. 5—1 to end. 2 Cor. 2. 6. to 11.—Even in a point of the very highest importance and which considerably depended upon those supernatural gifts which were poured out upon the apostles, and which were especially delegated by them by the directions of the Holy Ghost to others ; the trial and determination of the correctness of the pretensions of those who professed to be apostles ; the power of discrimination and the eventual judgment was not restricted to the apostles or to the elders alone, but was a privilege that belonged to the whole flock of Ephesus : Acts 20. 28, 29. Rev. 2. And this same flock even in the days of Ignatius assembled in one place and celebrated the death of our Lord as one company of Christian brethren.

Let us refer to the first ministers of the Christian Church, and we shall discover that the immediate successors of the apostles who were expressly devoted by them to the holy office, and who received similar powers from on high, know

nothing of the superiority among Christians which is now and has been claimed by the Roman Catholics and their Episcopalian offspring.

Clemens Romanus was not acquainted with any distinction between Bishops and Presbyters, he always referred the contending Corinthians to the church and to the bishop and presbyters evidently intimating that they were synonymous offices. Irenæus makes no distinction between Bishops and Presbyters. Polycarp exhorts the Christians at Philippi to respect the opinions of the Presbyters and deacons—but says nothing of a bishop. Justin Martyr always speaks of the *president* as the pastor of one congregation.

Jerome says the presbyters of some churches elected one of their body to preside, and called him bishop; and he expressly declares that they were both of the same rank in the church. Ignatius even always intimates, although he was the first who made any distinction between bishops and presbyters, that a bishop was the pastor of one congregation only—and Gregory Nazianzen laments as a “most destructive thing to the church,” the increasing distinction which the avarice, ambition and corruption of some of his brethren made among the ministers of the gospel. It hence appears, from the ecclesiastical history of the earliest fathers of the church—that bishops and presbyters were not of a different order at all events prior to the time of Ignatius—that the distinction was not of divine institution—and that episcopacy even as it was the subject of Gregory Nazianzen’s complaint was very different from the pomposity, pride, and lordly arrogance of the Romish and Episcopalian Bishops.

But if we were to allow for the sake of argument that there had been a distinction between the apostles and those who were employed by them in the less important duties of the church which is a fact that does not appear, for the apostles’ lives were perfect copies of the example which our Lord had

given them, both in humility, affection to the brethren, and complacency in the performance of the most servile offices; would it follow that those who have religion and talents in a degree infinitely inferior to many of the Laity should claim and exercise an authority among Christ's disciples which the apostles never exacted, and which consequently has no foundation except in the corrupt propensities of the human heart. Let those who thus assume an unscriptural influence over the church of Christ—read the history of their Romish and Episcopal ancestors, the Pope, Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops, and consider whether the awful threat contained in Ezekiel 34. 2 to 10. be not justly addressed to them. And had the Apostles even delegated their extraordinary qualifications to those who were especially commissioned by God to receive them by the imposition of their hands—will any man have the impudence to assert, that fifteen, or sixteen centuries at least after all the extraordinary gifts of the spirit had been totally removed from the church, that he is to be elevated to a rank, to enjoy privileges, and to exert a power over christians which neither the apostles nor the earliest ministers and martyrs of Christianity during the first two centuries of the gospel dispensation, and during the continuance of the diffusion of the miraculous gifts, at any period possessed?—It is an absurdity.

Before we proceed to demonstrate the extreme folly of N. L.'s "confident assertions, let us examine the evangelical definition of a gospel minister or elder. "The elders were to feed the flock, not for filthy lucre, they were not to be tyrants but examples; vigilant, sober, hospitable, patient, blameless, not self willed, not soon angry, just, holy, temperate, uncorrupt in doctrine, grave, sincere, not brawlers, and instant in season and out of season in preaching, reproof, and in exhorting, with all long suf-

fering." Now let a man be ordained by bishops, even if they were the uninterrupted successors of the apostles, which we shall presently prove, to be a "profane and old wife's fable;" let him be invested with office by the most pious men who ever published the gospel of Christ, if his principles, experience, and conduct be not conformable to this character of a minister, he is not called of God, and is no minister of Christ. The form of ordination, and the persons by whom that rite is to be performed are not detailed in the New Testament, and the laying on of the hands of bishops or presbyters is of no more intrinsic importance than it would be to flourish it in the air, or to put it into our pocket. The laying on of hands even in the apostolic age conveyed no new powers, whether ordinary or extraordinary; and Paul and Barnabas were as divinely called to their work of preaching to the Gentiles; and as ably fitted for it before the prophets and teachers at Antioch "laid their hands upon them," as after that act. Those therefore who are endued with great grace and indulged with suitable gifts are the only ministers whom the gospel acknowledges, and have all the call and mission which the Lord now gives to any man to teach, exhort, rebuke, and to administer the sacraments; whilst those who have not the character already quoted, have no call and no authority to dispense the christian ordinances.

