

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06829254 3

LETTERS

ON THE

REVIVAL OF POPERY,

ITS

INTOLERANT CHARACTER,

&c.

"All the Prelates, at their Consecration, make an Oath to the Pope clean contrary to the Oath which they make to us; so that they seem to be his subjects, not ours."—*Speech of King HENRY VIII. May 11, 1532.*

"Oh, my Lord God, defend this realme from Popistrie, and mainteine thy true religion."—*Dying Prayer of King EDWARD VI. See Holinshed.*

"It seems an infatuation not to be accounted for—to hope to persuade a free people, in the full enjoyment of all that is dear and valuable to them, to exchange FREEDOM for SLAVERY, the PROTESTANT Religion for POPERY, and to sacrifice at once the price of so much blood and treasure as have been spent in defence of our present Establishment! Our enemies have long taken advantage of our differences and dissensions: let it be known that the spirit of Popery, which breathes nothing but confusion to the civil and religious rights of a Protestant Church and Kingdom, has not so far possessed my People, as to make them ripe for such a fatal change."—*Speech of King GEORGE I. on the Opening of Parliament in the Year 1722.*

"The Established Constitution, in Church and State, shall be the Rule of my Government."—*Speech of King GEORGE III. on his Accession to the Crown.*

THE
REVIVAL OF POPERY,

ITS

INTOLERANT CHARACTER,
POLITICAL TENDENCY,

ENCROACHING DEMANDS,

AND

UNCEASING USURPATIONS:

DETAILED

In a Series of Letters

TO

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, ESQ. M. P.

WITH AN APPENDIX;

Containing copious Extracts from the Notes, inculcating Persecution,
which are annexed to the authorized Roman Catholic Bible,

AND

REMARKS ON THE WILFUL CORRUPTION

OF

holy Scripture.

BY **WILLIAM BLAIR, ESQ. A. M.**

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR OGLE, DUNCAN, AND CO.

37, PATERNOSTER ROW, AND 295, HOLBORN;

HATCHARD, Piccadilly; SEELEY, Fleet Street; WILSON, Essex Street, Strand;
OGLE and Co. Edinburgh; M. OGLE, Glasgow; and
JOHNSTON and Co. Dublin.

1819.

CPB

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
163094
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

ROY W. B.
DUBOY
REU.

CONTENTS:

EPISTLE DEDICATORY. The Author's apprehension of danger, &c. in conceding the Claims of Roman Catholics. Rumour of a design to grant their Claims clandestinely, as by "a side-wind." Declarations by the Editor of the British Press. Exorbitant demands of Roman Catholics, and certainty of their wish to subvert Protestant Establishments. Priests' love of power and pre-eminence, natural and not unreasonable. Dr. *Dromgoole's* frankness in opening his predictions to the Public, of the Church's downfall. Appeal to Mr. *Wilberforce*, grounded thereon. Religious liberty invaluable to Britons. The late Irish Secretary's answer to excuses and pretences in support of Catholic Claims, on securities, eligibility, exclusions, tranquillization, clerical influence, popular feelings, and Parliamentary distinctions, &c.

P. 1—8.

LETTER I. Man's attachment to civil and religious liberty. Mr. *Wilberforce's* love to the Church, not consistent with his supporting the Catholic Claims. Judge *Hale*, Sir *William Blackstone*, Lord *Clarendon*, Lord *Somers*, *Milton*, *Locke*, *William III.* deemed the *Pope's* Supremacy inimical to the State. Edinburgh Reviewer's opinion. Queries to Mr. *Wilberforce*. Philosophers and Statesmen often ignorant of this subject. The chief points to be considered in the following Letters.

P. 8—12.

LETTER II. Revival of Popery and its Institutions. The Inquisition. Jesuits. Political power wanted. Means of obtaining secular power. Unwise conduct of Protestants in supporting Popish Charities. Letter of Mr. *Andrews* to the Duke of *Norfolk*. Catholic school-boys signed the late Petition to Parliament. Propriety of a return being made of Popish Seminaries and Chapels, &c. to ascertain the progress of Popery.

P. 13—16.

LETTER III. The Author wishes for no interference in religious matters. Right of the Legislature to inquire what Sectaries and

Papists are doing. Reasonableness of a test or proof of Loyalty insisted on. Unguarded conduct of liberal and wealthy persons. Protestants give support to Popish Schools, and especially to *St. Patrick's*. The evils of Education, if not well directed and watched. Bishop *Poynter* unfriendly to the use of Bibles and a scriptural education. The School-committee at *St. Patrick's* oppose the Irish Free Schools in *St. Giles's*. Fraudulent proceedings of *St. Patrick's Society*. P. 16—19.

LETTER IV. Mr. *Kelly's* Examination at the House of Commons. The purpose of *St. Patrick's* Charity. Protestant Children never admitted. This distinction injurious. Union of the *Irish Charitable Society* with *St. Patrick's*, and transfer of 100*l.* 6*s.* 1*d.* Conditions of this transfer. No religious partiality is allowable. Forfeiture of money in the event of such partiality. Appeal to Protestant Princes, Nobles, and Gentry. The terms *Papist* and *Popery* used only as distinctive appellations by the Author. Peculiar feature of all Catholic Societies, &c. P. 20—23.

LETTER V. Gradual increase of Popery before the French Revolution. Rapid increase after French Exiles were maintained in England. More than 4000 converts in the year 1818. Roman Catholic population progressively advancing, and boasted of by Dublin orators. Comparative numbers in 1767, 1781, and 1819. Decrease in last century. No new Schools then opened. But three Schools of note at that period, and striking increase afterwards. About fifty Colleges, and other Seminaries, at present. School at Calmel Buildings omitted in Laity's Directory. Stonyhurst College of Jesuits particularly described, and its importance to the nation insisted on. Character of Jesuits given by a Roman Catholic Historian. Mischiefs arising from Confession to Priests. Influence of Jesuits, and their dispersion. No successors expected in 1781. P. 23—29.

LETTER VI. Quotations from an History of the Jesuits; showing their number, wealth, and power, &c. at Preston and Stonyhurst. Reply to Mr. *Dallas*. Jesuits not bound by any oath to our Government, but take an Oath to serve the Pope and Church of Rome. Practical deductions from the statements here made. Dean *Milner's* opinion. P. 30—39.

LETTER VII. Increased number of Popish Chapels. Some very large and magnificent. Glasgow Chapel. Moorfields Chapel, and City-grant of freehold ground to build upon. Degenerated Protestantism. Glory of the Reformation departed. False candour and liberality of the Citizens of London. Popish Journals, Printing Presses, Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Our Clergy fighting for Orthodoxy, but not seeing their danger from Popery. Statesmen do not mind affairs of conscience, but feel the evil of religious persecution. Freedom of private judgment. Circulation of the Scriptures by all Protestants. Opposed by the Pope. Church Establishments generally intolerant. P. 39—43.

LETTER VIII. Number of Priests in 1781. Their respective situations in England and Wales. Ex-Jesuits, and their decrease. Their character drawn by a Roman Catholic Historian. Enterprising spirit of the Jesuits at St. Omer's, Bruges, and Liège. Nuns, Dominicans, Franciscans, Benedictines, &c. P. 44—47.

LETTER IX. The spirit and genius of Popery unchanged. Its intolerance evinced by re-establishing the Order of Jesuits. They are named "vigorous and experienced rowers." Dr. *Geddes* apologizes for the English Catholics. Oath of the Spanish Sovereign. Dr. *Geddes* rejects the Papal doctrine of exclusive salvation. Politicians care little for *dogmas* which produce no civil discord. Absurdity of expecting all men to agree in religious opinions. P. 48—52.

LETTER X. Serious evils from the doctrine of Infallibility. Archbishop *Tray's* Pastoral Instruction. Copious Extracts from it; on the revolt of Henry VIII.—the jurisdiction of the Pope,—communion with the See of Rome,—salvation only in that Church,—the spirit of Proselytism,—infallibility of the Church,—General Councils,—Errors of Heretics,—one true faith,—dogmatical decrees,—canonical obedience,—universal extent of Papal jurisdiction,—ill-informed Protestants who advocate Catholic Emancipation. Mr. *Sheridan's* opinion of Popish doctrines producing persecution. Bishop *Bossuet*, and his Biographers. P. 52—58.

LETTER XI. Intimate connexion of leading Popish doctrines. The words of Pastors received as God's Word. Class-book of Maynooth College. English Bible printed at Dublin in 1816; sanc-

tioned by *Dr. Troy*, who retracts his name, and condemns the doctrine approved by other Bishops. Intolerance of the present Pope, evinced by his own words. He disapproves of certain Oaths. *Dr. Troy* and *Dr. Milner* at variance. Catholic Clergy swear to support the Established Church. Such Oaths not valid. *Lord Colchester's* observations on Oaths, May 14, 1813.

P. 58—64.

LETTER XII. Roman Catholic Oaths equivocal and dubious. The Pope decides on the quality of such Oaths. But Popes may differ in opinion. Protestants deemed Heretics by *Pope Pius VII.* He refuses to allow of sacrilegious nuptials. Vain hope of a brotherly reception from Roman Catholics. Bishop *Challoner* does not admit the validity of Protestant Orders, or Sacraments, &c. *Rev. Mr. Gandolphy's* animosity and sermons. No peace with the Roman Church. Protestants declared by *Dr. Delahogue* to be out of the way of salvation. The Trent Catechism says the same, and describes who are Heretics. The Church defined by it, and Protestants excluded. But still the Church is said to retain its power to rule, denounce, punish, and curse all such separated persons, &c.

P. 64—69.

LETTER XIII. *Dr. Hawarden* the successful disputant against *Chillingworth*. *Dr. Challoner*, the Editor of the Rheims Testament, in 1749. Roman Catholic principles stated from the writings of *Hawarden*. Zeal of the Booksellers in Dublin and London to reprint Popish works, and *Ward's* calumnies. The Catholic Church not deemed uncharitable in obliging men to believe its articles of faith. Heretics always accuse the Church of coining new articles of belief, &c. and of being uncharitable. None saved out of the Roman Church; a general rule, but not universal. The Catholic Church does not include Protestants or modern Greeks, &c. This shown at large and illustrated by *Hawarden*. Exclusive salvation, therefore, is an essential doctrine never to be forgotten,

P. 69—74.

LETTER XIV. The anathema of Papists does not exclude men from the authority of the Church, or from being subject to its punishment. The sentence of a Priest to be obeyed under pain of death. The Church decides all controversies, and allows of no appeal: inflicts death on the disobedient, as was done by Church guides under the Old Testament. This doctrine taught in all mo-

dern Bibles of Papists, who continue to be a persecuting people. Views of the Church of Rome exemplified, in her conduct to Baron *Wessenberg*, Bishop of *Constance*. The Church still forbids vernacular versions of the Bible to be used by the common people. Protestant laws prevent ancient scenes of persecution in Ireland. A coalition of Popish devotees and Protestant senators deprecated. Mr. *Leslie Foster's* speech in 1812, showing that Members of Parliament returned from Ireland would follow the people, who would be led by their Priests. The temperance of Roman Catholics accounted for, when they had no power to exercise, and before the relaxation of the Penal Laws. In 1792 the Irish Catholic committee disavow the design to seek for unqualified emancipation, and limit their demands in Parliament. No contentment produced by concession. When the Catholics of Ireland had political power they abused it, returning only six Protestants to Parliament, but 230 Catholics. They repeal the Irish Act of Settlement, repossess the estates of Protestants, and adjudge 2500 of them to be traitors. P. 75—82.

LETTER XV. Bondage of Irish people to their Priests; who levy fines, inflict bodily punishments, enjoin pilgrimages, work pretended miracles, exorcise the deluded peasantry, and practise other foul artifices; they discourage education, promote Purgatorial Societies, refuse the Scriptures, and oppose the Hibernian Society's Schoolmasters. Letter from the late Bishop of *Killala*, and affidavits before a Magistrate. Spiritual domination of Priests. Danger of multiplying Popish Magistrates in Ireland. Detailed account of Priestly oppression in the diocese of *Killala*. The nature of Excommunication. Infamous character and principles of the Clergy. The Bishop countenances bad customs and collections, and shares the booty. Scandalous private Confessions, and cabin-hunting, encouraged by the Bishop. Exorbitant fees and cruel extortions, accompanied with base conduct and drunkenness of the Priests. Their gross ignorance and neglect of duty. Oppose the *Veto*, lest they lose their dominion over the people. Priests compared to *Sancho Panza*. The Bishop called on to deny and disprove these allegations, which are attested by the narrator's name, and printed in 1817. P. 82—95.

LETTER XVI. Brief account of the Trent Council, the number of Prelates who attended: its Committee, and Laws of the Congregation of the Index; condemnation of Books, especially Versions

of the Bible. Rules of the *Index* enforced against Englishmen by the Vicars Apostolic. Particular description of the Rules of the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. No absolution for those who disobey the Rules of the *Index*, or resist the Pope's will. Absolute power of the Vicars Apostolic, who rule half a million of British subjects. Lord *Colchester's* opinion that their office should cease and be prohibited, and the civil consequences of Excommunication be prevented, by Parliament. Religious liberty not sought for by Roman Catholics, but political ascendancy. Lord *Colchester* condemns the proceedings of Jesuits at Stonyhurst and in Ireland; disapproves the partial allegiance of the Regular Clergy. The right of private judgment in religion asserted, and defended; but not allowed by Roman Catholics, who deem its exercise an act of rebellion against the Church. Unsocial consequences of such a principle, and its tendency to generate persecution. Lord *Castlereagh* considers spiritual authority dangerous, and likely to be abused for temporal purposes: he thinks the times may return when the power of the Roman See may be turned against the State.

P. 96—103.

LETTER XVII. Dr. *Geddes* regarded Popish principles as incompatible with civil government, and Papists therefore disloyal subjects. A Bishop of the Established Church compared to a stuffed Calf. Allegiance of the English Catholics insecure under Apostolic Vicars; and a letter of M. *Quarantotti*, as well as the present *Pope's* Memorial to M. *Champigny*, demonstrate this. Mr. *Charles Butler* maintains the Supremacy of a foreign power in this kingdom, which Judge *Blackstone* considered adverse to civil obedience. Bishop *Poynter* obeys and supports the Laws of the Congregation of the *Index*. Bishop *Milner* likewise. The opposition between the Roman and Anglican Churches in the article of reading the Scriptures, and trusting to them alone for salvation: this fully explained, by the author of a History of the Jesuits, in reply to Mr. *Canning* and others. The most enlightened Roman Catholics do not concede any thing to us Protestants, in order to effect a union. King *James's* Translators of the Bible reproach the Catholic Church for withholding the Scriptures, and being forced by Protestants to bring out a translation against their will. English and Irish Papists are not now allowed to read the Popish Scriptures without a license, and are admonished not to do so. Bishop *Poynter's* New Year's Gift quoted. General *Matheu* ignorant of Popish tenets. Lord *Colchester's* Speech on

the Papal power, which is conferred without any written instrument or state-control whatever: its exercise inconsistent with our Protestant Constitution, and an injurious power to be delegated. His determination to resist the admission of Roman Catholics into Parliament. Lord *Castlereagh* stated that the Apostolic Vicars are obliged implicitly to obey the mandates of the Pope, and are removable at his pleasure. P. 103—111.

LETTER XVIII. *Mahomet* commandad his followers to use violence and the sword, in propagating his religion: but Mahometans might, nevertheless, advance a claim for political power in a Christian Legislature, under the same pretence as the Roman Catholics now do. A parallel drawn between the two cases, and an Extract given from the new Petition to the British Parliament. Archdeacon *Paley's* sentiments on different religious opinions, and the benefit of such as are not maintained uncharitably. Extract from a Protestant Dissenter's Letter on Catholic Emancipation. Another Dissenter, on this subject, inviting to petition Parliament against the Catholic Claims. Intolerance of the Creed of Pope *Pius IV.* and its incompatibility with social order. Yet some Roman Catholics propose a union between the English and Roman Churches; and such proposal is recommended by Mr. *Butler* and the Rev. Mr. *Wiz.* The Author's remarks thereon.

P. 112—119.

LETTER XIX. A Critique on Mr. *Wiz's* proposed Union, which is shown to differ materially from that of Archbishop *Wake* to M. *Dupin.* Mr. *Wiz* will be answered by the Bishop of *St. David's,* who approves of the Bible Society. That institution defended against the unjust reflections of Mr. *Wiz* and other adversaries. Anecdote of a Wesleyan Methodist. Letter by a writer in the *Times,* signing himself *Luther,* to show the present state of Popery on the Continent. Decided opposition of the Pope to Protestant worship, permitting which is contrary to the Catholic religion, &c.

P. 120—127.

LETTER XX. A translation of the Papal Bull of June 29, 1816, against Bible Societies; and the Jesuits' enmity in Bavaria. Another similar Bull, dated Sept. 3, 1816.

P. 128—137.

LETTER XXI. Effects of those Papal documents. A Decree of the Hungarian Government, Dec. 23, 1816; and a Declaration of

the Hungarian Prelates against Bible Societies, quoting both the Pope's Rescripts, and referring to other Papal letters sent to Eastern countries. P. 137—141.

LETTER XXII. A Popish Mirror for clear-sighted Englishmen. The inflexible nature of a principle of conduct, when once adopted by the Church of Rome, exemplified by a striking case. The Persian New Testament of Mr. *Martyn* deemed more mischievous among Infidels than the Koran. The Author's reflections: those of Bishop *Watson* and the Bishop of *Durham*, on the Bible Society's exertions. The Scriptures circulated in seventy dialects. *Leander Van Ess* distributes 240,000 copies of the German New Testament; and is designated Luther the Second, by the Cardinals at Rome. Pious Catholics persecuted abroad. Inconsistency of Church-of-England men opposing the Bible Society. *John Fox* recommends unity in our Church. P. 141—147.

LETTER XXIII. Importance of Papal records. The Pope's two Bulls copied in Latin by *Leslie Foster*, Esq. M. P. Also mentioned in his Speech, and in that of the Bishop of *Ossory*. The latter cited a recent example of Popish subtlety in construing an Oath: his quotation from M. *Quarantotti's* letter to Bishop *Poynter*, evading the oath of Parliament in 1813. The Emperor of *Russia* offended at the Pope's Bulls, and Prince *Czartoryski* opposes the one sent to Warsaw. Extract from the Warsaw State Gazette, and translation. Incredulity of Mr. *Andrews*, and others, who wished the Papal Bulls had not been discovered by Englishmen. Translation of the first Bull into the Tamul language. The Rev. Mr. *Cecil's* remarks on Popery, as the master-piece of Satan and the Mystery of Iniquity. M. *Pascal* and *Fenelon* infatuated by its principles. *Fenelon's* book against using the Scriptures, translated into English, and approved by Bishop *Milner*. Citations from that work. The new conflict between Protestants and Roman Catholics, exactly resembling the old one in *Luther's* time. The bloody deeds of Pope *Innocent III.* and the persecuting doctrines of Church-guides in our day agreeing thereto. Councils of *Lateran* and *Toulouse*. Dr. *Milner* convicted of an untruth. The Encroachments of Papal laws on English liberties, and the oppression of Irish Priests. P. 147—157.

LETTER XXIV. Bishop *Milner* alarmed and indignant at the prospect of a Bill to be soon proposed in Parliament, similar to a

former one. Lord *Nugent's* observation on the Penal Laws. No reliance to be placed on Popish Faith or Oaths: this proved by their own writings, &c. They have not any natural right to Political power. The times of persecution may possibly return. *John Fox* defended by Dr. *Wordsworth* against Dr. *John Milner's* charge of falsehood. The *Apparatus* employed by Papists to make converts and retain them. No national advantage to be gained by conceding the Claims of Catholics. A Protestant dissenting Gentleman's letters quoted, bearing the signature of *Melancthon*.

P. 157—166.

LETTER XXV. *Luther's* Epistle to Mr. *Wilberforce*, and the sentiments it contains adopted by the Author. Extract from a Speech of *George I.* respecting Popery. P. 166—177.

LETTER XXVI. Extract from Mr. *Leslie Foster's* Speech, praising the Bible Society. The religious freedom allowed by Roman Catholics, compared with that which they receive from Protestants. The University of Oxford reprints the Vulgate Testament for the exiled French Priests. Mr. *Butler's eulogium* on that subject, and on the vast munificence of Great Britain. Address to Dr. *Phillimore*, from Morning Post, March 10, 1819. On the charge of Heresy, and the execrations denounced, by the Roman Church, upon Protestants. Defective Loyalty of Roman Catholics. The glory of modern victories, acquired by the joint efforts of Protestants and Papists. Narrow bigotry and uncharitableness of the Roman Church, and the impossibility of a re-union. Extracts from the Creed of Pope *Pius IV.* and from the Episcopal Oath now used. The Church of Rome not the Catholic Church, not the original Church, not the true Church, nor the Pope to be acknowledged as head of the Christian Church. P. 177—187.

LETTER XXVII. The great Earl of *Clarendon's* sentiments of Papal usurpation and supremacy. Mr. *Charles Butler's* defence of the supremacy, &c. Confused notion of spiritual power among Papists. Degrees of political allegiance among them. Their imperfect subjection to the State. No Pope ever disclaimed the power and jurisdiction usurped by his predecessors. A meeting of Roman Catholics at Arundel House disconcerted by one Jesuit. The Author's observations on Oaths, and on the sentiments now generally held by Irish Catholics. Protestants still considered as Heretics, with whom faith is not always to be kept.

The doctrine of breaking an oath never renounced by the Church itself, but often acted upon. The acrimony of modern Papists not abated. Disunion and separation not necessarily uncharitable.

P. 187—186.

LETTER XXVIII. Lord *Clarendon's* view of a reunion between Protestants and Roman Catholics. The impediments thereto. Danger of Councils to the Church of Rome; and the uselessness of them to other Churches. The Pope's conduct towards *Charles II.* The expulsion of Jesuits insisted on as needful, and the renunciation of all foreign jurisdiction. The difficulties of concession to Roman Catholics are greater now than in Lord *Clarendon's* time, and why. Statutes to be first repealed. Mr. *Burke's* opinion, and that of Lord *Colchester.* Mr. *Fox* willing to grant equal power to Roman Catholics eighteen years ago. The late Lord *Ellenborough's* decision on the points here noticed, and especially of Papal encroachments upon civil liberty.

P. 195—203.

LETTER XXIX. Two Classes of Roman Catholic Controversialists. Each described: Bishop *Milner* and Mr. *Butler* adduced as examples. A critique on Mr. *Butler's* historical writings, and particularly his last work: deemed unfaithful, defective, and unworthy of credit. A brief account of Dr. *John Milner's* last work, in reply to the Bishop of *St. David's*; with an exposure of his uncharitable calumnies, which are detailed further in an Appendix at the close of this volume. The Author's apology for his own unintentional defects or inaccuracies.

P. 203—207.

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX.

THE genuine principles of Roman Catholics developed in their Notes to the Bible, printed first at Rheims and Douay, but reprinted at Dublin in 1816. Inexcusableness of this measure, during the tolerant state of the public mind towards Roman Catholics. The sanctions prefixed to that Dublin Bible. Notice of this work in the *British Critic.* A large collection of texts from Dr. *Troy's* edition of the Bible, here adduced; tending to excite

- animosities and bitter religious persecution, as well as to calumniate the Protestant Clergy, &c. This collection signed by *Fabricius*. P. 209—214.
- A further account of this Bible, with more extracts, and new observations thereon by *Fabricius*. P. 214—219.
- Extract from the Dublin Correspondent, with the names of many dignitaries of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland; proving that this work is sanctioned by almost the whole body of Popish Bishops. P. 219.
- Remarks by the Editors of the Antibiblion on seeing Dr. *Troy's* revocation of his name. Mr. *Butler* and two Popish Journals copy Dr. *Troy's* paper, but omit the answer to it by his Bookseller in Dublin. P. 220.
- Extract from the Freeman's Journal of Dublin, containing Archbishop *Troy's* recantation, October 24, 1817; and Mr. *Coyne's* Reply to him, Oct. 26. P. 221—224.
- Remarks by *Fabricius*, on the above-named censure of Dr. *Troy* and the withdrawal of his name. Postscript to these Remarks. P. 224—230.
- Additional observations thereon, by the Editor of the Antibiblion; including the original attestations and official sanctions given to that Bible, and an exact copy of its title-page, &c. with a Note from Dr. *Challoner's* modern editions of the same work; and also a most obnoxious advertisement widely dispersed in 1810, to which the names of a dozen Booksellers are subjoined. P. 231—236.
- Proceedings of the Irish Catholic Board, respecting the Douay Bible and Rheims Testament; including several Speeches, at different meetings, in December, 1817. P. 236—241.
- Further Remarks thereon by the Editor of the Antibiblion; fully refuting the statements of those Gentlemen in Dublin, and confirming his observations by Extracts from the Orthodox Journal, as likewise by the contents of a pamphlet printed at Dublin in 1817. Application of the whole to the case of Roman Catholics demanding political power. P. 241—244.

The Author's answer to a charge of wilful corruption of the Bible.
This charge made by Mr. *Gandolphy*, Bishop *Challoner*, Bishop *Milner*, &c. against the Translators of our Bible in the reign of King *James I.* Their allegation stated, examined, and refuted, by the Author of these Letters. The contrary proved to be the fact; and Roman Catholics themselves clearly shown to have corrupted the Holy Scriptures, by departing from numerous early editions of the Latin Vulgate, as well as from the Greek copies of the best authority. P. 244—252.

Epistle

Epistle Dedicatory,

TO

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, ESQ. M. P.

SIR,

THE condescending and kind manner in which you have always acted towards me, affords encouragement to believe that you will not deem me obtrusive or disrespectful in addressing to you the following pages. If I have the unhappiness to differ on this momentous subject from some few friends, to whose judgment I submit on most other occasions, it is a misfortune which I cannot hope to remove, except by mutual explanations.

The crisis has at length arrived, Sir, I conceive, when the religious and civil privileges of Protestants in this empire are threatened with imminent danger,—when the augmenting intolerance, activity, and strength of their adversaries inspire them with increasing confidence of success,—when new measures of attack are devised, and dormant Papal institutions are re-established,—when clamorous demands are made on the Legislature for an unconditional repeal of ancient fundamental statutes, essential to the very existence of a Protestant constitution,—when such unconstitutional claims are urged with a pertinacity and renewed vehemence, which no negative voice of the Crown or of Parliament has been able to repress,—and when the obvious design of these annually encroaching demands, is not for obtaining any na-

tural right or liberty, but for gaining a large measure of **POLITICAL POWER**, which may be easily abused, to the irreparable loss or injury of Protestant freedom.

Sir, "a rumour has lately been prevalent, that the Roman Catholics expect to gain admission into Parliament, not by a direct concession of their claims, but by a side-wind" § — which, if true, shows how one clandestine step inspires the reasonable hope of another being taken! When a late concession was made, under circumstances which surprised the nation, a Roman Catholic Editor of a daily print in London, † used the following exulting language: "The road to military fame AND POWER is now thrown open to the Roman Catholics; and in making this GREAT CONCESSION, it would seem as if EVERY *point of importance were conceded with it, &c.*" He then reminds the reader of his newspaper, that if danger be apprehended "*from their machinations, you have thereby granted them the means of inflicting a vital injury;*" and he confidently asks, "*Should they be disposed to turn their swords against the State, COULD A VOTE IN PARLIAMENT DISARM THEM? If the Catholics be enemies to the State, they have obtained TOO MUCH POWER.*"

But, however meritorious the individuals were on whom such Parliamentary honour was justly bestowed, this is a very different thing from granting **LEGISLATIVE POWER**, and enabling them to guide the **HELM** of our national vessel. Yet, Sir, this is the **POWER** which the Roman Catholics now demand, without securities or condition! I do not deem it any reproach on persons whose religious principles are totally different from my own, to believe that they conscientiously

§ See an advertisement to the Bishop of ST. DAVID'S new publication, in answer to GENERAL THORNTON'S Speech, &c. 8vo. 1819. Hatchard.

† British Press: after the passing of an Act "*by a side-wind,*" in favour of military officers who were Roman Catholics.

intend to subvert my principles and destroy my religion, whenever a fair opportunity may offer; nor do I think that any man is seriously attached to his religion, who would act otherwise. Let this mode of reasoning be applied therefore to Roman Catholics acting in Parliament, under the laws of a Protestant constitution, and intimately connected with a Protestant Church Establishment. If they would not strenuously endeavour to subvert these obnoxious laws, I shall disbelieve their religious sincerity and consistency.

The love of pre-eminence, wealth, honour, authority, and political influence, is natural; and, therefore, is universal. It is not a feeling peculiar to one class or description of persons, but inheres in all; and cannot be wholly extinguished in any set of men, though it may vary in degree. The teachers of religion, being but men, are infected with this powerful and operative principle of action, at least as much as the Laity: indeed, they are more likely to be ambitious of distinction and rule, because they are usually more learned and capable of governing than mankind in general; and because they have more sure modes of subjugating the conscience and judgment of others, than civil magistrates or lay-rulers possess. Consequently, the Roman Catholic Clergy, without being supposed to act under the impulse of wicked or malignant motives, must naturally endeavour to direct and subjugate the minds of their people; they must be expected to remain steadfast and inflexible, in always supporting their own high notions of Church discipline, implicit faith, spiritual submission, and Papal supremacy.

Speaking of the Established Church, Dr. Dromgoole says, "In vain shall Statesmen put their heads together; in vain shall Parliament, in mockery of Omnipotence, declare that it is permanent and inviolate; in vain shall the lazy Churchman 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 accident, and to decay; it *shall fall*, and nothing but the memory of the mischiefs it has created shall survive: already the marks of approaching ruin are upon it; it has had its time upon earth, a date nearly as long as any other novelty." So exclaimed this orator, in a speech received with general applause, at the Roman Catholic Board, on the 8th of December 1813: and similar predictions might be adduced from other quarters, in England as well as in Ireland, from Priests as well as Laymen!!!

Then, Sir, can you doubt whether it be dangerous or not, to concede high political power to the petitioners? Whether or not the Hibernian church will be in jeopardy? Whether or not our Union with Ireland may not soon be shaken, and finally dissolved? The answer will depend on the degree of power you would allow; but, "as when one letteth out water," who can tell the remote consequences of loosening the pins of such a fabric? It now stands firmly, and has always done so under a Protestant ascendancy; but who knows that it will long have a Protestant monarch and Protestant laws, if two branches of the sovereignty become vitiated with Popish elements? and if the advisers of the Crown may be the enemies to Protestantism?

Sir, Religious Liberty has ever been dear to Britons. Multitudes have perished in its defence; and our countrymen view with a jealous eye whatever tends, or threatens, to injure it. They well know that our admirable Constitution secures equal liberty and protection to the persons and property of the poor as well as the rich, and that our laws protect *every man* in the peaceable worship of God, according to the dictates of his own conscience. To this source we trace that strength and happiness, that energy and wisdom, which have extended the power, the influence, and the renown of this realm; and enabled it to withstand all its enemies, however numerous, subtle, and persevering. And it

is to this excellent system, under Divine Providence, that the domestic improvements of our country, its benevolent and religious institutions, flourish, and afford a satisfactory proof of great advancement in the *moral* condition of the people.

But you may say, “The number of Roman Catholics who will be returned to Parliament cannot be great; they may not be a dozen or twenty, and these will never overturn the Establishment.” That, Sir, is a matter of uncertainty. Permit me, however, to answer this and some other excuses in the strong, but just, terms of Mr. PEEL:

“And are *these* the clumsy securities which are offered to us? *These*—so little in unison with the spirit of that Constitution which we profess to maintain, but which in truth we are about to abandon? If the Roman Catholics entertain no principles and no views hostile to the establishments of the State, admit them to privilege without reference to the number to be admitted; if they entertain such, exclude them, not because their numbers will be limited, but fairly and openly, BECAUSE YOU CANNOT CONFIDE IN THEM.

“We are told again, that the Roman Catholics will only be *qualified* for office,—that they will only have *eligibility*,—and that the Crown may still, if it think fit, continue the exclusion.—Sir, if the Parliament confers *eligibility* on the Roman Catholics, the Crown ought not to exclude them from a just proportion of power:—the exclusion will be ten times more mortifying than their present disqualification;—it will be so, because it will be attributed to caprice—to unjust preference—to unfair suspicion. If it be unsafe to admit the Roman Catholics to a share in the Government proportionate to their numbers and influence in the State, all the branches of the Legislature ought to share in the odium of disqualifying them; it ought not to be transferred to one branch exclusively—to that branch too which is to continue unchangeably Protestant; to that branch which will be the more liable on that very account to

the suspicion of prejudice and partiality, instead of being, as the Constitution intends it to be, the fountain of grace and favour.

“ But we are told that these concessions are to tranquilize Ireland ; we are told that the mass of the people are in a state of irritation, and that nothing but Catholic emancipation can allay it : but, we are not told what this emancipation is to effect with respect to the mass of the people. Do you confer any direct and immediate benefit upon the lower orders ? You argue, indeed, that the ultimate effects of emancipation will be to meliorate their condition, to raise up new classes in society, and to unite the lower and upper orders by gradations which are now wanting. Will the peasant understand this ? will he feel any immediate benefit ? will he receive any practical proof that his condition is improved ? Will he be less subject to the influence of that most powerful body, the Roman Catholic Clergy ?

“ And reflect, how that body is affected by what you call Catholic emancipation. You confer certain privileges—substantial benefits perhaps—on the Aristocracy and the Bar ; but you confer none on the Clergy ; you do not even leave them as you find them : you concede to the Laity, but you accompany these concessions with regulations and restrictions, bearing exclusively on the Clergy ; on that body whose influence is all-powerful, and who, of all classes, must naturally view your establishments with the greatest jealousy and hostility. And then, the connexion between the mass of the People and the Clergy remaining the same,—the People receiving no immediate advantage, nor prospective advantage which they can comprehend, and the Clergy being subjected to restrictions against which they vehemently protest,—can we flatter ourselves that the predictions of tranquillity and concord are likely to be verified ?

“ You tell us that we have conferred substantial power on the Catholic, but subject him to mere *mortifying* co-

elusions, that serve but to irritate and annoy him;—that we have broken the chain which bound him, but still reserve some useless links of that chain to remind him of his former servitude. But *you yourselves* retain some of these links, fewer indeed in number, but just as offensive as a memento of degradation, and as a proof that the equality of privilege and the identity of interest is not established. And when you dwell, and with justice, upon the rank, and the station, and the character of Lord Fingal, let me ask you how, consistently with your principle, can you close against him for ever the first executive office of his native land, the only one, perhaps, to which he could aspire? He may represent his Sovereign in Jamaica or in Canada,—he may exercise in distant colonies all the functions of Sovereignty in Church and State;—but in Ireland he cannot represent him,—in Ireland, the source from which grace, and mercy, and favour flow, is still to continue Protestant, exclusively and for ever!

“ But, though you must have a Protestant Lord-Lieutenant, you may have a Roman Catholic Secretary: his friend, his adviser, his representative in Parliament, may be a Roman Catholic. Sir, those who know any thing of the relation in which these two offices stand, must know how desirable it is, even on public grounds, that something more than mere cold official confidence, something partaking of personal esteem and mutual attachment, should subsist between those who fill them:—and if this faithful servant and friend of the Lord-Lieutenant shall presume, in some hour of careless confidence, to advise him in the appointment of any ecclesiastical, nay even any lay, office or preferment in the Protestant Church of Ireland, the Secretary shall—(observe the cautious provisions against danger)—he shall, being convicted by due course of law, be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and disqualified for ever from public service! And this is the Bill which is to remove anoma-

lies, to establish some perfect system of government, some final and *satisfactory* arrangement, to bury in oblivion, in all time to come, religious animosities!

“ Then, again, the Crown is to remain Protestant, but the adviser of the Crown may be Roman Catholic. You confirm in the Bill the exclusion of the Roman Catholic from the Crown,—from that branch of the Legislature from which he was most recently excluded by law,—from that high office from which he is excluded, not by the indirect operation of an oath, as is the case in other offices, but distinctly because he is a Roman Catholic. The irresponsible head of the executive government must be Protestant, but his responsible Minister, his Secretary of State, may be a Roman Catholic. You expose the successor to the Crown to be educated under the guidance of Roman Catholic Ministers; and if he, from sincere conviction, shall conform to the religion of those whom you have given to him as confidential and responsible advisers, *you subject him for ever to the forfeiture of his inheritance.* In all this I can see nothing that can lead to harmony,—nothing that can constitute a final and satisfactory settlement—nothing but a wild and irreconcilable contradiction of principles.

“ I will now conclude.—Let me entreat Members to pause before they take the first step towards a radical alteration in the Constitution of their Country, and to reflect how difficult it is to predict the consequences of much less important alterations.”

Sir, I will not weaken the impression which these just sentiments must produce, by any observations of my own on this vital subject.

Believe, Sir,

To be always

Your devoted Servant,

THE AUTHOR.

LETTERS

ON THE REVIVAL OF POPYRY,

&c.

LETTER I.

Great Russel Street, March 16th, 1819.

SIR,

It is the remark of a celebrated French writer "on the Spirit and Influence of the Lutheran Reformation," that "two objects are especially dear to the heart of man; and it is not rare to see him sacrifice for them all his other interests, and even life itself. One is, the preservation of his social rights; and the other, the independence of his religious opinions: liberty in his civil actions, and liberty in his acts of conscience. He attaches to both the one and the other a value equal to his very existence."— P. 29, *Essai sur la Réformation*, &c. par M. CHARLES VILLERS.

Knowing, Sir, your firm adhesion to the cause of civil and religious freedom, and also your fixed attachment to our Protestant *United Church* as established by law, I make no apology for inviting your candid notice of the following pages. The decided part you have lately taken in favour of the "Roman Catholic Claims," and the apparent inconsistency of such Parliamentary conduct with your known character as a Christian Patriot, will vindicate my boldness in addressing you, and may be the occasion of your affording a public statement of the principles and motives on which you were acting.— It is certain that some of your best friends and former political supporters do not well understand your meaning, and that many of your bitterest foes

rejoice at this seeming deviation from the straight line of consistency: therefore, it has become due, both to them and your own reputation, to give a reason for this part of your Parliamentary proceedings. My conviction is, that you are carried away by a feeling of unbounded benevolence, which blinds your eyes to the real mischief of granting *further power*, where it may be immediately turned against the bulwarks of our constitution.

From the personal knowledge which I have of your private character, and the full assurance I possess of your excellent qualities, as a philanthropist and a Christian, I am quite satisfied that no unworthy or secular views influence your determination. But, it is because I respect you so highly, and venerate your name as one of the noblest champions for the true rights of man, that I am solicitous to call your attention towards a subject most intimately connected with the welfare of our dear country. I scarcely need inform you, that Judge Hale, Sir William Blackstone, and many more exalted legal characters, besides Lord Clarendon and Lord Somers as statesmen, Milton and Locke as political philosophers, and our revered King William III. as a sovereign, all deemed the usurped *spiritual* supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, however defined and exercised, to be at variance with the legitimate national rights and peace of this empire. They all, with one consent, on the plain simple ground of expediency and safety, regarded the principles avowed by Roman Catholics to be always and inevitably hostile to the general liberty of other religious denominations; and they, therefore, condemned every attempt made to place their Papal foes on an equality with Protestants, as to the possession of civil rank and power.

It has indeed been said, by the Edinburgh Reviewers, "that the admission of the Catholics of Ireland into the Parliament of the United Kingdom would not only sooth the feelings of their whole body, but it would afford a

security against rebellion, worth all the oaths of allegiance and ecclesiastical arrangements:" No. LVII. p. 124, Nov. 1817.—But, Sir, do we certainly know that all cause of discontent would then immediately subside? that political rank and influence given to a few, might not lead to secular cabals and efforts for employing the many? that Papal ascendancy, uncontrolled, would be a blessing to the population of Ireland, and especially to the Protestants? that our greater mass of British subjects would not be clamorous, and violently resist such domineering preponderance? and that the admission of tried enemies into the citadel of State, might not generate a spirit of constant rivalry and discord in our legislative or judicial proceedings? We have no ground to believe domestic Popish Laymen would desert the principles of their *Priests*, or oppose their fixed prejudices against every branch of Christianity but that of **ROME**.

Sir, allow me to ask you, Whether Popery be an evil? Whether it does not still exist? Whether it has undergone any radical change since the days of CRANMER and LUTHER? Whether the Papal religion be not in fact unchangeable, and every where the same, because deemed infallibly true? Whether or no we be indebted to those Martyrs, by whom the Reformation was introduced into Great Britain? Whether we ought not to feel grateful for the blessings of a subsequent Revolution in 1688, by a different class of heroes? Whether you be prepared to revoke all the legislative Acts of our pious forefathers, by which the full exercise of religious and civil liberty has so long been ensured? Whether you really think that a Protestant Church can long co-exist and flourish with Popery, in Ireland, if a hundred Lay-Papists shall sit in Parliament; and if the bulwarks of our present Constitution be undermined, in order to admit them? Lastly, I ask, Whether you then would, or could consistently, refuse Popish

Prelates and Apostolical Vicars a place (if it be demanded) in the House of Lords, or prevent their devoted friends from filling all the chief *judicial* offices in Ireland?

Sir, these are most serious and weighty questions; which, if you cannot answer in an instant, should make you pause, and reflect before you again vote for legislative measures that may possibly be fatal, and are not denied by yourself to be hazardous, to our best national privileges.

I am willing to hope, that, if your numerous occupations afforded more time for investigation, you are disposed to peruse the records of former ages, and certain official documents of the reigning Pontiff, in order to gain that information respecting this object which is imperatively required: for, as a late British Senator justly observed, "It is a melancholy truth, that the best informed on other subjects, Philosophers and Statesmen, are often most ignorant of this, which vitally affects the interests, the feelings, and the honour of millions of the people, and the security of the empire itself." You will pardon my freedom in quoting such a very "melancholy truth," advanced by a Gentleman whose deep researches entitled him to give an opinion so worthy of your candid consideration.

The chief points on which I propose to offer some remarks, are—1. THE REVIVAL OF POPERY—2. ITS INTOLERANT CHARACTER—3. ITS POLITICAL TENDENCY—4. ITS ENCROACHING DEMANDS AND USURPATIONS. I only request your calm and attentive perusal of what may be submitted to you. If it should be proved that Papal bigotry is greatly on the increase, that its forces are more numerous in this kingdom since granting the elective franchise, that the principles and practice of Roman Catholics are as intolerant as ever, that their religion still is, and always must be, secular and encroaching; I shall have shown the danger of giving them high political power, and the certainty of producing an endless litigation with *us* as Protestants.

LETTER II.

SIR,

IN attempting to demonstrate the revival of Popery, I need do little more than refer you to the religious state of Papal Europe at present, compared with what it was twenty or thirty years ago; and to the simple fact of some thousand Protestants having *annually* enlisted into the ranks of the Latin Church, from the inhabitants of Great Britain, during the same period! You are aware that the dormant or suppressed institutions of the Church of Rome are, in many places, revived and re-established. I more particularly ought to remind you of "THE POPE'S BEST BULWARK," as the Order of Jesuits has been emphatically named by an English apologist for Popery; and likewise the re-opening of those horrible instruments of tyranny, the prison-doors of the "HOLY TRIBUNAL OF THE INQUISITION," blasphemously so called! We have therefore an *holy* Church, an *holy* set of Dungeons, and an *holy* regiment of Prison-keepers, to carry on the *holy* work of Christianizing the nations which are willing to bow down to this merciless Dagon!

That the fires of Jesuits and Inquisitors are not again relighted in Europe, is owing to God's great mercy, and the cautionary measures taken by Statesmen, who have not lately joined hand-in-hand with the agents of superstition; but how long we may be preserved from the reeking altars on which burnt sacrifices have too often been immolated, will (under God) depend upon the *quantum* of political power conceded to Papistical Rulers and Legislators. It is POWER, Sir, and nothing but POWER, which is now wanted. This is the lever by which the world may be moved:—give POWER to those lamb-like Priests, who already tear and burn

our Bibles, and they will be quickly metamorphosed into Tigers—fierce, cruel, relentless, and thirsting for human victims.

To obtain secular power, it is requisite to increase the number of adherents, and then to multiply their institutions for worship and for education. I must be very brief in showing, that this is done, not merely in Europe at large, but at home, in our own country: and here I am not at a loss for facts, because Roman Catholics themselves have boldly told us the truth; for they boast of their numbers; and publish lists of their English schools, academies, colleges, and chapels,—which are occasionally alluded to in their periodical Magazines, Journals, Newspapers, and circular Addresses to Protestants, who (very unwisely!) promote such charities all over this kingdom!! On the very day I write this (March 17th), many of our British nobles and gentry, in the fulness of their Christian zeal, are meeting at one of the largest taverns in London, to aid, with their money and influence, extensive metropolitan schools—known to be purely and exclusively Popish—known to have deviated from the original plan of their institutors, so as wholly to shut out Protestant Irish sufferers, and only to admit those who fall prostrate before the shrine of St. Patrick; great numbers of whom (though mere children) are said to have just affixed their influential names to the last Roman Catholic Petition, lying for consideration on the table of the Commons' House of Parliament! †

Lest the above fact should be called in question, as too barefaced a specimen of Popish policy to be credited, I must refer to a printed "Letter to His Grace the Duke of NORFOLK," signed "WM. EUSEBIUS ANDREWS," in the last

† In what manner the St. Patrick's Benevolent Society has wholly departed from its original plan, and thereby forfeited the support of Protestants, is explained in LETTERS III. and IV.

Number of the *Orthodox Journal and Catholic Monthly Intelligencer* for February 1819. The Editor therein reproaches the "British Catholic Board" for its artful, insidious, and degrading mode of gaining signatures to their late Petition; and he charges this Board with condescending to obtain names by means of "Runners employed to attend the various Catholic Clubs which assemble for BENEVOLENT PURPOSES," and by Charity-school "boys from ten to twelve years of age," as well as by people "who entered for devotion" at the various Chapels in London, &c. He states, that, after his letter of February 18th was written, "he had been informed that Circulars were sent round to the different Catholic charity-schools in the metropolis, ORDERING THAT ALL THE BOYS THEREIN SHOULD SIGN THE VETO-PETITION OF THE SELF-NAMED BOARD."—Now, let it be recollected, Sir, that distinguished Protestants (Lord CASTLE-REAGH and Mr. CANNING are among the number) do therefore select boys, and actually educate them, on Popish principles; while they embody and array themselves in battle against our Protestant Laws, our Protestant King, our Protestant Constitution, and Protestant Church!!! Is this fair or consistent policy? Is it not, rather, *treacherous dealing*? Thus do our generous and unsuspecting fellow Protestants continually help to build chapels, erect colleges, and support schools; *all* expressly designed to overwhelm the simple benefactors in ruin, whenever strength enough is acquired by Papal agents to pull down our present national establishments. This system of proselytism is doubtless well understood by the Vicars Apostolic, and wonderfully admired at Rome.

I beg, Sir, most earnestly to suggest to you, as a Legislator, the propriety and necessity of an authorized return being made to one of the Houses of Parliament; which shall specify the exact number and quality of the Popish seminaries, chapels, and charitable asylums, of all kinds, now

in this United Kingdom, including a perfect list of their subscribers and different means of support, &c. I do not throw out this suggestion with any view to overrule such hostile institutions, or interfere with the management of them: for I abhor all kinds of spiritual oppression, or restrictive proceedings, nor would I wish ever to extend the hand of one person in authority to meddle with their religious concerns. An inspection and report of the actual case is all I want, to convince Protestant Statesmen of the growing evil of Popery, and to show what is the direct practical tendency of our improvident conduct for the last forty years.

LETTER III.

SIR,

THOUGH I should be one of the last men in this kingdom to wish for any interference with the religion of those who differ from me, by positive restraints or legal prohibitions; yet every government has a perfect right to know what progress is made, or effects arise, in the State, from any other religion than that which is deemed national, and what number of converts there may be, as well as what principles or means are employed for propagating such religion. If unrestricted liberty be granted, or only solicited, to teach the mass of the people, it is highly proper for the Legislature to ask whether the Petitioners and religious teachers do not promulgate doctrines subversive of civil society, or at least injurious to the settled form of government: otherwise, a legal encouragement and effective support may unwittingly be given to a set of men (like Mahomedans) who hold it right and just to use corporeal force, or inflict

temporal chastisement, or even to maintain their religion by fire and sword.

It is on this ground, I conceive, that some kind of evidence or security is reasonable to be demanded of those who claim political power, by which their full allegiance and entire submission to the existing Government may be discerned; for, without some specific and significant test, as proof, such religious professors may be placed wholly out of the reach of law, and obtain by artifice that supreme rule in the State which properly belongs to other persons. Whether or not the sign of complete loyalty should be *strictly religious*, or whether any other than a religious test, applying itself to the conscience, can be devised for that salutary purpose, is not now the subject of my inquiry: I am only hinting at the necessity of a Parliamentary investigation, by means of which the exact number and quality of all Popish establishments or charities should be well ascertained, prior to any discussion of the general question respecting UNCONDITIONAL CATHOLIC CLAIMS; and I consider this the more important, because I see vast multitudes of noble and wealthy people daily coming forward to promote Popery, by the indiscreet exercise of a most benevolent feeling, creditable indeed to their own hearts, but silently and gradually sapping the foundations of TRUE Christianity (as established by the Reformation) in the British empire.

This remark, Sir, leads me back to various elementary schools, &c. under the entire control of Romish Priests, but in a great measure maintained by Protestant Laymen, many of them existing in the metropolis; and though my observations will apply chiefly, yet they are not meant exclusively so, to the "Benevolent Society of St. Patrick," — an institution which once was, with much reason, patronized by the great and good of all parties who wished well to Ireland, though now made the tool of numerous Roman Catholics in England, guided by their Vicars Apostolic, to serve a po-

litical turn ! Education may be the greatest instrument of doing incalculable and lasting mischief to the rising generation, if it be not watched and regulated by wise heads : a whole community is capable, in a few years, of being infected with poisonous principles, if money *alone* is afforded by a large body of supporters, while a small company of Clerical men conduct all the machinery and interior arrangements. Writing, reading, and the other useful arts taught in schools, may be misapplied to the very basest as well as the best of purposes ; and it is possible to give such an education (though called RELIGIOUS) to infant minds, as shall train them up to be serpents in the bosom of their most liberal benefactors, if not unworthy members of the State which protects them !

We cannot forget the solemn anti-scriptural explanations and answers given by Bishop Poynter to a Committee of the House of Commons, in 1816 ; nor shall I soon believe, that certain Laymen of the Latin Church will ever, by a few candid concessions to Protestants, perhaps mixed with secular views, cause any the least change in their ecclesiastical discipline, or move one of their own Prelates to sanction them. Their church-discipline may, it is true, be *possibly* amended ; but it is only *possible*, by authority and command of the Roman Pontiff and concurring Bishops.

I now, Sir, shall revert to St. Patrick's Schools, which are so pompously described in the Morning Post, and other London newspapers, of the 18th instant ; and are held up as deserving unbounded support, from the Prince Regent, his Royal Brothers, the great Officers of the Crown, and every class of wealthy Protestants.

Different publications have been issued from " St. Patrick's Charity Schools, and Asylum for Catholic Female Orphans, under the Patronage of the Right Rev. Dr. Poynter ;" with a list of many Romish Priests annexed, as " the School Committee : " and I have read various printed Reso-

lutions of the said "School Committee," which were "confirmed by a Board of Governors," clearly demonstrating their plan of education to be *exclusively* Popish, without using the Scriptures. This is indeed natural, and might therefore be expected: but the question is, Whether it conforms to the original and fundamental laws of that institution? or, whether the present seminary, like some others, be not quite degenerated, and become a hot-bed for young political demagogues or religious disputants? It is certain that the said "School Committee" has authoritatively interposed to obstruct the gratuitous education of a very large body of other *Irish*-children in St. Giles's, both Protestants and Roman Catholics; where no spontaneous hostile feeling or prejudice had ever before disturbed the harmony of either, and where a fine experiment to produce NATIONAL UNION had only been deranged by those very Priests! I also know, that the grand difficulty in effecting a cordial junction of parties and interests, is owing to the perpetual disorganizing attempts of such Ecclesiastics, in all corners of this empire; and that it is therefore vain to expect any lasting mutual amity or co-operation, while THEY possess the entire control of conscience, and the sole management of popular schools.

But I will show you, that the system of exclusion which is thus acted on, looks too much like an insidious, fraudulent, and unjust scheme, "an illiberal and cruel perversion of the charity, contravening its principle, and subverting its foundation." I do not probe this wound from a sense of animosity, but a pure feeling of public duty; which, I trust, may tend to open the eyes of benevolent Protestants to the danger of confiding in Roman Catholic faith towards supposed "HERETICS."

This beneficial result of my labour will be a recompense to me for the obloquy I shall sustain, in return for my philanthropic disclosure of the truth.

LETTER IV.

SIR,

THE Report of a Committee on the Education of the lower Classes, printed by order of the House of Commons, in June 1816, states, that Mr. John Kelly, the Secretary and a Trustee of St. Patrick's Schools, was examined May 23rd; and being asked how long he had acted in those offices, he replied, Since 1808. The Committee (Henry Brougham, Esq. in the Chair) inquired of the Secretary and Trustee by what funds this institution was supported; when he answered, "By voluntary contributions." Now, Sir, mark the sequel!

