PETITION

OF

THE PAPISTS OF IRELAND,

PREPARED BY

"*THE CATHOLIC BOARD,*"

AND ADOPTED AT AN AGGREGATE MEETING HELD IN DUBLIN ON THE 29TH OF JUNE, 1813,

AS THEIR PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TOGETHER WITH

LETTERS,

WRITTEN IN ENGLAND, IN SEPTEMBER 1813,

CONTAINING

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS,

WITH

ADDITIONAL NOTES, AND AN APPENDIX.

BY SIDNEY.

"For the sin of their mouth, and for the words of their lips, they shall be taken in their pride: and why? their preaching is of cursing and lies"

"They have imagined craftily against thy people: and taken counsel against thy secret ones."

"They have said, 'Come, and let us root them out, that they be no more a people: and that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance.'"

PSALMS.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY L. TUTE, 15, PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1814.

INTRODUCTION.

To some Readers, it may appear unnecessary, and perhaps extraordinary, to offer the following LETTERS to the Public, in their present form, so long after the *Petition* which first gave rise to them. But, as the Roman Catholics of Ireland have in contemplation ANOTHER Petition to Parliament; and, as gross exaggeration and misrepresentation, as to their physical strength, their sufferings, their merits, and their rights, constitute the basis of all their Petitions; it is humbly hoped these LETTERS may not prove unacceptable to those Readers who are sincerely attached to the Constitution in Church and State, as settled at the glorious Revolution; nor entirely useless to others, as they may put them upon their guard against the artful designs of the Enemies of that Constitution.

December, 1814.

PETITION,

&c.

"*To the Honourable the House of Commons, in Parliament assembled.*

"WE, the Roman Catholic People of Ireland, again approach the Legislature with a Statement of the Grievances under which we labour, and of which we most respectfully, but, at the same time, most firmly, solicit the *effectual* redress. Our wrongs are so notorious, and so numerous, that their minute detail is quite unnecessary, and would indeed be impossible, were it deemed expedient. Ages of persecution on the one hand, and of patience on the other, sufficiently attest our sufferings, and our submission. Privations have been answered only by Petition—indignities by remonstrance—injuries by forgiveness. It has been a misfortune to have suffered for the sake of our religion, but it has also been a pride to have borne the best testimony to the purity of our doctrine by the meekness of our endurance. Like the great type of our adoration, we have not merely been the passive victims of unjust infliction, but we have even endeavoured to expiate the cruelty of our oppressors. We have sustained the power which spurned us—we have nerved the arm that smote us—with a gratitude always superior to our privileges, we have lavished our strength, our talent, and our treasures,

AND BUOYED, UPON THE PRODIGAL EFFUSION OF OUR YOUNG BLOOD, THE TRIUMPHANT ARK OF BRITISH LIBERTY.

"We approach, then, with confidence, an enlightened Legislature. In the name of NATURE, we ask our Rights as MEN—in the name of the CONSTITUTION, we ask our Privileges as SUBJECTS—in the name of GOD, we ask the sacred Charter of unpersecuted Piety, as CHRISTIANS.

"Are Securities required of us?!—We offer them—the best Securities a Throne can have—the affections of a People. We offer Faith, that was never violated—Hearts, that were never corrupted—Valour, that never crouched. Every hour of *Peril* has proved our Allegiance, and EVERY FIELD OF EUROPE EXHIBITS ITS EXAMPLE.

"We abjure all *Temporal* authority, except that of our SOVEREIGN—we acknowledge no *Civil* tie, save that of our CONSTITUTION—and for our lavish and voluntary Expenditure, we only ask a Reciprocity of Benefits.

"Separating, as we do, our *Civil* Rights from our *Spiritual* Duties, we earnestly desire that they may not be confounded. We "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's"—but we must also "render unto GOD the things that are GOD'S."—Our Church could not DESCEND to claim a State Authority, nor do we ask for it a State Aggrandizement; its hopes, its powers, and its pretensions are of ANOTHER WORLD; and when we raise our hands to the State, our prayer is not that the fetters may be transferred to those hands which are raised for us to Heaven. WE WOULD NOT ERECT A SPLENDID SHRINE, EVEN TO LIBERTY, ON THE RUINS OF THE TEMPLE.

"In behalf then of FIVE MILLIONS of a brave and an insulted People, we call on the Legislature to annihilate the odious bondage which bows down the mental, physical, and moral energies of Ireland; and, in the name of that Gospel which excludes all distinctions, we ask FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE FOR THE WHOLE CHRISTIAN WORLD."

SIR,

It is not my intention, in the present Letter, to enter into any remarks upon "*the manly and decisive manner in which this new Petition embodies the sentiments of the whole of Catholic Ireland,*" as an orator, in his introductory speech, *modestly* expressed himself, respecting this rare production of the '*wise men of Gotham;*' which term, I conceive, may with as much propriety be applied to 'the Catholic Board,'* as it lately was to the learned Authors of 'the Penal Laws.' But I shall pretty much confine myself to a few observations, upon the numerical account of 'the emphatical people of Ireland,' as given in the last paragraph of their *humble petition;* reserving for another opportunity a brief review of the conduct and merits of the claimants, and an examination into the nature and extent of their demands; as also of the consequences that must result from further concession.

The Roman Catholic Committee, assembled in February, 1791, first made the assertion in 1792, that the Papists of Ireland were to the Protestants in the ratio of three to one, and they admitted the latter to amount to one million; of course, there were three millions of Papists. Mr. Grattan, the constant, zealous, and doubtless DISINTERESTED† Advocate for Emancipation, stated their numbers at three millions, in his speech in the Irish House of Commons, early in the year 1793—it is to be presumed on their own authority. In a very few years, they increased, *by their own account*, to three millions and a half;

* The English Protestant Reader may form a just idea of the opinion entertained of "the Catholic Board," by the friends of good order, from the Resolutions adopted by the Grand Juries throughout Ireland, at the Spring Assizes, 1814; from the Resolutions of County Magistrates; from the speeches in Parliament of many of the advocates of what is called "Emancipation;" and also from the Lord Lieutenant's Proclamation of the 3d of June, (see appendix,) suppressing the Board, under the authority of the Convention Act. It is, however, said that they have, Proteus like, assumed another form; and are henceforth to be distinguished as "*The Friends of Religious and Civil Liberty;*"—Such friends, I ween, as the Popish Parliament in the reign of James the Second, had they the same opportunity.

† The Roman Catholic Committee were certainly very liberal to *their friends.* Over and above the aid they afforded to Defenders and United Irishmen, out of "*the voluntary subscriptions raised, in order to defray the necessary expences of their legal and constitutional exertions,*" they paid 1,500l. to Theobald W. Tone; 500l. to the Hon. Simon Butler; 1,500l. to Wm. T. Jones, M. P.; and 2,000 guineas to Richard Burke, Esq.; the two last for advocating their cause. But I would not have it understood that I mean to insinuate that any *Patriots* of the present day are in their pay: quite the contrary; they are solely actuated by *genuine patriotism* and *pure liberality!*

and in their Petition, presented to the Imperial Parliament in the Session of 1804, they stated their numbers then to amount to four millions; an increase of one third, in the short space of eleven years, notwithstanding the many thousands that must have fallen in different actions with his Majesty's Forces in the two intervening rebellions, not to speak of the numbers that fell by the hand of the executioner, or were transported, or fled from justice; notwithstanding, that, *by their own account*, they had almost exclusively supplied his Majesty's army with soldiers, and his navy with sailors. 'The Statement of the Penal Laws,' stated the Papists, in 1811, (the time the work was put to press) to amount to four millions two hundred thousand, *at the lowest computation*; and, *mirabile dictu!* it appears by *this* new Petition, if it be not a misnomer to call such a composition a Petition, that '*the emphatical people*' had increased in June, 1813, to five millions!!* With what view this grossly exaggerated account of the numbers of the Papists is given; with what view '*the men in buckram*,' with their, tenable passes,' and 'the readiest means of attack and defence,' are thus set in array, I am at a loss to determine, unless it be to deceive and intimidate: but I trust the good sense of the Protestants of the United Empire, will enable them to see through the deception; and I have no apprehension that their spirit will be subdued by intimidation.

But, the question will naturally follow, have the Protestants of Ireland increased in an equal proportion? No such thing! The poor Protestants, 'a handful of bustling bigots,' have made a retrograde motion in the way of population! In the year 1792, the Roman Catholic Committee allowed that they then amounted to one million: but the learned authors of the 'Statement of the Penal Laws,' have informed us, that their numbers had decreased to eight hundred thousand, in the same space of time (19 years) in which the Papists had advanced from three millions, to four millions two hundred thousand, *at least*.—So much for fiction, and now for a little plain truth.

* At an Aggregate Meeting in the Summer of 1814, a Popish Orator stated their numbers then to be seven millions!!! We learn, however, from Leland's History of Ireland, that, in the reign of the second Charles, "they *magnified* their own power and consequence in Ireland, as well as their attachment to the Crown."; so that the language of gasconade is nothing new in Irish Papists.

From the 10th Article of the Persuasions and Suggestions of the Irish Catholics to Charles the Second, supposed to have been drawn up by Talbot, Titular Archbishop of Dublin, and found in the house of his brother, Colonel Talbot, on the 1st of July, 1671, (as given in Appendix, No. 2, to Archbishop King's "State of the Protestants of Ireland,")—we learn, that, at that period, there were reckoned to be "twelve hundred thousand souls in Ireland;" of which number, by the 9th Article, they claimed "*six to one of all others*," as modern Roman Catholics now do. By an account, however, of the population of Ireland, taken the following year (1672) by Sir William Petty, under the authority of Government, it appears the aggregate numbers did not exceed eleven hundred thousand souls; and in sixty years after, (that is, in 1732,) when another enumeration was taken, the whole population did not amount to two millions. We have also the evidence of a Popish writer, as to the accuracy of this last enumeration; and it is worthy of notice how much he differs from his *pious* predecessor, Talbot—and from his learned successors, the authors of "The Penal Laws," as to the great preponderance of the Papists over "*all others*."—Thomas Burke, Titular Bishop of Ossory, in his "Hibernica Dominicana," mentions a census taken by the Popish Clergy, in the year 1731, by which it appears, that the Protestants amounted to seven hundred thousand four hundred and fifty-eight, and the Papists to one million three hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and sixty-eight—*not two to one*, notwithstanding the assertion of "*six to one*" in the article already quoted; and only ten thousand two hundred and twenty-six above two millions:—and yet, though the Reverend Author complains, that the proportion had *very greatly encreased on the Protestant side*, from 1731 to 1762, (when his work was first published at Brussels,) owing to the severe laws then in force against Popery, the operation of the Protestant Charter-schools, and other causes; the very learned expounders of "the Penal Laws," with equal *modesty* and *truth*, inform us, that the Protestant population had encreased only ninety-nine thousand five hundred and forty-two, in 80 years,—while the '*emphatical people*' had, in the same space of time, added to their numbers three millions six hundred and ninety thousand two hundred and

thirty-two, as appears by this *new Petition* to the House of Commons.

That the Reverend Author already mentioned was an *orthodox believer*, no Papist will deny; and, to convince Protestant readers that he was, I beg leave to submit to them a short extract from the work before cited, being a remark upon an oath of allegiance, introduced into a Bill under the consideration of the Irish House of Lords, in the year 1757, to secure the Protestant succession to the throne:—'Would it not,' says the *very reverend Author*, 'exceed the greatest imaginable absurdity, that a Catholic 'Priest, who instructs his Catholic people in the will of 'God, from scripture and tradition, by his discourse and 'action, and nourisheth them with the Sacrament of the 'Church, should swear fidelity to King George, as long 'as he professeth a heterodox religion, or has a wife of 'that religion? That then, and in that case, the same 'Catholic Priest ought instantly to abjure the very King 'to whom he had before sworn allegiance." And in a supplement to his work, published in 1772, he gives the opinion of the Pope's Legate, at Brussels, in the year 1768, respecting an oath then under the consideration of the Irish Parliament, that 'the abhorrence and detestation of 'the doctrine, that *faith is not to be kept with heretics*, 'and that *Princes deprived by the Pope may be deposed and 'murdered by their subjects*, as expressed in that proposed 'oath, are absolutely intolerable—because those doctrines 'are defended and contended for by most Catholic na-'tions, and the Holy See has frequently followed them in 'practice.' On the whole he decides, that 'as the oath 'is in its whole extent unlawful, so in its nature it is in-'valid, null, and of no effect, in so much that it can by 'no means bind or oblige consciences."—Who will now venture to dispute the *orthodoxy* of the Popish Bishop?

To shew that Protestants bear a nearer proportion to '*the emphatical people of Ireland*,' than Popish writers will allow, I shall lay before the reader an extract from a work entitled, "A Refutation of the Statement of the Penal Laws," which is worthy of the serious attention of the Protestants of the Empire, as is also "A Refutation of the Second Part of the Book," both published by Wm. Watson, of Dublin; nor can I avoid recommending to their notice, "A Series of Letters, by a Protestant of Ire-

land," published by C. Chapple, in London, which, though only an epitome of the History of Ireland since the Reformation, '*contains a mass of the most important information* '*on the Romish question, with strong and powerful arguments* '*and remarks.*'

'By the returns' (says our author,) 'given in Dr. 'Duigenan's Tract, of the number of beggars admitted 'into the House of Industry, in Dublin, for ten years 'successively, it appears that the number of Protestants 'during those periods were 6,403, and of Roman Catho-'lics 17,817, not three to one among the mendicants of 'the community; and it is well known that the Protestants 'of the lower orders, owing to the regularity of their 'conduct and habits of frugality, are not in general ne-'cessitated to apply for charitable relief: and we have 'been assured by a gentleman of veracity, who, in 1808, 'visited the Poor-house in Cork, that the Roman Catho-'lic paupers, in that public receptacle for misery, did not 'exceed in a greater proportion; yet all the beggars in 'the South flock to the House of Industry in Cork, the 'chief establishment of the kind in the "Catholic South 'of Ireland.'—There is a public document of no small 'weight, in contradiction of the assertions in the "State-'ment" of the great preponderance of the Roman Catholic 'population. We allude to the returns called for by, and 'furnished to Lord Wellington, when Chief Secretary in 'Ireland, by the officiating Clergymen of the several pa-'rishes in Ireland, of the number of common or poor 'Schools (not parochial or public foundations), and of 'the poor children attending them, distinguishing the 'Protestants and Catholics. These returns were furnished 'from seventeen dioceses only: by them it appears, that 'the number of poor Schools, kept by masters who were 'Protestants, was 1,255; and the number of those kept 'by Roman Catholics, 2,565. And that the number of 'Protestant scholars attending those schools, was 45,045; 'and of Roman Catholics, 115,072. The schools of the 'most Protestant diocese in this kingdom are not included 'in these returns; and, notwithstanding, the number of 'the schoolmasters is not two to one in favour of the 'Roman Catholics—and the proportion of the scholars of 'their religion, about two and a half. And yet we are 'told in the "Statement," that "*the Catholics are em-*

'*phatically the People of Ireland!!!*" Emphatically! when 'the disproportion of their numbers to the Protestants is 'not probably half of what their statement asserts—and 'those (their Nobility and their Gentry excepted,) com-'prising the most indigent and ignorant people of the 'community, and composing in fact—(shall we ever be 'pardoned the expression?)—the *mob* of the country;—'whilst the vast majority of the landed, the funded, and 'commercial property of Ireland, is in the hands of '*Protestants;* when the State and Church are Protestant, 'four-fifths of the armed yeomanry Protestant, and at 'least the same proportion of the other military force, 'since the interchange of the militias, Protestant; when, 'in fine, the power and force, and strength of the king-'dom---the rank and wealth, and station---the knowledge 'and experience in public business---the eminence in all 'the learned professions---the monopoly in arts and sci-'ences---the literature, education and talents, and manners 'of the country, (the leaders of the Catholic Committee 'always excepted,) are Protestant. And yet the authors 'of the "Statement," *well knowing the premises,* have as-'serted, that the Roman Catholics are *emphatically* the 'People of Ireland.'

It is to be hoped, however, that, when the "Act for taking an Account of the Population of Ireland," passed in the 52d year of his Majesty's reign, shall have been carried into effect*, it will put a stop to these hyperbolical and mischievously intended statements of popish demagogues and incendiaries, as to the great preponderance of their numbers over Protestants: at least, it will shew to the Protestants of Great Britain, how little faith is to be placed in such statements. In the mean time, let Protestants be watchful over their dearest interests; let them always bear in mind the consummate art, and persevering spirit of the enemies to those interests; nor let them postpone too long the performance of their bounden duty to themselves and their posterity---Petitioning the Legislature in defence of the Constitution in Church and State.

SIDNEY.

* Ten months after these Letters were written, the first volume of "A Statistical Account, or Parochial Survey of Ireland, by WILLIAM SHAW MASON," has been published; and, when completed, this work will be found worthy of the attention of the Protestants of the Empire.

SECOND LETTER.

SIR,

In my last Letter, I confined myself to general remarks upon the grossly exaggerated statement of the preponderance of the Popish population of Ireland over the Protestant, so impudently insisted upon by Popish Writers and Popish Orators, and at least so ignorantly advanced by their advocates; nor have I a doubt, that every impartial man, endued with common sense, will consider that hyperbolical account of the physical strength of the "*emphatical people*," set forth with a view to deceive and intimidate. The object of the present shall be, to give a succinct account of the system of Concession and Conciliation pursued by the Irish Government, and Irish Parliament, towards his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Ireland, which may not prove uninteresting to some readers; and it may be useful to such as are unacquainted with the real state of Ireland, at a juncture when the Papists of that part of the Empire are using every means that art and sophistry can devise, for the subversion of our glorious Constitution in Church and State.

The first relaxation of the laws affecting Papists in Ireland, was in the year 1774, when two Bills were passed by the Irish Parliament---by one of which they were secured in lending money on mortgages; and the other enabled them, under certain provisions, to take long leases. In the session of 1778, another Bill was passed, allowing them to take leases for 999 years, and abolishing all the penal statutes against discoveries: and upon this occasion, many of the Roman Catholics publicly declared, that "*they were fully satisfied**."

* In the reign of Charles the Second, we find, that "at the time when the Popish party *could avow their designs*, it plainly appeared, that nothing could content them but the utter abolition of these Laws. For the present, however, they affected some moderation." (See Leland's History of Ireland.)—From a review, therefore, of their conduct, subsequent to this declaration of *full satisfaction*, it is fair to infer, that it was not made in sincerity; but that, "like public foes," they waited an opportunity "to seek advantage from public calamity."

In February 1782, a bill was brought into the House of Commons, which was afterwards divided into three bills; and two were passed: the first enabled Roman Catholics to take, hold, and dispose of lands and hereditaments, in the same manner as Protestants; and several penalties were removed from Popish Priests, on their taking the oath of allegiance, prescribed by the Irish Acts of the 13th and 19th years of George the Third: the second was "an Act to allow persons professing the Popish religion, to teach Schools in this kingdom, and for regulating the education of the Papists; and also to repeal parts of certain laws, relative to the guardianship of their children": but the third, to enable Protestants and Roman Catholics to intermarry, was negatived.

In 1792, Sir Hercules Langrishe's Bill, as it is called, having been introduced by him, was passed; which gave to Roman Catholics the practice and profession of the law, restored to them education entire and unrestrained, allowed intermarriages between them and Protestants, and allowed Roman Catholic merchants and traders an unlimited number of apprentices. And for these boons the more moderate Roman Catholics expressed the warmest gratitude; but those of a contrary description were not to be satisfied.

In February, 1793, another bill, for the further relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Ireland, was brought into the House of Commons by the present Earl of Buckinghamshire, then Chief Secretary in Ireland; and was supported by the influence of Government. This bill gave to them the elective franchise *unqualified*, which the year before they had only required under certain restrictions, as appears by the ultimatum * of the Roman Catholic Committee, then legislating for their Body in Dublin; and from whence have flowed all the evils that now agitate Ireland: it also rendered them competent to be summoned, and to serve upon grand and petty juries; it permitted them to carry arms, and to bear commissions in the army and navy; it removed every restraint affecting

* A right of voting in Counties, *only for Protestant Members of Parliament*; in such a manner, however, as that a Roman Catholic Freeholder should not vote, unless he either rented and cultivated a farm of twenty pounds per annum, in addition to his forty-shilling freehold, or else possessed a freehold to the amount of twenty pounds per annum.'

property: in short, it put the middling and lower classes upon a perfect equality with Protestants of the same ranks in society; and it only excluded the few noblemen and gentlemen, who possess estates in Ireland, from sitting in Parliament, and from filling a few offices in the State.

In 1795, Mr. Secretary Hobart, now Earl of Buckinghamshire, moved in the House of Commons, that his Majesty might be impowered and authorized to enable Roman Catholics to endow a College and University, and Schools, for the education of their Priests; and, with great liberality, the sum of forty thousand pounds was voted, a tract of land was purchased at Maynooth, in the county of Kildare, and a splendid College was erected; for the support of which, a large sum was annually voted by the Irish Parliament, previous to the Union, and since continues to be granted by the Imperial Parliament. I shall only add, that Dr. Hussy, Titular Bishop of Waterford, and President of this Royal Roman Catholic College, was obliged to fly to France, to escape justice for a treasonable libel, in the form of a *pastoral letter*, published by him in the Spring of 1798; and that nearly forty of the Students joined the rebels, and fought at Kilcock, and other places, against their beneficent Sovereign, some of whom fell in battle, and the remainder escaped to France and America: but, after it has been ascertained who were conquerors—that is after the suppression of the Rebellion in 1798, the Governors of the College expelled sixteen other students for disloyalty, who had not actually taken up arms. *

I shall now lay before the curious reader an extract from a pamphlet † published in the year 1798, entitled "Considerations on the situation to which Ireland is reduced by the Government of Lord Camden," stating the commencement and progress of riots in Ireland during the present reign; and the data and the subjects of the statutes men-

* The reader will find a more diffuse account in "Letters shewing the Insecurity and Dangers of Catholic Emancipation, by a Protestant of Ireland," published by C. Chapple, of Pall Mall, London, and sold by Wm. Watson, No. 7, Capel-street, in Dublin.

† The motto chosen by the Author of this little Tract (an address of the Earl of Carhampton to the Viceroy) will convey some idea of the system of forbearance pursued previous to the explosion of Rebellion. "If, said his Lordship, it shall please your Excellency to permit them to go to WAR with us, and will permit us only to go to LAW with them, the issue of the contest may be readily foreseen."

tioned will shew, that concession to, and discontent, amounting to outrage, of "the emphatical people," have ever kept an equal pace.

'As to punish, (says our Author) instead of to conciliate outrage, is the first and natural thought of brave and prudent men, the 3d of George the Third, chap. 19, was immediately enacted; but being (like many other laws) defectively executed, the riot and the clamour still continued. At length, Parliament was prevailed upon to adopt a system, which has since acquired the names of CONCESSION and CONCILIATION. As a commencement of this system, the 13th and 14th of George the Third, chap. 35, was enacted, to enable a particular class of the King's subjects to testify their allegiance to him.'

'What followed?

'The moment they had sworn allegiance to their King, they renounced their allegiance to their God; and in the same year that gave them the enabling statute above-mentioned, their atrocities produced the necessity of passing the first of the Chalking Acts.'

'Oaths have ever been fatal to the morals of this country: for every man that took the oath of allegiance by day, a wretch took his stand at night, armed with a knife, to maim the King's soldiers; and even the unoffending cattle, belonging to any subject noted for his loyalty.'

'What followed?

'Despising the lesson of experience, uneasy, and terrified by unremitting cruelty and outrage, Parliament was tempted to another act of CONCESSION, in order to produce CONCILIATION. The 17th and 18th of George the Third, chap. 49, was accordingly passed, to enable Catholics to take leases for 999 years, or five lives.'

'What followed?

'Renewed clamour. The necessity (produced by extended and varied cruelty and outrage) of amending and extending the Riot and Chalking Acts, (the 17th and 18th of George the Third, and the 12th and 20th of George the Third.) Then also sprung, from the blood spilled by the chalking knife, the modern race of PATRIOTS, *with their list of grievances and oppressions*, and their doctrine of unalienable rights.'

'What followed?'

'To disarm the hand of the ASSASIN, and to still the

'tongue of the PATRIOT, Parliament gave the Act of '1782. Upon an express stipulation of *plenary satis-* '*faction*, the Catholics received a full and perfect equality 'of right to property.'

'What followed?

'The attack directly to establish a right to power; 'the subsequent union of the priest-ridden Catholic with 'the republican Presbyterian; the open avowal of a 'maxim long acted upon, though never before acknow- 'ledged—the assertion, that it is RIGHT AND MORAL to 'take advantage of public and imperial war and calamity, 'in order to enforce civil and local innovation. * A short 'but pointed history of our progress, and our arrival at 'the present state (1798), may be read in the preambles to 'the 3d of George the Third, chap. 19, and to the Act 'commonly called the Insurrection Act: by the pream- 'bles to those Acts, it appears, that our FIRST STEP was 'irregular riot, and our LAST, systematic rebellion. The 'space between these extremities is filled by statutes of 'CONCILIATION; CONCEDED, first to the pitch-fork and 'chalking-knife, and latterly to the firelock and the 'pike.'

I also may ask, what followed?

Notwithstanding the royal mercy extended to many for their former treasons, the "*emphatical people*" again had recourse to the firelock and pike, in 1803, under the guidance of the survivors of the United Irishmen, and of the Roman Catholic Committee, who had assumed the title of "*the Provisional Government;*" and to enable them to carry into effect their long-laid scheme of separation from Great Britain, Thomas Braughal was sent to Paris, to negociate with the tyrant of France for aid. At different periods too, since, has Ireland been convulsed by banditti exclusively popish, and equally hostile to the British connection, and the Protestant religion; first, under the appellation of Threshers; secondly, of Caravats; thirdly, of Defenders, again organized; † and lastly, of Carders; of

* Vide Mr. Grattan's answer in 1795, to the Address of the Papists of the City of Dublin, signed by Thomas Braughall, as Chairman, and John Sweetman, as Secretary, in the appendix to the 'Letters by a Protestant.'

† The oath of this new order of Defenders will be found in the third Letter by VERITAS, "explaining the Rise, Progress, and Principles of the Orange Institution in Ireland," lately published by L. TUTE, No. 15, Parliament-street, in Dublin.

whom the last-named took their title from the instruments of torture they used—wool-cards, with which they excoriated the backs of their victims; and in some instances, without regard to sex, they set their bare posteriors upon gridirons, placed on fires. And the country is now threatened with a revival of that demoniac Society, "*the United Irishmen,*" upon a new and improved plan; though the system has never been entirely abolished. *

Such, Sir, are the people, who, on the meeting of Parliament, are to appear before the Legislature in the guise of HUMBLE PETITIONERS, for the subversion of the Constitution in Church and State; and who, in the first paragraph of their Manifesto, (petition I think it can hardly be called,) say—"ages of persecution on the one hand, and "of patience on the other, sufficiently attest our sufferings and our submission. Privations have been answered "only by petition—indignities by remonstrance—injuries "by forgiveness. It has been a misfortune to have suffered for the sake of our religion; but it has also been "a pride to have borne the best testimony to the purity of "our doctrine by the meekness of our endurance. Like "the great type of our adoration, we have not only been "the passive victims of unjust infliction, but we have even "endeavoured to expiate the cruelty of our oppressors. "We have sustained the power which spurned us—we "have nerved the arm which smote us—with a gratitude "always superior to our privileges, we have lavished our "strength, our talent, and our treasures, and *buoyed, upon*

* To these may be added the more modern Ribbon-men, who were sanctioned by the Ex-Catholic Board, before the Lord Lieutenant's Proclamation obliged those agitators to dissolve their illegal assembly. From the Oath of Confederacy here given, the reader may see the same spirit that has distinguished the Papists of Ireland since the Reformation;—"I do swear in the "presence of my dear Brethren, and by the Cross of the holy St. Peter, and "our blessed Lady Mary, that I will maintain and support our holy Reli"gion, and that I will destroy all Heretics, and as far as in my power I will "not spare property or person—not one excepted. I do also swear that I "will assist you, my Brethren, in every design against the Heretics, as so "called by our most holy Father the Pope; and I do further swear that I will "be ready in twelve hours warning, to put that, our glorious design, into "execution against the Heretics of every sort, so help me God, by the Cross "of St. Peter, and make me faithful to this obligation."

Isaiah 35 c. 5 v.

"*The eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.*"

" *the prodigal effusion of our young blood, the triumphant* " *ark of British Liberty!!!*"—I shall not trouble you further at present, as I conceive that any thing bordering upon common sense and matter of fact must appear vapid to the reader, after this highly-wrought *romance* of '*the emphatical People of Ireland.*'

SIDNEY.

THIRD LETTER.

SIR,

By the Act passed in February, 1793, giving to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, besides the other immunities enumerated in my last Letter, the Elective Franchise unqualified, three Popish Earls, four Viscounts, two Barons*, three or four Baronets, and a very inconsiderable number of Gentlemen, have been excluded from seats in the House of Peers and the House of Commons, and from the following offices and situations:—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord High Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Chief Justice of the King's Bench or Common Pleas, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Justice of the King's Bench or Common Pleas, or Baron of the Exchequer, Judge of the Court of Admiralty, Master of the Rolls, Secretary of State, Keeper of the Privy Seal, Teller of the Exchequer or Auditor-General, Lieutenant or Governor of Counties, Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor of this kingdom, Member of his Majesty's

* To these nine Noblemen, I must now add two—a Viscount and a Baron; as I find, upon looking over the list of the Irish Peers, which before I had not an opportunity of doing, that they have lately assumed the mark (‡), to denote that they are *Roman Catholics*. The first sat in a late Parliament as an English Commoner, and voted for "Catholic Emancipation."—The reader will find, in the first of "A Series of Letters, by a Protestant of Ireland," some remarks upon such friends to our Church; but every one sincerely attached to that Church must rejoice when the mask is thrown off—as less is to be apprehended from open enemies, than from pretended friends.

most honourable Privy Council, Prime Serjeant, Attorney-General, Solicitor-General, Second or Third Serjeant, or King's Council, Masters in Chancery, Provost or Fellows of the University of Dublin, Postmaster-General, Master of the Ordnance, Commander-in-Chief of his Majesty's Forces, Generals on the Staff, and Sheriffs and Sub-Sheriffs of any county in the kingdom.

These the Papists of Ireland have called "the remnant:" to cut off which from the Protestants, and to secure it to themselves—(that is, to make Ireland what the learned expounders of 'the Penal Laws' have presumptuously styled it, "Catholic,")—have 'the emphatical people' been labouring, with indefatigable industry and perseverance, for upwards of twenty-one years. For be it remembered, that notwithstanding the declaration of their Committee, in October 1791, that 'it is not for the Irish 'Catholics, armed as their cause is with reason and with 'justice, like public foes, to seek advantage from public 'calamity;' notwithstanding the avowal of the Popish Convention, that 'they would satisfactorily acquiesce in 'having the King, the House of Peers, the House of Com-'mons, and the Church of Ireland, exclusively Protestant;' notwithstanding the ultimatum of their Committee, in February 1792, as given in a note to my last Letter; yet, in May 1792, when the affairs of the empire bore a most inauspicious appearance, 'like public foes seeking advantage from public calamity,' they demanded 'the remnant' of the constitution to be surrendered to them; and so energetic were they in their proceedings, that the Lord Lieutenant (the Earl of Westmoreland) and Privy Council deemed it necessary for the public safety to issue a proclamation, bearing date the 21st of May, 1792, and stating, 'that 'seditious writings and persons had attempted to villify and 'bring into contempt the wise and wholesome provisions 'made at the time of the glorious Revolution: and that 'correspondence had been entered into with persons in 'foreign parts, to forward the above criminal purposes.' Such was the spirit of conciliation at that day, that the elective franchise was conceded to them nine months after; with what wisdom succeeding events have shewn.

It must indeed be allowed, that after that bill had received the Royal Assent, the Roman Catholic Committee did pre-

pare and present humble and loyal addresses to our beneficent Sovereign, and to his Majesty's Lieutenant, the Earl of Westmoreland. They also voted 'the sum of two thousand pounds, to be applied to the erecting a statue to our most gracious Sovereign, George III. as *a monument of our gratitude* for the important privileges which we have obtained from Parliament, through his paternal recommendation.' But between retaining-fees to their numerous advocates, and providing Counsel and Agents for the defence of Defenders, tried for seditious riots, and of United Irishmen for high treason,* the demands upon *the Catholic Treasury* were so heavy, that they could never carry into effect this splendid scheme of gratitude; and the sentiment, it is to be feared from their subsequent conduct, was no more than a flitting shadow.

Having already exposed the falsehood of the statement in their new Petition of the amazing increase of the Papists of Ireland, (from which, however, the reader may learn to estimate their other bold and unqualified assertions;) I shall now trouble you with a few observations on the Prayer of that Petition.

After exhibiting to our view a highly-coloured caricature, representing, on the one hand, '*the ages of persecution*,' they have suffered under a Protestant Government—and on the other, their own meekness, patience, and forbearance, which could, they inform us, only have been equalled by what had been exemplified in the conduct of our blessed Redeemer in the days of his flesh—they say, 'we approach, even with confidence, an enlightened Legislature. In the name of Nature, we ask our rights as men—in the name of the Constitution, we ask our privileges as subjects—in the name of God, we ask the sacred charter of unpersecuted piety, as Christians.'

'Ages of persecution,' they assert, they have suffered!!! 'Unpersecuted piety' they ask from 'an enlightened Legislature!!!' Does the system of concession and conciliation pursued by the Irish Government towards his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, from the year 1774 to the year 1795, as given in my last Letter, evince any of that spirit

* Priest Quigley, who acted as *Chancellor of the Exchequer*, regularly went the circuits; and he was enabled to vie with the Irish Government in feeing Counsel for their defence. He was afterwards hanged at Maidstone.

of persecution they so loudly and so unjustly complain of? Is it a proof of 'persecuted piety' that, prior to the erection of the College of Maynooth, popish youths* were admitted into the University of Dublin for education, in violation too of the charter? Are the endowments of that College for the education of Popish priests, at an expence to the nation of forty thousand pounds---the enlargement of it afterwards, at a further considerable expence---and the annual grant of nine or ten thousand pounds; are these, I repeat, the proofs they would bring forward in support of the charge, that 'they have suffered for the sake of religion?' Is it a proof of 'persecuted piety,' that in the city of Dublin a Popish Priest is paid one hundred pounds per annum, and in each county forty or fifty pounds per annum, by presentment, under an Act of Parliament, for attendance in the gaol of Newgate, and in the county gaols, to administer to the spiritual wants and to the comforts of unhappy prisoners of that communion?†

'Ages of persecution!!!' 'unprecedented piety!!!' Is this the splendid 'monument of gratitude' they mean to erect 'to their most gracious Sovereign, for the important 'privileges which they have obtained from Parliament, 'through his paternal recommendation?'

It is a fact, and it must appear clear to every rational unprejudiced man, that the Papists of Ireland, of the

* It is worthy of remark, that a Committee of Assassination was formed in the University by those very youths, which was discovered in a manner not dissimilar to that which led to the developement of the Popish Gunpowder Plot in the reign of King James the First. A Visitation was held by the late Earl of Clare, as Vice-Chancellor of the University; and all who had taken the oath of secrecy of the United Irishmen were expelled; but none were tried, the ringleaders having fled.

† A circumstance worthy of notice has occurred since these Letters were written. The Grand Jury, at Easter Term, 1814, appointed Mr. Duffy, a Priest of most unexceptionable character, to attend the Popish prisoners in Newgate, at a salary of 100l. per annum, to be paid by presentment; but Dr. Troy, assuming an authority superior to the Grand Jury, or even the Court of King's Bench, objected to this nomination, without bringing any imputation against Mr. Duffy—and appointed another: upon which the Grand Jury appealed to the Court, and Mr. Duffy was confirmed in his situation. A similar attempt was lately made by a Titular Bishop in a Northern County; but the Grand Jury for the County put the question to rest, by declaring they would only present for whom they had appointed.—From hence we may form some idea of Papal humility and moderation!

middling and lower classes, enjoy as much civil liberty as Protestants of the same ranks in society. The popish artificer, farmer, and merchant, can exercise his ingenuity and industry with the same freedom and security as a Protestant: he is equally secured in the enjoyment of the fruit of his industry; he can lay it out in any manner he may think will tend most to the advantage of his family: he can devise it as he may think proper—to his children, if he has any; to his relations: or, notwithstanding the assertion in the Statement of the Penal Laws,' for charitable purposes; nay, even for masses for the repose of souls, without the interference of an heretical government: he can appoint guardians and trustees for his children; but, in the event of his dying intestate, they will become wards in Chancery, in the same manner as the children of Protestants: he can intermarry with a Protestant: he can keep arms, to defend himself and property from the midnight robber; but they must be registered, as the arms of Protestants are: the Bar, the Army, and the Navy, are open to his sons: he can fill the office of Magistrate in a county: he is competent to serve on Grand or Petty Juries; and finally, as a freeholder, he can vote in cities and counties for Members of Parliament. All these immunities have been conceded to the Roman Catholics of Ireland since our most gracious Sovereign's accession to the throne, and in the short space of 19 years---that, too, frequently on an assurance of *plenary satisfaction* on the part of the Roman Catholics.

The true definition of the word '*Toleration*,' is---a permission, under the laws, to every individual dissenting from the doctrines of the Established Religion of the State, to profess the religious opinions most consonant to his own feelings, from his interpretation of Scripture; and to adhere to that form of public worship which is most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience. I therefore do contend, that, so far from '*suffering persecution on account of their religion*,' the Roman Catholics of Ireland have long enjoyed, and do enjoy, perfect religious liberty, not only as to internal faith, but also as to external worship---nay, even long before the relaxation of the penal laws, as they were little more than a dead letter.

But an inconsiderable number of Noblemen and Gentlemen are excluded from a few offices of trust under the

Crown, on account of entertaining principles* hostile to our ecclesiastical and civil establishments; and, so long as any thing remains to be given up, Popish ambition and thirst of power are not to be satisfied. Concession on the part of Government has uniformly led to fresh demands from the Papists of Ireland—frequently in violation of solemn assurances and plighted faith—until at length they *insist upon* '*the total and unqualified*' surrender of the Constitution; and, '*as they are determined to obtain their freedom unconditionally*,' they offer in their *Petition* only the following *wordy* securities, which may be compared to '*a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal:*'—'Are securities 'required of us?! We offer them—the best securities a 'Throne can have—the Affections of a People. We offer 'Faith, that was never violated—Hearts, that were never 'corrupted—Valour, that never crouched. Every hour of 'peril has proved our *allegiance, and every field of Europe* 'exhibits examples.'

"*The Affections of a People!*" "*Faith, that was never violated!!*"—"*Hearts, that were never corrupted!!*" "*Every hour of peril has proved our allegiance!!!*"———

Surely, Sir, there never was a more impudent libel on common sense, than to suppose the Protestants of this part of the United Empire so totally ignorant of the history of Ireland for the last 20 years, as to give credit to such high-sounding bombast.

I cannot pursue the subject at present, but I shall resume it in a future Letter. In the mean time, I most earnestly recommend to the serious attention of Protestant readers the following passage from a Sermon, preached by the late Bishop Sherlock on the 7th of June, 1716, which I think very applicable to the present time—not only from the danger to our Constitution in Church and State, but also from the apathy with which Protestants seem to view that danger:—

'Our fathers, who lived under the dread of Popery 'and arbitrary power, are most of them gone off the stage; 'and have carried with them the experience which we 'their sons stand in need of, to make us earnest to preserve

* For an exposition of those principles, I refer the reader to Doctor Dromgoole's Speech, delivered in the Catholic Board on the 8th of December, several weeks after these Letters were written.

'the blessings of liberty and pure religion, which they have 'bequeathed us. O! that I had words to represent to the 'present generation, the miseries which their fathers un- 'derwent; that I could describe their fears and anxieties; 'their restless nights, and uneasy days; when every morn- 'ing threatened to usher in, *the last day of England's* 'liberty. *Had men such a sense of the miseries of the times* 'past, *it would teach them what consequences they were to* 'expect *from any successful attempt against the present* 'establishment.'

FOURTH LETTER.

SIR,

In the name and on behalf of their body, constituting, *by their own account*, five-sixths of the population of Ireland, have the "Catholic Board" offered '*the affections of a people—Faith, that was never violated—Hearts, that were never corrupted—Valour, that never crouched—Allegiance, proved in every hour of peril*,' as securities to a Protestant State, for an unconditional surrender of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Establishments; and to the Protestants of the Empire at large, for the subversion of the Constitution, erected by the wisdom, and cemented by the blood of our ancestors at the glorious Revolution.