The whole of the Episcopal system rests upon an assumption which is not believed by any well informed man in Christendom. It would be equally unprofitable and tedious to introduce the controversy respecting the truth of the fact whether the apostle Peter at any period visited Rome; although there are very strong arguments which can be adduced against it, and which if they do not fully convince, suffice to suspend the determination of every liberal inquiring mind. We will admit that he was martyred

in Rome, as stated in most ecclesiastical histories, but it cannot be believed that he was ever bishop of the church at Rome. Paul in the second epistle to Timothy, which was written from Rome not long previous to his death, makes no mention of Peter, which he surely would have done, had the latter resided in that city, and more particularly if he had superintended the affairs of that individual society. Thus unless the fact of Peter's ever having visited Rome be proved, the whole building is overthrown. But even did we allow that Peter was the first bishop of that city, he was not an officer in the Episcopalian sense; he places himself in the same grade with the other ministers. In his epistle to the "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia," he says, "the elders among you, I exhort, who am also an elder." Peter never suspected that from the silence of the gospel, with respect to his history, "evil men, seducers, and scoffers," should invent upon the credit of his name and apostleship, a tale whereby "the son of perdition should oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, sitting in the temple of God, shewing himself to be God." The Popish legend says, "that Peter was elected prince of the apostles," which if it could be proved would overturn his apostleship and the divinity of his mission; for our Lord had said to his primitive disciples, "call no man master nor father upon earth, be ye not called Rabbi, neither be ye called masters for one is your master, even Christ; and he that is greatest among you shall be your servant."—This alone is sufficient to prove that Peter was not head of the church, that he never delegated any power to others, because he never claimed it; for his humility after his backsliding and repentance was profound and not extinguished to the last hour of his life, and that if it were true the story would effect the total destruction of his divine mission and of those who

succeeded him : hence this fiction was the offspring of some ambitious usurper's mind, who wished to elevate himself above the rest of his brethren.

It must also be remarked, that as the endowments of the apostles, were extraordinary and peculiar, they could have no proper successors in the church ; it is not now known who were the first seven bishops of Rome, and Eusebius confesses that it is impossible to say who succeeded the apostles in the government of the church. The contested elections in almost all cases render it impossible to ascertain who were the true bishops ; the variety of ordinations which were declared void by popes and councils, and the conviction that the present bishop of Rome is not the legal successor of those who preceded him, authorize the assertion that there is not now in existence any one man, who is a regular successor of the apostles, and that therefore " hereditary divine right," is an usurpation which God will overthrow.

It has been already shewn that Peter had no more power than any other apostle, and that from the nature of his mission it is impossible that he could have been a bishop ; but if it be replied, that the subject does not depend upon Peter's ordinations alone ; but that any man who was ordained by either of the apostles and who ordained others in succession was a true bishop, and that their descendents are such to this hour ;—the following facts will shew how rotten the episcopal tree is, if we examine it from its root, through its growth and all its branches.

After the establishment of Christianity upon the ruins of Paganism by Constantine, the Roman bishop, and his brother at Constantinople were at perpetual variance on account of the supremacy ; the two *holy* Priests and their successors fulminated the wrath of heaven against each other, and each with great coolness delivered his brother and his adherents as far as bulls and anathemas would serve for that purpose to the

safe keeping of their mutual friend Beelzebub. It is a *certain fact* that the *English Bishops cannot be traced up even to the church of Rome*. In the year 668, the successors of Austin the monk being extinct, the new bishops were ordained by Aidan and Finan, two presbyters who resided in the monastery of Columbanus and who left their seclusion for the purpose of ordaining "presbyters to fuller powers." I would ask N. L. if it be not folly to talk of the uninterrupted succession when it was thus completely destroyed in England during many years, and when at length presbyters consecrated presbyters as diocesan bishops.--But waving the conclusions which might be drawn from this important fact what became of the uninterrupted succession when Pope Joan or John viii. governed the Roman see—can we believe that she who might in every sense be called the old "whore of Babylon," was a Bishop appointed by God to manage the affairs of his church?

But during the long division of the church when there were two popes, two bodies of cardinals, &c. &c. was not the line of succession interrupted—the schism existed during so long a time that every man who had been ordained before the two candidates for the Pontificate openly divided, must have died, and as they both damned each other with all their partizans—is it rational to believe that the fortunate "brawling priest" after 70 years was more evangelical than his unsuccessful opponent? What decided the quarrel at last? the consent of the different European Potentates, who wanted time and opportunity to provide those means, and to pursue those measures which should enable them to commence another war with more certainty of accomplishing their object.