"What is the purpose of the charity?"—Answer: "For the instruction of the poor children in St. Giles's and its vicinity; and if there is any superabundance of contributions" (Mr. Kelly said they had several thousand pounds in funded property), "it is applied towards the maintenance of orphans."—He was properly asked, "Do you mean by children in St. Giles's and its vicinity, the children of the poor GENERALLY, or only the IRISH children?"—Answer: "The children of the poor generally, *if they are CATHOLICS; but we feel bound not to admit any persons into the school but those WHO ARE OF THAT RELIGION.*" Mr. Kelly added, that the number of children then in the schools was beyond four hundred.—Thus it is clear, that the conductors "feel bound," by their religious obligations or ties, to make the above cruel distinction; but do not "feel bound" by a public and most solemn pledge, given in their "fundamental and unalterable laws," to make no such injurious distinction!!!

A Society was formed in 1704, for the RELIEF of poor and distressed natives of Ireland, or their children, between seven and ten years old, residing in London. It does not

appear, that the sole, or even chief, design of the founders was merely to *educate* the Irish children; but also, with instruction, to afford them "*clothing, maintenance, apprenticeship,*" and personal "*comfort in distress.*" These, certainly, were the original purposes of "The Irish Charitable Society."—The St. Patrick's Benevolent Society, agreeing with that Institution "in every respect," united with it, and absorbed all the remaining funds, A. D. 1784; on which occasion it received £1091. 6s. 1d. and formally stipulated as follows:

"It was Unanimously Resolved, That the Benevolent Society of St. Patrick adopts, with alacrity and gladness, the proposed union of the Irish Charitable Society with that of St. Patrick: and to effectuate this object, it is declared, that the funds of both Societies shall be joined, and the two Institutions incorporated into one body, under the title of the *Benevolent Society of St. Patrick.* The united Societies to be for ever conducted upon the following principles, which fully comprehend the substance of the conditions of union before alluded to: namely,

"That this Society being destined for the RELIEF of the poor and distressed Irish residing in and about London, and that of their children, such RELIEF, of whatever sort it may be at present or hereafter, shall be conferred *without any regard to the religious tenets or mode of worship of the objects; it being a FUNDAMENTAL MAXIM AND UNALTERABLE RULE of this charity, that no religious distinction whatever is to prevail in its execution.*

"That, in order to secure a faithful observance of THIS FUNDAMENTAL AND UNALTERABLE LAW, *it is expressly declared, that, if ever any religious partiality shall be found to have influence or bias in the dispensation of the benefits of this charity, or the selection of the objects of its beneficence, such an illiberal and cruel perversion of the charity (as it would contravene its principle and subvert its foundation)*

must be construed to be a violation of the compact upon which those funds are united; and the union, now formed, between the Irish Charitable Society and the Benevolent Society of St. Patrick, must be understood to be dissolved from the moment that such an abuse of the Institution becomes evident and manifest, and shall be so declared at a General Meeting of the Society, to be called by advertisement and summons for that special purpose; and the members of the Irish Charitable Society, who have joined themselves to the Benevolent Society of St. Patrick, or the survivors or survivor of them, shall again be entitled to the said sum of £1091. 6s. 1d. that they may appropriate the produce thereof to the purposes for which it was originally intended." [See Protestant Advocate, No. 44, p. 282—284; and A History of the Jesuits, 1816, vol. ii. p. 410.]

The foregoing Resolutions are copied by me from the Society's own publication, printed at the Philanthropic Press in 1805; but they were also copied, previously, into two works (cited above), without being noticed by the patrons of that Society. I therefore respectfully submit to the consideration of those Royal and Noble Personages, and Protestant Gentlemen, who are still very liberally subscribing to St. Patrick's Schools, whether it be not now a fit subject for their serious investigation.

I think, Sir, it has been clearly proved, that Papists are educated *as such*, on a very large scale, by means of Protestant funds and patronage. I use the terms "*Papist*" and "*Popery*," not as words of reproach, but merely as distinctive appellations, universally understood: for, while men adhere to the Papal Supremacy, and to the Church of the Pope, I cannot see why they ought to be ashamed of such names; nor do I conceive that they have any right to usurp the appellatives, "*Catholic*," or "*Catholicism*," as if Protestants were not also members of Christ's Universal Church.

In my next Letters I shall enter into a comparative view of the number of Roman Catholics at present, and forty years ago, chiefly in England; including some account of the rapid increase of their chapels, colleges, academies, &c. &c. during the same period. I conclude this, Sir, with one obvious remark, which cannot too often be repeated; that all the voluntary societies, charitable institutions, and multifarious establishments connected with Roman Catholics, possess the peculiar feature (not belonging to ours) of being closely linked together by one common religious bond — the end of that united chain being always in the hand of a SINGLE AGENT at Rome, whose instruments are the Prelates and Jesuits dispersed over Christendom. No British institution, affecting morals or religion, is ever capable of escaping the eye of so vigilant a head, nor the hands of such efficient members. This is a striking and imposing feature, not always remembered by Protestants.

LETTER V.

SIR,

If we look back to the period immediately preceding the French Revolution, it will be found that Popery was even then slowly advancing in Great Britain; but, the circumstances connected with that event had a powerful influence in promoting its rapid increase among our Protestant population, and contributed to soften down those feelings of antipathy which prevailed among the common people against Queen MARY'S admirers. The principle of kindness and sympathy so universally exercised towards thousands of heroic French exiles, while it afforded extensive relief to suf-

fering humanity, and was highly commendable in its motive, exposed us to the secret operation of insinuating errors. The Papist was charitably forgotten in the Christian; and the serpentine poison, thus gradually diffused through our population, was not discovered till its rankling tendency began to be felt: the Priests more especially (for I had full proof of this), were gratefully disposed to repay the national munificence by eager endeavours to introduce their own church notions into our families, in which they evinced their pious zeal and religious consistency. Schools were presently multiplied; more chapels soon were erected; numerous controversial works and Popish Journals were disseminated; new private teachers, of both sexes, had easy access to our children: at length, the busy Jesuits overran the British Isles, as they now do all quarters of the world; and it is stated, on good authority, that more than four thousand English converts to their faith have been made within the last twelve months! See a Letter signed FIDELI DEFENSOR, in the Orthodox Journal for Feb. 1819, p. 56.

In many of the large north-western towns, such as Liverpool, Manchester, Preston, &c. it is common to have a thousand or twelve hundred children at one time admitted into their communion, by the rite of confirmation; but one cannot pretend to say how many of these were born of Protestant parents, nor have I the means of knowing what proportion they bear to former admissions of that kind. The total number of Roman Catholics in England and Scotland has been variously estimated by their own writers: some say there are 500,000; others reckon them only 350,000; but all agree that the number is progressively advancing: and the Dublin orators (Mr. Scully, Mr. O'Connell, Dr. Dromgoole, &c.), hoping soon for the downfall of the Church of England by its continued defalcations, boast of their rapid increase! Now, whether the total number be half a million, or even the lowest computation, there has been a

frightful addition since the last Parliamentary returns, made to the House of Lords thirty-nine years ago, when they amounted to only 69,376; and they were but 67,916, in the year 1767.

A late Roman Catholic author, who published on "the State and Behaviour of English Catholics, from the Reformation to the Year 1781," says; "The truth is, within the present century we have most rapidly decreased. Many congregations have entirely disappeared in different parts; and in one district alone, with which I am acquainted, eight out of thirteen are come to nothing; nor have any new ones risen to make up, in any proportion, their loss. These are facts of certain notoriety. In the nature of things it could not be otherwise. Where one cause can be discovered tending to their increase, there will be twenty found to work their diminution."—p. 117, second edition. After comparing these facts and the preceding statements, I think you cannot doubt of their whole number being much augmented in Great Britain within the last thirty or forty years, and that their additional strength is chiefly deducted from our Established Church.

I shall introduce the general subject of Academies, Colleges, and inferior Seminaries, by another quotation from the above work; wherein the author gives, in his usual lively style, a brief answer to the opinions then prevalent, A. D. 1781, respecting Roman Catholic Schools, &c.

He tells us, p. 168, "It was a groundless rumour, which lately prevailed, that Catholics were opening schools in all parts of the kingdom, whereby the rising generation of Protestants were all to be perverted to the errors of Popery. The real fact is, that we have not opened one new school since the year 1778. The whole number of those which we have, are, I think, BUT THREE, at least those of any note. There is one in Hertfordshire; one near Birmingham in Warwickshire; and a third near Wolverham-

ton in Staffordshire. In London are some day-schools; and in other parts may be, perhaps, little establishments, where an old woman gives lectures on the Horn-book and the Art of Spelling. As her lessons convey no documents of treason or sedition, Government need not watch her with any anxious attention §.—At the two first-mentioned schools are generally about twenty or thirty boys, who leave them about the age of twelve or fourteen. That in Staffordshire is far the most numerous. Its design is to give some education to children of a lower class. They learn their religion, and such other things, as may qualify them for trade and the usual business of life. When it can be avoided, they never admit Protestants, from an apprehension that it might give offence; as also from a well-grounded suspicion, that it would tend gradually to *weaken the religious principles of the Catholic boys*. It is to me astonishing, that Protestants can be found, who, were it in their power, would deprive us even of this small privilege of educating our own children! I have omitted to mention two schools for the education of girls, one at Hammersmith, the other at York. They are ancient establishments; and by no means, I apprehend, calculated to bring danger to the Protestant powers of the British Empire.”

As a striking contrast to the above account, I refer you to another authentic Roman Catholic statement, published in “The Laity’s Directory for 1819;” a little book annually printed “BY PERMISSION,” for the use of their own people, by Keating and Brown, of Duke Street, Grosvenor Square. Here I see a list of about FIFTY institutions, under

§ “After more accurate inquiries, I am still confirmed in the truth of the above representations. *We have opened no new Schools of any note*: though it has been repeatedly asserted that even thirty-two or more had been erected since the passing of the Bill in our favour. The instructions of *Imaginary Teachers* cannot instil much poison into the breasts of *real Protestant Children*.”

the names of Colleges, Schools for Gentlemen, Seminaries for Ladies, Preparatory Establishments, and "Charitable Institutions for promoting spiritual and corporal works of mercy,"—all which latter (being in the Metropolis and its vicinity) are said to be "under the Patronage of the Right Rev. Dr. Poynter, V. A."—I do not find among them the famous school for Calmel Buildings, wholly under the management of Priests (Mr. Gandolphy was one of them), but chiefly maintained by the purses of Protestants in Mary-le-bone; nor do I know how to estimate the comparative importance of those numerous institutions, for promoting Popish education in England. But some of them, which are passed over superficially in the "Laity's Directory," are certainly very important in a POLITICAL point of view; for instance, the one thus described: "STONYHURST COLLEGE, *Blackburn, Lancashire*; REV. CHARLES FLOWDEN, President. The plan of education and the terms are the same as usual; and may be had by applying to the President, or to the Rev. John Scott, No. 11, Poland Street."

This is all the notice here presented! I feel it right to particularize and distinguish that Jesuitical College, however insignificant a place it may have found in the "Laity's Directory." Other Jesuitical proceedings might, perhaps, be sifted by the aid of Parliament, as they certainly ought to be, for the information of Protestants.

But, I first shall repeat what is stated of Jesuits, by the author of the conciliatory volume already cited: "It is often said, that Popish Priests have an unbounded zeal for making Proselytes. Were it true, I see no reproach in the charge. It proves that they are sincere in their religious belief; that they esteem themselves in the best way; and that they wish to impart to others the important truths of salvation. The man of zeal, and only this man, will, in every religion, strive to make converts; and when evidently he is not actuated by motives of interest or some

worldly pursuit, his only aim can be the good of his neighbour.

“The influence, which Priests have it in their power still to acquire from the use of *Confession*, it must be allowed, is very great! Take but once fast hold of a man’s conscience, and you may lead him where you please. It is therefore, in our Church, a concern of the greatest moment, that Priests be well-instructed, and that they be good men. Abstracting from all divine institution, were I to found a commonwealth, a law, obliging all my subjects to frequent confession of their sins, should be a principal ordinance. But the choice of my Priests should have my peculiar care. I would not, however, myself be found often in their company: for the Priest who holds in his hand the conscience of his Prince, too often meddles in the temporal concerns of State, which belong not to him.”

Sir, it is a most valuable concession FOR US, that so candid an acknowledgment as the foregoing has been thus spontaneously afforded, by a Roman Catholic of uncommon penetration: and, if the power of ALL *Priests be so* “*very great*” over men’s consciences, as is here represented, it cannot be denied that they who “*too often meddle in the temporal concerns of State,*” ought to be kept at the greatest possible distance from a reigning PRINCE,

“The Jesuits, from the day of their institution, raised through the Christian world, a suspicious jealousy, which they were little careful to suppress; they also raised an admiration of their zeal and of their unbounded activity.

“In our penal statutes they are marked out as a body of men wholly distinct from other Priests. It was thought, that they held principles inimical to the rights of mankind, and that their designs against Princes and their States were of the most deleterious complexion. There was no truth in this imagination. They had amongst them, indeed, Divines of wild fancy; they had loose and indulgent Casuists; and they had men of *dangerous activity*. Where the weak,

nesses and common passions to which our nature is subject, are allowed to operate, things could not be otherwise; and the Jesuits were not more reprehensible, than are all other societies of men. The influence which their zeal, their soft insinuation, and their abilities, acquired them, was, in every walk of life, amazingly extensive. It was often productive of great good, *and it was sometimes productive of great evil.* They aspired, I think, too high; and the rapidity of their fall could only be equalled by that of their ascent. To the Protestant Church they were always particularly odious: *they were purposely raised to oppose the progress, and to combat the opinions, of the first Reformers.* Their attachment to the See of Rome was great; and in them the Papal prerogative had *always experienced the firmest support.* It was, therefore, matter of astonishment when the Roman Pontiff pronounced their dissolution. He was either a bad politician, or he was compelled to do it. In abilities the Jesuits were thought to surpass all other religious Orders; but because they wanted prudence to rein their ambition, and to moderate their career of power, they fell,—probably to rise no more.

“The few still remaining, daily dying off, in the course of some years their generation will be extinct, and their name almost forgotten. WE shall then perhaps see reason to lament their suppression. At all events, it is now time to drop those idle fears, which the phantom of Jesuitical craft and machinations formerly gave rise to.”

At p. 160, this intelligent Roman Catholic writer again says, “The Jesuits are also dying away; nor is there any succession to supply their places.” *Sed tempora mutantur!*

In my next Letter I shall call your attention to a valuable record, which has never been contradicted, and must be believed until it is publicly disproved. The learned author of “A History of the Jesuits; to which is prefixed a Reply to Mr. Dallas’s Defence of that Order,” 8vo. 1816, 2 vols. gives a most luminous exposé of the Jesuits *now* in England,

LETTER VI.

SIR,

IN developing the views of the Jesuits in England, and describing their footsteps at Stonyhurst, in Lancashire, I shall only do what you personally requested of me on a late occasion; that is, lay before you a few extracts from one of the works which "you had not time to read."

The author of that History asks, "Now, how does the fact really stand? A reference to the extensive and increasing Establishment of Jesuits at Stonyhurst, near Preston in Lancashire, will best answer the question: at this place the Order of Jesuits has for thirty years past possessed a spacious College, which is principally a College of Jesuits; is amply provided with all the *materiel* and *morale* of Jesuitism, and is carrying on the work of Catholic Instruction, and Protestant Conversion, upon the most large and extensive scale! The studies at this place are conducted upon the same system, and to the same extent, as at the Catholic Universities abroad: and there are regular professors in Divinity, Mathematics, Philosophy, Astronomy, &c. The College, which is a very large building, is capable of containing at least four or five hundred pupils independently of Professors, Managers, and domestics. It is supposed to contain at this time five hundred or more individuals of various descriptions.

"About eleven hundred acres of land are attached to the College, which the Jesuits keep in their own hands, and farm themselves. A Jesuit (who would be called, in a similar situation in a Nobleman's family, the Land Steward) has the direction and management of the land, with a very liberal salary, besides board and accommodation. The Jesuits consume the produce of the land in the College, and

and also make large purchases in addition, from the farmers and graziers for many miles round; from which circumstance, their influence is considerably augmented, and their principles, are widely diffused throughout the country.— Adjoining to the College, they have suitable offices for all manner of tradesmen and artificers, such as tailors, shoemakers, smiths, carpenters, butchers, bakers, &c.

“ They have Pupils from various parts of the Continent; from Ireland, and from different parts of Great Britain: they have, of course, a correspondence with most parts of the world, and they adopt particular precautions with regard to their letters. Their present number of pupils may be from two to three hundred, and the general average for the last twenty-five years cannot have fallen far short of that number.

“ At Hirst-Green, within a quarter of a mile of the College of Stonyhurst, is a Seminary for boarding and educating young boys, preparatory to their entering the College of Stonyhurst. The apartments and grounds of this initiatory Establishment are appropriated solely to those who are destined for the superior College; and the almost entire seclusion of these youths from all intercourse with mankind, which takes place during their probationary studies, is not calculated to remove the distrust and apprehension which are naturally excited, by the mystery which attaches more or less to Jesuitism in general, and to this fact in particular.

“ The amount of the accumulating capital of the Jesuits is very considerable, arising from the value of their estate, and the annual profit accruing from their Pupils§.

§ “ A considerable part of the land attached to the College was granted to the Jesuits as a free gift; the other part is held by them at a low rent: the whole estate is of great value, and they have already possessed it nearly thirty years. Their Pupils (as has been observed above) have, for the last twenty-five years, averaged from about two to three hundred: and their gain by each Pupil (after

“ The influence of the Jesuits in the adjacent country is incredible: the Manor and surrounding district being their own, they are more or less the accredited heads of the neighbourhood; they are at once bold and indefatigable in making proselytes; and, in consequence of their exertions, Popery has very considerably increased in the vicinity of Stonyhurst, and in the town of Preston, within the last thirty years.

“ Before the establishment of this College, there were not half a dozen Papists about Stonyhurst, but now the greater portion of the population in that part of the country are Papists to the amount of *many thousands!* From this Jesuits' College *all the Roman Catholic Chapels in that part of the kingdom (which are nearly as numerous as the Protestant Churches) are filled with Priests of the Order of Jesuits,* though they are unwilling it should be known that they are any other than ordinary Romish Priests. There are several Jesuit Priests stationed in Preston, who frequently travel from thence to Ireland; and, since the last peace, they have great intercourse with France, and other parts of the Continent.

“ The principal Jesuit Priest of Preston now makes a boast, that when he first came into it (a little more than twenty years since) a small room would have contained his whole congregation; at this time, he proclaims with triumph that two large Chapels have been built which will hold two thousand persons each, and that even these Chapels will not contain their congregations. From this fact, some idea may be gained of the extent to which they have proselyted in one parish!!!

“ The Jesuits and Papists, in conjunction, have within every expense is paid) forms no inconsiderable addition to their annual revenue; to say nothing of the original endowment from which they derived their support in the first instance.”

the last eighteen months erected a large School (with an excellent house at each end, for the accommodation of the Master and Mistress), upon the plan of our National Schools, for the reception of children of both sexes: this School will hold about a thousand children. The Members of Parliament for Preston, and some Clergymen, as well as several other nominal Protestants, have contributed large donations towards this School!

“ The subtilty with which the Jesuits insinuate themselves into Protestant families of fortune is very remarkable, but quite in unison with their whole history: there is scarcely a single Protestant family of respectability which is not in a greater or less degree under the influence of the Jesuits. The Bishop of the Diocese himself, has not escaped the vortex of their influence; and a relative of his, who is a beneficed Clergyman, at no great distance from the College, is openly boasted of, by the Jesuits, as their patron and ally: to this list may be added some of the established Clergy of Preston and its vicinity. The Jesuits rule the Magistrates of that place completely, and the Mayor himself is in their interest,

“ They have regularly preached in Preston against the Protestant Church and Faith, for a series of years past, more especially during the season of Lent; and for this purpose they have selected some of their most able preachers.

“ Such is the influence of the Jesuits in Preston, that the Protestant Booksellers are afraid to sell publicly, or expose for sale, any books against Popery; and yet there is a Popish Bookseller in the town, whose windows and shop are crowded with all the poison of Popery.”

Then, in reply to Mr. Dallas's observation, that these Jesuits “ have pledged their allegiance to their King and Country, in the comprehensive Oath of 1791,” this author says: “ But he would have some trouble to prove that any Oath of Allegiance whatever is taken by his *protégés*,

either as Jesuits or as Romish Priests. If, however, he could establish this, he would not succeed in allaying our just apprehensions, unless he could at the same time disprove that the Pope possesses, in the estimation of all good Catholics, a dispensing power with respect to Oaths; and unless he could further show that Oaths made to Heretics are not binding, in cases where the keeping of them would affect the interests of the Holy Roman Church. Let it even be conceded that the Catholics (whether of the Order of Jesuits or not) may bind themselves by Oaths, which shall admit the supremacy of a reigning Protestant Monarch, and their allegiance to him as such: still the very nature of their religious system will preclude them from assigning any other than a subordinate and secondary rank to such admitted principles, while, at the same time, doctrines of higher obligation must necessarily retain the superior place in their affections, and command obedience in the first degree; a fact, which no man will be hardy enough to deny, who is in the slightest degree conversant with English history, or with the avowed principles of the Romish Church. In this sense, the Protestant may address the Jesuit, however bound by Oaths, or pledged by securities, in the expressive language of the Poet of France, in his *BAJAZET*:

‘ Promettez—affranchi du péril qui vous presse ;
 ‘ Nous verrons de quel poids sera votre promesse.’

“ So far, however, from its being true, that the Jesuit Priests are bound by any Oath, which affords the least protection or security to a Protestant Church and State, the fact is, that the Oath which Pope Pius IV. and the Council of Trent prescribed to be taken by every Priest, is directly opposite both to the existence and interests of that Church and State; and must oblige him, if he be an honest and consistent member of his own communion, to interminable hostility with each. This Oath is couched in the form of a

profession of faith: it is entitled 'FORMA JURAMENTI PRO-
 FESSIOIS FIDEI,' and is in the commencement expressly
 enjoined by Papal authority to be taken by 'all having the
 care of souls.' It contains a distinct and formal avowal, on
 the part of the person subscribing it, of his firm belief in
 the various errors of the Romish Church; such, for instance,
 as the doctrine of Tradition being of equal authority with
 Scripture—the exclusive right of the Romish Church to de-
 termine the true sense of Scripture—the divine institution and
 efficacy of the Seven Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation,
 the Lord's Supper, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Or-
 ders, and Matrimony—the entire acquiescence in, and con-
 sent to, every thing which was fixed and prescribed by the
 Council of Trent—the belief in the Mass being a true,
 proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and the living
 —the doctrine of Transubstantiation in all its fulness—the
 certain existence of Purgatory, and the necessity of praying
 souls out of it—the positive duty of worshipping and pray-
 ing to the Saints—the certainty and validity of their inter-
 cessions, and the obligation of worshipping their relics—
 the duty of preserving images of Christ, of the Virgin
 Mary, and of certain Saints, and of honouring and wor-
 shipping those Images—the belief in the power of Indul-
 gences having been committed by Christ to his Church, and
 in the essential utility of Indulgences to Christians—THE
 COMPLETE SUPREMACY AND PARAMOUNT AUTHORITY OF THE
 HOLY ROMAN CHURCH OVER ALL OTHER CHURCHES; AND A
 DECLARATION OF THE MOST ENTIRE AND UNQUALIFIED OBE-
 DIENCE TO THE POPE, AS THE SUCCESSOR AND VICAR OF
 CHRIST; AS WELL AS A FULL ACQUIESCENCE IN, AND SUB-
 MISSION TO, WHATEVER HAS BEEN SETTLED BY THE CANONS
 OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, BY ITS ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS,
 AND ESPECIALLY BY THE COUNCIL OF TRENT; AT THE
 SAME TIME CONDEMNING, REJECTING, AND ANATHEMATIZING
 all things contrary thereto, and all Heresies which the

Church of Rome condemns, rejects, and anathematizes:— in conclusion, that this is the true Catholic Faith, ‘OUT OF WHICH NO ONE CAN BE SAVED,’ which the party subscribing such profession expressly holds, and engages for ever to preserve and maintain whole and inviolate; and which he declares, vows, and swears he will, to the utmost of his power, see that all who are subjected to him, or committed to his care, shall hold, teach, and preach.†

“ If any one should be disposed to think that such a juridical profession of faith as the above, or any similar profession, can consist with attachment to a *Protestant King and Government*, he is at perfect liberty to enjoy that opinion; but it appears so impossible that such an opinion should be supported by any one sound argument, that it may perhaps be safely left to its own fate.

“ There are two observations which naturally arise out of the above statement: The first is, the magnitude and danger of such an Establishment as this in our own country, in the present state of its continental connexions, in the perturbed condition of Ireland, and in the sensible increase of Popery within our own realm. If Jesuitism, like her twin-sister Popery, continue what she has been ever since History has recorded her crimes, it is then a matter of no common importance, that such a Society should thus have gained so strong and central a position; should be proceeding unmolested in the holy work of proselytism; and should be annually turning loose upon this nation so large a number of disciples, imbued with all the doctrinal and practical errors which have been superadded by Jesuitism to the native corruptions of Popery. It would be absurd to suppose that

† “ This Sacerdotal Oath will be found at length, in the Bull of Pius IV. dated in November 1564, and published at Rome, on the 6th December following. It occurs in the ‘*Sacrosanctum Concilium Tridentinum*,’ as well as in almost every account of the acts of the Council of Trent, and the measures to which it led.”

all this influence has been acquired for nothing; that so many converts have been made, and so many scholars trained, without an object; and that an Establishment, whose plan is method itself, and whose union is well worthy even of our own imitation, should be thus concentrating its forces and talents, augmenting its influence and funds, and multiplying its converts and adherents, without danger to our *Protestant Church and State!!!* Under these circumstances, it is not surely too much to assert, that among the many objects for which this country has a right to look for protection to its Parliament, as the natural guardian of its religious and political liberties, there is perhaps no one which stands out more prominently, which is pregnant with greater danger to this nation, or calls for more prompt remedies on the part of its Legislature, than the revival of the Order of Jesuits.

“ In the second place, it may be observed, that nothing can more clearly evince the careless indifference and unsuspecting liberality of Protestants, so called, than the support which they are thus affording to the natural and avowed foes of their own religious and civil establishment. We find, from the above relation, that some of our own Protestant Clergy, some of the Protestant members of our Legislature, the Protestant Magistrates of an ancient and honourable Corporation, and some of the most opulent and respectable of our Country Gentlemen, are content to open their arms to the Jesuits; can consent to advocate their cause, to support their Schools, and to advance their interests. They find these characters persons of talent; are pleased with their society, and inquire no further: wearing their own religion but loosely about them, they can hardly conceive that the professors of another religion would proceed any undue lengths, or make any unworthy sacrifices, to promote their own faith: themselves the professors of a tolerant faith, they will not believe that the men whom they find so ami-

able and harmless without power, would become intolerant and persecuting upon principle, if power were placed in their hands: caring but little, themselves, whether men are Catholics or Protestants, and indeed scarcely knowing in what those systems differ, or whether they differ at all, except in name, they would not take the trouble of crossing the street in order to convert a man from Popery to Protestantism; and therefore can form no idea of the indefatigable vigilance and proportionate success, with which the Jesuits (like their prototypes, the Pharisees of old) ‘compass sea and land, to make one proselyte.’ Themselves loyal to their king and attached to regular government and good order, they are unwilling to think so ill of any men, as that they could betray the country which protects them; and observing, as yet, no overt acts of sedition or treason on the part of the Jesuits, they will not believe that any opportunity can ever arrive, which will be more favourable to the developement of the Jesuits’ talents in this way, than the present. Being themselves men of candour and liberal sentiment, they entertain no doubt, that while they and their Protestant countrymen have been so eminently benefited by the increased light and civilization of the age, all others will have derived advantage in the same proportion; and never suspecting that Popery is unchanged and unchangeable, they are disposed to refer all the atrocities and abominations with which its professors have been charged, rather to the darkness and ignorance of a barbarous æra, than to the radical and fundamental errors of their *religious system.*”

Several persons (says your friend, Dean MILNER), and even some of our leading Senators, suppose that Popery has long since been abundantly meliorated; but I wish *they* may not be nearer the truth, who think that the spirit of Protestantism has greatly degenerated. See Milner’s Preface to 5th Vol. of his History of the Church of Christ. I hope, Sir, you will not think me blameable for thus drawing

your close attention to the Jesuits now in the British empire. The national importance of the object is my best apology for the length of this extract, and for the proportion which it bears to my own remarks.

LETTER VII.

SIR,

IF the number of Colleges, Academies, and Schools in general, which belong to Roman Catholics at present, be reckoned only *fifty* (exclusive of those in Ireland); and if many of them be of considerable magnitude, or under the superintendance of Jesuits, who “too often meddle in the temporal concerns of State,” as one of their own writers admits; † and if there were but *three* such schools of any importance in 1781, throughout all England and Wales; we may expect to find a proportional increase of their CHAPELS, in every populous town of the British dominions. It must be remembered too, that a great number of these new places of worship have been erected partly, and sometimes chiefly, by the voluntary contributions of Protestants; who thus are materially aiding the design of proselyting their incautious descendants to a *corrupt faith!* When a father subscribes handsomely to build a new Chapel, it is not any wonder that his children should attend there out of curiosity, or perhaps from respect to the father’s memory; and they may unwarily be drawn on, by insinuating overtures,

† Another Roman Catholic author asks, “Who is ignorant that they meddle with every thing?—that they pry into every thing?—are referred to in every thing?” History of the Jesuits, vol. ii. p. 61.

to unite with that Church entirely, or at least to become perfectly indifferent to the peculiarities which distinguish it from our's. Examples of this kind are neither surprising nor uncommon, in the history of human aberrations.

I do not affect to know precisely how many Chapels there are, belonging to that communion, in Great Britain; but I have repeatedly seen statements in print, during the last five or six years, that there are about NINE HUNDRED POPISH CHAPELS, on a fair computation, most of which were erected within thirty years past! Several of these buildings are very capacious and magnificent; the one at Glasgow having cost above thirteen thousand pounds, and that now erecting in Moorfields (London) is likely to be on a scale more extensive than any in England.

While I am writing (March 24th), I see advertisements in our London Newspapers for a grand public festival, at the expense of a guinea each person, to promote the building of Moorfields Chapel, on a "*most advantageous piece of freehold ground, kindly and generously offered by the CITY OF LONDON;*" which "*spacious edifice promises to do honour to the liberality of the subscribers, and (it is said) to confer honour on OUR HOLY RELIGION:*" and, in order to stimulate a generous public, as the advocates of their cause urge, "*It must be remembered, that it is not easy at all times to find premises sufficiently extensive to accommodate a congregation of 15 or 16,000 persons; and even if such could on the instant be found, they might have been in a remote and unfavourable situation, and probably could not have been obtained but on most disadvantageous terms.*"

This "*eligible and central situation*" for an immensely capacious Mass House, in the very heart of the metropolis, is afforded most cheerfully by its pious Citizens, at a time when Roman Catholics are clamorous for *secular power*, and are ready to seize the reins of civil Government as one of their political rights!!! Thus shall we soon behold

“ A TEMPLE RAISED FOR THE TRUE WORSHIP OF God, NOT UNWORTHY OF THIS GREAT CITY.” See an Address, in the Laity’s Directory for 1819; signed “ W. M. POYNTER, Bishop of Halia, V. A. L.” i. e. Vicar Apostolic of the London District. Now may we therefore cry, “ POPYRY FOR EVER.”

Sir, I am obliged to be serious; for I really do not write ironically, or in extravagant language, when I say that these symptoms of public “ *liberality*,” by the Leaders of a vast concentrated population, strike me with awful apprehensions of what may follow at no distant period! “ How is the fine gold become dim!” Surely we have degenerated from the faith and piety of our martyred Reformers in the days of bloody Queen Mary! Where, Sir, are the noble principles of young Edward and his Preceptor? Has not the glory of our English Reformation departed? Never, never would I revive the accursed spirit of persecution; but I would recall the fervent piety and zeal of pristine times, which gave birth to Cranmer, Ridley, Farrer, Latimer, Tindale, Frith, Barnes, Coverdale, Rogers, Bradford, Taylor, Philpot, Hooper, Jewel, Fox, Parker, Nowel, Hooker, &c. men whose names and Christian views were once dear to *even the Citizens of London*, and whose memory You cherish in the deepest recesses of your heart. But what would THEY have said of Protestant Statesmen, Magistrates, or Merchants, who offer their land, or money, or influence, to build a splendid Popish Mass House almost on the spot where Reformers had preached and Martyrs died? Did our forefathers toil, and bleed, and burn, for such “ *liberal*” descendants as these? Yet this case is by no means uncommon in other large towns; nor can we wonder if Maynooth and Stonyhurst Colleges next shall become the archetypes of similar edifices, near Waterloo Place, or St. Stephen’s antiquated walls. Then will British candour and liberality have arrived at the very height of perfection!!!

Another strong symptom of the increasing opulence and

growing activity of Papists, is, that they have now the command of not only most of the Irish Journals and Presses, but also of four or five of the daily Newspapers in London; and they there regularly publish three Monthly miscellaneous Magazines, besides obtruding their officious hands into the British Reviews and best established literary Periodicals of other kinds. Roman Catholics are not to be blamed for so doing; though I blame unwatchful editors and readers of certain boasted orthodox writings—too often insipid, cold, tame, and lifeless: for, while some learned Clerical Leaders are fighting for what they call “strict orthodoxy,” the greatest enemy is at the gate; and yet they see no spiritual danger, but from a domestic company of *Protestant* soldiers in the same army, happening to wear another sort of exterior or different regimental clothes from themselves! Have none of these orthodox men ever seen or heard of Papal Bulls, Denunciations, and Rescripts in the 19th century? Or, do they look on the combatants with unchristian feelings and total indifference? Vide “ANTIBIBLION; OR, THE PAPAL TOCSIN,” of which only about nine numbers are published: a little work, disclosing the continental state of religion at present; and exhibiting many of the Pope’s modern evolutions in various kingdoms, but especially his repeated attacks on all Bible Societies—deemed by him “MOST IMMEDIATELY DANGEROUS AND IMPIOUS MACHINATIONS, AND A MOST CRAFTY DEVICE BY WHICH THE VERY FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGION ARE UNDERMINED.”

It has generally been said and admitted, that “State Politicians concern themselves very little about affairs of conscience; though they may wish for the concurrence of all men in their schemes, whether of war or peace.”—If we fight, pay taxes, and aid their views of self-aggrandizement, these are the main social duties they require: at least, we are told so by some who are in the secret; and hence, I conceive, Politicians must see the mischievous absurdity of dis-

cord, conflicting opinions, and especially of religious persecution.

But, in our own country, the Government is fully aware of the inestimable value put by all Protestants on the unalienable rights of conscience, and on the utmost freedom in the exercise of private judgment. We cannot endure any limits or restraints on such a point; and, therefore, when every class of Religionists, both in the Established Church, as well as out of its pale, had endeavoured to promote the widest possible circulation of the Holy Scriptures (though all did not agree as to the *mode* of doing so), it could not be that a succession of Papal Bulls or Prohibitions, expressing an utter abhorrence of such religious objects, would produce no indignation against Popish principles thus clearly divulged from the highest authority.

In this view a peculiar feeling of disgust and odium is every where excited, by official and violent measures which must be thought consistent with a fixed Church-discipline, although not universally admired by Roman Catholics of Great Britain. If the present Pope, as we are told, "has neither horns nor cloven feet," he has nevertheless shown that he possesses a heart to execute whatever mischief lies in his power: and we cannot deem him an inoffensive Head or Bishop, while he continually raves and gnashes his teeth at us Biblical Christians. Even the above cited author of "the State and Behaviour of English Catholics," honestly confesses, that "Catholics have often denied the external practice of religion to Sectaries, and continue to do so in many countries; but to be intolerant," he adds, as an excuse, "is a leading maxim of every Established Church, whether in England, or in France, in Hindostan, or in China." It is hoped, however, that ONE exception AT HOME may be allowed to so general a charge of religious intolerance.

LETTER VIII.

SIR,

I HAVE NO means of discovering how many Priests of the Roman Church are now in England, &c. and I must therefore decline forming any conjecture. But the author whom I last quoted, has given a statement applicable to the year 1781, which I lay before you: "By an arrangement, which took place in the reign of James the Second, England was divided into four districts, and a Bishop was appointed to preside over each. They had then 1000*l.* per ann. settled on each of them, out of the Exchequer: but this only continued till the Revolution, when they were reduced to the necessity of supporting themselves by the best means in their power. Since that time, the same regulation with regard to numbers has continued; and as they have no particular place of residence allotted, each Bishop generally chooses to live in the most central and convenient situation. Their office is, to attend to the small concerns of their respective districts; to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation; to provide the different Congregations with Priests; and to take care that these perform their duties, and behave in a manner becoming the character of Churchmen.— It has been said by a peevish writer, "That *Popish Bishops* go about, and exercise every part of their function, without offence and without observation." This is an unfair representation: for it is in the most private manner that any part of their function is exercised; and as they possess none of the insignia of the episcopal order, their *goings about* do not distinguish them from other men.

"As far as I can rely on my information, which I think is accurate, the number of Priests, now employed, is about

360. Their distribution is as follows:—In the northern district, which takes in the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, York, Lancaster, and Chester, there are about 167. Of these 48 are Ex-Jesuits. § Three places are now vacant. This district contains the greatest number of Priests, and also the greatest number of Catholics; but not in proportion to the number of Clergy, many being private Chaplains to gentlemen, where there are no congregations. Since their dissolution, nine places have been given up by the Ex-Jesuits, two of which are not likely ever to be revived.

“ In the midland district, are about 90 Priests; 28 of whom are Ex-Jesuits. There are now fourteen places vacant. This district declines very fast, as appears from the great number of congregations now without Priests.— Most of these have been vacant for some time, and no Clergymen unengaged have hitherto been found to supply them; though some of them are gentlemen’s houses; by which means some families are obliged to go from five to ten miles, on Sundays, to Chapel. It may be noticed that this district, though composed of the greatest number of counties, and those mostly large, to the amount of sixteen, contains only 8460 Catholics, which is computed to be about two thirds of what there were thirty or forty years ago.

“ The western district contains about 44 Priests; 23 are Ex-Jesuits. There is one place vacant, and has been so for some time; no person can be found to occupy it. This district is the thinnest of Catholics of any in England, though its extent be great. It contains eight English counties, and the whole of North and South Wales.

“ The London district, comprising nine counties, has

§ “ The Fathers of the *late* Society of Jesus, are distinguished by this appellation, since their Canonical dissolution in the Pontificate of Clement XIV. Ann. 1773.”

58 Priests; 11 are Ex-Jesuits. There are five places vacant. This district has also diminished, and is declining very fast.

“ These Priests, whose number and distribution I have given, either live as Chaplains in the families of gentlemen, and have the care of the little congregations round them; or else they reside in towns, or in some country-places, where funds have been settled for their support. The chapels are in their own houses. From many places being now vacant, as I have noticed, where Priests were formerly kept, it is evident that their number is greatly on the decrease. *The Jesuits also are daily dying away; nor is there any succession to supply their places.*”—[*This was first written in 1780.*]—“ In the lapse of a few years, we shall see a very great additional falling off. Never, surely, was there a wilder fancy than the common cry of the growth of Popery, and of the great influx of Priests, since the passing of the late act in favour of Catholics!

“ Our Priests, in their general character, are upright and sincere: but, narrowed by a bad education, they contract early prejudices, which they very seldom afterwards deposite. The theological lumber of the schools too often supplies the place of more useful furniture. Moderately skilled in the Latin and Greek languages, they know little of their own: nor do they become sensible of their manifold deficiencies, till it be sometimes too late to attempt improvement.

“ A man truly Orthodox *flies heretical company*; he fears to be contaminated, and he would not receive instruction from so foul a source. A Priest is seldom seen in the society of *Protestants*. The Catholics, he is told to herd with, either are unable to improve him; or, if able, they are seldom willing. Contracted in his circumstances, he has not the means of drawing information from books; the labours of his calling demand much of his time; and unfa-

shioned in the forms of elegant life, his company is not asked for. Thus denied most occasions of improvement, if his native dispositions will allow him, he soon sits down silently contented, and looks no further. If he ever had abilities, disuse will, in a short time, lay them asleep; and at sixty he will probably be found the same man he was at twenty-five.

“ Whilst the Jesuits stood, St. Omer was their great school for classical improvement; and they supplied *England with many able and active Churchmen*. At the expulsion of that body from France, their College was given to the Clergy of Douay: in whose hands it now is; but as yet it seems to have answered little purpose. English Catholics are not sufficiently numerous to supply scholars for so many houses.—The Jesuits themselves first retired to Bruges, in the Austrian Netherlands, where they opened another College; but, on their total suppression a few years after, that house also was dissolved, together with every other foundation they possessed. They then erected an Academy at Liege (*for their spirit of laudable enterprise was not to be broken*), under the protection of the Bishop and Prince of that place. They are now no longer Jesuits; but their Academy is in great estimation, and the children of our Catholic gentry principally resort thither for education.”

Besides the Order of Jesuits, in England, this author gives some account of the Nuns, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Benedictines, &c. &c.

I have thought it was fair to let that candid writer tell his own story, and wish an account as little alarming as this could be authenticated in 1819; but, Sir, you know the fact to be quite otherwise. It cannot be supposed, however, that any private individual, unconnected with Roman Catholics, can find out the present number of their Priests.

LETTER IX.

SIR,

PROBABLY you will allow that my first supposition is sufficiently established; *viz.* THE REVIVAL OF POPERY, not only in Europe and other quarters, but also in this part of the British Empire. I shall have no difficulty in convincing you, that the spirit or genius of Roman Catholics, as a body, remains the same which it was in former ages; though the means of exercising their spiritual intolerance may be more limited by outward circumstances. Should these restraining circumstances, however, by any change of events, be greatly altered in their favour, it cannot be doubted that Popery may then rise into immediate and powerful operation; her true and inherent character will then be developed; her political importance and pretensions will rapidly advance; and her ambitious demands on the State will be enforced with proportional arrogance and domination. We are now, therefore, to inquire, on what avowed and unchanging PRINCIPLES the Roman Church still acts, and by what injurious MOTIVES she is evidently governed; rather than to ask, for an exact description of her *present* secular encroachments among the neighbouring States, or for a positive exhibition of her widely extended political dominion.

I have admitted that the latter must be waited for, and can only be anticipated as really existing under more favourable circumstances: then, indeed, it may be too late to resist, and all regrets will be unavailing; but, now we are called on to use the best means of prevention, as foreseeing and avoiding the evil. The direct proofs in point of fact, of her unaltered spirit of intolerance, do not manifest them-

selves merely in an open avowal of tyrannical sentiments, quite at variance with the peace and liberty of other Churches; but also, by her recent determination to send out the wily Jesuits, like an army of Locusts, to over-run "ALL STATES AND DOMINIONS," as the Pope's Bull of August 7th, 1814, sets forth! In England; and even in London itself, are found many bold defenders of this odious and hostile measure; some of whom, disguised and under a mask (as Mr. CHARLES BUTLER), do not hesitate to cover or soften down all the past enormities of that Order with one hand, while they hold out the other towards Protestants, as if to offer terms of mutual amity and concord!

That Ex-Jesuits should have hailed with gratitude and joy the day of their regeneration, is natural; but that such men (who know this Order was at first established, and now again is restored, for no ostensible object besides opposing the Reformation of Religion) should assume the sacred garb of *friendship*, is a mockery to our understandings, too obvious to deceive any person who does not willingly shut his eyes. Yet these same defenders of Jesuitism have the effrontery to pretend that no harm whatever is intended against our *Protestant Church*, our *Protestant Government*, our *Protestant Legislature*, or our *Protestant Crown*!—*Credat Judæus, non ego.*

It is not against Infidelity, Sir, but against "Schism and Heresy" (for so the Reformed religion is called); that "THOSE VIGOROUS AND EXPERIENCED ROWERS," as the Sovereign Pontiff names them, are brought at this time into action: yes, it is manifest that the successful efforts of Bible Societies were meant thus to be counteracted, and the fundamental principles of the Reformation withstood. Accordingly, the Briefs of His Holiness are now freely circulating in various languages of the oriental and western nations; while Jesuits, together with other religious Orders,

are working the grand engine of Papal Inquisitors, &c. recast and newly fabricated in the Vatican. §

The late Dr. GEDDES, a truly respectable Roman Catholic Priest, whom I knew, wrote "A Modest Apology" for the members of his own Communion in Great Britain; which was "addressed to all moderate Protestants, particularly to the Members of both Houses of Parliament, 8vo. 1800." This book has become scarce; and, I shall therefore exhibit a few select passages, bearing on my present subject. You have sometimes expressed to me your deep regret, that it was not in your power (for want of time) to read certain works which I had named as important, and have requested me to make occasional extracts for your perusal; a task, however, which as little comports with my scanty leisure as with your own.

Dr. Geddes, p. 136, observes that there are Protestants, "and their name is LEGION, who are not easily satisfied; to whom our real or pretended tenets, in which we differ, or seem to differ, from Protestants, appear in some degree, and indirectly, *politically dangerous*: in as far as they are supposed to influence our moral conduct, with respect to those whom *we deem Heretics*; and, at the same time, to be injurious to the interests of genuine religion, which is the great bond of civil society; and corruptive of the pure Word of God, by ridiculous ceremonies, superstitious rites, and even gross idolatry."—This is not an unfair view of my own objection to granting them such eligibility to high offices of power, as might finally lead to a decided preponderance in the State, or at least to a perpetual struggle for domination

§ The Spanish Sovereign takes an Oath—"to persecute, and command to be persecuted, all heretics and apostates,"—and also that he will "command to be given to the Holy Office of the Inquisition, all aid and protection, in order that heretics, disturbers of their holy religion, may be seized and punished, conformably to the laws and holy canons," &c. &c.

over Protestants. The author then undertakes and endeavours "to apologize for the British Roman Catholics, and their distinctive tenets," in the following manner:

"Now the first," says he, "that strikes my view as the most objectionable, is the doctrine *That there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church*; a doctrine which appears to me so harsh, so uncharitable, and (let me add) so Antichristian, that I cannot possibly acquiesce in it. But, is this doctrine peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church? No: it has, with certain modifications and explanations, been adopted by almost every Christian Communion; and Creeds and Confessions of Faith, containing that doctrine, are said, or sung, or subscribed to, by every established Protestant Church with which I am acquainted! I know that, of late, the Theologians of most Protestant communions have laboured to mollify this odious tenet; particularly those of the Church of England, who allow" [Mark this] "*that salvation may be had even in the Communion of the Church of Rome*: and as concession commonly begets concession, the Theologians of the Church of Rome have found out two expedients to *save* Protestants; invincible ignorance, and invincible necessity. Thus, in theory," adds he, "they are nearly on a par."—In the concluding opinion I cannot agree, and must deny them to be "ON A PAR."

But, Sir, I do not intend to draw you into a discussion of Popish tenets, nor to demonstrate that any of those we object against are unscriptural or false: all I propose is, to show that some of their principles of moral and political conduct, now openly acknowledged and avowed by the Roman Church, are hostile to our peace and security as Protestants. This you will confess to be worthy of notice and consideration, even to Politicians; who do not, perhaps, much care whether the *dogmas* themselves be true or false, provided they will not excite any civil disorder and national mischief. Men certainly cannot agree on all points of opi-

nion, and the forcible attempt to make them do so is about as foolish (not to say wicked) as the attempt to contrive perfect time-pieces, which always shall exactly agree; a kind of absurdity that the Emperor CHARLES V. saw in his retired moments to be absolutely impracticable by human means, after having bitterly persecuted Lutherans for many years, because they would think and believe differently from himself.

LETTER X.

SIR,

THE Papal doctrine of infallibility must necessarily lead to two serious evils: first, that an infallible Church can never reform itself; and secondly, that her disciples, if sincere in their profession, must believe all who do not receive the Church-doctrines of faith to be damned, as infidels or heretics.—Now these consequences have been the practical and uniform result of the Papal notion of such infallibility—a fixed article of faith (as it applies to *their* Hierarchy) which no Roman Catholic denies, not even the English petitioners themselves. If you tell me that Dr. Geddes would not believe so, I can only say he was then very inconsistent, and not really a Son of the Church; but, I think he did assent to this infallibility *most fully* (not of the Pope alone, yet of the whole Church), and only disliked the deductions which we say clearly flow from the admission. It is, nevertheless, a doctrine taught in all their authorized Catechisms, and cannot any how be got rid of: it is this which forms the basis of their cruel despotism, and spiritual tyranny; it is this which gives plausibility to their Episcopal Claims of jurisdiction, and the right of universally directing or controlling conscience,

The present Archbishop Troy, in his Pastoral Instruction of 1798, remarks, that “the Catholic Laity of Ireland respect their Clergy, and consider it a duty to be regulated by their determinations on all points of religious doctrine.” This I believe to be generally true; and it is, therefore, important for Government to be certain what doctrines, called *religious*, may affect the *civil* allegiance of the Laity: some of them are thus explained and stated by Dr. Troy; others may be seen in the class-books used at the College of Maynooth, and especially “*Tractatus de Ecclesia, &c.*”

Now Dr. Troy observes, that “Ecclesiastical Rulers in the Catholic Church are obliged to direct and govern the faithful committed to their care, according to the existing canons and actual general discipline;” in proof of which notion he refers to the authority and proceedings of the Trent Council. Thus it appears, the Laity are bound to obey their Clergy, and these to obey the existing canons, &c.; so that in fact the decisions of Councils must ultimately regulate and determine the moral conduct of all persons in the State. But, when “Henry VIII. revolted against the faith of all Christendom” (according to the views of this Prelate), the people became enslaved! For “the people were enslaved when their Sovereign declared himself head of the Church of England: Parliament, Nobles, Clergy, all ranks became the servile flatterers and slavish instruments of a dissolute, capricious, and arbitrary monarch. The nation was enslaved, when schism was introduced by their brutal Prince.”

Query, Whether the Doctor’s reasoning may not consistently be applied to any other Prince besides Henry VIII. and whether the principle he lays down be correct?—Yet this is Roman Catholic doctrine!

Again he says, “It is a fundamental article of the Roman Catholic faith, that *the Pope or Bishop of Rome, as successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles in that See, enjoys, by divine right, a spiritual and ecclesiastical pri-*

macy, not only of honour and rank, but of REAL JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY, IN THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. Roman Catholics conceive this point as clearly established in the Scriptures, and by the constant tradition of the fathers in every age, as it is by the express decisions of their general councils, which they consider as infallible authority in points of doctrine. Hence they respect the Pope as the father and teacher of the faithful; and the Roman Church, as the mother and mistress of all others; the chair of Peter, the Apostolical Holy See, as the root of all other churches, and centre of Catholic unity."

"Communion with the Apostolical See has been considered, at all times, by Catholics, as essentially necessary to preserve that unity of the Church, which Christ promised under the guidance of one pastor, and which Catholics and Protestants acknowledge in the Nicene Creed."

"This communion with the centre of unity has proved a rampart against schism and innovation. Without it *private judgment becomes a rule of faith*, and spurns at the most sacred and best established authority: subordination is destroyed, and every one makes choice of the religion *most conformable to his own ideas*; or combats every religion, as a restraint on freedom of thought and action."

"The oath taken by Roman Catholic Bishops at their consecration, was devised to strengthen this union with the chair of Peter, and to repel schismatics and suspected persons from the episcopal ministry."

"The Apostles, their disciples, and successors, in every age, have thought it their precise duty to gain proselytes to this *one faith*, to this *one society*, to this *one fold*; and uniformly taught that *salvation cannot be otherwise obtained*."

"The Roman Catholic Clergy of this kingdom do not disturb the State, or violate the laws, by the spirit of *proselytism*. They do not *procure, incite, or persuade* Protestants or others to become Catholics by *officious, clandestine*

sine, or improper methods. They conceive such attempts as contrary to the spirit of their ministry as they are to the prohibition of the Legislature: but when freely called upon, *as they are frequently by the sick, to reconcile them to the Church of Rome, they do not, they cannot, hesitate to minister that consolation.*"

"We have already observed, that Catholics are obliged to believe, as an article of their faith, that the Pope or Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, is the Supreme visible head of the Church on earth, and centre of Catholic unity; with a primacy by divine right of real authority and jurisdiction in the universal church; and that all Catholics owe him canonical respect and obedience on that account: it is likewise an article of Catholic faith, that the Church of Christ is *infallible in her doctrinal decisions and causes, on points of faith and morals*; because he promised to be with her to the end of the world. Catholics, therefore, are obliged to adhere implicitly to such decrees and canons of the Church, assembled in general council, and confirmed by the Pope; as to rules of faith: they are also obliged, in like manner, to submit to similar decisions and decrees of the Pope, when expressly or tacitly assented to, or not dissented from, by the majority of Bishops representing and governing the Church dispersed. On these points all Catholics are agreed, as on immutable articles of their faith."

