

THE STATE
OF
POPERY AND JESUITISM
IN ENGLAND;
FROM
THE REFORMATION
TO THE PERIOD OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL IN 1829 :
AND THE CHARGE OF NOVELTY, HERESY, AND
SCHISM AGAINST THE CHURCH OF ROME
SUBSTANTIATED.

BY THE
REV. THOMAS LATHBURY, M. A.
AUTHOR OF "A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH EPISCOPACY," &c.



LONDON :
JOHN LESLIE, 52, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

1838.

160.

P R E F A C E.

THIS little volume originated in the conduct of the Roman Catholics and Dissenters of the present day. Perceiving the zeal and activity of the former in propagating their errors, and in endeavouring to make proselytes to their Church, and the apathy and indifference of the latter, as well as their culpable proceedings in associating with Papists for political purposes, I was anxious to render some assistance to the cause of truth, by an exposure of the principles and practices of the Papists, and by warning our Dissenting brethren of their inconsistent conduct.

Of course, all the Dissenters are not included in my censures. My remarks apply only to that

portion of the Dissenting community, who act in agreement with the Papists. There are many Dissenters, some of whom I could mention, who, so far from approving of the measures so eagerly pursued by their brethren, do not hesitate to condemn them in the most decided terms. These are the true representatives of the principles of the Dissenters of the last century. They are the successors of such men as Watts, and Doddridge, and Henry, and others of a kindred spirit; men who would be horror-struck at the unseemly unions which often are witnessed, on political questions, between the Papists and the Dissenters of the nineteenth century.

With respect to the facts stated in the ensuing pages, I am not aware that I can be exposed to the charge of misrepresentation. At all events, I can truly say that I have not intentionally misrepresented either persons or things. Errors, doubtless, may be detected; and, should they be pointed out, I shall be most anxious to acknowledge and correct them.

The extract from the unpublished letters of Lord Clarendon will, I think, be read with peculiar interest at the present day, when the Papists are using every exertion to propagate their faith among our countrymen. While engaged in carrying this work through the press, two unpublished letters of Lord Clarendon were placed in my hands. For this act of kindness I am indebted to a gentleman connected with her Majesty's Royal Hospital at Chelsea, at which place, during the last twelve months, I have myself been resident, but which I am now leaving as this sheet is going to the press. The first letter is addressed to James Duke of York; the second to the Duchess, and the daughter of Clarendon. The illustrious writer was at this time in banishment; and the letters were written in consequence of the rumours that were in circulation respecting the reconciliation of the Duchess of York to the Church of Rome. As I did not receive them soon enough to permit of making extracts in that portion of my work which relates

to the period in question, I will venture to quote a few passages in this preface, especially as the views and feelings of Clarendon must at the present moment be contemplated with peculiar interest.

The first letter is addressed to the Duke, and is confined to the subject of the rumours respecting his wife—"I have," says the writer, "been too much acquainted with the presumption and impudence of the times in raising false and scandalous imputations and reproaches upon innocent and worthy persons, of all qualities and degrees, to give any credit to those bold whispers which have been too long scattered abroad concerning your wife's being shaken in her religion: but when those whispers break out into noise, and public persons begin to report that the Duchess is become a Roman Catholic; when I hear that many worthy persons of most unquestionable devotion to your Royal Highness are not without some fear and apprehension of it, and that

many reflections are made from thence to the prejudice of your royal person, and even of the King's Majesty: I hope it may not misbecome me, at what distance soever, to cast myself at your feet, and to beseech you to this matter in time, and to apply some antidote to expel the poison of it. It is not possible that your Royal Highness can be without zeal and entire devotion to the Church, for the purity and preservation whereof your blessed father made himself a sacrifice, and to the restoration whereof you have contributed so much yourself; and which highly deserves the King's protection and yours: since there can be no possible defection in the hearts of the people whilst due reverence is made to the Church." He tells the Duke, after alluding to the devotion of the Duchess to her husband: "Any defection in her from her religion will be imputed to want of circumspection in you, and not using your authority, or to your connivance. I need not tell you the ill consequences, that

such a mutation would be attended with in reference to your Royal Highness, and even the King himself, whose greatest security (under God) is the affection and duty of his Protestant subjects.”

The truth of this prediction, for such it proved, was seen at the Revolution, when James lost the affection of the Protestants, and with that his crown.

Clarendon adds: “Your Royal Highness well knows how far I have always been from wishing that the Roman Catholics should be persecuted with severity; but I less wish it should ever be in their power to be able to persecute those that differ from them, since we know how little moderation they could or would use.” He tells James that he has written to the Duchess, “with the freedom and affection of a troubled and perplexed father.”

The letter to his daughter is of considerable length, and embraces topics of great importance; but as I have quoted a considerable portion in

the last chapter of this volume, I shall content myself here with two brief extracts.

He tells the Duchess: "Many good men in England do apprehend, from your frequent discourses, that you have not the same reverence and veneration which you used to have for the Church of England—the Church the best constituted, and the most free from errors, of any Christian Church this day in the world. And that some persons, by their insinuations, have prevailed with you to have a better opinion of that which is most opposite to it—the Church of Rome—than the integrity thereof requires." He feelingly adds: "It is to me the saddest circumstance of my banishment that I may not be admitted, in such a season as this, to confer with you, when I am confident I could satisfy you in all your doubts, and make it appear to you that there are many absurdities in the Roman religion inconsistent with your judgment and understanding, and many impieties inconsistent with your conscience; and that, before you can submit to the obligations of that faith,

you must deliver yourself of your natural reason and common sense, and captivate the dictates of your own conscience to the impositions of an authority which hath not any pretence to oblige or advise you."