After the commencement of the glorious reformation in Germany by Luther; Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Farrar, and other pious and enlightened clergymen promoted the good work in England so far as the "Head of the church"

would permit.—But here we must pause ; when Henry VIII. seceded from the Romish church the validity of the ordination of the English bishops, and the uninterrupted succession were totally destroyed. From whom did Cranmer and his brethren derive their episcopal authority—From the Pope or his Legate. But the whole generation of succeeding Popes and the council of Trent peremptorily declared that their ordination was null, that they were schismatics and heretics, and as such they were gravely “delivered over to Satan.” At length Henry VIII. died—all the bishops and clergy received their ministerial authority from these men—the remnant of popery was eradicating as fast as human means and human wisdom combined could effect it when Edward VI. was removed to heaven. To prove the truth of the Romish doctrine “that no faith is to be kept with heretics?” Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Farrar—and numberless others were murdered during the bloody reign of the merciless Mary.

Could it be proved even, which it cannot, that the English episcopacy derived its origin from the Romish see, would not this fact destroy the succession?—If it be said that Cranmer received his authority from the Romish church which succeeded the apostles, and that therefore his ordinations were valid, I answer, the man who gave that power, possessed the power to divest him of it when circumstances rendered it necessary, and this at once destroys the foundation of the Episcopal church ; besides some of the first bishops after the accession of Elizabeth were nothing but “Vicars of Bray,” Papists under Henry, Protestants while Edward swayed the sceptre, persecutors under Mary, and true church of England men when Elizabeth governed.—Let it be noticed also, that the Pope’s interdiction was removed from England but a short time ; and that the same men who were consecrated to office by Cranmer and his brethren, who renounced that ordination, and who were again

consecrated by Cranmer's successors invested with Episcopal authority by him, were all condemned to hell by the sovereign church Pontiff—But if we advert to the time of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate, where was the succession? it is insulting the rational mind to talk about succession, when the authority by which the office and the officer subsisted were both overturned:—and in James II. time several of the bishopricks when they became vacant were supplied with Popish priests in disguise. Now the Episcopalians pray every day for the overthrow of popery, and their parents retort, by “cursing them most solemnly and believingly in the name of God;”—those who are at this distance cannot be both correct, and yet Protestant Episcopacy was generated by Roman Catholic corruption, and has many outward marks of the beast inscribed upon its forehead.

N. L. allows that “there were no bishops in America until subsequent to the revolution; but can that be the true church which is not supplied with all the officers who are necessary to manage its economy?—The supposition is absurd; and by confessing this fact he has tacitly acknowledged that the Episcopal church cannot be the only true church; because Christ has solemnly promised that his church shall always have a regular supply of all the grace and gifts which are necessary to build up the household of faith. If bishops therefore be an indispensable requisite in the economy of the christian church—by the example of this country, we declare the gospel to be false.

One point more, modern Protestant Episcopacy never was, and is not, from heaven—the head of the church may be either an infatuated fool, an afflicted madman, a debauchee, or a silly woman; those make archbishops and bishops, or could keep every diocese vacant according to their whim and caprice. Yet such is the source of American Episcopacy.—It is the offspring of the spawn which flowed from Henry

VIII's brain, because the "Mother of Harlots" would not publicly sanction his libidinous desires.

The authority therefore for which the Episcopalians contend, that of deciding all religious opinions, of establishing creeds of faith, and determining the propriety of all religious ceremonies is the true relict of Popery, and the father of lies.—Is it not a well known fact that every Episcopal minister declares that he is solemnly moved by the Holy Ghost to assume the ministerial office—when many have neither the requisite virtue nor talents. Are they not likewise forced to subscribe to articles of faith which they either do not believe, or comprehend or which they never have studied. Do they not shew the most superlative contempt for these solemn engagements by the moral trash, with which the people are quieted, rather than with the animating and ineffably important doctrines of grace? And is not duplicity in subscription to articles, and prevarication in their assertions at the time of ordination, openly avowed and defended by the Episcopal moralists? Thus accounting for the want of success in their ministerial employments by solemnly asserting their faith in what they do not believe, by solemnly promising to perform duties of which they have no idea, or which they intend to "leave undone," and by making the most sacred engagements, which ought to proceed from the most pure disinterested motives, from no other cause than a desire to live in idleness and luxury, or from avarice, to fleece the flock—Whilst lukewarmness and indifference if no worse principle, render the clergymen of the different sects cool in their Master's work, and insipid in their publick official duties, Methodism will flourish.