It is not less the duty, than it is generally the business of every prudent man, about to lend his money, to investigate the nature of the security offered to him. Let Protestants, therefore, collectively adopt that line of conduct for the preservation of their dearest rights, religious and civil liberty, which an individual would pursue for that of his property; and, on this principle, I claim the attention of Protestant readers, while I shall endeavour

to examine---in the first place, the validity of the securities thus offered by the Papists of Ireland--and secondly, the nature and extent of their demands.

'*The affections of a people*' constitute the first part of the pledge. For proofs of this affection for his Majesty's person and government, shall we refer to the non-erected statue, alluded to in my last; to the proclamation of the United Irishmen, published in their official Gazette the 'Union Star;' to the placards or notices posted on Churches throughout Ireland, in 1798, and 1803, abusing his Majesty; and to the description given of his Majesty, by an eminent Popish leader, in his advice to his *brethren?* For evidence of '*unviolated faith*' and '*hearts that were never corrupted,*' shall we search the records of the Roman Catholic Committee of 1791; of the Popish Parliament, dissolved under the authority of the Convention Act; of the United Irishmen; of the more modern Committee, also dissolved under the Convention Act; of the Catholic Board, * and of Popish Aggregate Meetings; and also the preambles to the 3d of Geo. the 3d, chap. 19, and the Insurrection Act? To prove '*allegiance that stood the test of every hour o peril,*' shall we look to the mock oath of allegiance of the Right Boys, in 1789, similar to the one prescribed by the Supreme Roman Catholic Council of Kilkenny, at the time they were in open rebellion against King Charles the First; to the oath of the United Irishmen; to the more modern oath of the new order of Defenders;† or, in fine, to the history of riots and insurrections that preceded open rebellion; and of the rebellions of 1798 and 1803? To bring to the test '*valour that never crouched,* shall we consult the history of battles fought at Naas, the Curragh of Kildare, Arklow, Gorey, Carnew, Ballinahinch, Antrim, Saintfield, Kilcock, New Ross, and Vinegar Hill?—It is not by any means my intention to insinuate, that a Popish soldier or sailor, when from under the influence of bigotted priests, and ambitious demagogues, will not act with bravery. But are they driven to the army and navy like Bonaparte's slaves? Do

* Also dissolved under the Convention Act, since these Letters were written. I refer the English Protestant reader to the Lord Lieutenant's Proclamation in the appendix.

† The curious reader will find all the documents here referred to, in the "Letters by a Protestant of Ireland," published by Chapple, Pall Mall, London, and the Appendix.

they receive less bounty and pay than a Protestant soldier or sailor? Is their religious faith taken into consideration in the distribution of prize-money? Or, when they apply at Chelsea or Greenwich, for the reward of long service, or for some recompense for the loss of limbs, do the Boards question them whether they go to Church, to Mass, or to a Dissenting Chapel? Their bravery, however, certainly would be more 'emphatical,' if the Earl of F. were Chief Governor of Ireland; the Butcher's Son, Lord High Chancellor; Mr. O'Gorman, Chief Justice of the King's Bench; Mr. O'Connel, of the Common Pleas: Mr. Finn, Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer; Major Bryan, Commander-in-Chief; Mr. Edward Hay, Chief Secretary; Mr. Keogh, Chancellor of the Exchequer; the Smuggler's Son, First Commissioner of the Revenue; Mr. Thomas *Little*, Poet Laureat; and Doctor Troy, successor to Doctor Cleaver in the Archbishoprick of Dublin!!!

It is no less remarkable than it is true, that, from the period of the Revolution, to the commencement of the reign of our present most gracious Sovereign, the Roman Catholics of Ireland were tolerably quiet, though they certainly evinced every desire, during the Scotch Rebellions of 1715, and 1745, to assist the cause of the Pretender; and, to raise money for *this pious purpose*, Bulls were sent from Rome; but, owing to a vigilant government, a powerful army, exclusively PROTESTANT, and the enforcement of the penal laws, tranquillity was preserved. For some years, however, previous to the first relaxation of those laws, then indeed no more than a dead letter on the Statute books, (to the which many sensible well informed persons attribute the commencement of Irish riots,) the country was much disturbed by Popish banditti; and the history of Ireland, from our beloved Sovereign's accession to the throne, to the present period, exhibits an unbroken chain of outrages, seditious riot, rebellion, and renewed seditious riot, probably to end in rebellion again.* Be it

* Whosoever has read Mr. Peel's two luminous speeches, replete with a candour and intelligence that exhibit in the strongest colours the wisdom, moderation, and vigilance of the Irish Government, and the deplorable state of the country;—the one on the 25d of June, on the introduction of his Bill for tranquillizing Ireland—the other on the 8th of July, on his motion for the revival of the Insurrection Act: I repeat, whosoever has read those speeches

further remarked, that it was after the grant, on the part of a Protestant Government, of all the privileges enumerated in a former Letter, the Legislature was obliged to enact the Insurrection Act, to prevent tumultuous Meetings; the Gunpowder Bill, to prevent the importation of gunpowder for the purposes of rebellion; and the Convention Act, to prevent unlawful Meetings; and to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act.

If any man doubt this, let him read Mr. John Keogh's account; and, to give his information all due weight, I beg leave to add, that he was a member of the Roman Catholic Committee, of 1791, and of the 'Irish Brotherhood;' that in conjunction with Theobald Wolf Tone, and Thomas Braughall, he was the active agent in convening the Popish Parliament, in 1792, of which he was also a member, and which was dissolved under the Convention Act; and finally, that he was one of those that were to have "*constituted an integral part*" of the Popish Parliament, which the vigilance of the Irish Government prevented from meeting in 1811—so who can dispute his authority? 'Our history,' (says this person, in his speech at an Aggregate Meeting, held in Dublin, in January, 1807,) 'for the last forty years, exhibits a series of cruelty and oppression on the one side, *and illegal attempts to obtain redress on the other*; hence White Boys, Hearts of Steel, Defenders, Orangemen, and lately Thrashers.'—Why the ingenious and infallible Mr. John Keogh thought fit to introduce *heretical Orangemen* into the company of *holy Roman Catholics*, is best known to himself, and must be pretty obvious to the reader; also, why he kept out of view the Roman Catholic Committee, the United Irishmen, the Popish Parliament, or the members of the 'Executive Government,' in 1803.

I have now proved, how intimately Popish discontents have been connected with Irish riots, from no less an authority than that of Mr. John Keogh, an active leader in the Popish Cabinet, who has "*devoted the best years of*

with impartiality, will not think, either that this was a rash conjecture, considering the time those Letters were written, or that *aught* has been exaggerated in the sketch I have given of the conduct of "the emphatical people."

a long and meritorious life, in alleviating the calamities of Penal Law;" though this Catholic logician has mistaken the effect for the cause: however, notwithstanding the CANDOUR he has evinced, he has had recourse to *mental reservation*, in not telling the *whole truth*; for, as he endeavoured to keep from the ken of heretics the causes connected with Popish Committees and Conventions, so in like manner has he screened from their unhallowed eyes, the effects to be deduced from those causes, in the Rebellions of 1798, and 1803; respecting which he is totally silent.

Although I object, as a Protestant, to the validity of the securities offered by the Papists of Ireland; yet I must allow, that in some respects they have acted with consistency in the pursuit of the object of their ambition, which it was to have been hoped would have opened the eyes of Protestants to their views: but alas! some have been blinded by *Catholic gold*; * the weak optics of others have been dazzled by *Catholic sophistry*; while not a few, from a total disregard for religion, or from a secret predilection † for the Romish Faith, have lent their aid for the destruction of our glorious Constitution, under the specious mask of *liberality*. Let not those, however, that can justly estimate the blessings of religious and civil liberty they enjoy under that Constitution, shut their eyes against the following important truths, which must convince them, if indeed they are not already convinced, not only how fallacious are the plighted "affections of a people—unviolated faith—hearts that were never corrupted—allegiance proved in every hour of peril," but also how systematical, persevering, and consistent the Papists of Ireland have been, (I may add, how daring,) for the

* Richard Burke, and the other advocates for Emancipation, stipulated for prompt payment, with the exception of W. T. Jones, who was to receive 1,500l. by instalments; and the first and second 500l. were paid; but having lost his seat in the House of Commons, the "Catholic Managers" refused to pay the third 500l. in consequence of which a newspaper war commenced, but after some time the money was paid, from an apprehension that *their credit might suffer*; however, a reconciliation has taken place, and Mr. Jones is again their advocate, not in Parliament, but at Popish Aggregate Meetings, and at Religious Liberty Dinners. This may afford an useful hint to the modern advocates of Popery. Mr. Burke's fee was 2000 guineas.

† See Note in page 17.

attainment of political power; and let Protestants learn a lesson of prudence from the use already made of the elective franchise.

Early in the year 1793, at the very time the Irish Legislature was engaged in passing the famous Bill in favour of Papists, Mr. Theobald Wolfe Tone, Agent to the Roman Catholic Committee convened in February 1791, the planner of the "Irish Brotherhood" in June 1791, author of a treasonous work published in the same year, entitled "An Argument in Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland," Secretary to the five Popish Delegates appointed in 1792, to lay an humble Petition at the foot of the Throne, coadjutor with John Keogh, whose "*dear friend*" he was, in organizing the Popish Parliament, to which he acted as Secretary:—at that precise time, I repeat, Mr. Tone issued an official notice, conjuring the 'emphatical people 'not to abuse the present precious moment by a self-ex- 'tinguishment—by a credulous committal of their judg- 'ment and senses to the direction of others—by *an idle* 'and idiot gaze on what may be going on in Parliament.' In little more than a year, the same person prepared and forwarded dispatches to France, soliciting aid; and as an encouragement to invasion, stating that "the Dissenters* were enemies to the English from reason and reflection, and the Catholics from *hatred to the English name.*" For all which services, be it remembered, the Roman Catholic Committee paid him 1500l. and 30 guineas for a golden medal; and at the Aggregate Meeting, held in Francis-street Chapel, in the city of Dublin, on the 27th of February, 1795, after the famous address to their advocate, Mr. Grattan, had been carried with acclamation, a vote of thanks to Mr. Tone, was passed in the same manner, declaring, that '*the services*† *he had rendered the Catholic*

* These were of the "*new light*," or what Mr. Belsham styles "*rational christians*;" that is, no christians at all, being Deists.

† One of these services as I have above stated, was "An Argument in Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland," in which he speaks of the National Assembly of France as "*a Body of Representatives, not of their Constituents merely, but of Man, whose nature they had exalted beyond the limits that Providence seemed to have bounded it by.*" When he contrasts the National Assembly of France with other great Bodies which he could name, he confesses he feels little propensity to boast that he has the honour to be an Irishman and a Protestant." And he concludes by an address to the people

'*Cause were such as no gratitude can over-rate, and no* '*remuneration over-pay.*'

In the year 1797, Doctor M'Nevin, a Member of the Roman Catholic Committee, of the "*Irish Brotherhood,*" of the Popish Parliament, and of "*the Executive Government,*" went to Paris, to negociate for aid *to emancipate Ireland;* and his credentials stated, among other matters, 'that the Catholic Priests had ceased to be alarmed at the 'calumnies which had been propagated of French irreli-'gion, and were all affected to the cause; *that some of them* '*had rendered great service, in propagating with discreet* '*zeal the system of the Union.*'

On the 19th of February, 1798, (the day on which the Earl of Moira's motion in favour of concession and conciliation was under the consideration of the Irish House of Lords,) the Leinster Provincial Committee of United Irishmen in Dublin, and that of Ulster in Belfast, "*Resolved,* '*that we will give no attention whatever to any attempt,* '*made by either House of Parliament, to divert the public* '*mind from the* GRAND OBJECT *we have in view—as nothing* '*short of the complete Emancipation of our Country will sa-*'*tisfy us.*'

At the Aggregate Meeting held in Dublin, on the 19th of June, 1812, Mr. O'Gorman 'begged it might be dis-'tinctly understood, *that any arrangements or conditions* '*which might be connected with Mr. Canning's motion in the* '*House of Commons, would have no influence on the conduct* '*of the Catholics of Ireland—as they were determined to* '*obtain their freedom unconditionally.*'

of Ireland in those words—"let them once cry REFORM; and the Catholics and Ireland are FREE, INDEPENDENT, and HAPPY!" What his idea of FREEDOM was, we may learn from his accompanying letter to his correspondent in Belfast, with the Prospectus and Constitution of the United Irishmen, written in the same year; in which he says—"My unalterable opinion is, that the bane of Irish prosperity is the influence of England. I believe that influence will ever be extended, while the connection between the countries continues;—nevertheless, as I know that opinion is for the present too hardy, though a little time will establish it universally, I have not made it a part of the Resolutions: I have only proposed to set up A REFORMED PARLIAMENT, as a barrier against the mischief, which, every honest man that will open his eyes must see, in every instance, overbears the interests of Ireland. I have not said one word that looks like a wish for separation—though I give it as my decided opinion, that such an event would be a Regeneration of Ireland."!!!

And, at the Aggregate Meeting held in Dublin on the 29th of June last, Mr. Finn, in prefacing the petition, said—'As a composition, it could not fail to obtain the 'most unbounded approbation; but he chiefly valued it 'for *the manly and decisive manner in which it embodies* 'the sentiments of the whole of Catholic Ireland. It says, 'that the Catholics are determined to be free; and who, he 'would ask, is the person that SHALL DISSENT *from the as-* 'sertion?'

All these speak a language too plain to require comment, even to the most common understanding: therefore, as I must postpone the consideration of the extent of Popish claims to another opportunity, I shall only add—"Whoso is wise will ponder these things."

SIDNEY.

FIFTH LETTER.

SIR,

In the four preceding Letters—first, I have exposed the falsehood of the assertion, *that the Papists constitute five-sixths of the population of Ireland;* secondly, I have given a brief account of the privileges granted to his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, since his accession to the throne; thirdly, I have shewn, from their conduct, and the language they hold, *how ungrateful they have been for past, and how unworthy of future favours;* and, lastly, I have proved, from that conduct and that language, *the fallacy of their proffered affection, faith, and allegiance.* The object, therefore, of the present shall be—*to consider the extent of their demands, and the danger to our Ecclesiastical and Civil Establishments from further concessions.*

Every rational unprejudiced man, at all acquainted with the real state of Ireland, must be convinced, that the Papists of that part of the empire enjoy every degree of civil liberty consistent with the safety of the Constitution—and not only *complete toleration*, but *the protection of the laws* in their religion: therefore it must be equally manifest, that *Papal Ascendancy* * is the object certain Popish demagogues have in view—which will as certainly lead to *Papal Domination*, as that the cause precedes the effect. Our ancestors, at different periods, from the woeful experience they had had of that *overwhelming tyranny*, wisely enacted certain laws, as bulwarks to the Protestant Reformed Church established in these kingdoms—'*the Constitution of which was so connected and interwoven with the interests and preservation of the State, that the former could not be endangered without hazarding the safety of the latter.*' With the exception of the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth, those Acts were passed—some in the contemplation of the dreadful events connected with the great rebellion—some from the circumstance of the Heir to the Throne being a Papist—and others, from the fatal consequences resulting from the bigotry of that Prince (James the Second), after his accession to the throne; and are, the 13th of Charles the Second, called the Test Act, which requires all public officers to take the oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration—to repeat and subscribe the Declaration—and to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The 25th of Charles the Second, called the Corporation Act, which incapacitates all persons from being elected Officers of any City or Corporation, who have not, twelve months previous to such election, received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the Church of England; and it also requires them to take the above-mentioned oaths. The 30th of Charles the Second, which enacts, 'that

* In the reign of Charles the Second, they "desired to be restored to their Habitations and Freedom in Corporate Towns—to Magistracies, and Military Command; that the Army should be formed gradually of Catholics, and the Courts of Law filled with Catholic Judges: they even hinted the propriety of admitting Catholic Prelates into Parliament!"—See Leland's History of Ireland—and Appendix, No. 2, to King's "State of the Protestants of Ireland."

'no Member shall sit or vote in either House of Par-
'liament, unless he hath taken the oaths of Allegiance,
'Supremacy, and Abjuration, and repeated and sub-
'scribed the Declaration.' The 1st of William and Mary, which requires each King or Queen, at his or her coronation, to swear, 'to the utmost of his or her power
'to maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the
'Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion, esta-
'blished by the law; and to preserve unto the Bishops
'and Clergy of this realm, and to the churches commit-
'ted to their charge, all such rights and privileges as
'by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them.' The 5th of Anne, chap. 8th, (the Act of Union of England and Scotland,) in which are recited two Acts of the respective Parliaments of England and Scotland: that of the former being for effectually and UNALTERABLY securing the true Protestant Religion, professed and established by law in the Church of England—and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof: and by it, the English Acts of Uniformity, of Elizabeth and Charles the Second, and all other Acts then in force, for the preservation of the Church of England, are declared PERPETUAL; and it is enacted, that every subsequent King and Queen shall take an oath INVIOLABLY to maintain the same within England, Ireland, Wales, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed: and it is further enacted, that the two recited Acts of the respective Parliaments of England and Scotland shall FOR EVER be observed, as fundamental and essential conditions of the Union of England and Scotland. And the 8th of Anne, which provides, that every Sovereign of the British Empire shall swear INVIOLABLY to maintain the Church of England, in England, Ireland, Wales, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed; and the manner it is to be maintained, by that statute, is by the perpetual preservation of the two Acts of Uniformity of Elizabeth and Charles the Second, and all other Acts then in force, for the preservation of the Church of England.

In order to satisfy the insatiable love of power of a few ambitious and turbulent demagogues, the leaders of a sect, which, though it may exceed the Protestants of Ireland in numbers, does not possess more than a fiftieth

part of the landed property, which does not amount to one eighth of the population of the British empire; and, above all, which entertains religious opinions hostile to our Ecclesiastical and Civil Establishments: to gratify the ambition, I repeat, of these Chiefs, all these laws must be abrogated, and also the Act of Union of Great Britain and Ireland, which recites and declares to be PERPETUAL the 5th and 8th of Queen Anne, and all former Acts passed for the security of the Church of England—thenceforth to be called the United Church of England and Ireland. But our present most gracious Sovereign having, at his coronation, taken the oaths prescribed by the 1st of William and Mary, and the 5th and 8th of Anne, the 'Catholic Board' must send Ambassadors to Bonaparte, to solicit his permission for their 'Lord God,' the Pope, to absolve our good old King from his coronation oath—and it must be dispensed with in future.

Some uninformed Protestants in this country (England) may imagine, that the 'Emancipation,' as it is called, of the Papists of Ireland, cannot affect them; but they will do well to recollect, that a very few years have elapsed since the English Papists presented a Petition to the Legislature, in which they 'humbly pray for A TOTAL RE-'PEAL of every Test, Oath, Declaration, or Provision, 'which has the effect of subjecting (them) to any penalty 'or disability whatever, on account of their religious 'principles.' And a petition in their favour was also signed by a number of that description of Dissenters, who style themselves "RATIONAL CHRISTIANS," from their disbelief of the Divinity of our blessed Redeemer, and of the atonement by his death.

Let such Protestants as I have alluded to consult the history of their country—from which they may learn what Popery was, subsequent as well as prior to the Reformation; nor let them be deceived, by the artful misrepresentations of Popish advocates, into a belief that Popery now is different from what it was. Doctor Troy, Titular Archbishop of Dublin, has declared in his Pastoral Letter, published in 1798, that 'the religious principles of Ro-'man Catholics being UNCHANGEABLE, they are appli-'cable to ALL TIMES;' and Mr. Francis Plowden, in his

" Case Stated," has the following remark, worthy of the serious attention of every sincere Protestant, as coming from the pen of a Papist:—' If any one says, or pre-' tends to insinuate, that the modern Roman Catholics, ' who have been late objects of the bounty of Parliament, ' differ in ONE IOTA from their ancestors, he either de-' ceives himself, or wishes to deceive others. *Semper eadem* ' is more emphatically descriptive of our religion, than of ' our jurisprudence.'

From a retrospect, therefore, of what Popery was in the earlier ages—and from the declarations of two of its celebrated champions in our own times, (the one a Priest, the other a Layman,) that its principles are ' unchange-able,' and that it is " *semper eadem*,"—surely no person of common sense can hesitate in pronouncing what the fate of our Constitution in Church and State will be, if the insolent demands, accompanied with no less insolent menaces of ' the emphatical people,' shall be complied with. For can there be a man so weak as to believe, that, in the event of the admission of Papists into offices of trust under the Crown, and into Parliament, a Popish Member of the Cabinet will advise the adoption of measures, or that a Popish Peer and Commoner will support those measures, for the security of the United Church of England and Ireland,* which they consider heretical, and

* An attentive perusal of Doctor Dromgoole's Speech, delivered in " the Catholic Board" on the 8th of December, 1813, and published by L. Tute, in Parliament-street, must convince every person that has not pre-determined to shut his eyes against the truth, that a Papist, whatever may be his professions of " liberality" and " brotherly love" to his Protestant fellow-subjects, must ever be an enemy to the pure religion established in this empire. This Political Quack (to whose candour Protestants are much indebted, let the motive have been what it might,) thus speaks of the Protestant Reformed Church, connected and interwoven with the State:—" If its foundation be " on sand, no human power can support it. In vain shall Statesmen put their " heads together—in vain shall Parliaments, IN MOCKERY OF OMNIPOTENCE, " declare that it is permanent and inviolate—in vain shall the lazy Church-" man cry from the sanctuary, to the watchman on the tower, that danger is " at hand: IT SHALL FALL, FOR IT IS HUMAN, AND LIABLE TO FORCE, TO AC-" CIDENT, AND TO DECAY;—IT SHALL FALL, *and nothing but the memory of the* " *mischief it has created shall survive!* Already the marks of approaching " ruin are upon it: it has had its time upon the earth—a date nearly as long " as ANY OTHER NOVELTY!—And, when the time arrives, shall Catholics be " called, by the sacred bond of an oath, to support a system WHICH THEY BE-" LIEVE WILL BE ONE DAY REJECTED BY THE WHOLE EARTH? Can they be " induced to swear, that they would oppose even the present Protestants of

which they are using every art to subvert? If, indeed, one can be found so credulous, he knows nothing of human nature generally, and he is equally ignorant of the spirit of Popery. To such I recommend the following account, given of it by the late Rev. Richard Cecil:—

'It is perhaps impossible, in the very nature of things, 'that such another scheme as Popery could be devised. 'It is, in truth, the *mystery of iniquity*, that it should be 'able to work itself into the simple, grand, sublime, holy 'institution of christianity; and so to intervene in its abo- 'minations with the truth, as to occupy the strongest passi- 'ons of the soul, and to controul the strongest understandings! 'While Pascal can speak of Popery as he does, its influence 'over the mass of the people can excite no surprise. Those 'two master principles---that we must believeas the Church 'ordains; and that there is no salvation out of that 'Church---oppose, in the ignorance and fear they beget, 'an almost insuperable barrier against the truth.

'Popery was the master-piece of Satan: I believe him 'utterly incapable of such another contrivance. It was a 'systematic and infallible plan for forming manacles and 'mufflers for the human mind. It was a well-laid design 'to render christianity contemptible, by the abuse of its 'principles and its institution. It was formed to *over- 'whelm*---to *enchant*---to sit as *the great whore, making the 'earth drunk with her fornications.*

'Popery debases and alloys christianity; but infidelity is 'a furnace, wherein it is purified and refined. The in- 'juries done to it by Popery, will be repaired by the very 'attacks of infidelity.'

Father Paul, an orthodox believer and learned divine, in the sixteenth century, mentions the insatiable love of power, and the extreme desire of wealth, that distinguished the adherents of the See of Rome in his time; as also the lengths they went for the attainment of the objects of their ambition: nor is it a little remarkable, that the conduct of

" England, if, CEASING TO BE TRUANTS, they thought fit to return to their an- " cient Worship, and to have a CATHOLIC KING and a CATHOLIC PARLIA- " MENT?" !!!

the "emphatical people of Ireland," of the nineteenth century, in the pursuit of political power, and for the aggrandisement of their Church, should be such, that some of his observations may, not unaptly, be applied to the present times.—'The same exceeding devotion (says 'Father Paul) in Princes and People, which produced the 'vast increase of wealth to the Church, grew at last to 'excite an *extreme thirst in her ministers* to improve it. 'And certainly, from these *indiscreet zealots*, and the want 'of a due mixture of discretion, have flowed innumerable 'and incalculable mischiefs; for they, imagining *every 'thing justifiable that is done with a view to religion, by 'acting both against that, and even against humanity itself, 'have often set the world in dreadful combustions.*'

I shall conclude the present Letters, by laying before the reader the opinions of two eminent statesmen, the late Mr. Pitt, and the late Earl of Clare, as to the necessity of a Church Establishment, connected with the State. The former, in his speech in the English House of Commons, in March 1790, on Mr. Fox's motion for the repeal of some of the very laws the Legislature is now so imperiously called upon to abrogate, thus expressed himself: "The necessity of a certain permanent specific Church Establishment rendered it essential, that toleration should not go to equality, which would *endanger the establishment*, and thence no longer be toleration. The extent of the Right Honourable Gentleman's principles, he said, went to the admittance of every class of Dissenters, to a full and complete equality, and even to the admittance of those who *might conscientiously think it their duty to subvert the Established Church*; and not only to the admittance of Roman Catholics, but Papists, properly so called, the latter acknowledging the supremacy of a foreign, though an ecclesiastical Prince; so he, according to the Right Honourable Gentleman, with all his odious, detestable, and dangerous opinions that belonged to his Church, ought not to be kept out of the most important and official situations, before the commission of some overt act against the Constitution, manifested by force of arms in the open field, by which the policy of prevention might

be done away, and a dangerous door opened to the absolute ruin of the Constitution. The point at issue was, whether the House should or should not at once relinquish those Acts which had, *by the wisdom of our ancestors*, served as a bulwark to the Church, the constitution of which was so connected and interwoven with the interests and preservation of the State, *that the former could not be endangered without hazarding the safety of the latter.*"

"Religion (said the late Earl of Clare) is the great bond of society, and therefore in every civilized country there MUST BE A RELIGION CONNECTED WITH THE STATE, AND MAINTAINED BY IT AGAINST ALL ATTACKS AND ENCROACHMENTS! and therefore I deny the right of any man, who dissents from the religion established by the State, *to demand admittance into the State*, upon which alone the established religion can rest for support. Should Parliament once admit the claims of Irish Papists to political power, on the ground of right, I desire to know where we are to draw a line? If Papists have a right to sit in Parliament, they have a right to fill every office in the State; they have a right to pay tithes exclusively to their own Clergy—they have a right to restore the ancient pomp and splendour of their religion—they have a right to be governed exclusively by the laws of their own Church—they have a right to seat their Bishops in the House of Lords—they have a right to seat a Popish Prince upon the Throne—they have a right to subvert the established Government, AND TO MAKE THIS A POPISH COUNTRY, WHICH I HAVE LITTLE DOUBT IS THEIR ULTIMATE OBJECT."

The events that have succeeded to those sentiments, delivered in the Irish House of Lords antecedent to the rebellion of 1798, fully prove the great penetration that Nobleman possessed, when he declared it to be his opinion, that "their ultimate object was, to make Ireland a Popish country," as well as when he said, "separation of Ireland from Great Britain was their object."

Let the Protestants, therefore, of the United Kingdoms rally round our glorious Constitution, raised by the wisdom and cemented by the blood of our ancestors;

and, by petitioning the Legislature *ere it be too late*, (another Petition from the Papists of Ireland being to be presented in a few days,) convince the open and *secret* enemies to that Constitution, that they are determined to transmit it unimpaired to their posterity.

SIDNEY.

APPENDIX

TO FOURTH LETTER.

By the Lord Licutenant and Council of Ireland.

WHITWORH.

WHEREAS an Assembly, under the Denomination of the Catholic Board, has for a considerable Time existed in this Part of the United Kingdom, under Pretence of preparing or presenting Petitions to Parliament on Behalf of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

And whereas under the Provisions of an Act made in the Parliament of Ireland, in the Thirty-third Year of His present Majesty, entitled, "An Act to prevent the Election "or Appointment of unlawful Assemblies, under the Pre-"tence of preparing or presenting Public Petitions or

" other Addresses to His Majesty or the Parliament," the said Assembly is an unlawful Assembly.

And whereas great Artifice has been employed, in order to persuade the Public generally, and His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects in Ireland in particular, that such an Assembly is lawful, and necessary to the Exercise of the Right of Petitioning:

And whereas the Law hath hitherto not been enforced against the said Assembly, in the Expectation that those who had been misled by said Artifice would become sensible of their Error, and in the Hope that the said Assembly would be discontinued without the Necessity of Legal Interposition:

Now We the Lord Lieutenant, by and with the Advice and Consent of His Majesty's Privy Council, being satisfied that the Permanency or the further Continuance of the said Assembly can only tend to serve the Ends of Factious and Seditious Persons, and to the Violation of the Public Peace, do hereby strictly caution and forewarn all such of His Majesty's Subjects as are Members of the said Assembly, that they do henceforward abstain from any further Attendance at or in the said Assembly; and do hereby give Notice, that if, in Defiance of this our Proclamation, the said Assembly shall again meet after the

Date hereof, the said Assembly, and all Persons acting as Members of the same, shall be proceeded against according to Law.

Given at the Council Chamber in Dublin this 3d day of June, 1814.

MANNERS, C.
CHARLES CASHEL.
DROGHEDA.
WESTMEATH.
MAYO.
ERNE.
CHARLES KILDARE.
CASTLE-COOTE.
FRANKFORT.
WILLIAM M'MAHON.
G. HEWETT.
G. KNOX.
J. ORMSBY VANDELEUR.
WM. SAURIN.
S. HAMILTON.

God Save the King.

FINIS.

THE

PROTESTANT'S CATECHISM

ON THE

ORIGIN OF POPERY,

AND ON

THE GROUNDS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS;

TO WHICH ARE PREFIXED,

The Opinions of Milton, Locke, Hoadley, Blackstone, and Burke:

WITH A POSTSCRIPT

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF POPERY INTO IRELAND BY THE COMPACT OF HENRY II. AND POPE ADRIAN, IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

BY THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

LONDON:

Printed by Hughes & Baynes, Maiden-Lane, Covent-Garden;

AND SOLD BY RIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; HATCHARD, PICCADILLY; AND BLACK AND SON, TAVISTOCK-STREET, COVENT-GARDEN.

1818.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

BLACKSTONE, Comm. B. iv. ch. 8.

"These horrid devastations," [by the Anabaptists in Germany,] "the effects of mere madness, or of zeal that "was nearly allied to it, though violent and tumultuous, "were but of short duration. Whereas the progress of "the *papal policy*, long actuated by the steady counsels "of successive pontiffs, took deeper root, and was at "length in some places with difficulty, in others never yet "extirpated. For this we might call to witness the black "intrigues of *the Jesuits, so lately triumphant over Chris-* "*tendom, but now universally abandoned!!!* by even the "Roman Catholic powers; but the subject of our pre- "sent chapter rather leads us to consider the vast strides "which were formerly made by the *popish clergy;* how "nearly they arrived to effecting their grand design; some "few of the means they made use of for establishing their "plan; and how almost all of them have been defeated "or converted to better purposes, by the vigour of our "free constitution, and the wisdom of successive par- "liaments."

PREFACE.

In a country, which has suffered so much from Popery as this has done, both before and since the Reformation, it would be incredible, that the Roman Catholic claims should find any advocate among Protestants, if we did not know the many *delusions* and *fictions*, by which it has so long practised on the liberality, the credulity, and the indifference of the public.

Its delusive pretensions to *antiquity* and *universality* are the subject of the first fifteen sections of the following Catechism, in which it is shewn, that the Pope had no connection with this country for the first six centuries of Christianity;—that, whatever degree of authority was permitted to him by the Saxon sovereigns, for the religious instruction of their subjects, the Pope's jurisdiction was not established in England till the twelfth century, and then only by violent usurpation;—that

Popery was therefore an intruder upon the Church of England, and not the Church of England upon Popery;—and that the REFORMATION of the Church of England was not a *separation** from the Church of Rome, (for by what lawful or national Act were the two Churches ever united?)—not a schism in the Church of England, (for *that*, after the lapse of four centuries of usurpation, was become itself again,)—but a final rejection of the Bishop of Rome's authority, and a resumption of our *ancient* independence, and Protestant character. I say *final* rejection of the Pope's authority, because, in fact, his authority was restricted and rejected by Parliament from the time of Edw. I. our English Justinian, and first *Protestant Legislator*, though the laws were over-ruled by Popish counsels and principles. The *claims* of that portion of our fellow-countrymen, who, contrary to law, and the constitution, still acknowledge the Pope's supremacy over the Church of England, to re-admission to political power, from which they have been excluded by inviolable oaths and statutes, and national covenants, are the subject of the last nine sections of the Catechism.

*.Our Dissenters were originally a part of the Church of England, but the Church of England never was a part of the Church of Rome.

To fictions of the grossest kind,—the DONATION OF CONSTANTINE, and the DECRETAL EPISTLES,—the Pope owes the whole of his temporal and spiritual power on the continent. In this country, the Pope's compact with Henry II. by which the papal jurisdiction was first introduced into Ireland, about the middle of the twelfth century, was founded on the former of those celebrated forgeries. By FICTITIOUS STATUTES (5 R. II. 2 Hen. IV. 2 Hen. V.) the papal decrees for *the worship of images* and the *burning of heretics before the people* were enforced. These forgeries and fictions are the subject of the Notes and Appendix to the Catechism.

The *fictitious* Statutes before mentioned were (says Sir Edward Coke) disavowed by the Commons; and, though enforced as laws, they were not laws of the land, till they were confirmed by a Parliament of Henry VIII. The history of these Statutes is the more deserving of every Protestant's attention, because they were enforced in the face of the Statutes of *Præmunire*, which had been enacted against the intrusive and encroaching authority of the Pope. While these pretended Statutes were in force, the real laws of the land were dormant: (how completely dormant, was evident from Wolsey's plea of

ignorance of the Statute of Rich. II.) which could not have happened, if the laws had not been over-ruled by the prevalence of Popish counsels and principles about the Throne.

Through some providential occurrences not long after the beginning of the sixteenth century, our *actual* national *emancipation** from Popery commenced. Wolsey was the first victim to the long insulted laws of *Præmunire;* and the whole body of the Popish Clergy were the next. In the year 1531 " an indictment was brought in the King's Bench against the whole clerical body, for breaking the Statutes made in different reigns against *provisions* or *provisors*, and all the Clergy were declared out of the King's protection, and liable to all the pains and penalties of a *Præmunire.* — Accordingly the Clergy, dreading the consequences of ineffectual resistance, drew up a petition in the convocation of Canterbury, to be presented to the King, whom they styled, '*The supreme head of the Church and Clergy of England.*'"† These executions of the Statutes of *Præmunire* shew, that the origin of the REFORMATION is to be dated from a period

* Emancipation from Popery was a real emancipation. It was a deliverance from the yoke of a foreign Sovereign. But the emancipation, for which the Roman Catholics petition, is emancipation from the laws and constitution of their own country.

† Custance's Popular Survey of the Reformation, p. 124.

prior, by two centuries, to the time of Luther and Henry VIII.; and that the Church of England's rejection of Popery was the ultimate result of the national abhorrence of a foreign jurisdiction. The work of *religious inquiry* had begun a century before the first *Protestant Act of Parliament* in the time of Edw. I. The first vehement attack on Popery, was made in the *twelfth* century by Giraldus Cambrensis;* the next in the *succeeding* century, by Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln; the third, and most operative in its consequences, by Wickliffe, in the *fourteenth*. The great and good Lord Cobham was the martyred assertor of Protestantism in the *fifteenth* century.

To these progressive efforts, to the reviving vigour of the laws, and to Henry the Eighth's resentment and indignation against the intrusive authority of the Pope, and not to Luther, (as the Papists pretend,) whom Henry opposed, was the Church of England indebted for the REFORMATION.

How then may we hope most effectually to shew the injustice and unconstitutional nature of the Roman Catholic claims? By keeping constantly in view *the false foundations* of Popery, and the *Apostolical origin*, and *ancient Protestant character* of our own

* See Postscript, p. 59, Note.

Church; the Statutes of *Præmunire;* the *exclusive* principles of the REFORMATION, and REVOLUTION; and the inviolable covenants of the two UNIONS.*

Feb. 16, 1818.

* Mr. PITT's authority is often quoted as favourable to the Roman Catholic Claims of admissibility to political power. Yet Mr. PITT was the author of the last great national UNION. And the *Act of Union* provides for the inviolable maintenance of our *Protestant Constitution* in Church and State,—a provision which is wholly incompatible with the concession of claims, which involves the repeal of all the great statutes, which essentially form that Constitution.

The advocates of the Roman Catholic Claims charge their opponents with unreasonable fears and apprehensions. What, then, is the fear, that possesses them? It is not the unmanly fear of personal danger or personal injury, but the fear *ne detrimenti capiat respublica.* It is not the fear of national danger from *any external power,*—the "ineptiæ pene aniles," that the Pope can do us any external injury,—but the old English fear of "nolumus leges Angliæ mutari," those Constitutional laws, which have made England what it is, and have given to our form of Government that perfection, which was once thought too perfect to be realized. It is the fear lest the Constitution should suffer by the admixture of foreign *principles,*—of a foreign *despotism,*—of an *imperium in imperio,*—by the *re-admission* of the very evil, which it was the special object of the REFORMATION and REVOLUTION to *exclude.* It is, in one word, that high and honourable feeling, which Mr. WINDHAM expressed in his "Perish Commerce" *rather* than the Constitution; and by Mr. WILBERFORCE in his memorable observation on Mr. Wortley's motion† in 1812.

† "THAT HE HAD ONLY ONE OBJECTION, THAT IT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.—The first departure from Constitutional principles always takes place with a view to some immediate advantage; but when the House considered the connection between all these principles, and the confusion introduced by the departure from any one of them, he was sure they would see the impropriety of sacrificing any principle of the Constitution for the sake of a temporary advantage. In this he was confirmed by the result of whatever experience he himself had acquired, by the history not only of his own but of other countries, and by the opinions of many of the wisest and most eminent of men." *Courier, Friday, May* 22, 1812. If the Advocates of the Roman Catholic Claims should reply, that what they contend for would be a permanent advantage to the country, we deny the premises; and add, in the words of Mr. WILBERFORCE, WE HAVE ONLY ONE OBJECTION, THAT IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO

THE FOLLOWING TESTIMONIES.

THE opinions of LOCKE on all political subjects will ever be of great weight: It is necessary therefore that they should be correctly represented. Liberal as he was, the liberality of the present day, in the toleration of Popery, is opposed to his decided judgment. He thought that an *untolerating* Church ought not to be tolerated. His opinion, however, is still valuable; for if he would not have granted toleration to the Church of Rome, much less would he have admitted her members to *political power*. His opinions of Popery are the more necessary to be read, because his authority on this subject has been sometimes greatly misconstrued and misrepresented, even by persons well conversant with his writings. For such misconstruction it is difficult to account, otherwise than by supposing that the doctrines favourable to the Roman Catholic Claims, which have

either as purely religious, or as in order thereunto: but can also enjoin it them on pain of eternal fire."—(*Works*, vol. vi. p. 46, ed. 1812.)

HOADLEY.

Members of the Church of Rome not to be entrusted with power.

"The wonder is not that the professed members of the Church of Rome unite their hearts and hands, and leave no method, whether of deceit or violence, unattempted for the service of that cause, which, in all their lowest fortune, they never suffer to be removed out of their sight; that they put on all the forms of complaisance and dissimulation; of civility and good humour, even to hereticks themselves, to inveigle them into their own ruin; that they flatter and promise and swear every thing that is good and kind to their fellow-labourers; and at the same time enter into all the resolutions of destruction and desolation, *whenever the opportunity of power shall come.* This is nothing but what is worthy of themselves, and of that Church, to the slavery of which they have devoted themselves. It is no more than what they fairly and publickly profess, *if Protestants will but open their eyes and see it.* It is their religion and their conscience; it is inculcated upon them, as the great condition of their acceptance with God; that no good-nature of their own, no obligations from others, no ties of oaths and solemn assurances, no regard to truth, justice or honour, are to restrain them from any thing, let it be of what sort soever, that is for the security or temporal advancement of their Church."—(*Sermon XI.* p. 220.)

BLACKSTONE.

"While they acknowledge a foreign power superior to the sovereignty of the kingdom, they cannot complain if the laws of the land will not put them upon the footing of good subjects."—*Comm.* b. iv. ch. 4. § 3.)

BURKE.

"Dissent seeking for more than toleration is not conscience but ambition."

CONTENTS.

LATELY PUBLISHED,

And Sold by Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-Yard, London:

TRACTS

ON

The ORIGIN and INDEPENDENCE of the ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCH;

On the Supremacy of the Pope, and the Inconsistency of all Foreign Jurisdiction with the British Constitution;

And on the Differences between the Churches of England and of Rome.

Second Edition, with Additions; to which is prefixed a Map, shewing the Limits of the Pope's Jurisdiction at the end of the Fifteenth Century.—In one vol. 8vo. 9s. boards.