One other topic I wish slightly to allude to in this Preface. Some time after my former work, "*A History of the English Episcopacy, &c.*" was published, it was assailed, in the most abusive manner, in the *Edinburgh Review*. Of fair criticism, however severe, no author has any right to complain. But the article in the *Edinburgh* is replete with the grossest misrepresentations and perversions. I take, therefore, the present opportunity of stating, that, in the preface to another volume on English Ecclesiastical History, which is now in a state of considerable forwardness, and which I intend to publish as soon as my other avocations will permit, I shall answer all the calumnies of the Reviewer, whom I engage to convict, either of gross ignorance of the subjects of which he treats, or of the most wilful pervers-

sions, both of my work, and also of the views of the Church of England.

Should this present volume be favoured with the approbation of the public, I intend to publish another of the same size, in confutation of the peculiar dogmas of Popery, and proving many of them to be irrational, and all of them unscriptural, and unsupported by the writings of the primitive Fathers.

Royal Hospital, Chelsea,
April 3, 1838.

THE STATE
OF
POPERY AND JESUITISM
IN ENGLAND.

CHAP. I.

*The author's object—Importance of the subject—Henry VIII.
—Reformation—Edward VI.—Gardiner and Bonner
oppose the Reformers—Opposition of the priests—Queen
Mary—Progress of Protestant principles during her
reign—Fox's account of the martyrs—His history de-
fended from Popish attacks—The attempts of modern
Papists to palliate Mary's cruelties—Preservation of the
Princess Elizabeth.*

It is quite foreign to my purpose, to detail, in the ensuing pages, the circumstances in which the Church was placed prior to the Reformation, when Popery had enveloped the land in her dark mantle of ignorance and superstition. Unaccustomed to theological controversy, the English people, with some few exceptions, were indifferent spectators of the vast changes which were introduced by Henry VIII. and quite

passive in the Reformation as carried on by that imperious sovereign: but when the blessings resulting from the unrestricted perusal of the sacred scriptures had been experienced, and the people had been made acquainted with the trickery and fraud of the Romish priesthood, they entered into the subject with all that ardour which a sense of the value of the soul is calculated to inspire. The footsteps of Divine Providence may be distinctly traced throughout the whole struggle, which issued in the complete emancipation of this country from Popish thralldom: and the Protestant will do well to review the past; to look back and meditate upon the wondrous dealings of God in the establishment of the Reformation, to which all our blessings both civil and religious are to be attributed. Such a review is not however my object at present; nor is the task, which I have imposed on myself, of so pleasing a nature. But while it is our duty to trace the footsteps of Providence in the accomplishment of that event, by which the Papacy was laid prostrate in England, it is equally incumbent on us to watch the enemy, who though overthrown at the Reformation was not completely destroyed. When the Israelites were planted in the Land of Promise by the strong arm of Jehovah, the

nations of Canaan were not utterly rooted out, but were left in an enfeebled state, not sufficiently powerful to overcome their conquerors and re-establish themselves in their territories, but still strong enough to harass the Jews and to prove as thorns in their sides, for the purpose of proving them, and of reminding them that it was not by their own might but by the good hand of their God that they were established in Canaan: so at the period of the Reformation, Popery received a deadly blow, but it was not extinguished; it was permitted to maintain an existence; and at certain seasons it has appeared more vigorous than at others; nay, there have been periods since the Reformation, when Popery appeared likely to regain its ascendancy. That it was permitted to remain in the land as a trial of Protestantism there can be no question. By its existence Protestants are reminded of the thralldom in which their fathers were involved, and from which we are happily and mercifully delivered. At the present period, the Papacy appears to be gaining strength; at all events it is putting forth all its energies; and as in the case of Israel when they became lukewarm and indifferent, the Canaanitish nations were permitted to obtain certain advantages, and in some instances even to oppress the

people; so we may rest assured, that, if we forget our privileges, or lightly esteem our deliverance from Popery, the same wise Being will act in a similar manner towards us, and permit our enemy to make advances, and perhaps to assume a threatening attitude.

That the present is such a period cannot, in my opinion, be disputed; and that the emissaries of Rome are straining every nerve to regain their ascendancy, is a fact which can admit of no question. It is therefore desirable that we should be aware of our danger, in order that we may, by the divine blessing, avert it. And to assist my fellow Protestants in this necessary duty, I have undertaken in this work to trace the state of Popery in England from its first overthrow in the time of Henry VIII. to the passing of the Emancipation Bill. These pages will shew how at certain periods of our history the foe has rallied its forces, and how its advances have been checked by the efforts of Protestants; they will point out to us the weapons which were successfully used by our fathers, and encourage us to hope that the same line of conduct, if pursued now, will be crowned with similar success. As a man, who is involved in difficulties of whatever kind, is delighted at meeting with an individual who has been ex-

tricated from similar trials to those which now surround his own path, because he hopes to be made acquainted with the means by which his friend was delivered; so we in the present times of peril may gather experience from the past history of our country; we may consult its records with the assurance of discovering the means to which our fathers resorted in their distress, and which were so abundantly blessed. With such views I now proceed to narrate some facts connected with the history of Popery, which are not generally known, and to which we shall do well in the present day to pay particular attention.