"General Councils, however useful and highly expedient on particular emergencies of the Church, are not absolutely necessary. Our divine Redeemer promised to be with the Church for ever. His promises to the Apostles, particularly to St. Peter, and their successors, were to be realized to the end of time. As Governors of the Church, under his heavenly guidance, and with his promised assistance, they have from time to time assembled together, in General Councils, to expound the faith, and preserve it inviolate from the assaults of heretics and schismatics; but as,

from various circumstances, these assemblies are always difficult, and sometimes impracticable, they on such occasions apply to their supreme head and primate, the Bishop of Rome, whose decrees on doctrinal points of faith and morals are respected by all Catholics, *whether they consider him as infallible or not*: the acquiescence of the majority of Bishops in these decrees of the apostolic See, renders them completely decisive and *infallible*. The errors of the primitive Heretics, before the first Nicene General Council, in the year 325, were condemned by the Bishops of Rome. In after-ages, various heresies and errors were reprobated by their successors in the chair of Peter; and since the last General Council at Trent, in the sixteenth century, the erroneous doctrines of Bajus, Jansenius, Molinos, Quesnel, Fenelon, de Hontheim or Febronius, Eybel, and of numberless others, on points of faith; and many erroneous propositions, destructive of Christian morality, have been anathematized by the Popes. Notwithstanding the opposite opinions of Catholics respecting the Pope's *personal* infallibility when pronouncing solemnly, or, as it is termed, *ex cathedra*, on points of faith and morals; these different condemnations, in various ages, have been uniformly approved by the Church, dispersed and represented by the majority of the Bishops: this is fully sufficient to preserve the living authority and infallibility of the *Church*, which is an article of Catholic faith."

" Catholics, however divided on the question of Papal infallibility, are unanimous in asserting the doctrine of exclusive salvation in the *one* true faith and Church."

" Such Catholics as deny a limited infallibility in the Pope, *acknowledge his authority as supreme visible head of the Universal Church*. They obey him in that quality, which does not necessarily imply infallibility; and assent to *his dogmatical decrees when not dissented from by the Church* assembled in General Council, or dispersed speaking

by the majority of Bishops. These decrees are assented to by such Catholics, not on account of any *personal* infallibility in the Pope, which they deny; but on the authority of the *Church*, which they believe infallible.

“ We have observed, that the Pope’s primacy of jurisdiction is an article of Catholic faith. Catholics owe him respect and canonical obedience on that account. *Every Bishop* is entitled to canonical obedience when exercising his spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, within the limits of his diocese.”

“ The spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, as successor to St. Peter, is not limited to any province or kingdom: it extends, by divine right, to the Christian Church in general, and to every particular See in Christendom. Hence the canons establish that the care of *all Churches or Sées* belongs to him.”

“ The Church alone, through the medium of her hierarchy, of which the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, is the head, exercises that power not *only* in *Ireland*, as Mr. Sheridan asserts, but in all parts of the Catholic world; from China to America, in England, in Scotland, in Holland, in the Lutheran states of Germany, in the Zuinglian cantons of Switzerland, in Russia, in Sweden, in Denmark, in Africa.”

Archbishop Troy observes, “ It is not at all surprising, that some liberal Protestants retain a degree of prejudice against Catholics; or that others, better informed, and advocates for Catholic emancipation, appear ignorant of our religious principles in their well-intended publications.—We wish that Protestants and others may judge of our religious and civil principles by our Catechism, by our books of devotion and religious instruction, by the pastoral letters of our Bishops, by the dogmatical constitutions of Popes, by the doctrinal decisions of our General Councils, and by our uniform conduct.”

Whether the late Mr. Sheridan's opinion be true or not, I leave you to judge; "that the priestcraft-doctrine of *exclusive salvation* follows from the doctrine of *Papal infallibility*, as a natural inference: it is this," says he, "which has proved the fatal source of *all* the hatred, dissensions, intolerance, and persecutions, which have so frequently prevailed among Christians, and so often disgraced Christianity."— I am disposed to think there is some foundation for that Statesman's opinion, though he inclines to treat his opponents with too much levity and personality. Even some of the best and greatest men among Roman Catholics have been induced to promote severe cruelties against Protestants, from a conviction of their own sure and *infallible* grounds of belief; for I distinctly recollect several passages in the writings of Bossuet himself, either encouraging LOUIS XIV. to acts of intolerance, or laying down maxims which *must* lead to persecution: these passages, however, seem to have escaped the notice of his Biographers, Bausset and Butler; but I cannot now spare time to search for them.

LETTER XI.

SIR,

THERE exists so intimate a connexion between the leading articles of faith in the ROMAN Church (improperly usurping the name of CATHOLIC), that it is not easy to disjoin them. If you consult their Pastoral Charges, their controversial pieces, their religious and moral sermons, their catechetical instructions, and various class-books,—you will find the doctrine of an infallible church closely interwoven with that of *no salvation for heretics, or for schismatics*;

and it is, therefore, impossible to grant the former, without conceding the latter. This being the case, no sophistry can explain away the odiousness or evil tendency of so revolting a notion; and the Head of their Hierarchy does not dissemble, that all Protestants are at this day *considered out of the reach of salvation!*

Their Trent Catechism, accordingly, declares "that the words of the Pastors of their Church are to be received as THE WORD OF GOD,"—"Verba Pastorum Ecclesie TANQUAM DEI VERBUM recipienda." The class-book, *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, used by the students of Maynooth College, in Ireland, condemns to eternal death both those whom their Church casts out of her bosom, and those who forsake her, "tam illos quos Ecclesia e sinu suo ejecit, quam eos qui illam relinquunt;" and of all these it is said, "et sunt extra viam salutis," they are also out of the way of salvation! Professor Delahogue, who composed this class-book for Maynooth College, was twenty years a Divinity Professor of the Sorbonne, at Paris; and doubtless, he only gave to Irish students a new edition of the same doctrines, deemed truly Catholic, which were taught at that celebrated University.

I could enlarge on this point, and easily show that these are the identical notions found in an English Bible, issued, licensed and sanctioned, &c. by learned divines of the highest reputation among Roman Catholics, and six times printed by them since the work came forth:—to me it appears, therefore, that intolerance and bitterness must always arise from such principles, if they ever be cordially received. §

§ Who shall decide, when Doctors disagree?—I am perfectly aware, that the intolerable and persecuting Notes, annexed to the Doway Bible and Rheims Testament, have been lately condemned by Archbishop Troy, of Dublin; for he openly withdrew his respectable name from Mr. Coyne's edition of 1816, and "solemnly declared that he utterly rejects the Notes, as harsh and irritating in ex-

But the present Pope himself may surely be presumed to understand what are the approved doctrines of the Latin Church, to which he alone is the Supreme Head; and thus he plainly delivers his sentiments, *EX CATHEDRA* :—

He declares, that the free toleration of other worshippers is never to be admitted; that it would be “contrary to the Canons, the Councils, and the Catholic religion” (*“ apposto à Canoni, ed al Concilj, e alla Religione Catolica, al quieto vivere, ed alla felicità dello stato*), even tending to produce disquietude and misery: THEREFORE “*LO ABBIAMO PURE RIGETTATO,*” WE HAVE UTTERLY REFUSED IT!!! Religious liberty was once a matter of heavy complaint, indeed, against the French Government; as it now is against that of the Netherlands. “France protected all sects, and all kinds of worship,” says the Pope: “the form of its oaths,

pression, some of them as false and absurd in reasoning, many of them as uncharitable in sentiment, and as countenancing opinions and doctrines which he (with other Roman Catholics of the Empire) had solemnly disclaimed *upon oath*.”—I know all this, and much more; a full account of which is printed in the 6th, 7th, and 8th Numbers of the *Antibiblion*: but I also know that *other Roman Catholic Bishops*, and about 300 of their *Clergy*, still living in England and Ireland, sanctioned the same edition of this work (however bad it is), which had been used and generally approved of by their most learned Prelates *ever since 1582*. Further, it is well to recollect, that the venerable Dr. Troy confesses he “had now for the FIRST TIME read and considered these Notes,” to the said English Bible; though it had always been in common circulation, as a standard system of scriptural doctrine, and was perpetually read by all ranks of Papists! Again, the OFFICIAL attestations and licenses affixed to every preceding edition of that work declare, “*that nothing is contained therein which is not conformable to the doctrine of the Catholic Church and its piety, or which is in any manner repugnant to the civil power and peace*.”—Mr. Butler gives a delusive and very imperfect account of that affair, as indeed he does of many other transactions connected with the history of Roman Catholics in this Empire. See his new “*historical*” work, in two volumes, 8vo.

its institutions, its code, its laws, its acts, breathe throughout an indifference, at least, to all religions, not excepting the Jewish, essentially the implacable foe of Jesus Christ; and this system of indifferentism," adds he, "which supposes no religion, is *the most* of all injurious, and the *most* opposed, to the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion,—which, because it is divine, is necessarily *one, by itself alone*, and can form *no alliance* with any other,—in like manner as Christ cannot be associated with Belial, light with darkness, truth with error, true piety with impiety."

The Pope says, "The boasted and sworn protection of the French Sovereign towards all kinds of worship, is only a pretext and colour to authorize the secular power to interfere in spiritual affairs; since, in showing respect for all sectaries, with all their opinions, all their customs, and all their superstitions, the French Government in effect regards no right, no institution, no law of the Catholic religion. Under such protection, nevertheless, lies concealed and disguised the most dangerous and most artful persecution that can possibly be imagined against the Church of Jesus Christ; and the best concerted, unhappily, to throw her into confusion, and even to destroy her, if it were possible for the power and craft of Hell ever to prevail against her. HE (the late Emperor) does not know, HE does not love, this most holy religion, *out of which there is no hope of salvation,—fuòri della quale non vi è speranza di saluti.*"

The Sovereign Pontiff goes on in the same strain, and forbids any oath of fidelity to be taken, in obedience to the demands of such an "*infidel*" power; which would be a grievous scandal, tending to "endanger the faith and destroy souls:" for, says he, "it is a general principle, that one should not enter and persevere in a condition, however necessary for a subsistence, if it be incompatible with conscience and one's eternal salvation." His Holiness, notwithstanding, consented that the Prelates might take an oath of

“ submission and obedience in all things not contrary to the laws of God AND THE CHURCH.”—Pontifical Instruction, pp. 188—205, in Tome I. of the Relation, &c. 1812.

In the second volume also, p. 36, it is declared to be a falsehood and calumny, to suppose the Pope (in his CONCORDAT with France) had sanctioned “ *the tolerance of any other worship* ” than his own ; as such a toleration could not but “ *always be reprovèd and condemnèd by the Holy Father.* ” His instruction afterwards, as to oaths, Tome III, p. 28, forbids those “ *which are contrary to justice, and much more still if prejudicial to the Church and her Religion.* ” This Correspondence is published by Keating.

You perceive, Sir, by my note respecting Dr. Troy and the Doway Bible, page 59, that this worthy Archbishop, “ *with other Roman Catholics of the Empire,* ” now openly renounce *dogmas* which their orthodox predecessors had as strongly approved ; and that some divines of Dublin, in 1816, not only did so by an ordinary verbal declaration, but “ *solemnly disclaimed upon oath* ” (to Protestant Magistrates) the very same doctrines, long before believed and taught as being strictly “ *CONFORMABLE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS PIETY.* ” Now, I ask, by what criterion are Protestants to learn whether any *dogma* whatever of that Church be really orthodox or not ? You cannot well reply, it is to be known by the general test of a simple affirmation : for, here is Dr. TROY *versus* Dr. MILNER, one Prelate against another !!!

A noble Lord, on presenting several Roman Catholic petitions from Ireland against the continuance of the penal statutes, said “ *that the Catholic Clergy joined with the Laity to commit and bind themselves, BY SOLEMN OATHS, to support our Protestant Establishment.* ”—Would you trust SUCH AN OATH ? I suppose not ; and perhaps no other oath of a Roman Catholic, which could be deemed “ *prejudicial to the Church and her Religion.* ” This is the

distinguishing rule laid down by Pope PIUS VII. himself; as you have read in my quotation from his own instructions on oaths taken before civil rulers: and we have seen how little regard is paid by English Catholics to the known laws or fundamental regulations of a voluntary society, when the interests of their own Church and people were remotely concerned! (See LETTERS III. and IV.)

On the validity of Roman Catholic oaths, I will not carry you back to ancient times, nor to musty records, for information; but perhaps some statesmen who adopt erroneous and candid ideas concerning THE OATHS OF ROMAN CATHOLICS, would do well to read the luminous and sensible remarks of the highly intelligent Speaker of the House of Commons upon this point, May 14, 1818; viz.

“*As to oaths*:—I do not think they are to be undervalued; but they cannot be accepted without some discrimination. Upon enlightened and honourable minds, I do not doubt their obligatory force. It must not however be forgotten, that the minds of the great mass of Roman Catholic population are in a state of darkness, and of absolute subjugation to the Priesthood.

“Of the particular structure of these oaths I shall not now enter into any discussion; a matter upon which the Honourable Baronet opposite to me (Sir John Cox Hippisley) is competent to give the House much important information. But, that they are not to be entirely relied upon, is apparent by the very conduct of the friends of the Bill; and by the necessity they have felt of superadding regulations to enforce the same purposes. We must also bear in mind by whom these oaths are to be interpreted, and how they have been interpreted. Nor can we shut our eyes against the notorious fact, that the Sovereign Pontiff, not in ancient times, but so lately as in the year 1809, by a solemn instruction to the Prelates of his Church, has commanded them to distinguish between the *passive* oaths which may be

taken, and the *active* oaths which may not be taken, by the Roman Catholics of any *heretical* state; and has declared, *that all oaths taken to the prejudice of the Church are null and void.*

“Nor, Sir, are these doctrines to be found only in Italy; it is well known to the Honourable Baronet, and probably many other Members of this House, that in London also, *and within the last eight-and-forty hours, distinctions of the same sort have been promulgated in the name and by the authority of a leading Prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, AND CIRCULATED THROUGHOUT THIS METROPOLIS.*”—Thus spake the present Lord Colchester, and you know with what effect on his audience.

LETTER XII.

SIR,

You have seen how equivocal and dubious a security the *oath* of a Roman Catholic subject must be, to a Protestant Government, “if prejudicial to the Church and her Religion.” We are taught this, not by theory, nor merely by the experience of past ages; but by an express declaration of POPE PIUS VII. who is said to be remarkably amiable, conciliatory, and mild in his character. Shall we suppose that the Pontiff (advised by his Cardinals) does not know how to judge, whether or not any civil oath be really “prejudicial to the Church?” Can we pretend to decide, without consulting him, when an oath may possibly affect the Roman Church? Is it not then certain that *he*, and *he only*, will be the judge of this question, as to the moral nature and spiritual tendency of an oath? Therefore, the Pope himself must be the Arbitrator respecting any oath to be

given by Roman Catholic subjects, in testimony of their allegiance to an heretical State! And will this be endured by Englishmen, or by the British Legislature?

Besides, one Pontiff or one Conclave may differ in opinion from another; one may approve the form of any oath, and another may condemn it; one may reverse the solemn act of another, as the present Pope did the Bull of Ganganelli, by which the Order of Jesuits was abolished.

Perhaps you will doubt whether Protestants are branded by the present Bishop of Rome, with the harsh and odious name of "Heretics:" but, mark what was his language towards the Reformed Churches of France. On the 27th of February 1809, he issued to the Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, and Vicars Capitular of France, a formal instruction on various topics; in which are the following sentiments, respecting marriage: "Some of you demand of us a dispensation, or power of granting marriages to be contracted between two parties; one of whom professes the Catholic faith, and the other an HERESY: but, we suppose you perfectly well know that the *true* Catholic Church, the Church of Jesus Christ, has always strongly reprobated marriages with HERETICS; since the Church ABHORS THEM, as Clement the 11th said, our predecessor of happy memory, 'ob plurimum deformitatis nec parum spiritualis periculi quod pæ se ferunt,' because of the great dishonour and spiritual danger which they produce. The same laws which prohibit Christians from contracting marriage with Infidels, in like manner forbid Catholics from making SACRILEGIOUS NUPTIALS WITH HERETICS; whence we have been most bitterly afflicted (as our predecessor Benedict the 14th, of happy memory, was) to find Catholics so madly entangled by a shameful passion, as not to abstain FROM SUCH DETESTABLE COALITIONS, WHICH OUR HOLY MOTHER CHURCH HATH EVER CONDEMNED AND FORBIDDEN."

Pope PIUS goes on to insist further on the abomination

of these anticatholic unions; and, finally, he refuses his compliance with the most urgent solicitations from French Prelates, &c. Such uncharitable doctrines and very repulsive sentiments, being closely connected with the state of **MODERN POFERY**, should engage the attention of all incautious Legislators; who are ready to embrace the Roman Catholics in their arms, with the vain hope of a *brotherly* reception!!! (See pp. 107—111, vol. ii. of “*Relation de ce qui c’est passé à Rome dans l’Envahissement des Etats du St. Siège par les François;*” Lond. 1812.)

I need not enlarge and insist more fully on a point so incontestably obvious; viz. that we Protestants are still hated and shunned, as schismatics, heretics, and infectious enemies; that our Clerical ordinations are still considered of no avail, authority, or effect whatever; that our Prelates are not even called real Bishops, nor our Clergy deemed true Ministers of Christ’s Church; in short, that there can be no salvation for any such heretical disturbers of the peace, and that the toleration of them is never to be allowed when it can be prevented. Similar notions are instilled by English Vicars Apostolic, and contained in the authorized annotations to their own Bibles; so that, as the late Bishop Challoner affirmed, “Protestant orders are absolutely null:—but without true orders there can be no sacrament, no absolution, no lawful preaching, no keys for opening the kingdom of heaven, no church, no Christ; and, therefore, that they are obliged to seek security elsewhere than amongst those who are no Ministers.”

But, to complete the mischief of so much animosity, **enounced ON PRINCIPLE**, the present Mr. Gandolphy declares, in his printed Sermons, “*that the Pope pronounces absolutely on the schismatical and heretical character of persons, of books, and writings; that his authority extends to every part of the Church; that a Catholic finds no more difficulty in assenting to any truth the Church proposes to*

him as an article of faith, than he would in admitting the ORAL TESTIMONY OF GOD HIMSELF; that this is a submission which the Church requires from all her children; and THAT THE LIVING AUTHORITY OF HER BISHOPS IS THE RULE OF DOCTRINE."

If so, what harmony can be anticipated from a merely *external union* of Roman Catholics with Protestants in one legislative body, having two souls, to form enactments for each other's liberties and privileges, whether religious or political? The reply of Jehu to Joram is applicable to the present case; for, if a Popish Priest professes to be at amity with us, and inquires, "*Is it peace?*" we may answer (as Jehu did) by another question, "*What peace, so long as the whoredoms of THY MOTHER and her witchcrafts are so many?*"

The treatise "De Ecclesia Christi" of Professor Delahogue, published for the Divinity Students of Maynooth College, likewise is explicit and positive, in declaring *all Protestants* to be out of Christ's family, and excluded from salvation; because *all* are separated from communion with the Roman Catholic Church, whose Episcopal Head is deemed the centre of unity:—for, this alone is said to be the true and only Church, "*extra quam non est speranda salus,*" out of which there is no hope of being saved; and we Schismatics are accordingly "*extra viam salutis,*" out of the way of salvation, as is there stated at large.

The highest authority to which an appeal can now be made, to determine any point of faith or discipline, is the General Council of Trent; and in her Catechism (I refer to the edition of "*Catechismus Romanus, &c.*" printed at Rome in 1726, by the congregation *de Propaganda Fide*), you will find these sentiments on the 9th article of the Apostles' Creed, "I BELIEVE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH:"—

For urgent causes this 9th article is to be the most frequently inculcated of all, "*omnium frequentissimi populo*

inculcandus sit: since many more persons will be liable to err, and be deceived therein, than even on the mystery of the Incarnation; and because ungodly people will be found, resembling apes which feign themselves to be men, who would pass as the only Catholics, and who affirm (not less proudly than nefariously) that they alone are the Catholic Church. Besides, it is easy for a person, who has this truth strongly impressed on his mind, to shun the horrible danger of HERESY: for he is not called a HERETIC, that first offends against the faith; but he who, neglecting the authority of the Church, pertinaciously maintains impious opinions. Wherefore, no one can be defiled with the pestilence of HERESY if he faithfully adheres to what is implied in this article of the Creed; and Pastors ought very carefully to instruct their flocks therein, that they may be guarded against the artifices of the devil, and persevere in the true faith."

The Catholic Church consists of "the Faithful dispersed over all the world," *Populus Fidelis per universum orbem dispersus*; but, when the FAITHFUL come to be described, they are limited to a particular set of people who are united by *one* profession of faith, *one* communion of the sacraments, *one* spirit, and *one* bond of love,—and yet this always means the faith, communion, sacraments, &c. of the LATIN Church, "*whose visible head is the Roman Pontiff,*" and whose ample bosom includes them all. Hence it follows, that there are three sorts of people excluded from the visible Church; viz. 1. Infidels: 2. Heretics and Schismatics: 3. Excommunicated persons.—I need not tell you, that all Protestants are comprehended in the second class. But, I here give the words of this Trent Catechism: "Ex quo fit, ut tria tantummodo hominum genera ab ea excludantur: primò infideles, deinde hæretici, et schismatici, postremò excommunicati. Ethnici quidem, quòd in Ecclesia nunquam fuerunt, neque eam unquam cognoverunt, nec

ullius sacramenti participes in populi Christiani societate facti sunt: Hæretici verò, atque Schismatici, quia ab Ecclesia desciverunt; neque enim illi magis ad Ecclesiam spectant, quàm transfugæ ad exercitum pertineant, à quo defecerunt. *Non negandum tamen, quin in Ecclesiæ potestate sint; ut qui ab ea in iudicium vocentur, puniantur, & anathemate damnentur.* Postremò etiam Excommunicati, quòd Ecclesiæ iudicio ab ea exclusi, ad illius communionem non pertineant, donec resipiscant. De cæteris autem quamvis improbis, & sceleratis hominibus, adhuc eos in Ecclesia perseverare dubitandum non est: idque fidelibus tradendum assiduè, ut si fortè Ecclesiæ Antistitem vita flagitiosa sit, eos tamen in Ecclesia esse, nec propterea quidquam de eorum potestate detrahi certò sibi persuadeant.”

LETTER XIII.

SIR,

IT is far from my intention to detain you long with ecclesiastical statements, *not bearing on a political question*; but, it is quite impossible, in discussing the vital subject on which I now address you, to avoid bringing so much religion forward, as shall exhibit fundamental and unvarying Roman Catholic principles. Allow me, therefore, to give one more proof that their leading doctrine, so obnoxious and detrimental to Protestants in general, is taught in Great Britain at this time.—The late Dr. HAWARDEN § was au-

§ This author was a very acute disputant against Chillingworth, and is deemed by Bishop Milner, &c. to have been the *successful controversialist*. His works are particularly praised and recommended by the Vicars Apostolic and Clergy, at the present time; and, on this account, I select him: but the late Dr. Challoner is also one of their Pillars, who issued a new edition of the Rheims Testament, with Notes, in 1749, 12mo. often reprinted since.

thor of a celebrated work, entitled "The true Church of Christ shewn;" and also of another book, named "Charity and Truth, or Catholics not uncharitable in saying that none are saved out of the Catholic Church." I shall cite a few passages from his works, first printed at Brussels in 1728, without the author's name; but reprinted, with his name, by R. Coyne, of Dublin, 1809.—And, by the way, I may mention, that Mr. Coyne, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Messrs. Keating and Brown, and other authorized Roman Catholic booksellers, have long been very assiduous in disseminating the most pungent and bitter controversial pieces of their Church; and have lately put forth some of WARD's abominable calumnies against our Bible, and the Established Religion, by republishing his poetical and prose writings.

Dr. Hawarden inquires (and answers his own question), "Is not the Catholic Church highly uncharitable in coining new articles of faith, and in obliging all men to believe them?"

"To this I answer, first, If her adversaries are to be her judges, and judges in their own cause, she is. But if she is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church; if she is the pillar and the support of truth, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; if she is the judge appointed by Christ in all disputes of religion, which she has always thought it both her duty and right to decide, in seventeen centuries; that is, if the Creed, the Scripture, and universal tradition, is true; she is not uncharitable.

"I answer, secondly, This objection, I fear, will not be of much credit to our adversaries: for (without reflecting upon them) it is the common cry of all Heretics, who ever were in Christendom. We have long and large catalogues of heretical sects, as well in the history and councils of the Church, as in the writings of Theodoret, of St. Augustine, of St. Epiphanius, of Tertullian, and of St. Irenæus. But there was never any heretical sect which did not

accuse the Catholic Church of coining new articles of faith, and of obliging all men to believe them. And as our adversaries accuse the Council of Trent on this head, so did the Eutychians as freely accuse the Council of Chalcedon; the Nestorians that of Ephesus; the Macedonians that of Constantinople; and the Arians that of Nicea. For, as it is essentially necessary for all Schismatics to accuse the Catholic Church of casual schism, so it is essentially necessary for all heresies, which either are, or ever will be in the world, to accuse the Catholic Church of coining new articles of faith, and obliging all men to believe them. Why? Because Schismatics are certainly offenders, unless the Catholic Church be guilty of their schism. And Heretics have no claim to Christianity, unless they pretend to the faith first delivered to the Saints.

“ I must therefore beg leave to say, because it is undeniably true, that all Heretics and Schismatics, who ever were in Christendom, have accused the Catholic Church of UNCHARITABLENESS. All Schismatics have proclaimed her uncharitable, by being the cause of their schism. All Heretics have proclaimed her uncharitable, by coining new articles of faith, and obliging all men to believe them. A consideration which ought to make our adversaries more backward in renewing the charge: for Heretics and Schismatics are bad precedents; and St. Augustine makes it a question, Which is in the more dangerous condition, a most vicious Catholic, or a person who is guilty of heresy only?

“ It is a general, not an universal rule without any exception, that none are saved out of the Catholic communion: for, as in baptism, so we may here except two cases. The first is that of an inevitable and involuntary necessity: as if a person who loves God above all things, desires to be baptized or to be received into the Catholic communion, but dies before a Priest can be called. The second is probably that of an involuntary and invincible ignorance; as if a per-

son, who is out of the Catholic communion, be ignorant, without any fault of his, of the true Church, and of the true religion. And here too Mr. Chillingworth, in his Dedication to the King, is not altogether so sincere, as might be expected from a writer of controversies concerning religion: for, if I understand him right, he would have His Majesty to think, that a point of doctrine and its explication, a general rule and its exception, are contradictions. ‘For the most part,’ says he, ‘they speak nothing but thunder and lightning to us, and damn us all without mercy or exception. Yet sometimes, to serve other purposes, they can be content to speak to us in a milder strain, and tell us, that they allow Protestants as much charity as Protestants allow them.’ Neither is this the only contradiction which I have observed in this uncharitable work; and since his Dedication is so very exact, what marks of sincerity may we not expect from the book itself?

“Can the Catholic Church be in separate communions, as in that of Catholics, of Protestants, of modern Greeks, &c.?”

“This our adversaries assert; but whether by inclination or by necessity, I shall not determine, though I cannot but suspect the latter: for if it be a general rule, that there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church, how can a Protestant be saved? How can he be a member of the Catholic Church? The rock is plain. How is it to be avoided?”

“For this, two courses may be assigned. The first by holding, that Protestants are the whole Catholic Church, the Church of all nations, and the Church of all ages: and that this Church, although it be always in being, for ‘behold I am with you always,’ says Christ, ‘even to the end of the world,’ is not always visible; for in the fifteenth century, and upwards, there was no known society of Protestants on the earth. The second course is, by holding that the Catholic Church may be, and is, in separate and dissenting

communion, as in that of Catholics, of Protestants, of modern Greeks, &c.

“ The first of these two roads was not thought safe enough, though some bold sailors have attempted it; and therefore our adversaries choose rather to venture their salvation on the second; which to me seems equally unsafe, whether we consult the Scripture, the tradition of all ages, or common sense.

“ The Scripture seems very clear. For, 1st, St. Paul tells us, that without faith it is impossible to please God; and that there is only one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. So that, as there is only one Lord and one baptism, there is only one true faith: and as the Church of Christ upon earth has only one Holy Spirit, so she is only one body. From whence these consequences may be drawn:

“ First, that Catholics, Protestants, and modern Greeks, have not, all of them, the saving faith, without which it is impossible to please God, according to St. Paul, and is only one, as there is only one baptism: whereas Catholics, Protestants, and modern Greeks, have three opposite professions of faith; and therefore three different faiths.

“ Secondly, that Catholics, Protestants, and modern Greeks, are not all of them members of the Catholic Church; for this Church, according to St. Paul, is only one body: which three separate communions, dissenting from each other, in matters of religion, of government, of divine worship, of clear revelation, and excommunicating one the other, cannot possibly be; for, are not separate communions separate bodies? and when societies are divided with regard to religion, both in the articles of their faith and in the terms of their communion, is it not as clear as the sun, that, in matters of religion, they are not one society, but so many different and separate societies? If there be any degree of

uncertainty in this, are we not yet to learn what evidence means?

“ Again, Christ himself says, ‘ Other sheep I have,’ to wit, the Gentiles, ‘ which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd.’ Where I observe, 1st, That our blessed Redeemer speaks here of his whole Church upon earth: for, converted Jews and converted Gentiles are the universal Church.

“ 2dly, That few or no creatures keep so much together, as sheep of the same Shepherd, and of the same fold. They feed together, they herd together, and they are housed together: so that, if you see one, you see them all.

“ And therefore, 3dly, That the unity of Christ’s disciples, in one faith and one communion, could not, under the emblem and allegory of sheep, be expressed with more evidence, nor even with more elegance and beauty, than by calling them one flock and one fold. But what can be more repugnant to this than the opposite system? Are Christians of separate and disagreeing communions, who, in religious matters, will neither assemble, pray, nor communicate together, in the same fold, and in the same flock? May we not despair of finding things evident in Scripture, if this be not?

“ To suppose then, that Catholics, Protestants, and modern Greeks, are all of them members of the Catholic Church, is contrary to plain Scripture.

“ It is also contrary to the universal tradition of the Catholic Church; as it appears, both from her two creeds, and from her unquestionable doctrine and practice, in all past ages.”

Sir, their doctrine of *exclusive salvation* is therefore deemed essentially necessary, cannot be dispensed with by any Roman Catholic, and involves the general condemnation of all not in that Church. This point, *as an assumed maxim*, you must never forget in the discussion.

LETTER XIV.

SIR,

You observe, that our being excluded from the pale of the Roman Church, as well as being virtually shut out of heaven by its *anathema*, does not prevent us from still remaining under the Papal authority; so that, they say, we are equally liable to be punished by their Priest, however scandalous his life is, and however criminal his conduct may be! Do you think this tyrannical doctrine is fit to be taught at the present day, and to be even inserted in the common Bibles used by modern Papists, often reprinted in England, Scotland, and Ireland? Yet, Sir, this is the case; as I will prove, by quoting a passage from one of the last Catholic editions of the English Bible, published for their own sole use, under the eye of a Bishop and Vicar Apostolic!

The head, or contents, of DEUTERONOMY, xviii. 8—12, runs thus: "Controversies are to be decided by the High Priest and Council, whose sentence must be obeyed *under pain of death*:" and the note upon that part of the text is this—"Here we see" (alluding to the divine command, that whoever did not obey the Jewish Priest should die), "Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the Church Guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the Law; *promising that they should not err therein, and punishing WITH DEATH such as proudly refused to obey their decisions*: AND, SURELY, HE HAS NOT DONE LESS FOR THE CHURCH GUIDES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." See likewise the Latin quotation made by me from the Trent Catechism; and especially the Italic words, at p. 69, LETTER XII.

I intended, at first, to give merely this brief annotation from the most common edition of the English Bible, now in free use among English readers of the Popish Scriptures;

but, considering how much depends on my establishment of the fact, THAT THEY STILL ARE A PERSECUTING PEOPLE, and hold detestable antisocial principles, I must determine to reprint (as an APPENDIX to these Letters) all the important papers on this subject collected in a recent publication, and to lay before you a translation of some PAPAL BULLS against Bible Societies.

Need I inform you, Sir, that the Pope and Cardinals of Rome † are now acting on the old principles and discipline of their Church? that they are violently opposing the free circulation of *all vernacular versions of the Holy Bible*, and only allow their own to be perused with such limitations as nearly exclude the common people from its use?—Their views are, therefore, not in the least amended or altered in this respect, since the time of the Lutheran Reformation. Nay, it is equally true that the Prelates and Priests of the British Empire, who adhere to the Roman See, follow its bitter example in every way they can; and nothing prevents a renewal of the ancient scenes of cruel oppression (in Ireland more especially), but the personal protection afforded by Protestant laws. For, our Newspapers, and the testimony of numerous eye-witnesses, clearly establish this painful truth; and I know that some recent examples of such persecution in Ireland, unquestionably well-authenticated, have been communicated to you by several persons of veracity. While Priests still rule with a rod of iron, what might not be expected, if they possessed the power to act without restraint or apprehension? May the triumphant reign of Priestly terror never be permitted to return, by a coalition of Popish devotees with Protestant Senators!

† See the Papal Correspondence with BARON WESSENBURG, just published by Mr. Ackerman, of the Strand; a volume of documents particularly exemplifying the present arbitrary views of the Court of Rome, and its fixed determination to meddle with State affairs in Germany by any unlawful or insidious means.

Allow me here to subjoin the language of Mr. LESLIE FOSTER, in his Parliamentary speech of April 24, 1812. He then said, "I am far from thinking that, individually, the Catholics who might be returned to sit in this House, would look to their Clergy for any rule of political conduct: but I think I am justified, by all that is passing before our eyes, in saying that it would be the fate of those gentlemen *to follow*, and *not to lead*, the impulse of the great mass of the Catholics of Ireland. And of that mass I do distinctly believe, *that the moving power would be their Church*, if that Church chose to act; and I cannot suppose that with such means and such temptations, it would abstain from acting, without supposing the individuals who compose it to be divested of all the common feelings of human nature.

"I am also far from believing, indeed I have good reason for utterly disbelieving, that many of the respectable persons who now stand forward as the leaders, or at least as the organs of the Catholic body, approve of the violent course of conduct which they lately have pursued: but they feel and they know, that the whole of their own power and influence depend upon their consenting to lead in the direction which *their followers* point out; and that if they dared to express their true feelings, from admired leaders they would instantly become proscribed deserters, while the great mass would move forward as before.

"It has been urged with confidence, that the example of moderation which the Catholics have evinced under such a length of trials, is a sufficient earnest of the temperate use which they would make of any powers that may be conceded to them:—but here, Sir, considering the Catholics as a political body, and allowing them every merit as individuals, I must dissent not merely from this conclusion, but even from the premises from which it is drawn. For, from the long period of moderation to which we are referred, I feel obliged by all views of sound reasoning to exclude from considera-

sion that time during which they had no power to exercise,—that is, from the Revolution, till the relaxation of the penal laws. During all that time the political action of the Catholic was physically impossible.

“ God forbid that I should be understood as saying any thing in the defence of that system. I trust I have already said enough to obtain credit from the House, for sincerely reprobating its whole policy. But the very reason for which I condemn it,—namely, that the Catholics of necessity lay bound and prostrate under its operation,—prevents me from inferring any thing *from their quiescence* as to what would have been their conduct, had the pressure been removed. I must therefore restrain my view to that portion of this time, during which any means of political action was in their hands; and, referring to that portion, what are indeed the facts which it presents?

“ In the year 1792, the Catholic Committee of that day thought it necessary to publish resolutions, stating that, ‘ the Committee had been informed, that reports had been circulated, that the application of the Catholics for relief extended to total and unqualified emancipation.’—In those days, Sir, the Committee seem to have considered this even as an imputation incumbent on them to repel; for they go on to state, that they ‘ *therefore* think it necessary to declare, that the whole of our late application’ (I now use their own words), ‘ whether to His Majesty’s Ministers, or to men in power, or to private members of the Legislature, neither did nor does contain any thing more in substance, or in principle, than the four following objects:—first, admission to the profession and practice of the law,—secondly, a capacity to serve as county magistrates,—third, a right to be summoned and to serve on grand and petit juries,—fourth, the 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 rents a farm

of 20*l.* per annum in addition to his 40*s.* freehold, or else shall be in possession of a freehold of 20*l.* a year.'

" This formal act of the Committee was issued into the world under the signature of their Secretary, to undeceive the public as to those points on which they had taken up such *erroneous* impressions. Well, in the very year following, the Irish Parliament conceded not merely the whole of this ultimatum of Catholic desire, but a vast deal more,—the elective franchise unrestrained, and admission to very many offices not here alluded to. But, what has been the degree of content and moderation, what the order and purity of elections, what the mildness and constitutional language of the various organs of public feeling, whether aggregate or representative, which have ever since existed, what the feelings between man and man, which Ireland has ever since exhibited,—I shall not trespass on the House by detailing; wishing they should take the fact from what must be their own knowledge, rather than from my statement.

" Sir, hardly were the political concessions granted, when Ireland was in a flame from end to end; and one continued month of peace or security it has never known, from that hour to the present! And yet are we called on to assume as a matter so evident, that nothing but the most wilful and intolerant bigotry can prevent us from acknowledging, that the progress of Catholic content is in the direct proportion of the *concession of political power!!!*

" I know it will be said, that all this is easily accounted for; that the ambition of man is naturally progressive, and that so long as there is any unobtained residue of what is sought for, agitation will necessarily prevail.

" Well, then, Sir, I will not shrink from the task, however painful, of contemplating the career of the Catholic party when last they possessed in Ireland political power *unrestrained*.—Gentlemen on both sides of the House have talked much of the Revolution in England, have discussed

the measures of its great founders, and the true nature of their views; rightly considering it as a period when the springs of human action were developed in the fullest manner, and particularly as a time when the measures taken were intimately connected with the subject now under our consideration: but I know not how it is, that, as if by common consent on both sides of the House, they have abstained from the smallest allusion to what was passing in Ireland at the same period—which, however, will be found, if I mistake not, to abound with matter much more apt for illustration.

“ In the last year of King James the Second, after a lapse of twenty-four years since any Parliament had sat in Ireland, he summoned one to meet in Dublin, in his own immediate presence. For obvious reasons, Catholicity was likely to be its ruling characteristic; indeed, the Catholics naturally exerted all their energies to procure the returns of their friends at a moment so auspicious for their views: and it was the curious, and to us perhaps not uninteresting result of their exertions, that the House of Commons which was returned consisted of *six* Protestants and about *two hundred and thirty* Catholics.

“ Here, then, *are* the Catholics for the last time IN FULL POWER. Let us now inquire, what measures they pursued.

“ Before entering on any view of their proceedings, allow me to observe that this was no casual concourse of the dregs of the people, but the genuine Catholic Aristocracy of Ireland. I could easily enumerate the names of its principal members; but the detail might appear invidious, as they are generally the names of the families who in the same towns and counties (from which these members were respectively returned) at this day possess deservedly the greatest influence. In truth, Sir, they were not only the political but the natural progenitors of some of the most respectable members of the present Catholic Committee. Like that Com-

mittee, they possessed the property, the intelligence, and the spirit of the party of that day! like them also, they consisted of persons, individually no doubt of great respectability and worth, but whose actions *as a party* it remains for us to consider.

“ Their first step was to repeal an Act well known in Ireland by the name of the Act of Settlement—of which it may not be unnecessary to inform the English Gentlemen in this House, that it was an Act which had passed in the 14th and 15th years of Charles the Second, confirming to the various Protestant proprietors the estates which, after the troubles of his father’s reign, and a long course of grants and forfeitures, a court of claims had respectively allotted to them.—Many of these lands, I am ready to admit, had been seized by the violence and injustice inseparable from civil wars; but the infinitely greater proportion of them had been forfeited by the undoubted treasons of the original proprietors. This Act of Settlement, as appears by the Down Survey, constituted the title to rather more than 12 millions of English acres, that is, to about two thirds of the whole of Ireland: twenty-seven years had then elapsed since the passing of the Act; and these lands had become the object, not merely of family settlements and incumbrances, but of the most extensive improvements that had ever been effected within the same period in any country.—This Act was simply repealed by the Catholic Parliament, and the whole of these lands vested in His Majesty for the purpose of re-delivery to the old Catholic proprietors, as they might respectively make good their titles: and such repeal thus summarily disposed of all the property which the Protestants of Ireland had acquired during the forty-eight years preceding,—during the last twenty-seven of which they had been in undisturbed and unquestioned possession!

“ I am aware that I address some Gentlemen, who, if they spoke out upon this subject, think that this Parliament

was not much to blame for re-possessing themselves, however roughly, of the estates of their ancestors. But, waving all argument on that point, I will only observe that the next Act of this Parliament was one which cannot plead even such justification; for the first Act of Repeal operated as a seizure of only two thirds of Ireland, while in the remaining third the Protestants possessed a great quantity of Real property acquired long prior to that period—acquired not by forfeiture, but by purchase and intermarriage; and this became the object of a second Act, to which I shall beg now to advert.

“This second Act, Sir, enumerates a long list of names of Protestant Nobility and Gentry, declaring that every one of them are ‘thereby declared and adjudged traitors, convicted and attainted of high treason, and shall suffer such pains of death, and penalties of forfeiture, as in cases of high treason are accustomed.’ To enable the House to judge of the general nature of this list, it may be sufficient to observe that it contained the names of sixty-two Lay and nine Spiritual Peers, above thirty Baronets, above eighty Clergymen, very nearly two thousand two hundred Esquires, and many others—in all NEARLY TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED PERSONS.”

Here is a specimen of Catholic MODERATION, IN POWER!

LETTER XV.

SIR,

UNDER the cloak of RELIGION, and in the sacred name of JESUS CHRIST, the Priesthood of Ireland frequently enjoin on the generous natives a course of Church-discipline as severe as Egyptian bondage! They impose heavy fines, and extort pecuniary contributions, under the fictitious pre-

tence of "DUES;" they inflict cruel bodily punishments for imaginary offences, and demand the punctual performance of difficult pilgrimages or painful processions; they work supposed *Miracles*, exorcise the deluded peasantry, and otherwise impose on the illiterate by foul artifices; they refuse "the Rites of the Church," and terrify their followers, for acts which are in themselves either indifferent, or even laudable; they withdraw from places of gratuitous education the children of their poor, who might receive moral and virtuous lessons by Masters of their own Communion; they encourage the most gross Heathenism, promote "Purgatorian Penny Societies," and allow the deepest state of human degradation to continue, rather than see an English Bible in the hands of their ignorant flock, or only the Gospel extracts of Mrs. Trimmer! These facts are incontrovertible.

In a pamphlet now lying on my table it is stated, that the present Bishop Waldron opposed the London Hibernian Society, and promised to establish Catholic schools; in expectation of which, John Tympany, relying on the word of his Bishop, quitted the said Society's school, and was reduced to beggary! The Hibernian Society's schools use *only* the Spelling-book and Holy Scriptures, without any controversial or religious tract whatever; yet *the late Bishop of Killala*, as well as the present Doctor, denounced horrible curses against poor Roman Catholics who encouraged these schools, by sending their children to them, as you will perceive on reading the following letter and affidavits.

Copy of a Letter sent March 27th, 1811, from the Right Rev. DOMINICK BELLEW, Titular Bishop of Killala, to the Rev. Mr. BOLAND, Roman Catholic Priest of the Parish of Killglass, in the County of Sligo.

"REVEREND SIR,

"On Sunday next, Mr. Haran and I attend at Killglass Chapel, in order to cry down the nefarious Deistical Schools

which the unrelenting enemies of our religion have dared to establish, together with all their spurious productions.

“Assure all parents who will persevere in permitting the growing generation to attend such places, that no Priest shall console or absolve them, even at the hour of their death; and order the same thing to be done, bis, ter, et sæpius, in Drumard and Skrien. Vive, vale.

“*March 27,*

“DOMINICUS ALLADENSIS,

“*To Rev. Mr. Boland, Dromore West.*”

“John Tympany, of Logdoon, Schoolmaster of one of the Hibernian charity schools, in the parish of Templeboy, barony of Tyreragh, and county of Sligo, came before a Magistrate at Sea-view (R. Hillas, Esq.), on the 12th of April 1811; and being duly sworn, said, that on Sunday, the 7th of that month, the Rev. Francis Boland, parish Priest of the said parish, did, in the chapel of the said parish, read a letter, written by the Rev. Dominick Bellew, Titular Bishop of Killala, to the said Priest, &c. &c.—and then recited the above Letter.”

“*County of Sligo to wit.*—John Cavanaugh and Martin Gordon, both of the parish of Killglass, in the barony of Tyreragh and county of Sligo, for the Hibernian Society Schools (Teachers), came before me this day, and voluntarily made oath on the Holy Evangelists: and said, that on Sunday, the 31st of March last, the Rev. Dominick Bellew, Titular Bishop of Killala, came to the Chapel of the said parish of Killglass, accompanied by the Rev. James Haran, parish Priest of Castleconnor; and that the said Haran said, that the Societies' Schools were poisonous and pernicious baits, thrown out in order to seduce the children, and to take them from the paths of Heaven, to the eternal pains of Hell; that on the said day, the above Bishop, in the said Chapel, said, that if he (the said Bishop) had any of the

Societies' book, he would tear them and trample them under his feet,—for he would suffer *but a few* TO READ HIS OWN BIBLE, and much less the PROTESTANT BIBLE, because it leads them into a thousand errors. He (the said Bishop) asked William Atkinson and John Hart, both teachers in said parish, if they quitted teaching those schools? They said they did quit, upon the prohibition of the said Haran : and (the Deponents) could say much more ; but the above are the heads of their depositions, in consequence of which Deponents lost their schools.

“ Sworn before me, this 11th day of April 1811.

“ ROBERT HILLAS.

“ John Cavanaugh and Martin Gordon.”

Sir, to rescue Ireland from its forlorn condition, would, indeed, be a real “ CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION,” and a labour worthy of your high character for Benevolence and Christian Philanthropy. But we never hear the Politicians of a Dublin Committee, or the Members of a British Catholic Board, declaim against such consequences of *Spiritual* domination in our Empire. When the common people of Ireland are “ *emancipated*,” in the best sense of this term, we shall be ready to grant all the *Secular* power which Priests will not abuse, and cannot apply to religious objects. I should like, in the mean time, to learn from well-informed persons, what would be the probable effect of exchanging Protestant Magistrates in that “ Island of Saints” for Popish ones ; most of whom, we see, are already prepared by the superstitious religion of their Church, to become the oppressive tools of a tyrannising Hierarchy, and the persecuting opposers of *charitable* Protestantism.

As an illustration of the spirit and temper of many Roman Catholic Clergy *at the present time*, where the law does not reach them, and their defenceless people are kept in a state of vassalage, I might fill an entire volume from the

Reports of Education Societies, devoted exclusively to the service of Ireland : but, I shall here confine myself to ONE SOURCE of information ; and transcribe only a brief abstract, authenticated by names (which I omit) of the several parties concerned, and written by an oppressed person, whose case forms the subject of a pamphlet now before me.

You will here discern the illegal tyranny which, even at this day, is exercised towards subjects and inhabitants of the British Empire ; and may infer the tendency of those Church-principles by which we should also be governed, if a Protestant Administration did not protect us. You will perceive, that the power of Bishops and Priests ought to be greatly curtailed, in order to afford poor Natives of Ireland the benefit of OUR CIVIL CONSTITUTION ; and that the moral character of the lower classes in that country can never be elevated, without the general diffusion of useful knowledge.

This recent and authentic account is as follows :—

“ The Author feeling himself an injured and oppressed individual, who has fallen undeservedly under the displeasure of a Superior of his Order, and without any immediate means of procuring redress, thinks it advisable to lay a statement of his case before a tribunal whose impartiality he can rely on ; namely, the Public. It is true he cannot expect from them any satisfaction for the loss of character which he has sustained ; nor for the deprivation of his only means of support : nor yet can he hope for any recompense from the Public for the affliction of mind under which he has laboured, by being excluded from the sacred function of the Priesthood, in which he was early initiated ; and in the discharge of which he spent many years of the prime and vigour of his life, not only in his native land, but in regions far remote.

“ He is well convinced that nothing short of a public exposure of the evil practices which have crept into the Church, will be able to effect a proper reform in the lives

and conduct of the Clergy. A love of filthy lucre, and a proneness to indulge in sensual gratifications, are the foundation on which the present system of Clerical practice seems to be built; a practice generally adopted by the inferior Clergy, and either publicly countenanced by their Bishops, or tacitly connived at, for interested purposes!

“That abuses have crept into the Church, every impartial man of every religious persuasion must allow, unless he is determined to give up his own sense and reason to the interested views of others. That the lives of the Roman Catholic Clergy, at this day, in Ireland, as well as on the continent, are not much more correct than those of the Clergy at the time of the Reformation, when Luther inveighed against them, is a melancholy truth, which cannot be denied; and which ought to make a serious impression on the minds of those who justly appreciate our most holy religion, which may suffer at present, as it did formerly, from the severe scourge of one of its own members.—*Amicus Plato, Amicus Socrates, sed magis Amica Veritas.* Great as our love is for the Clergy, still greater should be our love for the truth.”

The author relates that his Bishop “endeavoured to starve him to death by means of a major Excommunication; and this Excommunication was to be read in all the Chapels of the diocese by each Priest to his respective flock—that no means of support, consolation, or sustenance should be left him, but to die like a dog in a ditch, if the Priest or man on whom the attack was made should be so weak as to become the dupe of such ill-timed fulminations.

“By a major Excommunication one is deprived of all the goods of the Church, and even of Christian burial, of assisting at Mass, or Divine Service, or Office of any kind, at the prayers of the Church!! It deprives a man of receiving the Sacraments, of the functions of Holy Orders, of all Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and of all the suffrages of the

Church; in such a manner, that those who have incurred this censure take no part in the affairs of the Church, unless they shall have a legitimate excuse. For a greater clearing of this matter, I will reduce to five classes the goods of which a man is deprived by a major Excommunication. They are contained in this verse:—

Os, orate, vale, communio, mensa negatur.

“The word *Os* signifies that the faithful should not speak to an excommunicated person; *Orare*, that they should not pray in his company; *Vale*, that they should not bid him the time of day, nor show him any mark of civility or respect; *Communio*, shows that they should not live in the same house, nor under the same roof, negotiate work, nor have any intercourse with him; *Mensa negatur*, signifies that the faithful should not eat, or drink, or sleep, with an excommunicated person. When denounced, all the faithful are forbidden, under pain of a minor Excommunication, to commune in any respect with the excommunicated person: but before this denunciation, the faithful may commune with them, and afford whatever is not forbidden in the divine or natural law.

“By the above we see, that, after the denunciation, the faithful are obliged to avoid the excommunicated person under pain of incurring a minor Excommunication.

“The Clergy never explain to their flocks the reasons that excuse from a major Excommunication; it is not their interest to do it. They only instil into them that by an Excommunication they are on the brink of destruction, and just ready to fall into the fiery furnace of hell!! This they do to keep them in awe, and to spread the veil of ignorance over their eyes; in order that they may be subject to themselves, and to themselves *alone*, upon all occasions!!!

“The poor are kept in the dark; and this is the interest of their Clergy, who tyrannize over them more than the In-

dian Chiefs do over the savages who inhabit the most uncultivated regions of the earth! It is but too well known that it is the want of preaching the Gospel, and inculcating its evangelical principles, in imitation of the maxims taught by Christ, by example and word, that make Roman Catholics so stupid and lukewarm in their duty to God and their neighbour: and when they see their instructors give a bad example themselves, in the violation of the principles that bind and link society together, what wonder that they, the lower orders, should be led out of the path, and commit the excesses we see daily by woful experience, which too frequently bring them to condign punishment? And all this owing to their Clergy keeping them in ignorance, with the oppression, extortion, and the tyranny of their curses and excommunications; which are always ready, even on the *most insignificant and trivial occasions!*"

Speaking of the Bishop, we are told, "His Lordship (in opposition to the London Hibernian Society) said, he would establish Catholic Schools in these two parishes, and appoint Schoolmasters for that purpose, with salaries of twenty pounds per annum. Full of this expectation, John Tympany (who had a wife and a house-full of very helpless children, and was in possession of twenty guineas a year by teaching one of the charity schools established for the benefit of the poor) was deprived of the means of supporting his wife and helpless family. Relying on the veracity of his Lordship's word of honour, he was drawn from his allegiance to the society, and lost a year's salary of twenty guineas! This poor man now has no alternative but that of going to beg! It is true the Bishop gave him a black suit of clothes; and so transformed him from Shane-Bane to Shane-Dough. The poor man was known by the name of *Shane-Bane*, which signifies *White John*. *Shane-Dough* is *Black John*, into which he was transformed by wearing the Bishop's black suit of second-hand clothes; which stands

the poor man in twenty guineas, and reduces him to the extremity of going to beg! He is indeed an honest, well-meaning man, who knows the Irish language well, and whose instructions to the Irish youth would be of great utility. I have seen very few who know the Irish better.

“ Doctor W. on his arrival to this diocese of Killala, to prove his firmness in discharge of his Apostolic mission, assembled all his Clergy, and preached the necessity of holding fast the principles of the most ancient religion from the time of Christ and his Apostles, down to the present epoch; that, to hold fast to it, and not to be turned about with every wind of doctrine, it would be necessary to begin and fix the Bishop on a permanent footing; that this could only be done by paying in to him all the money extorted by all and each of his Clergy, since the decease of the Right Rev. Doctor Bellew, to his commencement of assuming the reins of his Episcopal government.

“ That no one may be at a loss to know wherein this extortion lies; it is the Bishop’s exacting half-a-guinea, instead of half-a-crown, for the dispensation of banns,—making, at a very moderate average of this merchantable commodity, from five to six hundred pounds a year, by allowing from twenty to forty marriages in each parish. Formerly the dispensation of banns was but half-a-crown: now it is half-a-guinea; having no right, authority, or law, for this augmentation. Baptism is raised from an English shilling to an English half-crown: Legacy, on every corpse, from an English crown to ten shillings; which if the Priest does not get immediately, he will take away the pot, the wheel, or the blanket!! I have known a certain Priest, where the above furniture was wanting, *to take the hens from the roost!!* This Legacy they must get (though they were sure the miserable individual who survives had not a bit to put into his mouth that night), or some article proportionable in value. The distribution of the holy oils is raised. The

Priests are allowed to get and force a large measure of oats annually from the poorest creature in the parish, the poorest widow not excepted! This collection the Priest is allowed to make; provided that, of the collected oats, he sends a sack to the Bishop annually!!!