II.

LETTERS OF BRITANNICUS,

On Mr. Grattan's Bill for the Relief of the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland;

Or, as it should have been entitled, for the Advancement of Popery.

8vo. 2s. 6d.

III.

A BRIEF MEMORIAL

On the REPEAL of so much of the Statute 9 & 10 William III. as relates to Persons denying the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity: addressed to all who believe the Christian Religion to be a true Religion, and who are desirous of maintaining the Religious Institutions of their Ancestors. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE

Protestant's Catechism.

BLACKSTONE, Comm. B. iv. ch. 8.

"The ancient British church, by whomsoever planted, "was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome, and his pre- "tended authority. But the Pagan Saxon invaders having "driven the professors of Christianity to the remotest "corners of our island, their own conversion was after- "wards effected by Augustin the monk, and other mis- "sionaries from the court of Rome. This naturally "introduced *some* few of the *papal corruptions* in point of "faith and doctrine; but we read of no civil authority "claimed by the Pope in these kingdoms till the era of "the Norman conquest."

THE

PROTESTANT'S CATECHISM.

I.

Independence of the ancient British Church—Roman Catholic Petition, and Objections to it.

Q. WHAT has Rome to do with Britain?

A. It is connected with it by no ties of dependence, religious or political.

Q. What is Popery?

A. The religion of the Church of Rome.

Q. Why is the religion of the Church of Rome called Popery?

A. Because the Church of Rome is subject to the jurisdiction of the Pope.

Q. Who is the Pope?

A. The Bishop of Rome.

Q. Did the Pope ever exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England and Ireland?

A. Yes: for *four* centuries before the *Reformation.* "There does not appear much of the Pope's power in this realm before the Conquest." (1 Hawk. 4.)

Q. During these four centuries did the Pope nominate the Bishops?

A. Only during the first 150 years. Before

and after that time the King nominated the Bishops.

Q. After that time were there not many statutes enacted against the Pope's intrusive power?

A. Yes: long before the Reformation. From the time of Edward I. it was made treasonable for any one to pay that obedience to the Pope, which was due only to the King.

Q. What right had the Bishop of Rome to exercise jurisdiction in England or Ireland?

A. None, either in nature, or reason, or religion.

Q. Does the Pope now exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England or Ireland?

A. There are persons in England, and many more in Ireland, who still acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Pope, in defiance of the laws, and of the allegiance due to their rightful Sovereign.

Q. What is Protestantism?

A. The *abjuration* of Popery, and the *exclusion* of Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil.

Q. What is the object of the Roman Catholic petition to Parliament?

A. The *restoration of Popery*, so far as concerns the re-admission of Papists to a participation of political power.

Q. What are the general objections to the Roman Catholic petition?

A. There are two main objections. The first is, that the re-admission of Papists to a participation of political power, is contrary to our Protestant constitution in Church and State, (being wholly inconsistent with the 1st of Elizabeth, the 30th of Car. II. the bill of Rights, the Act of Settlement, and the Acts of Union.) The second is, that the possession of political power, instead of allaying the differences between Protestants and Papists, would be, on the part of the Papists, an increase of rivalry, demand, and contention.

II.

Popery, not the primitive Religion of the Christian Church.

Q. By whom was the Church of Rome founded?

A. By St. Paul.

Q. How does this appear?

A. It appears from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, that no Apostle had been at Rome before St. Paul,—that the first congregation of Christians at Rome was under the sole ministry of St. Paul,—and that they were not established in the faith before his arrival.

Q. Which was the *first Christian Church?*

A. The Church of Jerusalem.

Q. By whom was the Church of Jerusalem founded?

A. By Christ himself.

Q. On whom was it founded?

A. Not on St. Peter, individually, nor by St. Peter, but on "the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF being the chief corner-stone."

Q. Who was the first Christian Bishop?

A. St. James the Less first presided over the Church of Jerusalem, but, as it seems, in a higher sense than the usual meaning of the word *Bishop*.*

Q. By whom was he appointed?

A. By the joint authority of the Apostles.

Q. Which was the second Christian Church?

A. The Church of Antioch.

Q. What other Churches (does the New Testament inform us) were established before the Church of Rome?

A. The Churches of Thessalonica, Galatia, Corinth.

III.

The Pope's Supremacy, a Novelty of the seventh Century.

Q. Who was the first Bishop of Rome?

A. St. Clement, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul. (Tertullian de Præscrip. adv. Hær. c. 32.)

Q. By whom was he appointed?

A. By St. Peter, as some say; or, as others, by the joint authority of St. Peter and St. Paul.

Q. Were not St. Peter and St. Paul Bishops of Rome?

* See Tertullian, quoted in the next page.

A. No: they were of higher authority. The Apostles were not Bishops, but the appointers of Bishops. (Tertullian de Præscrip. adv. Hær. c. 32.)* Bishops had the care of particular churches; but the Apostles were sent to all nations, and had "the care of all the churches."

Q. Did St. Clement, or his successors, Bishops of Rome, exercise authority over the Churches of Asia, or of Greece?

A. Never. The Bishop of Rome had no precedence till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Adrian, and then only as the Bishop of the Imperial City. When Constantinople became the Imperial City, her Patriarchs obtained the same rank as the Bishops of old Rome, and were the *first* to claim supremacy.†

Q. How early did the difference between the Greek and Latin Churches shew itself?

A. As early as the second century, in the disputes about Easter.

Q. What do you mean by the *Pope's Supremacy?*

A. An assumed jurisdiction over the whole Christian Church.

Q. When was this jurisdiction first assumed by the Pope?

A. At the beginning of the seventh century.

* **Tertullian says, that in all the churches *the first Bishop* had an Apostle, or Apostolical man, for his appointer or antecessor. The first Bishops therefore were not the Apostles.**

† **Ecclesia urbis Constantinopolitanæ Romæ Veteris prærogativa lætatur. (Justinian. Cod. De Sacro-sanctis Ecclesiis.)**

Q. By whom was it granted to the Pope?

A. By the Emperor Phocas.

IV.

The Bishop of Rome, not the first Usurper of Supremacy over the Christian Church.

Q. Who was the first usurper of spiritual supremacy over the Christian Church?

A. A patriarch of Constantinople, in the sixth century.

Q. Did the other Bishops of the Christian Church submit to this usurpation?

A. By no means. It was vehemently opposed, especially by the Bishop of Rome, Gregory the First, the most learned and virtuous of the Roman Popes.

Q. Upon what grounds did he oppose it?

A. He reprobated it as presumptuous, heretical, and antichristian; and even excommunicated the Patriarch for it.

V.

The Pope considered by the Bishops of the eastern Church a Schismatic from their Church.

Q. Which was the mother church of Christendom, the eastern Church or the western?

A. The eastern.

Q. When Boniface, Gregory's successor in the Church of Rome, assumed the supremacy, which Gregory had reprobated, was it acknowledged by the whole Christian Church?

A. Far from it.

Q. By whom was it opposed?

A. By all the Bishops of the eastern Church, and by the Bishops of Britain and Ireland?

Q. What had the Churches of Britain and Ireland, at that time, in common with the eastern Church?

A. The time of celebrating Easter, in which they followed the rule of the Church of Ephesus, and other Asiatic Churches?

Q. In what light is the Pope still held by the eastern Church?

A. "It is most certain, that the Christian "Patriarkes and Bishops of these countries will "neither communicate with the Pope, either in "sacraments or in prayers; nor anywise yield "to his authority, nor give any manner of "honour or reverence to his person; no more "than to Mahomet, or Antichrist." (Jewell's Defense of his Apology, p. 714, ed. 1567.)*

Q. If the Patriarch of Constantinople was excommunicated by the Pope in the sixth century for assuming the title of *universal Bishop*, what must be thought of the Bishops of Rome, since his time, who assume the same title?

A. They are condemned by Gregory's sentence, and, under his authority, must be considered, as, virtually, in a state of excommunication.

* "I have heard more than one Greek Prelate pronounce him "to be nearly as great a deceiver of mankind, as Mahomet "himself." (Mr. Leslie Foster's Speech, p. 32.)

VI.

The Emperor Constantine, the first temporal head of the Church.

Q. When the Roman empire became Christian, who was the first temporal head of the Church?

A. The Emperor Constantine.

Q. Who convened the first general Councils of the Christian Church?

A. The Emperor.

VII.

Sovereign Princes, the present heads of the Christian Church, with one single exception.

Q. Who has at present the supremacy over the Protestant Churches in Europe?

A. The Sovereign of each State respectively.

Q. By whom are the Bishops of the Roman Church appointed in the several States of Europe?

A. By the Sovereign of each State, with the *single exception* of the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland.

Q. Is there any good reason for such exception?

A. None; but quite the reverse. In Roman Catholic countries, the religion of the State and of the Bishops is the same; their interests the same. But in a Protestant country, Roman Catholic Bishops have views and interests wholly at variance with the national establishment, and

ought therefore (if tolerated at all) to be directly and exclusively appointed by the Sovereign.

Q. Who nominates, at present, the Roman Catholic Bishops in Canada?

A. The King.

Q. Who nominated the Bishops in England before the Reformation?

A. The King, except during the twelfth century, and half of the thirteenth.

VIII.

POPERY, NOT THE ANCIENT RELIGION OF BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The Churches of Britain and of Ireland more ancient than the Pope's Supremacy.

Q. Was not the Church of Rome our mother Church?

A. No. The British Church subsisted many centuries before it had any connection with the Church of Rome.

Q. By whom was the Church of Britain founded?

A. By St. Paul.*

Q. What authority have you for so important and interesting a fact?

A. The authority of Venantius Fortunatus in the sixth century, and of Theodoret in the fifth.

Q. Have you no earlier direct testimony?

* See the proofs of this Section detailed at length in "Tracts on the origin and independence of the ancient British Church." London, Rivingtons, 1813.

A. Yes, Clemens, St. Paul's fellow-labourer in the Gospel, says, that St. Paul, in preaching the Gospel, went to the *utmost bounds of the west*.*

Q. What do you mean by the utmost bounds of the west?

A. The utmost bounds of the Roman empire to the west.

Q. Was Britain the utmost boundary of the Roman empire to the west?

A. Yes. Of the three *western provinces*,—SPAIN, GAUL, and BRITAIN,—the most remote from Rome is Britain.

Q. Are there any collateral testimonies between Theodoret and Clemens, that is, between the *fifth* century and the *first*?

A. Yes. Eusebius, in the *fourth*, says, that the Gospel was preached in the British isles "by *some of the Apostles*." And if by some, the Apostle of the Gentiles must, at least, have been one.

Q. Is there any evidence of the preaching of the Gospel in Britain, prior to the third century?

A. Yes. Tertullian, in the *second* century, says, that before his time Christianity had extended itself to parts of Britain inaccessible to the Romans arms.

Q. Is there any historical evidence from ancient British writers, that the Gospel was preached in Britain in the days of the Apostles?

* Το τερμα της δυσεως, *terminum, finem occidentis*, the extremity of the west, as τερμα βιου is explained in Hesychius by τελος βιου, the end of life.

A. Yes: Gildas says, that the Gospel was preached in Britain *before the defeat of Boadicea*, which took place in the year 61; and the British Triads state that the knowledge of Christianity was brought to Britain by the father of Caractacus, who was liberated from his detention at Rome seven years *after the defeat of Caractacus*, that is, A. D. 58, or 59,* the time in which (according to Eusebius, Jerome, Petavius, Scaliger, &c.) St. Paul was set at liberty from his first confinement at Rome.

Q. How do you connect these events with St. Paul's western journey?

A. They shew, that the knowledge of Christianity was brought to Britain the same year in which St. Paul was liberated from his first confinement at Rome.

Q. What is the conclusion which you draw from these several testimonies?

A. As we learn from writers of the *second* and *third* and *fourth* centuries, that the Gospel had been preached in Britain, and *that* by some of the Apostles; and from a writer of the first century, that St. Paul travelled to the utmost bounds of the west, (which he could not do without going to Britain;) and also from Theodoret and Venantius, that St. Paul was in Britain, I conclude and have no doubt, that St. Paul preached the Gos-

* Caractacus was carried to Rome with his father in the year 51, or 52, who (according to the Triads) was detained there seven years.

pel in Britain, and from the British records I infer that it was before the year 61.

Q. And how does this high antiquity of the British Church militate against the Roman Catholic Claims, grounded on the Pope's supremacy?

A. It shews the primitive independence of the British Church on the Pope, by the proof of its existence long before the commencement of the century, in which the Papal supremacy took its rise.

IX.

Seven Epochs of the British Church before the Commencement of the Pope's Supremacy.

Q. What answer do you give to the question, which Popish writers exultingly, but ignorantly, ask: *Where was the Church of England before the Reformation?*

A. I answer, that the Church of Britain existed for *six centuries* before the Pope's *first missionaries* were sent to this country for the conversion of our Saxon ancestors; and for *eleven centuries* before the establishment of the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction in England.

Q. What are the several epochs of the British Church before the arrival of the Pope's missionary, Austin?

A. There are seven:

* The papal *domination* did not exist before the time of Hildebrand (Clement VII.) in the eleventh century.

1. St. Paul's preaching in Britain in the first century;

2. Lucius's protection of Christianity in the *second*;*

3. The Diocletian persecution,† which, in the beginning of the fourth century, martyred the British saints, who were Christians of the Church in the *third* century;

4. The Council of Arles, at which were present several British Bishops, in the *fourth* century;

5. The Synod of Verulam in the *fifth* century;

6. The Synod of Llanddewi Brefi in the *sixth* century;

7. The rejection of the Pope's authority by the British Bishops in the *seventh* century.

X.

The British Churches, Protestant before they were Popish.

Q. Is not the ancient independence of the British Church on the Church of Rome, proved by the difference of usages, in the two Churches?

* The *conversion* of Lucius is a mere Romish fiction. But the general facts of Lucius's existence, christianity, and regal authority, are admitted by Godwin, Camden, Usher, Stillingfleet, Gibson, Spanheim, and Carte. To their authority may now be added the British Triads, which give no countenance to the monkish fable of the embassy to Rome.

† If the Diocletian persecution, which ended in the fourth year of the fourth century, lasted *nine* years, as Gildas says, then the Diocletian persecution itself belongs to the *third* century, as well as the fourth.

A. Yes: The difference in the time of celebrating Easter shewed, that the British Church was not under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, as late as the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century.

Q. Did not the British Bishops of the same period shew the independence of the British Church by the rejection of the Pope's authority?

A. Yes: in rejecting the overtures of Austin, and in refusing to acknowledge any spiritual authority, but that of their own metropolitan.

XI.

Establishment of Popery in Ireland.

Q. When the British Bishops rejected the Pope's authority, with what Church was the Irish Church in communion?

A. Not with the Church of Rome, but with the British Church.

Q. How do you know that the Irish Church was not in communion with the Church of Rome?

A. Because Austin's three Bishops, who invited the Irish to join the Church of Rome, said, in their Letter to the Irish Bishops, that the Irish differed in nothing from the Britons. (Bede's Hist. L. 2. c. 4.)

Q. How was the Pope's jurisdiction first introduced into England?

A. By the policy of William the Conqueror, and the intrusion of foreign ecclesiastics.

Q. Was not Peter-pence collected before that time?

A. Yes: it was permitted to be collected partly as alms, and partly as a recompence for an hospital for pilgrims at Rome.

Q. How was the Pope's jurisdiction first introduced into Ireland?

A. By the mercenary compact of the Pope and Henry II.

Q. What was the nature of that compact?

A. The Pope consented to Henry's conquest of Ireland, and Henry to the collection of Peter-pence.*

Q. Before the reign of Henry II. by whom were the Bishops in Ireland nominated?

A. By the Irish Kings, as in England by the Saxon and Norman Kings down to the beginning of the 12th Century. (Usher's Relig. of the Anc. Irish, p. 78, 79. Dublin, 1815.)

Q. When was the first Legate appointed by the Pope?

A. "It cannot be shewed out of any monu-"ment of antiquity, that the Bishop of Rome "appointed any Legates to exercise spiritual "jurisdiction over Ireland before Gillebertus, "that is, before the 12th Century." (Usher's Religion of the A. I. p. 74.)

Q. When was Peter-pence first collected in Ireland?

A. "The first ecclesiastical tribute, that ever "came into the Pope's coffers out of Ireland,

* See the Bull of Pope Adrian in the Postscript to this Catechism.

" was the voluntary offer of Henry II." (Usher, p. 120.)*

XII.

The Church of Rome, a very small Portion of the whole Church of Christ.

Q. Was not the whole Christian Church subject to the Pope's authority before the Reformation?

A. Very far from it.

Q. What was the extent of Popery compared with the rest of the Christian Church at the end of the fifteenth century?

A. It comprehended about one fourth part of Christendom.†

Q. What were the limits of Popery at that time?

A. It was confined to certain parts (the greater portion) of *Europe*, viz. England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Spain, Germany, Austria, Hungary, &c. but was excluded from all that part of Europe, which was occupied by the

* In the reign of Henry III. by the profits of Church benefices, and by the exactions of the Pope, no less a sum than " 70,000*l.* " was sent yearly out of England, an immense sum in those " days." (1 Hawk. 50.) The Statute 25 Edw. 1. &c. put an end to this enormous abuse of Church property; but the Peter-pence was not finally abolished till 25 Hen. VIII.

† See the Map prefixed to "*Tracts on the origin and independence of the ancient British Church.*" Lohdon, Rivingtons, 1815. The Russian Empire alone, according to Tooke, is twice the magnitude of Europe; to which must be added the Greek Christians within the Turkish Empire, the Syrians, Armenians, and other Christians in Asia and Africa.

Greek Church; and from the whole of the Russian Empire; and from the Syrian and Armenian Churches, and other branches of the Christian Church in *Asia*, and in *Africa*.

Q. What do you collect from this comparison of Popery with the rest of Christendom?

A. I perceive, that the Pope *never* had, even by usurpation, the supremacy over the *whole* of the Christian Church; nor, probably, over a fourth part of it;—and that whatever right he possessed, *at any time*, to exercise jurisdiction over any *part* of it, it was derived solely from the authority of the Roman Emperor;—and, of course, that such right could extend no further and exist no longer, than the paramount authority, that gave it birth.

Q. Was Britain a part of the Roman empire, when the first Roman missionaries arrived in Britain for the conversion of the Saxons?

A. No.

XIII.

The Church of Rome, the Intruder.

Q. Is it not said, that Roman Catholics in England and Ireland consider the Church of England, as an intruder on their ancient rights, and privileges, and possessions?

A. It is so said.

Q. From what we have been saying of the history of the Christian Church in Britain and Ireland, which appears to you to be the in-

truder,—the Church of England or the Church of Rome?

A. The Church of Rome. Six centuries elapsed before Popery had any footing in this country.

Q. How did the Pope's first missionaries establish themselves in Britain?

A. By the favour and patronage of the Saxon princes.

Q. In what respect did the Anglo-Saxon Churches differ from the Church of Rome?

A. In their objection to image-worship and the invocation of Saints, to transubstantiation and other errors.

Q. When was the Pope's jurisdiction first established in this country?

A. In the twelfth century.

Q. How long did it continue?

A. It continued (but not without frequent opposition and restrictions by the King and Parliament, from the 35th of Ed. I. to the 25th of Hen. VIII.*) till the beginning of the sixteenth century, that is, for about four centuries before the REFORMATION.

Q. And what, in this respect, was effected by the REFORMATION?

A. It abolished the intrusive jurisdiction of the Pope, and restored to the Crown the So-

* 35 Ed. I. 25. 27. 28 Ed. III. 3. 7. 12. 13 R. II. 2. 7 Hen. IV. 3 Hen. V. 32 Hen. VI. 7 Ed. IV. 10 Hen. VII. 24. 25 Hen. VIII.

vereignty over the State ecclesiastical, and to the Church of England its ancient rights and independence.

XIV.

The Reformation, not a Separation from the Church of Rome.

Q. I ask you again, *Where was the Church of England before the Reformation?**

A. Where it is now, and where it has been for more than seventeen centuries.

Q. How early did the Church of England form a part of the constitution?

A. The Church of England (Ecclesia Anglicana) is placed under the special protection of the law by Magna Charta; that great Charter, which was framed by the Barons, who refused the Pope's mediation, and by a Clergy, who hated the Pope for his exactions.

Q. Is not the Church of England a schismatic from the Church of Rome?

A. No. The Church of England is the same national Church, that has subsisted from the time of its first apostolical institution, having the same episcopal government, and the same fundamental doctrines, which it had from the beginning; but freed from the unscriptural

* A Papist once asked a Protestant, Where was the Church of England before the Reformation? to which the Protestant replied, "Where your's never was,—in the New Testament."—Another Protestant being asked the same question, answered it by another question, "Where was your face before it was washed?"

usages and antichristian doctrines, which had crept into it during the dark ages of papal influence.

Q. What do you mean by the "same National Church?"

A. The episcopal Church. There was no other Church in these Islands, for the first fifteen centuries of the Christian æra, but the episcopal Church. There were, indeed, from the seventh to the twelfth century *two branches* of the episcopal Church in Britain,—the *British* and the *Saxon*. But they were united by the submission of the Church of St. David's to the See of Canterbury, in the reign of Henry I. Both branches originated from St. Paul; the Saxon by succession from the Bishops of Rome, the British immediately from St. Paul.

Q. If the Church of England did not separate from the Church of Rome, what do you call our national *reformation?*

A. An *abjuration* of Popery,—a *renunciation* of the Pope's jurisdiction,—a *rejection* of the unscriptural doctrines and usages of the Church of Rome; and therefore a reformation of the Church of England, not a separation from the Church of Rome.

Q. Was not, then, the Church of England *a part* of the Church of Rome?

A. By no means. The episcopal Church throughout the world is, indeed, one Church. The episcopal congregations in England, Scot-

land, Ireland, Rome, France, &c. are all branches of one Christian community. But the Church of ENGLAND, as a *national* congregation, was never a part of the Church of ROME, though it had, through the weakness, or worldly policy, of some of the kings of England, become most *unnationally* and *unconstitutionally* subject to the influence of the Bishop of Rome. And therefore, not being *a part* of the Church of Rome, its rejection of Roman doctrines and usages, was not a *separation*, but a *reform*,—a reform on primitive principles.*

Q. What do you mean by the Church?

A. A congregation professing the doctrines of the New Testament, and governed by ancient, primitive, and apostolical institutions.

XV.

The Reformation, completed by the Revolution.

Q. What was the great purpose of the REFORMATION?

A. The exclusion of the Pope from the Church and State.

Q. How was that purpose enforced by subsequent statutes and events?

* Grotius's testimony to the purity of the Reformation in England is of great value. "In Anglia vides, quam bene processerit dogmatum noxiorum repurgatio, hac maxime de causa, quod qui id sanctissimum negotium procurandum susceperе, nihil admiserint novi, nihil sui, sed ad meliora sæcula [*the three first centuries*] intentam habuere oculorum aciem."—(Testimonia subjecta Libro de Veritate Rel. Ch.)

A. By the statute 30 Car. II. for excluding Papists from Parliament; by the expulsion of a Popish monarch from the throne; by the Bill of Rights, and by the Act of Settlement, for securing the Protestant succession. It was consummated by the Act of Union with Scotland, by which the Protestant establishment was finally and irrevocably guaranteed.

XVI.

Re-admission of Papists to political Power, not merely dangerous, *but* destructive *to the Constitution in Church and State.*

Q. Is there any *danger* in granting the Roman Catholic claims?

A. There must be danger in any measure which would affect the vital interests of the empire, by giving encouragement to a very corrupt Church, to an intolerant power, to a system hostile to our own establishment.

Q. Is the jealousy of Papal influence peculiar to this country?

A. No. Every country in Europe has provided against the intrusion of such influence.

Q. How have they provided against it?

A. Either by not permitting Roman Catholic Bishops to reside in the country; or by placing their nomination directly and exclusively in the hands of the Sovereign.

Q. Why did the Legislature in Charles the Second's reign exclude Papists from Parliament?

A. To "prevent the increase and danger of "Popery."—(Preamble to stat. 30 Car. II.)

Q. In what consists the *danger* of re-admitting Papists to political power?

A. It consists in the consequences, which would probably follow from the admission of eighty or perhaps a hundred Roman Catholics into Parliament, and into certain offices of high political trust and influence.

Q. What do you suppose the consequences would be?

A. I suppose, that all the Roman Catholic members of Parliament would be under the influence of *their own* ecclesiastical authorities, and would, of course, promote measures adverse to *our* ecclesiastical establishment, such as the appropriation of Protestant Church benefices, and the resumption of Protestant estates, and (as long as it should answer their purpose) the abolition of all religious tests.

Q. Do the Roman Catholics claim admissibility to *all* offices in the State?

A. They except, *for the present*, the Throne, the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and of Lord Chancellor in England.

Q. Is there any security against their *future* claim of these offices also?

A. None. The concession of legislative

power, and of *some* offices in the State, implies admissibility to *all*, and would naturally and inevitably excite their ambition for all.

Q. How would the re-admission of Papists to political power be *destructive* to our Protestant Constitution in Church and State?

A. Papists could not be admitted into Parliament without *repealing* the principle of all the great constitutional statutes. And though all these statutes would not at once be repealed, the Constitution would, for the most part, in fact, and *wholly in principle*, cease to be Protestant.

XVII.

Nullity of the Roman Catholic Securities.

Q. Against the *dangerous consequences* and *destructive effects* of the proposed concession to the Roman Catholics, what security do they offer?

A. *Domestic nomination!!!*

Q. What do you mean by domestic nomination?

A. The nomination of the Roman Catholic Bishops by the Irish Bishops, and not by the Pope.

Q. Is not this the usual practice of the Irish Church?

A. It is said to be.

Q. And do they seriously make this offer, as a compensation for all they have received, and all they ask for?

A. They make no other.*

Q. Would *domestic nomination* prevent the spiritual influence of the Pope?

A. No.

Q. Could *domestic nomination* repair the loss of constitutional statutes, or provide against the future spoliation of the Church?

A. No.

Q. Could their once offered and retracted Veto?

A. No.

Q. Could even the direct and exclusive nomination of the Roman Catholic Bishops by the King?

A. No.—Mere *arrangements* of Popery could

* "The aggregate Catholic meeting, held this day (July 3, "1817) in Clarendon-street Chapel, was numerously and respect- "ably attended. Several Resolutions were entered into. It "was resolved to petition Parliament early in the next Session, "—never to consent to the measure of a Veto,"—[*that is, never to acknowledge the King's supremacy, which is established by law, and which, it is, by statute, treasonable to oppose,*]—"to offer, as a "removal of every objection to emancipation, DOMESTIC NOMINA- "TION; and that the preparation and management of the "General Petition should be confided to the persons who com- "posed the late Catholic Board." (*Courier*, Monday, July 7, from the second edition of the *Dublin Evening Post*, July 3, 1817.)

not make amends for abandoning the principles of the REFORMATION and REVOLUTION.

Q. Is not all communication with the Pope, whether by domestic nomination, or the Veto, or the King's nomination, (if dependent on the Pope,) or in any way, that acknowledges the supreme authority of the Pope, equally unprotestant and illegal?

A. It is contrary to the ancient statutes of the realm, (25 Ed. III. &c.) and is condemned by the Bill of Rights, by which every person who shall hold communication with the See or Church of Rome, is declared to be excluded from the Crown.

XVIII.

No Security, but Exclusion.

Q. What was the principle of the REFORMATION?

A. The *exclusion* of the Pope from all share in the spiritual jurisdiction of this country.

Q. What was the principle of the REVOLUTION?

A. The *exclusion* of Papists from political power.

Q. What is our present and only security for the maintenance of our Protestant Constitution?

A. Adherence to the principles of the REFOR-

MATION and REVOLUTION. There can be no security, but by *Catholics* ceasing to be *Papists*, by renouncing the supremacy of the Pope, and the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome.

Q. Recite such titles or passages of the constitutional statutes as mark their Protestant and *excluding* character.

A. The first of Elizabeth (ch. 1.) is, "An Act "to restore to the Crown the ancient jurisdic- "tion over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual, "and *abolishing all foreign powers* contrary to "the same."

The 30th Car. II. (ch. 1. st. 2.) is, "An Act for "the more effectual preserving the King's per- "son and government, *by disabling Papists from* "*sitting in either House of Parliament.*" The preamble to this statute is very important. "Forasmuch as divers good laws have been "made for preventing the increase and danger of "Popery in this kingdom, which have not had "the desired effects, by reason of the free access, "which Popish recusants have had to his "Majesty's court, and by reason of the liberty, "which *of late* some of the recusants have had "and taken to sit and vote in Parliament."

By the Bill of Rights (1 W. and M.) Papists are excluded from the Crown for the following reason: "Whereas the late King James the "Second, by the assistance of divers evil *coun-* "*sellors, judges, and ministers* employed by him,

" did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the " Protestant religion, and the laws and liberties " of this kingdom."

And " Whereas it hath been found, by expe- " rience, that it is inconsistent with the safety " and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be " governed by a *Popish prince*, or by any King " or Queen marrying a Papist; the said Lords " spiritual and temporal and Commons do fur- " ther pray, that it may be enacted, that all and " every person or persons, that is, or are, or " shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communi- " cation with the See or Church of Rome, or " shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry " a Papist, shall be *excluded*, and be for ever in- " capable to inherit, possess, or enjoy, the Crown " and government of this realm and Ireland."

By the Act of Union with Scotland, (5 Anne, c. 8.) in order, " that the true Protestant re- " ligion professed and established by law in the " Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, " discipline, and government thereof, should be " effectually and *unalterably secured*," it was enacted, that " *all and singular Acts of Parliament* " *in force for the establishment and preservation* " *of the Church of England, and the doctrine,* " *worship, discipline, and government thereof, shall* " *remain and be in full force for ever.*"

XIX.

Popery always the same.

Q. Is not Popery very different now from what it was at the time of the REFORMATION?

A. No. *Semper eadem* is the governing maxim of the Romish Church. They still refuse *half the Sacrament* of the Lord's Supper to the Laity. They have still their unscriptural *Transubstantiation*, and *Purgatory*, and *Masses*, and *Indulgences*. Their Clergy are still *constrained to Celibacy*. The Councils and Decrees, which promulgated the most obnoxious tenets of their Church, are still held to be of divine authority. The Church of Rome retains her old pretensions to *supremacy*, *infallibility*, and *exclusive salvation*; —the same *intolerance*, the same hatred and execration of the Reformation and of the Church of England,* and therefore the same principled determination (if in her power) to subvert it.

Q. Does not the Church of Rome still retain in her daily service the obsolete language of ancient Rome?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it not a great error to offer up the prayers of the Church in a language not understood by the people?

A. It is.

* See Gandolphy's *Defense of the Ancient Faith*, vol. i. p. 221, 222. Vol. iv. p. 19, 23, &c. &c. throughout the work.

Q. Is Latin the original language of Scripture?

A. No: it is the language—of a translation with many errors in it.

Q. How came Latin, *originally*, to be the language of the Roman Catholic Church Service?

A. It was the *vernacular* language of *ancient* Rome.

Q. Does not the use of *Latin* in the Roman Catholic Church Service stand on the same footing with the *supremacy of the Pope?*

A. It does. They were both of them, *contingencies* of the *ancient* Roman Empire; and had no propriety, or consistency, or authority, after the Roman Empire in the West was extinct.

Q. Why does the Church of Rome still retain in her daily service the use of an obsolete language, a language not understood by the people?

A. Because she has, for many ages, *declared herself* to be infallible and incapable of error; and the people are weak enough to believe it: and because to reform errors would be to prove herself fallible and peccable; and would break the charm of that absolute dominion, which she has over the minds of those, who submit to it.

Q. Have the errors of doctrine in the Church of Rome any practical effect on the opinions of Roman Catholics of the present day?

A. Yes: her doctrine of the *atoning* power of

good works* is still productive of opinions contrary to the Gospel, and inconsistent with the propitiation by Christ's death, and affords a license to sin.

How deeply incorporated into common life that antichristian spirit still is, which makes the atonement of Christ of none effect, and which it was a great object of the REFORMATION to counteract, we may judge from the sentiments of a celebrated French writer of the present day. M. Chateaubriand, in his *Genie du Christianisme*, says, (Vol. iii. p. 181, 182, of the English translation,) "For our parts, during the few "years that we have devoted to these re- "searches, so many acts of charity, so many "admirable foundations, so many inconceivable "sacrifices have passed in review before us, that "we firmly believe, that in *this single point of* "*the Christian religion*, (which is but one "grand *expiation* for mankind,) there is suf- "ficient to atone for all the crimes, which men "have committed since the beginning of the "world:" and, of course, for all that may be committed to the end of the world. Most acceptable doctrine! to all, who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.

If this be true; if charity be capable of such

* In this error Socinianism and Popery unite. In how many points they do unite, may be seen in a very curious work entitled *Roma Racoviana, et Racovia Romana.*

atonement, or if priests can pray mens' souls out of Purgatory, in return for charitable bequests, and deliver them from any portion of punishment inflicted on them in the next life, then Christ died in vain, and the Scriptures are a *brutum fulmen.* But these doctrines are not true. They are contrary to Scripture, and have grown out of the gainful trade of Popish delusions. M. Chateaubriand's, no doubt, is the language of a declamatory writer; but, as he professedly connects his assertion with the Christian doctrine of *expiation,* misunderstood and misapplied, it shews the practical effects of the Popish system, and the dangerous state of those, who live under it.

Q. Does not it appear from recent events, that the Church of Rome is tenacious of her semper-identity?

A. Yes: It appears from the restoration of the Inquisition in Spain, the revival of the order of Jesuits, and the claim of exemption from the interference of the civil authorities in the Netherlands, as well as in this country, that the Church of Rome is governed by the same principles that she always was.

XX.

Religious Considerations inseparable from the Roman Catholic Question.

Q. What have religious distinctions to do with political claims?

A. A great deal. They are tests of political principles.

Q. Do not the Roman Catholics themselves connect religion with their claims?

A. Religion is the *ground* of the Roman Catholics' claim to *exemption from conformity* to the laws of their country. The Pope's Supremacy they call a part of their religion.*

Q. Is the Pope's Supremacy a part of their religion?

A. Certainly not. That cannot be a part of their religion, which is no part of Christianity,—which was unknown before the seventh century,—which was the grant of an usurper and murderer,—and which was reprobated by the most virtuous of their Popes, as presumptuous, heretical, and antichristian.†

Q. Do not also the advocates of Popery connect religion with their plea for the Roman Catholic claims?

A. They do. They admit the Pope's Supremacy to be a part of a Roman Catholic's religion, and urge the sacred rights of conscience in his favour; as if a Protestant had not the

* De necessitate salutis est credere Papam esse œcumenicum. (Council of Constance apud Jewell's Defense, p. 125.) Gregory the First, on the contrary said, In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil aliud est quam fidem perdere.

† For Gregory's strong terms of reprobation, see Jewell's Defense, p. 450, and Forbesii Institut. l. xvi. c. 7. § 16.

same sacred rights, and was not equally bound in conscience to deny the said Supremacy, and to oppose it, as a false ground of the Roman Catholic's plea for his non-conformity.

Q. Is not religion also very intimately connected with the Protestant's objections to the Roman Catholic claims?

A. It is. Our Protestant Constitution is religious as well as political. *Constitution in Church and State* is the standard of loyalty and religion. The King is the head of our Church, from whom the Roman Catholic transfers his spiritual allegiance to the Pope.

Q. What is it that excludes Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans, from our Churches and from Parliament?

A. Difference of religion.

XXI.

Declaration against Transubstantiation.

Q. Why was the declaration against Transubstantiation required by the Statute of 30 of Ch. II.?

A. For the purpose of excluding Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament; and because former Statutes had been found insufficient for that purpose.

Q. How does that appear?

A. By the event. Papists were excluded

from Parliament by the oath of supremacy required by 5 Eliz. Yet during the reign of Charles II. there were instances of Papists, who "took the liberty to sit and vote in Parliament,"* till they were finally excluded by the stricter test of the Declaration.

Q. Is it any hardship on Protestants to make the Declaration against Transubstantiation and the invocation of Saints?

A. No: Because, if they are really Protestants, they are so, on this very principle, that the worship of the Church of Rome is unscriptural, superstitious and idolatrous.

Q. Is it any objection to the Declaration, that many Protestants, who are called upon to make it, do not know enough of the subject to be satisfied of the truth of the Declaration?

A. No: Because no one can be a Protestant, on principle, who is *not* satisfied of the truth or the Declaration; and if he *is* a Protestant, on principle, there can be no hardship in making a Declaration, which he *knows* to be true, and, as an avowed Protestant, he *professes* to believe.

Q. Is it any objection to the Declaration, that many Protestants, who are called upon to make it, do not consider the worship of the Church of Rome to be idolatrous, and may therefore think the Declaration an unfounded calumny?

A. If they think the Declaration an unfounded

* Statute 30 Car. II.

calumny, and hold the worship of the Church of Rome not to be idolatrous, they are not *Protestants,* whatever they may profess to be; and the objection does not apply to them.

Q. Can we, then, consider the Declaration, as unnecessary, in respect of the Papists, or hard on the Protestants?

A. It is neither unnecessary, as to the Papists, because the experience of the past shews, that former laws were insufficient without it; nor can it be any hardship on the Protestants, because if they are Protestants, on principle, they *know* it to be true, and, as avowed Protestants, *profess* to believe it; and which if they do not believe, they belie their Protestant profession.

XXII.

Temporal *effects of the Pope's* spiritual *Power.*

Q. The Papists are willing to renounce, and by the oath prescribed by 31 Geo. III. do renounce, "the temporal and civil jurisdiction of "the Pope within this realm." Is not that a sufficient warrant for entrusting them with political power?

A. It is no warrant at all.

Q. France is conquered,* Buonaparte over-

* *Conquer France!* was the indignant exclamation of Mr. Fox, who, judging on worldly principles, pronounced the conquest of

thrown, and the war at an end; can there be any danger *now* in granting the Roman Catholic claims?

A. If the danger of Popery, and of Papal influence, were connected with the war, or with the power of France, that danger is only dormant, not extinct.

Q. What harm can the Pope do? His temporal power is weak and contemptible.

A. The formidable power of the Pope is not in his *temporal*, but *spiritual* authority.

Q. What deprived King John of his crown?

A. The Pope's spiritual authority.

Q. What was it, that held King John in vassalage to the Pope?

A. The Pope's spiritual authority.

Q. Was not this submission of the King disgraceful to England?

A. It was a disgrace never to be forgotten by all who have any regard for the honour of their country.

Q. What was the conduct of the Greek

France to be impossible. Who, indeed, could have believed, after the battle of Austerlitz in 1805, that in less than ten years France would be *twice conquered*, and Paris *twice captured* by Great Britain and her allies? But "the things, which are im-" possible with men, are possible with God." His almighty Providence over-ruled the vanity and ambition of Buonaparte to his own destruction. "Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and " though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring " thee down, saith the Lord." The name of Napoleon was placed by the Leipsic astronomers on the belt of Orion.

Church on their Emperor's submission to the Pope?

A. "The Greek Emperor, Michael Palæologus, "for that he submitted himself to the Pope, in "the late council of Florence, was therefore "abhorred and hated of the people while he "lived, and being dead, was forbidden Christian "burial. Isidorus, the Archbishop of Kiovia, in "Russia, for that, being returned from the said "council, he began for unity's sake to move the "people to the like submission, was therefore "deposed from his Bishoprick, and put to death." (Jewell's Defense, p. 457. ed. 1657.)

Q. What effect should the memory of the disgrace that was brought on the country by King John, have on their posterity of the present day?

A. It should make them cautious how they give any countenance to the jurisdiction of the Pope within this realm.

Q. By what authority was Henry VIII. and his Queen summoned to Rome?

A. By the Pope's spiritual authority.

Q. By what authority were the subjects of Henry VIII. of Queen Elizabeth, James I. and Charles I. absolved from their allegiance to their Sovereign?

A. By the Pope's spiritual authority.

Q. What counteracted the efforts of the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, and prevented resistance

to Cromwell, and overwhelmed the whole country in ruin?

A. The threat of papal excommunication.

Q. From what source did the titular Romish Bishops of Ireland, in the year 1729, seek and obtain authority to restore the Pretender, and to put to the sword his Majesty George II. and all his family?

A. From the Pope's spiritual authority. (*Irish Commons' Journals*, Vol. IV. Appendix, 46.)

Q. What is it, that declares the Protestant ministry of the Church to be heretical and invalid, Protestant marriages to be null and void, and the offspring of these marriages to be illegitimate?

A. The Pope's spiritual authority.

Q. What is it, that creates a controul over the minds of Papists superior to the laws of the land,—that prevents their acknowledging the entire sovereignty of their King,—and compels them to obey a foreign jurisdiction?