It is well known that the despotism of Rome was overthrown by Henry VIII. who, though he continued a Papist in doctrine, was nevertheless the instrument in the hand of God for snapping asunder the chain by which England had been bound for so many ages. He boldly renounced the authority of the Pope. Into his motives I am not now called upon to inquire; nor has the character of the King any thing to do with the Reformation itself. It is sufficient for us to know that Jehovah selects his own instruments—that he is not tied to the use of any particular means—that oftentimes he employs such as, according to human calculation, are most unsuited

to the end to be accomplished—and that good frequently results from evil, and peace and order spring from war and confusion. If therefore the passions of Henry were instrumental in effectuating a separation of this country from Rome, no one can in consequence plead that the cause of the Reformation is an unrighteous one; since on the same ground we should be constrained to reject as curses many blessings, which from time to time are showered down upon the sons of men. In reviewing the remarkable series of events which followed each other, during the reign of Henry, in such quick succession, we ought rather to be struck with admiration at the providence of that God, who rules in the armies of heaven as well as over the inhabitants of the earth, and who can cause even the unruly wills and affections of sinful men to promote his own glory, as well as the wrath of the wicked to praise him. Still as Popery was not altogether renounced until after the King's death, I shall hasten to the reign of his son and successor, the youthful and pious Edward.*

* Who can doubt that the late ruler of France, Napoleon Buonaparte, was an instrument, an unconscious one certainly, in the hand of God for the purpose of scourging the guilty nations of Europe: yet, like the Assyrian of old, "the rod of

It was so ordered by the providence of God that those, who had the custody of the young prince, and who were in the principal posts of authority at the death of Henry, were sincerely attached to the principles of the Reformation. In a very short space, therefore, the services of the Church were conducted in the vulgar tongue—the Liturgy was compiled—the Book of Homilies composed and circulated—and the Scriptures, which had been translated in the previous reign, were again printed and distributed throughout the country. It may, however, be asked, was Popery quiescent at this period? and were the Popish priests indifferent spectators of these so-called innovations? By no means. On the contrary, every effort was made by the enemies of the Reformation to check its progress and to thwart the measures of the Government. Gardiner and Bonner, those wily

God's anger," he was laid aside when his work was finished. In like manner the passions of Henry were overruled in bringing about the Reformation: and the Christian will see, and seeing will acknowledge, the wisdom of Jehovah in raising up a monarch of Henry's stamp to break the fetters by which this country had been so long bound in the thralldom of Popery. Henry had been lauded by the Pope, and abused by Luther; yet he was the instrument for renouncing the authority of the one, and establishing the faith, preached by the other, in his dominions.

prelates, whose hands at a subsequent period were so deeply imbued in Protestant blood, and from whose character the dark stain of cruelty can never be wiped, now appeared in their true colours, and steadfastly resisted the introduction of the Gospel. In the former reign these very men had gone the whole lengths of Henry in renouncing the authority of Rome, and in establishing the royal supremacy, a doctrine which struck at the root of the Papal system. Gardiner had actually written a book, *De Verâ Obedientiâ*, in which the Protestant doctrine on this subject was maintained, and Bonner had composed a preface to the work, in which the same sentiments were advocated.* Yet in the face of such declarations they could now condemn the men who acted on the very same principles. They well knew that they could not trifle with Henry, and that opposition to his will would have cost them their lives; while, by opposing the council of the youthful king, they would at least be subject only to

* See *De Verâ Obedientiâ*. This work was translated by Michael Wood from the Latin in which it was originally written, and printed at Rouen in 1553. Wood was a printer, but a man of learning. He was probably an exile for religion during the reign of Mary, and employed himself in translating this work. Prefixed to the work is a most severe epistle to the reader, written by Wood himself.

some slight inconveniences. What then ought to be our views of the men who could retract in one reign what they had written in the preceding, and practice, at one period, what they had condemned at another? Such, however, were the men who opposed the Reformation in the reign of Edward.

Besides these and some other prelates, there were numbers of priests in every part of the country who viewed the Reformation with abhorrence; and who, though they complied with the orders of the Council in reading the newly-established Liturgy, were ready to seize every opportunity to hinder the progress of the truth. They were, in short, traitors in the Protestant camp, who remained in the hope of better times. It must also be confessed that the mass of the people were very indifferent in this reign: and I cannot but conceive that this indifference was the cause of the return of Popery. Providence saw fit to cure the people of this sin by permitting the evil to return in the days of Mary, when their eyes became fully opened to the blessings enjoyed under Edward. It is certain that the bulk of the people were much more alive to the importance of the Reformation in the reign of Elizabeth. With such a body of men in the country, devoted to the See of Rome, it was not

surprising, that in some places the Protestant doctrines did not make a rapid progress. Wherever faithful ministers could be procured, there Popery could not maintain its ground: it was not possible however to obtain a sufficient supply of preachers. Every effort was used by the rulers of the Church—clergymen were authorized by royal licence to preach in all parts of the kingdom—and even some distinguished laymen were permitted to travel through the country and instruct the people from the pulpit in the principles of the Reformation. These individuals did not assume the priestly character: nor were they ordained to the work, but being qualified by learning and piety, it was considered that the circumstances of the country, arising from the indifference of the people and the hostility of the priests, would justify a departure from those strict rules of discipline, which in ordinary cases ought to be regarded. Other means were also adopted. To check in some measure the evil resulting from the want of Protestant preachers, the Homilies, as already mentioned were published, and the clergy were commanded to read them to the people: but the artifices of the priests were still in too many instances successful; for, instead of reading these Homilies with sufficient distinctness, they

were so mumbled over, that it was not possible for the people to understand a single sentence. Such was the state of things during this reign. Great advances were indeed made: but owing to the causes above enumerated the Reformers were cramped in their efforts.

The death of Edward inspired terror into the breasts of the Reformers, who could expect nothing but proscription from the bigotted principles of his sister Mary. God's ways are unsearchable, and his judgments are past finding out. The truth of these words was verified at this period. Edward's life appeared necessary for the preservation of the truth: and the wavering disciple might have been tempted to ask why he should be removed, when his death must pave the way for the restoration of Popery. It is, however, now evident to us that the Reformation, so far from being retarded by the ascendancy of Popery, during the reign of Mary, was very materially advanced by her proceedings. Popery, it is indeed true, returned, and with a violence too, that in no preceding age had, in this country at least, marked its course: yet it is certain that, but for the full and complete developement of its principles in the flames enkindled by its votaries, its true character would not have been discovered by our ancestors. The

progress of divine truth was no less rapid during this reign than in the preceding: nor is it too much to assert that the events that now transpired tended, far more than the previous prosperity, to bring about that final Reformation, which was so signally accomplished in the reign of Elizabeth. The severity of winter is as useful as the genial warmth of summer. Both assist vegetation. It was now the winter season of the Reformation: the soil was undergoing a process of preparation: and it operated most beneficially in producing an abundant harvest during the prosperous summer season of the succeeding reign.