“ If the poor had any forecast, they would establish a court of inquiry; to know by what authority, right, or law, they are so inhumanly oppressed. Not from the Pope of Rome, I am sure, can Doctor W. have a right to these forced, exaggerated collections: not from the King; nor from his Parliament.

“ He persecutes me for an example to the rest of his Clergy; that by my sufferings they may be intimidated, and subservient to his orders upon all occasions.

“ The great Father of us all has left us the Sacred Oracles of his divine mandates, in the Holy Scriptures, to govern us during our transitory sojournment in this vale of tears; but the people appointed to be our instructors are determined to blindfold us, in order they may be the better enabled to oppress us!!!

“ The Bishop has Chapels: why not make use of them? Why does he not confine his Priests to hearing the people's confessions in the Chapel; and rescind the scandalous oppressive abuses that his Clergy daily practise, by hearing confessions in private houses? He allows his Clergy to go cabin-hunting, alternately from house to house, and from village to village; to hear confessions in private houses, nay, even in private rooms, in evident opposition to Ecclesiastical discipline, and to the Canons of the Church!

“ At Christmas and Easter, it is the rule with every Parish Priest on Sunday to publish his weekly stations through the villages; ‘ *On Monday, for example, at such a man's house all the villagers are to attend; men, women, married, and unmarried.*’

“ Should, however, any one absent himself this day, for

the want of money or any other excuse, however legitimate, the Priest sends the vestments to his house on the following day, as a punishment upon the miserable man. This poor individual is then obliged, should he pawn his blanket, to prepare a dinner for the Priest; with tea and sugar, bread, beef, mutton, fowl, hay, and oats, and plenty of whiskey: although it may be for the want of a shilling to pay the Priest's dues, that the unfortunate wretch absented himself the day before, which he could not pay at this periodical season of the Priest's dues!!!

“ On Tuesday, the same at some other man's house, in some other village; and so on, until all the confessions are heard in all the parishes of this diocese. Easter comes on, and the same line of conduct is observed by the Priest as at Christmas.

“ At a moderate average, one or two guineas in bread, tea and sugar, beef, mutton, fowl, and whiskey, hay and oats, will not defray the expenses of the Priest; who has a right to invite all his friends to the feast! Any one who wishes to be exempt from these heavy charges, must be on the alert, and very cautious to send butter, eggs, chickens: in a word, he must ingratiate himself well, by means of these little complimentary perquisites, into the Priest's favour, a little before the return of these periodical seasons of Christmas and Easter.

“ Now, before these confessions begin, the Priest tells them, that it is intended to do penance for their sins, which is best done by fasting and prayer; but which is quite opposite to the grand feast that the Priest not only expects, but must necessarily have, though he was sure the miserable creature should go and beg the next day. I leave the world at large to judge what kind of penance that is!!!—Some Priests will not drink whiskey: they must have rum, brandy, or wine, by which they get basely drunk before they leave the poor man's house; and, in return for his civilities, they insult him with the most gross and ignominious language.

“ The good usage which the Priest has got, and the extravagant expenses he has occasioned, are no protection to the poor man against abuse and insult. I have known a Priest (Mr. M——, at Backs), to charge the man of the house for a bottle of wine, when he did not, on one of these occasions, get it to drink ; though the man had a bottle of rum for him. In Templeboy parish, through vengeance and an old grudge, a certain Priest, Mr. B——, went to a poor widow’s house to hear confessions. This poor widow had but a small cock of hay for the use of a little heifer. The hay she sold, to be able to procure a dinner for the Priest. Her means did not allow her to buy any whiskey. The Priest told her, she owed him half-a-crown for confessions : this half-a-crown she retained off the price of the hay, to pay the Priest. Accordingly, when dinner was served up, she said to the Priest, ‘ I have no spirits for you, nor any means to get it but this half-a-crown you say I owe you, and which I retained of the price of my little cock of hay ; will you take it in lieu of the debt, or shall I send it for spirits ? ’ The Priest took the half-a-crown, put it in his pocket, drank water at that dinner ; and replied, ‘ he might soon have a call to some other place, where he could get enough to drink.’

“ I could make up a volume, were I to recapitulate all the abuses of this nature I know ; but for brevity sake I omit them for the present. Every head of a family must pay an English shilling, at Christmas and Easter, and every woman a hank of yarn : the unmarried, sixpence halfpenny. No exceptions of widows, orphans, servants, male or female ; and if any remittance is made, it is to the rich, and not to the poor. It is made to those who are not real objects of charity. Innumerable are the examples of extortions that I could detail.

“ Priests who never have set their feet within the walls of a Convent, Seminary, or College ; who are the real repre-

representatives of ignorance, *Canes muti, non valentes latrare*, as the Prophet describes them; greedy and dumb dogs, not able to bark, are constituted Parish Priests in this deplorable diocese. They have the care of souls, and, like the blind leading the blind, they will both inevitably fall into the ditch. These are they of whom I can enumerate *Eleven* (nearly one half of the number in this diocese), who with unaccountable dominion tyrannize over the imbecility and weakness of their poor adherents; and whom the Bishop is said to hold in great esteem and high honour, for his own private views! Is not this the strongest reason, motive, and incentive, that makes them with so much obstinacy resist the *Veto*, for fear that in any respect whatsoever their clerical dominion should suffer the smallest diminution?

“ Will not those Bishops and Clergymen be considered rather perjurers than loyal subjects, who have taken their oaths of allegiance; and who deny the King a prerogative that cannot, by their concession, hurt their consciences, in consenting to merely a point of discipline, not contrary to faith or morals? If, indeed, they could aver that the *Veto* was contrary to faith or morals, there might they have a founded excuse; and then the King, or any man of sound judgment, would not impute any blame to them, in resisting the *Veto* even at the expense of their lives. They however only see at distance some shadow, which they are afraid will diminish the control and dominion that they have over the minds of the people; who are but too unfortunately dupes to them, in matters that do not concern their eternal salvation.

“ Our Clergymen boast of being Teachers and Doctors of the Catholic Church; that in this Church *alone* Salvation is attainable; that God is their Father; that the Church is their Mother; that they live in the society of the only Spouse of the only Son of God; that they are daily partakers of the Sacraments, those conduits of heavenly grace

to the soul; that they live in the communion of saints, &c. In God's name, if they possess all these advantages and blessings, why do they become extortioners? why oppressors of the children of God? Should not their faith be conformable to their profession? Do not their lives give the lie to their faith? We see them so prone to gratifying the flesh and the world, that no description of people are fonder of their bellies; *Sancho Pansa* never gave greater testimonies of eagerness to fill his paunch than they do! In the pursuit of amassing riches, and aiming at high honours, no class of men can exceed them; and all would be well enough if they did not oppress, and publicly rob, and extort from the poor, even from the most abject examples of poverty!

“ This pamphlet is but the work of a week: and if it does not produce the desired effect, of reforming the Bishop and his Clergy, I will soon put another to press that will be more particular; and that will clearly and more circumstantially depict them in their proper colours, as it will regard *individuals*, with a summary account of their scandalous excesses by which our holy religion is so much trampled on.—I shall be glad that Doctor W. or any of his Clergy, would state in answer to this any of the facts that may appear to him as untrue or fallacious. His answer may lead to a more ample inquiry.

“ The Public will consider his giving *no answer* as a proof that all the facts are true: and if so, an amendment of life and conduct is all that is aimed at and required; which that God may grant, is the humble hearty wish and prayer of the reader's

“ Most obedient humble servant,”

* * * * *

This statement was printed, with the author's name, in 1817; and I know the person who possesses the original manuscript. We have here, Sir, an *authentic* specimen of Irish slavery and Popish Intolerance!

LETTER XVI.

SIR,

MUCH has been said in the foregoing pages, and perhaps you will think too much, about the paramount authority of General Councils; but especially of the famous Council of Trent, which comprised *one hundred and eighty-six* Italians (mostly devoted to the Roman See), *thirty-five* Spaniards, *twenty-seven* Frenchmen, *six* Germans, *six* Greeks, *three* Portuguese, *three* Illyricans, *three* Irishmen, *two* Flemings, *two* Hungarians, *two* Poles, *one* Moravian, *one* Croatian, and *one* Englishman. This was certainly neither a free Council, nor (in my opinion) a General one; but was chiefly made up of the Pope's creatures, the Jesuits and Dominicans; nor were there always *fifty* Prelates in attendance, or even *thirty*, at each session! The notorious decree concerning the canon of Scripture, so highly important, was adopted when only *forty-nine* Bishops were present: yet we are told, by Roman Catholics, that this was a truly oecumenical Council, WHICH OUGHT TO GOVERN US AND THEM!!!

A Committee, appointed by that Papal Assembly, prepared a catalogue of obnoxious books, which they called "INDEX EXPURGATORIUS;" and the rules formed (both then and at other times) for the regulation of works to be read, printed, published, &c. (on the contrary), were denominated "THE LAWS OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX." Some of the most useful books are put into that Index, and prohibited; as Walton's Polyglott Bible, Buxtorff's Lexicon, our Spectators and Tatlers: with hundreds more of equal reputation, in different languages, arts, and sciences; among which are the writings of Erasmus, Stevens, Grotius, and other first-rate scholars; as likewise ALL VERSIONS OF

THE BIBLE MADE BY HERETICS AND SCHISMATICS. These last are strictly and universally forbidden.

If Protestant Bibles, here called "Bibles printed by *Heretics*," must be numbered among the prohibited books of THE INDEX, then it becomes totally impracticable for us to hold any friendly communion or intercourse with *real adherents* to the Papal religion; for, we shall always be at open war, and the intolerant principles of THE CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX will more or less govern our Roman Catholic brethren. Now, in reality, the Rules of the Index are acted upon, as far as possible, by the Vicars Apostolic; and they were attempted to be enforced against the late Mr. Berington and Sir John Throckmorton, as well as against Dr. Geddes, when he published his critical version of the Bible. (See his Letter to the Right Rev. John Douglass, Bishop of Centuriæ, and Vicar Apostolic in the London District, 4to. 1794.) But, perhaps, you know nothing about this INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM, and it may be necessary for me to describe it a little.

Sir, it is a barbarous inquisitorial engine, by means of which literature has been too long kept down, and made wholly subservient to the designs of a tyrannical hierarchy: Rome has its own Index—Madrid, Lisbon, &c. &c. have another Index; each containing a copious list of books, which cannot be sold, kept, or read, by people professing the religion of the Pope, without incurring ecclesiastical penalties and severe pains, in body, soul, and property!! This Papal invention first appeared after Luther began to write against the Church of Rome, and his Reformation had won the hearts of all the considerate men in Europe. It has been always complained of by men of sense and letters.

The 2d, 3d, and 4th Rules of the INDEX, being referred to in one of the late Bulls issued against Bible Societies, I will briefly explain the nature of those Rules; which are *appealed to as of full force* among all who acknowledge

the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and submit to the discipline established by the Council of Trent.

The copy lying before me was printed at Rome, and carries the proceedings of the Congregation down to no further than 1746. This Index of Rome contains ten Rules; with additional instructions and observations, by Pope Clement VIII. and Alexander VII. who imposed much more strict regulations on these subjects than had been previously laid down: so that every Pope may instruct his Inquisitors to be more and more rigid and unreasonable in their proceedings, according to the supposed exigency of the times or circumstances. For example, if Bible Societies be deemed "a crafty and pestilential device, undermining the very foundations of religion" (as Pius the Seventh tells us); then down they must go, and be rooted up, at any cost whatever.

The first Rule condemns all books which had been condemned by Popes and Councils before the year 1515, but they are not particularized in this Index. *The second Rule* totally forbids all the religious books of "Heresiarchs," or leaders of Heretics, such as Luther, Calvin, Zuingle, and others, herein named; yet it allows the books of Heretics, not treating of religion, and sanctioned by Catholic Bishops or Inquisitors, to be perused. *The third Rule* admits of certain ecclesiastical writings, with some restriction; but condemns utterly *all versions of the Scriptures* made by a vast multitude of authors, here classed and enumerated in alphabetical order.

The fourth Rule is very abominable, and contains the words cited in the Bull of June 29, 1816. It begins thus: Cum experimento, &c. "Since it is manifest from experience, that, if the Holy Bible be indiscriminately permitted every where in the vulgar tongue, more injury than good will be produced, from the temerity of men;" and then it goes on to show with what conditions alone the *Faithful* may have, and read, the authorized editions of the Scriptures, translated by

Catholics, with leave IN WRITING from their Parish Priests or Confessors, &c. And unless it be conformed to, they can receive no absolution of their sins!! This Rule was rendered cruelly strict by Pope Clement VIII.—for, by a decree of the Congregation of the Index, June 18, 1757, “No versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue are permitted, except such as are approved by the Apostolic See, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of Holy Fathers of the Church.”—Consequently, these “*LUCIFUGÆ SCRIPTURARUM*,” as Tertullian speaks, dare not now suffer one ray of pure light from the Scriptures of Truth to shine into the chinks of an *inquisitive* Papist’s mind, who does not entirely surrender his conscience and judgment into their hands.

If any should resist the Pope’s will, let them remember what the Trent Catechism tells us; “*that this does not hinder them from being still under the power of the Church, which may judge, punish, and inflict her Anathema.*”

Doubtless, Sir, you know that the Popes have also delegated certain powers to four Vicars Apostolic, absolutely to govern all the English and Scotch Roman Catholics who will submit to them. The tyranny with which they execute their ecclesiastical function has often been loudly complained of; and is sometimes very annoying to both the Priests and Laymen of that communion: but it is the opinion of many great Statesmen, that such Apostolical Agents “*should be expressly prohibited, within this realm,*” from any longer exercising their unconstitutional powers; in which opinion the late Speaker (now Lord Colchester) quite agrees.

In his admirable Speech of May 24, 1818, on the “Relief Bill,” his Lordship said, “The Apostolic Vicars are the direct diplomatic agents of the Papal See, governing ecclesiastically HALF A MILLION of His Majesty’s subjects in Great Britain. § By their offices they are bound to execute

§ It did not occur to my recollection, in making a statement of the rapidly increasing numbers of Roman Catholics, that Lord Col-

the mandates of the Pope, *without the power of hesitation or deliberation*; and these mandates, so delivered, the great majority of the English Roman Catholics have conceived themselves conscientiously bound to obey. This was the complaint loudly made by the English Roman Catholics in 1790; and it is for their protection, as well as for our own safety, THAT NO SUCH OFFICE SHOULD BE TOLERATED WITHIN THE KING'S DOMINIONS."

In particular, he recommended that "some provision should be made (by the Legislature) for imposing an effectual restraint upon spiritual excommunication, so far as to deprive it of *all civil consequences*." He stated, that "many and grievous were the sentences of this sort, which are known to have occurred, both in England and Ireland, in our own times: and it may be enough now to refer to the melancholy fate of those persons who were excommunicated in 1791, for their *civil conduct* in these memorable transactions; and whose misfortunes have been so often and so feelingly lamented, by the English Roman Catholics. Such sentences are derogatory to the *civil rights* of the subject, and in this free country *they should no longer be endured*. Some provisions for remedying these grievances," he observed, "could not be otherwise than acceptable to peaceable and conscientious Roman Catholics;" yet the omission of such a desirable request in the late Petition to Parliament, he said further, must "tend to demonstrate, that RELIGIOUS LIBERTY WAS NOT THE REAL OBJECT OF THE PROMOTERS OF THIS BILL, BUT POLITICAL ASCENDANCY."

The Speaker suggested, on that occasion: "Among the restrictions omitted, and which ought to have been inserted, stands first, the regulation of all religious houses now existing in this realm, and the not suffering others to grow up.

chester had then (six years ago) computed them at "HALF A MILLION" in Great Britain. See LETTER V. page 24.

Within the United Kingdom we have at present BENEDICTINES, FRANCISCANS, DOMINICANS, and almost every other description of Monastic Order. But the JESUITS' funds now at Stonyhurst are alone sufficient to awaken our attention! Of the system of education, indeed, as there conducted, we know only that it is not the same as at Maynooth; and that their young men are afterwards sent out for ordination to the College of the Order in Sicily, from whence they are re-imported into this country. And yet, these are the persons who are *now about to establish themselves in IRELAND, for the purpose of spreading their own peculiar and suspected modes of education.*"—Again, he said, "As to the regulations of the Clergy, and the restrictions of Foreign intercourse, for the purpose of giving us some domestic security against Foreign Encroachments; these, I think, are necessary matters for legislation. But, upon the head of the *Regular Clergy*, it is well known, over and above their imperfect allegiance to their temporal Sovereign, and their allegiance also to the Sovereign Pontiff, that *they* owe also another allegiance, each to the General of his own Order. The General of the Order of the Jesuits is to-day in Russia, to-morrow he may be in France; the General of the Dominicans was in Spain, and is now I believe at Rome: and although Dr. TROY, now the titular Archbishop of Dublin, is himself a Dominican, I confess I do not wish to see others of the same description in the same situations."

THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT, which forms the basis of Protestantism, and tends to destroy spiritual tyranny, has always been opposed by Roman Catholics, on account of the *infallibility* of their Church. Hence it happens, that every man presuming to doubt of their system, and to think wholly for himself, will be deemed an obstinate rebel. To persevere in disbelieving, leads necessarily to a state of independence and schism. It next, therefore, becomes requisite for Ecclesiastics to threaten and denounce

the offender; who is said to have fallen into a mortal sin, which demands auricular confession and priestly absolution: but if a culprit be not thus restored, nothing remains to be done, except a civil magistrate will execute vengeance on the condemned person, now expelled; who yet is canonically held fast, as a subject deserting from his first Lord, and is deemed by the Church *still* liable to death.

This procedure is very different from an act of self-defence and preservation, in a temporal Sovereign; which is not grounded on any mere obliquity of opinion, or speculative error, but upon some outward injury done to the commonwealth, some personal injustice or violence. The former is religious persecution, the latter is political prudence; the one is purely an affair between God and his creature, the other is a business concerning two or more members of a society. The Church of Rome claims this mental allegiance from every soul of man: her empire, though called spiritual, is secular and universal; nor does she conceive it possible for one human being, under any change of circumstances, to be dissolved from the obligation of obeying her dictates, because they are of Divine authority and origin. Such is her reasoning, and these are its *unsocial* consequences.

When religion has become so blended with a bloody policy, that no provision is made for dissenters, toleration is impossible, and cruel laws will inevitably follow: a close alliance between worldly and spiritual objects is, therefore, always dangerous; as tending to debase Christianity and produce hypocrites. But the Church of Rome does not provide for dissenters, cannot allow them to enjoy free worship, cannot admit of any the least rivalry, cannot avoid arbitrary means of upholding itself; and, consequently, never can cease to persecute others *when PHYSICAL power is acquired*. Its canon law, its system, its whole fabric, is a refined policy; moved and excited by an insatiate lust of dominion.

It was therefore wise and statesman-like in Lord Castle-

reagh to say, “ Whilst the Roman Catholic Clergy feel a becoming confidence in the purity of their own intentions, and justly appeal to the tests by which they have solemnly disclaimed all the noxious tenets that have, in former times, been imputed to their Church : whilst they declare that they owe no obedience to the Pope, inconsistent with their duty as good subjects; and that their allegiance to the external Head of their Church is purely spiritual, and restricted to matters of faith and doctrine : *yet, they must be too well versed in the history of mankind not to feel, and to allow, that, so long as SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY IS EXERCISED BY MEN, IT IS PRONE TO MIX ITSELF IN TEMPORAL CONCERNS, more especially in matters which may be considered as affecting the interests of the Church itself, since a taste for power is inseparable from human nature; and that the times may return when the power and influence of the See of Rome, if not restrained by wholesome regulations, may be turned against the temporal interests and security of the State.*

“ Why is the British Government alone, of all the powers in Europe, to remain exposed to a danger, against which it has been the invariable policy of all other States, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, to provide?”

See this whole Speech in Mr. Charles Butler’s *Historical Memoirs of the Catholics*, VOL. II. CH. XXXIX. § 6.

LETTER XVII.

SIR,

I HAVE affirmed, in my last Letter, that the oppressive and infamous “ Laws of the Congregation of the Index,” published at Rome, still remain in full force; and that they are, accordingly, sometimes insisted on by the

Vicars Apostolic acting in Great Britain. How truly, therefore, did Dr. Geddes declare, that "every one who knows what Popish principles are, must consider them as *radically* incompatible with *civil* government; and only ceasing to be hurtful by contingency and circumstances. I have no hesitation," said this *loyal Catholic Priest*, "in asserting, that a **GENUINE CONSISTENT PAPIST** cannot be a good subject under any government! There is hardly a nation in Europe, which has not at times experienced this: and as to their fawning on the established Clergy, it is truly ridiculous! The established Clergy must be dim-sighted indeed, if they can deem such homage sincere, and snuff up incense from a Romish censer.—I have heard a Bishop of the Establishment compared, by a Pope's Vicar, to the skin of a calf stuffed with straw, for the purpose of inducing the deceived cow to let down her milk."

Even Sir John Throckmorton and Mr. Berington were so bold as to admit, that "as long as the present Ecclesiastical Government (by Apostolical Vicars) continues, neither the *principles* nor the *allegiance* of the Catholic Clergy are secure." A letter of M. Quarantotti to Dr. Poynter *proves this*.

The Pontiff himself, on the 17th of April 1808, in his Memorial to M. Champigny, stated very plainly, that the personal allegiance claimed by the reigning civil power over the French Cardinals, "could not avail against the sacred obligations undertaken in the Church of God;" thus evincing the nullity and absolute childishness of all ties to temporal governors, which they who rule in the Church may determine to be prejudicial to the interests of their "**DIVINE HIERARCHY.**"

Mr. Charles Butler has printed a very learned pamphlet to demonstrate the *supremacy* of the Bishop of Rome.—But, **JUDGE BLACKSTONE** observes, that "while Papists acknowledge a *foreign* power, *superior* to the sovereignty of the kingdom, they cannot complain if the laws of that king-

dom will not treat them upon the footing of *good subjects* :” and, it was well said by King Henry VIII. in his speech on the 11th of May 1532, “ All the Prelates at their consecration make an oath to the Pope, clean contrary to the oath which they make to us ; so that they seem to be *his* subjects, not ours.”

Bishop Poynter, in his examination by a Committee of the House of Commons, in 1816, as also in a letter which I myself received from him (dated August 24, 1818), plainly shows his settled determination to be governed by the “ Laws of the Congregation of the Index.” § And Bishop Milner, in his late Inquiry into the Vulgar Errors of the Irish, complained of certain Societies in the following terms: “ Among other pious frauds of these Societies in Ireland, in order to trick the Catholic inhabitants out of their religion, is that of endeavouring to persuade them that their own Popes and most eminent Divines advise them to lay aside their Catechisms, turn a deaf ear to their Pastors, and hammer their own religion out of the several books of the Bible. For this purpose they have published and circulated among the Catholic poor, a *garbled* and *corrupt* translation of a letter from Pope Pius VI. to Martini of Florence, in commendation of his translation of the Scriptures into Italian: but they have taken care to suppress the passages in which His Holiness enforces the Rules of the Index, and praises the work for having notes to explain difficult passages conformably to the doctrine of the holy fathers.”

The irreconcilable opposition between our Church and that of Rome in the article of reposing on Scripture ALONE

§ See a “ Correspondence on the Formation, Objects, and Plan of the Roman Catholic Bible Society; including Letters from the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Clifford, Right Rev. Bishop Poynter, Rev. Peter Gandolphy, Ant. Richard Blake and Charles Butler, Esqrs.—with Notes and Observations, exhibiting the genuine Principles of Roman Catholics. London, 1813.”

(without human authority) for salvation, is very striking: our Church says, “*Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation*; so that, whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” The sacred books then enumerated as Canonical, exclude what the Church of Rome (in opposition to most of the earliest Fathers) imposes on its followers *as equal in authority with the rest*: and our twentieth Article enforces the doctrine already delivered in the sixth, denying all right in the Church to “ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s word *written*; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another.”

The author of the History of the Jesuits has given a body of irrefragable proof, “that the Church of Rome is as much opposed *at this moment*, as she has been at any former period of her history, to the introduction of THE BIBLE into her system of education; and that, in point of fact, her present Bishops, Vicars Apostolic, and subordinate Clergy, do *now* object to the reading of the Sacred Volume, without their own unscriptural comments and glosses—that they vilify Bible Societies, censure their Members, scandalize the motives of all who join those Societies; and, in short, do still oppose themselves, on all occasions, to the general use and free circulation of the Scriptures of eternal truth.

“Upon this, indeed, as on other points to which she has pertinaciously adhered, in defiance alike of scriptural truth and of right reason, we are at a loss whether to feel most astonishment and indignation at her obstinate attachment to the grossest errors, or at the ignorant assertions of certain ill-informed Protestants; who contend that the Church of Rome is influenced at present by *more liberal principles* than she once avowed; and even approximates,

in the spirit of genuine charity, to a cordial co-operation with such *Heretics* as ourselves.

“If any thing approaching to such superior principles, and such an improved spirit, could be shown to exist on the part of the Catholics, there is no sincere Christian, and no honest man, who would not heartily hail and rejoice in their appearance. It is, however, but too evident, that the direct contrary of all this is the fact; and it therefore behoves us to ascertain, in the midst of abundant profession, which costs nothing; and means as little, whether, while the voice which we hear is the voice of Jacob, the hands be not *the hands of Esau.*”

From the materials there collected, the writer observes, “that the Roman Catholic Clergy, residing at this moment in our own Metropolis, are decided, as one man, against the employment of the Bible in the work of Education, except to serve a purpose; that their objections are not only to the Bible, as translated by Protestants, but also to the indiscriminate use of *their own version of the Bible*: and that such is the length to which their prejudice and bigotry have conducted them, that they object altogether to any Extracts being used by Children from the Protestant version; even although it should be certain that the passages extracted were, *totidem verbis*, the same as in the Catholic version!!! We likewise find a sufficiently distinct avowal, on the part of their Priesthood, that the most profound ignorance and vice are more desirable in the Children of Roman Catholics, than that they should be permitted to associate with other children of different religious denominations, for the purpose of Education; although no mixture of religious instruction should be attempted to be inculcated, beyond the use of the Bible as a Class Book.

“It further appears, that a School in St. Giles’s, which was founded upon this broad principle, and had been remarkably instrumental in cultivating the minds, and improv-

ing the morals, of the poor in that quarter of the Metropolis, had excited the indignation of an active Romish Priest, who publicly preached against the School, from his pulpit; immediately after which, the School was attacked by the Catholics, and a child of the Master was finally made a cripple for life. Not contented with the personal visits and preachings of London Priests against this School, one or two of the Clergy from Ireland have been lately engaged in the same *pious* cause! and, in order to produce the greater effect, a Dublin Preacher addressed the people at St. Patrick's Chapel in the *Irish language!!!*

“ Let it now be fairly considered by Mr. Canning, and the other ‘enlightened advocates of the Catholic Claims,’ whether facts of this description, attested by the evidence of the Catholics themselves, before one branch of the Legislature, tend to encourage any reasonable hope, that if the Religion of Popery were to be strengthened with power, the Religion of *Protestantism* would be tolerated, or the free use of the Bible be endured; whether, in fact, the spiritual tyranny from which the Reformation delivered us, would not again revive in all its force, and the blood of CRANMER, of HOOPER, of LATIMER, and of RIDLEY, be found to have flowed in vain ?

“ It is generally admitted that Bishop Poynter and Mr. Butler (whose examination is here detailed) are among the most enlightened, candid, and moderate men of their religious persuasion; and that, if it were possible, they would readily concede something to oblige and conciliate their Parliamentary friends: but even these Gentlemen cannot depart from their fundamental principles, whenever they are put to the test: and, therefore, in a moment of conflict or severe trial, it will be seen that no approximation whatever can be made towards the sentiments and feelings of Protestants. Under such discordant circumstances, how is a political

union to be effected? and what stability can they possibly give to a *Protestant Constitution?*"

KING JAMES's Translators of our Bible (first published in 1611) tell us in the Preface, that "the Church of Rome would seem at length to bear a motherly affection towards her children, and to allow them the Scriptures in their mother tongue: but indeed, it is a gift not deserving to be called a gift, an unprofitable gift: they must first get a license *in writing* before they may use them; and to get that, they must approve themselves to their confessor,—that is, to be such as they are, if not frozen in the dregs, yet soured with the leaven of their superstition. Howbeit, it seems too much to Clement the Eighth, that there should be *any* license granted to have them in the vulgar tongue; and therefore, he overruleth and frustrateth the grant of Pius the Fourth! So much are they afraid of the light of Scripture, that they will not trust the people with it; no, not as it is set forth by their own sworn men; no, not with the license of their own Bishops and Inquisitors. Yea, so unwilling are they to communicate the Scriptures to the people's understanding, in any sort, that they are not ashamed to confess *that we forced them to translate it into English against their wills*. This seemeth to argue a bad cause, or a bad conscience, or both."

In their Epistle Dedicatory, the Translators again allude to "Popish persons at home or abroad, who therefore malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God's holy truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness."

If any one fancies that English or Irish Papists may without such permission *freely* peruse the Bibles as translated by their own Bishops; let him see the injunctions prefixed to their late editions, expressly to prevent this liberty among both "*learned*" and unlearned Roman Catholics.

So far from approving of the pious scriptural example

given to us in the conduct of Timothy's Grandmother and Mother, who "*from a Child*" instructed him in "the Holy Scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation" (2 Tim. iii. 15); the *modern, revised* Catholic translation of the New Testament has a formal "ADMONITION" prefixed to it, putting the English reader on his guard; and telling him, "IT WAS JUDGED NECESSARY TO FORBID THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THE VULGAR LANGUAGES, WITHOUT THE ADVICE AND PERMISSION OF THE PASTORS AND SPIRITUAL GUIDES WHOM GOD HAS APPOINTED TO GOVERN HIS CHURCH—NOR IS THIS DUE SUBMISSION TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TO BE UNDERSTOOD OF THE IGNORANT AND UNLEARNED ONLY, BUT ALSO OF MEN ACCOMPLISHED IN ALL KINDS OF LEARNING."—"From this high authority," says Bishop Poynter, in his *New Year's Gift* for 1813, "you have received the Scriptures, and the *true sense* of the Scriptures: from the same you learn, *with absolute certainty*, what Christ really taught, instituted, and commanded. By this authority, rising errors have been condemned in all ages, and unity of faith has been preserved. This authority" OF THE PRIESTHOOD "is the pillar and ground of truth." (See pp. 50 and 75 of a *Correspondence on the Roman Catholic Bible Society*, 1813.)

Such is the *present* practice of the Romish Church: to which, I may add, that endless testimonies might be easily produced, to show the activity of Bishops and Priests, in Ireland, England, and even in this very metropolis, to prevent the people from reading *their own authorized version*.

The late GENERAL MATHEW (on supporting an Irish Petition, presented by Sir Henry Parnell, said, in the House of Commons, "*He trusted His Majesty's Ministers would remember, that the eyes of the country were upon them, and that they were expected to make themselves completely masters of the tenets and faith of the Roman Catholic religion.*" One of these tenets, perhaps then unknown to

General Mathew, is, that the Sovereign Pontiff must be considered as "*God's Vicar on earth, the Supreme Head of the whole Church, the Representative of God made man, before whom Kings are but dust and ashes.*" Abbé La Trappe tells us so!

I cannot conclude this Letter in more forcible language than the words of Lord Colchester afford me: "Their Prelates will still inculcate the same doctrine, and bow with the same implicit obedience to the Papal authority: § and this SPIRITUAL JURISDICTION, we have been distinctly told by the highest Roman Catholic authority in England, can be completely exercised, if necessary, by mere personal AGENCY; utterly passing by all ostensible securities, and without the formal intervention of any WRITTEN INSTRUMENT, OR DOCUMENT, OR ANY STATE-CONTROL WHATEVER. This spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff, however exercised, is incompatible with the Protestant constitution of these realms: and this usurped dominion, although it be subdued and eclipsed for a time in France" [i. e. during 1818], "has recently blazed forth in Spain; and we may be well assured it never can be a harmless guest, much less a safe co-estate, with the government of any country under heaven. I feel it incumbent on me to repeat that, in my opinion, the great stand to be made for the preservation of our Constitution in Church and State, must be against the admission of Roman Catholics to seats in Parliament: a concession which would virtually accomplish, at no distant period, THEIR ADMISSION INTO EVERY OTHER BRANCH OF POLITICAL POWER; and an event which I dread and deprecate, and shall think it my duty to resist to the uttermost."

§ Lord Castlereagh, in a Parliamentary debate on the VETO, stated, that "the Apostolic Vicars were mere Missionaries, removable at pleasure, and obliged implicitly to obey all orders from Rome."—Are these agents, therefore, fit persons to direct the consciences of British subjects?

LETTER XVIII.

SIR,

IN the 8th and 9th chapters of the Koran, you may see that the Impostor MAHOMET gave express precepts and authority to propagare his religion by the sword. He tells his disciples "to strike off the ends of their enemies' fingers, and to kill idolaters wherever they are found;" and he says, "Ye Christian Dogs, you know your option—the Koran, the Tribute, or the Sword:" but, such precepts and injunctions form part of the Mahomedans' RELIGION, and *they* too might petition any Christian Legislature with which such men could live, to admit *them* into the supreme national council. They might urge: "We are subject to privations and restrictions, most unjustly, for no cause but our adherence to an ancient and pure RELIGION; which forbids us to take your common Test, Oath, or Declaration of loyalty; and it is solely owing to our conscientious attachment to principles of a *religious nature*, that we cannot do so; which principles, WE PETITIONERS AFFIRM, do not interfere or conflict with any of the moral, civil, or political duties we owe to your present Establishment."—Now, I ask, if this be not the *exact* prayer of a new Petition from English Roman Catholics, signed by more than 10,300 of them?

"They remain subject to penal laws, *merely* on account of their refusal of certain Religious Tests, Oaths, and Declarations: that they refuse these, is solely owing to their conscientious adherence to principles *merely* of a Religious nature, and not conflicting with any moral, civil, or political duty: that the Petitioners have, at different times, presented Petitions to the House for relief from the laws remaining in force against them; and they now again approach the House, with the most perfect reliance on its wisdom and

humanity—most humbly praying that the House will take their case into consideration, and grant them such relief as they shall deem proper *for extending to them the enjoyment, in common with their fellow-subjects, of the blessings of the Constitution.*—This is a very fallacious, and yet a very plausible, mode of stating their case.

I am a Churchman; but can assent to Archdeacon Paley's words, that "differences of opinion, *when accompanied with mutual CHARITY*, are for the most part *innocent*, and for some purposes useful: they promote inquiry, discussion, and knowledge; they help to keep up an attention to religious subjects, and a concern about them,—which might be apt to die away in the calm and silence of universal agreement. I do not know (adds he) that it is in any degree true, that the influence of religion is the greatest where there are the fewest Dissenters."—Paley's Evidences, Vol. II. chap. vii. p. 389, 4th Edition, 1794.

Let us hear a Dissenter speak on this topic, as *he* cannot be interested or prejudiced in favour of our Church: I copy the following Extract from a sensible Letter by a "*Protestant Dissenter*," in the Bristol Journal of March 27, 1819; signed "CANDIDUS."

"I have said that the Catholic labours under disabilities, because his religious sentiments militate against the principles of the Constitution, and I think the truth of the assertion is capable of the clearest demonstration. The Church established by law, is a part of the Constitution; and, though the Catholics profess to have no intention of overturning it, yet I must remind them that their profession is flatly contradicted by their religious principles. With regard to other religious systems, the uniform language of all the standard documents of the Catholic Church is—*anathema*. Its hierarchy, its government, its discipline, its creeds, are all founded on the same common principle of exclusive intolerance. From the Vatican of Rome to the

meanest cabin in Ireland, *one Church* is the watch-word of Catholicity: Catholics cannot consistently acknowledge any other; nor are they at liberty to sit with indifference in any assembly, where the interests of another Church are promoted.

“ If, on being admitted into Parliament, they were to act according to their principles, their first effort should be to abolish the Church of England, and to establish the Church of Rome. I do not mean to blame them for this; but I blame them for denying it. Let them come forward as Catholics; but let them come as Catholics who wish to be consistent; and let them candidly declare, that their principles are such as to require *the overthrow of the present Church Establishment, and the setting up of their own*;— and then let the Legislature judge of the true character of their claims.

“ I may be told that the Catholics disavow the intention which I have laid to their charge: I know they disavow it; and I know, also, that they disavow the principle of intolerant religious exclusion, which I have ascribed to their system; but how is the disavowal made? It is made by individuals who have *no authority* to make it! The character which I have given to Catholicity, has been drawn for it in the *Bulls of Popes, and in the Canons and Decrees of Councils*; but it has been disavowed by individuals only, or by bodies of Laity, not competent to make such disavowal, or by unauthorized meetings of Clergymen, equally incompetent.

“ The claims of ancient Catholicity have been dexterously lowered or raised, according to the spirit and circumstances of the times; but nothing has been changed: all has been reserved for future exigencies. Every one will admit that the obnoxious and intolerant principle to which I have adverted, is to be found in the *Bulls of Popes, and in the Canons and Decrees of Councils*; and yet I am certain

that none will affirm, that authority *equally competent* has been employed to disavow it. To say that *individuals* do so, or even bodies of individuals, is saying nothing to the purpose. If any man, or body of men, the subjects of this realm, should propose entering into a commercial contract with me, which an act of the British Parliament had pronounced to be illegal; would not the public consider me a fool were I to embark my whole property in such a contract, merely because the individuals concerned had said that *they* did not acknowledge the obligation referred to? Should I not act more consistently with my own interests, were I to tell them, that, however promising the results of the contract might be considered in itself, yet, as their disavowal of the law that made it illegal would be of no avail in a day of trial, I could not enter on the contract *until that law should be repealed by the same authority by which it was at first enacted?*

“Common sense would in this instance approve my conduct. I would act the same part in the question of Catholic Emancipation. Let the Church of Rome, by Bulls of Popes, and Decrees of Councils, remove from her standards her *anathemas* against those Churches which differ from her: for, until this be done, those CIVIL Constitutions of which such Churches form a part, are bound to exclude Catholics from so FREE a participation in their privileges as might give them an opportunity of doing those Churches an injury.”

Another Dissenter, of popularity and respectable name (*Mr. John Hyatt*), has just published a warning Sermon, which contains these passages:

“To an unprejudiced mind, there does not appear the least room for doubt respecting what is the paramount object for which the Catholics are struggling. Their pretext, till of late, has been religious liberty; but, *now* it is evident that *civil* power is the object to which they aspire. Already,

they have more religious liberty than Protestant Dissenters enjoy. Their unquestionable aim is to grasp power; and for what purpose? Certainly not to suffer it to lie dormant in their hands, but to employ it against Protestantism. He whose eyes are but half open, and whose mind is but half awake, must see that, the very hour the Catholic claims are granted, a foundation will be laid for the total subversion of the British constitution, which is composed of an union of the Established Church and the State, and which Church is declared by the law of England to be *Protestant*; and the very hour that the Catholics obtain a majority in the British Parliament, the Protestant Church will be annihilated, and Popery declared the established religion of the British empire: and, to have Christianity marred and distorted by the mummery and the blasphemy of Popery, were but little better than to have the candlestick taken out of its place. Then, instead of holding the celestial light which promotes peace, and holiness, and happiness amongst mankind; the candlestick would hold a torch lighted up in the infernal regions, which would promote discord, and malice, and the most savage cruelty.

“Who, that is but partially acquainted with the history of Popery, and that has any degree of holy zeal for the cause of unsophisticated Christianity, but trembles at the prospect of what is speciously, yet sophistically, denominated ‘Catholic emancipation?’ What, my brethren, is ‘Catholic emancipation,’ but the first sure step towards Protestant slavery? God forbid that we should be permitted to fall into the cruel hands of the pretended successors of Peter! God forbid that our descendants should be afflicted with the curse of *Popery*! Some persons, however, can see no danger that can possibly arise from granting the Catholic claims; and assert, that, on the principle of *justice*, they are entitled to what they demand. If a person demanded a sword which you held; and, from his known inveteracy

against you, the reasonable inference would be, that, if you surrendered it to him, he would instantly employ it to run you through the body; ought you, on the principle of *justice*, to grant him his demand? Civil power is that sword—it is now happily in the hands of Protestants, and in their hands it slays none on account of difference in religious creeds; but, put the weapon into Popish hands, and it will soon slay thousands. Popery is still what it was, in days of yore, when its adherents immersed their murderous hands in Protestant blood. Which of the sanguinary tenets of the Church of Rome have the Catholics abjured? and if they have not, as a body, abjured ONE, what rational argument can any man advance to prove that, if modern Catholics were placed in circumstances favourable to their views and rooted inclinations, those tenets would not be productive of the same dreadful consequences as heretofore? In the prospect of what is before us, we feel it to be a duty to which we are imperatively called, to urge our hearers to exert themselves in a lawful and peaceable way in resisting the claims of the Catholics. Our liberty—our lives—and the dearest interests of our posterity, are involved in this long agitated question.”

Mr. Hyatt adds, “We hope that, when the Catholic question is again brought forward, another ‘flood of petitions’ will roll into both Houses of Parliament, and prove equally successful with that which deluged the House of Lords, when it was proposed that the Toleration Act should be ‘explained and amended.’ The enemy stands knocking at the door, imperiously demanding admittance. The scorpions are already prepared for the torment of Protestants. The wolf no longer assumes the temper of the lamb: only let him into the fold, and we shall soon witness the treachery and the cruelty of his intentions.”

It is to me perfectly inconceivable, how a Roman Catholic who steadfastly holds all the notions inculcated by the

Creed of Pope Pius IV. (which every beneficed Clergyman, and every non-Catholic before he shall be admitted into that Church, is sworn to profess), can possibly be either tolerant or a friend to religious liberty in others: for he swears to many points of faith very inimical to peace and concord, as the following—“ I PROFESS, AND UNDOUBTEDLY RECEIVE, ALL THINGS DELIVERED, DEFINED, AND DECLARED BY THE SACRED CANONS, AND GENERAL COUNCILS, AND PARTICULARLY BY THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT: AND LIKEWISE, I ALSO CONDEMN, REJECT, AND ANATHEMATIZE ALL THINGS CONTRARY THERETO, AND ALL HERESIES WHATSOEVER CONDEMNED AND ANATHEMATIZED BY THE CHURCH. THIS IS THE TRUE CATHOLIC FAITH, OUT OF WHICH NONE CAN BE SAVED; WHICH I NOW FREELY PROFESS, AND TRULY HOLD, &c.”

If these offensive principles be not injurious in their tendency, restrictive of mental freedom, and incompatible with toleration, *at least under a settled Protestant Government*, I am much mistaken; and it is the opinion of one of their most moderate authors (p. 140, *State and Behaviour of English Catholics*, 1781), that “ whenever it is found that any sect of men profess principles in religion, which either *tend to the destruction of social happiness, or are incompatible with the established order of Government*, it will not be denied that the most rigorous means should be used for their suppression.”

Yet, this same author tells us,—“ He is convinced that, were certain obstacles removed (such as the views of interest, the animosity of party, the blindness of prejudice, and those thick clouds which controversy has raised), it would appear that the Protestant Church of England and Catholics are divided by a VERY THIN PARTITION.” He says, “ Take the two professions of faith; ours, as it is sometimes given without the comments of schoolmen; and that of Protestants, as contained in the Thirty-nine Articles

of their Church: compare them studiously together; and I think an inference will be drawn in favour of my assertion."

Mr. Butler, and the Rev. Mr. Wix, think the same—dreaming indeed of a possible UNION BETWEEN THE TWO CHURCHES!!!

I will suppose, for a moment, that English Catholics in power would be friendly to all Court measures, would join their interest to that of the Crown, and be always ready to strengthen the Royal prerogative; yet, it is clear that unrestrained liberty of thought and action on religious subjects, could never be allowed by them to the people at large: for this is contrary to the present Pope's express injunctions, and would not be compatible with their solemn obligations to obey the Papal Church.

Moreover, they do not admit, that any other Christian Church exists besides their own; they do not grant, that there are any legitimate Bishops, or any real Ministers of the Gospel, except those in actual communion with the Pontiff; and they must consider many of *our* secular arrangements intolerably uncanonical and profane—which no Protestant could dispense with, even after SUCH A SUPPOSED UNION OF THE TWO CHURCHES,

This would, therefore, be only a nominal union and a forced co-operation: it could not possibly be cordial on either side, whether in the affairs of Church or State, and is altogether chimerical in the extreme! But, there is no hazard of a junction, while it is previously necessary to gain important concessions from both parties; and while the consent of the Sovereign power is requisite, before so much as a distant negotiation can be commenced. I have no fear of our present Rulers attempting to produce so absurd a political change, and total an overthrow of the Reformed Religion! Nevertheless, Sir, I think this proposal, *as coming from a Clergyman*, ought not to pass unnoticed by me on the present occasion.

LETTER XIX.

SIR,

THOUGH I entertain no fear of a direct and immediate attempt being made by our present Rulers, either in Church or State, to unite once more the unreformed See of Rome with the reformed ecclesiastical establishment of England, yet I feel it right to allude here to this subject. The letters of Archbishop Wake to M. Dupin, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, may have given an idea that such a re-union (or rather a junction of the *Gallican* with the Anglican Church), was practicable; and yet, Sir, the result of that correspondence proved, that “Rocks as high, and more impene- trable than the Alps or the Andes, are cast betwixt us:” thus, indeed, thought the Roman Catholic author of “The State and Behaviour of English Catholics,” whose candour is always conspicuous, but not so extravagant as to *insult* or betray his own Mother Church.

In the 4th Appendix to any modern edition of Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History, you will find this whole correspond- ence. The translator, in conclusion, remarks; that, “from this narrative, confirmed by authentic papers, it will appear with the utmost evidence,

“1st, That Archbishop Wake was not the *first mover* in this correspondence, nor the person who *formed the pro- ject of union* between the English and Gallican churches.

“2dly, That he never made any *concessions*, nor offered to give up, for the sake of peace, *any one point* of the Es- tablished doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, in order to promote this union.

“3dly, That any desires of union with the CHURCH OF ROME, expressed in the Archbishop’s Letters, proceeded from the hopes that he *at first* entertained of a considerable

reformation in that Church, and from an expectation that its most absurd doctrines would fall to the ground, if they could be once deprived of their great support—the Papal *authority*, the destruction of which authority was the very *basis* of this correspondence.”

Such misconduct was left to be perpetrated by “a beneficed Clergyman of the Church of England, who is in the enjoyment of a very respectable Rectory in Essex, and a not less respectable Vicarage in London; who is a Fellow of Sion College, a Member of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, the Treasurer and Secretary of the Ecclesiastical Society of Dr. Bray’s Associates (of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is the President), the Chaplain at once of a Royal Hospital and of a Royal Duke, &c. &c.” §; and to whom we owe the obligation of now publishing an “*EARNEST RECOMMENDATION*” of such Union to “His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, the Most Reverend the Archbishops, the Right Reverend the Bishops, the Reverend the Clergy, and all Lay Persons who are able and willing dispassionately to consider the important subject.”

As I am one of those “*Lay Persons*” who (if not *able*) may be thought *willing* to consider this subject, I will very briefly state my own views,—which arise from an impression left upon my mind when I some time ago read the work alluded to. In the first place, I cannot dissemble my astonishment at this proposal, by a Clergyman of the Church of England; who so little feels the duty he ought to have practised as a faithful son of that Establishment, to which he professes allegiance, and by which he gains a maintenance! I am told, that this beneficed Clergyman has also written a work in explanation and defence of the Thirty-nine Articles: and I am surprised that, in doing so, he did not perceive the irreconcilable opposition (both in discipline

§ I learn this from the Eclectic Review for April, 1819, p. 301.

and doctrine) subsisting between the two Churches of England and Rome. But—

*“ Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis,
Tempus eget.”*

Secondly, I observe that Mr. Wix has a most insuperable antipathy against the parent Bible Society, and thinks it is the fertile source of heresy as well as schism: but, so thinks “His Holiness,” who presides at Rome; and so think the Cardinal Bishops, and the Inquisitors, and the Jesuits; and so do most Popish Prelates, and Priests, and Apostolic Vicars, all over the world! This coincidence is remarkable; and worthy of the consideration of some other opponents to that Society, whose notions symbolize too much with certain points of doctrine promulgated from Rome, and found in the Trent Catechism.

Thirdly, I see that Mr. Wix has much more charity towards Papists than towards Dissenters, not excepting the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, because there are no *Episcopal* guides in those Churches. Of course, if he argues consistently, the Lutheran, Helvetic, and Calvinistic Churches abroad, are condemned by him as being far less safe depositories of Christianity than the Apostate and Idolatrous Church of Rome!

Fourthly, On that account Mr. Wix unchurches the greater number of religious communities, and does not at all recognize them as real parts of the “Catholic,” or Universal Church of Christ, nor fit for him to embrace; but nevertheless he pretends, that a return of the Anglican Church to the bosom of “the Mother and Mistress of all Churches,” would quickly draw “all those Protestant Churches” into this one vortex. Does he, then, make so much ado about the “Apostolical DISCIPLINE” of our Church, and totally forget the more important Apostolic DOCTRINES which she inculcates? Is not that mistaking the shell for the kernel; and giving a preponderance to our ex-

terior discipline, which many of our best and wisest Bishops have denied to it? From the days of USHER to those of TOMLINE, an *Episcopal* form of government has been thought less obvious and prominent in the Sacred Writings than Mr. WIX believes it to be. Does he think *they* had no Theological learning, or had not studied the subject?

Fifthly, I recommend this champion for a Romano-Anglican Church to read Pallavicino and Paul Sarpi; when he will see how difficult it is to bring Popes into a fit humour to convene such a conciliatory Council as he proposes: he also should re-peruse the Constitutional Acts of our United Parliament, as well as the Homilies of our Church; which may teach him more correct ideas of Protestantism, as our *best bulwark*, and wiser means of securing its integrity and promoting its purity at home.

Lastly, I remark, that so long as tradition is EQUALLY venerated and obeyed by the Church of Rome, as even Holy Scripture itself, there can be no hope of a reconciliation with her; and so long as she contends for INFALLIBILITY in her decisions, she must go on to anathematize and execrate all who differ from her: while, at the same time, no possible chance can remain, either of any reformation of "her fundamental errors," or any concession to us whatever.

If Mr. WIX had lived and written his "Reflections" in the days of Queen Mary, would he not have been deemed a real Papist? And if he had published his concessions in the time of Elizabeth, would he not have been suspected and treated as one?

But, Sir, it being no part of my design to inquire into the truth or falsehood of doctrinal articles (but only to exhibit a few of the Romish doctrines, tending to subvert our Protestant constitution in Church and State), I decline combating the peculiar notions of Mr. WIX; a task which I have no doubt, will be executed satisfactorily, by other persons who love our Zion,—and especially by a Right Rev.

Prelate, to whom we already are indebted for many excellent controversial writings, and who differs materially from Mr. Wix, in his view of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

This lover of UNION has so little regard to the feelings and judgment of about TWENTY BISHOPS in our Church, who patronize or have subscribed to the Bible Society, that he indecently calls it "*delusive and mischievous, organized on a wild plan of comprehension, regardless of the purity of Christianity, and injurious to the unity of faith so earnestly desired by Christ and his Apostles.*" He might almost as well have said, Christ and his Apostles did not teach or desire the diffusion of the Gospel; for that Society disseminates no other doctrines of FAITH, and no other principles of UNITY, than are contained in the Book of Truth itself, which it circulates! During the reign of Robespierre and the system of terror in France, a set of wretches wanted to guillotine a Wesleyan Methodist Preacher; but, not knowing how to lay hold of his peculiar notions, which they did not understand, and taking it for granted that he must be an heterodox rebel, they thus questioned him in a court of justice concerning his politics: "Who are you?"—"A preacher of the Gospel."—"What doctrines do you preach?"—"Only what are found in this book," (holding up a pocket Bible.)—"But tell us what you think of our system of Government?"—"I think of it as I am taught by this book."—"Do you respect the rulers of our Glorious Republic?"—"I obey the powers that be, as I am required by this book."—"Dismiss the fellow: he is a good subject."

You, Sir, who are a Church-going man, and also a Vice-President of the Bible Society, can make a proper application of this anecdote.

An anonymous writer, whose assumed name of LUTHER has often appeared in the Times newspaper, makes the following judicious remarks on the state of Popery, at the present period:—

“ We have three remarkable examples, in our own day, of the continued and implacable hostility of the Romish church (as expressed through the medium of its accredited heads); to the Protestant religion, to political liberty, and to the circulation of the Bible. The Order of Jesuits has been revived in direct opposition to that reformation of Romish corruption which has proved the greatest blessing to the world at large, and which has been the glory of Great Britain in particular. The Inquisition, that monstrous engine of terror and cruelty, has been erected in our own enlightened age, for the obvious purpose of again usurping its ancient dominion over the mind, of enslaving the person, and giving full scope and effect to arbitrary power and ecclesiastical tyranny, at the expense of civil liberty and the inalienable rights of human nature. The Bible published by Protestants, without note or comment, is stigmatized as the work of *heretics, who are out of the pale of salvation*. It is declared by the first authority in the Romish church (the Pope and his Cardinals), that such a work is fit only for the *Romish Index of prohibited books*; in other words, for the flames.