A. The spiritual authority of the Pope.

Q. What, then, if every Papist in England and Ireland should renounce the *temporal* authority of the Pope?

A. The renunciation of the Pope's *temporal* authority, is no security against the influence of his *spiritual* jurisdiction, and therefore no warrant for entrusting Papists with political power.

Q. How should we guard against the *temporal* effects of the Pope's spiritual power?

A. By *temporal* provisions;—by taking experience as our guide; by remembering, that what has been, may be, and, if not guarded against, must be;* by observing the immutable spirit of the Roman Church; and by rendering equally immutable that Protestant Constitution,—that union of Church and State,—which the advocates of Popery are labouring to dissolve, but which the piety and patriotism of our ancestors have, by the most inviolable sanctions, declared to be fixed and unalterable. Let *us* remember, (if we cannot convince *them*) that in excluding Papists from our Churches, and from political power, while we maintain our own rights, we do them no wrong;—that *theirs* is *not*, as they think, *the ancient religion* either of England or Ireland;—that Popery was in both countries an intruder and usurper;—that in both countries it obtained its first footing, as a *system of jurisdiction*, by the weakness and ignorance of some,

* "*Whenever the opportunity of power shall come*," says Hoadley, "It is no more than what they fairly and publickly profess, "*if Protestants will but open their eyes and see it.*" If we consult the Parliaments of former days, we shall find the preambles of their acts the best reporters of the past, and advisers for the future. The predictions in the remonstrance of James's Parliament have been too accurately verified in our own days, to leave a doubt, that the whole of their oracular sentence will be fulfilled, if we shut our eyes to the inevitable consequences of unconstitutional concessions.

and the mercenary policy of others; and that, however first established, its exactions and oppressions were never congenial to the national spirit of this country, but were always (except in the twelfth and part of the thirteenth century,) from time to time, opposed and restricted by our Kings and Parliaments,—were abolished by the REFORMATION,—and their revival finally precluded by the laws of the REVOLUTION. We are the heirs of our ancestors' labours. May we do justice to the valuable inheritance entailed upon us, by maintaining inviolably what they have willed to be perpetual and inalienable.

XXIII.

Insurmountable Difficulties in the Plan proposed to Parliament.

Q. Do not religious considerations present insuperable difficulties in the plan proposed by the advocates of the Roman Catholic claims?

A. They do; and those difficulties cannot be better stated than in the forcible language of Mr. Peel. "Let us examine a little into the "manner in which this Bill is framed. The "preamble of it states, that the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland is "established permanently and inviolably. It "then admits that the Protestant Episcopal "Church forms an essential part of our free "Constitution, and prays that certain provisions "may be made, with a view to put an end to

" all religious jealousies between his Majesty's " subjects, and to bind them in all times to " come by the same privileges, and (observe) by " the same interests in defence of their common " Government. The same interests! you confirm " the Protestant establishment as an essential " part of the Government, and then assume " that the Protestant and the Roman Catholic " will have the same interests in maintaining " the Government! You may declaim as you " will, and make what preambles you please, " but the *force of nature* and the *spirit of re-* " *ligion* are opposed to you; they contradict your " preambles, and confute your declamation."

XXIV.

Other insurmountable Difficulties.

Q. Are there not other insurmountable difficulties in the way of the Roman Catholic claims?

A. There are. Every member of Parliament's conscience appears to me to be pledged and pre-engaged by his parliamentary oaths against these claims.

Q. Is not the King's Coronation Oath a still greater difficulty?

A. I think it is.

Q. Is not that oath (under existing circumstances) attended with a peculiarly inviolable sanctity?

A. I think it is.

Q. Is it at all probable, that his Majesty's

representative would make any concessions contrary to that oath?

A. I should think, that a representative, whose conduct (to the unspeakable benefit and happiness of this country and of Europe) has been distinguished by the most filial and exemplary adherence to his Father's principles, would never be induced, by any consideration, to make concessions inconsistent with his Majesty's scrupulous and decided sentiments.

Q. Do not the constitutional statutes of the Revolution and the Union declare the Protestant establishment to be for ever fixed and unalterable?

A. Yes.

Q. Do not these statutes declare, that the 30th of Car. II. which *disables Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament*, shall remain and be in full force for ever?

A. They do.

Q. But has not Parliament, by granting to Irish Papists the elective franchise, given them a kind of claim to seats in Parliament?

A. By no means. If the elective franchise be really inconsistent with the constitutional statutes of the Revolution, it ought to be repealed, (like *all other concessions that are injurious to loyalty or religion,*) or by some means be modified and rendered innoxious. But, whatever be done with the elective franchise, it does not follow, that because Parliament has been guilty

of one act of prodigality, that it should *therefore*, like a thoughtless and unprincipled spendthrift, plunge itself into inextricable ruin.

Q. Is not the intolerance of the Church of Rome, also, an insurmountable objection to the Roman Catholic claims?

A. It is. If the Church of Rome, on account of its *idolatry* according to Milton, and its *intolerance* according to Locke,* *ought not*, in their opinion, *to have been tolerated*, it follows, by parity of principle, that, in a Protestant country, it would be insanity to entrust it with *political power*.

Q. Does not their own present conduct afford an insuperable objection?

A. Yes: an insuperable objection on their own principles. They say, they will rather die, than consent that Protestants should have any controul over the Roman Catholic Church. Papists therefore ought, on no consideration, to have the power of legislating for a Protestant Church.

* See Milton's & Locke's opinions, prefixed to this Catechism.

*** **The means of *co-operating with the laws for preventing the danger and increase of Popery*, intended for the CONCLUSION, as noticed in the *Table of Contents*, being intimately connected with the credit and usefulness of our Ecclesiastical establishment, as I conceive, but admitting a difference of opinion, are omitted for further consideration.**

NOTE TO SECT. XIII.

On the Statutes of PRÆMUNIRE* *against* papal encroachments, *prior to the time of Henry VIII. and on certain* PRETENDED STATUTES *employed for the purpose of introducing the* papal jurisdiction *into England.*

THE long series of Statutes against the papal encroachments enacted prior to the Reformation, during the 14th and 15th Centuries, is of great importance in distinguishing the *political danger* of Popery from the religious corruptions of the Church of Rome; and in shewing that the Church of England's rejection of Popery at the Reformation, did not originate with Luther, or in the sensualities of Henry VIII. (as the Papists pretend,) but was the ultimate result of the national abhorrence of a foreign jurisdiction. To Blackstone's observations on this subject may be added Mr. G. Sharp's valuable *Appendix* to his REMARKS on the Irish Roman Catholic Catechism, containing an enumeration of the several Statutes from 35 Ed. I. to 1 Hen. V. "These "national Statutes (he observes, speaking of four in 38 Ed. III.) "are evidences of the most extraordinary and undeniable im- "portance, when we consider, that they were enacted above

* "In the writs for the execution of all these statutes the words *præmunire facias*, being (as we said) used to command a citation of the party, have denominated, in common speech, not only the writ, but *the offence* itself *of maintaining the papal power*, by the name of *præmunire*.—This then is the original meaning of the offence, which we call *præmunire*, viz. *introducing a foreign power into this land*, and creating *imperium in imperio*, by paying that obedience to papal process, which constitutionally belonged to the King alone, long before the reformation in the reign of Henry the Eighth." (Blackstone's Comm. B. IV. Ch. 8.)

" 180 years *before the Church of England was reformed* under " King Edward the VIth; so that the advocates for Popery " cannot reasonably attribute them to religious prejudices against " their corrupted Church."

In the Preface to the same Remarks, Mr. Sharp has directed the attention of the public to the frauds employed to introduce the papal jurisdiction into England, frauds equalled only by the forgeries of the *Decretals* and of the *Donation of Constantine*. " Through the influence of a *Foreign Power* some pretended statutes obtained the force and power of *law* in England, though they were enacted and ordained only '*by the King and his* '*Council*,' at the time of each enactment, without the least mention of the *consent of the Parliament*, or of the *Common Council of the Kingdom*, and which seem, therefore, to have been mere *orders in Council*, though artfully dated—'*At the Parliament*,' in order to give them the appearance of Law.* The learned *Sir Edward Coke*, in his 4th Inst. p. 51, gives several instances of such *supposed* statutes, that had been repealed or *disaffirmed*, (wanting the consent of the *Commons*,) which were, nevertheless, published and *enforced* as real statutes; viz. 5 *Rich. II.* c. 5. and 2 *Hen. IV.* c. 15. and again the 2 *Hen. V.* c. 7. all which, as *Sir Edward Coke* remarks, were *disavowed by the Commons*, and (yet) the pretended Acts were printed. (4 Inst. p. 51, and 3 Inst. p. 40, 41.) But when we consider *the purposes* for which these notorious frauds were committed by the three English Kings* above-mentioned and their ministers—that they were really to support and enforce the *Antichristian* doctrines of the *Papal Government at Rome*, they demonstrate the extreme danger of granting any share of *political* government to persons who submit their *religious* opinions to the *dictates* of that fatal *Foreign Power*."

" One of the *purposes* of the *first*-mentioned statute, (that of 5 *Rich. II.*) as stated by *Sir Edward Coke*, 3 Inst. p. 40, was

* We may justly exonerate the three Kings from the blame here imputed to them for measures, of which their Popish Prelates and Popish Clergy were the real authors. But we certainly derive from these *pretended* statutes an invincible argument against the admission of Papists to offices of political trust and power.

that — '*By colour of this supposed act, certain persons that* '*held*—THAT IMAGES WERE NOT TO BE WORSHIPPED, &c. *were* '*holden in strong prison until they (to redeem their vexation)* '*miserably yielded before those masters of Divinity to take oath,* '*and did* SWEAR TO WORSHIP IMAGES, *which was against the moral* '*and eternal Law of Almighty God.*'—The *purpose* of the *second* illegal statute above-mentioned, viz. 2 *Hen. IV.* c. 15, was against persons whom they were pleased to call HERETICS—'*giving power to the Bishop or Ordinary to convent before him, or* 'IMPRISON *any person suspected of Heresie,*' and ordaining (contrary to the laws of God) that '*an obstinate Heretick*' (or any person whom an ignorant Popish enthusiast was pleased to call so) '*shall be* BURNED *before the people!*' The *purpose* of the *third* illegal statute (the 2 *Hen. V.* c. 7.) was equally *diabolical*, viz. '*That all the officers of Government shall be sworn to assist the* '*Ordinaries in* EXTIRPATING *Heresies.*' (The condemnation of a *Heretick* to be *extirpated* was well known, by the ordinary process of execution at that time, to mean *extirpation by fire*, exactly in the sytle of Old BABYLON.) '*That an Heretick convict shall* '*forfeit all his fee-simple lands, goods, chattels: and they which be* '*indicted of Heresie shall be delivered to the Ordinaries,*' i. e. for an *inquisitorial trial*, and consequent '*extirpation in flames of fire!*"

"By such notorious *treachery* and *dishonesty* in *forging* statutes, did the zealots of the *Roman Church* introduce the *Papal* tyranny and cruelty into *England*, which circumstances amply prove the extreme danger of entrusting any persons with a share of *political* power, whose *religious* opinions are subject to such a fatal *foreign influence*." So far this venerable and patriotic advocate of the Protestant Church, whose opinion of the *elective franchise*, and its influence on the *Union*, will not be out of place here. "Above thirty-six years ago, I was an earnest advocate for *two distinct national Legislatures*.—But when (after a prudent repeal and removal of every unjust oppression, that had been laid upon the Roman Catholic subjects of Ireland) the privilege of *voting for representatives* in Parliament was imprudently and too hastily granted to them,—the case was totally altered, and the *union of the two Legislatures* was rendered absolutely necessary to maintain the equilibrium of the united states." (Preface to Remarks on the Irish Roman Catholic Catechism, p. iv. v. xiii. xiv.)

NOTE TO SECT. XVII.

THE Statutes of *præmunire*, not less than the laws of the REFORMATION and REVOLUTION, shew the absolute incompatibility of the measure, which was lately proposed in Parliament, as a full indemnity for the loss of our Protestant Constitution, I mean, the once offered, retracted, and re-offered VETO. On this delusive proposal Mr. Sharp's remark in the before-mentioned Tract is forcible and decisive. "The long-continued lawless "encroachments of the Papal Pontifex Maximus must neces- "sarily render it highly improper, and even *illegal* for the *Crown* "*of England*, to accept the power of the proposed *Veto*;* or to "have any concern in the appointment of *unreformed* Bishops, "who still acknowledge the Papal authority of Rome, as the "Head of the Catholic Church, though it has been proved by its "deeds to be more completely antichristian than any other "power in the Roman Empire." (p. 103.)

Every friend to humanity, Protestantism, and Sacred Literature, will rejoice to hear, that Memoirs of the Life of this excellent man, the worthy grandson of Archbishop Sharp, are preparing for the public by a learned friend of the family, eminently qualified for the undertaking.

* On this incompatibility of the Veto, see also Bishop Huntingford's Protestant Letter to Lord Somers, p. 36, 37.

POSTSCRIPT.

POPE ADRIAN'S BULL.

THE Bull of Pope ADRIAN IV. in which he gives his consent to Henry the Second's conquest of Ireland, on condition of his paying Peter-pence,* is a curious and important historical document, and contains indisputable evidence, that Popery† was *not the ancient religion* of the Irish—*not the religion of Ireland* before the middle of the twelfth century. If this fact, *the modern introduction of Popery* into Ireland, were more generally known in that country, it might tend not a little to break that spell, which blinds the eyes of the Irish Papists to the errors of the Church of Rome. "I confess," says Archbishop Usher in his Letter to Sir Christopher Sibthorp, "I somewhat incline to be of your mind, that if, unto the authorities drawn out of Scriptures and Fathers (which

* Propter hoc præcipue, ut Ecclesiam Hibernicam extolleret et exaltaret, et denarium S. Petri, sicut in Anglia, sic in Hibernia dari faceret, pater ipsius [Henricus Johannis] intrandi Hiberniam sibique subjugandi ab Ecclesia Romana licentiam impetravit; quemadmodum ex privilegio Adriani Papæ super hoc obtento aperte declaratur. (Giraldus Cambrensis de rebus a se gestis. L. 11. c. x.

† Popery is not merely the worship of *Saints* and of the *Mass*, and the belief of *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, &c. but submission to the *jurisdiction of the Pope*. "All ecclesiastical authority "in Ireland had, till about four years before the accession of "Henry II. been exercised by her own Prelates," (Leland's Hist. of Ireland, Vol. I. ch. 1.) and not by the Pope.

are common to us with others) a true discovery were added of that religion, which *anciently* was professed in this kingdom, it might prove a special motive to induce my poor countrymen to consider a little better of the old and true way, from whence they have hitherto been misled." And what was that old and true way? The Archbishop says, "As far as I can collect by such records of the former ages as have come unto my hands, (either manuscript or printed,) the religion professed by the *ancient* Bishops, Priests, Monks, and other Christians in this land, was for substance the very same with that, which now by public authority is maintained therein against the *foreign doctrine* brought in thither in *latter times* by the Bishop of Rome's followers." This the Primate has abundantly proved in the six first chapters of his *Discourse on the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British.** In the subsequent chapters he discusses the Pope's "spiritual jurisdiction, and shews how little footing it had at first in these parts."--But to return to Pope's Adrian's Bull.

The Archbishop considers the *general* claim, which in this Bull the Pope made to Ireland, on the ground that Ireland, and *all other Islands* into which Christianity had been introduced, belonged of right to St. Peter,† and to the Church of Rome, to be a proof, that he had no other claim, and that the Island had not been subject to him previously to his compact with Henry II.

Mr. Roberts also in his valuable and interesting *Review*

* Reprinted, Dublin, 1815, and sold by Hatchard and Seely, London.

† By the *donation of Constantine!* of which "notorious forgery," see Usher's *Discourse*, p. 118. Geddes's Tracts, Vol. IV. p. 1—52. and Bower's Hist. of the Popes, Vol. I. p. 111, and the *Conclusion* to this Postscript.

of the Policy and peculiar Doctrines of the Church of Rome, (p. 106, 107.) notices the *Address* being to the King instead of the Clergy;—and the expressions of Henry's *planting* Christianity in Ireland, and thus *extending the limits* of the Church, as evidences to the same purpose.

Bale,* indeed, informs us, that Adrian had condemned the Irish for *heresy;* and that their heresy was the reason of his entering into compact with Henry for the occupation of the country.† We have in that fact alone sufficient proof that Ireland was not *then* within the pale of the Church of Rome. This charge of heresy was also asserted by Harding in his Chronicle‡ a century before Bale's time; and is confirmed by a contemporary writer, Giraldus Cambrensis, in his character of the Irish;‖ and

* Cent. Scrip. 2. Cap. 94. in App.

† Anglorum Regi Henrico mandat Hadrianus Romanus, ut Hibernos, quos *hæreseos ipse damnat*, eo quod Clero legitima sacerdotum conjugia damnanti adversentur, et rebelles exsistant, opprimeret. (Hist. Eccles. Magdeb. Cent. xii. c. 7. ex Balæo.)

‡ Usher's Discourse, p. 119, 120.

‖ Topogr. Hibern. and in the treatise De rebus a se gestis, p. 488. in Wharton's Anglia Sacra. It is surprising to find the learned and excellent historian of Ireland so mistaken, as he is, in his opinion of Giraldus Cambrensis. He calls him a *Monk*. (Leland's Hist. of Ireland, Vol. I. p. 14. Note. ed. 4to.) He was Archdeacon of Brecon, and of very high birth, educated at St. David's and Paris, and was a man of great talents and learning. The *monks* had not a bitterer enemy than Giraldus. "Monachos (says Wharton, speaking of his *Speculum Ecclesiæ*) capitali odio semper prosecutus est. In omnibus suis scriptis Monachorum hypocrisin, fraudes et inscitiam acriter insectari gestit. Istud vero opus triennali labore contexuit, ut æternam Monachis infamiam induceret, atque odio suo plene indulgeret." He had the merit of attacking that corrupt part of the Roman Catholic system nearly a whole century before the era of Wickliffe.

by the provisions of the council of Cashel in 1172.* The imputed *heresy* was the heresy of *discipline* rather than of doctrine; but it equally shews the nonconformity of *the ancient Irish Church* to the Church of Rome.

But even without these evidences of their nonconformity it is clear from the language of the Bull, that Ireland was not subject to the Pope at the time of this celebrated compromise. For if Ireland had *then* been within the jurisdiction of the Pope, he never would have spoken of Christianity as *planted* there by Henry, nor of the *limits* of the Church being *enlarged* by him. Of this *planting*, too, and *enlargement* he speaks as the *intention* of the King, not yet done, but *to be done*. He mentions also his *adding* Ireland to the number of Islands subject to St. Peter and the Church of Rome, *in consequence* of Henry's proposal, and the good purposes professed by him. He likewise describes the Irish as *untaught*, and *ignorant of the Christian faith*, which he might do as a Pope, judging them to be *heretics*, but which he would not have done, if they had been *Roman Catholics*. We have, therefore, for the *modern establishment* of Popery in Ireland the authority of a Pope,—the very Pope, who was instrumental in that establishment. The present race of Irish Roman Catholics call Popery *the ancient religion* of Ireland. They may learn from Adrian's Bull, that Popery has no such claim to their veneration. They may learn, too, what, perhaps, will not increase their veneration for Popery, that its establishment in Ireland was the work of two Englishmen,—an English Pope,† and an English King.

* Carte's Hist. of Engl. Vol. I. p. 644.

† Adrian was a native of Langley, near St. Alban's in Hertfordshire. (Chalmers's Biog. Dict.) A third Englishman was the main agent in this nefarious transaction,—John of Salisbury,—

The original text of the Pope's Bull may be seen in Giraldus Cambrensis's Tracts *de Expug. Hibern.* and *De rebus a se gestis*, Matt. Paris, &c. There is a translation of it in Rapin's *History of England*, Collyer's *Eccles. History of Great Britain*, Leland's *Hist. of Ireland*, Lord Lyttleton's *History of Henry* II. Roberts's *Review of the Policy and peculiar Doctrines of the Church of Rome* before mentioned, Chalmers's Life of Adrian IV. in the *Biographical Dictionary*. For the translation here subjoined to the Latin text, this Postscript is answerable.

ADRIANI PAPÆ PRIVILEGIUM.

Adrianus, episcopus, servus servorum Dei, charissimo in Christo filio, illustri Anglorum Regi, salutem et Apostolicam benedictionem. Laudabiliter et fructuose de glorioso nomine propagando in terris, et æterno felicitatis præmio cumulando in cœlis, tua magnificentia cogitat, cum ad *dilatandos ecclesiæ terminos*, ad *declarandam indoctis et rudibus populis Christianæ fidei veritatem*, et vitiorum plantaria de agro Dominico extirpanda, sicut Catholicus princeps intendis. Ad id convenientius exequendum, consilium Apostolicæ sedis exigis et favorem. In quo facto, quanto altiori consilio, et majori discretione procedis, tanto in eo feliciorem progressum te, præstante Domino, confidimus habiturum; eo quod amplius ad bonum exitum semper et finem soleant attingere, quæ de ardore fidei et religionis amore principium acceperunt. Sane Hiberniam et omnes insulas, quibus Sol justitiæ illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ acceperunt, ad

who says it was at his request, that the Pope consented to the invasion of Ireland.

jus B. Petri et Sacro-sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, (quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit,) non est dubium pertinere. Unde in eis libentius *plantationem* fidelem, et *germen* gratum Deo *inseruimus*, quanto id a nobis interno examine districtius prospicimus exequendum. Significasti siquidem nobis, fili in Christo charissime, te Hiberniæ insulam ad subdendum illum populum legibus, et vitiorum plantaria inde extirpanda, velle intrare, et de singulis domibus annuam unius denarii B. Petro velle solvere pensionem, et jura ecclesiarum illius terræ illibata et integra conservare; nos itaque pium et laudabile desiderium tuum cum favore congruo prosequentes, et petitioni tuæ benignum impendentes assensum, gratum velle et acceptum habemus, ut pro *dilatandis ecclesiæ terminis*, pro vitiorum restinguendo decursu, pro corrigendis moribus, et virtutibus inserendis, pro *Christianæ religionis augmento*, insulam illam ingrediaris, et quæ ad honorem Dei et salutem illius terræ spectaverint, exequaris. Et illius terræ populus honorifice te recipiat, et sicut dominum veneretur; jure nimirum e contrario ecclesiarum illibato et integro permanente, et salva B. Petro et Sacro-sanctæ ecclesiæ Romanæ de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione. Si ergo, quod concepisti animo, effectu duxeris prosequente conplendum, stude gentem illam bonis moribus informare, et agas tam per te, quam per alios, quos ad hoc fide, verbo, et vita idoneos esse perspexeris, ut decoretur ibi ecclesia, *plantetur et crescat fidei Christianæ religio*, et quæ ad honorem Dei, et salutem pertinent animarum, per te taliter ordinentur, ut a Deo sempiternæ mercedis cumulum consequi merearis, et in terris gloriosum nomen valeas in seculis obtinere.

POPE ADRIAN'S BULL.*

"Adrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our well-beloved Son in Christ, the illustrious King of England, health and Apostolical benediction.

* "The papal power was gradually advancing to a formidable height, and extending its influence even to the extremity of the British islands. Not contented with assuming a dominion in the ecclesiastical system, it had already dictated to Kings and nations in their secular concerns. It had espoused the cause of William the Norman, made a solemn decision in favour of his claims, and denounced its spiritual vengeance against all those who should presume to resist a Prince, whom the sovereign Pontiff declared rightful and lawful inheritor of the crown of England. The usurper Stephen had obtained a ratification of his title from the same authority. To this power Henry now determined to resort, and by the solemnity of a papal decree to sanctify his intended enterprize against Ireland. John of Salisbury, his chaplain, was made the agent in this important negociation, and acted with the zeal and diligence of a man, conscious that his success would recommend him equally to his royal master and his spiritual sovereign. He represented to Adrian, the reigning Pope, that the inhabitants of Ireland were sunk into the most wretched state of corruption with respect both to morals and religion; that Henry, zealous for the honour and enlargement of God's kingdom, had conceived the pious design of erecting it in this unhappy country; was ready to devote himself and all his powers to this meritorious service; imploring the benediction of the pontiff, and requesting his permission and authority to enter Ireland, to reduce the disobedient and corrupt, to eradicate all sin and wickedness, to instruct the ignorant, and spread the blessed influence of the Gospel in its purity and perfection; promising at the same time to pay a yearly tribute to St. Peter from the land thus to be reduced to his obedience and that of the holy see. Habituated as we may be to the depravity of mankind, one cannot seriously reflect on the profane hypocrisy of this transaction without the utmost horror.

"Your Highness's desire of extending the glory of your name on earth, and of obtaining the reward of eternal happiness in heaven, is laudable and beneficial; inasmuch as your intent is, as a Catholic Prince, to *enlarge the limits of the Church*, to declare the truth of the Christian faith to *untaught and rude nations*, and to eradicate vice from the field of the Lord. For the more convenient execution of this design you require the counsel and favour of the Apostolic See. In this undertaking we are confident, that, with the blessing of the Lord, you will have the happier success in proportion to the excellence of your motive, and the greatness of your discretion, with which you proceed in it; because those undertakings are usually attended with a larger share of success, which originate in the ardour of faith, and the love of religion. There is, indeed, no doubt, that Ireland and all the Islands, which the Sun of Righteousness has enlightened, and which have received the doctrines of Christianity, belong to the jurisdiction of St. Peter, and of the holy Roman Church, as your Highness acknowledges. We have therefore the more willingly inserted among them a faithful *plant*, and a *graft* acceptable to God, because, after mature examination, we distinctly *foresee* that it *ought to be done*. Since, then, most dearly beloved Son in Christ, you have signified to us, that you intend your expedition to Ireland in order to subject the people to laws, and to extirpate vice; and that you are willing to pay to St. Peter an annual pension

Little did Henry foresee, in the blindness of his ambition, the perplexity he was to experience from that power he now contributed to aggrandize, or the heavy weight of oppression with which it was to fall upon his own head.—A Bull was framed without delay, fully conformable to the wishes and purposes of the King. It is here inserted at large, and affords a shocking instance of the profligacy and impiety of papal usurpation."—(Leland's Hist. of Ireland, vol. I. p. 5—8.)

of one penny from every house, and to preserve the rights of the churches of that land inviolate and entire; we, therefore, approving, as it deserves, your pious and laudable design, and giving our hearty assent to your petition, are well pleased, that you should make a descent on that Island in order to enlarge the limits of the Church, to repress the progress of vice, to correct the manners of the people, to implant virtue, to *increase the knowledge of Christianity;* and that you may execute whatever may conduce to the honour of God, and to the salvation of the people. May the people receive you honourably, and venerate you as their lord, provided, that, on your part, the rights of the Churches be preserved inviolate and entire, and the annual pension of one penny from every house be paid to St. Peter, and to the holy Roman Church. If then you determine to put your design in execution, study to improve the nation in virtue, and do all that in you lies, (as well as by the aid of such persons as you may judge to be qualified for this purpose by their faith, their doctrine, and life,) for the honour of the Church, for the *planting* and *growth* of the Christian faith; and that all things pertaining to the glory of God, and the salvation of souls, may be so regulated by you, as to entitle you to receive an eternal reward from God, and immortal renown on earth."

John of Salisbury, who negociated the compact between the King and the Pope, rests * the Pope's pretended right to the sovereignty of Ireland, on *the donation of Constantine.* But he does it with some hesitation. "All islands" (he says) "of ancient right, *are said* to "belong to the Church of Rome by the donation of "Constantine." He was too learned and sagacious a writer not to be aware of the forgery of this "imperial

* Joann. Sarisb. Metalogic. L. 4. c. 42.

edict." Laurentius Valla, Baronius and other learned Papists acknowledge it to be a forgery. Yet this surreptitious Donation was the foundation of all the Pope's temporal power. Under its sanctions the Pope claimed the right of conferring the sovereignty of Ireland on Henry the Second. At the time of the REFORMATION, the right thus conveyed was thought by the Papists to be still inherent in the Pope. It was unknown or forgotten, that, if the Pope had ever possessed the right, he had conveyed it away to the King and his heirs for ever: *jure hæreditario possidendam*, says John of Salisbury, who says it was at his request, (*ad preces meas*) that the Pope granted it to Henry. It was also forgotten that the King acquired a much better right in the submission not only of the whole body of the Irish Clergy, but of the Kings and Princes of Ireland, who received him as their "Lord and King;"* and the Nation a much surer means of civilization and protection by their participation of the English laws and government than the sovereignty of the Pope could afford them. "Ireland" (says Leland, speaking of the era of the Reformation) "had been for "ages considered, and industriously represented, as a *fief* "*of the Pope*, in right of the Church of Rome. By "virtue of this imaginary right the seigniory of the King-"dom, it was well known, had been conferred on Henry "the Second."† The Irish Parliament (7 Ed. IV.) had

* Venerunt ibidem ad Regem Angliæ omnes Archiepiscopi, Episcopi, Abbates totius Hiberniæ, et receperunt eum in Regem et Dominum Hiberniæ, jurantes ei et hæredibus suis fidelitatem, et regnandi super eos potestatem, et inde dederunt ei chartas suas. Exemplo autem clericorum prædicti Reges et Principes Hiberniæ receperunt simili modo Henricum Regem Angliæ in Dominum et Regem Hiberniæ; et homines sui devenerunt, et ei et hæredibus suis fidelitatem juraverunt contra omnes homines. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. Pars Poster. ad ann. 1171.

† History of Ireland, vol. II. p. 160. ed. 4to.

given countenance to the same delusion. And the body of the people, not more enlightened than their representatives, at a later period considered it as "profane and "damnable to deny the authority of the Pope even in his "*own inheritance*"——an inheritance! derived from forgery, and alienated by an unprincipled collusion!

So entirely is the whole superstructure of the Popish claims built on delusion and imposture; and so extensive have been, and still are, the consequences resulting from the forgery of Constantine's Donation,—so injurious to the progress of truth, and peace, and national amity,—that it cannot be unseasonable or out of place to repeat here Archbishop Usher's and Mr. Geddes's compendious demonstrations of this great fraud, and the futility of the claim derived from it. As to the Pope's claim to Ireland,

"*First*, (says the Archbishop,) the donation of Constantine has been long since discovered to be a notorious forgery, and is rejected by all men of judgement as a senseless fiction. *Secondly*, in the whole context of this forged donation, I find mention made of *Islands* in one place only, where no more power is given to the Church of Rome over them, than in general over the whole Continent, (by East and by West, by North and by South,) and in particular over Judæa, Græcia, Asia, Thracia, and Africa, which are not to pass in the account of St. Peter's patrimony. *Thirdly*, it doth not appear, that Constantine himself had any interest in the kingdom of Ireland: how then could he confer it on another? Some words there be in an oration of Eumenius the rhetorician, by which, peradventure, it may be collected, that his Father, Constantius, bare some stroke here: but that the Island was ever possessed by the Romans, or accounted a parcel of the Empire, cannot be proved by any sufficient tes-

timony of antiquity. *Fourthly*, the late writers that are of another mind, as Pomponius Lætus, Campinian and others, do yet affirm withal, that in the division of the Empire after Constantine's death, Ireland was assigned unto *Constantinus*, the eldest son; which will hardly stand with this donation of the Islands, supposed to be formerly made unto the *Bishop of Rome* and his successors. Pope Adrian therefore and John of Salisbury had need seek some better warrant for the title of Ireland, than the Donation of Constantine."*

Mr. Geddes in his "*Grand Forgery Display'd*" thus states the evidences against the Donation.

"*First*, the whole stile of that Instrument is exactly the same with that of *Silvester's Acts*, and the *Decretal Epistles*, and with that of *Pope Nicholas's Letters*, which was by the Emperor Michael deservedly called barbarous and Scythick; for tho' it is true, that in Constantine's days the Latin in Rome was not classical, yet it was far from the Scythick barbarities, which spread themselves over all that Donation. *Secondly*, In that Donation a Supremacy is granted to the Bishops of Rome over four Patriarchs. Now it is well known, that in Constantine's time, and in some years after it, *Patriarch* was a title not known in the Christian Church. *Thirdly*, The Patriarch of Constantinople is one of those Patriarchs. Now can any thing be more certain, than that the foundations of the city of Constantinople were not laid until some years after that Donation is said to have been made? *Fourthly*, This great Donation is never once mentioned by any writer, Greek or Latin, in four hundred years after Constantine's death, no not by any of the Popes,† that writ during that time, and some of them so

* Discourse, p. 118, 119.

† There is a title, *Universali Papæ*, in this Donation, applied

zealously too for the advancement of their See, that had they ever heard of it, they would not have failed to proclaim it to the world. *Fifthly*, After the time that this Donation is said to have been made, the Emperors continued Lords of Rome, and did exercise all the same authority in it, as their predecessors had done before; and so far was any Bishop of Rome, in several hundreds of years after Constantine's time, from complaining of this as an injury done to the Roman See, that they did one and all acknowledge the Emperors to be their Lords and lawful Sovereigns. The date, and several words and passages that are in that "Donation," might be produced as clear evidences, that it could not be writ in or near Constantine's time; but to what purpose would it be to multiply evidences, where there is no need of them?"*

On such a subject as the *Donation of Constantine*, the opinion of Mr. Gibbon is of too much value to be omitted. "The Vatican and Lateran were an arsenal and manufacture, which, according to the occasion, produced or concealed a various collection of false or genuine, of corrupt or suspicious acts, as they tended to promote the interest of the Roman Church. Before the end of the eighth century, some apostolical scribe, perhaps the notorious Isidore, composed the DECRETALS, and the DONATION OF CONSTANTINE, *the two magic pillars of the spiritual and temporal monarchy of the Popes.* This memorable Donation was introduced into the world by an Epistle of Adrian the first, who exhorts Charlemagne to imitate the liberality, and revive the

to the Pope, which was not only unknown to Pope Gregory, more than three hundred years after the death of Constantine, but was reprobated by him as antichristian.

* Geddes's Tracts, vol. IV. p. 39—41. An ampler discussion of this forgery may be seen in the Histor. Eccles. Magdeburgica, Sæc. iv. p. 315—323. in Dupin's Bibliotheque Nouv. vol. I. and in Richardson's Prælectiones Ecclesiasticæ, vol. I. p. 338—370.

name, of the great Constantine. According to the legend, the first of the Christian Emperors was healed of the leprosy, and purified by the waters of baptism, by St. Silvester, the Roman Bishop; and never was Physician more gloriously recompensed. His royal proselyte withdrew from the seat and patrimony of St. Peter; declared his resolution of founding a new capital in the East, and resigned to the Popes the free and perpetual sovereignty of Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the West. This fiction was productive of the most beneficial effects.—So deep was the ignorance and credulity of the times, that the most absurd of fables was received with equal reverence, in Greece and in France, and is still enrolled among the decrees of the Canon law. The Emperors and the Romans were incapable of discerning a forgery, that subverted their rights and freedom; and the only opposition proceeded from a Sabine monastery, which in the beginning of the twelfth century disputed the truth and validity of the Donation of Constantine. In the revival of letters and liberty this fictitious deed was transpierced by the pen of Laurentius Valla, the pen of an eloquent critic and a Roman patriot. His contemporaries of the fifteenth century were astonished at his sacrilegious boldness; yet such is the silent, and irresistible progress of reason, that before the end of the next age, the fable was rejected by the contempt of historians and poets, and the tacit or modest censure of the advocates of the Roman Church. The Popes themselves have indulged a smile at the credulity of the vulgar; but a false and obsolete title still sanctifies their reign; and by the same fortune, which has attended the *Decretals* and the *Sibylline oracles*, the edifice* has subsisted after the foundations have been undermined."*

* Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. IX. p. 159, ed. 8vo.

It is remarkable that there are two Popish forgeries, intended for the advancement of the papacy, yet both containing express evidences against it. The "letter of Pope Eleutherius," to the British Prince, Lucius, acknowledges the *King's supremacy* in his kingdom, even in the government of the Church. The "Donation of Constantine" *confers on the Pope* the supremacy over all the Churches in the whole world. Baronius was so displeased with this *earthly origin* of the Pope's supremacy, that he considered it as a proof of the forgery of the Donation. The concession of Pope Eleutherius was employed by the Archbishop of Dublin, a convert from Popery, in Henry the Eighth's time, in defence of the King's supremacy. "He pleaded the authority of the "Popes themselves against the usurpation of Rome. "They had acknowledged Emperors, Kings, and Princes "(he observed) to be supreme in their own dominions, "and even Christ's own vicars. So that in asserting the "King's supremacy, he claimed no more than what "Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, had granted to Lucius, "the first Christian King of the Britons."*

The Letter of Eleutherius is, no doubt, a forgery, though not accompanied with so many condemning evidences as the Donation of Constantine. But the concession contained in it, marks its high antiquity. It must at least have been prior to Boniface III. the first Bishop of Rome, who (at the commencement of the seventh century) assumed a supremacy over the whole Christian Church.

The right of supremacy pretended to be conferred by the Donation of Constantine, was wholly unknown till at least a century after Boniface III. Baronius, not content with any earthly origin of the papal supremacy, rests

* Leland's Hist. of Ireland, vol. II. p. 166. ed. 4to.

it solely on the authority of Scripture, where it has no better foundation, than in the *Donation* and *Decretals*. For, an interpretation of Scripture, which ascribes to our Saviour a promise, respecting the commencement of his Church, which was never fulfilled, must be false, and as groundless as those forgeries. *The Church of Christ was not built on St. Peter*, individually, but on Christ, and on *all* the Apostles and Prophets.* Christ therefore never promised, that it should be built on St. Peter, but on *the truth*, which he confessed,† which he and the other Apostles proclaimed, which the Prophets had predicted, and to which, Christ himself came into the world to bear witness.‡ The whole fabric therefore of the papal supremacy rests on *two forgeries*, and a *false interpretation*.

* "Now therefore ye are built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Eph. ii. 20.

† "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." Matt. xvi. 16. To this truth Christ bore witness at his trial: "The high priest asked him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am." Mark xiv. 61. This is the truth for which he suffered death. "The Jews answered Pilate, We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." John xix. 7. This "good confession, which Christ witnessed before Pontius Pilate," (1 Tim. vi. 13.) was the constant subject of the Apostles' preaching. To this truth the Prophets bore witness; and upon this truth the Church of Christ was built, not on the person of St. Peter. For this our Protestant interpretation of our Saviour's promise we have the authority even of two Popes: Pope Felix III. translates: *super ista confessione* ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Pope Gregory I. says, in petra ecclesia, hoc est in *B. Petri confessione*. Ep. 3. 33.

‡ John xviii. 37.

THE END.

Hughes & Baynes, Printers, Maiden-Lane, Covent-Garden.

SUPERSTITION;

OR,

THE PERILS OF IRELAND

IN THE PROJECTS OF ROME;

A POEM.

ADDRESSED TO

THE PROTESTANTS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE,

AND MORE ESPECIALLY TO

The Members of both Houses of Parliament.

BY CLERICUS HIBERNICUS.

Magna est veritas, et prevalebit.

London:

PRINTED FOR J. EEDES, No. 2, NEWGATE STREET.

SOLD ALSO BY W. SAMS, ST. JAMES'S STREET;

W. MASON, ST. MARY'S PASSAGE, CAMBRIDGE; C. P. ARCHER, 34, DAME STREET, DUBLIN; EDWARDS & SAVAGE, CORK;

AND BY OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1823.

PRINTED BY T. BENSLEY,
Crane Court, Fleet Street.

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

GEORGE LORD KENYON,

THE ZEALOUS AND INDEFATIGABLE SUPPORTER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AND OUT OF PARLIAMENT,

AND OF ITS GREAT BULWARK,

THE PROTESTANT ASCENDANCY,

THE FOLLOWING POEM

OF

Superstition

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,

BY

HIS LORDSHIP'S

MOST FAITHFUL

AND

MOST OBEDIENT HUMBLE SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

LONDON, 20*th June*, 1823.

PREFACE.

WERE the Author disposed to follow the modern practice of being his own Annotator, there is matter, in the little Work here offered to the Public, for ample gratification of that propensity. It is probable, too, that the notes it would admit might, as in some late instances, prove the most interesting part of the publication. But on a subject engaging so much notice, and consequently seeming to stand in no great need of illustration, he is unwilling to do any thing which might wear the appearance of unnecessary enlargement. The authorities on which he relies, in all that relates to past times, are to be sought in testimonies of unquestionable authenticity—the books of the New Testament, and the History of Europe since the commencement of Christianity. For what relates to present times, the vouchers to which he refers are the ACTA ROMANORUM of the passing day, the doctrines, writings, and discourses of the Romanists themselves. How far he has succeeded in his references, though he entertains no doubt himself, is

respectfully submitted to the judgment of his enlightened Readers.