It pleases God sometimes to sadden the prospects of his Church: and at such seasons some may wax faint, and even depart from the faith; but others are, on the other hand, endued with extraordinary strength and courage, in order that, like Peter, they may strengthen their brethren. Never was the marvellous power of the doctrines of Protestantism, in supporting the soul in the season of sorrow, and in scenes of bodily suffering, so signally displayed as during the reign of Mary—never were the words, “the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church,” more completely verified. The patient endurance of the most excruciating tortures by the

martyrs, who were called to seal the truth of their doctrines with their blood, afforded to wavering and hesitating Protestants a convincing proof of their heavenly origin. When the souls of the martyrs ascended from the circling flames to the paradise of God, numbers were animated by the sad spectacle, to perseverance in their faith, to brave danger, and even to covet death itself. The flames of Smithfield did more towards opening the eyes of the people to the real principles of Popery, as well as weaning their affections from the ancient superstition, than all the sermons that had been delivered by the champions of Protestantism throughout the reign of the youthful Edward: they operated with more force than the most powerful argumentation or the most commanding eloquence: on every fire was inscribed, in characters the most legible, the true nature of the apostate Church of Rome: and Cranmer and his companions in suffering did more by their death to assist the progress of truth than they had ever accomplished in their lives.

Nor ought we to lose sight of another remarkable circumstance connected with this period. It has been stated that comparative indifference had hitherto been evinced by the people in general: but the proceedings adopted by the

court became the very means of loosening their affections from the superstition of Rome: while the cruelties inflicted on the martyrs tended to facilitate the progress of the Reformation in the succeeding reign. The people were now so horror-stricken at Mary's vindictive proceedings, that their indifference was converted into the most deeply-rooted aversion to the Romish system. The blessings of the preceding reign were not duly prized. Popery seems indeed to have been permitted to return for a season, for the purpose of correcting the lukewarmness of the country. A corrective consequently must be administered, bitter indeed as to its ingredients, yet salutary in its effects; and thus the return of Popery induced an ardent desire for those privileges, which, when enjoyed, had not been duly appreciated.*

* The people were disgusted with a creed, which led to the perpetration of such unheard of cruelties. Strype assures us that many were induced to embrace the Protestant faith during the reign of Mary, who at her accession appeared to be firmly fixed in the tenets of Popery. "The strongest proof of this," observes an able writer, "may be drawn from the acquiescence of the great body of the kingdom in the re-establishment of Protestantism by Elizabeth, when compared with the seditions and discontents on that account under Edward."—*Hallam's Const. History*, vol. 1. p. 146. Burnet remarks of the cruelties of Mary, that they "raised that horror in the whole nation, that there seems ever since that

The character of this reign may be read in the pages of Fox. Nearly three hundred individuals perished in the flames, besides vast numbers who died in prison. The general fidelity of Fox, though constantly questioned by the Papists, has never been disproved. That he may have fallen into errors in his details of the earlier history of the Church, may be admitted without questioning his general veracity. Mr. Maitland has shewn that, in the case of the Waldenses, he was misled by his authorities: but with respect to the persecutions of his own time and his own country, though there must be in such a voluminous work some errors, his statements may be fully depended on, having been subjected during the reign of Elizabeth to the most searching examination by his bitterest enemies, who would have proved him to be unworthy of credit as an historian if it had been possible. Having escaped from such an ordeal unhurt, we may be assured that his fidelity rests on too solid a basis to be shaken by the attempts of the nineteenth century.

time such an abhorrence to that religion to be derived down from father to son, that it is no wonder an aversion so deeply rooted and raised upon such grounds, does upon every new provocation or jealousy of returning to it, break out in the most violent and convulsive symptoms."—p. 338.

As this work was so important at the time of its publication in establishing the Protestant faith, and as it and the author were assailed with so much virulence by the Papists, it may be desirable to trace its history, and to mention the sources from which the author's materials were gathered, and the means that were adopted to make it generally known among the people.

It is one of the glories of the Church of England that she patronized this important work. As soon as it was published an order was issued that this work, together with *the Great Bible*, and *Jewell's Defence*, and *the Book of Homilies*, should be placed in all the churches of the kingdom at the public cost, in order that the people, who were unable to purchase these works, might be able to read them at all convenient times.* To make the work as generally known as possible, it was ordered also to be placed in the halls of the Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, for the use of all who might wish to peruse it. By another order the head of every college and hall in the Universities was compelled to place a copy in his own hall for the use of students and others, who might not otherwise gain access to it. Now was it that the la-

* Strype's Annals, vol. v. 738.

bours of Fox were so abundantly blessed. It is not too much to assert, that this single work furthered the progress of the Reformation more than the wisest of the plans of the Reformers. The flames of Smithfield had been witnessed but by few, in comparison, and the cries of the martyrs were heard only by those who surrounded the funeral pile ; but the pages of Fox were read by all who could read, and his statements were heard by those who were unable to read themselves. It was, indeed, to the persecution under Queen Mary, that we are indebted for the Martyrology of Fox, a work, which, next to the Sacred Volume, was the most instrumental in bringing converts from Popery to Protestantism. Placed in every church, in the halls of the Bishops and Dignitaries, and in almost every nobleman's house in the kingdom, it was extensively read by all classes of the community ; nor did any single work inflict so deep a wound on the Papal system.