II. I shall developpe the genuine nature and objects of Methodism.

It is a fact which cannot be denied, that when the Methodists first became the object of publick notice, the whole of

the British nation were sunk in deplorable darkness, the comparatively small number of evangelical Dissenters excepted.—The light which was diffused by the Messrs. Wesley's, and Mr. Whitefield has pervaded every part of the British dominions, and has been the means of kindling a general flame among every sect of pious souls on the continent of Europe. In this vast country the gospel has extended its benign influence from one end of the continent to the other, and a work is already begun in Louisiana, which promises by the blessing of God to produce an abundant harvest, in collecting the scattered, ignorant and superstitious multitude into the fold of Christ. The writer of the pamphlet must have never studied the subject upon which he presumed to write, or he could not so wilfully have mistaken the nature of Methodism. With regard to its fundamental object, it was certainly the most laudable upon earth, the salvation of souls; and will this episcopalian wise-acre contend that the people who were perishing for the lack of knowledge and of the support which the gospel furnishes to all its professors, must wait until the indifference and worse than Laodicean lukewarmness of the Episcopalian drones were banished by the grace of God from their hearts. It is said also that Methodism is an "imposition on the world, a human device, a schism, and a promoter of infidelity."—N. L. asserts this with as much belief of its truth, as he believes the 39 articles which he seldom preaches; but how can Methodism be called an imposition on the world, it pretends to no supernatural energy, it boasts of no extraordinary gifts, it does not produce false miracles to deceive the ignorant and unwary—Its doctrines, form of government and all its affairs are published to the world with the most scrupulous exactness. Methodism is a "human device:" this I deny, it is "the work of God," if this N. L. believe the articles which he has solemnly engaged to enforce with apos-

zeal and energy—he must admit that the conversion of men from sin to holiness cannot be performed by man ; it must proceed from heaven : now the most virulent opponent of the Methodists will admit that a great change is visible in the lives of a great number of the inhabitants both of England and the United States ; which reformation was produced by the operation of the Spirit of God accompanying the labours of the Methodist ministers. But we are told that it is a human device,” because the Methodist ministers are not ordained by the hands of such men as lord Bristol, Dr. Mandie, &c : how absurd ! all the episcopal honour which now exists in this country flows from the hands of a royal natural, and yet this is the true church alone. Protestant Episcopalianism which commenced with the adultery of Henry VIII. and which was continued by the debaucheries of Charles II. is the only true church —yet its ministry have emptied all their temples ; their ignorance and vices have banished their auditors and still they shear the people without the performance of any of their official duties.

Methodism is a “ schism : ”—this must be also denied and retorted—at the time the Methodists united in England, they did not separate from the church as they ought to have done ; but continued in communion with her. In this country there was even by the confession of N. L. no church until since the revolution : how then can that be a schism which consists in the establishment of independent societies ; when this *foresaid true church* did not exist. But of all the schismatics who ever existed there are none to whom the same can with so much propriety be applied as to the church of England and their successors. They separated from that church to which they owe their origin, and continue out of her bosom, although they boast of their being the only true church, as her lineal descendents, and of being the only Christian ministry, when the “ old lady ” who

bore them, positively declares that their ordinations are invalid, their rites a farce, their worship offensive to God, and their departure from them the most vile heresy, for which they shall receive without repentance and unless they return to the Romish communion, eternal damnation.

Methodism is a "promoter of the cause of infidelity;" this is the trash which the Jews uttered against our Lord's miracles; they declared that the stupendous works which he performed, were the offspring of hell and thereby became guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost. The Episcopalians who have been cramped by the same round of prayers, and who have frittered away the genuine and peculiar doctrines of the gospel to a dull system of morality which has neither the beauty nor elegance of that of Socrates or Cicero; and who from being considerably independent of their flocks, care no more for them than decency requires, give every godly man the name of Methodist; and declare the whole body of Methodists infidels in disguise.

Methodism is "a promoter of infidelity;" who in your vicinity N. L. declare the indispensable necessity of faith in the gospel and faith in Christ; as the only medium of acceptance with heaven, with most earnestness?—who denounce the terrors of the gospel against all unbelief and wickedness with most zeal? who publish the whole counsel of God with most plainness and success? who most convince the genuine spirit of the gospel of Christ in the extent of their labours, their self denial, their persevering efforts, their anxiety to save the lost souls of men, and their submission to trials unpleasant to human nature, and mortifying to the pride of the heart? Must I answer for you?—The whole continent knows that the Methodist ministers are the men who are instant in season and out of season, whilst their Episcopalian brethren are idling away their lives in self-indulgence and effeminacy.