Facit indignatio versus is, he admits, an appropriate motto: but the indignation which prompted the verses arose from hostility to a dangerous and demoralizing system, not from any enmity towards its deluded and unconscious instruments. He knows and values many individuals of that persuasion, and feels a Christian charity for all. He would withhold nothing but political or legislative power; and there was a time when he would not have refused his mite of concession even to that. The change which forbids it now is not in him, but in themselves. That the great body of Protestants in this imperial realm is daily becoming less favourable to their claims, they must ascribe to the insolent intemperance of some of their lay demagogues, —to the rebellious spirit of their deluded populace —to the nauseous disaffection of their hireling journals, and (above all) to the bitter, uncompromising, unchristian, and undisguised enmity of their *spiritual directors!*

Quod optanti—promittere nemo
Audeat, volvendo dies en attulit ultro.

SUPERSTITION,

A Poem.

WHAT brought divine displeasure upon man,
Whose course in bliss and innocence began?
'Twas disobedience.—From that source arose
Sin, death, and all the train of human woes.
But heavenly love a remedy supplied;
For man's offences the REDEEMER died!
Awhile on earth th' appointed Healer trod,
By word and deed to point the way to God;
Then to his chosen few the task consigned—
"Go, teach my Gospel truths to all mankind."
And, lest vain fancies should corrupt the word,
It stands unchanged for ever on record.

This blest provision did we not retain,
Almighty condescension had been vain;
And e'en this holy care has failed to save
The sacred pages from the fool and knave,
Whose wayward passions, selfishness, and pride,
Reckless of that for which the Saviour died,
The ways of sin encourage, not repress,
Teach God's commands to curse instead of bless;
To false or futile ends the mind direct,
Their leading view—advancement of a sect:
And, basely bent on worldly cares alone,
For God's instructions substitute their own.

In early times two leading sects we find—
Christian and heathen chiefly marked mankind.
One church then claimed no empire o'er the world,
In proud anathemas no thunders hurled;
Affected not th' omnipotence of God,
To make and unmake princes at her nod:
To worldly grandeur bade no priests aspire,
Nor made the gracious Son of God a liar.

All earthly splendour, wealth, and power, and pride,
His tongue rejected, and his life denied.
With justice, meekness, love, and mercy, fraught,
One only lesson—to be good—he taught.
To sin, and sin alone, a foe profest,
To every pious heart he oped his breast;
On all, his heavenly mission who received—
On all, whose actions proved what they believed—
On all like these, whate'er their place of birth,
Their name, rank, station, business, here on earth,
His gifts, his promises, his grace descends:
These, and these only, are the SAVIOUR's friends.

Happy, too happy, were the race of man,
Had Christians held the course they thus began;
Their humble aim, a pure and pious life,
In goodness to excel their only strife;
The world's seductions ardent to defy,
Or in their Master's glorious cause to die!
A path so marked to everlasting bliss
The meek sincere believer could not miss:

And, ere ambitious thoughts the Church possest,
The votaries of Christ were truly blest!
Tho' pagan persecution oft assailed,
Strong Christian patience in the end prevailed;
And—save some restless wanderers in the flock,
Of innovating zeal some casual shock—
In union and fraternal love combined,
They lived in peace, the wonder of mankind!
True paths of pleasantness they learned to tread;
The Church all Christian, Christ its only Head:
Pride had no place, pre-eminence no boast—
The greatest Christian he who laboured most.
No high-throned Pontiff on rich velvet trod,
And called himself vicegerent of his God!
'Twas worth, or want of worth, made low or high,
And all enjoyed a glorious liberty!

What power perverse, what demon's subtle snares,
With wholesome seed commingled noxious tares?
Learning misused, and philosophic pride
From Gospel's simple truth turned some aside.

From their own stores conceited converts drew
New doctrines, and with false, perplexed the true.
Thus, with vain love of paradoxes fired,
They mixed their ravings with the page inspired.
But the grand ill, which history describes,
Sprung from the fury of the northern tribes;
Which, rushing onward like a mighty tide,
Spread terror, death, and desolation wide;
And, from their thrones the Cæsars having hurled,
In mental darkness buried half the world!
No human system found the least resource
'Gainst ignorance combined with brutal force:
Celestial truth indeed the shock endured;
But, tho' unconquered, truth may be obscured.
The savage tribes—who spurned with bitter scorn
The arts, the works, which cultured life adorn,
Who broke contemptuous every human law—
Heard the meek preacher's voice with secret awe;
Calmed by degrees, like ocean's angry waves,
And owned as masters whom they marked as slaves.

But—tho' the written source of human good
Surviv'd the perils of barbaric flood,
Amidst the darkness of the general mind—
Few to the page divine access could find;
Science, and arts, with all their beauteous train,
Expired beneath rude despots' iron reign.
Such rapid waste, destruction so entire,
Of all that wisdom, wit, and taste admire,
Threatened eternal loss of all we prize,
Of all that charms, refines, and dignifies:
Threatened from earth God's image to efface,
And turn to bestial all the human race.
Who signed his name was then a wondrous clerk;
The mightiest monarch could but set his mark.
Churchmen alone some glimpse of learning knew,
And e'en of these were numbered only few.
Full many a pastor, sent the word to preach,
Was near as rude as those he went to teach.
One precious maxim soon they learned to know—
What power a dext'rous influence might bestow;

How priests might rise superior to the rest,
The keys of conscience by the Church possest.
'Twas thus by steps Rome's hierarchy proud
Improved the 'vantage ground those times allowed;
Drew from the sad eclipse of human light
The means of trampling upon human right;
Made Him, whose laws the bad alone appal,
An instrument for subjugating all;
Employed meek JESUS' self-denying name,
To justify ambition's grossest aim;
Bartered his truth for pomp, and power, and pelf,
And left his Gospel mouldering on the shelf!
There, we must grant, 'twas meet it should be laid,
Since every page the rank deceit betrayed.
E'en to this day their wisdom has decreed
That laymen are not competent to read:
The pious pretext—lest of truth they doubt:
The real terror—lest they find it out!
Does then that Church's adamantine chain
Still in her cells the sacred page retain?

Oh, no!—one generous gift she proudly quotes—
THE RHEMISH BIBLE, WITH THE RHEMISH NOTES!
This precious book, to Ireland lately given,
Shews like hell's comment on a work of heaven;
The serpent's glozing tongue appears in all,
Some lack of cunning, but no lack of gall;
A book, where malice and vexation vie,
(Worthy companions) with stupidity,
Denouncing endless wo on who presume
To walk unfettered by the chains of Rome;
Whose want of charity would shame a brute,
Whose reasoning any schoolboy might confute.
'Tis not in language meetly to express
Perversion urged to such absurd excess;
The wondering reader can't forbear to cry,
Is this indeed the nineteenth century!
Doubt you my words? The precious book explore;
Read but three pages, and you 'll doubt no more.
They who man's frail and erring nature weigh,
So given to pleasure, and so fond of sway,

So ardent to improve the favouring hour
That leads to wealth, pre-eminence, and power;
So seldom found to keep the righteous way,
When strong temptation lures the mind to stray;
Will cease to wonder at the dazzling height
To which Rome's eagle winged his daring flight.
A prostrate people, past conception rude;
Save valour, with no energy endued:
Averse from all that language calls refined,
To superstition's grossest frauds resigned;
Ready to give e'en more than priest could ask,
Made their own servitude an easy task;
Encouraged churchmen a new course to steer,
And change CHRIST's kingdom for a sceptre here.

The power of mind o'er simple man to rule,
Employing superstition as its tool,
No comment needs; full many a record shews
How oft ambition thus to empire rose.
Pretended prophets, still this game pursue,
God's will the pretext—power the end in view.

Thus Mahomet, with rage of conquest fired,
Declared himself God's messenger inspired;
With holy zeal taught valour to combine,
And, to subdue, avowed a right divine.
His pupils with consistency maintain
Their Master's right by violence to reign,
On whom they can the Koran's yoke impose,
And treat all unbelievers as their foes.
But CHRIST, the meek, the merciful, the pure,
Who died our future welfare to secure,
To make men good, not great, whose precepts aimed,
All earthly power expressly who disclaimed;
Who, to the world and its allurements dead,
Had not on earth a place to lay his head,
Who, unresisting e'en perverted laws,
Proscribed the weapon brandished in his cause,
True to the voice divine that hailed his birth—
Glory to God, and Peace upon the Earth;
That any should his blessed name employ
The sacred rights of conscience to destroy,

To bend all realms to one proud Pontiff's sway,
Subject all states to tributary pay,
Exalt his crown o'er every earthly throne,
Grant charters for possessing worlds unknown,
Dissolve the monarch's rule, the subject's vow,
Where either dared such right to disallow;
That such perversion could have taken place,
Must ever stand the Christian World's disgrace!

Reader, whose judgment justifies appeal,
Say, have I passed the bounds of honest zeal?
Have I o'ercharged the picture? or my speech
On truth's fair precincts made unseemly breach?
No.—If the page of History be sooth,
I have not painted up to half the truth!

Yet tyranny so planned, and so achieved,
However vouched, would hardly be believed,
Did we not see the selfsame Church retain
Each style and title of her pristine reign,
In every place acknowledging her will,
Exert the same o'erbearing influence still;

And, tho' her thunders now less noxious roar,
Asserting every power she owned before!
How could a Church of Christ have erred so wide?
Because she left the sure, the written guide,
The Book, where none who read with honest mind
The way of life will ever fail to find,
Of which some curious facts recorded stand,
Of stragglers shipwrecked on a desert strand.—
This guide she left, and in an evil hour
Admitted vague Tradition's dangerous power!
Tradition, parent of religious pride,
That turns the mind from wholesome truth aside;
Of erring Jews at once the curse and boast—
The very fault our Saviour censured most,
As tho' his wisdom provident foresaw
The dire example might corrupt his law;
By care officious as a handmaid used,
The friend she came to aid she soon abused;
Bound by no ties that written laws impose,
From equal to superior soon she rose;

Beneath whose banners haughty, high church pride
All sense of shame and feeling laid aside—
On claims fictitious formed the daring plan
Of bearding God, and subjugating man!

I said th' historic page proclaims me true:—
To popish priest-land now direct your view;
Where'er that church exhibits her Eléves
See secret infidels, or groveling slaves;
While light and learning beam on all beside,
Behold that Church alone unedified!
Behold her straining every quivering nerve,
In light of day her darkness to preserve;
'Gainst free inquiry closing every door,
To rule secure the ignorant and poor;
And, lest the book of God its beams should spread,
Damning all those by whom that book is read!

What bred such countless infidels in France,
Where, spite of priestcraft, knowledge made advance?
Absurd old dogmas, stupidly maintained,
While minds of laymen daily vigour gained:

In Italy, in Portugal, in Spain,
Still see the dire effects of priesthood's reign:—
But, worst of all, fair Ireland's sons behold,
In equal darkness sunk as Huns of old;
Through twice five hundred years the yoke they own,
Through twice five hundred years no wiser grown;
For twice five hundred should they hug the chain,
The same dark bigotry must still remain!
Yet nature these for nobler ends designed,
Of active body, and of generous mind.
What God had done, a gloomy faith undid,
The duties Christ requires the Priests forbid!
He taught his flock o'er selfish views to soar,
Their minds to cultivate, their God t' adore!
How do Rome's pastors cultivate the mind
Of pupils to their righteous care consign'd?
By the inverted rule of holy Paul:
He saith, "Prove all things"—*they*, 'Prove none at all;'
In our cimmerian darkness ever dwell,
Else we consign your house and you to hell!

Their adoration more I blush to paint,
A crust, a stick, a relic, and a saint!
He taught to purify the heart within,
And wage eternal war with nought but sin;
Their church has ever taught, and teaches still,
No Peace with those who bend not to her will;
With bitter hatred against all she raves,
Who, tho' Christ's servants, will not be her slaves.
Of evangelic love be others fond,
She "finds it not, it is not in her bond;"
In Christian amity to mix disdains,
Content with nought unless alone she reigns!

What! are Reformists then exempt from blame?
No—every church, or sect, whate'er its name,
Is so far wrong, corrupted, or absurd,
As it forsakes the pure, the written word.
Such, and such only, orthodox I deem,
Worthy of God, and claiming man's esteem,
As by their conduct and their doctrines shew
The genuine Christian source from which they flow.

'Mongst these should faults and errors find their way,
As man, frail man, is prone to go astray,
Long as the page of God before them stands,
And freely gives its treasure to their hands,
Lives a redeeming Spirit, to redress
Frailty's too frequent lapse, and zeal's excess.—
But endless error must that church produce,
Which stands on time to sanctify abuse,
O'er Christ's free kingdom holds an iron rod,
And grasps the whole authority of God;
Makes servitude to *Her* the test of right,
And damns Christ's servants in his own despite;
Whose boasted title rests upon a lie,
Man's, wretched man's, INFALLIBILITY!!

Power such as this that lordly Church once held,
Each rising doubt by fire and faggot quelled;
Her rights unaltered now her priests maintain,
And pant to see this power enjoyed again.
To whispered hope that such blest times are near,
Her sons, deluded, lend a willing ear;

And now, with rapture premature elate,
Even now the blissful hour anticipate,
When rights of conscience shall expire once more,
And Popedom be, what Popedom was before.
Hence, under PASTORINI's fictious name
Lurks fuel meet to feed the bigot flame;
Perversions, diabolic and absurd,
Suited to blind the superstitious herd,
Whose ignorance and prejudice supply
Materials fit for popish subtilty,
Which, by the breath of priestcraft kept alive,
" Explodes," say they, " in eighteen twenty-five!
Haste, glorious era! seal our sanguine aim
When Holy Mother shall her rights reclaim,
When heretic usurpers, fiercely hurled,
Shall, by one sweep, be banished from the world,
That we, in pristine plenitude's excess,
May batten on the spoils they now possess!
O, holy brotherhood, your vows redeem,
Your sinuous plans shall consummate the scheme;

Let Castle-Browne and Stonyhurst conspire,
Let Rome's Hibernian college fan the fire,
So shall your trusty emissaries prove
Their title to your confidence and love.
The nightly plunders of the marshalled throng,
Whom your concocted wiles now urge along,
Do but a sample to the world display
Of the full crop that waits that signal day.
Should we, with power invested, once regain
Th' *ascendancy* those *Protestants* maintain,
No compromise should greet th' intrusive heirs,
Resumption ours—extermination theirs!
The *glorious memory*, to us transferred,
Memory of Rome's success, should then be heard.
No efforts spare—no secret arts forego,
Let Holy Church to you this triumph owe!
Your maxim here, if ever, must apply,
—Whate'er the *means*, the *end* shall justify!"
Thus, with anticipation's syren dream,
Th' infuriate zealots chant the fervid theme.

In England MILNER leads th' embattled van,
By Ireland's prelates followed to a man.
With feeble *yet*, but with unfearing hand,
They strive to shake the pillars of the land;
Of free-born Protestant the rights deny,
Those rights that guard his spiritual liberty;
Those rights that placed his Sovereign on the Throne;
Those rights the free will yield with life alone;
Our Sovereign's right supreme to hold the rod,
Our Church's right to preach the Word of God!
As arrogant since favours were obtained,
As tame and cringing ere the boon was gained.
The more they get, for more they louder call,
Unsatisfied with any thing—but ALL.

Yet these are they whom Wisdom's voice invites
To equal honours, and to equal rights;
Whom Senators, as liberal as sage,
Extol as patterns of the nineteenth age;
As changed in spirit, tho' in shew the same;
As only Anti-protestant in name.

As *now* from all old bigot rancour freed;
As liberalized in mind, tho' not in creed;
As giving all us upstarts to the devil,
But thereby never meaning ought uncivil;
As to our glorious Constitution true,
And seeking power *without one hostile view!*
Believe this, British Senates, if you can;
Amuse yourselves with theories of man;
Believe whatever to your whim seems best,
When playful fancy asks no other test:
But when in council's solemn chair you sit,
When deeper themes preclude the sport of wit,
List to the lessons of experience wise,
And view the scenes that pass before your eyes;
Recall those great events which raise your name
Above all Greek, above all Roman fame,
The glorious era which for ever broke
The galling chain of Superstition's yoke;
The wise enactment of that happy hour,
That shut on Popedom's slaves the door of power.—

Senate of Britain, would that fame endure,
Touch not the Statutes which that fame secure;
Seek not the CONSTITUTION thus to mend,
Your Church's foe will never be its friend!
Then only safe your envied fabrick stands
While power remains in free and friendly hands.

NOTES.

Page 10, line 3.—*Tho' Pagan persecution, &c.*

These words suggest an annotation which, I trust, will not be deemed improper or impertinent. Among the writings of the Augustan age, which have fortunately escaped the ravages of time, are the very elegant letters of the younger Pliny, including a correspondence between him and his celebrated master, the Emperor Trajan. These letters, and the character of the writers, are too well known to require any comment: and it is only necessary to observe that, both in public and private estimation, none seem to have obtained or deserved a higher place than both enjoyed Pliny was in the habit of consulting his imperial master when any doubts arose in his mind respecting the discharge of his public functions; and it is to one of those doubts that we owe the incidental mention of a sect so obscure and contemptible as the Christians were then considered to be. Little did Pliny think that this incidental and contemptuous mention of an oppressed and persecuted sect should, in after ages, be found to furnish an irrefragable proof of the most unfeeling cruelty on the part of the judges, and the most exemplary innocence on the part of the patient sufferer. The doubt itself must now strike the reader as extremely curious. Pliny entertained no doubt as to the propriety of punishing Christians, known to be such, and persisting in the confession of their faith; about such audacious obstinacy, as he says, there could be no question; but he has other doubts—whether the same degree of punishment should be extended to *all*:—whether, in case of abjuration, he should forgive the penitent:—whether the name itself was so flagitious as to draw down punishment on those who ever bore it, be their innocence in other respects what it might:—whether he ought to encourage informers. And he deems it requisite to make some apology for those to whom he had shewn lenity on their renouncing their faith, cursing Christ,

and joining with him in the rites of Paganism, one of which was, making libations to Trajan's image! Here it is right to observe, that the good sense and humanity of Trajan recommended the milder course of proceeding.

So far we have pretty satisfactory proof of what Gibbon and other liberal writers call the *mild* and *tolerating* spirit of Polytheism, and the refined and generous sentiments of Pagan philosophy. Let us now recur to the same pages for a discovery of those abominations which made the Christians so justly detestable. From those, whom terror had induced to renounce the faith, as well as from two unfortunate females, whom he acknowledges he had tortured to extort confession, Pliny discovered the following particulars—"That they were in the habit of privately assembling and singing hymns to Christ as to a deity;—that they bound themselves by a solemn oath not to be guilty of any wickedness; not to steal, to rob, to commit adultery, to break plighted faith, or deny deposits committed to their trust when called upon to return them;—that they met occasionally to eat together, using innocent food, and without any discrimination of rank." These were the enormities, which, according to the said mild spirit of Polytheism, were deemed worthy of tortures, infamy, and death!

It may seem remarkable, in the present day, that such a man as Pliny should have passed by this discovery of their private conduct without a single observation; and that a behaviour so moral as well as inoffensive should have failed to draw from him one word either of approbation or of pity. But he has left us a very sufficient explanation of his silence, which, if not very creditable to his philosophy, is perfectly consistent with his character as a politician, and defender of an established, and I presume, in his opinion, *infallible* religion. The test of merit on which he relied, and which, as one of the priesthood (*augur,*) he was particularly bound to enforce, was perfect conformity to the established rites of the Roman religion. Their offence was—embracing a different

faith, and refusing to worship gods of wood and stone. He proceeds to mention, with much complacency, the success of his measures, the gradual return of the people to the worship of the temples, and the sale of the victims going on as usual. Were Pliny's spirit permitted to revisit Rome, he might be gratified with a sight of his old objects of adoration, only a little changed in dress and name. Vide Middleton's Letter from Rome.

One is naturally disposed to ask: Such being the state of Christianity in Trajan's time, what credit can possibly be given to those who place the triple crown on the head of St Peter, and record the names of those possessing Papal supremacy in regular succession to the present day? A Pope is nothing without his College of Cardinals; and I believe it would have been just as difficult to find one as the other in the days of Nero, or any of his successors, at least before Constantine. From the strict inquiries of bitter persecution, such offices, had they existed, could not well be hid, and would have drawn down most signal and severe punishment. Yet Dr. Milner gives us a list of Popes from St. Peter downwards, with as much gravity as if he believed it to be true, and no doubt with equal ease could have given the names of the Cardinals also. The form of investiture, too, must have been the same as at present, that Church being *immutable* as well as *infallible*. The present form is as follows:—The senior Cardinal puts the tiara on the Pope's head with these words; "*Accipe tiaram tribus coronis ornatam, et scias te patrem esse Principum et Regum, rectorem orbis in terrâ vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi!!!*" No wonder the possessor of such crowns should look down on such a petty Sovereign as George the Fourth; or, that his loyal subjects should hold in contempt and scorn the subjects of such a puny Empire as Great Britain.

The only style of empire resembling that of his Holiness, which has occurred in the course of my reading, is to be found in the travels of an ingenious author, much celebrated

in his day, and who, notwithstanding his reputation for originality, did, as I suspect, steal a hint from the senior Cardinal. I will transcribe it: "Golberto, Momerem, Mully, Ully Gue,—most mighty Emperor of Liliput,—delight and terror of the universe,—whose empire extends to the extremities of the globe,—monarch of all monarchs,—whose feet press down to the centre, and whose head strikes against the sun; at whose nod the princes of the earth shake their knees!!!"

The imitator has omitted the circumstance of making his monarch God's vicegerent; either because he thought it might detect the plagiarism, or, which is more probable, because he thought all decent readers would be shocked by putting words so profane into the mouth of a mortal.

Page 23, line 5. "*Pastorini's fictious name*"—

In the year 1771, a book was published by Dr. Charles Walmesley, then titular Bishop of Bath and Wells, intitled "The General History of the Christian Church, from her birth to her final triumphant State in Heaven; chiefly deduced from the Apocalypse of St. John the Apostle. By Sig. Pastorini." This Dr. Walmesley, alias Sig. Pastorini, died on the 25th November, 1797, aged 75 years: but the fanaticism of his book, though long dormant, and deservedly despised, has been found of late years to be a very suitable vehicle for the revivification of Popish acrimony amongst both the higher and lower classes of the populace of Ireland. By the most strained and contradictory perversions, the Author affects to consider Luther and the other Reformers as the Apostate Church; and, by a fancy of his own, predicts the downfall and final extirpation of the Protestant heresy at the latest in 1825. It has gone through many editions, one of which (since suppressed) appeared under the sanction of high dignitaries of the Romish Church, and lay characters of the same communion. The book was also very rife at the period of the Popish rebellion in 1798. A still later edition of it was published (precious gratitude!) by the Professors of the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth,

for it was printed in Dublin (as the title page informs us) "by H. Fitzpatrick, 4, Capel Street, Printer and Bookseller to the Roman Catholic College, Maynooth. 1805."!! and it has passed through several other editions. Independently of the whole book, however, smaller portions of it, in pamphlets or placards, relative to the particular subject here alluded to, have been printed and distributed with unremitting assiduity among the illiterate and lower orders of the Irish, whose minds, still further inflamed by songs composed for the prospective triumph, are already wrought up to that degree of enthusiastic frenzy, that they conceive themselves fully justified in enforcing the fulfilment of the prediction by all the means which they have it in their power to adopt, whether of force or of fraud—as is evidenced by several recent occurrences, and as must be but too plainly demonstrable to every candid observer of constantly passing events. In fact, the present outrages upon, and the future prospects of, the Protestants in Ireland, render their situation by no means enviable. The "holy brotherhood" have been permitted quietly to settle at Clongowes, Stonyhurst, &c. but whether the United Empire has increased in quietude since their lodgment, is another question. And while lawless violence attempts to overawe on the one hand; and the insidious bane of Jesuitism is secretly, but effectually, pervading us on the other—whether that pernicious poison be fostered and disseminated by the higher or the lower sphere; whether it be diffused by officers and tutors, or instilled through the more humble disguise of messengers, labourers, servants, or domestics—it is alike destructive and fatal in all. Their dissembling intrigues should be met with open exposure, and it will be but a becoming duty in every Protestant, every well-wisher to his King, his country, his family, and himself, to raise his voice, and use his best exertions, for the defence and protection of that Constitution and those liberties, the blessings of which he has hitherto enjoyed, and the deprivation of which would be one of the greatest miseries he could entail upon his posterity.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ANNOTATIONS OF THE RHEIMS TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

To justify the character given of this extraordinary performance, it is necessary to lay before the reader some of those annotations on which that character was founded; the more especially because there seems reason to believe that this work is little known in Great Britain. It was published in numbers, and appeared with the following recommendation—"A new, superb, and elegant edition of the Catholic Bible, now publishing in numbers and parts, by J. A. M'Namara, Cork, under the patronage of his Grace the Most Reverend Dr. O'Reilly, Roman Catholic Lord Primate of all Ireland; his Grace the Most Reverend Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; his Grace the Most Reverend Dr. Murray, Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin, and President of the Royal College of Maynooth; the Roman Catholic Bishops of Cork, Waterford, Ferns, Leighlin, Kilmore, Ossory, &c. Containing the whole of the books in the Sacred Scripture, explained or illustrated with notes or annotations, according to the interpretation of the Catholic Church, which is our infallible and unerring guide in reading the holy Scriptures, and bringing men to salvation."

There is also a note from the editors, entreating the lower classes to lay by a pittance of their earnings, in order to enable them to purchase this inestimable treasure of Christian charity and knowledge.

In justice to the respectable and intelligent among the Roman Catholic laity, I am to observe, that this superb edition of infallible orthodoxy was so ill received by some of them, as to induce one of their Graces publicly to disavow the patronage here ascribed; in reply to which, one of the editors

sturdily maintained the contrary proposition, and his Grace prudently suffered the question to expire. The disavowal, however, extended only to the patronage of the publication, not to the authenticity of the contents; which, as all my readers, whose curiosity has induced them to consult Dublin newspapers, must know, are at present maintained to the very utmost extent of the letter. Among the more respectable classes of Roman Catholic laymen, it is not improbable that there are many to whom these extracts will appear new, for they are no great readers of Scripture: but Protestants have a right to ask, whether, in professing themselves Roman Catholics, they do not in fact embrace the obnoxious tenets of their Church? If they do, let them not complain that the door of a Protestant Legislature is unopened;—they have shut it on themselves. Other churches allow some latitude. *Their* church declares that *all* her members *must* embrace *all* her doctrines.

I propose to exhibit a few samples of the three leading characteristics of this superb work, revised and corrected (as we are informed,) with critical accuracy: and the only difficulty is, which to prefer among abounding instances. These characteristics are, imbecility of argument, puerility of comment, and inveterate hostility to all Christians daring to dissent from the Church of Rome. It would be too hard upon her infallibility, to expect any thing like elegance of style from a semibarbarous age, this superb edition being the republication of a very old work: but, we might at least have expected such a measure of understanding as would not have wholly disgraced so lofty a claim. If this be her best exposition of holy Scripture, she certainly possesses one good argument for keeping it to herself: it is utterly unworthy of seeing the light.

IMBECILITY OF ARGUMENT.

Gospel of St. Matthew, ch. ii. *ver.* 2—"come to adore.")

"This coming so far, out of devotion, to visit and adore

Christ in the place of his birth, was properly a pilgrimage to his person, and warranteth the faithful in the like kind of external worship to" (I defy the most ingenious guesser to say what) "holy *places, persons,* and *things.*" These wise expositors should have added—any thing in the positive commandments of God to the contrary notwithstanding. If this be the logic of Maynooth, the *faithful,* whoever they may be, are warranted to do any thing.

Verse xvi. *same chapter*—"murdered (viz. the innocents."

"By this example we learn how great credit we may owe to the church in canonizing saints, and celebrating their holy days; by whose only warrant, without any word of scripture, these innocents have been honoured for martyrs, and their holy day kept" (more Hibernico) "since the Apostles' time, although they died not voluntarily, nor all perhaps circumcised, and some the children of Pagans." More Maynooth logic. Does not this stuff remind one of Mrs. Malaprop, whose peculiar felicity of dialect threw the weight of her argument to the side of her opponents. They tell one truth indeed, that their warrant for celebrating, canonizing, &c. is *without one word of scripture* to support it.

To the characteristics above mentioned I might have added falsification, of which I subjoin an instance.

Ch. iii. *ver.* 10—"the axe."

"Here preachers are taught to depart from doing evil, for fear of hell; and to exhort to do good, in hope of heaven: which kind of preaching our adversaries do condemn"—an assertion the reverse of truth. Infallibility ought not to tell gross falsehoods.

Luke, ch. x. *ver.* 30—"half dead."

"Here is signified man wounded very sore in his understanding and free-will, and all other powers of soul and body, by the sin of Adam; but that neither understanding, nor free-will, nor the rest were extinguished in man, or taken away.

The Priest and Levite signify the Law of Moses, the Samaritan" (a heretic of that day by the bye)—" is Christ the priest of the New Testament; the oil and wine his sacraments; the host is the priest and ministers;—whereby is signified that the law could not recover the spiritual life of mankind from the death of sin, that is, justify men, but Christ only, who by his passion, and the grace and virtue thereof ministered in and by his sacrament, *justifieth* and increaseth the *justice* of man, healing and enabling free-will to do all good works!!!"

No wonder the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland should vaunt of an antiquity that can produce such brilliant commentators. There is nothing like them in *our* Church, most unquestionably. One thing, however, is clearly signified by the comment, and that is, *a man wounded very sore in his understanding*—none other could possibly have made it.—Enough of this sort.

Puerility is so blended with the other kinds, that one pure specimen may suffice. In a note on the second chapter of St. Matthew, at the word " treasures," we are told that those who came from the East to present gifts to the infant Christ, were " three in number and three sages," for the comfortable purpose of " expressing our faith in the Trinity!" and we are subsequently informed, that " according to a convenient and agreeable tradition, these three sages were three kings, called the Kings of Colen" (not because they reigned there, but) " because their bodies are there, translated thither from the eastern country;" (Lord knows how) " that their names are said to have been Gasper, Melchior, and Balthasar!!" Odd names enough for Orientalists. It would be gratifying, indeed, had we nothing to censure but the imbecile and the puerile. We now come to comments of a more reprehensible character; inexcusable even at the time those comments were made, but utterly disgraceful to a liberal and sober-minded Christian of the present day.

St. Matthew, ch. vii. *ver.* 1—"judge not."

"It is no Christian part to judge ill of men's acts which be in themselves good, and may proceed of good meanings or intentions which we cannot see; of which fault they must beware who are too suspicious, and given to deem always the worst of other men." This is very well, and had they stopped here, though there would be little credit due to so meagre an explanation of a divine precept, far more comprehensive than this comment implies, for it forbids hasty judgment in any case, in judging of evil as well as good: yet there would be nothing to reprehend. But the expositors, alarmed at the expression of a sentiment which might be turned against themselves, endeavour to counteract it by this charitable addition, "but to say that Judas, or an heretic evidently known to die obstinately in his sins, *is damned*, is *not* forbidden." Every one who has died a Protestant since the Reformation, however pure his intentions, and virtuous his conduct, is therefore, according to this doctrine, in a state of damnation. The text whereon this favourite doctrine is here sought to be established, is most unhappily chosen. The admonition of divine benevolence, made the instrument of sweeping malediction, affords an instance of most extraordinary perversion.

St. Matthew, ch. xiii. *ver.* 39—"lest perhaps."

"The good" (viz. the adherents of papacy) "must tolerate the evil, when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance of the whole Church, and commit the matter to God's judgment in the latter day. Otherwise, when ill men, be they heretics or other malefactors, may be punished or suppressed without disturbance, or hazard of the good," (the aforesaid Papists) "they may, and OUGHT, by public authority, either SPIRITUAL or temporal, to be chastised, or EXECUTED!!!" So said the Church of Rome in the early days of the Reformation, and her practice did not belie her

profession. So says the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland in the 19th century; and they who support her claim to power in a Protestant State, must have recourse to a very uncourtly argument, viz. that she is a liar.

St. Mark, ch. iii. *ver.* 11—"Thou art the Son of God."

"The confession of faith is not grateful to God proceeding from every person. The devil" (I thought he was an evil spirit, and the very reverse of a person confessing faith in Christ, though he may possibly have a concern in *some* confessions) "acknowledging our Saviour to be the Son of God, is bid to hold his peace; Peter's confession of the same is highly approved and applauded." (Peter is not much complimented in the illustration.) "*Therefore,*" (a most logical inference) "neither heretics' sermons are to be heard, no, *not though they preach the truth*: so it is of their prayers and service, which being never so good, in itself is not acceptable to God out of their mouths; yea it is no better than the howling of wolves!!" So then the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland modestly assume the power of directing the approbation of the Most High, to whom even truth and excellence are not permitted to be acceptable without their warrant. Who can reflect, without pain, on the injury their fine feelings suffered at the time our most gracious King condescended to visit Ireland, to think how his Royal ears must have been tortured by the *Sunday howling of heretic wolves!* I wonder they did not notice it in their dutiful and loyal addresses.

A Comment on the 16*th and* 17*th verses of the Gospel of St. Mark.*

"He (Christ) could not abide to see the Temple of God so profaned; no, nor suffered those things to be done in it which otherwise were not unlawful. How then can he abide the profaning of churches now with heretical service, and preaching of heresy and blasphemy. If the Temple was then a den

of thieves because of profane and secular merchandize, how much more *now*, when the house appointed for the holy sacrifice and sacrament of Christ's body, is made a den of thieves for the ministers of Calvin's breed!!!" The reasoning is almost as just, as the language is Christian and conciliatory.

St. Luke, ch. ix. *ver.* 55—"rebuked them."

I will add the words that follow; "and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save." In utter defiance of which divine annunciation, these Christian expositors (whose words, I blush to say, the Irish Roman Catholic church have adopted) give us the following humane explanation:

"Not justice, not all rigorous punishment of sinners, is here forbidden; nor are the *church* and princes blamed for putting *heretics to death*, but" (amiable qualification) "that none of these should be done of our particular revenge, or without *discretion*, and regard of their amendment" (after they are executed) "and example for others!!!" Good God! can such a system find a single proselyte among intelligent and honest Christians?

With one comment more, on a passage of St. John the apostle, peculiarly distinguished for charity and benevolence, I shall conclude.

Ch. xiv. *ver.* 28—"The Father is greater than I."

"There is no place in scripture that seemeth any thing so much to make for the sacramentaries, as this and others in outward shew of words seemed to make for the Arians, who denied the equality of the Son with the Father. Which words yet indeed, rightly understood according to the church's sense, make nothing for their false sect, but only signify that Christ, according to his manhood, indeed was inferior, and that according to his divinity he came of the Father."

"And if the heresy or disease of the time were Arianism, we

should stand upon these places and the like against the Arians," (chusing, as usual, the very worst ground to make a stand upon,) "as we do upon others," (equally conclusive) "against the Protestants, whose sect is the disease and bane of this time ! ! !"

Published in Dublin cum Ecclesiæ C. R. privilegio, A. D. 1814 ; at the very time when the Reverend Editors and Patrons were in confident expectation that Roman Catholics would be admitted to legislative power, and full equality of civil rights with their Protestant brethren, by an imperial Government, composed of those very persons whose profession of Christianity they have here denounced as *the disease and bane of these times !*

I think I have redeemed my pledge, and therefore will not insult the understanding of my readers by unnecessary comment—*Verbum non amplius addam.*

Printed by T. BENSLEY, Crane Court, Fleet Street.

USURPATIONS

OF THE

CHURCH OF ROME.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY BENTHAM AND GARDINER,
40, WESTMORLAND-STREET.

SOLD BY R. M. TIMS, GRAFTON-ST. AND W. CURRY, & CO.
SACKVILLE-STREET.

1825.

PREFACE.

The object of the following pages is to exhibit in a summary way the circumstances which led to the Usurpation of the Church of Rome; and to trace the steps by which the establishment of this usurped authority was accomplished.

To those who have investigated the subject in the original authorities, this little treatise would be altogether unnecessary; but as few are disposed to seek for this information through the voluminous pages of Ecclesiastical History, the present sketch, it was deemed, might prove acceptable.

We endeavour here to shew, that the right of private judgment in religious matters was a privilege asserted by the early Church, and which never was disputed until the Church of Rome assumed her usurped authority: *thus*, placing the truths of a rational religion on the footing of the most absurd, by requiring our assent to it on principles of compulsion, not of reason and choice.

To seek to convince the supporters of such a system of the absurdity of it, would be a useless task: the character which Plato gives of the Sophists, applies with peculiar force to these theologians: "When they "are discussing a question they care not how the sub-

"ject they are treating really stands, but only consider "how the positions they themselves lay down, may "be made to appear true to the mob which surrounds "them."

If a sect thus professing maxims of unqualified despotism, in the very face of its clamours for liberality, should attain to political power, how dreadful would be the bonds in which we should be fettered! Watched with a jealousy, the result of past experience, the human mind could scarcely hope again to free itself. Its tyrants dreading to relax their oppression could rely only on the strictness and perseverance of their vigilance for repressing the attempt once more to emancipate itself, and crush for ever so dreadful so intolerable a despotism.

But we trust the privileges we now enjoy will not be lightly risked, or *power* granted under the name of religious toleration to those, who themselves, with true Jesuitical inconsistency deny the right they claim.

USURPATIONS

OF THE

CHURCH OF ROME.

NOTHING, perhaps, has contributed more to uphold the Church of Rome, than the bold assumption of being the representative of the universal church, and the boasted regularity of the succession of her pontiffs.* The imposing attitude which the former claim gives her, and in which she is without a competitor, serves as a sort of prima facia evidence in her favor; while the latter confers a unity of character which pleases by its simplicity.

How false the previous *position* is, a reference to history will determine. How untenable the *principle*, we shall endeavour to shew in its application to secular governments. Of these there are essentially but two kinds: those which derive their authority from the governed; and those which derive it from the principle of force, against that authority. With the latter we have nothing to do, we presume: such government is an open, avowed despotism.

* The succession of bishops, in all the principal churches of the first centuries, is given by Eusebius. If, in latter ages, this succession has been confined more especially to the Church of Rome, the cause is obvious: after her usurpation it is preserved in the line of her bishops as temporal princes, not as fellow-pastors with their brethren in the Church of Christ.

The former admits of two modifications, alike in principle, but very different in form: those of republicanism, and of constitutional monarchy. The republican form of government is the most artificial of these, and yet is perhaps rather the result of accident in the earliest stage than of design: the loss of its natural head, or excessive abuse of the power with which the patriarch or chief was invested, alone would be like to induce a society to assume this form, and not even under these circumstances permanently, until experience had taught it to reflect on government as a science.

Constitutional monarchy has, in all probability, its foundation in patriarchal government; in the clans and chiefries of modern times. Mutual interests and mutual confidence were its basis. This good understanding could not be perpetual; the love of power, the love of license, so natural to man, must produce occasional deviations from this path of *undefined* duty and harmony. General principles would first become recognized: general maxims would consequently follow. Specific regulations would afterwards be adopted, and general customs, general maxims, receive the precision as well as the force of laws. Such are, perhaps, the foundation of the firmest bulwarks of liberty. Time alone, however, could perfect a work to be equally applicable to the various stages of society, experience alone, by reflection on the past, provide against the contingencies of the future, and embrace all the principles of order and of freedom in a CHARTER.

Now if in a republic a citizen usurp that authority over his fellow-citizens which they alone had a right to confer, does his possession of this authority legalize the crime, or render the succession of his children legitimate? Or, if in a constitutional monarchy, one, not the heir to the throne, comes in by force; or if the true heir depart from the principles of that constitution: are we to recognize in the one, or in the descendants of the other, a legitimate sovereign, and accept of a genealogical tablet in lieu of our violated liberties? By either of these rules we are willing to examine the claims of the Church of Rome.

While Jesus Christ was upon earth, he was indeed the lord and head of the Christian Church; when that head was visibly removed, unless he clearly and unequivocally appointed a successor, that church became an universal republic. Such it unequivocally was during the first ages of Christianity, nor did the Apostles themselves claim any precedence, save that which the Holy Spirit conferred upon them, and which was willingly conceded them by others; and where the Holy Spirit was poured out with equal measure upon others, it gave them equal dignity with the very chief of the Apostles.

But if the Church of Rome claim a supremacy over other churches on the score of legitimate succession; then it follows, that the appointment of that successor should be proved by charter, and if the appointment itself appears equivocal, that the practice of the Church in the pursuance of such appointment should be adduced in proof thereof, and satisfactory evidence given of adherence to the principles and letters of that charter, which alone could constitute legitimate succession in the Church.

For it cannot be questioned that the Christian Church is founded upon the charter of the New Testament, and in examining the claims of any particular branch of this Church, to the charter we have a right to refer. This written declaration supersedes all oral laws, not having the authority of ancient prescription and universal reception: such we may consider the general law of morality, which the christian charter amplifies does not abrogate.