Not only was this great work sanctioned and authorized by the English Church, but it may be said even to have emanated from the Church herself. It was supported by the Prelates of the Establishment, and in consequence of their sanction it passed through no less than four editions during the life of its author. It was to one of

the Bishops that the author was indebted for many of his materials, and this circumstance is of too interesting a nature to be passed over. Indeed I dwell with pleasure on these topics; for I cannot but rejoice in the fact, that our beloved Church may be said to have given birth, by the support and countenance which she gave the author, to this extensive and important work. It proves the Protestant character of our Church. The martyrs whose deeds are recorded by Fox, died in communion with that Church; and the work, in which their memories are embalmed, was received as an authentic narrative of facts, in which every Protestant ought to feel deeply interested. Grindal, who succeeded Parker in the see of Canterbury, was the individual to whom Fox was mainly indebted in the composition of his history. On the accession of Mary, Grindal fled with many others to Frankfort, where he employed his leisure in collecting the narratives of those who had suffered in England, for their attachment to the principles of the Reformation. The materials were collected in England and forwarded to Grindal on the Continent. It appears to have been his wish to publish the accounts as they reached him from time to time, but he was restrained by the apprehension that such a proceeding would ir-

ritate the Papists to more vindictive measures against his countrymen. Fox was also occupied in the same labour; and Grindal therefore relinquished his intention of publishing his materials, and forwarded them to Fox, as they reached him from their fellow-exiles. The account of Bradford's martyrdom, that of Cranmer, and many others, were drawn up by Grindal, and inserted in Fox, without alteration. To him also was Fox indebted for advice and counsel in all matters connected with his important work.*

When the Martyrology appeared it was viewed by the Papists as a public document, rather than as the work of a private individual. Hence it was not to be expected that it would escape censure. Accordingly, "when it first appeared there was extraordinary fretting and fuming at it through all quarters of England. They charged it with lies; but, indeed they said this, because they were afraid it would betray their cruelty and their lies, as the author speaks in the epistle before his book."† At a subsequent period it was violently assailed by the Jesuit Parsons in his "Three Conversions of England," who charged Fox with defacing the Bishop's registers. This assertion was however entirely false; and we have the

* Strype's Grindal, p. ii. 221.

† Strype's Annals, 375.

testimony of Strype, to his general accuracy and fidelity: "Fox was an indefatigable searcher into old registers, and left them as he found them, after he had made his collections and transcriptions out of them; many whereof I have seen and do possess. Many have diligently compared his books with registers and council books, and have always found him faithful."* This most honest, the most accurate and industrious of our historians, elsewhere observes: "And as he hath been found most diligent, so most strictly true and faithful in his transcriptions. And this I myself in part have found." After all their efforts, the Papists could only detect three or four material errors; a fact calculated to excite our surprise as well as our admiration. Some of the relations, which were alleged as falsehoods, were, when sifted, proved to be true. And thus the means used to shake the credit of the work became instrumental in establishing its veracity. In short, it would be impossible to select any work of equal size so worthy of credit as the Martyrology of Fox, in all those things relating to the persecutions under Queen Mary. The attacks so repeatedly made have fallen harmless, and the author's integrity remains unimpeached. Anthony Wood,

* Strype's Annals, 376.

who writes with no friendly feelings towards Fox, mentions a circumstance, respecting which he says the writer was mistaken : but Strype, who took nothing upon hearsay, investigated the matter fully, and proved that Fox was correct in his statement.* Two other contemporary authorities may be adduced in favour of Fox's fidelity, Whitgift and Camden. These distinguished men were well qualified to form an accurate opinion, and they were not likely to be biassed by prejudice or party principles.†

Fox evinced the utmost readiness to correct any errors into which he had fallen. Accordingly the mistakes which were pointed out in the first edition were corrected in the subsequent ones. The Papists asserted that many who were burnt in Fox in the reign of Queen Mary, were alive and drank sack in the time of Queen Elizabeth : only one instance however was adduced in proof of their assertions. It was the case of Marbeck, and this error was joyfully corrected by Fox in his second edition. The truth is, Marbeck was actually condemned for heresy, but afterwards pardoned. The publication of such a work was exceedingly annoying to the

* Strype's Annals, under the year 1561.

† Whitgift's Defence, p. 333. Camden's Annals.

Papists ; and when it was set forth by authority, and placed in parish churches, their anger exceeded all bounds. They therefore laboured with all diligence to impeach the author's veracity ; nor would his person have been safe had they found the means of entrapping him. His name was inserted, with those of others, in a " Bede-roll," or list of persons to be despatched whenever England should be invaded. The churches of England in those days must have presented a refreshing spectacle in the multitudes resorting to them, to read or to hear the narratives of the martyrs in the pages of Fox. The Bible and the Martyrology were placed side by side ; and we may imagine that vast numbers would be eager to read those Scriptures which had hitherto been locked up in a dead language, and the history of those, who in the days of Mary, had sealed the truth in their own blood at the stake. Among the poor, few only at that time were able to read ; but in every parish there was at least one individual who was qualified for the task. We can imagine the poor assembling in the chancels of the churches in anxious groups waiting to hear, from the lips of him who could read, the surprising narratives of Fox. In many parish churches these works

still remain, in a state more or less perfect, chained either to the rails of the altar, or to a small desk appointed for the purpose.*

During the reign of Charles II., when a new edition, the edition of 1684, was published, the promoters of the work obtained a kind of promise from the king that the order of Elizabeth and James for placing the book in parish churches should be revived.† Had that promise been fulfilled, the work would have been replaced in all those churches from which, through the lapse of time, it had disappeared. It is not likely, however, that Charles entertained any intention of fulfilling that promise. I must confess that it would afford me the most sincere pleasure to see it again placed in our churches, or in some public place in each parish, where it would be accessible to the poor, who are from their poverty unable to purchase a work so expensive. It is gratifying to the Protestant to know that a new edition of this extensive work is now in a course

* I have seen the Bible, Jewell's Defence, Fox's Martyrs, and the Homilies, or at least remains of them, in several parish churches, where they have remained from the days of Elizabeth. Several years since, when an under-graduate in Oxford, I recollect seeing some of them in the parish church of Abingdon, and that of Cumanor, a village near the University.