Are those men promoters of Infidelity who with undaunted boldness and child-like simplicity declare through all parts of the continent and to all who hear them without respect of persons, that “without faith it is impossible to please God, and he that believeth not shall be damned.”—This is the same method which our Lord used to destroy Satan’s reign and the unbelieving Jews declared him to be the agent of infernal spirits.—The Methodists labour without ceasing to destroy the cause of infidelity and corruption, and yet are branded with the stigma of being its promoters.—To such men as N. L. may be justly applied the saying of our Lord ; “Hearing ye hear, and do not understand ; seeing ye see, and do not perceive.” To men of this stamp all reasoning is useless. Men who thus decry others for performing the labours which belong to themselves would shew the truth of their principles did they fulfil the apostle’s injunctions which he gave to Timothy—constantly preaching, praying, exhorting, and visiting the sick. Would the rectors thus act the number of Methodists would be lessened ; but whilst these seclude themselves from their labour, and spend their time in laying plans to amass money and in objects equally ignoble : the candid mind will upon comparing the parties by the gospel standard assert that Methodism is not a “human device,” and that the blessed effects which flow from it, prove that it is not the “promoter of infidelity.”

Can we believe that when every art has been used to oppose the progress of Methodism, when not even the common share of riches are possessed by the whole body, to give influence to its spread, that it should have included that large portion of the citizens of these states, who are now united in the societies, if God had not been its author ?—Infidels may rail, hypocrites may cavil, and Devils may rage ; but whilst some of the other sects are upon the stand or de-

clining, the increase of the Methodists, without influence or riches is almost unexampled in the history of the Christian church.

Because Methodism has been called "the work of God," this N. L. wishes to distinguish it from the gospel by at once assuming that it is opposite to the religion of Christ—and therefore he demands the evidence of miracles before he will believe it—hence he denies the whole system of Methodism upon the ground which has already been shewn to be a nonentity. Egyptian blindness would not have uttered what is more inconsistent than that which he asserts—he denies Methodism because its disciples do not belong to the Episcopal Church which has already been proved bears no mark of the church of Christ: and he intimates that as the religion of Christ was distinguished from the law of Moses, so Methodism is distinct from Christianity. The greatest miracle which can be performed is the conquest of the corrupt dispositions of the natural man, and the conversion of a hardened turbulent sinner to the childlike humility and meekness of the gospel, this is the effect of Methodism, but it is not the effect of Episcopalianism, and it demonstrates that the work is of God. In the first establishment of the Episcopal church this effect was not produced; people professed to be of the national church because force and gain were both used to influence that profession. But was the heart reformed, were sinners converted, was holiness diffused, was the genuine temper of the gospel disseminated, were these mongrel, Romish Protestant Bishops owned of God? No—When Presbyterianism began in Scotland amidst some extravagances pure religion flourished—but they (with the English Puritans) were persecuted with all the virulence of Roman Inquisitors by the relentless Episcopalian;—Is not persecution in the gospel the infalible characteristic of the false church?

Methodism is the union of a number of christians who worship God according to the dictates of their consciences ; having a strong desire to propagate the gospel, and an insuperable wish that all men should enjoy the privileges of Christianity, they preserve the itinerant plan, that in every place the solemn truths of Christ may be delivered :—to effect this object—the number of the ministers must necessarily be large and as the societies are generally poor, the preacher’s salaries are barely sufficient to clothe them :—as all bodies must be governed by certain discipline—the assembled ministers by the recommendation of Mr. Wesley elected Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury their Presidents or Bishops to use the scriptural term—and since that period they joined to them Mr. Whatcoat lately deceased. It is indispensibly requisite upon the present Methodist plan that there should be some person whose knowledge of all the societies fitted him to inspect and manage their concerns ; and whose principal employment should be to visit all the churches ; that the union might be preserved, and that their grand object the diffusion of the gospel of Christ should be promoted. This is the sole object which the Methodists have in view by the increasing efforts which they are making for the “ conversion of sinners from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God.” The promise of God, that the reign of the gospel shall extend over all people of all climes, colours and languages must be fulfilled : and if the Methodists, the Congregationalists, and the Baptists, all of whom are now exerting their utmost strength to bring sinners to God by the aid of his spirit, should settle upon their lees, imbibe a Laodicean spirit, and become useless in the church ; he would remove their Candlestick, and raise up “ others to introduce that glorious and happy period when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of our Christ, for ever and ever.”

III. I shall now prove that every ministerial ordination among Congregationalist, Methodist, and Presbyterian christians is valid, but that the Episcopalian ordination is neither valid, nor evangelical.

It has been already demonstrated that the uninterrupted succession of Bishops is an "imposition on the world and a mere human device"—let us weigh the Episcopal church in the gospel balance—and we shall see at once its intrinsic value.