“ We are assured, on the same authority, that the Bible in the proper language of the different nations of the world (without which those nations cannot read or understand it), *is productive of more harm than good*;’ and the heaviest denunciations are levelled against those Protestants who engage in such a manifest duty as the circulation of the Holy Scriptures through the earth—a design which is characterized by these ministers of error and ignorance as ‘an abominable device for undermining religion’—‘a pestilence to be detected and rooted out’—an event ‘threatening to Christianity’—a ‘defilement of the faith,’ and ‘an imminent peril to souls.’ Can any man in his senses doubt what would be the fate both of readers and distributors of the Bible in this Protestant land, if the professors of such intolerant opinions as these were once to obtain a share in the

legislative and executive administration of our Protestant empire?

“ What are such things as have been enumerated, but the worst features of Popery in action under our eyes? and with such evidence before us of the spirit and genius of papal Rome, continuing to be what they have ever been in all periods of her history, are Englishmen deliberately to permit the foes of the Reformation, the patrons of the Inquisition, the opponents of the Bible, and the enemies of all religious toleration, to recommence a course of experiments upon a constitution which has ever been the admiration, and recently the protection of the world? ‘ He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.’ Let Englishmen be wise in time. Let those of them especially who value their own religious and civil privileges, as enjoyed under a tolerant and free government, examine a little more minutely into the political theories of those Statesmen, who, because they have a favourite scheme to carry, have resolved to make the experience of ages bend to their own particular system; and would expose to innovation and ruin the fair fabric of our religious and political code, with all the unfeeling coolness of modern experiment !

“ If Popery be what these reasoners would now represent it—a system no longer hostile (as it once was) to the religion of Protestants, nor unfriendly to their civil rights; if it can for the first time consent to use power in a Protestant state, without abusing it; if it has re-established the Jesuits, with no intention of employing them; if it has erected the theological prisons of the Inquisition, with no design of filling them; if it has prohibited the use of the Bible, without a wish to enforce the prohibition: if such propositions can be fairly established, then will the advocates of the Catholic question possess some better claim to attention than we have hitherto discovered. At all events, it is not too much to ask, that (while such manifest evidences of the character of Popery in our own times are thus before us) we should not

be compelled to act upon general professions of increased light and liberality; which, as they are known to mean nothing by those who employ them, ought not perhaps to make a very deep impression upon those to whom they are addressed.

“The main distinction between the Romish and Protestant churches, as a political question affecting ourselves, is, that Protestants can, *upon principle*, tolerate Catholics, and do tolerate them in practice; while Catholics are intolerant *upon principle*, and show themselves to be actuated at the present moment by the same implacable spirit of bigotry which has ever formed an integral part of their theological system. Thus the present Pope, in his celebrated letter missive to his Cardinals, dated the 5th of February 1808, observes, in allusion to the freedom of religious worship which had been required by the French government, “It has been demanded that all religious persuasions should be free, and their worship publicly exercised; *but we have rejected this article, as contrary to the canons, and to the councils, TO THE CATHOLIC RELIGION, to the public peace, and to the interests of the state*, on account of the unhappy consequences which it would produce.—See this document at length in the ‘Relation de ce qui s’est passé à Rome dans l’Envahissement des Etats du Saint Siège,’ published by Keating and Brown, in 1812,—vol. i. p. 48.”

Sir, to the passage cited above, as proving the Pope’s intolerance, I will add another from his Pastoral Instruction, dated at Rome, May 22, 1808; which I transcribe from p. 59, “Correspondence authentique de la Cour de Rome avec la France,” Paris, 1814:

“La protection jurée, et si vantée du Souverain des Français pour tous les cultes, n’est autre chose qu’un prétexte et qu’une couleur pour autoriser la puissance séculière à s’immiscer dans les affaires spirituelles; puisqu’en montrant du respect pour toutes les sectes avec toutes leurs opinions, toutes leurs coutumes et toutes leurs superstitions, le Gouvernement Français ne respecte en effet aucun droit, aucune institution, aucune loi de la religion Catholique.”

LETTER XX.

SIR,

ACCORDING to my promise, I lay before you a translation of several official Documents, published lately against Bible Societies: and first, the Papal Bull or Rescript issued from Rome under date of June 29, 1816, to the Archbishop of GNEZN, Primate of Poland. §

“ POPE PIUS VII.

“ VENERABLE BROTHER,

“ Health and Apostolic Benediction.

“ In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours; in which you have appealed to this Holy See, in the name also of the other Bishops of Poland, respecting what are called *Bible Societies*, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of accumulating concerns have so pressed upon us on every side, that, till this day, we could not attend to your solicitation.

“ WE HAVE BEEN TRULY SHOCKED AT THIS MOST CRAFTY DEVICE, BY WHICH THE VERY FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGION ARE UNDERMINED; and, having, because of the great importance of the subject, convened for consultation our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have

§ By recent information it appears, that the Jesuits have been indefatigable in different parts of Europe, to prevent the success of the Bible Society; and that they have prevailed so far in *Bavaria* as to obtain an express prohibition (and even the *total suppression*) of all Bible Associations, whether connected with foreign countries or otherwise! We know, likewise, how active they are in other quarters of the world to prevent the free use of the Scriptures.

deliberated, with the utmost care and solicitude, upon what measures, within the compass of our Pontifical authority, are proper to be adopted, IN ORDER TO REMEDY AND ABOLISH THIS PESTILENCE AS FAR AS POSSIBLE. In the mean time, we heartily congratulate you, venerable brother; and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so hazardous to Christianity, in having denounced to the Apostolic See, THIS DEFILEMENT OF THE FAITH, MOST IMMINENTLY DANGEROUS TO SOULS. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since of your own accord you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and oppose THE IMPIOUS MACHINATIONS OF THESE INNOVATORS; YET, IN CONFORMITY WITH OUR OFFICE, WE AGAIN AND AGAIN EXHORT YOU, THAT WHATEVER YOU CAN ACHIEVE BY POWER, PROVIDE FOR BY COUNSEL, OR EFFECT BY AUTHORITY, YOU WILL DAILY EXECUTE WITH THE UTMOST EARNESTNESS, placing yourself as a wall for the House of Israel.

“ For this end we issue the present letter, viz. that we may convey to you A SIGNAL TESTIMONY OF OUR APPROBATION OF THESE YOUR LAUDABLE EXERTIONS, and also endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral sollicitude and vigilance. For the general good imperiously requires us to combine all our means and energies TO FRUSTRATE THE PLANS, WHICH ARE PREPARED BY ITS ENEMIES FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF OUR MOST HOLY RELIGION: whence it becomes an Episcopal duty, THAT YOU FIRST OF ALL EXPOSE THE WICKEDNESS OF THIS NEFARIOUS SCHEME, as you already are doing so admirably, to the view of the faithful; and openly to publish the same, according to the RULES prescribed by the Church, with all that erudition and wisdom in which you excel; *namely*, ‘ THAT BIBLES PRINTED BY HERETICS ARE NUMBERED AMONG PROHIBITED BOOKS, AGREEABLY TO THE RULES OF THE INDEX, (No. II.

and III.); FOR IT IS EVIDENT FROM EXPERIENCE, THAT THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, WHEN PUBLISHED IN THE VULGAR TONGUE, HAVE, THROUGH THE TEMERITY OF MEN, PRODUCED MORE HARM THAN BENEFIT:’ (Rule IV.). And this is the rather to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is, therefore, NECESSARY TO ADHERE TO THE SALUTARY DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX (June 18th, 1757); THAT NO VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE IN THE VULGAR TONGUE BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT SUCH AS ARE APPROVED BY THE APOSTOLIC SEE, OR PUBLISHED WITH ANNOTATIONS EXTRACTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF THE HOLY FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

“ We confidently hope that, even in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will afford the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and this especially by your care, as well as that of the other Prelates of this kingdom, *whom, on account of the stand they are so wonderfully making for the faith committed to them, we congratulate in the Lord,* trusting that they all will very abundantly justify the opinion entertained of them.

“ It is moreover necessary that you should transmit to us, as soon as possible, the Bible which JACOB WUIEK published in the Polish language with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations, taken from the writings of the holy Fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, what errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair for the preservation of the true faith.

“ PROCEED, THEREFORE, VENERABLE BROTHER, TO PURSUE THE TRULY PIOUS COURSE UPON WHICH YOU HAVE ENTERED; VIZ. DILIGENTLY TO FIGHT THE BATTLES OF THE

LORD IN SOUND DOCTRINE, AND WARN THE PEOPLE INTRUSTED TO YOUR CARE, THAT THEY FALL NOT INTO THE SNARES WHICH ARE PREPARED FOR THEM, TO THEIR EVER-LASTING RUIN. The Church waits for this from you, as well as from the other Bishops, WHOM OUR EPISTLE EQUALLY CONCERNS; indeed we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of THE NEW SPECIES OF TARES WHICH AN ENEMY IS SOWING SO ABUNDANTLY, may, by this cheering hope, be somewhat alleviated: and, we heartily invoke upon you and your fellow Bishops, for the good of the Lord's flock, ever increasing spiritual gifts, through our Apostolic Benediction, which we impart to yourself and to them.

“ Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June 29, 1816, the 17th year of our Pontificate.

“ POPE PIUS VII.”

Sir, I shall next present you with a translation of another similar Rescript, addressed to the Archbishop of Mohileff (or Mohilow), in Russia.

“ POPE PIUS VII.

“ *To our Venerable Brother Stanislaus, Archbishop of Mohileff.*

“ VENERABLE BROTHER,

“ Health and Apostolic Benediction.

“ We are worn down with poignant and bitter grief at hearing of the pernicious design, not very long ago entered upon, by which the most Holy books of the Bible are every where dispersed in the several vernacular tongues; and published, contrary to the most wholesome Rules of the Church, with new translations, and these craftily perverted into bad meanings. For we have perceived, from one of those versions which has been brought to us, that it tends to destroy the sanctity of purer doctrine; so that the faithful may

easily drink deadly poison, from those fountains whence they ought to draw the waters of salutary wisdom.

“ But we were still more deeply grieved, when we read certain letters signed with the name of You our Brother ; wherein You authorized and exhorted the people committed to your care, to procure for themselves modern versions of the Bible, or willingly to accept them when offered, and carefully and attentively to peruse them ! Nothing certainly could more aggravate our grief than to behold You, who were placed to point out the ways of righteousness, become a stone of stumbling. For You ought carefully to have kept in view, what our Predecessors have always prescribed ; namely, *That, if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue were permitted every where, without discrimination, more injury than benefit would thence arise.*

“ Further, the Roman Church receiving only the *Vulgate Edition*, by the well-known Decree of the Council of Trent, rejects the version in other languages, and allows only those which are published with notes, properly selected from the writings of the Fathers and Catholic Doctors ; lest so great a treasure should be subject to the corruptions of novelties, and in order that the Church, scattered over the whole world, might be of *one lip and of the same speech.*— Truly, when we perceive in a vernacular tongue very frequent changes, variations, and alterations, proceeding from the immoderate licentiousness of biblical versions, that immutability would be destroyed ; nay, the divine testimonies and even the faith itself would be shaken, especially since, from the signification of one syllable, the truth of a dogma may sometimes be ascertained.

“ Wherefore, by this means, *Heretics* have been accustomed to bring forward their corrupt and most destructive machinations ; in order that they might insidiously obtrude each their own errors, dressed up in the more holy garb of the Divine word, by publishing the Bible in the vulgar

tongues, (though concerning the wonderful variety and discrepancy of these they mutually accuse and cavil at each other). *For Heresies arise only, saith ST. AUGUSTINE, when the excellent Scriptures are not well understood; and what in them is ill understood, is nevertheless rashly and boldly asserted.*

“ But, if we lament that men, the most renowned for piety and wisdom, have often failed in interpreting Scripture; what may not be feared, if the Scriptures, translated into every vulgar tongue, are given to be freely read by the ignorant common People, who usually judge not from any preference, but from a sort of temerity? Is it so, exclaims ST. AUGUSTINE properly, that you, untaught by any poetical skill, do not venture to open *TERENCE* without a master; but you rush without a guide upon the Holy Books, and dare to give an opinion upon them without the assistance of an instructor?

“ Wherefore, our Predecessor *INNOCENT III.* in his celebrated epistle to the faithful of the Church of Metz, most wisely commanded these things: The hidden Mysteries of the faith are not every where to be laid open to all people; since they cannot every where be understood by all men, but by those only who can comprehend them with a faithful mind. On which account, the Apostle says (1 Cor. iii. 2), To you who are the more ignorant, as it were babes in Christ, I gave milk to drink, not food; for strong meat belongeth to the elder. As he himself said to others: We speak wisdom among the perfect; but among you I determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified. For, so great is the depth of the Divine Scriptures, that not only the simple and illiterate, but even the prudent and learned, are incompetent fully to discover their meaning. On which account the Scripture affirms: Because many who have diligently searched have failed. Whence it was rightly ordained of old in the Divine Law (*Exod. xix. 12*), that the

beast which shall touch the mountain should be stoned ; lest truly any simple and unlearned person should presume to reach after the height of Sacred Scripture, or even proclaim it to others : for it is written, Mind not high things. Therefore the Apostle commands ; Not to be more wise than is becoming, but to be wise soberly.

“ Yet, not only the letter of INNOCENT III. just quoted, but also the Bulls of PIUS IV. CLEMENT VIII. and BENEDICT XIV. are very well known ; in which they forewarned us, lest, if the Scripture was unreservedly laid open to all, it would perhaps be despised and disregarded, or being improperly understood by persons of low capacities, it would lead them into error. But You, our Brother, may know plainly what is the opinion of the Church concerning the reading and interpretation of the Scripture, from the famous Bull UNIGENITUS by another of our Predecessors, CLEMENT XI. ; wherein are expressly REFUTED those opinions which asserted, That it is useful and necessary at all times, in all places, and for all descriptions of persons, to know the mysteries of the Scripture, the reading of which was intended to be for all,—That it is pernicious to keep it back from Christian people,—Yea, that the mouth of Christ was closed against the faithful, when the New Testament was taken out of their hands.

“ But what caused even still greater grief, is this ; that You have gone so far as, when transcribing the decree of the Council of Trent concerning the Canon of Scripture, that You omit those things respecting Traditions, which are sanctioned by the same context. For, when these Holy Fathers openly declare, That the Word of God is contained not merely in the written books, but also in the most indubitable Traditions of the Church, in things pertaining to faith, as well as to morals ; which, as proceeding either from the mouth of Christ, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved by continued succession in the Catholic

Church, this most Holy Synod receives and venerates WITH EQUALLY PIOUS AFFECTION AND REVERENCE :—

“ You, Venerable Brother, have not feared entirely to garble this passage, with the same artifice with which we observe You have quoted the Letter of PIUS VI. our Predecessor, to MARTINI, Archbishop of FLORENCE ! For, when that most wise Pontiff, for this very reason commends a version of the Holy Scriptures, made by that Prelate, *because he had abundantly enriched it by expositions drawn from Tradition, accurately and religiously observing the Rules prescribed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index and by the Roman Pontiffs* ; You have suppressed the part of that letter, in which these things are related : and thus not only have You excited the strongest suspicion of your judgment on this subject, but also, by not fully quoting both the context of the Holy Synod and that of our aforesaid Predecessor, You have given an occasion to others to err, in an affair of so great importance.

“ For what else, Venerable Brother, can these mutilations mean, but that either You thought not rightly concerning the most holy Traditions of the Church, or that these passages were expunged by You for the purpose of favouring the machinations of Innovators ? which certainly tend to deceive the faith of the readers, and to make even the common people themselves read with an unsuspecting mind those versions *which, as we showed above, must to them be much more injurious than profitable.*

“ Moreover, if this would by no means be lawful for any Catholic person, what shall we say of a holy Prelate of the Church, whom Pastoral Dignity has constituted the guardian of the faith and doctrine committed to him ; and who is strictly bound by the force and obligation of the *oath* he has taken, both strenuously and diligently to remove from the people dangers of erring, and to observe and maintain the laws and regulations of the Church ?

“ You see therefore, Venerable Brother, what ought to be Our mode of acting toward You, if we were disposed to enforce the severity of the Canon Laws ! ‘ For,’ said ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY, ‘ he who does not come forward to remove what ought to be corrected, gives his sanction to error ; nor is he free from suspicion of a secret confederacy, who evidently neglects to oppose mischief.’

“ But we, for the love we bear You, insist only upon that thing, from which, since it must be enjoined upon You by Divine Authority, we cannot refrain ; namely, that You would take away the scandal, which by this mode of acting You have occasioned. Hence we most earnestly exhort You, our Brother, and beseech You by the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you will strive to repair, by a due and speedy amendment, all those things which You have improperly taught or done concerning the new versions of the Bible.

“ And I wish, Venerable Brother, emulating the example of illustrious men, which procured for them such honour, that you would consider how You might reprobate these your deeds by a solemn and formal retractation ! We cannot, however, avoid exciting You, and by virtue of Holy obedience we even command You, to do at least what is necessary for preserving the purity of doctrine and the integrity of the faith : namely, that in a fresh letter addressed to the people, containing the whole contents both of the Decree of the Council of Trent, and of the letter of PIUS VI. on this subject, You should sincerely and plainly teach, *that the Christian Truth and Doctrine, as well dogmatical as moral, are contained not in the Scriptures only, but also in the Traditions of the Catholic Church ; and, that it belongs to the Church herself alone to interpret each of them.*

“ Moreover, You should declare ; that You did not intend to recommend those versions of the Sacred Books, in the vulgar tongues, which were not exactly conformable to

the Rules prescribed by the Canons and Apostolic Institutions: lastly, You should make known and likewise declare, that, in advising and recommending the perusal of these divine Scriptures, You had not respect to all the Faithful indiscriminately, but only to Ecclesiastical persons, or at most to those Laymen who *in the judgment of their Pastors* were sufficiently instructed.

“ If You shall truly perform all these things, as we trust in the Lord You will, and which we promise Ourselves most certainly from your prudent and tractable disposition, You will afford great consolation to our mind, and also to the Church Universal.

“ Filled with this hope, we permanently impart to You; Venerable Brother, and the flock committed to your care, the Apostolic Benediction.

“ Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, on the third day of September 1816; the Seventeenth Year of our Pontificate.

“ PAPA PIO VII.”

LETTER XXI:

SIR,

THE influence immediately produced by the foregoing official documents, was such as might have been expected in Popish countries, and in the remotest parts of the civilized world! I shall not detail those pernicious effects; but, as a single example, shall here lay before you an Edict issued by the Hungarian Government, together with a formal Declaration of its Bishops, evincing that the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* sent other similar prohibitions to distant Eastern countries!

“ Considering that the London Bible Society has caused the establishment of several affiliated Societies, particularly in Germany, and that several such Associations in the Imperial Hereditary Dominions, particularly among the Protestants, have more intimate connexion in view; His Sacred Majesty has been graciously pleased to ordain, that care be taken that printed copies of the Bible *be not circulated gratis, nor at a low price*, by such foreign Associations and Societies in His Majesty's Hereditary Dominions; *nor the establishment of a Bible Association allowed*. For the rest, His Sacred Majesty is graciously pleased to allow the trade with Bibles, as with all other books, by booksellers, according to the ordinances published on **THIS SUBJECT**.

“ The Royal Government hereby publishes this His Majesty's resolution, that the most punctual care may be taken to observe it in every point.

“ Given at Buda the 23d of December 1816, in the Assembly of the Members of the Royal Hungarian Government.”

“ A Declaration of the Most Reverend the Bishops of Hungary against Bible Societies.”

“ That the Bible Societies, not long ago formed among the English, and aimed to be promoted in all the world, have failed to produce that general good for which they are extolled, the most clear-sighted English themselves now perceive, and openly acknowledge. And, therefore, it becomes us to be peculiarly grateful for the very provident care of our government, which has hindered the entrance of these Societies into the empire of the illustrious House of Austria: for, the old adage truly says, ‘It is more infamous to turn out a guest than not to admit him.’ But, that these Bible institutions, although they have a plausible appearance, by no means agree with the principles of the Catholic religion and Church; the SOVERAIGN PONTIFF, Pius VII. has ul-

ready declared: and indeed, by an Apostolical Letter, addressed to the ARCHBISHOP OF GRESN himself, on the very day of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, June 29th, 1816, praised his exertions, and also those of the other Bishops of Poland, because they combined with might and main to resist the attempts which, by means of the Societies called Biblical, its enemies have made for the utter destruction of our most holy religion; especially in so depraved an age, when our holy religion is assailed on all sides; with subtlety, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church.

“ Likewise, in another Apostolical Letter, dated Sept. the 3d in the current year, sent to the ARCHBISHOP OF MAGNIEFF, His Holiness speaks thus:

“ ‘ We are worn down with poignant and bitter anguish, when we learn that a pernicious design was not long since undertaken, by which the most sacred books of the Bible are every where dispersed in the several vernacular tongues; and published, contrary to the most wholesome rules of the Church, with new translations, and these cunningly perverted into bad meanings. For we observed, from one of those versions which was brought to us, that it tends to destroy the sanctity of pious doctrine; so that the faithful may easily drink deadly poison from those fountains, whence they ought to draw the waters of salutary wisdom. But we were even still more deeply grieved, when we saw that some were made a stone of offence who are placed to show the ways of righteousness to others.

“ ‘ These ought to have kept in view, what our predecessors constantly apprised them of; namely, *That, if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted every where without discrimination, more harm than good would hence arise.* Moreover, the Roman Church, receiving only the Vulgate edition, by a well-known decree of the Council of Trent, rejects the versions of other languages, and permits those alone which are published with annotations properly

lected from the holy Fathers and the writings of Catholic Doctors; lest so great a treasure should be laid open to the corruptions of novelties, and in order that the Church, diffused all over the world, might be of one lip and the same speech.

“ ‘ Indeed, since we perceive in the vernacular tongue very frequent changes, varieties, and alterations; truly, from this immoderate license of biblical versions, that immutability would be destroyed, which becomes the divine testimony, and the faith itself would be shaken. Wherefore, by this means the Sectaries have usually brought forth their de-prayed and most ruinous machinations; as, by publishing Bibles in the vernacular tongues, on the wonderful variety and discrepancy of which they nevertheless mutually accuse and cavil among themselves, that each might obtrude their own errors dressed up in the holy garb of the divine word. *‘ For heresies do not arise,’* saith ST. AUGUSTINE, *‘ except when the excellent Scriptures are ill understood; and what in them is badly understood, is also rashly and boldly affirmed.’*

“ ‘ But if we lament that men, most renowned for piety and wisdom, often have failed in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; what may not be apprehended, if the Holy Scriptures, translated into every vulgar tongue, are given to be freely perused by the ignorant common people, who mostly judge, not from any preference, but from a sort of rashness? *‘ Is it so?’* justly exclaims St. Augustine, *‘ that you, uninctured by any poetical skill, dare not open TERENCE without a master, but you rush without a guide on the sacred books, and venture to give an opinion upon them without the aid of a teacher?’* Wherefore, it is clearly and sincerely to be held and taught, that the Christian truth and doctrine, both dogmatical and moral, are contained not only in the Scriptures, but also in the traditions of the Catholic Church; and that it belongs to the *Church itself alone* to interpret both. Besides, it should be maintained and in-

culcated, that the reading of the Scriptures is not for all the Faithful indiscriminately; but for the Clergy, or at most those of the Laity who were sufficiently instructed *in the opinion of their Pastors*, and deemed rightly prepared to read therein with profit.

“ The Sacred Congregation for propagating the Faith, by the like authority of His Holiness the Pope, on the 3d day of August in the current year, sent letters to the Vicars Apostolic and Missionaries in Persia, in Armenia, and in other Eastern countries: wherein he cautions them against a version of the New Testament into the Persian tongue, recently made, as if canonical; but yet dispersed very numerously, by means of the English Bible Society, even among the Infidels; and he warns them against all connexion with these Bible Societies, speciously pretending to promote Christianity. Thus the provident and Most Holy Chief of the Apostolic See, and the provident and most august Sovereign of this Kingdom, by uniting their care, watch lest any injury should in our days befall religion and the State.”

LETTER XXII.

SIR,

THE last official document was transmitted by a Roman Catholic Clergyman of high respectability and character, who regretted that the two Papal Rescripts therein cited had done so much mischief among bigoted religionists on the Continent, &c. The small number of “ *clear-sighted Englishmen themselves* ” who have opposed Bible Institutions, will now behold (as in a Popish Mirror) the exact resemblance of their own objections.

It is particularly deserving of your notice, that when

A PRINCIPLE OF ACTION has been once laid down by the See of Rome, no circumstances of place or distance, &c. will prevent the rigid application of that *principle*.—I shall illustrate and prove this by an example, which might perhaps escape your attention in perusing the above official “Declaration of the Hungarian Bishops.” You there see, that the *principle* of excluding all unauthorized versions of the Holy Scriptures from the common people is carried to a length so extravagant and preposterous, that even *Mahomedans and Idolatrous Nations* are not allowed to read a New Testament, because it was not made from the *LATIN Vulgate* edition, and accompanied with the edifying notes of Popish Theologians!!!

The words of that “DECLARATION” are remarkable:—
 “Ejusdem Sanctissimi Pontificis autoritate Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide ad Vicarios Apostolicos et Missionarios in Persia, in Armenia, et in aliis Orientis partibus die 8 Augusti anno currente dimisit literas: quibus eos contra versionem Novi Testamenti in idioma Persicum recenter utut canonicè factam; sed tamen agente Societate Anglorum Biblica, etiam inter Infideles numerosissime dispersam; cautos reddit, et contra omnem cum his Biblicis Societatibus, speciose propagationem Christianissimi prætextibus, nexum præmunit. Ita nempe unitis studiis providus Sedis Apostolicæ Antistes Sanctissimus providusque Regni hujus Apostolici Rex augustissimus pervigilant, ne quid religio ac res publica detrimenti capiat diebus nostris.”

Thus, Sir, it appears, that, if Turks, Jews, Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, Arabians, Persians, Hindoos, Chinese, and other Oriental nations, could obtain (by means of the Bible Society in London) copies of the Sacred Volume free of expense, and were disposed to study it privately in their own vernacular tongues; this act would be deemed contrary to the laws of the Pope, and must therefore be prevented by his Missioners and *Apostolic Vicars*; whatever they can do

so! Such Vicars, I think, should be called "*Diabolical*," and not "*Apostolical*" Agents! Yet, the work of converting the Heathen must not then go on by God's instrumental means, because a PRINCIPLE OF ACTION laid down at Rome stands in the way!!! This, Sir, is one of the many consequences of that doctrine to which even the liberal Mr. Charles Butler tenaciously subscribes, of the Papal Supremacy and an *infallible* Church Guide; a notion, as obviously wicked and mischievous as it is absurd.

You observe, that the excellent Mr. MARTYN's Persian translation of the New Testament, lately printed at St. Petersburg, but which the Jesuits in that city had opposed, is condemned by the Pope; and that he has issued letters accordingly, to his Agents in the East.—Thus a version, so highly approved by the King of Persia, and by all good judges, is prohibited by an Italian Prelate as injurious to the "Infidels;" so that (in the Pope's opinion) Mahomedans had better remain attached to their KORAN, than read so heretical and uncanonical a book as the New Testament, translated by the best scholars out of the pale of the Roman Church!!! Of this Persian Testament, the Rev. Dr. John Paterson wrote from St. Petersburg, under date of June 25, 1816: "The eagerness with which the Persians receive, and the attention with which they read, the New Testament, exceed all expectation. The style is allowed by them to be elegant and simple, such as befits the sacred books. MARTYN, though dead, is now preaching the Gospel to this numerous people. We cannot supply them fast enough. In three days I sent off one thousand copies to Astrachan."—P. 477, Seventeenth Report of the Church Missionary Society. Yes, Sir, nothing can now stop this current of Divine Truth, which is flowing in a full stream through all the barren regions of the earth, and has already reached the opposite Poles.

If the Bible, the whole Bible, and the Bible alone, con-

tains the religion of Protestants, as Chillingworth of old, and the Bishop of St. David's in modern times, decidedly affirm;—if Bible Societies have no other object, notwithstanding the alarms of prejudice or malignity, than to disperse God's own Word, purely, without note or comment;—if this be done in a peaceable and honest manner, wherever Bibles are wanted, and (should any exist) in the approved or generally received versions;—then, to condemn such Associations, as crafty, pestilential, mischievous to society, and as being at variance with real CHRISTIANITY, is to falsify Divine Truth, declare war against Protestants, and to set up the standard of anarchy and discord! Yet this has been done by the Pope and his Cardinals: for, unless it be proved that *other* designs or practices had mingled with the work of Bible institutions, existing in Poland, Russia, Bavaria, Austria, and in other countries where opposition has been excited by Papal interference; and, unless such proofs are very clearly exhibited, we must admit that great injury and unjust provocations have been sustained by *British* Protestants, in so preventing the general diffusion of heavenly light.

Besides, since Bible Societies consist always of different religious denominations, not only of Protestants and innumerable members of the Greek church, but even of Jews and Mahomedans,—and also embrace Hindoos, Chinese, Tartars, Persians, Hottentots, Negroes, Calmucks, &c. blind worshippers of dumb idols, feeling their way to the God of Christians, flocking to the ark as doves to their windows; all these and many more “nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues,” must likewise be shut out from “the light of life,” and sustain damage, if the translation and circulation of the Scriptures be *thus* prevented.

The day is now dawning, “which portends that a new epoch will commence in the history of humankind, when the Christian religion shall be universally received, rightly un-

derstood, and conscientiously practised," as the late Bishop of Landaff has observed; and when, by means of these combined exertions, as the Bishop of Durham says, "the Holy Scriptures will be made known in the most unenlightened regions of the earth, conveying to millions what they would not have otherwise enjoyed, the inestimable blessing of the Gospel."§—It is surely an earnest of the future harvest, to find (after only a few years' labour) that nearly SEVENTY LANGUAGES, or dialects, are made to speak in divine accents to a perishing world.

Then I ask, if the ruling powers in the Church of Rome; by their recent conduct, be not committing an act of hostility against the natural rights and liberties of ALL mankind? FOR ALL HAVE GOD'S PERMISSION to read and profit by his revealed Word; and no man, or set of men, can have authority to hinder this. They may not conceal the recorded truth, nor alter or dilute it; nor restrain any one from using it freely, at all times, and in all places; no more than they are entitled to exclude the natural light, to corrupt the air we breathe, or to turn aside the rain which descends on the earth.—I hold this principle to be beyond controversy; that what is given, or allowed, TO ALL by our Creator, cannot be justly withheld by any human power: and whoever shall act contrary to this principle, violates the law of God, and obstructs human happiness; becoming thereby a traitor to the Majesty on high, and an enemy to man.

Although not a few unprejudiced, learned, and zealous Priests abroad, *truly called Catholics*, † have long been en-

§ See a circular paper, entitled, "Episcopal Testimonies in favour of the general Circulation and Perusal of the Holy Scriptures without Note or Comment." Printed and sold by Mr. Low, 21, Gracechurch Street.

† DR. LEANDER VAN ESS, Roman Catholic Professor of Divinity in the University of Marburg, has distributed about 240,000 copies of the German New Testament, chiefly among persons of his

rolled in our lists, and have come boldly forward to enlighten their dark brethren of the Romish communion; yet, *these* good men are now stigmatized and bitterly persecuted by their respective Prelates, who are chiefly desirous to bolster up the tottering remains of a narrow and exclusive system: and many of those honest Christians abroad have brought down on their heads the vengeance of Inquisitors, who strenuously combine with the crafty Jesuits in opposing or corrupting Christianity.

Sir, the language used by King James's venerable and learned translators of the Bible (which I have already quoted, at page 109, in a former Letter), should be deeply impressed on the minds of all those Church-of-England Ministers who object to the unlimited and most free use of the Scriptures; lest they, unintentionally, be seen to fight in the ranks of Papal Troops, and to join in their antichristian WORK OF SUBJUGATING CONSCIENCE TO A HUMAN TRIBUNAL. The beneficial effects of the Bible, universally read, would be like a moral vaccination of the world; tending not only to stop the ravages of ignorance and Christian corruption, but to heal the wounds inflicted on the body-politic by civil and religious discord. §

“No man liveth in that commonwealth where nothing is amiss; but yet, because God hath so placed us Englishmen here in one Commonwealth, also in one Church, as in one

own communion! But the Conclave at Rome has evinced its decided abhorrence of such conduct, and branded this hero with the honourable name of “LUTHER THE SECOND.”—See the late Extracts of Correspondence of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and its 14th Report for 1818.

§ “La vaccine elle-même aura-t-elle produit d’aussi grands résultats que cette sorte de vaccine morale, pour ainsi parler; qui, non seulement doit prévenir les ravages du double fléau de l’ignorance et de la corruption, mais peut cicatrizer encore les plaies du corps politique.”—Page xxvij, “*Avant-Propos de l’Abrégé de la Méthode des Ecoles Élémentaire*; Paris, 1816.”

Ship, together,—let us not mangle or divide the Ship's crew, which being divided perisheth : let every man serve with diligence and discretion, in his order, wherein he is called ; they that sit at the helm must observe the point of the needle, to know how the Ship goeth, and whither it should. Whatsoever weather betideth, the needle, *well touched with the Stone of God's WORD, will never fail.*"—So said JOHN FOX, *the Martyrologist*, whose advice is not unseasonable in our own time of dissension.

LETTER XXIII.

SIR,

HISTORICAL records (exhibiting the actual views and principles of the Roman See, and ascertaining the state of modern Popery beyond contradiction) must be deemed highly valuable by every British Legislator. It was therefore a proper step in Mr. Leslie Foster, to copy (from the *Antibiblion*) both of the Pope's *Latin Bulls* at the end of his late Speech in Parliament ; and an appeal to these documents is known to have produced no small sensation upon his hearers in the House of Commons. It is only as containing historical *facts* that I call your attention to these Rescripts, and now beg leave to offer a few more remarks on them. They were also noticed in the House of Lords by the Bishop of Ossory, whose printed Speech has disclosed to the public a fresh example of Popish subtlety, in the construction and EVASION OF A CIVIL OATH. §

§ In a letter to Bishop Poynter from Sig. Quarantotti (Feb. 16, 1814), this Cardinal refers to the words of an OATH proposed, A. D. 1813, for the British Catholics, in what was called the "RELIEF BILL;" and the Cardinal says, "In case the Bill be already passed containing the same words [i. e. of *this oath*], or that nothing in it is al-

The Court of Rome made a sad mistake in sending the two former Bulls, or antibiblical Rescripts, to Poland and Russia, where the great Alexander had long been promoting Bible Societies with the utmost assiduity and success! Poland was not pitied by the Pope, though it was peculiarly distressed for want of the Scriptures; § as appears from Dr. Pinkerton's numerous letters to the British and Foreign Bible Society, A. D. 1816, &c. published in their last Reports: but, it seemed to be forgotten by the Pope, that no Bull could be received by any Roman Catholic Prelates who were under the dominion of the Russian Emperor, without his Majesty's express permission. The magnanimous Emperor had been previously annoyed enough by the Jesuits, and therefore drove them out of his two Metropolitan cities; so that, when the first Bull was circulated at Warsaw, it met with his decided disapprobation, and was accordingly opposed by Prince Czartoryski.

Agents abroad wrote to the Parent Bible Society very plainly, stating *all* that was done; but the delicacy of its Committee in London was such, as to keep back the worst part of this intelligence from the British public. In doing so, I think they acted properly. A friend of mine, however, sent me a printed copy of the "*Warsaw State Ga-*

lowed to be altered, LET THE CLERGY ACQUIESCE; AND IT WILL BE SUFFICIENT FOR THEM TO DECLARE THAT THIS, AND THIS ONLY, IS THE SENSE IN WHICH THEY HAVE SWORN TO IT; SO THAT NOTHING IN THE OATH MAY BE ADVERSE TO ORTHODOX DOCTRINE."—As the Bishop of Ossory observed in the House of Lords, "Here is an *ex post facto* interpretation of an oath, commanded by a foreign authority!!! How, then, is it possible to rely on the faith of persons professing such principles?"

§ Dr. Pinkerton says, "There have been printed only about 3000 Bibles in the space of 217 years, for upwards of 10,000,000 of Catholics, who speak the Polish language! Hence it is, that a copy is not to be obtained for money; and that you may search 100,000 families in Galicia and Poland, and scarcely find one Bible."

zette," No. XII. called "KORRESPONDENTA;" which, at page 241, gave a short *official* account of that first Bull, and mentioned the notice taken of it in a Committee of the Warsaw Bible Society, at its sitting on the 21st. of October 1816. This Polish newspaper has long been in my hands; and it will alone fully confirm the authenticity of a Papal document often alluded to by Protestant writers, but which was flatly denied by some Roman Catholic Journalists to have had any existence! You can easily tell why they wish it did not now exist. The paragraph, p. 241, begins thus:

"Protokol of the Committee of the Polish Bible Society, in its Session of October 21st, 1816.

"The Committee having met, at which the Count, and WOJWODA STANISLAUS POTOCKI, Minister for Religion and Civilization, JOSEPH SIERAKOWSKI Referendary, and Mr. PINKERTON, Agent of the London Bible Society, were present: the Prince (CZARTORYSKI) as President, in an introductory address, explained the causes which had prevented the Society from augmenting the number of its Members, by the opposition which had arisen to it in different parts from certain prejudiced persons; who, influenced by impure motives, circulated the Declaration of the Pope, sent to the ARCHBISHOP OF GNEZŃ, against the Bible Society. But the whole of this *Brief* of the Pope is founded on false representations, *as if the Society had actually printed an unauthorized Bible,*" &c. &c. &c.

I subjoin the original passage in a note, and will at any time show you the Gazette itself. §

§ "*Protokół Posiedzenia Komitetu dnia 21go Października 1816.*

"Zobrawszy się posiedzenie Komitetu, na które przybyli raczyli JW. Stanisław Potocki Wojewoda, Minister Wyznan religijnych i Oświecenia, Józef Sierakowski Referendarz Stanu, i Pan Pinkerton Agent Towarzystwa Biblijnego Londyńskiego, Xiąże Jmc Prezes oznajmił Towarzystwu, iż przeszkody, które mu dotąd

You also perceived, that the Hungarian Bishops alluded to both the Papal Rescripts in their LATIN DECLARATION.

But I shall exhibit a specimen of incredulity in one of the Popish Journalists, who can be credulous enough on any occasion where the honour of his own Church is *not* at stake. For Mr. WILLIAM EUSEBIUS ANDREWS, the Editor, Printer, Publisher, and Proprietor of the "ORTHODOX JOURNAL," in his remarks on Mr. FOSTER's powerful Speech, says: "What was my surprise to find the newspapers reporting, that Mr. LESLIE FOSTER, *in opposing our Claims in the Commons, alluded to this spurious document as the official declaration of the present Pontiff*; from which he is stated to have read a large extract, commenting upon it with much severity and at considerable length. We are further told, that this had great weight in deciding the fate of our question in that House. *No doubt of it; and such was the intention of the CONSPIRATORS!!* Foaming with rage at the firm and unbending principles of Catholicity, and alarmed at the steady though slow march of the public mind in its favour, the biblical zealots know no bounds to their malevolence! Hence *forgery, treachery, falsehood*, and every species of dishonourable warfare is resorted to in their endeavours to arrest the progress of our cause; *which may retard it for a while, but cannot prevent the flowing of its course.*"

nie pozwalaly rozpoczac skutecznie swych czynnosci, a które wyplywaly to ze skutków mieszczesc krajowych, to z opozycyi niektórych uprzedzonych osób, mianowicie z niecheci przeciw temu przedsiwzięciu X. Arcy-Biskupa Gnieznienskigo, i z cyrkulacyi listu Papieza ganiaecgo Towarzystwa bibliyne; ze przeszkody te i trudnosci za zupełnie uprzatnione odtad uwazac mozna. W szczególności, iz *Breve* Papieza bedace odpowiedzi na doniesienie mylnie oparte na faktach falszywych '*iakoby Towarzystwo iuz aktualnie nieapprobowana Biblia wydrukowalo*' nie moze bydz do Towarzystwa stosowanem, i szkodziec mu nie bedzie, &c."

Mr. Andrews again remarks,—that this was too gross a fraud to be believed; only it happens that, “of all classes of Christians in the world, none are so *stupidly credulous* as the generality of Protestants in England.” Another Journalist of that stamp, however, was honest enough to tell us, that “*if the first Bull was genuine, he did not think it needed ANY APOLOGY from Roman Catholics !!*” But it was very soon copied into the European journals abroad; since which I find it is translated into the Tamul, &c. for the illumination of the Hindoos in India!!!

It was observed by a late friend of your's and mine (the Rev. RICHARD CECIL) “that Popery is the master-piece of Satan, and that *another* such contrivance could not possibly be invented: it is a systematic and infallible plan, to form *manacles and mufflers for the human mind.* §—Popery, said he, is a well-laid design to render Christianity contemptible; by the abuse of its principles and its institutions. It was devised to overwhelm, to enchant, to sit as THE GREAT WHORE, MAKING THE EARTH DRUNK WITH HER FORNICATIONS. It is, in fact, THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY,—that it should be able to work itself into the simple, grand, sublime, holy institution of Christianity,—and so to interweave its own abominations with the truth, as to occupy the strongest passions of the soul, and to control the strongest understandings.”

“While PASCAL could speak of Popery as he does, its influence over the mass of the people can excite no surprise. Those two master-principles,” Mr. CECIL observes, “*That we must believe as the Church ordains,—and That there is no salvation out of this Church,—*oppose, in the

§ “Whose freedom is by suff'rance, and at will
Of a superior, he is never free.
Who lives, and is not weary of a life
Expos'd to *manacles*, deserves them well.”

. Cowper's Task, book v.

ignorance and fear which they beget, an almost insuperable barrier against the truth."—I may also add, that if so holy and amiable a man as the ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAY was conscientiously persuaded to close the Word of God against the generality of Laymen, and to exalt human traditions in place of the written ORACLES, so as to defend the doctrine which the present Pontiff and himself cite from a Decretal Epistle of POPE INNOCENT III. ; then we may be certain, that a spirit of blind infatuation seizes the minds of consistent Papists, and that they cannot open their own eyes!!!

Now, such was really the case of even FENELON himself: for, he declares, "*In fact, it is the same as reading the Scripture when a person listens to the Pastors of the Church, who dispense to him such parts of it as are adapted to his particular wants. Yes, the Pastors are the living Scriptures. Hence no individual has reason to complain, that he is deprived of what is necessary for him, without the guilt of calling in question the sufficiency of the Church's TRADITION; and without entertaining the presumption of imagining, that he is capable, by his own researches, to discover those things in the text of Scripture, which he supposes the Church does not impart to him with sufficient purity, unction, or integrity. As often, then, as the Church shall judge it expedient to withdraw the use of the book itself from the people, in order to give them an equivalent by instructions, more accommodated to their weakness; they ought to humble themselves, and be convinced upon the authority of their holy mother, that they lose nothing thereby: they ought, in this case, to be as well satisfied with milk as they would be with bread, and to receive with docility and contentedness from that Divine Spirit, who dictated the Scriptures, the truths which it contains, without meddling with the Text, from which they might perhaps extract a wrong meaning.*"—See a Letter to the Bishop of Arras, on Reading the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar Tongue, by

Monseign. de Salignac de la Mothe Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambrai; translated from the original French, by the Rev. Edward Peach, Pastor of St. Chad's Chapel, Birmingham; to which is subjoined an *Approbation* by the Right Rev. Dr. John Milner, Bishop of Castabala, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. London, 1816, printed and published by W. E. Andrews.

The Archbishop says further, in this letter to the BISHOP OF ARRAS, "It was the dread of these evil consequences that induced the Faculty of Theology at Paris, in the year 1527, to censure certain propositions of Erasmus; the purport of which was, that 'if his opinion were to be adopted, labourers, masons, and other artisans should read the Holy Scripture, and that it should be translated into every language.' The Faculty, on the contrary, declared thus: 'The Waldenses, the Albigenses, and the Turlupins, have taught us what danger there is in allowing to all, indiscriminately, the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, &c.; and although it may be profitable to some, it ought not to be put into the hands of every one without exception.' The Faculty adds, with respect to Laics, 'The Church does not forbid the reading of certain books of Scripture, which may contribute to the improvement of men's morals, with an explanation sufficiently clear to make them understand it.' Lastly, it remarks, that 'the Holy See has, long ago, forbidden the Laity to read those books, &c.'"

FENELON again quotes with approbation the language of the Clergy of France, and of St. VINCENT DE LERINS: Namely, that "the Holy Scriptures had been called *the book of Heretics*, on account of the artful sophisms by which they endeavour to turn the texts against the authority of the Church;" and that it was the familiar use of the sacred volume "which gave rise to the sects of Protestants."

A great deal more is adduced by him to the same purpose; so that we cannot now be startled to find, "that not

only the letter of INNOCENT III, but also the Bulls of PIUS IV. CLEMENT VIII. BENEDICT XIV. and the famous Bull *Unigenitus* by CLEMENT XI." are appealed to by the present Pope PIUS VII. as if they refuted the scriptural views of Jansenists and Protestants!

The new Conflict, therefore, which at present subsists, is exactly the same as our Reformers had to maintain in the days of LUTHER and CRANMER: one party declaring with the Psalmist, that "God's word giveth light to the understanding, and wisdom to the simple;" but, the other party affirming, and still continuing to affirm, in a tone of ridicule,

" By paraphrasing this, they mean
To make the simple people keen
For BIBLES; as if ev'ry clown,
Or whistling cobler in the town,
Young girls, old wives of eighty year,
When they the SCRIPTURE read or hear,
Could ev'ry one the sense on't tell,
And ev'ry text expound as well
As Austin, Hierom, or Aquinæ:
Thus ev'ry fool may turn DIVINE,
And judge of all the SCRIPTURE saith,
Or pick from thence what they call faith!"

(Vide Ward's *first Canto*, reprinted at Manchester in 1816.)

We see that the same weapon, "the Sword of the Spirit," with which our forefathers conquered the powers of darkness in the sixteenth century, must still be wielded by *ourselves* for a similar purpose: and we may certainly expect, that a degree of success proportioned to our fidelity, will follow the use of such means for enlightening mankind. Though no well-instructed Christian will put the *written* word and the preached word in opposition to each other, or suppose that the former can supersede the latter; yet it is certain, that the neglect of God's recorded Truth occasioned the long reign of Papal darkness, prior to the

Reformation, and that the mist of ignorance then prevalent was dispelled chiefly by diffusing its beams over Europe.

Sir, what says the ruling Pontiff? and how does he address the Archbishop of Mohilow, in his Bull of September 3d, 1816? His Holiness declares that "he is worn down with poignant and bitter grief at hearing of the pernicious design entered into" (by the Russian and Polish Bible Societies), "to disperse the Holy Books every where in the vernacular tongues." He then pronounces this practice to be "contrary to the rules of the Church;" and especially repugnant to a "well-known Decree of the Council of Trent," which affirms "that more injury than benefit would thence arise to mankind." He charges these "*Heretics*" (such as we Protestants are), with forming "corrupt and destructive machinations," tending to ruin souls; and dissuades that Archbishop from following their "pernicious designs," by quoting the Decretal Epistle of Pope INNOCENT III.

The name and deeds of so bloody a tyrant strike Protestants with the utmost horror: for, it was HE who wasted the riches of whole kingdoms,—laid this and other nations under a dreadful interdict,—excited the most murderous crusades against the peaceable Waldenses and Albigenses,—appointing merciless Inquisitors to propagate the religion of Christ by brutal violence and barbarism! This man was fit, indeed, to set an example to all future Pontiffs; and his ecclesiastical discipline has been therefore admired in the Church of Rome, ever since the infamous Councils of Lateran and Toulouse.

The great LATERAN Council acted on the principle, so clearly recognised by the more modern annotators of DOUAY and LONDON; viz. that of deciding all controversies "without appeal from the Church guides," and "*punishing with death such as proudly refused to obey their decisions.*" The subsequent Council of TOULOUSE, held A. D. 1229, absolutely forbade the Laity to possess *any* of the sacred books,

wings of such Apostolic Vicars as the author of that letter ; and I presume you will not deny, that the application of such SPIRITUAL faculties as are claimed by Papal Agents, conformably to the language of those Bulls, &c. which are here translated, ought at length to be restricted in Great Britain. It is enough to have endured their oppressive tyranny and usurpation, until the NINETEENTH CENTURY !

But, I nevertheless feel a doubt, whether the Honourable Member who presented the *New Petition* signed by upwards of 10,300 Roman Catholics, was duly impressed with the extent and bitterness of such tyranny : for he is reported to have said, “ The horrible spirit of your laws is, that you mark out the Catholics as a sect or caste separated and contra-distinguished from yourselves, ON ACCOUNT OF SOME UNDEFINED SUSPICION OF THEIR PRINCIPLES ; ” and that Member is reported to have asked, “ WHERE SUCH HONOUR AND FAITH HAVE BEEN EXHIBITED, WHAT SECURITIES ARE NECESSARY ? IF IT BE ASSUMED, THAT THEY HAD NOT HONOUR AND FAITH, WHAT SECURITIES COULD BE OPERATIVE ? ”—See *Orthodox Journal*, p. 120, &c. where this speech of LORD NUGENT, on the 4th of March, is given at some length.

Sir, I have shown pretty clearly in several of my Letters, that POPISH FAITH is not always, and under all circumstances, to be securely confided in ; nor can it be doubted, when the nice distinctions laid down in their own casuistical books are considered, that Protestants may possibly be cajoled, even at this time, to depend too much on CIVIL PLEDGES OR OATHS TENDING TO INJURE THE RELIGIOUS SYSTEM OF SUCH MEN. I have not led you back to ancient times, for proof of my opinion, or in support of my allegations ; I have not quoted the doubtful Decrees of early Councils, nor the epistolary productions of Popes in the dark ages : though I might *fairly* have availed myself of all such materials, in evidence against persons who themselves

freely admit the validity of those testimonies. But, I have taken another road : I have exhibited and almost wholly relied on *recent* authentic documents, which you must allow to be descriptive of *modern* Roman Catholic principles. I did not invent or feign, but honestly discovered, the Papal Doctrines and Maxims which have been here submitted to your notice : what I found has been adduced without disguise or colouring, and recorded without malicious or wilful exaggeration.

It has sometimes been matter of just complaint, that controversialists do not collect their opinions and views of Popery from fit and accredited sources. This is a charge to which I have carefully endeavoured not to expose myself ; and, Sir, should you feel disgusted with the mass of rubbish I have compiled, remember that it *now* forms a real portion of the spiritual temple erected by Roman Catholics themselves. If these offensive materials be onerous and distressing to a few men of intrinsic worth, still remaining connected with the Church of Rome ; let them now “ come out of her and be separate, that they partake not of her sins.” But, if they prefer to retain their peculiar religious maxims and ancient discipline, it is unreasonable to expect that we Protestants (who constitute a large majority of the whole population) should give up to them the reins of Government or Legislation, while they are allowed an unlimited exercise of their conscientious principles and prejudices. It is one thing for them to keep whatever they call “ RELIGION,” and a totally different thing for them to participate in the enjoyment of POLITICAL POWER : the former is a natural right ; the latter is a social privilege, to which no class of men, however noble and virtuous, can have a natural claim.

What times of persecution might again return, if they had more liberty to rule, is not for me to predict ; but, I do not at all doubt, that, so long as men’s actions are governed by *motives* and not by chance, true Papists are likely

to commit all the enormities depicted by our Martyrologist JOHN FOX, in the event of their repossessing the Power they had during the reign of QUEEN MARY. The enmity of certain authors has been especially directed against our ecclesiastical historian JOHN FOX; whose "Acts and Monuments," in three folio volumes, detail the bloody deeds of Papal tyrants in every country, illustrated by striking *prints* (as Bishop Milner rightly says) "of men, women, and children expiring in flames."—My reply to these objectors shall be made in the language of Dr. Wordsworth, whose valuable collection of "Biography" should be consulted by all modern Liberalists: "I am not ignorant of what has been said by Dr. John Milner's predecessors in the same argument, by Harpsfield, Parsons, and others. But these writings have not proved that JOHN FOX is not one of the most faithful and authentic of all historians. We know too much of the strength of Fox's work, and of the weakness of those of his adversaries, to be further moved by Dr. John Milner's censures, than TO CHARGE THEM WITH FALSEHOOD. And the many researches and discoveries of later times, in regard to historical documents, have only contributed to place the general fidelity and truth of Fox's melancholy narrative on a rock which cannot be shaken."—Indeed, I defy Dr. Milner to name three other bulky folios of Church-history, written by Roman Catholics, which contain more truth and less doubtful matter: but, I see it is the habit of this Prelate to condemn Fox, Jewel, Burnet, and other English writers on the Reformation, as being deceitful liars or gross hypocrites! Such really is his language!