† Wood's *Athenæ*.

of publication; and that the Papists are alarmed at its appearance, and published in such a form as to render it accessible to many who would never read the old black letter editions, is evident from certain symptoms among their body, and especially from the allusions of Mr. Sheil, in his speech in the House of Commons, to the numerous list of subscribers attached to the prospectus of that work.*

Before I conclude the present chapter, there are a few topics illustrative of the character of Popery in this reign, which may now be introduced. Most of my readers are aware of the attempts of Popish historians to palliate, if not to justify, the cruelties exercised against the Protestants during this bloody reign. Dr. Lingard gravely assures his readers that the severities were revived by the excesses of the Gospellers and by a new conspiracy,† and elsewhere he adds, “If any thing could be urged in extenuation, it must have been the provocation given

* I wish also to mention an edition by Mr. Seymour, in which he has condensed within the compass of one volume the substance of the great work. This edition is calculated to be eminently useful, inasmuch as from its cheapness it will be procured by persons who could not purchase the edition now in a course of publication by Seeley. I would recommend Mr. Seymour's edition for parochial libraries.

† Lingard, vol. vii. 266.

by the Reformers.”* He insinuates that the grossest insults were offered to the Queen and to the priests: but when he comes to proofs he can only adduce a few facts of a few individuals, and these forsooth are to be regarded as evidences of the general disaffection of her Protestant subjects.† It would have been strange if the people had not manifested their disappointment at the breach of those promises made by the faithless Queen to the men of Kent, (who seated her on the throne) that they should not

* Lingard, vii. 285. Mr. Hallam remarks, “Dr. Lingard has softened and suppressed, till this queen appears honest and even amiable. A man of sense should be ashamed of such partiality to his sect.”—*Hallam*, i. 144.

† I quote the following just remark in reference to Dr. Lingard’s defence of Queen Mary. “But those who would diminish this aversion, will do better by avoiding for the future either such panegyrics on Mary or her advisers, or such insidious extenuations of her persecution as we have lately read, and which do not raise a favourable impression of their sincerity in the principles of toleration to which they profess to have been converted.”—*Hallam*, i. 145.

The number of sufferers at the stake during this reign is reckoned by Fox at 284, by Speed at 277, and by Lord Burleigh at 290. See Strype. Carte imagines that many more were put to death, whose names were not recovered by Fox; and in the preface to a work of Ridley’s on the Lord’s Supper, it is asserted that no less than 800 actually suffered death in the flames. Grindal is supposed to be the author of this preface.—See Burnet, ii. 364.

be disturbed in the profession of their religion. As to outrages, however, there were none. But supposing some of the Protestants had been implicated in rebellion, why were they put to death as heretics, and not as traitors? The truth is, the Papists of the present day would gladly turn away the eyes of Protestants from the cruelties of this inglorious reign: but it behoves us as Churchmen to look back upon this period, in order that we may discover the true character of Popery. In the present day it is restrained from committing excesses; but as its principles are unchanged, we have no reason to believe that its practices would be different, if the restrictions of law and public opinion were removed. At all events Popery cannot be trusted. Its promises may be specious, but what single principle or tenet have the Papists renounced? How, indeed, can they, so long as they retain the monstrous doctrine of infallibility. It is the decision of their Church that all Protestants are heretics, and the doom of heretics is death: can we, then, with the utmost stretch of charity, believe that the flames of Smithfield would not be rekindled, if power was again possessed by the Papacy. As we have seen the fruits of their doctrines in past times, and as from the nature of things their tenets cannot be changed, they

surely cannot deem us unreasonable or uncharitable in our belief, that the same principles would lead to the same results, if unrestrained by the authority of law or the force of public opinion.

As the princess Elizabeth was known to be attached to the Protestant faith, and as she was the hope of the Protestant party, several attempts were made by her enemies to remove her out of the way. Her preservation amid so many dangers was truly wonderful. At one time the Papists had resolved on her destruction, in order that the hopes of the Protestants might be extinguished: the warrant for her execution was actually signed by many members of the council, and the signature of the Queen was alone wanting to give effect to the document. From some cause or other Mary relented, and Elizabeth was spared. After the death of the Queen, Philip confessed that he had been instrumental in preserving Elizabeth's life against the repeated solicitations of the crafty Gardiner: his interposition, however, did not spring from pity, but from motives of policy, for he hoped in the event of Mary's death, to secure his position in England by marrying Elizabeth. When Dr. Lingard arrives at this period of our history, he endeavours to make the merit of Philip more

conspicuous, by telling his readers that Elizabeth was concerned in a conspiracy against her sister, and that Philip spared her life in the hope of marrying her afterwards. That her life was spared at the intercession of Philip is certain; but that she was engaged in any conspiracy is false, and that Dr. Lingard should assert the contrary is surprising. Elizabeth's danger arose not from her politics but her religion. Elsewhere the Romish historian observes that the emperor urged the execution of the princess, and that she was saved by the interference of Gardiner; but there is abundant evidence to prove that the prelate was one of her bitterest enemies, and that he was closely connected with those plots, whose aim was her destruction. Amidst all these dangers Elizabeth was spared; she was under the Divine protection, and not a hair of her head was injured. Great and glorious deeds were to be accomplished, and Elizabeth was the destined instrument in their execution. In her case the words of Holy Writ were verified, "He disappointeth the devices of the crafty, so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise."* Her enemies were placed under restraint; and though they were daily plotting

* Job, v. 12.

her ruin, yet they were not permitted to injure her person.