Can it for one moment be supposed that all the generations of idiots who filled the episcopal office during several centuries transmitted the Holy Ghost by mimicking the apostles in one of the most solemn duties attached to the apostolick office—men who had not the least pretensions either to piety or to learning—but who were blind and ignorant as moles, depraved and vitiated as Rochester in his worst days, and hypocritical as the old scribes and pharisees—Every individual member of Christ's mystical body has an inalienable right to worship God according to his view of the precise meaning of Christ's commands "whatever is not of faith, is sin:" we do not depend upon the good or evil opinions of others, "to our own master we stand or fall:" hence if the doctrine of christian liberty be sound, and no man who reads the New Testament will say that God has not given his people the most unbounded religious liberty—those of all others are the worst rebels against their creator who usurp the throne and power of the deity, who trammel the consciences of men, who daub over their sins, and quiet their consciences by their untempered mortar.

Common sense dictates that no man can give that grace and those gifts which they themselves possess not: how then can some of the bishops who are disguised infidels, extravagantly licentious, and stupidly ignorant, give piety, genius, knowledge, grace or gifts suited to the per-

formance of the most solemn duties in which mortals can engage? What then can be more unjust than the claim which the Romish devotees and their cast off children make to have the sole direction of all spiritual matters? What know they of leading the lambs of the flock? what know they respecting the operation of the Spirit of God in conviction for sin? what know they of encouraging the humble penitent contrite soul and of directing him to the cross of Christ? what know they of reclaiming the backslider, of comforting the mourner, of supporting the fainthearted, of encouraging the weak, of animating the believer, and of meeting souls for the purity and joys of heaven?—To the great majority of these spiritual tyrants, you may as well talk Arabick, as concerning the peculiar saving doctrines of grace; and yet these are the men who claim a right to say what we shall believe, and what we shall practice. For fifteen hundred years, says N. L. “the whole Christian world was episcopal:”—true! and a fine world they made of it; the most barbarous nation of savages which at present exists upon this continent were not so depraved, vitiated, ignorant and brutal as the episcopalian world, from the “man of sin,” the “abomination of the earth,” the “beast;” the Pope himself, down through all ranks of people, including both the clergy and the laity. There are no complications of villainies, which the bishops did not commit; there are no refinements of cruelty which these murderers did not invent; there are no depths even of Mohammedan superstition or Pagan idolatry into which these blind watchmen did not wade with their more stupid flocks; there is no brutal coarseness of licentiousness in which these *holy* Fathers of Episcopalianism did not indulge;—and to carry their impiety, their profanity, and their infernal dispositions to the highest pitch, they would receive the penitent’s confession for sin, and would absolve her from all her past

transgressions for the privilege of repeating the same crimes immediately as the ceremony was over ; even the altar and those places which they denominated the most holy and from the sight of which the laity were kept with the most scrupulous exactness they profaned by their worse than beastly excesses. The bishops who were almost all Monks, were adepts in vice not so refined, but equally artful with the Jesuits ; the nunneries were mere seraglios, in which these “successors of the apostles” O profanity dost thou not blush ! committed every excess ; first debauching the sisterhood ; then absolving them from crime ; then repeating it, then murdering the offspring of their licentious amours ; and to add to the climax, burning and torturing with hellish ingenuity all those who could not believe that these were characteristics of the gospel ministers. If any man can possibly suppose that such bishops are the only true bishops, and this the only true church ?—to him may be addressed the words of the “voice from heaven”—“Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues !”

Our Lord assured the apostles, that success should accompany their labours, “that he would work with them, that he would always be present with his church world without end.”—Now either the gospel is false or the Episcopal church is not the true church :—for from the period when Episcopacy was established, God removed their candlestick out of its place.—No success has at any crisis accompanied the labours of its ministers except that which was produced by indulging the vices, and stupifying the consciences of men.

The presence of Christ among his people by means of the Holy Spirit would produce gospel fruit ;—what are the fruits of the Spirit ?—A man, and it would be gratifying if our

bishops would think more about him, and copy his example a little more exactly, says "they that are of the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit:—the works of the flesh are manifest—Adultery, fornication, idolatry, &c. they who do these things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."—If men who are guilty of these crimes shall not inherit the future kingdom of heaven; they cannot be the true church on earth.—"But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

Paul positively asserts that they who belong to Christ, produce the fruits of the Spirit, and do not perform the works of the flesh—but what says the history of the Episcopal church from its commencement to the present day.—Some few solitary instances excepted, such as one man appearing once in an age, the whole of Christendom was immersed in an ocean of darkness; they seem to have experienced that which God has declared in his word, is the portion of impenitent sinners, judicial hardness of heart. Not feeling the importance of Christian liberty, and gradually coaxed to a quietus by the Devil's own sons, "ye are of your father the Devil;—they departed from the faith, gave heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;—they spoke lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared as with a hot iron; they forbade to marry, commanded to abstain from meats, were without natural affection, "witness those hoary Sodomitae the Monks and Jesuits," were false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those who were good; traitors, heady, high minded, lovers of pleasure more than of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; creeping into houses to lead away silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts."—This is the prophecy nearly eighteen hundred years ago of that which the Episcopalian church should be; and the description of the modern

historian who relates the facts, must be in the same or similar words. Is that heresy or schism that separates from a body which God has condemned?—But if we view the Protestant Episcopal church since the reformation who have already been demonstrated to be the only Christian schismatics, what shall we say? The business is not mended.