I am afraid that, in these days of peace and religious freedom, we are too apt to forget the kind of *Apparatus* which Roman Catholic Priests have contrived, to subdue and direct human consciences for secular ends! *They can* lay hold of a man's mind, by private and severe interrogatories, and threats, and censures, and curses, and excommu-

nications, which no Clergyman of our Church is familiar with; *they* possess a formidable artillery, connected with the doctrine of *Confession, Absolution, &c.* which none of the Reformed Churches ever attempt to employ for sinister purposes; *they* have not only various *compulsory* modes of producing or of retaining converts,—but also have *seducing* allurements, promises, pardons, indulgences, and rewards of merit, for all cases, and applying to the time past, present, and to come!!! These, Sir, are weapons of spiritual warfare not in *our* hands, and never likely to be wielded in support of real Protestantism; but, they are weapons too keen to be non-effective, and too commonly used for *us* to overlook them in arguing against Popery.

You certainly cannot believe, that giving power to the Representatives of five millions of people (who patiently submit to such Church-discipline, and may be instructed by their Priesthood to curtail or entirely to withhold religious freedom), would enlarge *our* national privileges, or could strengthen the hands of *our* Government and Legislature: This illusion, I trust, cannot be!

A dissenting Gentleman and a Layman, writing on this subject, well observes:

“ If such an illusion in any degree prevails, it is time it should be dispelled. It is time *we* should review what is past; that the nature and essence of Popery should be re-examined, and compared with existing, irrefragable, and notorious facts; facts which concern ourselves, and which have a silent, but pernicious aim, against *our* faith, *our* liberties, and *our* happiness. Nor does it become *us* to feel less when these are attacked through the Ecclesiastical Establishment of this country, than if they were assailed by a distinct attempt to abolish *our* several denominations. We should even feel more on this account. The Establishment of this country is *our* friend, *our* guardian, *our* protector. It has common cause with *us* in this great concern, and is

all the essentials of true Christianity. If the Establishment falls, we must fall with it. The same unsparing axe will cut down the oak, and the ivy which clings to its trunk.

“ We ought moreover to consider, that not the Protestants of England alone are concerned in this measure. Through this attempt to amalgamate Popery into the Government of England, the whole system of Protestantism is threatened. Of how great importance the conduct and government of this country are to the liberties and happiness of Europe at large, the progress and termination of the late eventful war sufficiently demonstrate. But this Government derives its vigour from being ESSENTIALLY AND ENTIRELY PROTESTANT. Should the councils and politics of England again become shackled by Catholic interference, her influence, her pre-eminence, nay, her very existence as an independent nation, must totter from its foundations.

“ Has the Reformation at length caused Protestants to forget the great principle of the Reformers, and the hardness of that iron bondage from which they were made the instruments of delivering *us*? Are the oppressions and cruelties of the Romish Hierarchy blotted out from the page of history? Are they not, on the contrary, written in letters of blood, freshened up as it were on purpose, at this important crisis, by the re-establishment of the Inquisition, and the restoration of the Order of Jesuits?

“ But we have been living at ease. The privileges of this happy country seem to have lulled us into forgetfulness. We seem not to be aware, that for that peaceful and tolerant intercourse with Catholics, at home and abroad, to which we have been accustomed, we are indebted, not to the spirit of Popery, but to that of Protestantism alone. And hence we have used ourselves to look upon Popery as children look on a Leopard in Exeter Change; admiring its apparent docility and obedience to its keeper, and pleased with the sleek and dotted appearance of its skin, but un-

mindful of the sharp claws which curl under its paw, the cruel armature of its jaws, and the fierce spirit which resides within, and waits only for convenient circumstances to display itself.

“ But under whatever veil of innocence and mildness this corrupt Hierarchy may be shrouded, there is one test which our Reformers applied to it, of which we are now particularly called upon to avail ourselves; and which, like the spear of Ithuriel, will make it instantly appear in its real character. That test is **THE BIBLE—THE BIBLE;**

“ —For no falsehood can endure
Touch of celestial temper, but returns
Of force to its own likeness—UP IT STARTS
DISCOVER'D AND SURPRIS'D.”

Par. Lost, B. iv. 811.

“ The Bible is that sharp two-edged sword, with which our forefathers fought and conquered for themselves and for us. To this are we indebted for our deliverance from tyranny and superstition. Had they not wielded this empyreal weapon, they would only, like the French Revolutionists, have established one corrupt system on the ruins of another. But wearing this armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, they wrought at length that glorious Constitution under which we live—a Constitution, of which the end and the means are alike pure, *because the Scriptures are embodied in its laws and form the basis of its Government.*”

“ Now, we have only to read the Bulls issued by the present Pope concerning the circulation of this blessed Book, on which all our peculiar happiness as Britons is founded, as on its corner-stone, to see the immensity of the danger into which we must inevitably be brought, should power again revert into such frightful hands. For, it is *Power*, and not *Liberty*, that the Catholics seek.—It is not freedom to worship God, but influence to govern men, which they want.—

It is not to reason, but to *rule*, that they aim. And with what sceptre will they *rule*? Not with the sceptre of the Bible, that sceptre of righteousness, that *right sceptre*, which is the sceptre of the MESSIAH."

He says, in conclusion, "It is utterly impossible that persons holding such opinions should ever harmonize with Protestants in any extensive system of political administration. For religious principles must bear upon every important point of discussion in government and in law—it is impossible to detach them. The attempt must be vain. The readmission of the adherents of Popery into power, therefore, would be destructive of all that free and liberal communication which subsists between men agreed and at rest on the great essential principles relating to their conduct in this life, and their hopes of that which is to come; and who have therefore no cause to distrust each other on points of the heaviest responsibility. But in a mixture of two parties, one of which assumes to itself *the exclusive inheritance of salvation*, and considers the other as in the way to everlasting perdition,—it must be contrary to the nature of man, and to all the reason of things, to expect or to hope for that entire and cordial co-operation in the government of the State, which is absolutely essential to peace within, to respect without, and to the continuance of all that is most dear to conscientious Protestants of every name."

See a masterly Letter, signed MELANCTHON, p. 67, Antibiblion. In another place, the same able and very spirited writer judiciously observes;

"That the British Constitution owes its chief perfection and greatness to the influence of the Reformation (which we are to recollect was both a reformation from the errors, and a deliverance from the domination, of Popery), is a proposition, of which no doubt can be reasonably entertained. It was the Reformation which gave to Britain that lofty and independent spirit which has made her shine forth as the

arbiter, instead of being a make-weight in the scale, of European politics: England, since that time, has hurled defiance against all Powers that have attacked her, because she has loudly exclaimed in the ears, and to the dismay of them all—

‘*Je crains DIEU, et je n’ai point d’autre crainte.*’

“ The power of the Catholic priesthood over their flocks is not faithfully represented when it is called a *mere Spiritual power*, because it is supported by penal sanctions. The penances they may inflict, and the privations they may enjoin, are in fact corporal punishments; and punishments in themselves as rigorous and severe as many of those adopted in military discipline. *Commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth, they exercise a power and possess an influence, not less inconsistent with civil liberty, than with the principles of unsophisticated Christianity.* Were equal restriction and rigour enforced by civil authority in any case without the most absolute necessity, how many voices would be lifted up against it? It is true, that, in a sense, submission may be considered as voluntary here. But this only shows the *slavery of the mind* under ignorance and superstition; and it demonstrates the utter discordance of such a system with the true principles of British freedom. That system, which gives influence enough to one description of men, to make others forego their food and punish their own bodies at their priestly orders, is too unsafe, to be allowed a sway again in a country once delivered from its tyranny.

“ When also to this power in the hands of the Catholic Clergy is added that of interdicting the study of the Bible, and the consequent concealment of so large a field of intellectual matter from the contemplation of their flocks, the Spiritual dominion which the one exercise and the other en-

ture, becomes still more awful. To argue from the *physical force* men have exerted in the field, under the direction of skilful Commanders, to the *moral strength* of their intellect, as if the former were conclusive of the latter, would be an absurdity scarcely worth refuting. For the former, they merit those rewards which a grateful country rejoices to bestow, and that confidence in their prowess which they have so amply deserved. But their Spiritual courage and strength is not yet proved: when it is, they will cast away those *mental* bands by which their eyes are closed to the Scriptures of truth, and their feet restrained from the pursuit of knowledge. Till these fetters are broken, and their minds are unshackled, they cannot be eligible to *power*, in a country which owes the whole salubrity of its moral climate to the healthy and invigorating atmosphere of religious freedom.ⁿ

LETTER XXV.

SIR,

I SHOULD not do justice to my subject, nor to a writer who addressed you in July 1817, in the Fifth Number of a work from which my last extracts are made, if I did not openly call upon you for a moment's calm attention to his epistle,—which I suppose has not yet met your eye, as it has never been, either publicly or in private, noticed by you.

LUTHER'S LETTER TO WM. WILBERFORCE, ESQ. M. P.

“There is a false and prurient species of CHARITY which, however specious in appearance, and however common at the present moment, is but the bastard and counterfeit of another, and a nobler principle. If the Charity which would affect to comprise the whole world, at the same time overlooks and despises the claims of its

near kindred; and, while it professes to take in all the human race, spurns and slights the superior duties which stand in the first relation, and are of the highest importance; we need be at no loss to determine the character of this species of Charity. It may be ignorance; it may be impolicy; it may be infatuation; it is any thing else than the legitimate charity of Christianity."—*History of the Jesuits*, vol. i. p. 342.

“SIR,—The acknowledged value and importance of that great public triumph which, after years of labour, and amidst unexampled opposition, was achieved by yourself, in the cause of humanity and justice, has designated you the champion of freedom in the most large and extensive sense; while the various other services of your active life in the cause of divine truth and sound morality have placed your character, as it were, on a pinnacle of the temple, and proved you the uniform advocate and friend of pure and undefiled religion. True piety and legitimate liberty, indeed, are twin Sisters, which will ever walk hand-in-hand, and mutually afford stability and grace to each other. It was, therefore, entirely in unison with each of those blessed principles, that, while your private and public actions have tended to display the power and extend the influence of vital religion, they have equally served to promote and recommend genuine liberty, the birthright of every Englishman, whether regarded in a spiritual or secular point of view. With this conviction on my mind of the nature and extent of our common obligations to such a Christian and to such a Statesman as yourself, it is with feelings of surprise amounting to astonishment, and with emotions of concern little short of pain, that I contemplate your late vote in favour of the undefined and undefinable claims of the Roman Catholics.

“When I observe such a man, whom it is impossible to consider as influenced by mere party motives, espousing the untenable cause of what is sophistically termed Catholic Emancipation; and venturing on so tremendous an experiment as investing Catholics with legislative and executive

power in this Protestant nation, I seek in vain for the reasons of such conduct in any part of your religious or political life; and am only left to deplore, in common with multitudes who entertain the same regard for your character as I unfeignedly do, that you should have thus lent the splendour of your name, and the weight of your influence, to the ancient and implacable foes of the Church and the State; and, in spite of the accumulated wisdom and experience of past ages, have unwittingly ranged yourself on the side of spiritual darkness, Papal intolerance, and political bondage.

“Whatever may be the cause, either remote or proximate, of the error into which you thus appear to have fallen, I will at least venture to affirm, if either ancient or modern history be credited, that the obvious and necessary consequence of success in such a cause as you have espoused, must be to introduce into this nation, at no very distant period, the errors of a worldly religion, the cruelties of an intolerant priesthood, and the curse of arbitrary power. Whatever scepticism there may be among many Protestants upon such points, it is impossible, Sir, that you should doubt any one of these three truths—first, that Popery is a *secular* religion, and not the religion of the Bible; secondly, that the Popish church has, in principle and practice, ever been a *persecuting* church; and, thirdly, that there has always subsisted between Popery and *despotism* a necessary and inevitable connexion. These are facts which, with the history of all nations, and especially of our own, in your hands, you cannot but admit; and I, therefore, shall not at present stop to prove them. The fallacy, then, which appears to have conducted many Protestants to the conclusion which they have formed, is a supposition that, although such things have been, they will never be again; that the Church of Rome is no longer intolerant; that Roman Catholics may now assist as Legislators in making laws for Protestants, and as Judges, Juries, and Magistrates, in executing those

laws; that the religion of Popery is not now so corrupt a thing as our forefathers considered it: and that, whatever foolish fears they entertained of its arbitrary and tyrannizing policy, we may now, in all candour and charity, very safely trust ourselves and our children to the tender mercies of such a system.

“ Permit me, however, to inquire how it has appeared to you that Popery has changed its character? If, on that memorable night when you voted for the clause of Mr. Grattan’s Bill which would have given seats in Parliament to the Catholics, and when only a majority of four delivered our country from such a clause and such a Bill together—if, I say, on that occasion, you had not the experience of the Pope’s reviving the Order of the Jesuits, have you not now the benefit of that additional fact to show that the Head of the Catholic Church is resolved to employ the same subtle and nefarious agents to overturn the Protestant faith as were originally instituted for its destruction? Nay, have you not the means of knowing that the Jesuits are at this moment exerting themselves with all their might in Germany, Hungary, and Poland, not only to overturn the Bible Societies in those empires, but to vex and injure all who support them? And is not your present political course in the very face of such fresh light and information?

“ If, indeed, the Catholics of our own nation had declared themselves against the revival of an Order which has always been the greatest scourge and curse of the Christian and civilized world; there would perhaps be some excuse for your separating the cause of Jesuitism from that of Popery; but the Catholics to a man have made common cause with those agents of crime and darkness, and have applauded and defended the Order in every way: it is well known to you, that the great English Advocate of the Catholic Church and Claims, in the last work which he has published, and which he has thought fit (for reasons not very difficult

to conceive) *to dedicate to yourself*, eulogizes that Order in the highest terms, and publicly stands forth as its champion, in defiance of the clearest case of moral and political turpitude which was ever established against any society. At the period also when Mr. Grattan's Bill was rejected, the Head of the Holy Roman Church had not established the Inquisition; but it is under the knowledge of that awful fact that your late political course has been shaped, and that, notwithstanding the revival of this most sanguinary tribunal in Christian Europe, by the pretended Vicar of the Prince of Peace, you are content to hope better things from a Church which, as she has been 'drunk with the blood of the Saints' from her earliest history, is evidently unwilling to surrender her claim to her ancient and scriptural designation.

"Also, when Mr. Grattan's Bill was rejected, the modern thunderbolt of the Vatican had not been launched against the circulation of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. Is it inquired, Who now regards the thunders of the Vatican? I answer, every good Catholic; and I ask in return, what spirit is evinced on the part of the Pope in thus denying the Scriptures of light and truth to the Christian world, but a resolution to perpetuate his own empire of ignorance and darkness? And yet it is in contempt of the additional experience with which the world is thus favoured, that the same course is pursued at present by the friends of Biblical truth, of British liberty, and (*mirabile dictu*) of Catholic Emancipation! In like manner, the Catholic Bishops of Belgium had not, when Mr. Grattan's Bill was rejected, declared that the 'existence and privileges of the Catholic Church are inconsistent with equal favour and protection being given to all religions:' they had not then declared that 'schism and heresy' (that is, Protestantism) 'must be rejected from the bosom of the Church,' and that if the King of the Netherlands 'should protect the public pro-

cession and spreading of the Reformed Religion, they' (the Bishops) 'should be found in formal opposition to his laws, since they could not release themselves from the obligation of preserving their people from such a doctrine, without violating their most sacred duties;' in other words, that, rather than permit the toleration of Protestants, they were determined to be rebels against their lawful Prince!

“ It is in the face of this important declaration, dated the 28th of July 1815, that you still hold that there is nothing to fear from the Catholic Bishops of modern times; who are thus shown, however, to be just the same persons as their predecessors in other times. The close connexion between all the parts of the Popish Hierarchy is of no small importance in this argument. The present Pope expressly refuses to tolerate any other than his own religion, declaring toleration to be contrary to the Catholic religion, of which he is the spiritual head, and to the Canons and Councils of which he claims to be the legitimate interpreter. § He also asserts, that an union exists by divine right between himself and all his Bishops, which is no more to be questioned than his own Primacy; and further, that the entire dependence of all these Bishops upon himself as their head is ordained by the Pontifical Bulls, and by those very Canons and Councils, of which (as before observed) he assumes to be the interpreter. † The Catholic Bishops therefore, in Eng-

§ “ It has been required, that all religions should be freely and publicly exercised; but we have rejected this article as contrary to the Canons and the Councils, to the Catholic religion, to the public tranquillity, and the good of the State, by the unhappy consequences which would result from it.”—See Circular Letter of the present Pope to all the Cardinals, dated 5th of February 1806, in the Narration, &c. published by Dulau and Keating, London.

† “ Our Lord and Saviour ordained a union between St. Peter and the Apostles, which is now represented by the union between ourself and our Bishops: we therefore maintain for ourself and our successors the plenitude of our own Primacy, and the dependence

land and Ireland, as well as in the Netherlands, and elsewhere, being thus expressly declared by the Pope to be united with himself, and dependent upon him, it necessarily follows, that those Bishops (to say nothing of their episcopal oath) are collectively and individually, by the very nature of their office, allied to, and dependent upon, an intolerant head; and, as one consequence in particular, that they, as well as their master, are pledged to refuse toleration to Protestants. To suppose the contrary would be to imagine a schism in the Holy Roman Church, one and indivisible; since it would be to suppose the English and Irish Bishops no longer in union with their Spiritual Head—to hold a doctrine which he solemnly disavows in the face of all Europe (that of toleration)—and to pursue a practice which none of his predecessors have ever acted on, and which he himself declares to be ‘contrary to the Canons and Councils, to the Catholic religion, to public tranquillity, and the good of the State.’

“Here, Sir, lies the main distinction between the Romish and Protestant Churches: the Romish Church, whenever she has had the power of acting upon her own avowed principles, never has tolerated Protestants: no man can believe, under such plain declarations as the above, that she can now consent to tolerate them. Our Protestant Church, on the contrary, can, in perfect accordance with her own principles, tolerate the Romish Church; nay, to do otherwise she must deny herself, and act inconsistently with her profession. The respective systems of Protestantism and Popery oblige their respective professors to a distinct line of conduct, the one of tolerance, the other of intolerance. If it could be supposed for a moment, that an individual, or even many individuals, of our own church were actuated by

of the Bishops upon our See, as ordained by the Pontifical Bulls, the Sacred Canons, and the Councils,”—*Ibid.* and see *ANTIBIBLION*, No. II. p. 32.

intolerant principles, the Church to which they belong, being herself radically and essentially tolerant, would afford no countenance to such a mistaken policy: all those of her members who might desire to display an intolerant spirit, would be at once restrained by their own Church from carrying out their principles into practice.

“ It is in vain that such persons, if such there be, might wish to ‘ call down fire from heaven ’ upon those of a different creed from themselves; their venerable Mother would instantly silence their unfounded complaints, and prevent their unchristian excesses: the Catholic would continue to repose, in common with the Dissenter, under the broad and ample ægis of religious liberty. Under a different system, however, we have seen that the same toleration cannot be afforded. The Pope and his Bishops are as decidedly pledged to an opposite line of policy, as if they and ourselves were at this moment living in the thirteenth century: they have gained no light by the diffusion of divine truth, and have learnt no wisdom by their own recent humiliation. Either therefore you must, in the event of farther concessions by the Protestants, be prepared to expect a frightful contest on the part of the people of England with these ancient foes of their religion and their liberty; or (which is not very probable, nor perhaps very desirable), that they should tamely surrender both without a struggle.

“ This very essential difference between the two Churches, supplies a ready answer to the comparison which was instituted in the course of a late debate, between certain of our own Prelates who had opposed the Bible Society, and the Pope who had done the same; from which it was sought to be inferred, that this act on his part showed no more hostility to the Protestant cause than the same act in these members of our own Church. The analogy, however, between the cases, fails in this particular—namely, that the Pope was pursuing a system to which his Church has stood pledged

from the beginning, and was acting in perfect consistency with all the Canons and Constitutions of the Romish Hierarchy; while, on the other hand, those of our own Prelates who have entered on a similar opposition are not acting in concert with their own Church, nor in consistency with any one of her avowed principles: they even differ from many of their brethren on the same bench, who at this moment support that Society, subscribe to its funds, and attend its meetings; and so far from being considered as exhibiting the characteristic features of their own Church, or displaying any knowledge of its genuine principles, they can only be considered as so many exceptions to the general and incontrovertible rule—that the duty and interest of the Protestant Church is to circulate the Holy Scriptures. Individuals, undoubtedly, may be found, and will be found, to the end of time in every Church, who are acting contrary to the spirit and letter of their own ecclesiastical system; as in the Catholic Church many individuals may be found at this moment, who, contrary to the ancient and modern principles of their own Church, are favourable personally to the dispersion of the Holy Scriptures: but this fact no more proves that the Romish Church herself is friendly to the distribution of the Scriptures, than the indifference or even opposition of more than one of our own Prelates proves that the Church of England is inimical to the dispersion of the Scriptures.

“ It is really extraordinary that so obvious a distinction as this should have been overlooked in a late debate, where so much stress was laid on the supposed agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposing the circulation of the Bible. It appeared equally extraordinary in a late debate to find a Protestant Bishop, of acknowledged talents, resting the whole defence of the Protestant cause upon the single point of the Papal Supremacy, which is indeed one argument out of many against the Ca-

tholic question, but is no more than one, and by no means the strongest; nay, I will venture to affirm, that if other noble and experienced Statesmen (although only *lay* members of our venerable Establishment) had been content to cut down the arguments against the Catholic Claims to that single point, and to narrow the vantage-ground on which they stood in so considerable a degree, we might have looked in vain for such a majority as then disposed of those Claims:

“ To conclude: if there be any justice in the above observations, you will have supported the demands and revived the hopes of a Church which is and must be the sworn foe of the Church of England; and which, with power in its hands, cannot tolerate the members of that Church. If, Sir, you were merely a nominal member of our own Church, I should better understand the course which you have pursued; but believing, as I do, that you admire her evangelical doctrines, and have drank deep into her heavenly spirit, I am involved in difficulties from which I looked in vain to be relieved by any explanation which might have been expected to accompany your recent vote. From mere politicians, Sir, the Protestants of England expect far less than from yourself, and they are not disappointed when they find less: but when, on a question affecting their best interests, because involving their religious and civil existence, they observe one so deservedly dear to them adopting a line of policy from which the good and great men (whether Churchmen or Dissenters) of a former Era would have recoiled with dismay;—when they find the advocate of liberty, and the friend of religion, pursue so peculiar a course, as (doubtless with the best motives) you have thought proper to take in such an awful crisis as the present, and on a question so big with events as that which is just disposed of, they are wholly at a loss to understand upon what principle it is that something almost approaching to a judicial infatuation should have overspread certain minds—which are thus found

closed against all the accumulated wisdom of ages, and prepared to rush upon an experiment, the success of which is at best problematical, but the failure of which can be nothing short of destruction to this Protestant empire, unless all history be a solemn forgery, intended to impose on the world.

“ I conjure you, Sir, if not too late, to employ the breathing-time which yet lies before us, for the purpose of reviewing your present opinions. I know you too well to believe that the dedications of designing Papists, or the compliments of half-witted Protestants, will ever compensate for the injury which may accrue to true religion and civil liberty in this highly favoured land, from any errors which you (and certain friends who are known to follow in your train) may commit. I entreat you to remember, that, if you be in error, it is not possible for such a man to err alone. It is not (as has been said) like the blunder of a pocket-watch, which only deceives an individual; but like the error of the town-clock, which misleads a multitude.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ Your most obedient Servant,

“ LUTHER.”

Sir, I am disposed to adopt these sentiments as my own; and respectfully entreat you to consider, if they be not deserving of your approbation. As King George the First observed, “ It seems an infatuation not to be accounted for — to hope to persuade a free people, in the full enjoyment of all that is dear and valuable to them, to exchange FREEDOM for SLAVERY, the PROTESTANT Religion for POPERY, and to sacrifice at once the price of so much blood and treasure as have been spent in defence of our present Establishment ! Our enemies have long taken advantage of our differences and dissensions : let it be known that the spirit of Popery, which breathes nothing but confusion to the civil and reli-

gious rights of a Protestant Church and Kingdom, has not so far possessed my People, as to make them ripe for such a fatal change."

LETTER XXVI.

SIR,

IN the last session of the former Parliament, Mr. LESLIE FOSTER observed, "There is one circumstance more than any other which had induced him to give to the Roman Catholic religion credit for increased moderation, and that was its late-born toleration for the diffusion of the Sacred Scriptures. He thanked it, if not for its co-operation, at least for its endurance of the efforts of that noble Association; which," *said he*, "amidst all the glories of our country, will shine forth, I am convinced, to after-ages the brightest ornament of our times—I mean the Bible Society of Britain, whose mighty spirit, like the angel described in the Apocalypse, is now '*flying through the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every kindred and nation, and tongue and people.*' Alas, Sir, I gave to that religion a credit which it has not deserved. That candour and moderation which had succeeded in disarming even Portuguese and Sicilian superstition, has served but to sharpen the keen hostility of Rome." The striking difference between that religious freedom which is given by Protestants to Papists, compared with what *we* should receive from *them*, is exemplified in England, at the precise moment when the latter are crying out against our "cruel persecutions." For, Roman Catholics of this country, even in their late Petitions to Parliament, admit that they are now fully enjoying religious toleration. The words of their *former* Petition,

are copied into the Orthodox Journal published by Mr. W. B. Andrews, are as follow:—"YOUR PETITIONERS HAVE THE HAPPINESS OF LIVING IN A FREE COUNTRY, AND UNDER A WISE AND LIBERAL LEGISLATURE, WHICH AFFORDS RELIGIOUS TOLERATION TO ALL ITS SUBJECTS, LEAVING THEM TO FOLLOW THEIR OWN RITES AND DISCIPLINE, NO LESS THAN THEIR BELIEF." (Petition from the Midland District.) I am also sure that Bible Institutions, connected with the original one in London, have often printed versions from the Vulgate, for the use of Roman Catholics abroad; and that the great object is, to circulate such translations as will be acceptable to readers in general, wherever any are already in common use. The liberal and highly charitable conduct of the University of Oxford, in this respect, when the exiled Priests of France took refuge here, is particularly deserving of imitation; and it has been acknowledged by Roman Catholics themselves, that we acted toward them as became Christian Brethren. Mr. CHARLES BUTLER has done justice to Protestants by the account which, in his *Horæ Biblicæ*, he gives of that transaction:

"To give the text," he says, "in its utmost purity, has been the object of the editions and publications we have mentioned, and of many others. An Englishman must view with pleasure the useful and magnificent exertions of his countrymen in this respect: Bishop Walton's Polyglot § ranks first in that noble and costly class of publications. Foreign countries can show nothing equal to Dr. Kennicott's edition of the Bible, or similar either to Dr. Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, or Dr. Kipling's edition of the Codex Bezae: and, in the whole republic of letters, nothing is now so impatiently expected, as the completion of Dr. Holmes's edition of the Septuagint.

§ Walton's Polyglot stands among the condemned books of the Index of Rome! Popes and Cardinals, therefore, by virtue of their *Spiritual Power*, have committed that "*magnificent*" work to the flames!

“ Yet useful and magnificent as these exertions have been, an edition of the New Testament has lately appeared in this country, which, in one point of view, eclipses them all. It has been our lot to be witnesses of the most tremendous revolution that Christian Europe has known: a new race of enemies to the Christian religion has arisen, and, from Rome to Hungary, has shaken every throne, and struck at every altar. One of their first enormities was, the murder of a large proportion of their *Clergy*, and the banishment of almost the whole of the remaining part. Some thousands of those respectable exiles found refuge in England. A private subscription of 33,775*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.* was immediately made for them. When it was exhausted, a second was collected, under the auspices of His Majesty, and produced 41,304*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Nor is it too much to say, that the beneficence of individuals, whose charities on this occasion were known to God alone, raised for the sufferers a sum *much beyond* the amount of the larger of the two subscriptions. When, at length, the wants of the sufferers exceeded the measure of private charity, Government took them under its protection: and, though engaged in a war, exceeding all former wars in expense, appropriated with the approbation of the whole kingdom, a monthly allowance of about 8000*l.* for their support; an instance of splendid munificence and systematic liberality, of which the annals of the world do not furnish another example! The management of the contributions was intrusted to a committee, of whom Mr. Wilmot, then one of the members of Parliament for the city of Coventry, was president: on him the burden of the trust almost wholly fell, and his humanity, judgment, and perseverance in the discharge of it, did honour to himself and his country. It should be observed, that the contributions we have mentioned are *exclusive of those which were granted for the relief of the LAY EMIGRANTS.*

“ So suddenly had the unhappy sufferers been driven from their country, that few had brought with them any of those books of religion or devotion, which their clerical character, and habits of prayer had made the companions of their past life, and which were to become almost the chief comfort of their future years. *To relieve them from this misfortune, the University of Oxford, at her sole expense (A. D. 1796), printed for them, at the Clarendon Press, two thousand copies of the Latin Vulgate of the New Testament, from an edition of Barbou; but this number not being deemed sufficient to satisfy their demand, two thousand more copies were added, at the expense of the Marquis of Buckingham.*

“ Few will forget the piety, the blameless demeanour, the long patient suffering of these respectable men. Thrown on a sudden into a foreign country, differing from their's in religion, language, manners, and habits, the uniform tenour of their pious and unoffending lives procured them universal respect and good will. The country that received them has been favoured: in the midst of the public and private calamity, which almost every other nation has experienced, Providence has crowned *her* with glory and honour; peace has dwelt in her palaces, plenty within her walls; every climate has been tributary to her commerce, every sea has been witness of her victories.”

But, I ask, *would* peace now dwell in her palaces and in her cottages, if Papal tolerance *alone*, and if Papal charity *alone*, prevailed here?—The comparison needs not to be urged further.

Allow me, however, to submit to you the following excellent observations, which I transcribe from a letter addressed lately to Dr. Phillimore, in consequence of some opinions expressed by him when the last Petition of the British Catholic Board was presented to the House of Commons. See *Morning Post*, March 10, 1819.

“ A large portion of the public seems to be perfectly unaware of the political evils of the Roman Catholic system, and its entire and radical hostility to some of the most valuable of our Protestant rights. The Church of Rome considers every Protestant Society as *cut off* by heresy from THE CHURCH (as they call, exclusively, the Church of Rome); and therefore they deny the validity of our whole ecclesiastical establishment. They assert that we have *no Church, no Orders, no Ministry, no Sacraments; and, of course, that our marriages are null, and our children illegitimate.* And why is this anathema pronounced against our Church?— Because we have renounced the Pope’s authority; because the King, and *not the Pope*, is the supreme head on earth of our Church. The King we hold to be the fountain of ecclesiastical as well as civil honour. We pay obedience to the ‘ King, as supreme’ in all matters temporal and spiritual. He nominates the Bishops of our Church, as our Saxon and Norman Kings did down to the twelfth century; as was done again after Edward III. But he interferes not with the ministry of the Church by which they are consecrated.

“ The advocates of the Roman Catholics seem to have forgot the many Papal interdicts on our Church and Nation; and, perhaps, do not know, that by the Bull *IN CŒNA DOMINI* excommunication was annually pronounced against the Church of England. They forget, that *POPE PIUS’S CREED* is a *perpetual Bull*, of curse and excommunication, against every Protestant Church. The impotence of these *bruta fulmina* shows the inestimable value of our Protestant Constitution, but it does not show that the *grounds* of our protest and reformation are extinct; it does not, in the smallest degree, lessen the incompatibility of Popish principles with a Protestant Legislature. And yet you tell us, that ‘ the peculiar circumstances, on which the restrictions on the Roman Catholics were founded, no longer exist: and therefore that it is now time to ‘replace within

the pale of a Protestant Constitution,' the members of a Church which does not allow us to be within the pale of the Christian Church.' What evidence is brought of this most desirable, but almost hopeless change? What mighty events have happened since the subject was debated in Parliament in 1817, when a very contrary doctrine was most luminously and decisively established? Has the Pope renounced his supremacy? or the Church of Rome her presumptuous infallibility, and exclusive intolerance? Does not the Pope still claim a right of jurisdiction over the Church of England? and do not the Roman Catholics of England and Ireland pertinaciously adhere to this unlawful and unconstitutional authority? Has the Church of Rome remitted the least of that intolerance, by which she 'condemns, rejects, and accurses,' (*damno, rejicio, et anathematizo*, are the words of Pope Pius's Creed), 'all things that are contrary to the Holy Council of Trent, and all heresies whatsoever that have been condemned by the Church?' that is, all professors of Christianity, who are not within her own communion? Does not her latest advocate, Dr. MILNER, say, that 'no divine of this Church (the Church of Rome), consistently with her characteristic unity, and the constant doctrines of the Holy Fathers, and of the Scripture itself, can allow, that salvation is to be found out of *that communion*, except in the case of invincible ignorance?' (The End of Religious Controversy, vol. iii. p. 345.) Of course no Popish congregation can allow it, consistently with Pope Pius's Creed, their Pastor's oath, and his instructions.

"If such be the immutable spirit of the Roman Church, shall it be said, that the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, who are *emancipated* from the unscriptural errors and usages of the *unreformed Church*, are less faithful to their own King than British Papists are to a foreign Bishop? less faithful to their own Church, than British Papists are to the Church of Rome? Will British subjects be per-

suaded to abandon their constitutional laws, and to admit into any share of political power the members of a Church whose Creed pronounces by a spiritual anathema *them*, and their Protestant countrymen, ‘condemned, rejected, accursed, and excluded from all Church union?’ and by a civil anathema, impotently, but consequently, *annuls their marriages, and illegitimizes their children?* and which alienates a large portion of their fellow-countrymen from the entire allegiance which they owe to their rightful Sovereign?

“The *loyalty* of the Roman Catholics is held up as a motive for granting their *claims*, as they are usually called. The Roman Catholics are justly entitled to their full share of the military glory of their country. They fought bravely with their Protestant brethren in arms, for their country, against the most powerful and inveterate enemy that England ever had to contend with. And who that now enjoys the blessings of peace and national independence, does not feel the merit of the united exertions of Protestants and Papists in this long and arduous contest? But whatever share of merit may be due to the Roman Catholics in this cause, the Protestants’ larger claim to their country’s gratitude must not be overlooked. What were we contending for? Not merely for ‘ships, colonies, and commerce;’ not merely even for national independence; but also for our *national religion and laws*. And what is demanded of us by the advocates of the Roman Catholics? To repeal the *laws*, which are the bulwarks of our *national religion*.

“The merit, then, of the Roman Catholics in the defence of their country, *in common* with their Protestant countrymen, cannot easily be exaggerated. It was a great *common cause* in which they were engaged; the cause of liberty, property, existence; of parents, wives, and children: and (to use the language of Cicero) of that dear name, which comprehends all charities and affections, the cause of our COUNTRY. And had that Country done nothing to

merit the loyalty of the Roman Catholics? If their friends will compare the situation of the Roman Catholics at the commencement of the present reign with the advantages which they have possessed for these last five-and-twenty years, they must agree that no exertion of bravery or devotion to their country could be too great for the immunities and privileges which they have obtained.

“ Neither must it be forgotten, that fighting the battles of our country is only *one* species of loyalty. LOYALTY, as its original term, *Loi*, denotes, is submission to the *laws* of our country; and, by long usage, expresses, in an especial manner, *a devoted attachment to the Sovereign*. And here unhappily originates the distinction between the terms *Protestant* and *Papist*. A Protestant is one who protests against the intrusive authority of the POPE and of his Church. A Papist, on the contrary, is one, who adheres to the Pope’s authority, in opposition to the laws of his country. A Papist is subject partly to the King, and partly to the Pope. Now, we have great authority for saying, that ‘ no man can serve two masters. Either he must love the one, and hate the other; or he must cleave to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.’ We cannot serve the King and the Pope. We cannot give our whole allegiance to the King, as the laws require, if we give half of it to the Pope. If we are the spiritual subjects of the Pope, we are only half subjects of the King, as HENRY VIII. and JAMES I. used to say.

“ We are reminded by you, that ‘ in the signatures attached to the Roman Catholic Petition, now before Parliament, may be recognised names illustrious in the annals of our country; names mixed up with the *most glorious periods* of our history, and recalling those acts and deeds in peace and war, which had raised so high the honour and character of the empire: names of persons, who, though precluded from following the public example of their ances-

tors, emulated them in private virtues.' These are delightful topics of chivalrous and romantic feeling, but they add nothing to the weight of the Roman Catholic Petition; not merely because those periods of our history were in their military character *incomparably less glorious than the present*, the foreign wars in which we were then engaged being mere wars of conquest and ambition; and because the glory of those days has been renewed and eclipsed by the splendour of the naval and continental victories at Aboukir and Trafalgar, at Salamanca and Vittoria, the Pyrenees and Waterloo; but, because, *in their political character*, they cannot be contemplated without emotions of shame and degradation. For *those are the very periods, which first fixed the yoke of Popery on our country, and, in their gloomy progress, constituted the dark ages of Papal domination.*

“ Besides, the adherence of our ancestors to the Pope under a Popish government, is no warrant for the adherence of their descendants to the Pope under a Protestant Government; especially as that adherence is grounded on such imaginary scruples and fallacies, that nothing can account for its continuance, but the force of education, and of hereditary prejudice—and, above all, the subjection to a system, which, by its pretensions to infallibility, precludes the exercise of private judgment, and of an enlightened conscience. The Roman Catholics are persuaded by Pope Pius's Creed to believe, that the Church of Rome is, exclusively, the holy *Catholic Church*,—the *mother and mistress* of all Churches, and the *true Church*; and, therefore, that Protestants are *out of the pale* of the Church, and, consequently, have no Church, no Orders, no Ministry, no Sacraments, no valid marriages, no legitimate offspring, and, as they believe, no hopes of salvation, being condemned, rejected, and accursed by the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. There is no need of a *great Council* to deliberate on the possibility of Protestant Union with such a Church,

so long as the POPE's supremacy is maintained. For, strange and intolerant as those doctrines are, they are *Articles of Faith*, which the Roman Catholic Clergy are sworn to maintain to the last moment of their lives; and to inculcate to their parishioners, and to all within their cures. And we learn from very late Roman Catholic publications, that *they can make no concession, that would alter the minutest article of their Creed, of which the condemning, rejecting, and accursing of all heresies, is one.* The heresy of the English Church is not excepted from this curse, as you will see by the 11th and 12th Articles of Pope Pius's Creed. §

§ “(11.) That the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches, I acknowledge; and I vow and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter (the Prince of the Apostles) and the Vicar of Jesus Christ.—(12.) And all other things do I undoubtedly receive and confess, which are delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons, and general Councils, and especially the holy Council of Trent; and withal I condemn, reject, and accurse *all things* that are contrary thereunto, and *all heresies whatsoever* condemned, rejected, and accursed by the Church. This true Catholic faith (*out of which no man can be saved*), which at this present time I voluntarily profess and truly hold, I, N. promise, vow, and swear (with God's help), that I will retain and confess whole and inviolate to the last breath of my life; and will take care, as far as in me lies, shall be holden, taught, and preached by all that are under me, and within my care and tuition. So help me God, and these his holy Gospels.”

Their devotion to the Pope, and hostility to heretics, are still more strongly expressed in the oath taken by every Roman Catholic Bishop, *viz.*

“I, N. from this time forward, will be faithful and obedient to my Lord the Pope, and his successors. The counsels with which they trust me, I will not disclose to *any man*, to the hurt of the Pope or his successors. I will assist to retain the Popedom and the *royalties of St. Peter against all men.* I will carefully *preserve, defend, and promote the rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Pope.* I will not be in any council, deed, or treaty, in which any thing prejudicial to the person, *right, or power of the Pope* is contrived; and,

As the alienation of Papists from all Protestant communion, and from the KING's spiritual supremacy, arises from their belief that the Church of Rome is the *Catholic Church, &c.* and as it is demonstrable that the Church of Rome is

Not the Catholic Church,
Not the original Church,
Not the true Church;

consequently the head of that Church cannot be the head of the Christian Church. The proof of this will show the unsoundness of that system which induces so many of our countrymen to pay that obedience to the POPE, which is due only to the KING; and the unreasonableness of a Petition that requires us to sacrifice our constitutional laws and rights, to scruples of conscience, and articles of faith, which are warranted neither by Scripture, nor historical tradition."

LETTER XXVII.

SIR,

THE GREAT EARL OF CLARENDON (formerly the Lord High Chancellor of England and Chancellor of the University of Oxford), at the close of his excellent historical work, entitled, "*RELIGION AND POLICY,*" &c. advances some very important suggestions, as the general result of his extensive observation and inquiry. Availing myself of his able assistance, I shall state to you some few of the inconveniences and remedies of the POPE'S USURPED SUPREMACY; which even our own most candid Roman Catholic writers,

if I shall know any such things treated of by *any whosoever*, I will (to the utmost of my power) hinder them, and with all possible speed signify them to the Pope. I will, to the utmost of my power, observe the Pope's commands, and make others observe them."—See Dr. TROY'S Pastoral Instruction, 1788, page 58.

in favour of what they call their civil "RIGHTS AND CLAIMS," have nevertheless defended, as a doctrine inviolable, and always inseparable from their adhesion to the Church of Rome. §

During the Pontificates of about two hundred and fifty Bishops of Rome, it never occurred for so short a period as half a century, that these pretended Successors of St. Peter have not challenged and assumed this universal authority (which is now considered as of Divine origin), nor were they allowed to exercise the sovereign power without dispute, by large portions of the Christian Church; so that, if it has been on one hand generally usurped by the Popes, it has also been on the other as much opposed, and denied to be a true Catholic doctrine.

Schisms and separations, wars and rebellions, have taken place among Christians, and extensive ruin has happened to whole kingdoms, in consequence of this monstrous affectation of supremacy, and the Pope's magisterial rejection of all reasonable overtures: but, it is too long a tale for me

§ Mr. CHARLES BUTLER's sentiments "on the Spiritual Supremacy of the Pope" are exhibited in a pamphlet printed A. D. 1812; and he maintains, "that a conclusive argument for the right of the Pope to a supremacy of rank and jurisdiction, in the spiritual concerns of the Church of Christ, might be brought from the acknowledgment of it by the Christian world, in every age, from the commencement of the Reformation upwards to the earliest æra of Christianity:" this he attempts to prove, "with the exception of the SCHISMATICS of the Greek Church, the SECTS in the East, A FEW Waldenses in Lucerne" (whom he elsewhere has treated with bitter calumnies), "A FEW Hussites in Bohemia, and A FEW obscure Paulicians." Even "LUTHER HIMSELF" is brought forward to support the pretended Supremacy of the Popes!!!—This is done by CHARLES BUTLER, Esq. whose name is seen affixed to the tract; and in the same collection is a discourse pronounced (May 16, 1811), on the miserable condition of the poor Irish Children, whose education, because it is promoted through the benevolence of PROTESTANTS, has been violently opposed by his Vicar Apostolic and Clergy,

now to narrate the bloody Crusades, the Eastern and Western revolts, the temporal encroachments, the scandalous excommunications, and national interdicts, which arose in Christendom from this one fruitful cause, this tyrannical and proud domination over God's heritage!

If a few modern schoolmen, whose respective governments teach them the madness of such spiritual abuses, have told us they renounce all the secular claims of their Church, and deny the right of the Sovereign Pontiff to touch our *temporal* things, did ever that Church itself (assembled in Council) deny the said right? Did ever one single Bishop of Rome renounce this claim? Have not some Councils, and Creeds, and Episcopal Oaths, and authorized Catechisms, taught a lesson clearly conceding this mischievous claim? Have not the most bitter reproaches of heresy and schism been cast of late on many Churches, Prelates, and Pastors, merely for disobeying the Pope's extravagant orders, or refusing to submit to his usurped jurisdiction?

And, I ask, who is to be the judge of what constitutes a spiritual and what a temporal offence? Is the affair of a duel, or the eating of fish, or the selection of a wife, or the ceremony of marriage, or the reading, printing, buying, and selling of books, to be deemed *spiritual*? Yet, Sir, these, and a hundred more secular things, are nevertheless considered as under the Pope's *spiritual* control, and subjected to his code of Canon Law! Indeed, the carrying on a domestic trade with Infidels or Protestants, contrary to a Priest's direction, subjects Roman Catholics occasionally to Church censures and ruin! So, if a bargain be struck, or a promise made, which is not conformable to a supposed Church duty; or, if an oath be taken, which any Roman Catholic Bishop deems at variance with the Canon Law, it must be counted null and void! When two duties clash, one demanded by the Church and the other by the State, the Popish rule *always* is, for the latter to give way: and

these are the doctrines *now* taught and received, even in Great Britain.

It is certain, however, that the insulting notion of Supremacy is differently handled by different teachers in Europe, there being scarcely two national Roman Catholic Churches which explain it alike; yet, they all contend for the universal Episcopal jurisdiction of His Holiness in some way or another; and this extends to bodies of Christians separated from him and denying his authority. The right of jurisdiction is therefore, in all places and at all times, affirmed, though not exercised; but municipal circumstances may determine when and how to bring a Papal power into full operation, that happens to be under some civil control. Take away or diminish this restraint in a Protestant kingdom, and you immediately will see the Ecclesiastical power rise into action.

The political allegiance of Popish subjects in like manner differs, according to the degree of Papal influence which is admitted to prevail over their consciences: thus Jesuits can hardly ever be good and obedient subjects, under a purely Protestant government; and perhaps it is easier for English Roman Catholics to evince their seemingly perfect and consistent loyalty, than for those who are resident in Ireland. Lord Clarendon says, "it is therefore very unreasonable [for the Popes] to put a yoke upon the necks of the Catholics who live under Protestant Princes, by obliging them to contend with the laws of their country under which they are born, in things merely temporal; and to distinguish themselves from their fellow-subjects, by acknowledging but half that obedience to their Prince which others pay and thereby force their Sovereigns, who should be common fathers, to give but a half protection to them who pay but a half obedience."

Now, this civil distinction is the entire fault of their own system of religious policy and Church discipline; yet, it is

needful, he says, “ to make the strictest laws to disable those from doing hurt, by their depraved affections, to their King and Country, who will not secure their King and Country of their good affections to them, by taking those lawful oaths which are the common bonds of all subjects within the same dominions, and which have as well to do with the illimited fancies of the brain as the dutiful affections of the heart; and though men cannot reasonably be tied to think what others think, they may be ready to *do* what others *do*. For, no Prince nor State can be secured of the dutiful actions of those who subject themselves to *opinions* which control those actions, and dispose the persons not to perform them; as when the Pope excommunicates all those whom he calls Heretics, and absolves all those who are in subjection to those excommunicated persons from any oaths they have taken to them, and from all duty that they are understood to owe them. And when Princes see that, accordingly, their subjects depart from their duty and obedience, have they not great reason to make themselves as sure as may be, that those subjects to whom they allow the protection of their laws shall not submit to such authority, nor should consent to such doctrines? And, if they shall refuse to make any such declarations, have they not great reason to provide for their own security by other restrictions?”

Lord Clarendon then asks his countrymen who refuse to give sufficient security for their obedience to the Sovereign, “ Whether, by adding something to their religion which is not religion, they do not deservedly bring those penalties and forfeitures upon themselves, which they sustain in the very exercise of their religion; and whether the Crown can be without a reasonable and just jealousy of their affection, until they renounce all kind of subjection to, and all kind of dependance upon, the Bishop of Rome, who doth desire

all opportunities by which the peace of the kingdom may be disturbed?"

He goes on therefore to observe, "It is no more excuse for them than it is security for the King, to say that they do not acknowledge any *temporal* authority to be in the Pope, so that he cannot disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that, if himself came to invade the kingdom, they would oppose and resist him with the same courage as they would fight against the Turk! *Spiritual* authority hath done too much mischief to be undervalued, or believed to have less mind to do mischief than it had; nor do they who talk of resisting, know to what degree they would resist, or to what degree they would not assist it, if there were occasion."

"No man yet knows what themselves mean by that *spiritual authority* which they own to be in the Pope; and which they would before this time have carefully explained, if they thought it so innocent that no harm could be apprehended from it; and till they do clearly define what it is, they must not take it ill, if we conceive that they mean enough by it to compass any thing the Pope thinks *seasonable* to apply it to. So that the attributing any power to him, or acknowledging any to be in him, of how *spiritual* a nature soever it is thought to be, shall be enough to give law to the *temporal*, when a spiritual end shall so direct it: and all Kings have reason to believe, that every Pope thinks he hath the same authority over them which any of his predecessors have ever exercised over any of their predecessors; and as much as Bellarmine, Mariana, or any other Jesuit, hath assigned them."

He says, "Since the Popes have not in the least degree disclaimed or renounced the highest act of power which any of their predecessors have ever exercised (though they may have not found it *seasonable* or *safe* for them to *attempt* the same usurpation); nor hath the Catholic Church condemned or disapproved those opinions published by Jesuits and other

writers, which have been published by authority; we may reasonably, and without breach of charity, believe, that it is only want of opportunity, and despair of success, which restrains them from those outward excesses, and not any reformation in their judgments, or an opinion that their jurisdiction is not in truth as large and illimited as any of their predecessors ever presumed to infest the Christian world with."

Lord Clarendon relates the fact, of a large meeting of Roman Catholic Noblemen and Gentry occurring at Arundel House, who had generally agreed to disclaim "the Pope's authority in temporal affairs," during the restoration of the King; but who, on a Jesuit objecting to such disavowal, broke up, and met no more!! He therefore insists upon all the secular and regular *Clergy*, as well as *Laiety*, being required to renounce the Pope's authority in a solemn manner; and without such renunciation, he considers the OATH administered to the *Laiety* as quite *nugatory*: "nor can less than an entire and absolute renouncing *any kind of submission to the Pope, as well in ecclesiastical as temporal affairs*, be in any degree a reasonable assurance of their dutiful and peaceable behaviour." §

He regards the declaration of the Roman Catholics, that

§ It may here be asked, how any Oath taken to the prejudice of the Church could bind a Priest who had already sworn to do all she demands for her aggrandizement? No such Oath to the civil Government of a Kingdom could be a *security*, if administered; but, I presume no such a pledge *will ever* be required of the *Clergy*,—and without it there can be no adequate hold on the consciences of *Laymen*, provided they are *sincere Roman Catholics*.

On the subject of *Oaths* it is particularly worthy of recollection, that Dr. Butler's Catechism and Delahogue's Treatise, both drawn up for the sole use of *IRISH* students, fully admit the right or liberty of breaking a solemn promise, which tends to injure their Church; so that this doctrine may be regarded as *settled*, and very generally received by *Roman Catholics*, at the present time.

they cannot define, or determine upon, the jurisdiction of the Papal authority, as to its precise limits in every case, to be an admission of the Pope's claim, or the right of the Latin Church, to command their obedience; and he justly remarks, that "*all Protestants are still considered as excommunicated Heretics,*" with whom it is forbidden by the Church to hold friendly commerce and Christian amity!!! What is this (he asks) but declaring and proclaiming "*a perpetual hostility with them?*"

His Lordship allows, that many pious and learned persons in this communion have renounced the horrible doctrine, "THAT FAITH IS NOT TO BE KEPT WITH HERETICS: yet (adds he) we must say, that this is but the act of particular men, as to the pronouncing a Catholic verity. THE CHURCH of Rome hath in no degree deposited this weapon, by disavowing it; and no half age passes without her avowing and assuming it: and if she dictates of the Popes themselves be of authority enough to establish (or to propagate) a doctrine, the tenet and assertion will have no less credit to support it."

He cites the case of Cardinal D'Ossat's mentioning Henry the Fourth of France, as a man who would keep his oath; to whom Pope Clement the Eighth replied, "That oath was made to an Heretic, and the King had made quite another oath to God and to him."

He states the views of the Gallican Church and the Sorbonne on this subject; and concludes that, whatever they may do to shake off the power of the Pope, His Holiness and the Court of Rome "adhere still to their old most rigid maxims; and, however their civility and manners in conversation are more refined, their bitterness, animosity, and malice, against all those of the Reformed Religion, are not in any degree inferior to what they were *when Luther first provoked them.*" "I say, the same spirit still reigns, and the same pride and acrimony will be expressed, when

they shall find a conjuncture which they believe will be favourable to them. And of this, there needs no other manifestation than the very virulent expressions and invectives throughout the two great volumes published by the late Cardinal Pallavicino against all of that religion, in his answer to the unanswerable History of the Council of Trent." Lord Clarendon also observes, that the books of Pallavicino were formally licensed, and favoured with the Pope's own grant to publish them; so that they contain the received doctrine of the Church, and afford a sanction to all those vile reproaches against Protestants, &c.

The noble Earl, therefore, insists on the necessity of requiring from the Roman Catholic CLERGY the same oaths as from the Laity, to renounce the POPE'S SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY; lest, by their artifice and comments on such power, it should be "extended to such a magnitude as to shake the *temporality* when it shall be applied for that purpose." This claim, says he, "is the greatest, if not the only cause of the uncharitable disunion and separation between Christians: I say uncharitable—for disunion and separation there may be, *without uncharitableness.*"

LETTER XXVIII.

SIR,

LORD Clarendon, vol. ii. pp. 680—692, goes largely into the subject of uniting the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches; but he held *this* to be totally impossible, until the Papal supremacy is given up and demolished, and its Bishop is compelled to renounce *all* jurisdiction or power in any other territory than his own. "For," says the historian, "we may judge by past experience of what

he has done, that he is willing to do the same in future, if he gets power into his hands." But, it is quite improbable that the Pope will ever consent to any reformation, or concession, or abridgment of his own usurped claims over other Prelates, &c.—and his agents are apt always to gain an advantage over others, by wanting ingenuousness or veracity. The learned author observes, it was a common bait before our troubles of 1640, held out by the Catholics, to affirm that there was but small difference between the Churches of England and Rome, which might easily be reconciled; and he relates an attempt then made by Mr. Davenport, a Franciscan Monk, towards effecting such reconciliation.—“ Alas! those men know little of the Pope's constitution, and how little he is moved by such overtures;” nor is it reasonable to expect “he will depart from the prerogatives of his predecessors, with which he is invested, or fail to support the Papacy to the full height at which he received it. Besides, *he* may himself be deposed, if he become an heretic, and favour those who have withdrawn from the Church. It is further certain that Leo X. considered it wrong to comply with the wishes of a poor Friar (Luther) in a matter which might even be agreeable to his own judgment, and might be palpably erroneous; nor would the Pontiff concede to the German and French Bishops, so moderate a request as the marriage of the Clergy and the cup of the Eucharist to the laity: and now the contrary is looked upon as main pillars of the Catholic faith, so that no proposition in Calvin is considered less heterodox than the violation of either practice.