But this charter the Church of Rome will not submit to be judged by. This is good policy, but bad principle. This church claims the right of judging the charter, and does not admit the duty of being regulated by it. On what grounds can this claim be made? On that of tradition. Yet how can this be? Unproved documents surely cannot be received in proof of disputed rights. The charter is acknowledged on all sides, and is therefore the only recognized ground of judgment. Suppose, for a moment, we admitted traditions:

some of these are acknowledged to be false. How then are we to distinguish between the false and the true? By the estimony of authors. But such testimony is not infallible, and therefore makes nothing for our purpose: fallible evidence cannot avail to establish infallibility.

The claim of the Church of Rome is founded in two texts of Scripture: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church," and again: "Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world." With respect to the first of these texts, we conceive it, by the connection of its context, to be capable of an easy, a rational, and, we will add, an indisputable solution. Our Lord asks his disciples, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" They replied, "Some Moses, and some Elias, and some one of the Prophets." "But," continued our Lord, "whom say ye, that I am?" and Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God;" and Jesus answered, and said unto him, "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." How will any person say, that this revelation by the Father of his Son is not a rock of certainty that admits of no dispute? "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," &c. &c. Upon what rock? Upon the rock of the revelation of the Father, on the rock of confessing, Jesus to be the Christ; or on the rock of a poor, fallible, though honest hearted man: which of these three should be preferred?

Saint Augustine thus expresses himself upon this passage: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, upon this rock which thou hast known, saying, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, will I build my Church; for the rock was Christ." With this conclusion of Saint Augustine we perfectly agree, premising only that such confession of Christ be understood as proceeding from the revelation of the Father, that is, by the Holy Spirit; for "no man can call Jesus Lord, truly, but by the Holy Ghost." But the conclusion that Peter was that rock we cannot come to.

For independent of our decision on the above passage, and its unison with that of St. Augustine, no reference whatever appears to have been made by the other Apostles as to the point of union of the Church being in Peter, nor does Peter himself ever seem to have entertained such an idea; he neither exercised precedence or claimed infallibility. Neither was it promised to any Church: the most steadfast was cautioned to take heed lest it should fall; and the only safety for any Church was in humility, and dependence on the Holy Spirit. If any church imagined itself rich, the language of the Spirit to it was, "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire:"—if any wrapped up in its own righteousness, it was counselled to buy of Jesus Christ "white raiment that it might be clothed." No person will pretend this was material gold or material raiment; but confess that it was spiritual gold that comes pure and more pure out of the furnace of tribulation, and *that* spiritual raiment which is the righteousness of Christ Jesus.

The promise of Christ, made to his disciples after his resurrection, "Lo! I am with you always even to the end of the world," can only be received as a pledge to those who, professing to be his disciples, possessed true and living faith in Him, as did the apostles, not to any one particular Church or congregation, for we have abundant evidence that once such Church presumed in its own purity, then did its stability in the truth become wavering, and the danger of its candlestick being removed out of its place imminent.—Now does any Church presume to the same extent as the Church of Rome? Or will any person pretend conscientiously to declare that the Church of Rome has been that humble, meek, pure Church which a true Church ought, and which THE CHURCH OF CHRIST must be?

In continuation of the claim to supremacy in the Church of Rome, it was necessary to connect the promise made to Peter with this city. He is accordingly asserted, upon what authority we shall hereafter see, to have been bishop of Rome. The principal ground for the supposition of St. Peter being

bishop of Rome appears to have been drawn from the circumstance of one of his epistles being dated from Babylon;* which Eusebius† thinks was a designation bestowed, of course in the spirit of prophecy, on Rome, for we know that otherwise it would be absurd. This opinion of Eusebius St. Jerome supports by powerful arguments. Thus if we admit that St. Peter did reside in Rome, we have equal authority for believing, that he applied to that city the appellation of "Mystery Babylon," and truly the concession required makes little in favour of the claims of the Roman Church.

It was, indeed, the opinion of several of the fathers that St. Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome, with St. Paul, whom all authors agree was beheaded in that city. But how uncertain opinion must be in such cases will appear when the very same authority, which favours his residence at Rome, doubts the authenticity of his second epistle. The Gospel, according to St. Mark is stated by many of the fathers to have been written at Rome, at the request of the christians residing there. Mark was the disciple of St Peter and was supposed to have written it immediately under this apostles direction: yet, notwithstanding our particular information thus far no account is transmitted us of the circumstances of his martyrdom, of any authenticity: the very time is unknown: nor had the Church for a long period decided who was St. Peter's successor in the see of Rome; a decision which was the result rather of reflection or convenience when the fact itself was obscured or lost in the lapse of time. So late as the fifth century St. John Chrysostom terms the bishop of Antioch the successor of St. Peter.

But admitting that St. Peter may have been bishop of Rome, though we are decided in our opinion that he never was so, it at least behoves those claiming rights as his successors to shew that their claims extend no further than those made or exercised by him. It would likewise be but reasonable to fix the period when the authority claimed for Peter was vested in him; and it should be proved at what period he became

the standard of orthodoxy. He did not become so previous to St. Paul's conversion is certain; for this apostle detected Peter weakly betraying the principles of the Gospel in deference to the prejudices of Judaism, from the fetters of which miracles were inadequate to free him. Now if Peter had introduced circumcision into the Church of Rome, would it follow that the Universal Church should adopt an error that, as the apostle of the Gentiles said, would render the grace of God of none effect? Our argument then comes to this, that if St. Peter were not infallible, neither could his successors be: and that if infallibility belong to any body of christians it must belong to the Universal Church and not to the Church of Rome, to a whole not to a part. But we deny Peter's being bishop of Rome—we deny his infallibility—we deny the right of any one Church to assume a precedence over any other without its consent—we deny the Church of Rome to be the Catholic Church—and we deny the succession of its pontiffs to be legitimate. In support of those views we shall take a survey of the Christian Church from the earlier period of its establishment.

Of all the systems of religion or philosophy ever proposed to the world, none was comparable in the purity of its doctrines and the rationality of its principles to that of christianity: yet never perhaps was there one more perverted from its original simplicity, or proposed at subsequent periods in forms more absurd. The vanity of life is a theme that has been dwelt on from the foundation of the world through every generation of men, and is a truth equally recognized by the sage and by the savage. The beauty of virtue has captivated the imagination and engaged the pencil of the most splendid names of antiquity; nor are we to suppose that thousands who were unskilled to express themselves, adored with less sincerity in their silence.

Notwithstanding the prejudices which existed in the church, even in the earlier ages of it, the most learned of the Fathers do not hesitate to acknowledge that some of the heathen were acquainted with the true God. In the eleventh book

of his "Evangelical Preparations," Eusebius demonstrates that the doctrine of Plato is agreeable to that of Moses, though he would have us believe that this coincidence is derived from his acquaintance with the books of the Old Testament. For our parts we are rather inclined to attribute any similarity of views to the enlightening influence of some universal principle, which had a tendency to unite the minds of unprejudiced and enquiring men towards the same centre of truth. How weak this influence was, we may perhaps admit, compared with the revelation of truth in the Gospel; but perhaps we should rather be disposed to admire that contemplative disposition of mind, which, undeterred by the prejudices of heathen superstition, could, aloof from its absurdities, penetrate so far into the sacred arcana as to confess the blindness which could see no further, for such is the natural consequences of a glimpse of the truth, and anticipate a Messiah to conduct us into a more perfect knowledge of God. Such views are attributed to Plato, and there is no reason to doubt that those sentiments were more extended than to the limits of a sect.

In the fifth century St. Augustine also ascribes to the Platonists the knowledge of the true God:* others do not scruple to extend it to the Pythagoreans. The Fathers of the Church, however, condemn the addresses of those sects to Demons as *Mediators*, and St. Augustine refuses to admit this title even to Angels, affirming that it belonged to Jesus Christ alone. He endeavours to prove that all demons are devils, but this is a mere dispute about words; the heathen certainly did not so understand the matter, they had their good and their evil demons, as Christians have, or express themselves of, good and evil angels, angels of light, and angels of darkness, protecting angels, and fallen angels.

That the heathen were very remote from the attainment of that knowledge of God contained in the Gospel is indisputable, yet their error with respect to worshiping demons does

* "It is difficult," says this Philosopher, "to attain to, and dangerous to publish the knowledge of the true God."

not appear to have been far removed from our worshiping of angels,* and for all we know they had their "latria" and their "dulia," to distinguish the nature of the reverence paid to these demons, from that which they paid to the Supreme Being, in whom alone they acknowledged the power of forgiving sins. The readiness with which the Gentiles received the gospel, the unbelief of the Jews who, witnessses of the miracles of our Lord, generally rejected it, argues much in favour of their disposition to admit *their* blindness, while the contrary feeling of presumption in the Pharisees and the Sadducee confirmed them in their sin. "If they acknowledged themselves blind they had not had sin," but as they asserted they saw, therefore they were accountable for the guilt. In fine, the whole New Testament seems to be one continued denunciation against spiritual pride and presumption, and we cannot think the lessons against these crimes, addressed to the Pharisee or the Sadducee, have in the least degree lost their virtue in the present day.

As we have referred to the superstitions of the heathen, we may here express an opinion not hastily adopted, that however obscured by the priest or perverted by the poet, the beautiful fabric of Grecian mythology had its origin in truth; and its application to the doctrines of Christianity itself, is illustrated in the pages of one of the most instructive and fascinating of human productions, the Telemachus of Fenelon. Whether the facility with which this mythology admitted the gods to assume human form, could tend to reconcile them the more readily to the doctrine of the incarnation, we shall not pretend to determine, nor is it the purpose of these pages to enter on the enquiry†: but we are apprehensive that many of those who embraced Christianity, while the mere profession of the name, and the rite of baptism sufficed for this purpose, brought minds into the church

* A practice sanctioned by the Romish Church.

† We were not aware, when we wrote this, that the same idea had occurred to the Historian.

better prepared to refine the Gospel away in questions of theology, than by submission to its dictates experience purification of heart. To enter on but a sketch of the theological controversies which agitated and disgraced the church, would be as unpleasant as it would be an unprofitable task. The errors of the Gnostics were scarcely more reprehensible than the disgusting discussions of the professed orthodox: but while the noisy babblers of the various opinions of the day were administering to their own vanity in the extension of their peculiar doctrines, some of the churches pursued the peaceful tenor of their way, in the simplicity of that truth which they had received from the unpolluted hands of the Apostles; and in the second century the Church of Jerusalem could boast, that she had remained to that period an unpolluted virgin.

To a certain extent this boast of the Church of Jerusalem was perhaps well founded; but how tenaciously the prejudices of the disciples of Moses were of their rites, will appear from the testimony of Eusebius, that the first fifteen bishops of this see were all circumcised Jews. This church however, and not the Church of Rome, was long considered as the standard of orthodoxy, and to it remote churches referred in cases of doubt for its decision. But when the Gentiles began to flock into the fold of Christianity, the philosophy of the Greeks, and the paganism of the barbarians, inclined at length the doubtful scale against the church of the Nazarenes and the rite of circumcision. Nor was this sufficient. This church, which had been revered as a parent, had yet to experience further humiliation. The tolerance granted to the laws of Moses was about to expire in the Christian Church; and when the believing Jews, overwhelmed by their misfortunes in the ruin of their country, had to seek an asylum beyond the walls of Jerusalem, their sorrows were brought to a climax in their rejection from the more orthodox communion of the churches of the Gentiles.

In the first ages of Christianity, notwithstanding the various prejudices which may have been introduced by its con-

verts, much simplicity existed in the faith of the believers. No creed was framed by the Apostles:* but the purity of that called by their name, shews it to have been adopted at a very early era of the church. Succeeding ages multiplied the articles deemed requisite to our belief, till at length the simplicity of faith merged into the doctrine of the infallibility of one particular church, and the duty of bowing implicitly to all its decrees.

The character we have ascribed to the Apostles' Creed, so called, we cannot extend to the Apostles' Canons, or to the Constitutions to which their name is prostituted. The progress of the church's errors may be traced in those compositions. In the first of the canons it is decreed, "That a bishop should not be ordained but by two or three bishops," though, in the days of the Apostles, no such rule existed. In the fourth, "That oil and incense should be offered on the altar," when no such things were offered in the days of the Apostles. In the 34th and 35th the "Rights of metropolitans" are treated of, when no such rights existed; and the names of "altars and sacrifices" introduced, when no such things were in use.†

Of the Apostolic Constitutions a few specimens will suffice. In the first book it is declared, "That the beards of women ought to be shaved, but not those of men." Again, "That female slaves may suffer themselves to be deflowered by their masters." In book second, "That the bishops preside over kings and magistrates." We shall forbear to pursue such impious, such disgusting absurdities, to which the purity of the Gospel has been too long obnoxious, and shall proceed to notice a few less culpable though objectionable peculiarities.

An unreasonable abhorrence of the customs, manners, and amusements of the unconverted was indulged in by the faithful, and the celebration of those festival days, common to every people, branded as idolatry and profanation. The use

* Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. vol. 1, p. 37. † Idem. p. 42.

of gold or silver vessels, of foreign wines, and the indulgence of the bath, were prohibited: the eating *white* bread or wear-garments *other than white*, were likewise proscribed; while the practice of shaving was held to be "an impious attempt to improve the work of the Creator." Less excuseable was the reprobationof the institution of marriage, which was stigmatized though tolerated. How a respect for the works of the Creator so fastidious as the former of those prohibitions affects, could be united with the abhorrence of His most sacred institution, may excite some surprise: but it must also be admitted, that the general motives of the conjugal union are not always in unison with our ideas of delicacy much less of sanctity. That a hallowed character may attach to it we cannot doubt. That the ceremony itself confers it may with equal certainty be denied. Theologically, the love of the individual or the love of the sex is the only line of demarcation we can draw; the ceremony is a duty we owe to the order of civil society.

But whatever the peculiarities of the primitive christian, he demonstrated the sincerity of his faith by the sacrifices he was willing to make to it, and its efficacy by the fruit it produced. He was distinguished by meekness, humility, and patience; mutual charity and confidence prevailed, and the Church, on the whole, presented a beautiful picture of harmony and brotherly love.*

In the first century, the most perfect equality reigned among the individuals of each particular congregation, and independance was the undisputed privilege of every Church. The bonds of a mutual faith, of a reciprocal charity, were those alone which they acknowledged, or to which they were subjected. The bishop was only the first of the flock, appointed by them, and for their benefit.

But the love of power and of influence is so natural to man, that those virtues which served as the highest recommendation to the office of bishop or of presbyter were but

* Decline & Fall. Vol. 2, p. 315. † Mosheim.

too soon exchanged for the ambition of precedence or more sordid love of gain. The unauthorised restrictions affected by the Church, gradually, as might have been anticipated, relaxed, and the contempt of the honours and the pleasures of the world, which at first prevailed, now sought an equivalent for the sacrifice within the orthodox pale of the Christian Republic. The respect which had once been paid to the virtues of the bishop, became by an easy gradation transferred to the dignity of the See, and prepared the way for that period, when intrigue and violence were to be the heralds to the pastoral office, and overpower the recommendations of a blameless life and unspotted integrity.

Thus, the FIRST step was taken in the scale of spiritual ambition. The basis of that equality which had existed in each particular Church was destroyed; and the term of bishop, or presbyter, no longer implied an officer recommended, by his sanctity or his age, to the notice and appointment of his equals, as a suitable superintendant of the Church. The independence of the separate Churches continued notwithstanding to be maintained, perhaps with greater jealousy than, when strangers to ambition, the presbyters sought the benefit and assistance to be derived from their mutual counsels. This state of equality could not last. Once the sentiment of ambition becomes the ruling principle, subordination to one supreme head is a desirable and therefore a natural consequence. In the Provincial Synod the most influencial pastor was called on to preside, and the title of bishop soon appears to have been specially, if not exclusively, claimed by this head, while the term of presbyter was bestowed his on humbler brethren; the terms, however, appear to have been in their original nearly synonymous. Thus, Episcopal Power by degrees raised its head, each local pastor submitting to the authority of his provincial, while these again were obliged to submit to the overbearing influence of the metropolis.

Already in the SECOND century the Bishops of Rome began to pretend to a superiority over their fellows: but these pre-

tensions met with a speedy check from the authority of the most revered of the Church's guardians. The conduct of Anicetus was censured and resisted by Polycarp, the disciple of the beloved apostle John ;* and Ireneus, bishop of Lyons, with his brethren of the French Church, rejected the pretensions of Victor, spurned his traditions, and sharply reproved him for the conduct he was pursuing.†

The bishop of Ephesus, Polycrates, opposed the same Victor in the beginning of the THIRD century, about the observance of times, meats, drinks, and vestures, and was supported in this opposition by the Asiatic Churches. The Romish Historians confess that Polycrates had the authority of the Primitive Church and of the beloved Apostle on his side. In the same century St. Basil, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, St. Gregory Nazianzenus, and Gregory bishop of Nyssa, protested against the pride and pretended supremacy of the Bishops of Rome. Pamphilius also bishop of Cesarea, a name of great authority, and highly extolled by the Romish Historians, wrote specially against the bishop of Rome's assumed supremacy, the worship of images, and injunctions for fasting.

As a climax, we shall close our account of the supporters of the rights of the Church, against the claims of the Bishop of Rome, with the authority of Athanasius, a name too great to need eulogy, and the holiness of whose character has been borne testimony to by the Romish historians.

This celebrated man wrote freely against the admission of traditions, the invocation of saints, the introduction of the seven sacraments, and against the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.‡

Yet this very Athanasius, with many of those whose names we have before introduced, received canonization at the hands of the bishop of Rome, a masterly stroke of policy we must

* Ireneus, lib. ad. Hæn. ch. 2. It may be proper here to observe that Polycarp was the recognized Metropolitan of all Asia, and Prince of its Churches. "Princeps Ecclesiarum Asiæ."

† Eusebius, lib. 5. cap. 23, 23. — ‡ Orat. 2. Contra Aria.

admit, but that cannot conceal from the enquiring eye the palpable usurpation of the Church of Rome.

The following charges were made against the heretics of this century: Overthrowing the rule of faith—Perverting the simplicity of the faith taught in the Holy Scriptures.*

In this century, also, the pacific principle so prevailed, that the faithful would "suffer themselves to be killed rather than kill others."† At this era of the Church the *Mass* was unknown.

In the FOURTH century, the corruptions which had been creeping in for some time previous, rushed in as a flood; and the imperial hypocrite, Constantine, completed the pollution of the Roman Church, or, at least, removed all those barriers which tended to keep out corruption, which from this period flowed in without even an exertion to repel it. The love of peace, which was the peculiar characteristic of the Christian, who but a few short years before would sacrifice his own life rather than take the life of his enemy, now rushed to the combat nor questioned its justice, proud to follow an emperor who professed to protect his interests and to favor his creed.

The consequence of this change in their political conduct may be traced in that which was henceforward pursued in the affairs of the church. At the election of Damasus to the see of Rome, such were the feelings which had superseded those we have described as prevailing in the previous century, such the demoniacal passions of ambition and hatred with which they were governed, that the blood of one hundred and thirty victims is recorded to have stained the very altar and temple of their worship.‡

In the FIFTH century, the Bishops of Rome continued their attempts, as opportunity offered, to establish their authority over others;—but these attempts were repelled. Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, denied his supremacy or authority over other churches, and proceeding to Rome withstood Leo,

Du Pin, pa. 1. vol. 84. — † Idem. pa. 38. Idem. 434. — ‡ Platina.

the first and greatest of this name, to his face.* St. Augustine, also, Bishop of Hippo, opposed in many instances the tenets of the Church of Rome at this period. The doctrine of Purgatory is one of those inventions which he combats; and in this he is supported by the high authority of St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and Origen. The churches also, now comprised under the general denomination of the Greek Church—the several churches of Asia Minor—those of Syria subject to the patriarchate of Antioch—of Chaldea subject to that of Babylon—the churches of Egypt, of Abyssinia, of Armenia, and of Georgia, were utterly ignorant of the doctrine.

We have before referred to St. Augustine's exposition of the words upon which the Church of Rome founds her claim to supremacy, and which this great man explains as applicable to Jesus Christ alone, and the confession of him as the Messiah. But the Papists say he was in error; and their Cardinal Bellarmine condemns as well this opinion as that of the same Saint, respecting purgatory. This is the same author, who teaches, that if the Bishop of Rome call virtue vice and vice virtue it becomes so; and thus the Church of Rome would level the eternal barriers which God has placed between right and wrong, good and evil: thus, not only breaking the commandments of our Lord themselves, but teaching others so to do. The Papists unquestionably act wisely in thus lopping off the members of the Saints to suit their mutilated trunks to the Procrustian measure of their own calendar: they could not have done otherwise. Yet, wherefore, canonize the men who attack the very foundation upon which the Church of Rome is built? The reason is obvious: to impose on the credulous, and assume the honours conferred by names of high authority, required patience to detect the plunder, and courage to divest the plunderer of. In this century the Church of Rome was so far from being submitted to, as the mother and mistress of Churches, that Asacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, not only denied its su-

* Leo ad Gal. Epist. 77, 89.

periority, but excommunicated Felix, the Roman Bishop, erased his name out of the dyptics or roll of Bishops, and denied his being Pope.*

In the SIXTH century, Gregory, surnamed the Great, Bishop of Rome, refused the title of UNIVERSAL BISHOP, because, according to Gibbon, he had not authority to support it; but according to authors more partial to this pontiff, because he deemed it too proud a name. This prelate authorised the marriages of the priests. Yet the same Gregory sought to draw over the English to embrace the doctrines of the Church of Rome, or rather to submit to its supremacy; for which purpose Austin, the Monk, was sent into England.

In the SEVENTH century, about the year 609, Austin, who had obtained the See of Canterbury, took decisive steps to ensure this object. The British Church was, however, reluctant to stoop to the yoke of that of Rome, or bow to its supremacy. In consequence of this refusal eleven hundred of the firmest of the opponents of Austin's authority unarmed and unresisting were cruelly butchered and slain.† Notwithstanding these terrors with which the Church of Rome sought to establish itself in these countries, the English, with sullen reluctance, submitted to the degrading yoke in silence, or when more favourable moments presented, opposed and denied it.‡ It is but justice to the memory of Gregory to state that he never appears to have sanctioned the measures pursued by Austin, and that he was no longer in this world when the massacre we have related was perpetrated by his former legate.

Of the state of the Church of Rome in Gregory's days, his own testimony will give a tolerably correct, though no doubt a qualified idea: "The devil," says he, "so strongly fasten-"eth his teeth in the members of the Church, that unless by "God's grace the provident company of the bishops join to-"gether, to resist him, he will soon destroy the whole flock "of Christ." And again: "I speak it with tears, I tell it

* Baronius.—† Bede.— ‡ Bede. Henry of Huntingdon, &c. &c.

"with sighs of heart, the order of Priesthood being fallen "within it cannot stand long without."* How far the provident company of bishops joined to loose the devil's tooth out of the members of the Church, or to fasten in their own, the History of the Romish Church will unfold in its sequel.

The venerable Bede says, "Let it not be beheld without "tears, in that it is worthy to be lamented, the state of the "Church is grown worse and worse."† Now this refers to the Church of Rome, not the English Church, of the former of which Bede was a member and a Saint, the Pope having by fire and sword established his authority in England before this period. Paul, the Deacon, also thus addresses the Church at this time: "You have buried in contempt and "oblivion the Word of God, you have made his temple a "den of thieves," and instead of sweet melody you resound "blasphemies against God himself."‡

Even Charlemagne, the protector and the dupe of the Church of Rome, writes thus of it: "The Priests laying "aside all sound and wholesome doctrine, and little regard-"ing that of the Apostle: If an angel preach other doctrine "let him be accursed, do transgress the commandments of "the Fathers, and bring into the Church such doctrine as "was never known to Christ and his Apostles."§

On the death of Gregory, Sabinian was chosen to succeed him: his pontificate was short, having survived his election but about eighteen months, and thus opened the way for the elevation of Boniface the 3d., who, after his accession to the pontifical chair, assumed the first of the Roman bishops, the title of Universal, and thus gave occasion to Protestant writers to recognize in him the perfect revelation of the Man of Sin. Of the corruption of the Church of Rome at this period no doubt can be entertained; the circumstances which preceded his election we shall take a cursory view of.

The public virtue, which had laid the foundation of the

* Book 4. Ep. 36.—† Bede. lib. 4, cap. 2. pa. 30.—‡ Wolph. tom. 1. pa. 203.
§ Carlo. Magno de Imag.

Roman greatness, and which had been gradually expiring through the line of the Emperors, was long since extinct, and even the sense of honour, which is considered as the securest pillar of Monarchy, was sharing the fate of its nobler predecessor, ere Boniface filled the papal chair. Military subordination had been rapidly on the decline since the death of the great the injured Belisarius, and the Emperors of Constantinople had evinced a perverted inclination to exchange the active duties of Sovereignty for the idle contests of polemical controversy. Exceptions there were even at this period to this charge, but such was the character which began to mingle with the more requisite qualifications of a Roman Emperor.

If at any time the Emperor was roused to exertion, worthy of the Roman name, it was only when stimulated to it by the apprehension of immediate danger, from which the morbid frame sunk back with encreased exhaustion, evincing even by the greatness of the effort, that it was but the convulsion of a giant, that hastened in endeavouring to prolong the hour of his dissolution.

The virtues of Tiberius the 2d. were inadequate to infuse new health and vigour into the corrupted mass of the unwieldy Empire of Rome. No bond of union or of common interest seems to have held it together; and a short reign of four years, distinguished principally by the personal character of the Sovereign, could confer no permanent benefit.

To Tiberius succeeded Maurice to whom the Empire was transmitted as a legacy to his merits, but which proved in the sequel the most unfortunate of bequests. The military virtues of Maurice were of the most respectable order, and he had the honour and the good fortune of restoring the Persian Monarch to his throne. But he was inadequate to protect his own dominions, or establish discipline in the ranks of his own legions.

Italy was ravaged by the barbarians: but at this period Rome found the qualifications of a Monarch in her Bishop. And while circumstances created him such in effect, Gregory

had the art to direct those circumstances to the aggrandizement of the Roman See. Such, in fine, was the prudence with which he filled the double character of Prince and Priest, that, as events should prove, he might either appear to have been acting the part of an independent Sovereign, or of the faithful steward of his Imperial Master.

In his character of pontiff, he appears to have been governed by the most distinguished moderation and firmness. He alike declined the title of UNIVERSAL BISHOP for himself, and refused to concede it to the Metropolitan of Constantinople. It is, indeed, asserted that this title he was too feeble to assume,* but we are disposed to attribute his conduct to a more generous motive. The Churches of the East would no doubt have refused him the proud distinction, but Italy and a large portion of the Western Churches would have bestowed on him the title by acclamation.

Having willingly paid to Gregory this tribute of our admiration, we must now enquire into his character in the professed capacity of a Minister of the Gospel, and a successor of the Apostles. Gregory must then, in this view, either have been the slave of superstition himself, or more culpably lent himself to impose its fetters upon others. The stories of ghosts, miracles, and resurrections which he recorded, or framed and gave currency to, are so numerous and so extravagant, that it is difficult to reconcile his belief of them with the good sense which otherwise distinguished him: or the wilful imposition of such puerile fictions, with that integrity we should wish to ascribe to his general character.—We are induced to make the former election.

The history of the human mind may convince us, that once a door is opened to the entrance of credulity, no barrier of intelect is adequate to resist its progress; nay, those very qualifications which would seem to have been an insuperable obstacle to its admittance, accellerate its course when once received, and display an ingenuity in support of the most ab-

* Gibbon.

surd hypotheses, worthy of a more rational and useful subject.

Our adoption of this opinion is supported from the consideration of the amazing zeal and industry of Gregory, which impelled him, amidst all his important avocations, to form a liturgy for the Roman Church of voluminous magnitude, and which has occasioned the pointed observation, that while the Lord's prayer consisted of but half-a-dozen lines the *Sacramentarius* of Gregory fills 880 folio pages. Were the full force of this remark felt, it would lighten the world of many of those ponderous tomes of divinity, beneath which the shelves of our libraries are still destined to groan.

This unfortunate propensity of Gregory, undoubtedly tended to corrupt the simplicity of the Gospel, and to give, by the weight of his authority, a sanction to error and superstition. As a Sovereign we would be disposed to concede Gregory the character of a Patriot King.

One circumstance, however, we must relate which deducts somewhat from the reverence which we should otherwise pay Gregory in this character. The Emperor Maurice was supposed to have occasioned the massacre of twelve thousand of his subjects, prisoners in the hands of the Chagans, by his parsimony in refusing to ransom them for the trifling sum of six thousand pieces of gold. The charge seems altogether improbable: if he delayed to carry into immediate effect the terms of the proposal, it is the utmost extent that the accusation against a Prince, whose virtues alone obtained him the empire, will bear: but Maurice had rendered himself obnoxious to the army by attempting to restore its discipline, and the guilt of rebellion was willing to shelter itself beneath the imputed crime of the prince. Indignant at the massacre of his unfortunate subjects, Maurice issued orders to the army to enter the territory of the enemy and avenge the murder of their fellow-countrymen and soldiers. The order but fanned into flame the mutiny, and the army in place of penetrating into the provinces of the enemy, returned to the walls of Constantinople under the command of a Centurion the

destined successor of the hapless Maurice. So obscure, says the historian, had been the former condition of Phocas, that the Emperor was ignorant of the character and even name of his rival; but as soon as he learned that the Centurion though bold in sedition was timid in the face of danger, "Alas!" said the desponding prince, "if he is a coward he will surely be a murderer."

It is painful to humanity to record or to repeat the wanton cruelties which, with malignant pleasure, man can exercise on fallen man. As the monarch walked barefoot in a religious procession, perhaps deprecating the fate which awaited him, he was pelted with stones and his person with difficulty protected by his guards. A fanatick monk ran through the streets with a drawn sword denouncing against him, though unconvicted of any crime, the wrath of God, while a vile plebean, who represented his countenance and apparel, was seated on an ass and pursued by the imprecations of the multitude. He refused yet to fly before the successful usurper, patiently waited the event of the revolution, and addressed a fervent and public prayer to the Almighty, that the punishment of his sins might be inflicted in this world rather than in a future life:* a prayer that we trust was answered agreeable to his hopes.

Maurice had abdicated a crown he could no longer retain, and the Centurion, Phocas, ascended the throne of a long succession of legitimate Soverigns. But a living emperor is a dreaded if not a dangerous rival in the eyes of a usurper: the unfortunate Monarch was dragged from his retirement: his five sons were successively butchered before his eyes, while at each stroke that fell upon his heart the agonized father faintly exclaimed, "Thou art just O Lord! and thy judgments are righteous."

Such, to the last, was the rigid attachment of this virtuous but most unfortunate Prince to truth and justice, that he revealed the pious fraud of a mother who, moved by his complicated sorrows, presented her own child in the place of a

* Gibbon.

royal infant. The murder of Maurice himself closed the scene.

The assassin was consecrated Emperor by the Patriarch of Constantinople, in the Church of St. John the Baptist, *as soon as the orthodoxy of his Creed was ascertained*, to such a depth of infamy was already sunk the profession of the Christian name. But it is with Gregory we have to do. As a subject and a christian, it was the duty of the Bishop of Rome, as the historian justly observes, to acquiesce in the established government, but Gregory saluted with "joyful applause" the fortunes of the assassin, and thus sullied with indelible disgrace the character of the Saint.

Ere Phocas himself met that fate which awaited him, and which he must have met without the same consolatory hopes which supported his predecessor, Gregory was no more. Sabinian, as we have related, soon followed him; and from the hands of the Centurion Phocas, from the hands of the murderer of his Sovereign, Boniface the 3d. was destined to receive the long coveted title of UNIVERSAL BISHOP. The foundation of papal dominion had been laid by Gregory, but the structure of supremacy achieved by Boniface, at first but an empty title, soon rose into an edifice that was to overshadow the whole earth.

We have thus endeavoured without prejudice to trace the gradual, the natural steps by which one Church obtained a superiority over its fellows, and the circumstances which led to that supremacy becoming the *alledged inheritance* of the Church of Rome. These steps may be resolved into three principal ones: The FIRST of the bishops or presbyters over the heads of their brethren: The SECOND the precedence assumed by the presiding Bishops of the Provincial Synods: The THIRD and last, the tremendous stride which placed the Metropolitan at an immeasurable distance from his former equals, and left him without a competition.

The year 606 witnessed the elevation of Boniface to the See of Rome, the gratification of his ambition in the title of Universal Bishop, and his death. The sketch which we have

drawn is derived from various authors, how far it is confirmin its general outlines may be gathered from the summary which we shall here transcribe from the elegant historian of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

"It has been remarked," says he, "with more ingenuity than truth, that the virgin purity of the Church was never violated by schism or heresy before the reign of Trajan or Hadrian, about one hundred years after the death of Christ. We may observe with much more propriety, that during that period, the disciples of the Messiah were indulged in a freer latitude both of faith and practice, than has ever been allowed in succeeding ages. As the terms of communion were insensibly narrowed, and *the spiritual authority of the prevailing party was exercised with encreasing severity*, many of its most respectable adherents, who were called upon to renounce, were provoked to assert their private opinions, to pursue the consequences of their mistaken principles, and openly to erect the standard of rebellion against the unity of the Church."

So much for the *cause* of errors in *doctrine* which took rise in the earlier Church, and the *consequences* of which still continue in all their sad operation. We shall now repeat the observations which relate to those of the *discipline*.

"The government of the Church has often been the subject as well as the prize of religious contention. The hostile disputatants of Rome, of Paris, of Oxford, and of Geneva, have alike studied to reduce the primitive and apostolic model, to the respective standards of their own policy. The few who have pursued this enquiry with more candour and impartiality, are of opinion, that the apostles declined the office of legislation, and rather chose to endure some partial scandals and divisions, than to exclude the Christians of a future age, from the liberty of varying their forms of ecclesiastical government, according to the changes of times and circumstances. The scheme of policy, which, under their approbation, was adopted for the use of the FIRST CENTURY, may be discovered from the practice of Jerusalem, of Ephesus,

or of Corinth. The Societies which were instituted in the Cities of the Roman Empire, were united only by the ties of faith and charity. Independence and equality formed the basis of their internal constitution. The want of discipline and human learning was supplied by the occasional assistance of the prophets, who were called to that function, without distinction of age, of sex, or of natural abilities, and who, as often as they felt the divine impulse, pourred forth the effusions of the spirit in the assembly of the faithful. But these extraordinary gifts were frequently abused or misapplied by the prophetic teachers;—they displayed them at an improper season, presumptuously disturbed the service of the assembly, and by their pride or mistaken zeal introduced, particularly into the Apostolic Church of Corinth, a long and melancholy train of disorders. As the institution of prophets became useless, and even pernicious, their powers were withdrawn, and their office abolished. The public functions of religion were solely intrusted to the established ministers of the Church, the *Bishops*, and the *Presbyters;* two appellations, which in their origin, appear to have distinguished the same office, and the same order of persons.—The name of Presbyter was expressive of their age, or rather of their gravity and wisdom. The title of Bishop denoted their inspection over the faith and manners of christians who were committed to their pastoral care. In proportion to the respective numbers of the faithful, a larger or smaller number of these *Episcopal Presbyters* guided each infant congregation with equal authority, and with united counsels."

"But the most perfect equality of freedom requires the directing hand of a superior magistrate: and the order of public deliberations soon introduced the office of a president, invested at least with the authority of collecting the sentiments, and of executing the resolutions of the assembly. A regard for the public tranquility, which would have been so frequently interrupted by annual or by occasional elections, induced the primitive christians to constitute an honourable and perpetual magistracy, and to choose one of the wisest

and most holy among their presbyters to execute during his life the duties of their ecclesiastical governor. It was under these circumstances that *the lofty title of Bishop began to raise itself above the humble appellation of Presbyter;* and while the latter remained the most natural distinction for the members of every christian senate, the former was appropriated to the dignity of its new president. The advantages of this episcopal form of government, which appears to have been introduced before the end of the first century, were so obvious, and so important for the future greatness as well as the present peace of christianity, that it was adopted without delay by all the societies which were already scattered over the empire, had acquired in a very early period the sanction of antiquity, and is still revered by the most powerful churches, both of the East and of the West, as a primitive and even as a divine establishment. It is needless to observe, that the pious and humble presbyters, who were first dignified with the episcopal title, could not possess, and would probably have rejected, the power and the pomp which now encircles the tiara of the Roman pontiff, or the mitre of a German prelate. But we may define in a few words the narrow limits of their original jurisdiction, which was chiefly of a spiritual, though in some instances of a temporal nature. It consisted in the administration of the sacraments and discipline of the Church; the superintendence of religious ceremonies, *which imperceptibly encreased in number and variety;* the consecration of ecclesiastical ministers, to whom the bishop assigned their respective functions; the management of the public fund; and, the determination of all such differences as the faithful were unwilling to expose before the tribunal of an idolatrous judge. These powers, during a short period, were exercised *according to the advice of the Presbyterial College, and with the consent and approbation of the assembly of Christians.* The primitive bishops were considered only as the first of their equals, and the honourable servants of a free people. Wherever the episcopal chair became vacant by death, a new president was chosen among the presbyters

by the suffrage of the *whole congregation*, every member of which supposed himself invested with a sacred and sacerdotal character."

"Such was the mild and equal constitution by which the Christians were governed more than an hundred years after the death of the Apostles. *Every society formed within itself a separate and independent republic:* and although the most distant of their little states maintained a mutual as well as friendly intercourse of letters and deputations, the Christian world was not as yet connected by any supreme authority or legislative assembly. As the numbers of the faithful were gradually multiplied, they discovered the advantages that might result from a closer union of their interests and designs. Towards the end of the SECOND CENTURY, the Churches of Greece and Asia adopted the useful institutions of Provincial Synods, and they may justly be supposed to have borrowed the model of a representative council from the celebrated examples of their own country, the Amphictyons, the Achean league, or the assemblies of the Ionian cities. It was soon established as a custom and as a law, that the Bishops of the independent Churches should meet in the Capital of the provinces, at the stated periods of Spring and Autumn. Their deliberations were assisted by the advice of a few distinguished presbyters, and moderated by the presence of a listening multitude. Their decrees, which were styled canon, regulated every important controversy of faith and discipline; and it was natural to believe that a liberal effusion of the Holy Spirit would be poured on the united assembly of the delegates of the Christian people. The institution of Synods was so well *suited to private ambition* and to public interest, that in the space of a few years it was received throughout the whole empire. A regular correspondence was established between the provincial councils, which mutually communicated and approved their respective proceedings; and the Catholic Church soon assumed the form, of A GREAT FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC."

As the legislative authority of the particular churches was

insensibly superseded by the use of councils, the *bishops* obtained by their alliance a much larger share of executive and *arbitrary power;* and, as soon as they were conneced by a sense of their common interest, they were enabled to *attack* with united vigour, *the original rights of their clergy and people.* The *prelates* of the THIRD CENTURY imperceptibly *changed the language of exhortation into that of command, scattered the seeds of future usurpations, and supplied, by Scripture allegories and declamatory rhetoric, their deficiency of force and reason.* They exalted the unity and power of the Church, as it was represented in the EPISCOPAL OFFICE, of which every Bishop enjoyed an equal and individual portion. Princes and Magistrates, it was often repeated, might boast an earthly claim to a transitory dominion: it was the *episcopal authority* alone which was derived from the Deity, and extended itself over this and over another world. The BISHOPS were the VICEGERENTS OF CHRIST, the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES, and the mystic substitutes of the High Priests of the Mosaic law. Their exclusive privilege of conferring the sacerdotal character, *invaded the freedom of clerical and popular elections;* and if, in the administration of the Church, they still consulted the judgment of the presbyters, or the inclination of the people, they most carefully inculcated the merit of such a *voluntary condescension.* The Bishops acknowledged the supreme authority which resided in the assembly of their brethren; but, in the government of his peculiar diocese, each of them exacted from *his flock* the same implicit obedience, as if that favourite metaphor had been literally just, and as if the *shepherd* had been of *a more exalted nature than that of his sheep.* This obedience, however, was not imposed without some efforts on the one side, and some resistance on the other. The democratical part of the constitution was, in many places, very warmly supported by the zealous or interested opposition of the inferior clergy. But their patriotism received the ignominious epithets of *faction and schism;* and the episcopal cause was indebted for its rapid progress to the labours of active prelates, who

like Cyprian of Carthage, could reconcile the arts of the most ambitious statesman, with the christian virtues which seem adapted to the character of a saint and a martyr.