Who formed the Protestant Episcopal church?—the most debauched potentate in Europe, Henry VIII.—who scrupled not to murder his wives when satiated with them, to admit others to his bed. Who restored it after its destruction by Mary? Elizabeth, one of the most corrupt women who ever disgraced a throne, except the late old Jezebel, Catharine of Russia? Who a second time restored it after Oliver Cromwell's protectorate? Charles II. as beastly a wretch as ever wore a cardinal's hat, or a bishop's mitre.—Can N. L. or any other man who does not need the Maniac's discipline and attention, believe that to such worthless bipeds as these, who spurned at Christ's authority and who manifested by every act of their lives that they cared not for him or his church, our Lord has committed the weighty charge of governing his redeemed. If we investigate the Episcopal church in this country, we shall find that there is little difference—As to the Roman Catholics as a body, living in open violation of a moral law, and in practices which most highly derogate from the honour of God, and which affect his sovereign authority in the most sensible point—I mean the idolatrous worship of graven images, which command they have banished from their code—they are past all human redemption.

Whence does the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country derive their origin? from the English Bishops, whose authority, it is not pretended by any Episcopalian, is received either from Christ or from his apostles, but from the King of England. Can that then be the only true church which depends for its existence upon so precarious a basis as the whim

sies of frail mortals , “ dress’d in a little brief authority.” But the christian church must have some discipline—it is indispensably necessary to its existence—but where is your discipline N. L. you cannot refuse the most immoral man to partake of the Lord’s supper if he pay you—you cannot refuse to bury a man, unless in case of suicide, and you must assure his friends and most solemnly appeal to God for the truth of it, that a sinner who was overwhelmed with crimes, and who died impenitent, is taken to heaven? Do your Bishops and Clergymen take cognizance of the conduct of those *few* who bear them? do they “ watch for souls as those who must give an account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief?”

Do not every man and woman shun the Episcopal Church as soon as they begin seriously to reflect upon their responsibility to their creator? Is it not a notorious fact that no society can subsist without regulations? but you have not even the shadow of christian discipline or regularity, except in the uniformity of your prayers, the monotonous dullness of your harangues, and the steadiness with which you punctually collect your salaries.—Can that be the true church which has not our Lord for its head? whose ministers acknowledge that they derive their authority from that Babylon which God has said shall be “ utterly burnt with fire,” and over whose destruction, he calls “ heaven, the holy apostles and prophets to rejoice because he hath revenged upon her, the persecutions of “ the souls of them whom she had slain for the word of God?” Can that be the true church which has no christian discipline—and whose whole economy bears not one visible feature of the genuine church of Christ? To N. L. and to all those who implicitly believe the contradictory, unfounded “ specious professions and confident assertions” of his pamphlet may be justly addressed the words that Paul delivered to the Jews and others at Antioch in Pisidia.—“ Beware there-

fore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets, Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which you shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.”

Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Farrar, &c. although the highest dignified officers of the church of England—all confessed that the remains of superstition among the people were so strong that they could not perform the full work of destroying popery as they wished.—These men denied the “episcopal succession” in toto—they solemnly declared immediately before their flight for heaven that they did not derive their ministerial office from the Pope but from Christ—they claimed no power over christians but that which their piety, talents and learning gave them—and persisted to the last in expressing their regret that the providence of God had not seen fit to permit them to imbue the whole English nation with those principles which afterwards actuated the Puritans.—Does not this destroy Episcopal ordination if it depend which it necessarily must upon the uninterrupted succession? Of these characters all sects of christians boast—but they were not Episcopalians in principle.—As Abraham longed to see the day of the Son of man, so did they pant for the diffusion of puritanism; could they arise from their graves, and be permitted again to make a short stay upon the earth, those who now fill the stations which they held, would be the very last men with whom they would become acquainted.—To what inconsistency is error reduced? They boast of having derived their origin from the “apostles’ successors,” the Roman bishops as they are impiously called, and yet glory in men who would spurn them from their presence. These godly men devoted their lives to prove the truth of their professions, whereas it may be justly affirmed that with scarcely any exceptions—the whole fraternity of bishops now in existence as their conduct proves would not surrender their sala-