He cites Pallavicino, who says, “ Nothing is harder to be made, or, being once made, of more dangerous influence, than a General Synod; so that, as long as the course of the world shall go on as it does, an attempting it in extreme necessity, would be a perfect tempting of God, and such an assembly would make the Church run an evident risk

of having its flock scattered." Will not all those men who think a General Council is the only representative of the Church, conceive that they who object thus to General Synods would have no other Church than what is comprehended in the person of the Pope himself? And Lord Clarendon admits the absolute *useless* tendency of any council; if it be not *first* settled what submission should be paid to it, and what it should determine when met; for, otherwise, the Pope will elude, corrupt, and render ineffectual every measure for the general good, as he did at the Council of Trent. The usurped authority and pre-eminence of the Pope is never likely to come to a righteous and just decision at such a Council. He describes the tergiversation and scandalous dealings of the Pope in regard to the Trent Synod, after it had been dissolved, when he refused to confirm such canons as he did not like, and which required a reformation in his court, &c. but he was at length induced to yield a reluctant confirmation of all. Therefore, upon the whole, Lord Clarendon deems National Councils more likely to do good; which may be convened by the respective Sovereigns of each State, when required, and will not be liable to the control of Jesuits or Romish Bishops.

He narrates the ill conduct of the Pope to Charles II. in his exile, because he would not surrender his conscience, and engage to use his endeavours towards effecting a re-union of England to the Church of Rome; and he advises the expulsion of the Jesuits from Great Britain, as absolutely indispensable to her welfare, and to the loyalty of other Roman Catholic subjects, who then might possibly shake off their foreign allegiance. He considers it, however, totally unsafe to repeal the penal statutes, till they "absolutely renounce *all* manner of authority or power in the Church of Rome, or in the Pope, to lay *any* commands upon them within the King's dominions;" for, he says, that this obedience in spiritual things is "not of the essence of

the Catholic religion, or embraced by any other Catholics in any other manner than as they are directed by the laws of the kingdom or country in which they live:" such renunciation he contends is requisite, and this only should entitle them to equal privileges with Protestant subjects. "For, if that subjection to the Pope were once disclaimed and rooted out, their other errors are not dangerous to the State, and would be reformed by their being rescued from such captivity;" since it is this *foreign jurisdiction alone* which renders them bad subjects, and prohibits Government from allowing them equal advantages with others. Thus, adds he, might prejudice and uncharitableness be banished among us Christians, all faction being removed; and no mischievous civil consequences would result from their speculative erroneous opinions.

This masterly treatise, of which I have here given but a very slight idea and compressed abstract, is dated Feb. 12, 1673; at MOULINS. It seems to be less known than his Lordship's other historical writings, and has been too little consulted in connexion with the "Catholic Claims." If the obstacles to a legislative and political coalition between Protestants and Roman Catholics appeared *so great* to LORD CLARENDON, how much greater are they now; when so many constitutional guards and fences, which did not exist in his time, must first be destroyed! We have now to break down the protecting laws of KING WILLIAM'S reign, by which the Revolution of 1688 was confirmed and declared inviolable for ever; and we have now also to remove other subsequent Parliamentary and National Acts, which united Scotland and Ireland with this southern portion of the Empire!

Sir, are you quite prepared to annul and abolish "The Bill of Rights?" Will you lay aside the "Act of Settlement," which still further secured a Protestant ascendancy and throne? Will you alter the form of the Coronation

Oath, and leave the Crown open to any Prince who may not choose to "maintain the Protestant reformed Religion established by Law?" Or, do you only intend to give Popish advisers and State Ministers to our Protestant King? Do you mean to discontinue the barriers and tests by which certain offices have hitherto been preserved from the occupation of Protestant Dissenters, who are far less obnoxious to our Religion (as established by law) than even the most moderate Roman Catholics? Are you ready to dispense with the fundamental articles of the Union, which bind together the several members of this empire; and which assure the permanency of a Protestant Church in each of them, while such national Union shall continue? Will you finally dissolve the Irish Union, and our United Church, or at least hazard their speedy dissolution?

Sir, these questions are vitally important; and must be well considered by those who legislate for "A CHURCH" (as Mr. Burke said) "which is Protestant, A STATE which is Protestant, A GOVERNMENT which is Protestant, in all their parts."—If you be not willing to confer equal *power*, as well as equal *eligibility*, on Roman Catholics, you cannot consistently give them "admission to seats in Parliament; a concession" which (to use the words of Lord Colchester) "would virtually accomplish, at no distant period, their admission to every other branch of political power, and an event which I dread and deprecate."

It was honest and fair in the late Mr. Fox, eighteen years ago, to avow (in the House of Commons, March 25th, 1801), that "he would have a Catholic possess AS MUCH power and AS MUCH influence as a Protestant;" but he did not tell how to preserve inviolable SUCH EQUALITY IN PRACTICE, during all future generations! He did not divulge the secret of preventing animosity and strife between two conflicting parties, so as to avoid A PREFONDERANCY OF EITHER in some favourable moment! Nor did he then see

the Papal Pontiff exalted, sending forth armies of Inquisitors and Jesuits, and reviving all his dormant institutions!

The late Lord Ellenborough (so eminently skilled in the profession of the law), when the last debates on the Catholic Petition took place, thus delivered his sentiments on the points treated of in this Letter:

“Catholic Emancipation (as it is improperly called, if that term is meant to designate any slavish subjection as still subsisting on their part, either in respect of person, property, or the profession of religious faith, or the exercise of religious worship) has been fully attained. The only remaining emancipation which they are capable of receiving, must be acquired by an act of their own; by redeeming themselves from the foreign bondage under which they and their ancestors have long unworthily groaned, and from which the State, as it has neither imposed nor continued it, has no adequate means of relieving them, consistently with the duty of self-preservation which it owes to itself. Every State, claiming and exercising independent powers of sovereignty, has incidentally belonging to it, as such, the power of binding its subjects by laws of its own; not only paramount to, but exclusive of, any authority or control to be exercised by any other State whatsoever. In so far as any foreign State or person is allowed to exercise an authority, breaking in upon this exclusive and independent power of legislation, and enforcement of authority in another State; to that extent such State, so entrenched upon, is not *sovereign and independent*, but admits itself to be *subordinate to, and dependent upon* the other. The declaration contained in the Oath of Supremacy, which expresses a denial and renunciation of the existence of any power and authority, in respect of ecclesiastical and spiritual matters, in any foreign State, potentate, or person whatsoever, is but the affirmance of a proposition, which is logically and politically true, as an essential principle of independent sovereignty,

applicable not to this Government only, but to every other Government under the sun, which claims to possess and exercise the powers of independent sovereignty.

“ It is not only true, as a maxim of government, but essentially necessary to be insisted and acted upon also, in all cases in which obedience may be questionable, in order to give the State that assurance and test which it has a right to require and receive from its subjects, of their entire submission and fidelity in all matters to which the power and authority of the State can extend.

“ But, it is said, that what is prayed by this Petition is not a matter which impugns the authority of the State in matters to which its authority extends; that the reserve made by our Roman Catholic brethren is only in favour of matters which concern God and their own consciences; matters of mere abstract faith, and mental persuasion.

“ *That*, however, is not so: the Pope, in virtue of his general spiritual authority, claims authority in matters of *morale* (i. e. of moral conduct, and which extends to all the acts of man), as well as in matters of *mere faith*: he claims and habitually exercises, on some subjects, a power of dispensing with OATHS, and in that respect of nullifying all human sanctions whatsoever, as far as they affect the conscience through the medium of oaths. He claims and exercises by himself, and delegates to others, an effectual, or supposed effectual power of absolution. What fatal effects that power, as exercised by the Roman Catholic priesthood, and applied to a credulous multitude, is capable of producing upon the civil and political condition of that community in which it is allowed to prevail, let the recent experience of Ireland during the late rebellion attest; where wretches, reeking with the blood of their murdered countrymen, have been purified from the guilt of past atrocities, and prepared for the commission of new, by the all-atoning virtues of Popish absolution! Such a power as this over the conscience,

engrosses and directs more than half the faculties and energy of the entire man, &c.

“ But, besides the spiritual power thus capable of being, and thus being in fact abused; the ecclesiastical power of the Church of Rome over its obedient sons is enormous. It establishes and sustains, in the instance of Ireland, an hierarchy dependent on the See of Rome, as to the original nomination and subsequent control of its bishops and pastors, through the medium of which it enforces an obedience not *in matters of faith only*, but in *temporal acts and concerns* immediately connected with the duties and habits of ordinary life; not only in the payment of money for the maintenance of the local ecclesiastical establishment, or for such other purposes connected with their political economy as may be thought fit by the same authority to be enjoined, but in the performance also of rites and ceremonies, particularly that of marriage, from which all civil rites originate, and which they enjoin to be performed by their own ministers exclusively,—thereby *ousting the law of the land, and endangering or destroying the legitimacy of its subjects, and all rights of descent, inheritance, and representation founded thereon.* The power of excommunication is, in the hands of their Clergy, a most powerful and dangerous engine, not of *spiritual and ecclesiastical only*, but of *temporal power.* It acts at once upon all the comforts of domestic and social life in this world, and upon all the hopes and expectations of happiness in that which is to come. With what harshness and rigour, and with what daring defiance of the established law of the land, this most operative power of interdiction has been recently applied, not to a few individuals only, but to large multitudes of people, a noble and learned Lord detailed to us on a former evening.

“ These are a few, and but a few, of the practical civil inconveniences which might be instanced, as derived to the State and its subjects from the authority of the See of Rome,

spiritual and ecclesiastical, as it is exercised over the sons of its Church; producing, as it does, a distracted allegiance in the same person, acknowledging and living under the temporal power of one sovereign, and bound in faith and morals by the authority of another, claiming to be his spiritual guide and governor, his ecclesiastical sovereign, and in effect, in all matters of supreme conscientious concernment, God's vicegerent and representative on earth."

LETTER XXIX.

SIR,

There are two classes of controversialists among English Roman Catholics; one class (by much the larger of the two) is bitter in reproaches, and unmeasured in calumny; the other is full of amenity, calmness, and subtle dealing.—They have a Milner, Fletcher, Gandolphy, Lingard, and Andrews, to wield the Tomahawk or the Hatchet; and they have their Butlers ("apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto"), to smooth down the wrinkled brow of opponents, and to handle the keen Sabre with graceful adroitness! Bishop Milner's new Work, against the principles of Protestantism, which he calls "The End of Religious Controversy," may serve as a specimen of the former sort of writing; and Mr. Butler's three volumes of Church History (the first of which is very obligingly dedicated to You), will afford a sample of the latter kind. I beg to make some brief remarks on both these modern productions, because few English Lay-Protestants are so anxious and sincere in behalf of Christianity, as to inquire what is doing by Roman Catholics at home.

Sir, our Church is assailed incessantly, and on all sides, by different sorts of weapons; and it will be well if *no other*.

be ever allowed to such adversaries, than these legitimate weapons, of literature and a free press. It is the constant and uniform habit of those who take up their pen against us, to traduce our most faithful historians; and to cast out insinuations or direct charges of perfidy and gross falsehood, against Fox, Jewel, Fuller, Burnet, Clarendon, Usher, Strype, &c. while they praise their own Stapleton, and Ward, and Dodd, and Challoner, &c. as oracles of TRUTH. If they can but impress their readers with an idea that all Protestant Historians are WILFULLY corrupt and erroneous, *their end* in noticing or answering them is half gained. Another point is never forgotten: that is, to misrepresent and magnify the examples of Protestant persecution (which, when they happen, must be in direct contravention of our RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES); and to deny, disguise, or greatly to palliate, the numberless cases of cruel barbarity by Roman Catholics, only acting conformably to THEIR AUTHORIZED DOCTRINES.

In Mr. Butler's three last volumes (one upon the Gallican Church, and two on the Roman Catholics at home), this learned Gentleman never once loses sight of his main object—to promote the *political* aggrandizement of Roman Catholics, and to establish their unconditional "*Claims*" in Parliament; for, though he treats on many different subjects, and makes devious movements as his work demands (like a ship steering in almost opposite directions during a long voyage), the writer tacks about at last towards the wished-for point, and brings all the materials of his history to bear upon "the Catholic Question."

It is, therefore, considered by me as an historical record most partial, very defective, and unworthy of credit; suppressing facts in almost every chapter, and giving so meagre or distorted a view of the state of Popery in this Empire, as will serve to blind Protestants, and make Jesuitical Catholics smile with complacency: I could easily fill a volume, in

pointing out the author's omissions, inaccuracies, and unfaithful dealings. Even already (notwithstanding two editions of the *Memoirs* have been rapidly sold), one of the *Vicars Apostolic* complains of the writer's insincerity and false statements!

I myself am also of opinion, that *Dodd's History of the Roman Catholic Church* is infinitely more faithful, though not so classically pure in its style of composition, and I think will justly be regarded as a safer authority for future generations. The artifice with which these *Memorials* are drawn up is equally manifest in *Mr. Butler's* collection of *Creeeds or Confessions*, of which I now shall say no more; but if time and health should allow, I may possibly hereafter take further notice of the book just alluded to. *Of dissingenuousness* we may surely complain, even when a work is written with the utmost elegance, method, and literary skill; for nothing can compensate the want of honest and strict fidelity in a professed *historical* production.

Dr. John Milner's new work in three parts, comprising 660 pages, is "addressed to the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of St. David's, in Answer to his Lordship's Protestant Catechism." It explains and defends *all* the leading principles of the unreformed Latin Church, which some candid Statesmen are pleased to say have no existence! It alleges that *Bishop Burgess*, and other honourable opponents, teach and desire Protestants "TO HATE AND PERSECUTE *their elder Brethren, the authors of their Christianity and civilization.*" It brands with infamy and blackness the character of *Milton*, *Locke*, *Hoadly*, and a long list of modern Prelates, some of whom are still living; not to mention *Wickliff*, *Lord Cobham*, and a host of other "Lollards," &c. &c. who are described as the most worthless and rebellious of human beings. It spares neither Kings, nor Nobles, nor Prelates, nor Scholars, nor meaner persons of unblemished morals, if they dislike Popery and its superstitions. The

author attacks all Bible-men with most malignant and unmeasured virulence, not omitting our venerable translators of the Bible, who are said to have committed "MANY WILLFUL ERRORS."

You will pardon me, Sir, if I give (at the close of my Appendix) a single specimen of the author's gross ignorance, mingled with the foulest calumny against those translators.

Dr. Milner's book is adorned with engravings; one of which is "THE APOSTOLICAL TREE," showing the constant succession of Bishops, &c. "likewise the chief Heretics and Schismatics who have been cut off" from the Roman Catholic Church! In this tree, I find, classed together and lopped off, the names of "Henry VIII. Duke of Somerset, Queen Elizabeth, Servetus, Chillingworth, Bayle, George Fox, Rousseau, Voltaire, Zinzendorf, Brienne, Robespierre, and Condorcet," as "Chief Heretics and Schismatics of their ages;" also, on the opposite side of this tree, are the names of "Wycliff, Jerome of Prague, John Huss, Luther, Calvin, Anabaptists, Zuinglius, Melancthon, Beza, Arminius, Gomarus, Jansenius, J. Wesley, G. Whitfield," with many others, all cut off and falling down—as being only fit for the fire, and out of the "true Church of Christ." I hardly need add, that (in this author's view) "there is and can be no Apostolical succession of ministry in the Established Church, more than in the other congregations or societies of Protestants: all their preaching and ministering in their several degrees, is performed by mere human authority," he says; and consequently, the whole work of that "Intrusive Church" is invalid, useless, profane, and a perpetual imposition, without efficacy, without real sacraments, without legitimate baptisms, or lawful marriages, or right to Christian ceremonies, or hope of divine acceptance at the bar of mercy. This is genuine Popish charity, in the 19th century, and in the British dominions!!!

I do not question the logical subtlety, the profound an-

tiquarian knowledge, the deep classical erudition, and the superior acquaintance of Dr. Milner with his own Church History; but, Sir, I do question his critical accuracy, his knowledge and love of the Scriptures, his taste for pure evangelical truth, and his fairness in controversial discussion. All the writers of his class are far too dogmatical, too overbearing, too abusive and personal, too rude to their equals in literature, and too acrimonious to their inferiors in debate, —sparing no epithets of reproach or censure towards any one who thinks and speaks in the temper of an honest and independent mind! But, Sir, I regard not the contumely of such men: the fear of man never deters me from the performance of a Christian duty; and I stand fully prepared to endure all consequences, and to leave my moral reputation in the hands of a Divine Omniscient Judge.

If, as Dr. Johnson observes, “no book was ever spared out of tenderness to the author, and the world is little solicitous to know whence proceeded the faults of that which it condemns;” I cannot expect any indulgence for the deficiencies or mistakes which may be detected in the foregoing pages,—though written or compiled “*amidst inconvenience and distraction*,” without the aid or concurrence of a single friend, in broken moments of time, stolen either from sleep or pressing avocations, and during so short a period as not to admit of revisal or one more day’s delay.

I am, Sir,

With great respect,

Your obliged Servant,

WILLIAM BLAIR.

LONDON,
April 10, 1819.

APPENDIX.

CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES EXEMPLIFIED, IN PERSECUTING BIBLE-ANNOTATIONS.

(From the *Antibiblion, or Papal Tocsin.*)

“If it be proved that Catholics are bound by their principles to persecute and extirpate persons of a different religion from themselves, it is absurd in them to look up to a Protestant Legislature for any extension of their civil privileges; they may rather expect to see their former chains rivetted upon them.”—BISHOP MILNER'S *Letters to a Prebendary, Postscript to Letter IV.* p. 136, 4th edit. Cork, 1807.

ABOUT four years ago, a certain “Correspondence on the Roman Catholic Bible Society” was published by Mr. Blair, in which select Notes appeared, taken from the Doway and Rheims Bible, purporting to exhibit “the Genuine Principles of Roman Catholics.” We do not forget the clamour which was then raised; for it was observed, by Mr. Butler, in his reply, “When the harsh expressions of the Rheimish annotators are brought forward, the dungeons too, the racks, the gibbets, the fires, the confiscations, and the various other modes of persecution, in every hideous form, which the Catholics of those days endured, should not be forgotten.”—“That these,” says Mr. Butler, “should have produced some expressions of bitterness from the writers in question, cannot be a matter of surprise; if something of the kind had not fallen from them, they would have been more than men.”

This was the apology made for such disgraceful annotations, first published in 1582 (see *Gent. Mag.* for Feb. 1814, p. 123); and it was asked, “*Why the Roman Catholics of the present day* should be criminated for an alleged intemperance of some of the Rheimish notes?” The plain answer is, because such notes are approved and circulated by “Roman Catholics of the *present day*,” and of this fact English Protestants have *now* an undoubted right to complain, because there is no such palliating provocation in the nineteenth century; and indeed there never was a

period when greater forbearance and religious toleration were shown to our bitterest opponents.

The following information on this subject is copied from the Courier of October, 1817; since which time we have seen an advertisement in the Dublin Correspondent, announcing that this Bible (with *infallible* annotations) is publishing in numbers at Cork, under the sanction of "Their Graces Archbishop Troy and the Lord Primate of all Ireland, with the President of the Royal College of Maynooth," and several of the other Popish Prelates, &c. &c.

"SIR,

"Many complaints have been made, that the principles maintained by the Roman Catholic Priesthood have been calumniously misrepresented, in Parliament and out of Parliament, by the opponents of the measure so delusively termed 'Catholic Emancipation.' The following extracts from the New Roman Catholic Bible, published at Dublin, in the last year, under the express sanction of Dr. Troy, the titular Archbishop, do not, it is to be supposed, contain any misrepresentation of the principles of the Romish Priesthood. My attention has been directed to this very important work, containing a republication of all the *persecuting principles* of the Rhemish Priests, by an article which appeared in the last number of the British Critic.

"In the Annotations of Dr. Troy's Bible, the authority of which, as being ecclesiastical *tradition*, stated and expounded by the Pastors of the Roman Church, is maintained to be no less binding on the conscience of a Roman Catholic, than the text itself of the sacred Scripture, the Romanists are informed, that *Protestants* are *heretics* and *schismatics*—'the bane and disease of *this time*' (note on John, xvi. 28); that 'all the definitions and marks of an *heretic* fall upon them' (Tit. iii. 10); and that '*the church* of God, calling the *Protestants*' doctrine *heresy*, in the worst part that can be, and in the *worst sort that ever was*, doth right and most justly' (Acts, xxviii. 22): that '*the new pretended Church Service of England* is in schism and heresy; and, therefore, not only unprofitable, but also *damnable*' (Acts, x. 9); that, as the Jewish temple was made a den of thieves, the church, or 'the house appointed for the holy sacrifice, and sacrament of the body of Christ, is *now* much more' made a den of thieves, being made 'a den for the ministers of Calvin's breed' (Mark, xi. 17); and that, if our divine Redeemer could 'not abide to see the temple of God profaned' by the secular business of money-changers, he

can 'much less abide the profaning of the churches now with heretical service and preaching of *heresy and blasphemy*' (Mark, xi. 17); that the prayer of a schismatic (*i. e.* a Protestant) cannot be heard by Heaven (John, xv. 7); that 'the speeches, preaching, and writings of heretics (Protestants) are pestiferous, contagious, and creeping like a canker; therefore *Christian* men must never hear their sermons, nor read their books' (2 Tim. ii. 17): that, 'as the devil acknowledging the Son of God, was bid to hold his peace,' 'therefore, neither heretics' (Protestants) sermons must be heard, *no, not though they preach the truth*: so is it of their prayer 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' (Mark, iii. 12): that 'a *Christian* man is especially bound to burn and deface all heretical books' (and therefore Protestant Bibles, Prayer Books, &c. Acts, xix. 19); that the translators of the English Protestant Bible ought 'to be abhorred to the depth of hell' (Heb. v. 7); and, as it is remarked in the British Critic, not only are the memories of the dead to be held in detestation, but the same abhorrence is to be extended to the persons of the living. The Roman Catholics are enjoined to 'abhor those new Manichees of our time, both *Lutherans* and Calvinists' (Acts, ii. 23): and they are informed that, 'though in such times and places, where the community or most part are *infected*, necessity often forces the *faithful* to converse with such in worldly affairs, to salute them, eat and speak with them; and the Church, by decree of Council, for the more quietness of timorous consciences, provides that they incur not excommunication or other censures for communicating, in worldly affairs, with any in this kind, *except they be by name* excommunicated, or declared to be heretics; yet, even in worldly conversation and secular acts of our life, *we* (*viz.* the Roman Catholics) must avoid them as much as *we may*, because their familiarity is in many ways contagious and noisome to good men, namely, to the simple; but in matter of religion, in praying, reading their books, hearing their sermons, presence at their service, partaking of their sacraments, and *all other communication with them in spiritual things*, it is a *great damnable sin* to deal with them.' (John, ii. 10.)

"Thus, though the Roman Catholic Church commands her members to avoid all communication *in spirituals* with Protestants, as a *great and damnable sin*; yet, where the community is generally *infected* by Protestantism, she

permits them to converse with their Protestant fellow-subjects in worldly affairs, *unless they shall be by name declared to be heretics*: but even such conversation must be avoided as much as possible, being contagious and noisome to good Roman Catholics, and is permitted by their Church, only because *necessity forces it!* Such is the tolerant spirit of that Church, whose members now clamour for admission to the political power of the state, on the alleged ground of the duty of toleration!

“But how long would Dr. Troy, and his brethren the Romish Priests, consider even *such toleration* justified by *necessity*? We are informed in the following annotations: ‘The good (*i. e.* the Roman Catholics) must tolerate the evil (*i. e.* the Protestants, &c.), when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger or disturbance of the whole Church, and commit the matter to God’s judgment in the latter day; *otherwise*, where evil men, be they *heretics* or *other malefactors*, may be punished and suppressed, without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and *ought*, by public authority, ‘either spiritual or temporal, to be *chastised* or EXECUTED’ (Matt. xiii. 29): and, again, ‘all heretics,’ though in the beginning they may appear ‘to have some show of truth,’ yet, in due time their *deceits and falsehood* shall be known by all wise men; ‘though for troubling the state of such commonwealths where unluckily they have been received, they cannot be *so suddenly EX-TIRPATED*’ (2 Tim. iii. 9). SO SUDDENLY EX-TIRPATED!

“In another part of this newly published and sanctioned Roman Catholic Bible, the words of Hierom are perverted, in order to convince the Romanists that their ‘zeal ought to be so great toward’ *all Protestants* and ‘their doctrines, that they should give them the anathema, though they were never so dear to them,’ and ‘*not spare even their own parents*’ (Gal. i. 8). And at the same time, the Roman Catholics are informed that ‘the Church and holy Councils use the word anathema for a *curse* against *heretics*,’ &c.; and, that to say ‘Be he anathema,’ means ‘Beware you accompany not with him, accursed be he, *away with him!*’ Such are the exhortations now addressed to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and addressed to them in their Bible, as the authorized exposition of the word of God!

“The expression, ‘*away with him,*’ may be found four times in the *text* of the New Testament; on every occasion it is stated as the expression of a furious rabble, having uni-

formly for its meaning, that the object of their rage should be put to death; it occurs twice, as used against our Saviour; and twice as used against St. Paul (Luke. xxiii. 18; Acts, xxi. 36; John, xix. 15; Acts, xxii. 22). But it remained for the contrivers of the Rhemish perversion of Scripture, and for Dr. Troy and the other Popish Doctors, who have republished that mischievous work, to inform the Roman Catholics that the murderous cry of the Jewish rabble, is a divine command which *they* are bound to obey and execute, in due season, against their Protestant countrymen.

“ The Roman Catholics are also informed in Dr. Troy’s Bible, that the *Protestant Clergy* are seducers of the people, intruders into the fold of our Redeemer’s church, usurpers of the *rightful possession* (passim), and leaders of a *rebellion* against the *lawful authority of the Roman Catholic Priests*. The Protestant Clergy of all denominations are farther described in this authorized Bible, as ‘*thieves, MURDERERS, and ministers of the DEVIL*’ (John, x. 1, and Heb. v. 1). They and their flocks, as supporters of the Protestant ‘*heresy*,’ are declared to be engaged in a ‘*rebellion and damnable revolt against the Priests of God’s church*,’ that rebellion ‘*which is the bane of our days, and especially of our country*’ (Heb. xiii. 17): and the Roman Catholics are warned from this, ‘*their authorized divine Oracle, that ‘Christian people (especially Bishops)’ (meaning the Romish Bishops and their adherents) ‘should have great zeal against heretics’ (meaning Protestants, &c.) ‘and hate them; that is, their wicked doctrine and conditions, even as God hateth them:’ and the Popish Bishops are further told to be ‘zealous and stout against false prophets and heretics of what sort soever’ (of course meaning the Protestant Clergy and their flocks, &c.); and to be thus zealous, remembering ‘the example of holy Elias, that in zeal killed four hundred and fifty false prophets.’ (Rev. ii. 6. 20.)*

“ The Roman Catholics are also assured that, ‘*when Rome puts heretics to DEATH, and ALLOWS THEIR PUNISHMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES, their blood*’ (the blood of Protestants, &c. shed on account of alleged heresy by Papists) ‘*is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors; for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer*’ (Rev. xvii. 6). They are reminded, that though the Son of God rebuked

his disciples for proposing to invoke fire from heaven against the Samaritans, as Elias had done; 'yet that Elias's fact was not reprehended, nor the Church nor Christian Princes blamed, for putting *heretics* to DEATH' (Luke, ix. 55); and, in another annotation, Dr. Troy adopts and sanctions the exclamation of Queen Mary's Rhemish Priests, 'If St. Paul *appealed* to Cæsar not yet christened, how much more may we call for the aid of Christian princes for the punishment of *heretics!*' (Acts, xxv. 11.)

"Now, if for the aid of Popish *Princes*, why not also for the aid of *Popish Magistrates*, whenever a favourable opportunity may arrive?

"Even to those who profess obedience to a Priesthood maintaining *such principles*, our free and happy Constitution grants the fullest toleration; and I rejoice at it: but how far it may be *wise* to subject the executive powers in Ireland to the influence of *such principles*, or to permit them to have a share in directing the proceedings of the British Parliament, I leave to the judgment of an enlightened public.

"I propose addressing you soon again on this important subject, and will not, at present, trespass longer on your valuable columns.

"Your obedient servant,

"FABRICIUS.

"P. S. The annotations in Dr. Troy's New Testament are considerably longer than the text; and almost all the annotations, at least three fourths of them, breathe the same spirit of charity and toleration towards Protestants, which the specimens quoted in this letter evince."

A FURTHER ACCOUNT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE,
PUBLISHED IN 1816, AT DUBLIN.

"SIR,

"AN unquestionable and decisive evidence of the principles maintained by the Roman Catholic Priesthood in Ireland, is at present of such *great political* importance to the whole United Kingdom, that some additional particulars respecting their new Dublin Bible may appear to you to be entitled to the serious attention of the British public, and proper to be inserted in the Courier.

"In the letter which appeared in your paper of Saturday the 11th inst. it was stated that the authority of Annotations on the Scripture, sanctioned by the Roman

Church is held to be no less binding on the conscience of a Roman Catholic, than that of the Sacred Text itself.

“ This tenet is thus declared in the Dublin Bible: 1 Thess. ii. 12, ‘ The word of God.’—Annotat. ‘ The adversaries’ (meaning the Protestants) ‘ will have no word of God, but that which is written and contained in the Scripture: but here they might learn, &c.: also, that *whatsoever* the lawful Apostles, Pastors, and Priests of God’s church, preach in the unity of the same church’ (meaning the Church of Rome) ‘ is to be taken for God’s own WORD.’

“ The Annotations in Dr. Troy’s Rhemish New Testament, containing *this divine word*, are of a length nearly twice that of the whole text; and in almost every instance they exhibit the same irreconcilable hostility and persecuting spirit against Protestants.

“ It is to be wished that the history of this perversion of the sacred Scripture were known to the public.

“ While the ministers of Romish vengeance were inflicting on the innocent Dissenters from Popery, in the valleys of Piedmont, the severest tortures that inventive cruelty could devise—sparing neither age nor sex *; while France was stained with the blood of murdered Protestants, and England yet mourning for her Cranmers, her Riddleys, and her Latimers; within a few years after the Guises had led their band of assassins, with their *white crosses* on their hats, to the massacre of Paris; and Pope Gregory the Thirteenth had ordered a solemn thanksgiving and general jubilee for the dreadful murders they had committed †; under the immediate patronage of the Guises and of Gregory, some of Queen Mary’s bigotted Romish Priests, who, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, fled from their indignant country, published at Rheims their translation of the New Testament with annotations: they artfully perverted the expressions of some of the early Christian writers, in order to give an apparent sanction to their own pernicious tenets; and, under the name of an exposition of the word of God, circulated all the exterminating principles which, in that age of Romish bigotry, spread over so great a portion of Europe the horrors of a sanguinary persecution. But it would swell this letter beyond reasonable limits, to give a

* See Leger’s Vaudois.

† Mezeray, De Serres, Thuanns, &c.

particular account, either of the Rhemish Doctors, or of their pernicious productions. Suffice it to say, that they have been described, by the authentic historians of that melancholy period, as plotters and zealous supporters of Romish conspiracies and rebellions*—as authors of publications, exhorting Romanists to insurrection against their Protestant governors—and even encouraging and justifying *assassination*. The general character of their principal work, the Rhemish Exposition of the New Testament, may be estimated from the Annotations cited in the Courier of the 11th October. This *chef d'œuvre* has been republished at different periods; but, in the *later* publications of it, from the middle of the last century, at least in those which are generally known, that of 1750, and of 1752, the *persecuting* notes were omitted. They have now been unhappily revived, and under what circumstances? In the year 1816, when the Roman Catholics confidently expected legislative concession to their demands, and the *speedy* approach of their *day of power* in Ireland, and of influence in England.

“Sir, upon this I shall make no comment; but proceed to state a few more specimens of the principles maintained in those Annotations, now sanctioned by Papal Archiepiscopal authority, and again proclaimed to the Roman Catholics as the DIVINE WORD.

“The unfounded and dangerous claim of the Roman Church, to jurisdiction over all Protestants, which has been so fully exposed by Dr. Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Landaff †, is asserted in various parts of Dr. Troy's Annotations.

“It is stated in the note on Matt. xvi. 19, that, to the Church of Rome has been committed ‘*all kind* of discipline and *punishment* of offenders, either spiritual, which is directly meant, or CORPORAL, so far as it tendeth to the execution of the spiritual charge: of which sort are excommunications, ANATHEMAS, &c. &c. for punishment—specially of heresy and rebellion against the Church, and the chief pastors thereof’ (of course of Protestantism, which is described in these Annotations, as the worst of heresies, and a most wicked rebellion against the Romish Church and her chief pastors). Now, let it be remembered, that when the Popish authorities shall think proper to issue their

* Stow, Speed, Fuller, Strype, Camden; all the authentic historians confirm this account.

† In his Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome.

ANATHEMA against any body of Protestants, the effect is to be the same, as if the divine Voice proclaimed ‘Accursed be they—AWAY WITH THEM!’ (See note on Rom. ix. 3.) Even the appellation of *Roman Catholic*, it seems, is not to be accounted for, without reminding the Romish authorities of their jurisdiction over Protestants, and of their obligation to punish them, whenever the proper occasion may arrive. The word ‘Roman,’ they are informed, ‘is added to Catholic in many countries where sects abound, for the better distinction of true believers from heretics’ (Protestants, &c.); ‘who, in all ages, did hate and abhor the Roman faith and church, as ALL MALEFACTORS do their JUDGES and CORRECTORS.’ (Rom. i. 8.)

“The claim of the Romish Church to the exclusive right to the spiritual offices and privileges, and to the temporal possessions of our Ecclesiastical Establishments, is plainly asserted; and, in order to justify it, the words of Tertullian are perverted, and used against the Protestant Clergy: ‘Who are you, and from whence came you? What do you in *my possession*, that are none of mine? Why do you sow and seed for these companions, at your pleasure? It is *my possession*—I possess it of old—I am heir of the Apostles. As they provided by their Testament, as they committed it to my credit, as they adjured me, so do I hold it. You surely they disinherited always, and have cast you off as enemies.’—Preface, p. 16. The Protestant Clergy and their flock are not to be allowed even the possession of the Sacred Scriptures: ‘No heretics’ (Protestants, &c.) ‘have right to the Scriptures, but are usurpers; the Catholic Church’ (the Roman Catholic) ‘being the *true owner* and faithful keeper of them.’—Preface, *ibid.*

“To take leave of the Notes in Dr. Troy’s Bible, with two or three more quotations. ‘It is declared that heretics’ (Protestants) ‘follow in hypocrisy and show of virtue, the pernicious doctrine of DEVILS, who are lying spirits in the mouths of all heretics and *false teachers*,’ 1 Tim. iv. 1 (of course in the mouths of the Protestant clergy especially). That they have ‘*no Conscience*,’ *ibid.* (This may explain the well-known Popish interpretation of ‘Liberty of Conscience’ under James II.) That they resemble ‘Judas in apostacy’ (John, vi. 68), ‘and Cain, in having, for envy that his brother’s sacrifice was accepted, and his rejected, slain his brother, and become a fugitive from the face and city of God, i. e. the Church’ (meaning the Roman Church); and that ‘to all such the Apostle giveth the curse. and

telleth them, that the storm of darkness and eternal damnation is provided for them.' Jude, 11. That 'no heretics' (Protestants) 'can possibly be saved, though they shed their blood for Christ's name'—'though they die among Heathens or Turks, for defence of TRUTH, or some article of Christ's religion:' and that 'Calvinists, who *now-a-days* die in defence of *their heresies*,' are, on that account, only 'more damnable.'—1 Cor. xiii. 3.

"This Annotation appears to have been introduced by the persecuting priests at Rheims; because, when they wrote, their patrons, the Guises, at the head of the *League* for the extirpation of French Protestants, who were generally Calvinists, were executing their sanguinary projects. Why it has been revived and sanctioned by the Popish Archbishop of Dublin, I cannot pretend to say; but certain it is, there never existed a sect (I speak not of the pure Christian Church, at any time); but there never existed a sect fancying themselves the peculiar favourites of Heaven, excluding all the rest of their countrymen from salvation, and consigning them to the vengeance of an offended God, who were not of an *intolerant* spirit.

"The fanatics in the days of Cromwell exclaimed against *toleration* for 'soul murder.' And an English Popish Priest, in a late work of celebrity, describes the 'toleration' of Protestants, as the '*tabula rasa* of religion,' as the 'mere effect of political interest, or rather of *indifference* to all religion.'—Gandolphy's Defence of Ancient Faith, vol. ii. p. 219 and 222.

"But, Sir, whether we contemplate the excluding principles, or read of the persecuting violence either of sectarian fanaticism, or of Romish bigotry; are we not naturally led to bless a gracious Providence for that mild and tolerant Christian Church, whose spirit pervades our free constitution, and secures alike to all the subjects of our revered Monarch, their PROPERTY, LIBERTIES, and RIGHTS?

"And now, Sir, to conclude this Letter, for the length of which I am bound to apologize, with the words used by a Prelate of the Church of England, shortly after the Revolution of 1688:—'I know it was *formerly* a popular objection of divers misguided dissenters from the Church of England, that we carried the doctrine of obedience farther than might be consistent with the safety of a Protestant Church, or the privilege of a free-born people. But it is *now* to be hoped, that the strongest argument of all others, which is experience, from undoubted matter of fact, has

put this objection for ever out of countenance; since it is *undeniable*, that during the whole time, when our civil and spiritual liberties were in so much danger, the greatest and most considerable stop that was here put to the arts of Rome, and intrigues of France, was by the steady resolution of the true sons of the Church of England. It will be sufficient to affirm, once for all, that the main body of those, who made so brave a stand, were ALL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and the principles on which they stood, were all Church of England principles. It was by these persons, and these principles alone, that Popery was stopped in its full career; by these it was hindered from conquering.—Bishop Spratt's Letter to Lord Dorset. See Echard's England, vol. iii. book 3, chap. 3.

“ I remain, Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ FABRICIUS,

“ P. S. The following is a statement taken from the *Dublin Correspondent*, of the heads of the title-page of the *Cork publication*:—‘ 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 Rev. Dr. O'Reily, Roman Catholic Lord Primate of all Ireland; HIS GRACE the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; HIS GRACE the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin, and President of the Royal College of Maynooth; the Roman Catholic Bishops of Cork, Waterford, Ferns, &c. &c. containing the whole of the Books in the Sacred Scriptures, explained or illustrated, with *Notes or Annotations*, according to the interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church, which is OUR INFALLIBLE AND UNERRING guide in reading the Holy Scriptures, and bringing men to salvation.’

“ I have seen the three specimens of the persecuting Notes taken from the Cork publication, and they are precisely and verbatim the same as those on the same parts of Scripture in Dr. Troy's Dublin Bible. I have no doubt that the two publications are in all respects the same; and therefore, that Dr. Troy's Bible is now sanctioned either *actually* by the *whole* body of his brother Popish Bishops in Ireland, or by such a body as may be considered equivalent to the whole, by *all the leading* Popish Bishops.

“ The *Dublin Correspondent* newspaper to which I refer, is dated Thursday, July 3, 1817.”

The foregoing communication appeared in the *Courier* of October 23. And as it was not to be expected that Annotations so odious and grossly offensive as those of the Rhemish divines, could long pass without censure, we are not surprised to find that the "*British Critics*" have held up this edition of the Bible in the light which it deserves. But, we confess that we were a little surprised to see in the Dublin Newspapers of the 24th of October, a declaration from ARCHBISHOP TROY, most solemnly rejecting and condemning the said Bible, and denying that he ever had given his approbation to this Dublin edition! The booksellers in Dublin and London, whose names were prefixed to the work, found it needful to vindicate themselves; one from the charge of having used Dr. Troy's authority surreptitiously, and the other from the allegation of selling the work in the British metropolis.

It is certainly our bounden duty, as well as our inclination, to let the Archbishop and the booksellers speak for themselves; but, when we have put the public in full possession of their own story, it will be proper to weigh the whole affair in the balance of justice and truth, in order to discover what conclusions should be drawn by Protestants in general. It will be necessary to consider whether or not OTHER PRELATES, PRIESTS, and BOOKSELLERS, OF THE ROMISH COMMUNION, *in this empire, disapprove the "opinions and doctrines" alluded to?* for, with all due respect to the Archbishop immediately concerned, it is not enough to discountenance such sentiments himself, unless the great mass of His Grace's Irish colleagues, and the four Vicars Apostolic of Great Britain, will also declare explicitly their entire acquiescence in his views; and it is further requisite that they should recall, if possible, every unsold copy of so infamous a publication, however painful this might be to their feelings.

We transcribe the following documents from Dublin newspapers, though they have since appeared in those of London. Two of the Popish Journals (called "*Orthodox*" and "*Catholicon*") have reprinted Dr. Troy's Declaration with great pomp and circumstance, but not COYNE's *letter in reply*; § and the editor of one of these Magazines "*re-*

§ Mr. CHARLES BUTLER, in his *Historical Memoirs of the Roman Catholics*, of which two editions have been printed and published in 1819 (apparently in two months), has been guilty of the same partiality as the Popish Journalists, omitting Mr. Coyne's Reply to the Archbishop's Declaration.

spectfully solicits the particular attention of his friends to the *Declaration*,"—which (as it came too late for insertion) was thought "important" enough to claim "two additional pages" of letter-press beyond "the common limits."

EXTRACTS FROM THE DUBLIN FREEMAN'S JOURNAL.

"ON CATHOLIC AFFAIRS."

"WE consider the following a very interesting document, and, therefore, readily give it a prominent place in our columns. The publication to which it alludes, has drawn on the Catholic Hierarchy, through the pages of the *Times*, and other English papers, much severe and injurious censure. These journals, we hope, will have no hesitation in acquainting their readers, by copying the Declaration of the Titular Archbishop of Dublin, that all the reprehension grounded upon this work, of which their columns have been the vehicles, is wholly unmerited; and that it has fallen under the eye of no censor who more cordially denounces it, than the venerable individual said to have given it all the benefits of his revision and declared approbation:—

"DECLARATION.

"Having seen a new edition of the Rhemish Testament, with Annotations, published by *Coyne, Dublin*, and *Keating, &c. London*, 1816, said to be revised, corrected, and approved by me; I think it necessary to declare, that I never approved, nor meant to approve, any edition of the Old or New Testament which was not entirely conformable, as well in the notes as in the text, to that which was edited by *R. Cross, Dublin*, 1791, containing the usual and prescribed formula of my approbation, and which has served as an exemplar to the several editions that have since been published with my sanction.

"As in the said new edition the notes vary essentially from those of the last-mentioned editions, which exclusively I have sanctioned for publication, I should think that circumstance alone fully sufficient to induce me to withhold every kind of approbation from it; but having read, and now, for the first time, considered these notes, I not only do not sanction them, but solemnly declare, that I utterly reject them, generally, as harsh and irritating in expression, some of them as false and absurd in reasoning, and many of them as uncharitable in sentiment. They further

appear to countenance opinions and doctrines, which, in common with the other Roman Catholics of the Empire, I have solemnly disclaimed upon oath.

“ Under these circumstances, and with these impressions on my mind, I feel it an imperious duty to admonish that portion of the Catholic body which is intrusted to my charge, of the danger of reading, or paying any attention to the notes and comments of said new edition of the Testament; and I enjoin the Roman Catholic Clergy of this Diocese to discourage and prevent, by every means in their power, the circulation, amongst Catholics, of a work tending to lead the faithful astray, and much better fitted to engender and promote, among Christians, hostility, bitterness, and strife, than (what should be the object of every such production) to cultivate the genuine spirit of the Gospel—that is, the spirit of meekness, charity, and peace.

“ J. T. TROY.

“ *Dublin, Oct. 24, 1817.*”

TO HIS GRACE THE MOST REV. DR. TROY.

“ *Parliament Street, Oct. 26, 1817.*”

“ MOST HONOURED LORD,

“ It is with pain and difficulty that I am obliged to controvert, for a moment, any statement coming from Your Grace; but the character which I have earned and maintained these fifteen years, unsullied in the opinions of the Catholic Clergy and Hierarchy of Ireland, as the *only* publisher and bookseller in the kingdom, of works *exclusively* Catholic, puts me under the indispensable necessity of addressing Your Grace in public. The Declaration, which Your Grace has published in the *Freeman* of Saturday, leaves no alternative but that of either submitting to the imputations which it fastens upon me, or of giving, as I now do, a simple statement of facts; for the truth of which I appeal to Your Grace’s candour, and which shall, I trust, substantially remove the impression that Your Grace’s Declaration is calculated to produce on the public mind with regard to me.

“ On Monday the 13th inst. Your Grace sent me a message by your servant, requesting to see me at Cavendish Row, at the hour of two o’clock. I had scarcely entered Your Grace’s apartments, when the Very Rev. Dr. Hamill, Your Grace’s Vicar-General, and the Rev. Mr. Kenny, of Clongowes College, appeared. Your Grace then

produced and read a paper, purporting to be an extract from the British Critic, and containing animadversions on the Notes of a late edition of the Catholic Bible, bearing in the title-page the approbation of Your Grace. You then observed, 'that you were sure I had no bad intention in putting Your Grace's name to the work, but that very bad consequences had followed; that, finding its way into England, it had armed our enemies against us; and this at a time we were seeking Emancipation.' Upon these remarks I asked, 'Did not Your Grace approve and sanction the publication of a Bible by a M'Namara of Cork?' Your Grace replied, 'I did.' I then asked, 'Did not Your Grace depute the Rev. P. A. Walsh, of Denmark Street Chapel, to revise, correct, and approve for publication, in Your Grace's name, the said Bible of M'Namara?' Your Grace answered, 'I did.'—'Then, my Lord,' said I, 'that is the Bible now in your hand.'—'I never authorized,' replied Your Grace, 'the Rev. Mr. Walsh to approve a Bible with the *Rhemish Notes*.'—'Of any private understanding,' said I, 'between Your Grace and Mr. Walsh, I know nothing; but this I know, that Mr. Walsh is accountable for Your Grace's approbation, which is now in the title-page.'—'But,' said Your Grace, 'are not *you* the person that published *this* Bible?—It bears your name.'—'No, my Lord,' said I; 'I am neither the printer nor publisher; and I shall now relate to Your Grace how it comes to bear my name:—M'Namara, the publisher of the Bible, to which Your Grace gave your sanction, became a bankrupt before the work was completed. Mr. John Cumming, of Ormond Quay, assignee to the bankrupt, purchased the unfinished part, and, to cover his own losses, resolved upon perfecting the publication. Having called upon, and requested me to allow him to put my name to the work, I refused, except on the condition that the Clergyman, deputed by Your Grace, continued to correct the unfinished part. This I did without any interest whatever in the transaction. Mr. Cumming accordingly applied to the Rev. Mr. Walsh, to whom he paid 20*l.* on completing the revision of the work, and took his receipt for the amount.' When I had finished this narrative, Your Grace, in presence of Dr. Hamill and Rev. Mr. Kenny, acquitted me, in the most unequivocal terms, of having had any thing to do with the publication. I then remarked, that Your Grace having in different conversations disclaimed your approbation, and certain individuals having in consequence denounced me as the forger

of it, I should in my own defence publish the whole transaction; upon which, Your Grace promised me to take every opportunity of disabusing those, to whom you had spoken on the subject. For the truth of what I have now related, touching this interview of Monday 19th inst. I appeal to Your Grace, to Dr. Hamill, and to the Rev. Mr. Kenny.

“ Did I not afterwards send Your Grace the Numbers of this said Rhemish Testament, on the covers of which are printed these words: ‘ Now publishing by M^cNamara, the Catholic Bible. To render it the more complete, the elegant, copious, and instructive *Notes or Annotations of the Rhemish Testament* will be inserted. By permission of His Grace Dr. T. Troy, Catholic Lord Primate of Ireland, this work is carefully revising, by the Rev. P. A. Walsh, Denmark Street, Dublin. Printed by Cumming?’—Moreover, did I not accompany these Numbers with a letter, calling on Your Grace to make good your promise of clearing my character from the imputations it had lain under, through Your Grace’s misconception of the facts? This letter, my Lord, I suppress, from the same motives of delicacy which have kept me silent, until Your Grace’s Declaration forced me thus to state the facts: nor shall I add one single comment, but leave the public to draw their own conclusions.

“ I am, most honoured Lord, Your Grace’s very humble and most obedient servant,

“ RICHARD COYNE.”

REMARKS BY FABRICIUS, ON THE ABOVE CENSURE OF THE NOTES IN THE RHEMISH TESTAMENT.

“ SIR,

“ If the late republication of that shocking engine of mischief, the *Rhemish Testament*, with its *persecuting Annotations*, were a subject merely for theological criticism, I could not expect that you would admit any observations upon it, into your columns. But, Sir, it is a subject nearly connected with the tranquillity of a great member of the empire: permit me to add (and I speak it not lightly), bearing in its consequences on the dearest interests of Great Britain.

“ On a subject, then, of such deep importance, I hope to be allowed, through the medium of the *Courier*, again to address the British public.

“ Your paper of the 30th ult. contained an article, described as a Declaration on the part of the Popish Arch-

bishop of Dublin, in which he 'not only disclaims the publication in question,' but censures it, in a tone every way worthy of a Christian Prelate.

"Revering, as I do, the high and sacred office held by Doctor Troy, in the Roman Catholic branch of the Christian church; impressed as I am by those honourable public testimonies which have been borne to his private character; I must regard any document issued by him, as justly possessing extraordinary weight; and his *late* Declaration respecting the Rhemish Annotations, as eminently entitled to the consideration of the public.

"It has been stated in the *Courier*, first, that he has disavowed his having sanctioned those Annotations; secondly, that he has expressed his censure of them.

"On the subject of his *sanction*, I shall trouble you little at present, farther than to observe, that after a full consideration of Dr. Troy's protest, and of the Dublin Roman Catholic Bookseller's reply, published in the *Courier* of the 1st inst. I find myself obliged, reluctantly, *still to consider the Rhemish Annotations, as published with the official sanction of the Titular Archbishop of Dublin.* I enter not now into the grounds of my conviction on this head, lest the limits I have prescribed to this letter should be exceeded, and because the *censure*, as it is expressed in Dr. Troy's protest, appears to me to call for immediate inquiry and PUBLIC EXPLANATION.

"I object to this *censure*; that it is expressed in a form so *evasive*, as to be wholly unsatisfactory. All that Doctor Troy has said may be true, according to the Romish interpretation of his words; and yet, he may religiously adhere to every one of the persecuting *principles* contained in the Rhemish Annotations. He has not expressly denied any of the *Principles* which were taken from that book of high Popish authority, the Rhemish Testament, and brought before the view of the public, in the *Couriers* of the 11th and 23d ult. He censures the Annotations *generally*, as being harsh and irritating in *expression*: some of them as containing false and absurd *reasoning*; and many of them as uncharitable in *sentiment*; and he adds, that they *appear to countenance* opinions and doctrines, which he and the other Roman Catholics have disclaimed upon oath.

"Now, Sir, the great question at issue relates to the *PRINCIPLES* plainly avowed in the Annotations, not to the form of *expression*; not to the nature of the *reasoning*, or

of the *sentiment*, observable in those comments; nor to what opinions and doctrines Dr. Troy may conceive them to *appear to countenance*. If it be the wish of the Titular Archbishop of Dublin to give just satisfaction to his Protestant fellow-subjects, I would propose for his adoption a very different form of declaration.

“ Let even the few specimens of the *Principles* inculcated in the Rhemish Testament, and lately inserted in the *British Critic*—or, let the more numerous and important specimens, which appeared in the *Couriers* of the 11th and 23d ult. be stated distinctly by Dr. Troy; and let him declare his judgment upon *each of those principles separately*: or, if this be too troublesome, let him select from the Rhemish Testament the one great comprehensive principle that contains them all—the *infallibility, the perpetual and divine authority, of the decrees of the Romish General Councils*. (Note on Acts, xv. 28.) The Rhemish Annotations are little more than a development of this fundamental principle. If Dr. Troy shall retract his sanction from the Rhemish Annotations, on account of the *falsity of the principles* they contain; let him act consistently, and *retract* his solemn avowal, in his Pastoral Letter of 1798, of the principle in which they are all included.