Mary's reign was short, inglorious, and bloody. It is a dark spot in our history, and furnishes a black page in our annals: yet it is a period pregnant with instruction. To it may the Protestant revert for evidence of the persecuting nature of Popery: and whatever may be alleged by spurious liberalism in proof that Popery is changed, or against the injustice of condemning the principles of Popery for the practices of three centuries ago; let not Protestants lose sight of one simple fact, namely, that the Papists themselves have never asserted that their views on the subject of heresy and persecution have undergone any change. It is stated, and there appears to be no reason for questioning the statement, that Mary's last days were rendered miserable by the recollection of the blood that had been shed during her short reign. She had been taught by Gardiner and Bonner to believe that by putting heretics to death she was doing God service; but when death appeared near, she began to view her actions in their proper light; and the remorse which she experienced was undoubtedly deepened by the review of those events which will cast a shade on her memory to the latest posterity.

CHAP. II.

Hopes of the Reformers revived by Mary's Death—Wisdom of Elizabeth—The Pope delays the Bull of Excommunication—First Popish attempt on the Queen's Life.—Pius V. excommunicates Elizabeth—Plots and Treasons ensue—Spanish Armada—Views of the Papists in that attempt.

AFTER a short reign of five years and a few months, death summoned Mary into the presence of a righteous Judge. And the flames which had been kindled in every part of the country were extinguished. It was an event that revived the expiring hopes of the Reformers. How frequently has Jehovah interposed when the Church appeared to be in her extremity. He often comes to our rescue when deliverance seems to be at the greatest distance. Israel was rescued from Egyptian bondage at a time when hope had almost expired; and when the Reformers were fearful lest all the faithful should be devoured in the flames, or banished into foreign lands, the death of the Queen suddenly restored their hopes, and made way for the re-establishment of the Reformation. It is worthy of observation, that the death of the Queen was speedily followed by that of many of the most zealous defenders of Popery,—men who, had they survived, would

have opposed those measures which were now to be pursued. "There was," says Fuller, "a strange mortality, different from other infections, not sweeping but choosing, which did chiefly single out men of wealth and quality. We will conceive that God, intending to place in Queen Elizabeth, first cleared the ground, by removing such as probably would oppose her." After observing that the Papists did not oppose her accession, he adds, "Thus those whom God will have to rise shall never want hands to lift them up."* It was certainly remarkable that some of the greatest enemies of Protestantism should be removed when Popery was about to be overthrown.

Much has been written on the character of Elizabeth. Her wisdom and prudence were very conspicuous at the commencement of her reign. It is remarkable that the daughters of Henry VIII. should have been so dissimilar: what was set up by the one was cast down by the other; and the doctrines which were de-

* Fuller, Book viii. 43. Heylin referring to the same circumstance, says, "That a violent fever took off such a number of the priests that a number of the churches were unserved. God so ordered it, that by the death of so many of the present clergy a door was opened for the preaching of sounder doctrine."—*Heylin's Reformation*, 251.

nounced by Mary were propagated by her sister. In his anger God permitted Mary to reign for a brief space, and to steep her crown in the blood of the saints; yet his anger endureth but for a night, whereas his mercy is everlasting; and therefore in his love he permitted Elizabeth to ascend the throne, and to rule over the nation during the period of forty-four years. The Church may be tried under a sovereign like Mary: it shall be restored by another like Elizabeth. The fires of persecution were extinguished at her accession, and the stream of blood, that seemed even to be gathering strength, was dried up. Many were delivered from prison who would shortly have been fastened to the stake, and the fury that had wasted the Church was now placed under restraint. The circumstances in which the Queen was placed at her accession were most critical, and the difficulties by which her throne was surrounded were such as could not have been surmounted except by a sovereign of the most consummate abilities. The safety of the throne was threatened by the priests at home and by the Pope and Popish sovereigns abroad; but her wise and cautious measures strengthened her hands against all her enemies, foreign and domestic.

It is well known that the Pope arrogated to himself the power to depose kings, and to confer their dominions on others. Nor was this a mere empty pretension, since many European Sovereigns had at various periods experienced its fatal influence. Whenever it pleased his Holiness to issue his bull of excommunication, the kingdom of the offender was either bestowed upon another, or offered to any invader. In the present age the Popish excommunications are innocuous, but at the period of which I now speak they were by no means so; for though no neighbouring potentate might be sufficiently powerful to seize upon the interdicted kingdom, yet the excommunication was the signal for attack on the part of foreigners, and for the planning and execution of treasons on the part of the offending monarch's own subjects. That the Pope would at once proceed to excommunicate the Queen was fully expected. It pleased God, however, to cause the Pope to delay the sentence, which, had it been issued at that time, would have involved Elizabeth in many difficulties. A concurrence of remarkable providences is visible at this period. On the one hand the Popish Sovereigns of Europe were embroiled in mutual disagreements and hostilities, by which they were prevented from turning

their attention to the English Queen; and on the other hand, the Pope was induced to delay the issuing of the bull from time to time in the hope of her reconciliation to the Church of Rome. The Papal chair was occupied at Elizabeth's accession by Paul III., who was induced to believe that he should be able to prevail upon the Queen to return to the allegiance of the Holy See. His successor was Pius IV., also a moderate man; for though he was urged to issue the bull, he did not see fit to follow the advice. He recollected the fatal consequences that flowed from the measure of one of his predecessors, Clement, in excommunicating Henry VIII., an act which led the monarch into courses that otherwise might not have been pursued. But mark the short-sighted policy of man! Both these events, the precipitancy of Clement, and the delay of Pius IV. were over-ruled in favour of Protestantism: the former confirming the separation from Rome, the latter permitting Elizabeth to prepare against the dangers by which her throne was menaced.