"THE SAME CAUSE WHICH AT FIRST HAD DESTROYED THE EQUALITY OF THE PRESBYTERS, introduced among the bishops a PRE-EMINENCE OF RANK, and from thence a superiority of jurisdiction. As often as, in the spring and autumn, they met in provincial synod, the difference of personal merit and reputation was very sensibly felt among the members of the assembly, and the multitude was governed by the wisdom and elequence of the few. But the order of public proceedings required a more regular and less invidious distinction; the office of perpetual presidents in the councils of each province, was conferred on the bishops of the principal city, and these aspiring prelates, who soon acquired the lofty title of METROPOLITANS and PRIMATES, secretly prepared to *usurp* over their episcopal brethren the same authority which *they* had so lately assumed above the College of Presbyters. Nor was it long before an emulation of *pre-eminence and power* prevailed among THE METROPOLITANS THEMSELVES, *each* of them affecting to display, in the most pompous terms, the temporal honours and advantages of the city over which *he* presided; the number and opulence of the Christians who were subject to his pastoral care; the saints and martyrs who had risen amongst them; and, the purity with which they preserved the tradition of the faith, as it had been transmitted through a series of orthodox bishops from the apostles, or the apostolic disciple, to whom the foundation of their church was ascribed. From every cause either of a civil or of an ecclesiastical nature, it was easy to foresee that ROME must enjoy the respect, and would soon *claim* the obedience of the provinces. The society of the faithful bore a just proportion to the capital of the empire; and the Roman Church was the greatest, the most numerous, and, in regard to the West, the most ancient of all the Christian establishments, many of which had received their religion from the pious labours of her missionaries. Instead of ONE

apostolic founder, the utmost boast of Antioch, of Ephesus, or of Corinth, the banks of the Tyber were supposed to have been honoured with the preaching and martyrdom of the TWO most eminent among the apostles; and the bishops of Rome very prudently claimed the inheritance of whatsoever prerogatives were attributed either to the person or to the office of St. Peter. The bishops of Italy and of the provinces were disposed to allow them a *primacy of order and association*, such was their very accurate expression, in the Christian aristocracy. But the power of a monarch was rejected with abhorrence, and the aspiring genius of Rome experienced from the nations of Asia and Africa a more vigorous resistance to her spiritual, than she had formerly done to her temporal dominion. The patriotic Cyprian, who ruled with the most absolute sway the church of Carthage and the provincial Synods, opposed with resolution and success the ambition of the Roman Pontiff, artfully connected his own cause with that of the Eastern bishops, and, like Hannibal, sought out new allies in the heart of Asia. If this Punic ware was carried on without any effusion of blood, it was owing much less to the moderation than to the weakness of the contending prelates. Invectives and excommunications were their only weapons; and these, during the progress of the whole controversy, they hurled against each other with equal fury and devotion. The hard necessity of censuring either a Pope, or a Saint and a Martyr, distresses the modern Catholics, whenever they are obliged to relate the particulars of a dispute, in which the champions of religion indulged such passions as seem much more adapted to the senate or the camp.

"The progress of the ecclesiastical authority gave birth to the memorable distinction of the LAITY and the CLERGY, which had been unknown to the Greeks and Romans. The former of these appellations comprehended the body of the Christian people; the latter, according to the signification of the word, was appropriated to the chosen portion that had been set apart for the service of religion; a celebrated order

of men, which has furnished the most important, though not always the most edifying, subject for modern history. Their mutual hostilities sometimes disturbed the peace of the infant church, but their zeal and activity were united in the common cause, and the love of power, which, under the most artful disguises, could insinuate itself into the breasts of bishops and martyrs, animated them to encrease the number of their subjects, and to enlarge the limits of the Christian empire."

We apprehend this sketch, which we were unwilling to circumscribe, will convey a pretty adequate idea of the steps by which supremacy came to assert and establish itself in the Metropolitan Church of Rome, and we trust it will carry conviction to every unprejudiced mind, of the very slight foundation upon which that church would build her claim to superiority in the alleged authority of Scripture, or practice of the primitive church. We could multiply proofs in abundance in support of the views above taken, but shall confine ourselves here to a few extracts from the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historian Du Pin. In his "Abridgment of the Doctrine of the Church" during the three first centuries, he thus expresses himself: "The doctrine of the "True Church was always the same and will be ever so to "the end of the world: for, it is utterly impossible that the "True Church should cease to be, or that the True Church "should not teach the doctrine of Jesus Christ, because if "she should teach a doctrine different from that of Jesus "Christ, or if she should not teach the doctrine of our blessed "Saviour, in both these cases she would cease to be the True "Church." So that it depended on the doctrine taught, whether it were conformable to that of Jesus Christ or otherwise, to determine the Church's character, and not whether it was preached in conformity to the dogmas of any particular Church, as of Rome, Ephesus, or Corinth, for we find that every such church was liable to error. Again, we are told that "They," the primitive Churches, "believed the Holy Scriptures to be "written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and that they

"contained all the principal articles of faith: that though "they are obscure in some places, they are clear enough in "many others, and that even their obscurity has its use." That the primitive churches "sometimes cited the Apocryphal "books, but never reckoned them among the canonical Scrip-"tures." Of the Discipline, the same author observes: "It "was plain and simple, and had scarce any other splendour to "recommend it, but that which the holiness of the manners and "lives of the Christians gave it. They assembled every Sun-"day, in particular, in certain places appointed and set apart "for public devotions. The bishop, or, in his absence, the "minister, presided in the congregation, where they read the "Holy Scriptures, and oftentimes the bishops preached the "word of God." On the whole a greater contrast can scarcely be conceived than that which the primitive Church presents in its doctrine and practice, with that which characterises the Church of Rome at the present day. We shall here set down a few of those circumstances in which the Primitive Church and the Church of Rome are especially opposed to each other.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.	THE CHURCH OF ROME.
1. In the Primitive Church great simplicity of faith and doctrine existed; a sincere belief in the Lord Jesus Christ was the terms of salvation required.*	1. In the Church of Rome a complexity of doctrine was established, with refinements and distinctions altogether remote from the simplicity of the Gospel.
2. The Christian Church in the first ages formed ONE GREAT REPUBLIC: the individuals of each separate Church or Society of Believers were perfectly equal, and those Churches were all independent one of the other.†	2. The Church of Rome through the authority of the Emperors usurped pre-eminence over many of these Churches, and established in place of a Free Republic ONE UNQUALIFIED DESPOTISM.
3. The Primitive Church *asserted* and maintained, with irresistible force and argument, the right and reasonableness of PRIVATE JUDGMENT.‡	3. The Church of Rome *denies* the right of PRIVATE JUDGMENT, of course removes the only grounds upon which a rational being should build his faith, and thus levels the Christian

* Du Pin. † Tertullian. ‡ Origen.

	Doctrine with the Creed of Mahomet, making the sword or the stake, not the understanding, the arbiter of truth.
4. The Church of the three first centuries never admitted, nor once thought of admitting, a pretended infallibility, but "had prodigious respect for "the decisions of Councils, "and the opinion of the UNIVERSAL CHURCH, that is to "say, of ALL THE CHURCHES IN "THE WORLD."*	4. The Church of Rome claims infallibility, and has shed streams of blood to establish this absurd pretension; requires its decrees to be received without questioning them, and holds an appeal to the UNIVERSAL CHURCH to be rebellion and a declaration of war.
5. The Christians of the first ages of the Church would not take the life of a fellow creature even in self-defence.†	5. The Church of Rome gloried in shedding the blood of those whose innocence it acknowledged in every respect, but that of differing from it in their dogmas and denying its supremacy: nay, sanctioned often indiscriminate massacre.
6. The Primitive Church professed that its kingdom was *not* of this world, and its members were distinguished by humility, charity, and patience.‡"	6. The Church of Rome asserts that its kingdom *is* of this world, and that to it belongs the right to bestow or to take away crowns; and it is distinguished by pride, a spirit of hatred, and of intolerance.

* Du Pin. † Eusebius. ‡ The Gospel. ‡ Du Pin, &c.

As the principles and conduct we have attributed to the Church of Rome are avowed and historical truths, a reference to the several authorities would be impertinent; should any of the allegations respecting this Church be disputed, full and adequate proofs can at once be adduced in support of the charges here made. Not to go farther back, with respect to the most important of these charges, the "denial of the right of private judgment," and the "acknowledgment of the Church of Rome being an Intolerant Church," we have only to refer to the discussions at the Carlow Bible Meeting in confirmation of the one: to the other Bishop Doyle has pleaded "guilty."

While, therefore, WE are the friends and advocates of UNRESTRICTED RELIGIOUS TOLERATION and LIBERTY OF THOUGHT, we caution and entreat all who value these inestimable privileges, to consider how they entrust the smallest particle of POLITICAL POWER to those who deny the RIGHT OF THOUGHT to be the INESTIMABLE PRIVILEGE OF EVERY ENGLISHMAN.

Our *object* is not to apologise for every particular in the form of the ESTABLISHED CHURCH: but, recollect, that THIS CHURCH recognizes the RIGHT which we contend for. Whatever is VALUABLE in its Constitution IS ITS OWN: whatever is CONDEMNABLE in it, it derives from

THE CHURCH OF ROME!!!

PAPAL IMPOSITIONS

AND

MONASTIC INTRIGUE

POURTRAYED;

OR A CONCISE AND IMPARTIAL REVIEW

OF THE EFFECTS RESULTING FROM THE

Principles and Discipline of the Romish Church,

AS PRACTISED IN

FRANCE, SPAIN, AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

BY THE REV. M. BRENAN,

Lately a Priest and an eminent Preacher of the Church of Rome—now a Minister of the Church of England.

DUBLIN:

RICHARD MOORE TIMS,

GRAFTON-STREET.

M.DCCC.XXV.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In presenting these few sheets to the Public, the Writer is obliged, from a variety of circumstances, to be more concise than he should have otherwise wished. While a small work of this description is best adapted for general circulation, it will, at the same time, render it more convenient for him to continue this and other useful and interesting subjects occasionally. This small pamphlet, therefore, which has been hastily drawn up, is merely a preliminary matter; and the Public are respectfully informed, that other important subjects, with which religion is vitally connected, shall in future be regularly presented by him to their consideration.

PAPAL IMPOSITIONS,

&c.

THE object of the present Review is not so much an immediate and direct refutation of the erroneous doctrines of the Church of Rome, (a subject which has been repeatedly and successfully handled by various writers,) as a fair, dispassionate exposition of the melancholy effects which such a system of religion is calculated to produce on the minds and actions of men, and of consequence on the general constitution of society. This we could abundantly elucidate by a reference to the history of the dark and dismal ages that are past; but as existing facts, and the character of modern times, are to us of a more interesting description, and are naturally calculated to create a more lasting impression, we shall confine ourselves to such principles and observations, as the present state and circumstances of the Church of Rome will supply.

In order, therefore, to place the subject in its proper point of view, to exhibit these effects with the greater clearness and accuracy, we shall direct our attention to two countries, in which this Church is established in the full plenitude of its might and strength, its tenets enforced, and its discipline, rites and ceremonies, conducted in all their mystical, complicated, and pompous forms. In France, the Church of Rome is upheld and cherished by law; its Priests are not only supported by the State, but are moreover powerfully aided in the performance of every public observance prescribed by their Councils and Canons; so that we may reasonably expect to discover in this country a striking elucidation of the subject before us—that is, the effects resulting from the tenets, discipline, and usages of the Church of Rome. As the Gallican Church has, since the Revolution, shaken off its former attachment for the disgusting institutions of lazy mendicants, and has fortunately freed itself from at least one incumbrance, that of monks and friars, it stands at present under the guidance of what they

term the secular clergy; but Spain, unfortunate Spain! is still doomed to writhe under the dominion of these artful bigots, whose interest it is, and always has been, to traffic on the credulity of the people, and in lieu of the sacred truths of the Gospel, to set up their own ridiculous fables and blasphemous inventions. We shall, therefore, in the second instance, have recourse to Spain, as the land of *monks* and *friars*; and shall, on the whole, establish upon the strongest moral evidence, that the doctrines and observances of the Church of Rome, are calculated to produce immorality, libertinism, and infidelity, among the more enlightened portion of society; superstition, vile, besotted habits, and mental degradation, among the ignorant and lower classes; and, in fine, to bring religion into disgrace, contempt and derision.

2. It may be matter of just and serious inquiry, how a religion so clearly unscriptural and fraught with such gross absurdities, could for so many centuries have swayed the human heart, and gained such an ascendancy over the reason and common sense of mankind; but this apparent difficulty will vanish upon a slight investigation of facts, and the powerful circumstances with which they had been accompanied. Let us, in the first instance, recollect the awfully distracted state of Europe at the close of the fourth century, when the great Western Empire was convulsed and torn asunder by numberless hordes of Goths and Vandals, rushing like so many torrents from the deserts and frozen regions of the North, into the rich and luxuriant provinces of the Roman Empire, and in their progress overwhelming the institutions of man and the establishments of religion in one general indiscriminate ruin. The mental darkness, the frightful ignorance which pervaded Europe for centuries after is well known and admitted by every person acquainted with the history of those ages; and it is but too true that such periods of confusion, darkness, and irreligion, are every way adapted not only to give birth to the most foul, superstitious, and monstrous errors, but even to afford them that stability which the most powerful efforts of succeeding enlightened ages can with difficulty remove. Secondly—Whatever learning existed in those times was almost exclusively confined to the monks, and these artful recluses were ever cautious enough to conceal from the people such portions of knowledge as would expose their deceptions, or endanger the vast revenues in which they so indolently and luxuriously rioted. Hence the pages of God's inspired word were seldom or never examined by the Laity, and in place of the truths of that divine book, the people were amused with the pretended miracles of canonized monks, relics, images, glittering processions, candlesticks, human mediators, &c.—in short, the beautiful simplicity of the Christian Gospel was disfigured, sunk and degraded beneath a system invented by man, and evidently compounded of Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity. Thirdly—A species of

worship such as that is, composed of rich altars, embroidered vestments, pompous and tinsel ceremonies, &c. is of all others most likely to win the admiration and reverence of the gazing multitude; and even at this day the Spaniard or the Frenchman will cherish it, for it is well adapted for the gratification of that levity, curiosity, and desire of pompous exhibitions, for which these people are so generally remarkable.

3. Fourthly—Who will be surprised that human policy, superstition and error, had prevailed for centuries, when he considers the sanguinary inquisitions that had been established in the several countries—engines the most efficacious and powerful for upholding the doctrines and intrigues of the papal court, and for putting a dead silence to every attempt towards opposition or reclamation. The annals of these blood-stained tribunals (by which human nature had been so long disgraced) are too well known to require any comment in this place. Suffice it to say, that under such a reign of terror, no man durst avow his sentiments, or if he did, were not these sentiments crushed, and his lips closed for ever? and had not Providence raised up a friend for Luther in the Elector of Saxony, by whom he was sheltered in the Castle of "Wartburg," where he was safe from the violence of his enemies, and found leisure to complete the translation of the New Testament into German, and to commence the version of the old, very likely the long-desired Reformation would not so soon have dawned upon the nations. Fifthly—It is almost incredible what despotic ascendancy the Popes usurped over the Princes of Europe, and with what rigorous authority they maintained it. Witness that groundless but most dangerous principle of Roman Divines and Canonists—"that the Pope has a divine power over temporalities," and that he can thereby exonerate subjects from their oath of allegiance. Among the many instances in which this doctrine has been acted upon, the conduct of Hildebrand, alias Gregory VII. towards Henry IV. one of the greatest, but at the same time the most unhappy of the German Emperors, may be recorded. This monk became Pope by simony, and was deposed by the Council of Brixen, held in 1080 and composed of German and Italian Bishops, among whom Henry IV. presided. This Pope excommunicated Henry, and after stirring up the clergy and people against their Emperor, afterwards forced him to come, during a very severe winter, into Italy, attended with his Empress and his son; nor did he take off the sentence he had fulminated against him, till he had made the Emperor stand for three days barefooted and clothed in sackcloth, in the court-yard of the fortress where his haughty Holiness had shut himself up with the notorious *Matilda.* In fact, by the above-stated doctrine it would appear, that the civil liberties of mankind were surrendered to the discretion of these domineering pontiffs and their haughty court; and in

such a state of affairs, what but some most extraordinary intervention of Providence could dissipate that cloud of error, in which the moral world had been so lamentably involved? Sixthly—though last not least—The institution of mendicant orders had been at all times found a most powerful instrument. The infuriated zeal of these ecclesiastical bodies, in augmenting and supporting the overgrown authority of the Roman Court, is notorious: this shall be substantially elucidated when we shall come to describe the state and effects of that Church in Spain.

4. Of all the National Churches subject to the Roman See, the Gallican Church is, I believe, the most respectable; whether we consider the number of eminent Canonists, Theologians and Preachers, which it has produced, or the independence with which they had, in the sixteenth century, consolidated their disciplinary immunities. The contest which they had maintained against the *Ultramontanists*, that is, the Italian Divines, relative to the authority of a General Council above the Pope, and in which I think the French Doctors held the most honourable part, while it elicited much furious argumentation on both sides, will afford us an idea of the singular unity which prevails in that infallible Church. By a decree of the Council of Lateran, which they admit as œcumenical, the Pope is declared superior to a General Council; and on the other hand, in the œcumenical Council of Constance, a decree is passed pronouncing a General Council superior to the Pope.—What a wonderful concordance here between two œcumenical Councils! I state this fact to show also, that in the controversy the French Theologians rested upon as good authority, and made as respectable an exit as their adversaries. Their opinion is, I believe, the one now generally received, but the Roman Court, in its policy, has buried the question in utter silence; dreading, no doubt, the fatal effects of which it might most probably be productive. At this day, the French Clergy live in the secure enjoyment of all their ecclesiastical prerogatives, and are encouraged and aided in the exercise of all their ministerial functions by the Civil Government. They possess their churches—they have their masses, processions, services for the souls of the dead, days of indulgences, penances, and all the other tenets, rites and ceremonies decreed by their Church, and prescribed by its ritual; but in vain do we look for any general diffusion of real Christian godliness arising from all these fine things. We cannot here trace any of those genuine fruits which should naturally spring from a true living faith in the Gospel. I am ready to admit that their preachers frequently and emphatically inculcate many sound principles of morality and Christian virtues, but these lessons being accompanied and blended with a variety of ridiculous and superstitious practices, become inefficient, and are totally lost in the absolute disgust which these absurd and irreligious observances are calculated to create.

5. If true religion had any dominion in the hearts of men, it certainly should manifest itself in an attention and reverence to the temple of the living God, and to his solemn worship; but unfortunately a conduct the very reverse, forms a prominent feature in the general character of the French nation—go into any of the splendid, spacious Churches of Paris, and what will we witness? groups of persons of both sexes recreating themselves in parading the long-vaulted aisles, or amusing themselves in viewing the different altars, paintings, statues and ornaments of the church, and all this during the performance of divine service. Such conduct might suit a theatre, a museum, or an exhibition gallery; but is by no means becoming the awful dignified sanctity of the temple of God. The fact is, divine worship is totally neglected by the people even on the Lord's day, for the theatres are crowded while the churches are deserted—even at their high Mass or at their last Mass on Sundays, when the greatest number might be expected, you will scarcely observe a dozen men in the congregation. In truth, the people seem to have abandoned every idea of religion, and have given themselves up to an infidel sense of thinking and acting—instead of attending external worship and the public exercises of religion, they are either employed in their usual occupations, or indulging themselves in the most vicious and scandalous profanations—the theatres are open,—music, shows, dancing and public gambling engross the attention of the multitude, so that not only the sacred cause of the Gospel is slighted, but its ministers and its most hallowed precepts and maxims are notoriously despised and scorned—it appears also, that multitudes display this libertinism and infidelity of heart, even on the death-bed—for I have it from the lips of a respectable Curè, that numbers of his parishioners in their last sickness turn with disgust from the presence of a Priest, and with frighful impiety presume to appear before an awful and just God, without the aid or consolations of religion.

6. Such an universal contempt of the Christian Gospel, while it appears almost incredible to the mind of a reformed people, must be traced to those absurd principles, of which their religious system is composed. The dogma of Transubstantiation, and Mass-sacrifice, with their concomitant pompous ceremonies, might meet an easy reception with weak and superstitious minds, sunk in all the horrors of a dark and ignorant age, but can never stand before the tribunal of a learned and enlightened generation. The French people see clearly the unscriptural and sophistical basis upon which these leading propositions rest—the sacred Scriptures are now, through the medium of a benevolent and Christian Association, rapidly diffusing the broad day light of truth over an hitherto benighted world, and in despite of human sophistry and philosophical ingenuity, the serious reflecting inquirer can, by the

aid of that divine book, at once discover the simple and spiritual sense in which the Redeemer expressed himself, both in the promise and institution of that holy sacrament. He can conclude also with the apostle, that in the Christian dispensation there is but one sacrifice for sin, and that this sacrifice once offered by our High Priest, he hath for ever sat down at the right hand of his Father—that by that one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified—and that hence a continuation of sacrifice is unnecessary, and altogether abolished. He must perceive that Christ, in the institution at the last supper offered no sacrifice, otherwise, that on the succeeding awful day was useless; and without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sin. The truth is, these dogmas of the Roman Church are composed not only of such inconceivable materials, but even gross and palpable inconsistency; that such of the French people who have received any portion of education, or have a mind desirous of inquiry, have literally abandoned it, and have altogether declined attending every public service in their churches. It is moreover too evident, that these things were invented for the artful purpose of enriching and aggrandizing the clergy. The man whom we would believe invested with such power as to be instrumentally able by a few words to change a created substance into the body and blood of an uncreated God, would unquestionably challenge the most profound respect, nay, from many, a sort of public veneration; and it is notorious, and well known to the clergy, what an immense revenue accrues from the doctrine of the Mass, being a sacrifice propitiatory for the sins of both the living and the dead.

7. But the conduct and practices of the Priests in the different churches are additionally calculated to create scandal and disgust. To understand this, it must be observed, that there are in each church a vast number of chairs, which the people generally use for the purpose of sitting or kneeling, as occasion may require; and for this accommodation it is understood that a something must be paid. Now, the most awful and sacred part of their worship is at the time of the consecration of the host and chalice—and mark—that is the solemn moment, when the noisy and scandalous ceremony of begging commences in the church. A Priest comes forth attired in his ecclesiastical sutan and surplice, and preceded by the swiss or sextons, habited likewise in purple robes, with sword, spear, and military hat on in the very temple!—round he goes through the prostrate congregation, and with an elemosynary and vociferating tone, calls repeatedly on the people to open their purses and contribute to his support; and still remember, he receives an handsome annual stipend for his services from the government. His reverence, with his attendants, has not yet ended his rounds and finished the collection, which he himself makes in person, when a group of old women start up and commence making

their public demand for the chairs, which they hire by the year from the Curè, in the same manner as a toll-gate or a ferry is hired in this country—so that between the Priests clamouring for their share, and the old women for theirs, and not unfrequently a bustle on the part of some stubborn recusants, the house of God and his worship must be scandalously, but awfully abused. But what forms a shocking and an aggravating circumstance to all this, is, that the scene takes place at the most solemn part of their service, when the very Priest, from an appearance of reverential awe for the host, is commanded by his rubric to pray *(submissa voce)* in in a low voice; and when the people are all on bended knees, and from the subject going on at that moment, presumed to have their hearts and souls wrapt up in the contemplation of the boundless riches and mercy of heaven. Were the ministers of reformed religion at the time of general and solemn supplication in their churches, thus to disturb the order and devotion of the congregation, what idea should we form either as to their character or that of their peculiar doctrine? And a similarly lamentable effect has been produced in France, or rather a more sensitive effect—for to this scandalous system of clerical mendicity, and distraction of public worship, is super-added the palpable absurdity and notorious incongruity of the doctrine. Hence that disgust for every thing sacred or religious, which is at this day so deeply and literally rooted in the hearts of that people, and which nothing but the powerful intervention of God's grace, and the free circulation of his inspired word, can eventually and successfully dissipate.

8. Besides the Mass, or morning service, there is also the Vespers, or evening service, conducted with nearly as much fulsome and superstitious pomp, and which is attended in much the same manner by a number of females of the lower order, but by very few men of any order. This service is composed of a certain portion of the Psalms, intermixed with some antiphons, responses, hymns and orations, addressed either to the Virgin Mary or to some favourite Saint of the day, and are sung alternately in Latin by a select number of men, stationed in the choir, always in the centre of the church, and in front of the high altar. These chorists, selected from the working classes, and habited like the Priests, are well paid for their attendance, and are generally possessed of little knowledge, but much less of religion, or respect for the worship of God. Their general behaviour during the service is scandalous in the extreme, and such as must offend any observer who has ever attended any rational place of public prayer, or possesses in his breast a spark of reverence for the presence of the Almighty. A continued routine of laughing, and other irreverential gesticulations is kept up during the entire Vespers, which, it must be observed, is, as well as the Mass performed in the Latin tongue,—a discipline, of which we shall speak at large in a succeeding paragraph.

Among the complication of ceremonies with which they endeavour to give a shew of solemnity to this evening devotion, it might not be amiss to remark that of offering burnt incense at the principal altars in the church; this offering is also made at the High Mass, but then they shelter themselves under the *specious argument* of having the sacrament on the altar; however, at Vespers they do not scruple to do it before the altar and image of the Saint; nay, in many instances, they seem to pay as much respect to an Anthony or a Dominic, as to the Almighty himself. This jumble of ceremony closes with a still more superstitious piece of Romish exhibition—what they term a salutation of the sacrament. The Host is deposited in a remonstrance, or glass-cased vessel, and placed aloft on the altar in view of the people. The Priests knowing well that this is the most favourable moment for eliciting money from the people, when their hearts are softened with extraordinary fervour, or perhaps overawed by the eucharistic presence, that is, in their minds, the real presence of the very God-head, seize the opportunity, and commence once more their base, scandalous, mendicant operations. While I state this fact, I feel myself most anxiously desirous to accompany it with some comment or suitable observations; but such are my feelings at even the bare recollection of such vile, bare-faced imposition, that I confess myself unable to find expressions adequately strong to convey the utter disgust and indignation which I feel. In truth, these shameless and mercenary hypocrites make a public traffic of their transubstantiation, and seldom or never exhibit the host, but for the purpose of cajoling the people, swindling them out of their property, and afterwards exulting at the adroitness with which the deception had been carried on. Assuredly men will not suffer themselves to be for ever the dupes of such knavery, nor are they to be pitied, who having eyes to see, and common sense to direct, should still suffer themselves to become the victims of such clerical impudence and fraudulent deception.

9. If the unmeaning ceremonies with which the Romish worship so extravagantly teems, had been confined within the walls of their churches, and not carried into the public streets, it might, perhaps, not be exposed to such general ridicule, or at least it would not be so offensive to the professors of true and rational devotion. But here again the Roman ritual travels beyond the bounds of ordinary discretion, and apeing after the empty pageantry of pagan times, the host, with all the paraphernalia of a theatrical exhibition is borne in procession through all the streets, lanes, alleys, and public markets of the city. As many of my readers may, perhaps, have had the good fortune of never being annoyed by witnessing such contemptible mummery, I shall take the liberty of giving a brief outline of one of these solemn shews or processions. The Romish religion, as I have already

said, being upheld by the civil government, the different streets through which the procession is to pass, are lined with the military, and the inhabitants are obliged, under a very severe penalty, to decorate at least some part of their houses—this they do by hanging out pieces of white linen, such as are fond of ostentation, with a share of family pride, add thereto some scraps of old tapestry; but those *irreligious folks* who seem to have no taste for such a farce, evade the law by exhibiting old rags, broken carpets, and such other emblems as testify their lukewarmness on such a national fete. The procession is led on by a number of young females, tastily dressed in white robes with flowers, garlands, and various flags, displaying the several sodalities to which they belong, and the favourite Saint under whose patronage they have sheltered themselves. These are followed by an equal number of young men, with much the same insignia, and who evidently enter the ranks for purposes very remote from piety—next follow a train of ill-looking fellows, dressed out in dalmatics or deacons vestments, though mere laymen—these are succeeded by a group of boys with censors, lighted tapers, &c.; then follow the Priests in their vestments, in the midst of whom are carried in great solemnity the bones and relics of dead men, whom they consider as Saints, together with part of the cross on which the Redeemer suffered, and which they pretend to have in almost every church. And lastly, the host borne by the officiating Priest, under a canopy of embroidered velvet and gold. Although the procession halts at different altars erected in the streets, and every mark of external veneration is expected from the spectators, yet I have seen but very little of it—on the contrary, the French in many instances refuse to take off their hats, and hence a dreadful bustle frequently ensues between the populace and the gens d' armes. I recollect to have been present at a procession, when the benediction of the sacrament was given from an altar erected by the fish-women in the middle of the market of the Rue St. Denis, which by the bye, is one of the most shocking markets in all Paris, by far outstripping Billingsgate in London. During the ceremony, a most tremendous uproar arose between the market women and the soldiers, which was rendered still more appalling by the imprecations and blasphemies issuing from both parties; in so much, that it was the wish of every well-meaning person present, that their reverences should return as soon as possible to their church with their relics and paraphernalia, and never again think of annoying the public with such nonsense. It is unnecessary to waste time in commenting on this unmeaning ceremony—it has been, and it is in conjunction with their other tenets and practices, the cause of public scandal, libertinism and irreligion in that country.

10. After what we have seen, it may be readily anticipated what idea the people entertain of their auricular confession, pen-

ances, and other satisfactory works. Any person slightly acquainted with the sacred Scriptures, must be sensible that such a tribunal is never mentioned nor warranted in a single sentence of holy writ, but is, on the contrary, diametrically repugnant to it, as being a human work, and considered, *ex necessitate precepti*, as a necessary and preparatory step to justification. Moreover, with regard to tradition, I never could discover a single authority from the primitive Fathers confirmatory of it—there is the fact of Nectarius of Constantinople; yet, what has that to do with private auricular confession? But who does not see that this deception was first palmed on mankind, with a view of enlarging the authority of the Priests, and of giving them an unbounded dominion over the minds and consciences of the laity? Is not the man who is considered to preside juridically in that spiritual tribunal, and act upon a divine commission, to whom I am obliged to reveal the most hidden secrets of my soul, and in whose hands I am to believe my acquital rests. Is not, I say, such a man, under such circumstances, possessed of the most absolute species of authority, and such as has been not unfrequently carried beyond all bounds of prudence and toleration? The evils resulting from this confession-system, in which the failings of individuals, and the private concerns of families are committed to the knowledge of a weak man, are shocking and numerous. I had never indeed known any confessor to have acted in an open and direct manner upon the knowledge received in the confessional, although I read a letter addressed from one Priest to another, in which he threatened to reveal the confession of the latter; and I have heard numbers of Priests declare they would be afraid to depend on such and such a confessor for secrecy. While these statements, and the unscriptural nature of the doctrine, stand expressly against it, my readers may be certain, that the practice of attending this tribunal is generally confined to the laity; at least it is much more observed by them than by the Reverend Divines themselves. An additional source of superstition and falsehood is to be found in the doctrine of penances and satisfactory works, both before and after their absolution. This is the error which the apostle so argumentatively combats in his Epistle to the Primitive Church in Rome, and which any person may see, tends to diminish and insult the infinite merits and atonement of Jesus Christ. In France, these things are held in sovereign contempt; even their abstinence from flesh meat on Fridays and Saturdays is despised and neglected by all ranks, both by rich and poor. And as to wells and places of pilgrimage, I believe Spain and Ireland are the only countries now in Christendom disgraced by such rendezvous of fanaticism, vice, and corruption.

11. When ambitious and crafty men had presumed to disfigure the simplicity of the Gospel, by annexing thereto the trammels of

paganism, and their own inventions, if the glare of self-interest did not so visibly appear in almost every part of the system, it might, among an irreligious and an unenlightened people, have more readily passed with a semblance of truth and plausibility; but manifestly a vein of self interest pervades the entire system, having for its grand and ultimate object, the wealth, influence, and aggrandizement of the clergy. To the doctrines already stated in confirmation of this truth, may be added this other of purgatory, and prayers for the dead, than which a more absurd, unscriptural tenet was never advanced—from the first to the last page of holy writ, there cannot be found a single passage warranting such an intermediate place of torments—on the contrary, that sacred book, and the nature of Christ's infinite atonement, demonstrate the impossibility of such a place of labour and sufferings. A passage is generally quoted from the book of Macabees; but surely, that very book disclaims every pretence to canonicity; nor did the primitive church, or the learned author of the vulgate, rank it among the canon of the Scripture. But who can imagine what an immense revenue arrises to the church from the belief of this principle, and what an imposition is here practised on the credulity of the people, by cheating them out of their money. Masses they consider as most efficacious for bringing people out of the torments of purgatory; but these masses the priests have no idea of saying, unless they are first well paid for doing so. What an unfortunate thing is poverty? under its wretched pressure, man in this life is the victim of want and sorrow, and in the next he is doomed to linger in the flames of purgatory, while his *wealthy companions* are speedily *liberated*, because they had money to pay the Priests for offering sacrifices for them. But surely, if the Priests do really believe in such a place as purgatory, and that their masses would benefit the souls therein detained, and had they a ray of charity in their hearts, or of sympathy for the sufferings of their fellow-creatures, they should, I think, make a daily gratuitous offer of their masses, and their powerful aid to the poor and needy, who had not the means of paying them. This assumption is still strengthened by another, which no candid man can contest—admitting for the moment the absurd idea, that Christ at the last supper, did offer a true and propitiatory sacrifice, and did thereby celebrate and institute the mass; I ask, did he require money for it? did he intend that money should be demanded for it? or that his divine ordinance should be made use of by Priests, "like an instrument in the hands of a mechanic," for the purpose of enabling a solitary individual to pamper himself, and hoard up wealth and riches for a group of poor, indolent, depending relatives? the principle resolves itself into this—either they do not believe in the truth of these doctrines, or they are of all men the most deceptious, unfeeling, and hard-hearted. It may be urged, that

this stipend is required as a means of support; but how futile is this pretext, when we know that the demand is made by members already wallowing in wealth; and in France, by men otherwise amply supported by the Government? This is the scandal, the base, mercenary conduct, which has opened the eyes of that people, and which has eventually diffused among all classes the most sovereign contempt both for the persons of the Priests, and for the doctrines which they pretend to maintain.

12. This body of doctrine, involved as it is in complicated and unmeaning ceremony, and bereft of every support both of Scripture and common sense, is rendered still more objectionable from its disciplinary custom of employing an unknown tongue in the performance of its public worship, and in the exercise of all its ministerial functions. This very circumstance has exposed it to frequent and just censure, and is, I am persuaded, a very formidable obstacle to the great and various advantages which should naturally result from the public practice of religion. "And even things (says the Apostle, 1 Cor. xiv.) without life-giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise you, except they utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? For ye speak into the air. There are it may be so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto them that speaketh a barbarian; and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." And again, "If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful: what is it then? In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." And again, "How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" And indeed these impressive observations of the Apostle are both strengthened by reason and confirmed by daily experience. The very learned are precluded from considerable benefit which they would derive from religious offices performed in a familiar tongue; what then must be said of the poor and illiterate, who have neither time, nor means, nor capability of reading the revealed word of God? Alas! our own country furnishes too many instances of this truth. I feel myself conscientiously authorized to assert, that even in this our day, the Priests in most of the country parts of Ireland very seldom deliver to the people an explanation of the Gospel, or with spiritual and edifying instructions, endeavour to remove the dark ignorance under which this generous, but benighted people are most notoriously involved. The general prac-

tice of the country Priest on the Sunday, is, to say his mass and hear a few confessions occasionally; but a sermon, or any thing in the shape of an exhortation, is a "*rara avis*"—a rare novelty; nay, there are numberless parishes in which the deluded flock are never fed with the bread of instruction—never hear the word of God publicly announced to them for years! What then is the consequence? They return from their chapel on the Lord's day, just as well informed as when they had entered it. Neither Latin prayers, nor any thing the Priest could do, can dispel the mental ignorance under which they labour: hence that universal lack of public decorum, and in fact, of civilization, which characterizes the lower classes—hence those unnatural and crying outrages which, for the last few years, have stamped an eternal disgrace upon this country. No wonder that the justice of heaven should visit those very identical quarters in which the laws of nature, of God and man, were so daringly set at defiance—which were polluted by crimes unheard of in days of barbarism—unparalleled in the annals even of the most savage tribes; therefore have we witnessed those districts—where nocturnal villainy stalked in all its ruthless and brutal array—where the fruits of the earth and of honest industry were destroyed—men's property invaded—their dwellings consumed—their bodies reduced to ashes, and their immortal souls suddenly summoned before a just and an all-seeing God—I say, we have witnessed those very districts, by a just judgment, writhing under misery, beggary, pauperism, distress, and starvation, and compelled to cry out not only to the rest of Ireland, but even to England, for relief and assistance. I most sincerely and heartily believe, that every Roman Catholic clergyman in Ireland, contemplates such scenes with regret and horror—I know that many of them have, in several quarters, afforded prompt and laudable assistance to magisterial exertions; but I do still think, that until the minds of the people are enlightened by something more than "Latin prayers and useless ceremonies"—until the Divine Gospel of Jesus Christ is freely circulated, and constantly and solemnly impressed upon their understanding and their hearts—until the commandments of God, and the truths of the Christian dispensation, are read and expounded to them, that real good will not be done—the people will continue sunk as they are in ignorance and barbarism, and Ireland will be still exhibited to the view of the civilized world, as a land of crime and terror, of wretchedness and disorder. Turning from this digression to the principle with which I opened this paragraph, I re-assert, that the adoption of an unknown tongue in the Liturgy of the Church of Rome, has been the cause of much evil, and has given rise to a variety of superstition among the French people: while it gives an air of mystical significance and authority to the Priests, and casts a shade of pantomimic unintelligibility over the entire ceremony, it places the people in the attitude

of merely gazing spectators; and converts the sacred worship of the Deity into a fulsome, pompous, and unmeaning exhibition: hence arises a general disgust among the wise and well-informed —ignorance, superstition, and their concomitant vices, among the lower and uninstructed portion of the community.

13. The articles of faith and of discipline to which I have hitherto adverted, having derived a seeming importance from the supremacy of the Pope and the infallibility of the Church, it might not be amiss to consider briefly these two points. Before we can be persuaded to believe such a doctrine as the supremacy of the Pope, whom they style the Successor of St. Peter, and Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, it will be necessary to show us positive texts of Scripture, by which such power had been vested in St. Peter; and again, that St. Peter had actually fixed his See in Rome. Now the very contrary appears from holy writ, as might be shown from numberless quotations. But the effects which this usurped authority has produced for centuries in the Christian world, are notorious and lamentable. Volquin, a Roman Bishop of Minden in Germany, and who lived in the reign of the Emperor Albert I. and under the pontificate of Boniface VIII. has given us an honest and independent account of many of these Popes. This Bishop Volquin, relating how violently Gregory VII. Alexander III. and Boniface VIII. had stirred up the clergy and people of their times against the Emperors Henry IV. Frederic I. and Philip the Handsome of France, cries out in the language of indignation, "*Proh dolor! et proh dolor! hodie meretrix antiqua, quæ poculum aureum abominatione, fornicatione, et immundicia plenum in manu sua habebat, mirabiliter inebriat Sacerdotes et Clericos; de qua in Apocalypsi prædictum est.*"—"Grief! Grief! to-day the old strumpet who held in her hand the golden cup, full of abomination, fornication, and uncleanness, to a wonderful degree intoxicates the Priests and Clergy, according as it is foretold in the Revelation." The same Roman writer informs us, that Benedict Cajetan, or Boniface VIII. came to the Popedom like a fox, held it like a lion, and died like a dog, after being deservedly chastised by Philip the Handsome of France. He gives us the following epitaph of that overbearing Pontiff—

"Hic jacet eccè Nero, laicis mors, vipera Clero
Devius a vero, cupa repleta mero."

His history of Lotharius II. and Innocent II. is most interesting; and proves how true it is that the Popes have always behaved with the greatest insolence to those Emperors who have bestowed most favours upon them. In short, it is too notorious that these domineering Pontiffs have not only assumed titles and power to which they had no claim, and which were even blasphemous; but had been for centuries the cause of frightful confusion in the different nations of Europe.

