



# The Burning Bush - Online article archive

## Ivan Foster replies to Dublin Critic.

This letter appeared in the "Belfast Newsletter" of August 11th.

It purports to be a reply to a letter by Rev Foster in response to criticism from a Roman Catholic with regards to his [article on IRA man Joe McCann](#).

### **Letter from Mr. John McFarland Campbell of Dublin.**

The Rev Ivan Foster (August 4) is quick to accuse Mr McEvoy of using weasel words.

But the Reverend gentleman should be careful with his own pronouncements lest he be found to be using weasel words himself.

If he is going to quote the texts of the Anglican Church to make a point, then it is important to quote them correctly and not mislead the readers of this newspaper by changing words here and there.

Mr Foster quotes the 22nd Article of Religion as saying that "Purgatory ... is a futile thing, foolishly conceived".

However, this is not the case. The Article says that: "The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Relics, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

If Mr Foster can be so lax about quoting this text accurately, one wonders how diligent he is about all other statements he has made.

One last thought, as Mr Foster is so keen on quoting the Articles of Religion of the Anglican Church, one wonders why he appears not to be an Anglican priest but a Free Presbyterian minister.

John McFarland Campbell, Dublin, 1

### **Ivan Foster's reply.**

Sir,

They say that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing! In Mr. John McFarland Campbell's case ('Letters' August 11th) it leads on to false accusations and smugness.

The quotation I gave is taken from the 'Church Society' website, a Church of England linked society, where not only are the Articles quoted as they first appeared in 1662 but also a rendition in modern English. The phrase 'a fond thing, vainly invented' is rendered by the Society's modern version as 'a futile thing, foolishly conceived.'

Mr. John McFarland Campbell may not have noticed that there is no difference in the meaning of the two renditions, merely a replacing of old adjectives with more modern ones. In both, it is stated that Rome's doctrines referred to in Article 22 are not of God but are of the devil, the inventor of false doctrine.

It is rather satisfying that this 'nit-picker' had only this 'fond thing, vainly invented' to complain about!

As to why I am not an Anglican, the answer is simple. I would not belong to a denomination that has repu-



# The Burning Bush - Online article archive

diated its own creed, questions the authority of the Bible, seeks reunion with Roman Catholicism, tolerates sodomy within its ranks and places women in roles God ordained for men.

I might also say that I reject the Anglican doctrine of Church Government and believe that the New Testament Church was one governed by Elders or Presbyters and deacons.

Ivan Foster.

12th August 2016.