“ In this case, it might also be advisable, that his Co-adjutor, the President of the Royal College at Maynooth, should examine the class-book for the divinity students, in order to its condemnation. In this class-book, he may not only find the same comprehensive principle maintained, but some of the most shocking of the *minor tenets* inculcated in the Rhemish Annotations, distinctly asserted. If Queen Mary’s Rhemish Priests have informed us, that Protestants are heretics, and that all heretics have ‘ devils’ lying spirits in their mouths;’ Professor Delahogue has instructed the young Popish Priests of Ireland, that ‘ *the deadly tongues of heretics*’ (and therefore of all sincere Protestants, according to his explanation) are ‘ **THE GATES OF HELL**’ (de Ecclesia Christi, p. 221). If Queen Mary’s Priests have declared that heretics (Protestants) cannot be saved, though they should die martyrs in the cause of truth; Professor Delahogue has given the same information to his Maynooth divinity students: softening it, however, by intimating, that in *such a case*, the Protestant may, *possibly*, suffer a *more tolerable* punishment in the regions of the damned. (De Ec. Christi, p. 24 and 25.)

“ If Queen Mary’s Priests have maintained the monstrous

and perilous pretension of the Church of Rome, to a jurisdiction over Protestants, as over deserters and rebels; the Professor at Maynooth acquaints the students, *ex Cathedra*, that 'the Church' (of Rome) 'retains her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and schismatics' (Protestants), 'kc. as a MILITARY GENERAL has a right to decree MORE SEVERE PUNISHMENTS against a DESERTER, who may have been erased from the Army List.' (De Ec. Christi, p. 394.) If, then, Dr. Troy shall, *bonâ fide*, censure the persecuting principles inculcated in the Rhemish Annotations; let him also recall and censure his own Pastoral Letter of 1798, and condemn the divinity class-book of Maynooth. Let him command the Popish Priests, who have, of late years, been sent from that seminary, throughout Ireland, to deny the maxims they have been instructed to maintain and disseminate; perhaps, to contradict many of the sermons they have preached. And, lastly; if the principles contained in the Rhemish Annotations shall be condemned as false; let the progress of consistency be completed, by an injunction to the Romanists of Ireland to unlearn the Catechisms they have been taught in their childhood, and disavow the tenet of Popish infallibility.

"But, Sir, the Rhemish Annotations having been published at Dublin, in 1816; it appears, that they have been circulated amongst the Roman Catholics of Ireland for the space of *at least* a year; possibly almost two years. The Rev. Mr. Walsh had '*carefully revised*' them; and, in the discharge of the solemn duty intrusted to him, ordered them to be published. Dr. Troy says, in his Declaration, 'Having read, and *now for the first time considered* these notes.' He does not say, that he never read them nor heard of their character before. To suppose that this were the case, would be to charge that very learned and zealous Prelate with being shamefully unread in the history of his Church, and grossly ignorant of subjects with which his sacred office required him to be acquainted: but he never '*considered*' those notes before. Were *all* the other Popish Prelates in Ireland like Dr. Troy, and did they never before the last month '*consider*' them? And were *all* the other Popish Priests like Mr. Walsh, and did *they approve* of them? However, this may be, it appears certain, that notwithstanding the length of time during which that *notorious* instrument of rebellion and persecution, devised originally by a band of conspi-

rators † against the PROTESTANT GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND, under the name of an infallible exposition of the word of God, was in operation amongst the Romanists; no one Popish Prelate or Priest in Ireland gave warning of the danger, until it was published in ENGLAND, in the BRITISH CRITIC, and proclaimed in the COURIER, from the Land's End to the Orkneys!!!

“As to Dr. Troy's having now, for the first time, ‘considered’ them; I will only observe—they were most obviously designed, not so much for the consideration of the closet, as for the EXCITEMENT of the MULTITUDE: that ‘he who runs, may read’ and see their terrible intent.

“Dr. Troy's authority was printed on the COVERS of the numbers of the work (for it was published in *numbers*, for more easy and extensive circulation amongst the Romanists); and on the same COVERS was the following statement:—‘The elegant, copious, and instructive Notes, or Annotations of the Rhemish Testament will be inserted.’ And for what purpose?—‘to render the CATHOLIC BIBLE more complete!!!’ Were Dr. Troy, and every one of his brother titular Bishops in Ireland, ignorant of all this for the last year or two?

“But, how was Dr. Troy's sanction given to this volume of persecution? By the Rev. P. Walsh, an eminent Roman Catholic Priest, and confidential friend of Dr. Troy, expressly deputed by him, for the purpose of examining, revising, correcting, and *sanctioning with his name*, the Roman Catholic Bible, then in preparation. Dr. Troy must have been *well assured* of the principles, and of the integrity of the Rev. Mr. Walsh, or he would not have committed to him an office of such stupendous importance; no less than that of declaring in his name, to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, what was, or was not, to be received as the DIVINE WORD. Of the Rev. Mr. Walsh's principles, the Rhemish Notes speak with sufficient evidence: and, surely, a very moderate portion of integrity would have induced him to mention to his Archbishop the Bible he had sanctioned in his name; with the nature of which, however, his Archbishop (it would now appear) was wholly unacquainted, *until after it was published in the last month, to the BRITISH NATION!*

† Some historic memorials of these men were inserted in the British Critic for September 1817:—other records of a similar description might be adduced.

“ Sir, the subject is painful. I will make but one observation or two more on it:—‘ Very bad consequences’ (said Dr. Troy, in his *private* conversation with the Roman Catholic bookseller) ‘ have followed,’ from publishing his sanction to the Rhemish Notes. He then stated what those *very bad consequences were*.

“ Were they, that disaffection to the Protestant Government, rebellion against the Protestant Government, persecution of their Protestant countrymen, may have been instilled into the minds of numbers of the Roman Catholics of Ireland?—No—nothing of all this. The *bad consequences*, and it would appear, the *only* bad consequences stated by him, in *private*, were, that ‘ finding its way into ENGLAND’ * * * * Yes—it has found its way into ENGLAND * * * * ‘ finding its way,’ he said, ‘ into ENGLAND, it had armed *our enemies* against us, and this *at a time* when we were seeking *Emanicipation*.’ § Surely this requires no comment. Afterwards, comes forth the *public* Declaration, Dr. Troy’s apprehension, lest ‘ *the faithful*’ should be led astray, by a work of such dangerous tendency. Even in this Declaration, designed for the purpose of giving satisfaction to Protestants, he *distinguishes* the Romanists from their Protestant fellow-subjects, by the epithet of ‘ the faithful.’ Roman Catholics alone are to be accounted ‘ the faithful,’ and therefore the *accepted* servants of the Saviour of the world.

“ But, Sir, as long as they shall be instructed to imagine themselves the exclusive favourites of Heaven; to view their Protestant King, (eternal blessings rest upon his head!) and their Protestant fellow-subjects, as the just objects of divine vengeance; and to consign them to everlasting damnation; a spirit must be excited and fostered among them, which, if it should be aided by the *powers of the State*, would, ere long, produce the fatal fruits of persecution and tyranny. Reason, the history of Popery, the past and present circumstances of Ireland, unite in demonstrating this. A similar principle, operating on the sanguine minds of the motley Sectarrians of the days of CROMWELL, in-

§ When Dr. Troy used these words, he held (it appears) in his hand a paper “ purporting to be an extract from the *British Critic*, and containing animadversions on the Notes” of the Rhemish Testament, republished with his sanction. Was he *then* ignorant of the tendency of those Notes?

volved the English nation, first in the horrors of civil war, and then in slavery.

* * * * *

“With most unfeigned respect for the enlightened, sober, and loyal body of our dissenting brethren, I would entreat them to ponder on the consequences, political and religious, of the example of their separation from the Established Church. To that pure Church do they owe the liberty they enjoy. Its free, tolerant, Christian spirit, circulates through every part of the Constitution, as the life-blood through the frame. The Church of England, unlike the Church of Rome, unfurls not the auriflam of persecution; displays no motto of military conquest. § In characterizing the Church of England, we are unaccustomed to talk of *standards*. But, Sir, if we were required to describe that Church, with a banner and a motto, expressive of her attributes, we might justly represent her, bearing on her ensign the DOVE and the OLIVE—and her motto—the Song of Angels: ‘GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST; on earth Peace; Good Will towards men.’

“FABRICIUS.

“P. S. Dr. Troy, at the conclusion of his Declaration, speaks of ‘meekness, charity, peace,’ and ‘cultivating the spirit of the Gospel.’ I have thought it unnecessary to observe upon this part of the document. Queen Mary’s Priests, in their Rhemish Annotations, have said *much more* in favour of those duties; and with the professed view of promoting them, endeavoured to excite ‘*the faithful*’ to the extirpation of Protestants. Therefore those expressions of Dr. Troy, though highly becoming him to use, appear to me *quite insufficient* to effect that which seems to be the object of his Declaration: viz. to give satisfaction to *Protestants*, respecting the republication of the Rhemish Annotations.

“N. B. That the Rhemish Notes do not appear to have produced disturbance in Ireland, during the last year, is no argument against their perilous efficacy. While these Notes inculcate a deadly animosity against Protestants, they at the same time enjoin the politic caution to *defer* the work of *extirpation* until the *strength of Romanists* shall be

§ “The columns of *Catholicity* . . . unfurl the auriflam, and display its *glorious motto*.”—(*Speech of the Roman Catholic DOCTOR DROMGOOLE.*)

sufficient to effect it, without hazard to the Popish Church."
—*Courier*, Nov. 6, 1817.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE
ANTIBIBLION OR PAPAL TOCSIN.

IN the first place, let it be remembered, that the Dublin edition censured by Dr. Troy, so honourably to his own private feelings, contains nothing more than had been many times (at least five or six times) printed and circulated before, without any scruples of conscience; and that *those Notes*, from the smallest duodecimo to a folio size, had been bought, sold, or exchanged, as an article of trade, by ALL Roman Catholic booksellers in this kingdom, even up to the very day of Archbishop Troy's denunciation.

We must, therefore, assume that none of the Vicars Apostolic ever interfered to prevent the sale of a work, heretofore sanctioned by various leading Divines of their own Church at Rheims, &c. nor expressed any censure like this of Dr. TROY *alone*. On the contrary, the pages of the "Orthodox Journal" will bear us out in the opinion, that BISHOP MILNER (the Irish Representative and Agent), and other Roman Catholics of distinction, regard the milder notes of a late stereotyped New Testament as indicating an unwarrantable dereliction of Catholic principles, or a desertion of their true Anti-protestant doctrines. §

The OFFICIAL attestations in favour of the very Notes to which Dr. Troy now objects, declare (in all the former editions), "THAT NOTHING IS CONTAINED IN THIS WORK WHICH IS NOT CONFORMABLE TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS PIETY, OR WHICH IS IN ANY MANNER REPUGNANT TO THE CIVIL POWER AND PEACE:" such, truly, was the original sanction affixed to the vo-

§ Vide *Orthodox Journal*, vol. iii. pp. 259, 282, and 313; also vol. iv. pp. 18, 70, 103, 110, 140, 184, 299, 401, 410, and 429.—The exact title of this Dublin Bible is: "The Holy Bible, translated from the Latin Vulgat; diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in divers languages: the Old Testament, first published by the English College at Douay, A. D. 1609; and the New Testament, first published by the English College at Rheims, A. D. 1582. With Annotations, and an Historical and Chronological Index. Revised and corrected according to the Clementin Edition of the Scriptures; AND APPROVED OF BY THE MOST REVEREND DOCTOR TROY, R. C. A. D.—Dublin: Printed and published by Richard Coyne, Parliament Street; and sold by Keating, Brown, and Keating, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, London, 1816." Large 4to.; the Old Testament in 927 pages; the New Testament in 430 pages.

lume; and no opinion of a single Bishop will avail to prevent the general use of this work, except perhaps in a small degree within his own limited diocese. Nor would the prohibition of even a Vicar Apostolic in England prevent such a bookseller as WM. EUSEBIUS ANDREWS from selling it; as he still continues to sell Mr. GANDOLPHY'S obnoxious volumes in spite of BISHOP POYNTEE'S disapprobation and censure. See his own justification in the Orthodox Journal for October, 1817.

But if it were possible for Dr. Troy to satisfy the public that he has used his utmost endeavours to discourage this abominable Rhemish New Testament (for the Old Testament is more bearable, and the same as that of Bishop Challoner), it would still remain a saleable work; being praised by most of the other Irish Prelates and Clergy, and by some of the Vicars Apostolic in Great Britain. In Bishop Milner's Life of the late Bishop Challoner, he eulogizes the "*Rheims Testament and Douay Bible*," and the "*long Annotations with which it is ENRICHED*," calling it "**THIS EXCELLENT WORK**." In such predicament, then, the work will be sold, read, and circulated, notwithstanding the private or individual sentiments of Archbishop Troy: and nothing which he alone can do, will tranquillize the feelings of considerate and candid Protestants; nothing short of a synodical and explicit act of condemnation by ALL the Roman Catholic Prelates, can make any atonement to the British public.

Our readers will not forget that Fabricius quotes a Dublin newspaper of July 3, 1817, announcing the publication of this very Bible at Cork, in numbers and parts, "under the patronage of His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Roman Catholic Lord Primate of all Ireland; His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin, and President of the College of Maynooth; the Roman Catholic Bishops of Cork, Waterford, Ferns, &c." expressly naming this Commentary of the Romish Church, "**WHICH IS THEIR INFALLIBLE AND UNERRING GUIDE IN READING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AND BRINGING MEN TO SALVATION.**" Consequently, these very numbers of the Old and New Testament lately sent to Dr. Troy by Mr. Coyne, for his inspection and approval, are at this moment circulating with the highest clerical authority!!! It is known, indeed, that this work, by being published in numbers comparatively cheap, has obtained

a very extensive circulation in Ireland; and that (as is expressly mentioned on the title-page of the numbers) it was not only authorized by the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, but also recommended by nearly *three hundred of the Irish Clergy!*

Now, if it were possible for Dr. Troy, by his tardy Declaration in a Dublin newspaper, to get rid of the influence which his own name and dignity confer on the title-page of this Bible; and, if his *apparent* Episcopal sanction did not yield the smallest impulse to its sale; we should ask, how can he prevent the effect of all the other various Clerical recommendations?

But, for argument sake, we will suppose that all the Notes of the Rhemish Annotators on the *New Testament* were quite annihilated; there will still remain a large mass of exceptionable and irritating matter in the *Old Testament* of 1816—which is found even in the late Bishop Challoner's editions; and has been very often reprinted since the year 1749, in London, Edinburgh, Manchester, and Dublin. We shall submit to our readers only one specimen, on Deuteronomy, chap. xvii. ver. 8—12:—"Here we see" (alluding to a divine command, that whoever did not obey the Jewish Priest should die), "Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the Church Guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the law; *promising that they should not err therein, and punishing with death such as proudly refused to obey their decisions:* AND, SURELY, HE HAS NOT DONE LESS FOR THE CHURCH GUIDES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." The title at the head of this chapter in Deuteronomy, answering to the 8th and following verses, is this: "Controversies are to be decided by the High Priest and Council, whose sentence must be obeyed *under pain of death.*" See p. 165, Dublin Bible of 1816.

Be it remembered, that this is a Note which all the editions of Bishop Challoner contain; and that (so far as we know) it has not been omitted in any one of the Dublin editions, sanctioned by Episcopal authority!!! Is this murderous doctrine conciliatory? Is it calculated to inspire Protestants with confidence in the tolerating principles of Roman Catholics? Is it the true doctrine of Christianity, or of the New Testament dispensation? Dismissing this painful subject, in the words of Mr. Richard Coyne to his Archbishop, "WE LEAVE THE PUBLIC TO DRAW THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS."

But we are compelled to propose one distinct question to Dr. TROY, Dr. Murray, and their bookseller, which ought to be publicly answered: viz. Have they not fully sanctioned and approved of the following obnoxious advertisement, and did not they promote its wide dispersion as an HAND-BILL in 1810? We subjoin an exact copy of this HAND-BILL, only omitting the list of Coyne's publications:—

“Now in the Press, and printing by RICHARD COYNE, 165, Capel Street, Dublin, with the permission of the Most Rev. Dr. TROY, and the Most Rev. Dr. MURRAY, a new and cheap edition of the HOLY BIBLE, with ANNOTATIONS for clearing up the principal Difficulties of Holy Writ, in five volumes duodecimo. Price to Subscribers in Boards, 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* in plain calf 1*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

“This edition of the Holy Bible, for the accommodation of the public, will be delivered to subscribers in single volumes (to be paid for at 1*s.* 1*d.* per week). The first to be published on the 1st of February, 1811; the second in six weeks after, and continued to be published every six weeks, until completed. A book is now open at the Publisher's, R. COYNE, 165, Capel Street, for the purpose of entering subscribers' names.

“As the Bible is now nearly finished, the above plan is adopted by the Editor, in order to give the working people and well-disposed an opportunity of purchasing the Bible at an easy rate. This arrangement is calculated to obviate the difficulty arising from their situation, which precludes the possibility of purchasing the work at once; and, at the same time, it will substantially refute the calumny industriously circulated in twopenny pamphlets; that the Catholic Clergy prohibit the faithful from reading the word of God, or having it in their possession; a charge every day made, not only by these ignorant daring pamphleteers, but by the learned, who ought to know that scandal is a deadly crime, which neither their zeal nor their prejudices can palliate. It was the boast of the first pretended Reformers, and continues to be the boast of their disciples to the present day, that they had emancipated their followers from the shackles of Catholic despotism, and had restored to them the freedom of the children of God. This freedom, it appears, consisted in reading an erroneous version of the inspired writings, and in venerating, as the dictates of Eternal Wisdom, the blunders of ignorant and interested translators.

“What crime more foul in its nature, more prejudicial in its consequences, more nearly allied to diabolical malignity

than that of *designedly corrupting the Holy Scriptures*; and by such corruption leading the sincere inquirer into error, and converting the food of life into the poison of death? And do we not *every day hear these Deformers of the Holy Writ* calling on Catholics to read their spurious and corrupted translations; telling them, at the same time, that, by doing so, they will easily detect the errors of Popery, and learn the true and genuine doctrine of the Gospel; exclaiming that the Scriptures are no longer concealed under the obscurity of a learned language, but exhibited to you in your native tongue? But Catholics answer, 'We will not read your Protestant Bible, we will not drink at the muddy part of the stream, while we can drink with equal ease at the fountain-head.' Catholics will desire Protestants to read the Letter of Pius the Sixth, our supreme pastor, of blessed memory, to ANTHONY MARTINI (afterwards Archbishop of Florence); who translated the Bible into the language of his country, and he covered with shame for their vile misrepresentations. He writes thus: 'At a time that a vast number of bad books, which most grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated even amongst the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judged it exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for these are the most abundant sources, which ought to be left open to every one, to draw from them the purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are widely disseminated in these corrupt times: this you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the sacred writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity; especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus you have not swerved, either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index, or from the Constitutions published on the subject by Benedict XIV. that immortal Pope, our predecessor in the Pontificate. In the mean time, as a token of our good-will, receive our Apostolical benediction, which to you, beloved son, we affectionately impart.—Given at Rome, on the calends of April, 1778, the fourth year of our Pontificate.'

"The Editor begs to inform those whose means will allow them, that by paying one-half of the subscription in advance, they can have the Bible within two months hence, A few copies on fine Paper, hot-pressed, will be struck off;

price, in super-extra binding, three pounds eight shillings and three pence. With each volume of the Bible will be given a beautiful engraving.

“Subscribers’ names received by the Publisher, H. Coyne, Capel Street, Dublin; Keating, Browne, and Co. London; Matthews, Cork; Reynolds, Kilkenny; Gor- man, Clonmel; Farrel, Waterford; Nolan, Carlow; O’Brien, Limerick; Hart and M’Donnel, Drogheda; Clay- ton, Galway.”

LATE PROCEEDINGS OF THE IRISH CATHOLIC BOARD RESPECT-
ING THE DOUAY BIBLE AND RHEMISH TESTAMENT.

SEVERAL Dublin newspapers lie before us, detailing the proceedings of the ROMAN CATHOLIC BOARD on the 1st and 4th of Dec. 1817, relative to the “*Rhemish Annotations*,” of which we gave a full account in our two last Numbers. It appears, that the Dublin orators are greatly dismayed at the powerful effect which these obnoxious Notes have produced, on the mind of considerate Protestants; and they complain that the writer of an article in the *British Critic* has misrepresented these Notes, making them more odious than they are in reality. We do not fully believe this as- sertion; and think (if any accidental error has occurred) that the Reviewer could not easily have aggravated the mischievous tendency of these Notes, which are in them- selves sufficiently abominable.—No such charge of mis- representation is made, however, against *our own* Quota- tions from those Notes; and we, therefore, confidently ap- peal to the extracts given in our 6th and 7th Numbers, which demonstrate the *hostility* of Roman Catholic prin- ciples beyond the power of refutation.

The Dublin “*Evening Post*,” and “*The Correspond- ent*,” report Mr. DAN. O’CONNELL to have said, “These Notes were of English growth; they were written in agi- tated times, when the title of ELIZABETH was questioned on the grounds of legitimacy. Party spirit was then extremely violent; politics mixed with religion, and, of course, dis- graced it. Mary (Queen of Scotland) had active partisans, who thought it would forward their purposes to translate the Bible, and add to it those obnoxious Notes. But, very shortly after the establishment of the College of Douay, this Rhemish edition WAS CONDEMNED BY ALL THE DOCTORS OF THAT INSTITUTION; who, at the same time, called for, and received, the aid of the Scotch and Irish Colleges,

“ The book was thus suppressed, and an edition of the Bible with notes WAS PUBLISHED AT DOUAY, which has been ever since adopted by the Catholic church:—so that they not only condemned and SUPPRESSED the Rhemish edition, but they published an edition with notes, to which NO OBJECTION has been, or could be, urged. From that period there have been BUT TWO EDITIONS of the Rhemish Testament; and the late one was published by a very ignorant printer in Cork, a man of the name of M'NAMARA, who was not capable of distinguishing between the Rhemish and any other edition of the Bible. He meant to publish a Catholic Bible; and, having put his hand on the Rhemish edition, he commenced to print it in numbers. He subsequently became a bankrupt, and his property in this transaction was vested in a Mr. CUMMING, a respectable bookseller in this city. He is *either* a Protestant or a Presbyterian: but, he carried on the work, like M'NAMARA, merely to make money of it, as a commercial speculation: ‘ And yet,’ said Mr. O'CONNELL, ‘ our enemies have taken it up with avidity; they have asserted, that the sentiments of these Notes are cherished by the Catholics in this country.’ He would not be surprised to read speeches in the next Parliament on this subject,” &c.

We have thought it needful, as a point of justice, not only to give the very words of this advocate, as contained in the Dublin Correspondent of Dec. 5th, but we deem it right to add the whole of what is detailed on this subject in another Dublin Journal; from which the reader will see, that *even Roman Catholics are compelled to admit the infamous nature of a work, that (UNTIL AFTER PASSING THROUGH SIX EDITIONS) Protestants have never before been able to persuade them was of an uncharitable and hostile tendency*: nor is it at all likely that this truth, so obvious to unprejudiced minds, would have been now conceded, if “ THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS ” had not produced conviction, and demanded some acknowledgment from the Lay-orators of that “ CATHOLIC BOARD.”

At a meeting on the 1st of December, Mr. O'CONNELL is represented to have observed, “ That he had been informed that a number of commercial gentlemen could not conveniently attend the meeting this day, as they were detained on Change. He submitted the propriety of adjourning to Thursday next, as matters of considerable interest and importance were likely to come under discussion. He would, in the mean time, give notice, that on the next day

of meeting he would move that a sub-committee might be appointed to draw up a *disavowal* on the part of the Catholics of this country, of the *bigoted, uncharitable, and intolerant doctrines* contained in the Notes to the Rhemish Testament. Considerable efforts, it appeared, had been made to impute these doctrines to the Catholic body, even by men who knew the Catholics held them in utter detestation; it was necessary that they should refute the calumny—the disavowal might be made somewhat comprehensive, and the curious history of the Rhemish Testament might be stated; for it is an historical fact, that in angry times in England, these notes were written by English Clergymen, *but were never countenanced by any of the divines of the Catholic church in Ireland.* They were always denounced, and, at the present day, no Catholic, he believed, in the country would peruse them without disgust; and yet their corrupt and interested enemies do not hesitate to say, that these doctrines are entertained by the Irish people. The calumny has gone abroad; and, under the circumstances, he thought it would be wise to refute it: he would, therefore, give notice, that, on Thursday next, a Committee be appointed to draw up a disavowal of these doctrines.

“ Mr. ENEAS M'DONNELL said, that the words of Mr. O'Connell's notice appeared to him to be too general. Some of the Notes to the Rhemish Testament were bad enough—but this would go to condemn the entire.

“ Mr. O'CONNELL rose and observed, that it would be soon enough to discuss the motion when it should have been made. He was now merely giving notice of a proposition which he intended to submit. He remarked, however, that the denunciation of these intolerant Notes by the Archbishop of Dublin was ‘general.’ It was his intention, that the *disavowal* which he contemplated should be framed in such a way, that a copy of it could be forwarded to every member of both Houses of Parliament. When he came to make his motion, he would recommend that the committee be instructed to introduce a short history of these obnoxious Notes into the document they should prepare. He again stated, that the *Rhemish Notes* had been originally written by *English Clergymen*, immediately after the Reformation—men who had just been deprived of valuable livings—who fled from England—who were smarting under their recent losses, and were irritated by personal injury, and inflated by religious rancour. Through the *Rhemish Notes* they

gave vent to their feelings, and these Notes were immediately disclaimed by the Church. They had lately been surreptitiously put into circulation again; and, that they had been again denounced, was matter of public notoriety.

“ Mr. O’CONNELL then moved, that Mr. Hay be requested to summon the members of the Catholic Board to meet on Thursday next, at three o’clock, for the purpose of discussing the propositions concerning the *Rhemish Notes* and *Mr. Hayes’s mission*.”

“ *Thursday, December 4.*

“ A remarkably full meeting of the Catholic Board took place on Thursday, pursuant to adjournment: OWEN O’CONNOR, Esq. in the chair.

“ After some preliminary business, Mr. O’CONNELL rose to make his promised motion, for the appointment of a committee to prepare a denunciation of the intolerant doctrines contained in the *Rhemish Notes*. *He dwelt upon the injurious effects of these abominable Notes, in prejudicing the public mind in England against Catholic emancipation;* and urged the consequent necessity of an immediate explicit, authentic, and public *disavowal* of them, by every Catholic in this country. He had recently been in England himself; and personal and accurate information acquired upon the spot, enabled him to state, that if these Notes were not denounced, the member of Parliament who should be hardy enough to support emancipation in the next session of Parliament, would run a very considerable hazard of losing his seat in the House of Commons on the approaching election. *If they were suffered to remain without a disavowal, the Catholics would have to encounter in the new Parliament a more determined hostility than was yet arrayed against them since the Union. Nor would the evil be delayed even until the assembling of a new House of Commons.* Doubtless those briefless barristers who had already made themselves remarkable by their hostility to religious freedom, would gladly seize the opportunity which the very opening of Parliament would give them, of illustrating their own bigotry, by imputing bigotry to the Catholic people of Ireland. We should see a Mr. *Leslie Foster*, and other gentlemen like him, rising to support the address to the Throne, and proving from the *Rhemish Testament* that the Catholics were unworthy of trust or of favour. But, powerful as these reasons were, there were others of equal weight, though of a different nature, which made him urge this disavowal more anxiously.

He owed it to his religion, as a Catholic and a Christian—to his country, as an Irishman—to his feelings, as a human being, to utterly denounce the damnable doctrines contained in the Notes to the Rhemish Testament. He was a Catholic upon principle—a steadfast and sincere Catholic, from a conviction that it was the best form of religion; but he would not remain one hour longer, if he thought it essential to the profession of the Catholic faith to believe that it was lawful to murder Protestants, or that faith might be innocently broken with heretics—*Yet such were the doctrines laid down in Notes to the Rhemish Testament.* Mr. O'Connell concluded an eloquent and sensible speech by moving, that a committee of five be forthwith appointed to prepare a denunciation of the Rhemish Notes. He said he would also move, that the denunciation so prepared should be transmitted to every member of the Houses of Peers and Commons, to all the dignitaries of the Established Church, to the members of the Church of Scotland, and to the Synod of Ulster. It would be for the subsequent consideration of the Board, whether it might not be expedient to call an aggregate meeting, to which a recommendation should be made of pronouncing a similar denunciation.

“MR. ENKAS M'DONNELL conceived it would be imprudent and improper to interfere in theological questions, and spoke at considerable length in support of this opinion. He condemned the intolerant doctrines contained in the Rhemish Notes, in the most unqualified terms; but recommended a general exposition of the religious and political principles of the Catholics of Ireland, in preference to a denunciation of any particular work. He read an *exposé* of this description which had been *prepared by himself.* It was of very great length, and was in the form of AN ADDRESS OR APPEAL TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

“MR. MAHON thought the Clergy were the proper persons to dispose of this question.

“MR. O'GORMAN was of the same opinion.

“MR. RICHARD O'GORMAN thought a denunciation could only be pronounced with propriety by the Bishops, or an aggregate meeting.

“MR. HOWLEY advocated a full denunciation in animated terms, and indignantly expressed his abhorrence of the detestable doctrines of the Rhemish Notes.

“MR. O'CONNELL agreed to alter the form of his motion, by instructing the Committee to prepare an *Address*.

upon the occasion of the recent republication of the intolerant Notes to the Rhemish Bible. It was then carried *unanimously*, and the following Committee was instantly appointed :

“ Mr. O’Connell, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Scully, Mr. M’Donnell, Mr. O’Kelly.

“ The Board then adjourned, at six o’clock.”

FURTHER REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE ANTIBIBLION
OR PAPAL TOCSIN.

THESE proceedings of the Irish Catholic Board are memorable on several accounts: 1st, Because of the unequivocal admission of Roman Catholic Laymen, who stand prominent at the head of the Irish Board, that the doctrines contained in the Rheims Testament, reprinted lately for the *sixth time*, afford strong objections to granting what they mis-call “ *Catholic Emancipation.*” 2dly, Because the recent “ ADDRESS AND APPEAL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND ” was occasioned by the late publication of the Rhemish Notes; and was contrived by Mr. ENEAS M’DONNELL with the express view of blinding us Protestants to the intolerant principles developed in that work. 3dly, Because the elaborate, ingenious, and artful attempt of the famous DANIEL O’CONNELL, Esq. to nullify the authority of those Annotations (by a sort of history), is a mere fiction; which proves nothing, except that he strongly feels the importance of getting rid of them at the present critical juncture.

Now it happens, unfortunately for their cause, that nearly the whole of what this lawyer says is incorrect and fallacious: for, these very Notes, though condemned so solemnly at present, were never “ condemned by all (nor by any) Doctors of the College of Douay:”—they never “ called for and received the aid of the Scotch and Irish Colleges,” in exploding the said doctrines:—“ the book was,” therefore, *not* “ thus suppressed:”—the “ edition of the Bible, with notes, published at Douay,” in 1609 and afterwards, “ to which (he tells us) no objection has been, or could be urged,” is really of the same complexion as the Rheims Testament, and has been always objected against:—what he says about there being “ but two editions of the Rhemish Testament,” is also untrue; there being many editions and variations, printed in folio, quarto, and smaller sizes:—the ignorance of the printer at Cork is nothing to the purpose, since he had a Clergyman to superintend this

work, who was appointed by Archbishop Troy and paid for his editorship:—and lastly, “the sentiments of those Notes” are avowed to be those of the Church to which Mr. O’CONNELL belongs, and are pronounced by the highest Clerical authorities in Rheims and Douay to be strictly Catholic: “Nihil in hoc opere reperiri quod non sit Catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrinæ et pietati consentaneum.” (See the “Censure and Approbation” prefixed to the first five editions, “Permissu Superiorum,”—in 1582, 1600, 1621, 1633, and in 1738.) Consequently, the leaders of the Dublin Board of Catholics have laid themselves open to severe reprehension; and are accordingly charged by the editor of the “Orthodox Journal” with being “nearly *non compos mentis*.” (Vide ORTHODOX JOURNAL for December 1817, pp. 449—462.)

Mr. WM. EUSEBIUS ANDREWS and his friends approve the work which others have partially condemned; and he is even anxious, he says, to obtain copies for sale in London! This work will then be circulated still more widely; though it has already been four or five years in distribution, by cheap numbers, with some hundred Clerical recommendations annexed!!!

A pamphlet now lies before us, 8vo. pp. 154, dated Dublin, 1817, entitled, “Notes on the Preface to the Rhemish Testament, printed in Dublin 1813;” the editor of which, p. iv. mentions that this work, so far as the Epistle to the Romans, was published by M’NAMARA in 1813,” and that its exterior title-page was then as follows:

“The Holy Catholic New Testament, patronised by His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. O’REILLY, Roman Catholic Lord Primate of all Ireland, and Archbishop of Armagh; His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. TROY, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. MURRAY, R. C. Coad. Archbishop of Dublin, and President of the Royal College of St. Patrick’s, Maynooth; the Rt. Rev. Dr. MOYLAN, R. Catholic Bishop of Cork; the Rt. Rev. Dr. POWER, R. Catholic Bishop of Waterford; the Rt. Rev. Dr. REGAN, R. C. Coad. Bishop of Ferns; the Rt. Rev. Dr. DELANY, R. C. Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin; the Rt. Rev. Dr. O’REILLY, R. C. Bishop of Kilmore; the Rt. Rev. Dr. MANSFIELD, V. C. of Ossory; the Most Rev. Dr. BODKIN, R. C. Warden of Galway; the Rev. Dr. JOHN MURPHY, Archdeacon of Cork; the Rev. Dr. M’CARTHY, Dean of Cork; and nearly THREE HUNDRED R. C. CLERGYMEN in different parts of Ireland:

translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, &c. Dublin: printed by J. CUMMING and Co. at the Hibernia Press, No. 1, Temple Lane, 1813."

We shall add no more at present, than to state, in reply to the Dublin Orators, that "the official and responsible Reviser," Mr. WALSH, is bound to justify his own conduct as the appointed editor: for, it is observed by the Orthodox Journalist, in vindicating this work, "Mr. O'CONNELL should have recollected, that the printer, well aware of his own want of knowledge, applied to the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin for his sanction of the work, and also that he would depute a *competent* person to revise and correct it for the press. Dr. Troy accordingly did depute the Rev. Mr. Walsh, of Denmark Street Chapel, to superintend and approve for publication, *in Dr. T.'s name*, the said Bible. M'Namara not being able to finish the work, Mr. Cumming engaged the same Clergyman to complete the unfinished part, which he did; and the work was, moreover, publicly advertised as containing '*the elegant, copious, and instructive Notes or Annotations of the Rhemish Testament; carefully revised by the Rev. Mr. Walsh, by permission of Dr. Troy.*' This being the case, what had the *ignorance* of M'Namara, or the *speculation* of Cumming, to do with the question?"—The weak and evasive disclaimer of ARCHBISHOP TROY will now do no service; it comes too late; and nothing short of a formal act of an Episcopal Synod, convened or fully sanctioned by the Pope himself, can wipe away the odium of these Notes, if even this be capable of allaying the just apprehensions excited by such "*orthodox and pious Catholicism.*"

While the agents of Popery and the bigots of Rome are thus circulating the vilest trash, under the name of "Annotations to the Holy Bible," their Pope sends forth new rescripts and mandates to prevent the free use of the Scriptures themselves! and this, forsooth, under the pretence that the common people will *misinterpret* the sacred text!!! Can any set of men, with a very moderate share of integrity and good sense, make mistakes in *explaining* the Bible, which are half so mischievous to society as these Notes?

No answer to the objections of anti-protestants and of half-protestants against the free and unskackled use of the Bible, can be more convincing than the expositions which learned doctors of the Romish Church have produced in

this volume, *Six* times printed "PERMISSU SUPERIORUM."—If the Catholic Laymen of Great Britain and Ireland receive such expositions, they are unfit to join with Protestants in any civil concerns; and if they do not receive them as true, they are unfit to unite in communion with the Clergy of their own Church, but ought immediately to separate themselves. By this simple *test*, then, let us judge of the sincerity of their professions; for, unless they come out from among such rulers, we have no warrant to believe they *sincerely* reject the hostile tenets which are maintained in their Douay Bible and Rheims Testament.

It is utterly impossible for Laymen who are governed by the Clergy and canon law of Rome, to be fit legislators in a Protestant constitution: their whole system is intolerant and exclusive; nor could the pretended infallibility of the Romish Church stand one day on any other, and more liberal foundation, than that which now supports it. Any melioration in the ecclesiastical policy and discipline of their Church, would be fatal to its existence. This is well known to the Priests; but *they* cannot be expected to unbind the spiritual fetters of the laity. The case is therefore desperate, and admits of *only one* remedy.

As for the "ADDRESS AND APPEAL" just issued by these few Gentlemen, it is not "a disavowal of the Notes," nor is it an exhibition of their articles of faith. A writer in the "TIMES" of Jan. 2d has answered that Address, and exposed its fallacy: but while the unerring decrees and canons of Councils are adhered to, and the creed of Pope PIUS IV. is received, we need not to be informed *by what principles any Board of Lay-Catholics must always be governed.*

THE AUTHOR'S ANSWER TO A CHARGE OF WILFUL CORRUPTION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, BY KING JAMES'S TRANSLATORS.

IN all the modern editions of the Roman Catholic New Testament, reprinted from Bishop Challoner's amended English version, (whether edited in London, Edinburgh, Manchester, or Dublin, &c.) I find a variety of notes, charging Protestants with "*corrupting the Scriptures,*" and therefore circulating a false translation. If this charge had only meant, that mistakes were accidentally made,

with a pure intention and not wilfully, it would be no imputation of moral guilt; but the accusers mean to insinuate that errors were committed purposely, in order to deceive and mislead the unlearned reader! They sometimes, indeed, say so in direct terms; but, at other times, this sentiment is conveyed by implication rather than in express words.

The text of 1 CORINTHIANS, xi. 27, is the only one, I believe, on which the Latin church (pretending that Christ's whole body and blood are contained in either species) founds its practice of withholding the sacramental cup from the Laity; and on which text there is always this note in their common version from the Latin Vulgate, universally received by English and Irish Roman Catholics: "HERE THE PROTESTANT TESTAMENT IS CORRUPTED, BY PUTTING AND DRINK, CONTRARY TO THE ORIGINAL (ἢ πίνω), INSTEAD OF OR DRINK." This text in the Greek copies, as usually printed (after Erasmus and the Paris editions), runs thus: Ὡς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐσθίει τὸν ἄρτον τούτον, ἢ πίνει τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος εἶσται τῷ σώματι καὶ αἵματι τοῦ Κυρίου. The foregoing verse is thus rendered by King James's Translators, who chiefly followed ROBERT STEPHEN'S THIRD EDITION OF 1550: "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, AND drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." Now, the question at issue is, *Whether or not our last translators PURPOSELY deviated from the original, and thereby corrupted this text, as they are said to have done; in order to evade the force of the small disjunctive particle OR, which the Papists deem so essential, and by which they try to support an unscriptural usage in their church?*

I will first show how important it is reckoned, before I make any critical remarks on the passage; only premising, that POPE PIUS VII. declares "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion to be necessarily ONE by itself ALONE, because it is *Divine*,—forming no alliance with *any other*; in like manner as *Christ* cannot be associated with *Belial*, *light* with *darkness*, *truth* with *error*, *true piety* with *impiety*." We shall, therefore, here see a famous example of the wisdom, the infallibility, the charity, the truth, the light, and the piety, of this "ONE ROMAN RELIGION"—with which our's can form no possible alliance, nor is deserving of any the remotest communion! It has been already observed, in the circular paper copied on page 234, how malignant the late editors of a Dublin Bible were, in so plentifully discharging their abusive words against us,

for our WILFUL corruptions of the sacred text! "Stand off at a distance," say they, "for we are holier than you." §

My attention was first directed by a Romish Priest to the above 27th verse, in the 11th chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, immediately after my "*Correspondence*" was published in 1813; wherein, at page 12, appears: "The Substance of a Conversation respecting the Distribution of the Bible among Roman Catholics, between Mr. Blair, Mr. Lefroy, and the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, April 7th, 1813." This Priest then told me that the Notes of Bishop Challoner to the New Testament could not be omitted in any edition which might be printed by the Board of Roman Catholics who met at the Earl of Shrewsbury's, because "it would oppose a principle of his church, if Catholics were to print the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue *without notes*; and that they could not allow the English Bible without them, because ignorant persons would misinterpret certain important texts, unaccompanied by explanations." I then remarked, "that those notes of Bishop Challoner, though short, were highly exceptionable; since they reflected uncharitably on Protestants, often charging them with being heretical, and with WILFULLY corrupting the text of the Holy Scriptures."—"NO," exclaimed Mr. Gandolphy, "not with doing so *now*, but with having done so formerly." To which I rejoined, "that the charge was altogether groundless and unfair; but, in reality, the notes *would* convey an idea of such practices being *still continued*, especially when hand-bills, pamphlets, and commentaries, were *at the same time* dispersed abroad industriously (for I had some of them in my possession), expressly making similar allegations! The republication of such notes, therefore, was both unjust and illiberal."

But, as if this Reverend Gentleman had conceded too much, in allowing that our last translators did not WILFULLY corrupt the version we now use, Mr. Gandolphy soon wrote me a letter on purpose to give a proof of such WILFUL mistranslation; and, as if such letter, sent privately to me, would not be a sufficiently strong evidence of his

§ It is here not amiss to mention, that vast quantities of "WARD's *errata* to the Protestant Bible," are now in circulation, under the sanction of high Clerical authority; and that Mr. R. COYNE, the Dublin bookseller, in his printed list of Popish works, calls WARD's infamous *Cantos* by the new title of an "HISTORY OF THE DEFORMATION OF RELIGION."

charitable opinion, the same Clergyman afterwards repeated his allegations in the Orthodox Journal! To save time and space, I do not here transcribe his observations at length: but the whole amounted to this, that he cites the above text as an unanswerable proof of WILFUL corruption, and as a clear vindication of what had been only insinuated lightly by him against our last translators, in his conversation of April 7th, 1813. §

My answer to him, by a private note, went to show that I deemed this version fair, and quite consistent with the Greek words in the context of that passage: yet, I had THEN no suspicion that the very same version was to be found in a multitude of early Roman Catholic Bibles, and that this rendering (if it were really erroneous) was formerly seen in even THEIR OWN BEST LATIN VULGATE COPIES! Well might Mr. Gandolphy tell us, in his Sermons (vol. i. p. 296), that, "provided he is allowed to EXPLAIN the Scriptures to a child, he cares not who is employed to teach him to READ THEM:" but, I will presently prove how little reason he had to affirm (as it concerned this text, &c.) that our "Protestant English translations are CORRUPT, ABSURD, SENSELESS, CONTRARY, AND PERVERTING THE MEANING OF THE HOLY GHOST." Like Bishop Milner, he untruly says, p. 310, "The Catholic Church has never *absolutely* prohibited, but simply regulated, the reading of the Scriptures;" as if a prohibition applied to nine tenths of all who can and would read the Bible, were not an absolute prohibition, because one person in ten is grudgingly permitted to read by a written license, obtained from his tyrannizing Confessor or Parish Priest!!!

Since the year 1813, I have occasionally looked into such Bibles as happened to fall in my way, in order to ascertain what ground there was for Mr. Gandolphy's assertion respecting the text in 1 Cor. xi. 27. And, I have the more solicitously done so, because I soon perceived this charge to be very frequently made by other English Papists, but most warmly by Dr. John Milner in several of his publications. Thus, at p. 385 of his "Inquiry into the

§ One of Mr. Gandolphy's arguments in favour of his PURE version of 1 Cor. xi. 27, is, that THE GREEK TEXT IN THE SEPTUAGINT IS, *ἡ κεφαλὴ*, &c. not knowing that the Septuagint was a version of the Hebrew Old Testament only, and made about *two hundred and eighty* years before the birth of Christ! Such profound Critics are some of these zealous Missionary Priests of England!!!

vulgar opinions of Ireland, third edition, 1810," I find the following remarks:—"I cannot," says he, "help noticing another corruption in the common English Testament, which, though small to the eye, *is great as to the sense*, in as much as it spoils a scriptural argument in favour of the Catholic doctrine concerning the body and blood of Christ being both received under either kind. The Greek text is: ἵνα ὅς ἂν ἐσθῆναι τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου, ἢ πίνειν τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἵνα ὅς ἂν ἐσθῆναι τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου, 1 Cor. xi. 27. 'Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the *body and blood* of the Lord.' Instead of this our *faithful* version, the Common Testament most *unfaithfully* translates the passage: 'Whosoever shall eat this bread *and* drink this cup shall be guilty, &c.'"

This objection I recollect to have also seen in a MS. letter of our Henry VIII. against Luther's followers, to prove that the sacramental wine might be kept back from the Laity; so that Bishop Milner is not the first distinguished personage who builds an argument on such a sandy foundation, to cloak an act of injustice! In his last volume too, but just published, called "The End of Religious Controversy," he again renews the attack upon our Bible in the following language:

Having mentioned the "many **WILFUL** errors of their predecessors," which King James's translators "left behind" without correction, he says; "Two of these I had occasion to notice in the Inquiry into the character of the Irish Catholics, namely, 1 Cor. xi. 27, where the conjunctive *and* is put for the disjunctive *or*, and Matt. xix. 11, where *cannot* is put for *do not*, to the altering the sense in both instances. Now, though these corruptions stand in direct opposition to the original, as the Rev. Mr. Grier and Dr. Ryan themselves quote it; yet, these writers have the confidence to deny they are corruptions, because they pretend to prove from other texts, *that the cup is necessary, and that continency is not necessary.*" The above remark occurs in his ninth letter; and again he resumes the subject in the thirty-ninth, on "Communion under one kind," where the author charges the late Bishop Porteus with unfairly overlooking this text of St. Paul:

"Another more important passage for Communion under either kind he [Bishop Porteus] entirely overlooks, where the Apostle says, '*Whosoever shall eat this bread OR drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty*'"

of the body and the blood of the Lord.' True it is that in the English Bible the text is here corrupted, the conjunctive AND being put for the disjunctive OR, contrary to the original Greek, as well as to the Latin Vulgate, to the version of Beza, &c. But, as his Lordship could not be ignorant of this corruption and the importance of the genuine text, it is inexcusable in him to have passed it over unnoticed."—Dr. Milner in a note here tells us, Mr. Grier had nothing to say for this alteration of St. Paul's Epistle, in his defence of our Bible.

I have thus explicitly and largely set down the very language of our opponents, in order to give the utmost force to their vile accusation: and I will now prove that the crime of "*corrupting this text*," as they call it, is not of our committing but their own; for that the first editions of the Vulgate New Testament had the disputed word of this passage as we have rendered it, *viz.* AND not OR. Readers will also remember, that, in all theological disputes, a Roman Catholic has no right to rest upon any version as "*authentic*," except the Latin Vulgate; and, therefore, if I demonstrate that the Latin editions of highest authority and of the earliest date agree with our English translation, no Vicar Apostolic, or Bishop, or Priest in the Church of Rome, can claim any other reply, or justly require any superior evidence.—"The fact is," says Bishop Milner, "our Church being under the necessity of pointing out to her children AN AUTHENTIC, UNADULTERATED TEXT of the Holy Scriptures, recommends that which she has *always had under her own eye*, and in constant use, without saying any thing of the other texts; which *do not possess the same honour and advantage*." P. 386, Inquiry, &c. of Dr. Milner, on the Antiquities of Ireland.

Learned men know what a long and very warm debate there has been about the text of the three heavenly witnesses, 1 JOHN, v. 7; and they know how little a Papist cares for the fact of that text being wanting in *every Greek* manuscript, except only *one* of but modern existence, because it is found in all the printed copies of their Vulgate and in most of the Latin manuscripts: nay, BOSSUET, the great oracle among them, places the genuineness of this passage in John among the ecclesiastical traditions which all the faithful are obliged to receive, under the pain of an *anathema* if they refuse. (See a quotation from Bossuet, in Mr. Charles Butler's Works, 1817, vol. i. Appendix 2nd, p. 388, "J'avou au reste, &c.")

This therefore being the case, I contend that no Roman Catholic ought to hesitate one moment in admitting our English version of 1 Cor. xi. 27, when I shall have shown this to be the common reading in nearly all the early and approved editions of the Latin Vulgate. Even then, however, it is possible for such an unfair disputant as Bishop Milner to find some bye-way of escape; for he, when it suits his argument, can not only give up the Greek copies, but the Latin Vulgate and the authorized Rheims Testament, and translate differently from them all in a theological controversy!!! § An example of this is cited in p. 79 of my late "Correspondence on the Roman Catholic Bible Society."

My proofs are these: FIRST, I find it stated in p. 492, vol. iii. of *Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ WOLFFII*, 4to. Basil, 1741, that more than thirty of the earliest printed editions of the Vulgate translation, between the years 1469 and 1569, have *et biberit*, agreeing with our own version: SECONDLY, he states that the Missals, both printed and manuscript copies, likewise read *et biberit*; which is demonstrated indeed by Le Brun, a late Priest of the Oratory at Paris, in *Continuat. Memoriarum Literariarum et Historicæ*. tom. viii. parte i. n. iii.; and in *Ephemerides Paris*. An. 1730. Dec. p. 451. sq. ed. Belg. Besides, THIRDLY, I have myself, since Mr. Gandolphy wrote to me on this subject in 1813, examined such printed editions of the Vulgate Latin as came in my way, and have found *above sixty* of them to contain the same rendering of the text. In the FOURTH place, I have consulted several manuscripts of the Vulgate, some at the British Museum, others in the libraries of private individuals (whom I can name), in which I found *et biberet*, &c. not *vel* or *aut* biberit. FIFTHLY, some of the very oldest translations into German, French, &c. made from the Vulgate by Roman Catholics themselves, agree in the disputed passage with ours. SIXTHLY, Not merely do the printed versions agree, but likewise different manuscript translations which I examined; and particularly those in French which are founded on the version of *Guiart des Moulins*, or on the History of *Peter Comestor*, so highly esteemed by the schoolmen, &c. before printing was discovered.

§ For a full proof that our common version is justified by the best and oldest Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, and also is supported by unanswerable criticisms, I refer to the commentaries of Wolfius, Rosenmüller, Whitby, Macknight, Dr. Adam Clarke, and the MSS. named in Griesbach, Wetstein, &c. &c. &c. But none of these are wanted to answer, POPISH OBJECTORS.

And here I will incidentally take occasion to observe, that many Popish translations used before the discovery of printing, as well as long afterwards, till Protestants detected their infidelities, were the most abominably incorrect, and published with interpolations or omissions. Those which I have myself seen are chiefly the *French* manuscripts and early printed Bibles; but, I cannot now stop to enumerate or detail them. The worst of these were issued from Paris, Lyons, and Bordeaux; of which as only *one* specimen, I will give the corrupted text in 1 Cor. xi. 27, from a Paris edition of "La Grant Bible en François Historiée," 2 volumes folio, very splendidly printed, and in my own library. It stands thus: "*Quiconques mangera le corps de nostre Seigneur indigne, il sera coupable comme Judas qui le vendit;*" *i. e.* "Whoever shall eat the body of our Lord unworthily, he will be guilty as Judas who sold him."—Now, let Dr. Milner and Mr. Gandolphy, with all their abusive comrades, tell me who are the corrupters of Scripture. If this short reply to their base charges against our English Translators will not silence them, I have other materials in reserve for a future publication, to repel their bitter calumny.

It is particularly to be noticed, that, among the editions of the Latin Vulgate to which I allude above, as being examined by myself, are some of peculiar value: for instance, the very first Bible ever printed by FUST and GUTTENBERG (called the Mazarine Bible), about the year 1450 or soon after, but without a date; the first Bible executed with a date, by the next printers at Mentz, A.D. 1462; the famous Bible, without a date, in two volumes folio, double columns, 45 lines each, supposed by some to precede the last named edition; the celebrated copy in the POLYGLOTT of Cardinal XIMENES, with the authority of Pope LEO the Tenth; the early Bible of Eggerstein, about 1468; also, that with the Notes of NICOLAS DE LYRA; PETER COMESTOR'S Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, written in the middle of the 12th century; the Bible of the Louvain Doctors; that of the Paris Divines; the grand Polyglott of Antwerp; the Bible of the Salamanca University; and a multitude of others, highly important, which it would be tedious to particularize: but to these I could add some very early German and French versions made by authority, and not less valuable for demonstrating my point.

Therefore, it is certain that no Protestants could have had any hand in corrupting the text mentioned, as LUTHER

and CRANMER were not born when most of those editions were printed and circulated; but this and some other WILFUL CORRUPTIONS were made by Papists in after-times, apparently to form a ground for their abominable perversion and misapplication of the Apostle's language. Here I leave that disputed passage, and trust no more will ever be advanced by Roman Catholics, to criminate our venerable English Translators of the Bible.

The extreme jealousy of such Theologians—who set up for Biblical Critics, and are constantly warning unlearned readers against the imaginary errors of our English Bible,—ought to subside a little at this late period of Biblical research. Yet, we still find them telling the common people that Protestant Bibles are full of damnable errors, that God never intended them to learn his laws and will from a book, that no school-children ought to read extracts or lessons from the New Testament, nor even from the Parables of Christ, without the permission of their Priests; and that all persons “*must hear their Church, which is a speaking tribunal, deciding every moral and religious question.*”

But, it turns out at last that this pretended “CHURCH” is nothing but some blockhead or half-witted man, though called a Pastor; who never received a smattering of Biblical learning, and perhaps who never saw a Greek Testament, or a Septuagint, or a Hebrew Bible!

This is their short, simple, easy, and rational way of settling all religious controversies, and of ruling over their deluded people!

WILLIAM BLAIR.

Great Russel Street, Bloomsbury,

April 12, 1819.

THE END.

27