The infallibility of their General Councils is another basis upon which the Romish Church rests its doctrines. This question is ably considered by the Rev. Mr. Digby, in his reply to Bishop Milner, to which I therefore refer my readers. Such a power is clearly unscriptural, and indeed very dangerous in its consequences. As the limits of this short Review do not allow me to enter into a detail of these Councils, I shall merely confine myself to the last and most important—that of Trent. This Council commenced under Paul III. 1545; it was continued under Julius III. and did not end till 1563, under the pontificate of Pius IV. The Protestants of Germany, on whose account principally this Council was called, refused to assist at it, as not considering it a lawful one, for many reasons published by them in 1545; the principal of which are—"That according to the promises of Charles V. and of the Popes Adrian VI. and Clement VII. a general and free Council ought to have been called in a city of Germany—that Paul III. had declared his intention to preside by his Legates at the Council of Trent, there to propose all matters that ought to come under their determination; and that he would overrule the decisions by the prelates who were devoted to him—that Protestants consider him only as Bishop of Rome; and as such, that he neither can nor ought to have any such authority in a General Council, to which he should be subject as well as all other Christians—and that, in fine, as he had a difference with them, it was absurd in him to pretend to be both judge and party in the same cause."—(See Philip de Marnix in his Apiarium.) Francis I. had no better opinion of the Council of Trent—Martin Chemnitz, John Calvin, Innocent Gentillet, and others, have, by a multiplicity of sound arguments, proved its invalidity; and after comparing it to the ancient "latrocinium Ephesinum," proceed to combat and expose the errors and sycophancy of Palavicini, Bellarmin, and James d' Andrada, and particularly that shameless flatterer, Campian the Jesuit. But not only Protestants have attacked this Council—several divines even of the Roman Church have written against it, particularly Fra Paolo the Venetian, and Andreus Duditius an Hungarian Bishop, Counsellor and Ambassador from the Emperor Maximilian II. The history of Fra Paolo had nearly cost him his life. Mark Anthony de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, brought it into England, where he had it printed and dedicated to James I. It was afterwards translated into several languages, but most elegantly into the French by Amelot de la Houssaye, and Jean Diodati, a learned Professor at Geneva. But the work of the learned Duditius, a Bishop of great authority in the Church of Rome, who assisted in person at the Council, and was an eye-witness of all that passed in it, is of all others the most interesting. This prelate was sent expressly by Maximilian II. to obtain the cup in the sacrament for the laity, and

to arrange many other matters, and not being able to accomplish his mission, gives a faithful account of the entire transaction in a letter to the Emperor. As the description is truly important, I shall take the liberty of making a short quotation from it in the following paragraph.

14. "What progress could be made in that council, in which sentiments were estimated by the numbers upon a division, and not by their weight and importance upon a debate? Had success depended upon the merits of the cause or the force of reasoning, had we even but a few assistants, few as they were, we could have defeated the numerous forces of our antagonists. But as numbers only were brought into the field, where we were to make but an inconsiderable figure compared to them, it was impossible that we could come off victorious, even in the best of causes. The Pope could draw hundreds of his own creatures against every single man of us; and if even *hundreds* had seemed too few, it was in his power of a sudden to create a *thousand* to send to the relief of such of his party as were engaged in action. Therefore, one might have every day seen bishops, hungry and needy; and on the other hand, young prelates for the most part just bearded, flying to Trent, after being hired to vote as the Pope should direct. These fellows are indeed very unlearned, but yet they are useful for their impudence and presumptuousness. When these auxiliaries had joined the old worshippers of the Pope, there it was that iniquity grew rampant and triumphant—nor now could any thing pass but according to the sentiments of those who thought that all religion consisted in defending the power and luxury of the Pope. Was there any man of wisdom and learning, who thought such infamous proceedings intolerable; he was traduced, threatened, and persecuted, and represented as a bad Catholic for opposing what he could not but abhor. In short, things were so conducted by the roguery of those who had come thither, created and prepared for that purpose, that the council seemed an assembly, not of bishops, but of puppets; not of men, but of images put in motion by machines behind the curtain—most of the bishops were hirelings, actuated and inspired, much like these wind-bags which it is necessary to swell np, in order to make them give a sound. The Holy Ghost had nothiug to do in that assembly—all their consultations were these of mere men, bribed and corrupted, turning upon the preservation of the immoderate, and indeed shameful power of the See of Rome. From thence, as from another *Delphos* or *Dodona*, their answers were expected. It was from thence that the Holy Spirit, which they boasted to preside over their councils, was conveyed in the mail of a post-boy or messenger; and which is very ridiculous, if at any time the waters swelled to a height, as they sometimes did, he could not fly over until they fell; the consequence of that accident was, that

the Spirit of God did not here, as in Genesis, *move upon the waters, but according to the motion of the waters.* Monstrous and unparalleled madness! bishops, as if they had been a mere mob, could come to no positive resolution, unless directed by the Pope."

Such is the description given us of the Council of Trent by this bishop of the Romish Church, and who was moreover sent expressly to that council by the Emperor Maximilian the 2nd, for the purpose of adjusting many matters which were known to be errors and impositions of the See of Rome. The same candid independent writer mentions a variety of evils which followed the decrees and transactions of the same council, nor will such an assembly, though sheltered under the specious title of infallibility, be ever able to put down in France, or any other country, the strong opinion, that its doctrines and decrees are not only erroneous, but most dangerous and destructive in their consequences.

15. Having hitherto concisely and candidly considered the principles of the Romish Church, and their immediate consequences as affecting the character of a nation, in which that church receives every secular and ecclesiastical support, we shall, before we leave this part of the subject, take a summary view of what we have said in the foregoing paragraphs.

It must appear self-evident to any man who attentively examines the Scriptures, that the divine truths of that sacred book have been grossly corrupted, and that in times of darkness and confusion, a number of human inventions and heathenish superstitions and rites have been blended with the genuine and simple truths of the Christian dispensation. The doctrine of mass-offerings, processions, prayers to departed people, image worship, indulgences, human merits and mediators, and all this performed in a language unknown to the people, and wrapt up in a cloud of silly fantastical ceremonies. Such a doctrine, I say, however pleasing it might appear to the rude and illiterate, will be treated with scorn and contempt by men of sense and education—neither should I omit, in this recapitulation, the many pernicious usages and disciplinary laws established in the canons of its councils, nor those monstrous decrees by which the Roman Pontiffs attempted to trample upon the civil liberties of Europe; and above all, the notorious fact, that this creed "*in globo,*" taking it altogether, was originally devised and palmed upon mankind, for the mere purpose of keeping up an ecclesiastical traffic—for cajoling the people, swindling them out of their money, enriching the Priests, and giving them a licentious and domineering sway over the minds and actions of a credulous and deluded laity. The practical effects resulting from all these, I have distinctly stated—a general disgust for external worship, and all the public duties of religion—an universal spiritual blindness—ignorance of the truths of God—contempt of his ministers—neglect of his temple—profanation of his Sabbath—in

short, from the general conduct of all ranks, more seemingly a land of immorality, libertinism and infidelity, than a country in which the truths and maxims of the Christian Gospel had been believed and practiced. I have adverted to the Gallican Church, that, it might appear upon evident and unexceptionable grounds, what effects the Romish doctrines are calculated to produce. I have considered it exactly as it is, left to its own operation, and that in a country where it is not only unshackeled from restrictions, and secured from opposition, but even legally upheld and cherished. The facts which I have stated are such as have fallen under my own observation, and for the truth of them, I appeal to such of my readers as have resided for any time in that country. We trust, however, under a merciful and providential God ("whose judgments are unsearchable, and whose ways are past finding") that brighter days will ere long open upon them by the spread of the Gospel and the diffusion of his revealed word—we hope to witness the gloom which now thickens around their horizon, entirely dispersed, to see the pure truths of Christianity publicly announced and practiced, and her cause under the hand of God established upon an everlasting and a triumphant foundation.

16. I have promised in the commencement of this review, to direct the attention of my readers to the effects which the principles of the Romish Church have produced in Spain, and with which the character of that nation is so indelibly stigmatized, I shall, therefore, without asking the permission of the holy brotherhood or the blessed inquisition, devote the following few paragraphs to this truly interesting subject—deplorable as were the consequences in France, yet that country had one blessing, it got rid of that most noxious excresence, hermits, pilgrimages, monks, and friars. But unfortunate Spain is still doomed to submit to the curse. This is the land of convents and monasteries, of monks and friars—here they swarm; and after devouring the produce of honest industry, and venenating the moral atmosphere around them, they seem to bask in the full glare of fat, contented ignorance, rank hypocritical superstition, and indomitable bigotry. Hence we find the reign of fanaticism in this country universally predominant—the people sunk in vile besotted habits—the spirit of industry and of national improvement almost extinct, and every species of civil and religious liberty literally exploded. It may not be amiss to subjoin here a brief explanation of the origin, nature and tendency of monastical mendicant institutions, from which suitable and illustrative observations can, like so many corollaries, be occasionally drawn. The clergy of the Church of Rome are divided into what they term secular and regular; all, of course, having one and the same ordination. The seculars have the management of parishes, the cure of souls, and in Spain, the tythe and other parochial emoluments. The regulars, or friars, have

neither parishes nor the cure of souls, but are cloistered in their convents, unless when sent out on domestic or foreign service, either by the conventual superior, by the general of the order, or by the Pope, and are usually supported by grants of land, and other bequests made to the convent. These friars are bound to live according to certain rules drawn up by the founder of their order, and sanctioned by the Pope, and make three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience—in the invention and appointment of which, the court of Rome has acted upon a most ingenious and deep laid scheme, and has, for good reasons, always considered these several orders, under the aforesaid vows, as the strongest bulwarks of its usurped power and authority. As there is a great variety of these mendicant orders in that church, I shall notice only a few of the most famous and remarkable—these are, the Dominicans, Franciscans, with the Capuchins, Augustinians, Carmelites, and to these may be added the modest, unassuming disciples of Ignatius of Loyola, commonly called the Jesuits. All these, except the latter, owe their birth to the affairs of the 13th century. Although the Augustinians pretend to derive their origin from their holy Father, the Bishop of Hippo; and the Carmalites, like real lying beggars, pretend to bring their genealogy down from Elias, and that the blessed virgin revived the order by giving the scapular, (that is a scrap of brown cloth suspended from a string) to some fellow of the name of Simon Stock, in the 11th century. Although this story is truly ridiculous, and such as would elicit a smile from any sensible person, nevertheless this badge is more valued and esteemed by the ignorant common people, than the very Bible itself. We shall now consider the circumstances to which these several worthies owe the origin of their sodalities.

17. At the close of the 12th century, the South of Europe was just recovering itself from the shock which it had sustained during the confusion of the preceding Gothic ages—and men tired of intestine broils, and the erratic notions of knight-errantry began to assume the appearance of a settled and regulated society, and to accustom themselves to domestic and retired habits of living. At this time, also, the legendary writings, and mystical theology of Metaphrastes, and other cotemporary authors of school divinity engrossed the attention of the studuous, and filled the minds of a credulous people with the ridiculous miracles and fabulous memoirs of pretended saints, and with the erroneous and superstitious doctrines of the day. The relics and images of such characters as had done any signal service to the church, or had evinced an extravagant zeal for the over-grown power of the holy See, were held up to public veneration, and their mediatorship solemnly and earnestly solicited. The flames of purgatory and papal indulgences were repeatedly dinned in the ears of the multitude, and

the [illegible]y of human works and satisfactions preached up as a necessary step to salvation, and of course, as a means by which man was bound to co-operate with and assist the Saviour of the world in the work of redemption. The sacred Scriptures were read, but by a few, and never consulted by the laity, and particularly the eloquent and divine Epistles of St. Paul, were altogether removed from the people. Men, who had for a series of years led loose and abandoned lives, listened with attention to these unscriptural doctrines—they were gradually impressed with the idea, that some meritorious work was necessary on their parts as an atonement to God and his church for their crimes and enormities, and particularly the feudal Lords and their opulent military. Vassals believed, that the only means now left them of making satisfaction for the cruelties, public robberies, and blood-shed they had occasioned, was to offer some considerable part of their property as a donation to the church. We, therefore, find in this age an immense revenue sacrificed to monkish institutions; and the ever dissatisfied and greedy mendicants still improved on the scheme, by artfully enticing numbers of the donors to live and die within the walls of their cloisters, and thus continued to add new and magnificent grants to the already boundless property of the convents.

18. These several orders of friars were rapidly and wonderfully augmented, to which the splendid revenue they possessed—their high and luxurious living—their lazy indolent life—and the veneration and sanctified reverence in which they were held by the people, were all powerfully concurring circumstances. These, we should observe, were still reinforced by the vast multitude of ruffians who had just returned from the crusades, and after being beaten out of Palestine, had spent years after on their return home, polluting and plundering the different countries through which they passed. These out-casts, without either property, profession, principle or character, unwilling to labour, and worn out in crime, regardless of God and man, and more fit for the work of assasination than of religion, were readily admitted into these receptacles and dens of hypocricy, and were afterwards employed as spies and executioners by the agents of the holy and spotless inquisition. So greatly had their numbers increased, even before the death of some of their founders, that the famous Saladin, Sultan of Aleppo, was wont to say, if he had such an able and zealous body of men attached to him, as had the Roman Court, he should not fear of making himself master of all Christendom. The fact is, not a Prince in Europe had such a regularly constituted body of Gens' d'armes, as had the Pope in these several orders of friars; all devoted to his cause from self-interest, and obliged by their vows to maintain his arrogant power and authority. But of all these the Franciscans seemed to have mustered the greatest

number. The apparent austerity of their dress and discipline, and the mortified exterior with which these impostors appeared before the public, gained them a character of *sanctity* and *perfection* in this fanatical and besotted age. However, this austerity, mortification and holiness, were merely exterior—for the coarse, dirty, disgusting habit and cowl of the filthy Franciscan, served to cover an indulged and well-pampered body. And these worthies were accustomed to riot, and drown dull care in their jovial convents as well as the Lord of the soil, or the Pope himself. As to piety or edification, their cloisters exhibited quite the contrary—they were generally scenes of licentiousness, contention, mutual jealousy, bickering and disorder; and even at this day, there is scarcely to be found a single man of spirit or talent in the community of these stupid, ignorant, worthless, over-bearing drones. During the several wars of Europe, great numbers were also enrolled in these sodalities, and particularly during the late continental war, multitudes of indolent cowardly fellows took shelter in the convents, merely to escape the military conscriptions—all these were, of course, obliged to submit, at least externally, to the superstitious vows and obligations of the institute; and having a vocation for any thing but Christian principle and common honesty, we may easily imagine what a fetid rendezvous of dissimulation and profligacy was exhibited within the walls of these Spanish monasteries—this truth is further illustrated by the public dissatifaction of all classes in Spain, and by the late noble and brave exertions of the constitutionalists, to establish their natural rights and liberty; and although their efforts have not been crowned with present success, yet, will every honest man indulge the hope, that the day is not far distant, when they will see their country triumphant on the firm basis of freedom, and monks, friars, cloisters, convents and inquisitions for ever exploded from amongst them.

19. The Court of Rome, it appears, had a leading self-interested object in every one of its institutions, of which that of monastic orders was not the least powerful or conspicuous. These ecclesiastical bodies, cloistered up in their convents, and composed of numerous diversified characters, many of whom had been experimentally versed in all the intrigues of life, were well adapted for the purposes of a designing and political court, such as that of Rome had always been. Accordingly they were employed in preaching up indulgences, papal power and supremacy—in compiling legendary memoirs of pretended Popes and Saints, and volumes of fulsome panegyric on the councils and decrees by which that supremacy had been established; but particularly they were the agents, to whose mangagement and superintendance were committed the dark and mysterious secrets of the blood-stained tribunals of the inquisition. All this was merely a "*quid pro quo*"—there was a mutual understanding, a regular contract entered into by both par-

ties—if the friars were zealously devoted to the interest of the Romish Court, the Pope on his part granted them a "*mare magnum indulgentiarum*"—a whole ocean of indulgences, and other exclusive privileges, which served to attract great crowds of devotees to their churches, and augmented the already splendid revenues of the convents. But this bond of interest and union was additionally strengthened by the vows and obligations of each order, which every member was bound solemnly to make at his profession. Their vow of poverty, as I have already said, was a mere external thing, an impudent abuse of the term. The royal prophet ranks beggary among the curses of God, Psal. 109–10. "Let his children be continually vagabonds and beg; let them seek their bread also out of the desolate places, as those that are cast out of their own habitations." And in Psal. cxxviii. 2.—"Thou shalt eat the labour of thine hands; happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee." But the friars it seems are happy, and even perfect, while unwilling to work, they fatten on the labours of others. The truth is, this semblance of poverty was a most ingenious trick for getting constant denations from the people; and while the friars rioted and feasted sumptuously on the revenues of the convent, the "*altum dominium*" of the property was vested in the Pope. The vows of chastity and obedience had also their political object, and were productive of most shocking evils—by the former of which, these monks having no families, or legitimate children, were the better enabled to augment the wealth of their respective foundations—and by the latter they were obliged to shew blind obedience to some ignorant, artful sycophant, who had found means of surreptitiously obtaining the priorship, and were by the most solemn ties, bound down to the authority and commands of their general, the Cardinal Protector, and the Pope.

20. Having briefly adverted to the origin and nature of the orders and institutes of monks and friars, and as it is notorious that these bodies have been in a great degree the instrumental cause of all the superstitions which have for so many ages disgraced the Christian world, I shall, before I draw any general inferences, take the liberty of pursuing the subject a little farther. The doctrine of pretended miracles, extraordinary visions, saints, relics, &c. have had a wonderful effect in bestowing an assumed excellence and sanctity on the Romish Church. Now of all places, convents are best adapted for such impositions and priest-craft. If Brother Bonaventure or Father Anthony happened to die, although during their whole life they behaved like vagabonds, still every friar in the community would swear black was white in favour of his canonized brother, and afterwards write volumes of lies on the heroic exploits, spiritual triumphs, nocturnal watchings, fasting and discipline, by which this man of God subdued the carnal mind, and in despite of the devil, the world, and the

flesh, bore off the *meritorious* palm of victory. The truth of this assertion is fully illustrated in every page of the Roman Breviary. Almost every saint commemorated in that compilation, belonged to some order of monks or friars; and indeed the contests for superiority among the several orders, has been frequently carried to such excess, as to throw whole communities into confusion. I have never been inclined to go to the trouble of ascertaining by a calculation, which of them all can boast of the greatest number, but I have been assured by a jolly old Capuchin, who could repeat the Breviary from beginning to end, but knew nothing else, that the Franciscans, in which he was included, mustered by far the greatest body—a circumstance, which at the same time, does them very little credit. We know, however, that Metaphrastes, the inventor of this fictitious biography, was determined, for the better circulation of his work, to give full scope to his imagination, and excite the astonishment of his readers with a detail of the extraordinary wonders and miracles of his several saints, and that it was in those days a prevailing custom in the monasteries to propose the life of some particular sanctified brother as a theme or subject of composition, with a premium bestowed on the person who would, by a description of the most austere penances and miraculous actions, exalt his hero to the highest pinnacle of excellence and perfection. I might here give extracts and lengthened accounts of several hermits, confessors, martyrs, &c. but the detail would carry me beyond my intended limits: for this I refer the curious reader to the works of Metaphrastes and Bollandus. However, it is extraordinary, that men who call themselves Christians, and the teachers of a Christian Gospel, should in any shape countenance the circulation of such monstrous fables. No wonder, indeed, that Spain is a land of superstition and darkness, where these absurd legends are encouraged, while the Sacred Scriptures, the book of God, is buried and concealed from the people.

21. I should be guilty of a most gross and unpardonable neglect, and would no doubt be justly accused by the reverend brotherhood of ingratitude, and perhaps of disrespect for the *learned congregation of rites*, were I to pass over in dead silence that luminous and inimitable compendium of sacred biography and ecclesiastical literature, well known to the friars under the appellation of "The Breviary." This book is of great weight and importance in the Church of Rome; it ranks next to the Missal, upon which it is presumed to bestow a considerable degree of strength and plausibility, by exhibiting the stupendous actions of those saints, whose festivals, masses, and commemorations, are distinctly appointed in the Missal. In consequence of a decree of the Council of Trent, Pope Pius V. ordered a number of learned and able men to compile the Breviary, and by his bull "*quod a nobis*," July, 1566, commanded the daily perusal of it to the clergy of the Roman Church, secular and regular: it had been afterwards

revised and corrected by Clement VIII. and lastly by Urban VIII. both of whom have stamped the seal of papal authority on the present edition, by pronouncing an excommunication on any person who should in future presume to alter it. That the Church of Rome sets the highest value on the Breviary may be easily perceived from the strictness with which she demands the perusal of it. All Subdeacons, Deacons, and Priests—all persons of both sexes who have professed in any of the regular orders; and such as enjoy any ecclesiastical revenue, are bound, under pain of mortal sin, to repeat daily, either in public or private, the whole stated service out of the Breviary. An omission of this duty deprives the incumbent of all legal right to every clerical emolument arising to him during the period of neglect, nor can he be absolved until he has made restitution, by giving certain alms to the poor, or a donation to the Spanish Crusade, the Inquisition, or some similar establishment. From all these considerations, and particularly from that of incurring the guilt of eternal damnation, it should be reasonably presumed that the contents of this ecclesiastical compendium would furnish a variety of powerful aid to the cause of truth and religion, or at least some historical candour and information. Of this, however, the reader will be able to form a competent opinion from the following few extracts, taken literally from the Breviary of Urban VIII. Various are the stories by which this volume of legends endeavours to support the extravagant veneration for the Popes, and to magnify the power of the Roman See. We read in the life of Pope St. John, that his Holiness being on a journey to Corinth, and desirous to have a quiet and comfortable horse, borrowed one, which the lady of a certain nobleman used to ride. The animal carried the Pope with the greatest ease and docility, and when the journey was over was returned to his mistress; but in vain did she attempt to enjoy the accustomed services of her favourite. The horse became fierce, and gave the lady many a disagreeable fall—"as if (says the Breviary) feeling indignant at having to carry a woman since the Vicar of Christ had been on his back." The horse was accordingly presented to the Pope as unfit to be ridden by a less dignified personage. The Pontiff was afterwards imprisoned by Theodoric the Goth. Shortly after the Emperor and the Pope die, and Theodoric is seen carried to hell by Popes John and Syminachus, through one of the volcanoes of the Lipari islands.—Brev. Rom. die 27 Maii. On another occasion, Pope Clemens is thrown into the lake Mæotis, with an anchor tied round his neck by the infidels to prevent his floating. The plan succeeded, and the Pope was drowned; but the sea shortly after receded three miles from the shore, where a temple appeared, in which the body of the martyr had been found inclosed, together with the anchor, in a marble sarcophagus! St. Peter's chains, which are at this day exhibited in Rome, were (according to the Breviary) brought from

Jerusalem by Eudoxia, the wife of Theodosius the Younger. The Pope was overjoyed at the sight of this relic, and produced from his treasury another chain which the holy apostle had borne under Nero. The moment the two chains were brought into contact, the links at the extremities of each joined together, and the two pieces became one uniform chain.—In festo St. Petri ad Vincula.

22. While the lying friars spared nothing in this compilation to magnify their masters the Popes, they took good care not to forget their own brethren. St. Peter of Alcantara, on returning one evening to his convent, was overtaken by a tremendous fall of snow—in this distressed state, he took shelter in an old ruined building, of which nothing remained but the bare walls—the snow, however, arose gradually upon the walls, and at length congealed into a solid roof, under which the friar most comfortably passed the night. St. Andrew Avellini returning home with his brethren on a dark and rainy night, although the distance was great, and the rain pouring in torrents, nevertheless they were all as dry as if they had been in their cloister, and what was more humoursome, they had the pleasure of seeing their way for miles in the dark by the radiancy of the Saint's person! Die 10th Nov. St. Philip Neri, whose chest was too confined for the expansive glow of divine love, was miraculously enlarged by the fracture of two ribs! Die 26th Martii. Frances, a Roman widow, set at defiance not only rain, but even rivers—at one time she multiplied a few crusts of bread, so as to afford a substantial meal for fifteen nuns, and filled a basket with the fragments; at another she allayed their thirst with a single bunch of grapes. Die 9th Martii. Ahdreas Hyspellus returning from the choir to his cell, had a long conversation with the infant Jesus; and when the Clare-nuns of the Nallis gloriæ were perishing for water, he instantaneously drew a beautiful fountain of water for them in the convent. Die 3d Junii. Paul the hermit was fed daily by a raven—the Abbot Ægidius was supported in the desert by a wild doe, who came to him every day to be milked. St. Francis de Paula crossed the strait of Sicily on his cloak, and was good-natured enough to take another friar with him as a deck passenger! Die 2d Aprili. Raymond de Pennafort sailed with flying colours on his cowl from Majorca to Barcelona—and St. Hyacinth steered on his thread-bare habit across the Vistula, at the time of a great flood, carrying with him a whole cargo of friars! Die 16th Aug.—But it would be an endless detail were I to make allusion to Theresa, Scholastica, Bernard, Benedict, and an innumerable host of monks and friars, who seemed to have the elements, and the whole physical order at their disposal. The sufferings of the martyrs have been made to contribute most copiously to the composition of the Breviary. The renowned Dionysius walked with his head in his hands, from Paris to the site of the present Abbey of St. Denis! St. Januarius, after been thrown into a burning furnace, came out so perfectly

hurt, that not even his clothes or his hair was singed. On another occasion, his body extinguished the flames of Mount Vesuvius—and even at this day, his blood, which is preserved in Naples, though formed into a coagulated mass, presently liquefies, and is changed into a bubbling fluid on being placed near the head of the martyr. St. Cecily had a whole house in flames about her for a natural day, and received no injury. Even the Lictor exerted his strength and his axe in vain on the neck of his victim. After much labour, he almost severed the head from the body; however, she continued to live for three days longer. The Pope invites us to see the manger where the infant Saviour lay at Bethlehem. The house of the Virgin Mary at Loretto was carried by angels, first to Dalmatia, and thence over the Asiatic, to the opposite shore in the pontificate of Celestine 5th, and is (says the Breviary) "the identical house in which 'the word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us,' as is proved by the decrees and bulls of Popes, &c. who have appointed an anniversary festival, with a proper mass and office, in commemoration of such a miraculous gift." The collect in the mass commences thus—"Deus, qui beatæ Mariæ Virginis domum per incarnati verbi mysterium misericorditer consecrasti, *eamque in sinu ecclesiæ tuæ mirabiliter consierasti*," &c. "O God, who by the mystery of the incarnate word, hast mercifully consecrated the house of the blessed Virgin Mary, and *hast miraculously placed it in the bosom of thy church*," &c. Mark here the unparalleled impudence and impiety with which they assert this lie, by even addressing it to the Deity in the form of a solemn prayer.

These few instances, taken from the immense collection, with which the Breviary is almost every page abounds, may serve as a basis for the following argument. That ecclesiastical epitome of sacred knowledge, presented to the clergy, under the sanction and authority of a church, and the perusal of which is enjoined under the awful penalty of eternal damnation, should be a book replete with genuine Christian principles; at least it should be a standard and a model of truth, candour and common sense; but reader, mark thou, if the facts in the Roman Breviary have any semblance to truth, or are they consistent with common sense,—the conclusion, I presume, need not be drawn. We hope, however, that the day is not far distant, when reason and religion will triumph over Italian fables and lying wonders—and when the human understanding, influenced by an honourable and an independent spirit, will no longer suffer itself to be cajoled by the inventions of stupid friars, or overawed by the menaces of Cardinals, or the bulls of Popes.

28. I have once seen a small book, which was printed in Ireland, and obtained a very general circulation over the country—entitled, "the Scapular book." I regret that my limits do not allow me to make some comments at present on this most infamous

production, by which the friars extract large sums of money from the credulous, and expose the character of the people, by representing them as a silly unthinking multitude. According to this book of lies and impiety, the blessed Virgin Mary appeared to a monk of the name of Simon Stock, and invested him with a badge called the Scapular; he was then directed to form an order of confraternity in honour of the Virgin—the Scapular was to be its emblem—and whoever had the honour of wearing it, was to be secured by the blessed Virgin from plague, pestilence, and famine, from lightning, thunder, and sudden death—women were to be freed from the pains of child-birth, and old matrons blessed with a numerous and healthy offspring—and what is more consoling, when the brother or sister of this confraternity is on the bed of death, the blessed Virgin is to be there also, who will close the eyes and lips of the dying person, and securing the soul from the flames of purgatory, will bear it aloft without any interruption to the kingdom of heaven. The various miracles wrought through the virtue of the Scapular, by crowds of old women in different parts of the country, and by cripples, beggars, and rambling pilgrims at wells and such places, are most tastefully arranged, and piously depicted in that precious little volume. The only difference, indeed, between the wonders of the Scapular book and those of the Breviary is, that the miracles of the latter, as having been intended for the clergy, are not described in such low, coarse, and vulgar language, while the stories of the former are in every sense, most artfully suited to the taste and credulity of an ignorant, superstitious and benighted multitude—it may be said in reply, that the church has nothing to do with this book—but what sophistry—has the ordinary of each diocese no obligation of securing his flock from error and imposition, and his church from public scandal? has the host of indulgences with which the Pope has bedaubed the Scapular, and which are drawn up in solemn array in that book, no effect in giving to it the sanction of the church? the truth is too evident and notorious—the people are duped—the unfortunate members of the confraternities and purgatorial Societies are literally humbugged, while the friars may laugh and keep all the joke to themselves.*—But to return to the state of Spain,—

* According to the discipline of their church, no secular Priest can enroll in any order without permission and licence from the superior of that order—the friars, no doubt, considering themselves legally and solely entitled to the pecuniary blessings and emoluments arising therefrom. I have, however, known one Curate in the diocese of Waterford, who, without any authority, used to receive in crowds all the old men and women of the country into every order, still reading one and the same prayer over them all, which was the "benedictio novæ navis"—the blessing prescribed by the ritual to be pronounced over a new ship, when about to be launched—his reverence, we may be assured, was handsomely recompensed for his trouble,—however, the gentlemen of the cowl would be far from feeling obliged to him for such impudent and uncanonical intrusion.

what a dismal scene of superstition, and its concomitant vices must be exhibited in that country, which has been for so many ages inundated by successive hordes of mendicant orders, all vieing with each other in practicing on the credulity of the people. Witness the doctrine of indulgences, and the wealth which has from thence flowed into the lap of Rome. I shall merely allude to what is called the "bull of the Crusade." The Spanish Government has two or three petty fortresses on the coast of Africa, which are used as places of punishment for criminals—a few soldiers are stationed in these garrisons, and hence a perpetual war is said to be kept up against the *Infidels*. For this purpose, *summaries* of a Papal bull are printed every year, which the Spaniards purchase, in order to enjoy the indulgence, and obtain permission to eat meat on prohibited days. There is also the *defunct bull*. When this is purchased, the name of any dead person being entered on it, a plenary indulgence is conveyed to his soul, and he is immediately *turned out* of purgatory. *The composition bull* is still more satisfactory; by purchasing this atonement, any property may be kept, which, having been obtained by robbery, cannot be traced to the right owners for restitution. The tax thus levied upon the people of Spain is then divided between the Friars, the King and the Pope.

24. What a different character would the Christian world assume, had the sacred Scriptures been universally circulated and encouraged. In consequence of the many and luminous discussions which have taken place on the subject of the Bible, it will not, I presume, be necessary for me to advert copiously to that subject in this compendious review. The question, however, may be considered under three capital heads—namely—the indiscriminate perusal of the Scriptures—the genuine text of the Scriptures; and the rule of faith, or medium, by which the word of God is to be expounded—these three points, I shall, by way of digression, but still with my accustomed conciseness, reasonably and Scripturally discuss. First, then, the Scripture is the property of the Christian public, and every man is at liberty to read it—"All Scripture, (says St. Paul to Timothy, iii. c. v. 16.) is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." We read in Isaiah xxxiv. c. v. 16. this solemn command—"Seek out the book of the Lord and read, &c.—and, therefore, (says the Saviour) John v. c. v. 39. "Search the Scriptures," &c.—if then the Scriptures give testimony of Christ, and of course of his doctrine—if they are so profitable as to render the man of God thoroughly furnished unto all good works—if not only these few quoted texts, but a multiplicity of others, strictly command us to peruse the Scriptures—and that clearly without distinction of Priest or

laymen—learned or unlearned—is not then, I would ask, the indiscriminate perusal of God's word fully established? And, moreover, I appeal to common sense. When the apostle wrote to the Christians or to the Romans, did he intend that his Epistle should be concealed. Were the people never to hear of it—were they only to have "in partibus" by piece-meal, and according to the discretion of the spiritual guides. Ah! Church of Rome, give the flock at least one Epistle, to which from the very name they have adopted, they seem to have at least the semblance of a title—give them the Epistle to the Romans—nay, it should not be surprising, were you to have it written in letters of gold on the very walls of your temples.

As to the second point, the inaccuracy of the Protestant translation, it requires no distinct reply, as no instance of error has, at least to my knowledge, been as yet produced. And, indeed, when we consider the extent and diversity of talent, particularly as linguists, with which nature and education have gifted many of the guardians of the Protestant Church, it might be *easily* conjectured, that they would be as able to translate an Hebrew or a Greek Bible—as the "*Doctors*" of the Dunboyne establishment; the professors of Carlow; ay, or their Eminences, the Cardinals of the Propaganda. Let De la Hogue, with the Maynoothean and Carlow folks, if they are able, translate the Scriptures into English from the Asiatic, African and other languages into which they have been rendered by Protestant Divines, and then indeed will we consider them *serious* in charging the Protestant translators with inaccuracy—and ultimately the very Scriptures, in a variety of passages, proclaim themselves the sole and sufficient rule of faith. I should be carried beyond my intended limits were I to insert here a vast collection of scriptural authority in favour of my position: for this I refer my readers to the discussions at Carlow, Carrick-on-Shannon, and other places: and as to the pretended infallible tribunal so much lauded by the Church of Rome, I shall merely adduce the following observation—they pretend to prove the infallibility from a text of Scripture—suppose the following—"Go teach all nations," &c. and "lo I am with you," &c. Now they explain this text, either by their own private interpretation, or by that of an infallible authority; if by their own private judgment, then they adopt the rule of Protestants; if by an infallibe authority, they suppose the question at issue "a petitio principii." The conclusion is evident. The effects resulting from this clerical monopoly of the Scriptures—from this abstraction of the word of God, are well known to every reflecting man in this country; and, by analogy, we may conceive what character they must assume in Spain and other places where the same system so powerfully prevails.

25. Another source of superstition and monkish villainy is to be found in the tremendous collection of pretended relics which they exhibit in the different churches and convents. They shew you here the thorns that crowned our Saviour—the nails by which he was suspended from the cross—whole vessels full of the blood of the holy innocents slain by Herod—an arm of one saint, the head of another, and the legs of a third; and almost every church pretends to have a large piece of the cross upon which our Redeemer suffered. These impositions are not confined to Spain—they are universally practised over Portugal, Italy, and every country where the Romish Church prevails. In the Church of St. Mark in Venice may be seen that part of the rock of Mount Horeb, which Moses struck with his rod in the desert—the body of St. Mark—and the chair in which he sat when he wrote his Gospel—the table at which Christ and his disciples sat at the last supper—a large piece of the cross—the robe which Christ wore in the house of Caiaphas—the head of St. John the Baptist, and a piece of his leathern girdle—the sword with which Peter cut off the ear of Malchus—the fingers of Mary Magdalene—the legs of St. Matthew—the hair and some of the milk of the blessed Virgin; and, in short, the precious blood of Jesus Christ himself, which they keep in a vial, and expose to the people on certain festivals. The Church of the famous Anthony of Padua is equally remarkable: this is the saint who was, at one and the same time, in two different places. From a motive of charity he transported himself to Lisbon, in order to raise from the dead a poor man whom the judges had falsely condemned to be beheaded; and at the same instant he was obliged to be at Padua to prove his sanctity by a miracle, which he wrought in presence of the magistrates, by cutting a large block of marble with a piece of glass: a relic of this is of course preserved. In the Church of St. Justina in Padua, they pretend to have the body of St. Luke, and of Uriah whom King David had murdered: they have also the slab of marble on which St. Prosdocimus, the disciple of St. Peter, used to say Mass, with the following inscription—

"Hæc super insigni petra Prosdocimus olim
Obtulit o' quoties munera sacra Deo."

While this mass of ridiculous falsehood is impudently exhibited to the public, the monument of the illustrious Henry IV. and the tombs of Patin, Speroni, Bevetinus, and other men of genius, to whom the University of Padua will be for ever indebted, are passed by unhonoured and almost unnoticed. But the artful friars are deeply interested in these pretended relics, from whence they draw an immense revenue, nor does it require much effort of imagination to conceive what dark and melancholy effects originate from

this vile, superstitious practice. To afford this body of unscriptural and silly doctrine strength and permanency, and to give it a triumph over reason, truth, and honesty, they have placed it under the protection of the most merciless and sanguinary tribunal that ever disgraced human nature—the Inquisition. Behold Galileo on his knees at the foot of the scaffold!—See the commentators of Newton prefixing a false declaration to his immortal *Principia*, by which they avoid the fate of the Florentine astronomer—"Newton (say the great mathematicians Le Seur and Jacquier) assumes in his third book the hypothesis of the earth's motion: the propositions of that author could not be explained except through the same hypothesis: we have, therefore, been forced to act a character not our own; but we declare our submission to the decrees of the Pope against the motion of the earth."—Newt. Principia, Colon. Allob. 1760. By a solemn decree of the Council of Trent, the press was subject to the previous censure of the Inquisition—"ad coercenda petulantia ingenia"—to subdue the petulant minds of those who should dare to broach any thing which jarred with the principles of school philosophy or divinity; and the *Index Erpurgatorius* of Rome shews how well the inquisitors exercised their authority. What horror must fill the mind of a generous, sensitive man, when he reflects that the leading executioners in this work of blood and massacre, have been canonized and commemorated in the public office of their church. "St. Ferdinand, King of Castile, (says the Roman Breviary,) shone illustrious for magnanimity, clemency, justice, and above all, zeal for the Catholic faith: this he evinced by persecuting heretics, to whom he allowed no repose in any part of his kingdom, and for whose execution, when condemned to be burnt, *he used to carry the wood with his own hands.*—Die 30 Maii:" and in the Missal, a collect thus concludes, "et ab ecclesia tua cunctam repelle nequitiam, et gentes paganorum et hereticorum dextræ tua potentia conterantur," &c.—"and repel all wickedness from thy church, and by the power of thy right hand let the nations of pagans and heretics be crushed," &c. The annals of the Spanish Inquisition, polluted as they have been with deeds of mystery, darkness, and death, will stand as a monument of eternal disgrace on that nation, while the blood of thousands sacrificed at its altar, must cry out louder than that of Abel, for the justice and vengeance of Heaven upon the heads of the merciless ecclesiastical monsters by whom it was upheld. As long as this tribunal is suffered to exist, so long will ignorance, superstition, and human craft, stalk with unblushing superiority and triumph, and thus from generation to generation, and from age to age, will error, and vice, and misery, be the portion of a people whom the God of nature seems to have destined for a better and a more propitious fate.

26 Turning away, therefore, with disgust and with Christian fortitude from these disagreeable scenes of fanaticism and cruelty, let us cast our eyes to that divine and immortal treasure, which a merciful Saviour has bequeathed to us, as our guide and comfort —"the sacred book of his inspired word:" "it is a light to our feet and a lantern to our path;" "and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." With it, and with God's grace, man is happy—without it, all the learning of this world is of no avail: it matters not what literary ground his talents may occupy, or what regions of science his genius may explore—let him with Milton indulge in the recreative fanciful numbers of the muse, or with Demosthenes rush into the bold strains of eloquence, and by the powers of oratory bear along with him the sentiments, the plaudits of admiring multitudes and of crowded senate-houses—should he, with Locke, develope the reasoning faculties, and settle them upon logical principles; or with the bold and undaunted Columbus, lay hold of the mariner's compass, and setting at defiance the terrors of the Atlantic, ride in triumph on its billows in search of new shores and unexplored hemispheres—let him, in short, mount with the immortal spirit of Newton into the heavens, and pursue the planets and the fixed stars through their respective revolutions and orbits;—still, oh great God! this towering genius is darkness itself without a knowledge of thy divine word. No wonder, therefore, that Jesus Christ should promise to support for ever the divine truths of this book of life—no wonder that its inspired pages should set at defiance both the power of man and the wreck of time: at this day it stands triumphant, after the long lapse of eighteen dark and tempestuous centuries: during that time, states and empires have risen and fallen, the reigning powers of many nations have disappeared, the ancient line of monarchs broken, and their thrones crumbling beneath the shock of political revolution; meanwhile the book of God and its truths, like the mountain oak, have braved the fury of the darkened storm; and no intrigue, no political commotion, no power on earth was able to crush that building of which Christ Jesus is the corner-stone, and which is supported by the strong arm of the most high God. We have, therefore, to return eternal thanks to that merciful Saviour who has blessed us with the possession and with the knowledge of his inspired word; and with humble and fervent prayer to beseech him that the day may soon arrive, when error and darkness may scatter and vanish before the brightness of Christian truth, and that the light of his Gospel may be spread from meridian to meridian, and from pole to pole, in every kingdom and in every climate of the habitable world.

FINIS.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Church Missionary Society

FOR

AFRICA AND THE EAST.

FIFTY-SEVENTH YEAR,

1855—1856.

CONTAINING

THE ANNIVERSARY SERMON,

BY THE

REV. JOSEPH FENN,

MINISTER OF BLACKHEATH PARK CHAPEL, KENT.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE,

&c. &c.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM M. WATTS, CROWN COURT, TEMPLE BAR.

Published for the Society,
BY SEELEY, JACKSON, AND HALLIDAY, FLEET STREET;
R. B. SEELEY, HANOVER STREET;
HATCHARD, PICCADILLY; AND J. NISBET & CO., BERNERS STREET.