ries to save the whole world from eternal misery.—Who makes the Episcopal Bishops, the Pope among Catholics, the King of England amongst Protestants—and let it be duly remembered, that every Roman Catholick Bishop at his ordination swears to obey the order of the Pope in opposition to all others, and in defiance of the civil government to which he swears allegiance, and to persecute hereties by all the means in his power: and what kind of an oath the church of England Bishops in this country took when they were ycleped right reverend fathers in God, I leave to God and their consciences, and how they can reconcile it with their duty to their country, I submit to the Casuists.—If the fountain be corrupt, can the streams be other than polluted—If the “Head of the church” be an earthly monarch, instead of the Lord our Saviour, how can that church be the true church?—if the men from whom the Protestant Episcopalians in these states professedly derive their origin, be as has been sufficiently proved, not the ministry of the gospel of Christ—what must be said of those whom they send? That they are not ministers of Christ.

The Pope’s Legate and the poor deluded, ignorant multitude who obey his commands, are not referred to in this discussion; they are past all amendment, except the energy of the spirit of God descend into their souls—but the Protestant Episcopalians derived their ministerial offices from the “head of the church,” the king of England—under him from the archbishop of Canterbury—let us see if he be not himself an incontrovertible proof that he is not a minister of Christ, and that those who have received the “Holy Ghost,” by the imposition of his hands—O impiety! what sacred names dost thou assume to conceal thy hideous nature—are not ministers of the Gospel. The present archbishop of Canterbury bears no single characteristic of a christian—he is mean, selfish, griping and avaricious to a degree—wallowing in riches, he

exacts his small rents with the hard heartedness of a usurer, and for his paltry trifle will ruin a whole family. He should be an example of piety to the kingdom, and to all his brethren ; but one of his exactions of all his tenants is, that they shall have no preaching nor praying in their houses.

He either in person or by deputy, laid hands upon the Protestant Episcopal bishops of America, and from whom they say that they received the Holy Ghost, when every body knows that the archbishop of Canterbury scarcely believes that there is such a being ; or if he does credit the Gospel in that particular, evinces that he pays no respect to him, by the want of the first christian principle—liberality ; by the want of the most necessary requisites in a christian minister—humility and zeal : and by his uniform active opposition to every scheme which is calculated to bring sinners to God, and to dissipate the clouds of superstition, ignorance and infidelity.

I therefore do assert that all christian ministers whose religious characters, and talents amount to the gospel standard are the only men who are appointed by him to dispense the gospel—and that Episcopalian ordination is not valid, is not Christian, is not of God.—Well then says N. L. by destroying Protestant Episcopacy—you have overturned Methodism !—No, Sir, the Methodists do not derive their right to administer or receive the sacrament from you—They profess to dissent from you altogether—did they claim to descend from you, you might say of them as your “mother of harlots,” says of you, that you are heretics—but they declare that they have never owned, and will never acknowledge your *unspiritual* jurisdiction.

You call Methodism a “new gospel”—this you know to be false—what difference is there between the doctrines of the thirty-nine articles which you so solemnly subscribed when you entered the church of England and those which you preached when a Methodist minister—A Polemic profoundly versed in controversial divinity might be able to point

but some nice minutia, but you cannot be expected to do it.

Christ says he is always in the midst of his worshipping people, but he is not in your church—else you would not preach to the clerk and the sexton. Do you believe in the divine inspiration and authority of the New Testament? if so you cannot be the church of Christ or you would experience the truth of the Saviour's promises—if you will continue to assert that you are the only true church—then you declare the gospel to be an “imposition upon the world.”

The most childish weakness of mind would not be led away by such “confident assertions”—But it seems that you and your deputies have been endeavouring to induce the married females on the Eastren Shore to believe that because you Episcopalians did not perform the marriage ceremony, or in other words did not *receive the fee* which is given to the officiating minister—that their children are all bastards—To insult—this is adding crime—should you endeavour when the laws of their country and the scriptures of God declare that the cohabitation of these people is strictly legal—to harrass their minds upon this most delicate point? Those of you who thus have endeavoured to destroy the natural affection of a parent for her offspring, and who wish to infix the most lasting wound in her heart, and the most indelible stigma on her character, are the “apostles successors” and the “only true church of Christ”!!! What makes deists, what promotes infidelity? your church. Whoever reads the scriptures, and then recollects that the Episcopalian Bishops boast to be the “sole true church of God,” and will not accurately investigate the subject, must be a Deist.—There is not now in existence, unless he be indeed half witted, or unable to think, one christian who would not renounce his profession of christianity—if he could for one moment BE GUILTY OF supposing that the Episcopalian was the “true church.”

FINIS.