During the space of eleven years was the blow suspended by the prudence of the Pope, who was induced to act in this manner by the cautious measures of the Queen; and when it actually fell it was scarcely heeded. Had the excommu-

nication been issued at an earlier period, before her power was consolidated, the consequences might have been serious, as in that case her Popish subjects would have resisted her authority, and she might have found it difficult to enforce it. In the fourth year of her reign Poole and others made an attempt, which was happily defeated. They confessed at their trial that they had been led to believe by certain astrologers whom they consulted, that the Queen would die within the year, and that this belief had kept them quiet. During eleven years, therefore, the land had great peace and rest; learning and piety increased, and Popery was upon the wane. The Papists frequented the parish churches without hesitation as long as the excommunication was delayed, a practice which was authorised by the Pope. At this time, as the Puritans had not separated from the Church, the whole land, to use the language of Fuller, "was of one language and one speech."* But this peaceable state of things

* That the Papists during eleven years frequented the parish churches is absolutely certain. Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, in his speech at the arraignment of the conspirators of 1605, thus speaks on the subject. "For from the year 1 Eliz. until 11, all Papists came to our Church and service without scruple. I myself have seen Cornwallis,

was not destined to continue. In the eleventh year of the Queen's reign, the year 1569, the Pope Pius V. issued his bull, by which she was excommunicated, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance. It was observable afterwards that this edict proved more troublesome to the Papists than to the Queen and her Protestant subjects; for many of the former were thereby encouraged to enter upon treasonable practices, which issued in the forfeiture of their lives to the offended majesty of the law. The expected fruit was never gathered. The Queen retained her crown, and the great majority of her subjects were true to their allegiance. But it was the signal for entering upon all kinds of treasonable practices; and the people were now prohibited from attending at the parish churches, lest by frequenting the preaching of Protestant ministers, they might eventually embrace the

Beddingfield, and others, at church. So that then for the space of ten years they made no conscience nor doubt to communicate with us in prayer; but when once the bull of Pope Pius Quintus was come and published, wherein the Queen was accursed and deposed, and her subjects discharged of their obedience and oath, yea, cursed if they did obey her; then did they all forthwith refrain the church. So that recusancy in them is not for religion, but in an acknowledgment of the Pope's power."—See the Gunpowder Treason, by Bishop Barlow, p. 109.

Protestant creed. The event dreaded by the Church of Rome actually took place. At first the people were permitted by the Pope to go to church; but when all hope of reclaiming the Queen had expired, the prohibition was issued. It was, however, too late. The common people, after eleven years attendance on the service of the Protestant Church, were become so attached to the principles which had been inculcated, or so averse to the errors of Popery, that there was little if any danger of a relapse into their former superstition. The wise were taken in their own craftiness, and those measures, planned with so much caution, which were intended to overthrow the Reformation, became the very means of its complete establishment.

The attempt to re-establish Protestantism at the Queen's accession was a hazardous one. The churches were occupied by Papists; the Protestant preachers were in exile; and the mass of the people were led by a corrupt priesthood. The court of Rome was her enemy, and she might expect that the Popish Sovereigns of Christendom would attempt to invade her dominions. Yet in the face of such obstacles did Elizabeth determine to establish Protestantism. The retaining of Popery would have removed these apparent difficulties; but

she was enabled to choose the good part, and the issue was a train of blessings, which heretofore had been unknown by Englishmen.

As soon as the bull was issued, the enemies of the Queen both at home and abroad, began to devise mischief and to plot her ruin. The attempts of foreign enemies were supported by her disaffected subjects at home. I shall in this chapter select the most remarkable instances of Popish rage, as evidenced by the attempts of foreign enemies and treasonable subjects. All the powers of darkness appeared to be marshalled against her; they were continually devising her ruin, either by foreign or civil wars; by open acts or secret practices; by invasions and rebellions; by attempts at poisoning, or secret assassination. Yet the danger was warded off, and God's power was displayed in the deliverance of which she was the subject. The princes of Europe combined against her in vain, and the Church of England, under her auspices, became fixed on an immovable basis. The most remarkable attempt at foreign invasion was that of Spain, in their Invincible Armada, in the year 1588. So confident of success were these emissaries of Rome, that they had actually disposed of the property and titles of the kingdom. That fleet,

manned with forty thousand of the best troops of Spain, was fitted out for the purpose of overturning the infant Church of England, of dethroning the Queen, of placing a Papist on the throne, and of re-establishing Popery. The enemy appeared somewhat unexpectedly on our coasts, owing to the treachery of a Popish Sovereign, who had, under the pretence of a friendly alliance, promised to apprise the Queen of the enemy's movements; but who perfidiously broke his solemn engagement, thereby verifying the Popish maxim, that no faith is to be kept with heretics, he himself being at the same time in the interest of Spain. In consequence of his treachery the enemy appeared unexpectedly; but as unexpectedly were they dispersed by a tempest. They had impiously named their fleet the *Invincible Armada*; but he that was seated in the heavens laughed them to scorn. The same arm, that in ancient times had broken the chariots of Pharaoh, now scattered the forces of Spain, broke their cables, sunk many of their vessels in the ocean, and dispersed the remainder.

The year 1588 was selected for this enterprise, in consequence of the predictions of astrologers that it would be a remarkable year, a year

of wonders.* The prediction was in a certain sense verified, but in a different manner from what was anticipated by the emissaries of Rome. It was a year of wonders. The most powerful fleet that had ever been collected was destroyed, and England was saved. Several years had been occupied by King Philip in making his vast preparations, and in consequence of the magnitude of his fleet, and the predictions of astrologers, he believed that success was certain. The fleet was commended to the intercessions of the saints, and as to defeat, its possibility was never contemplated. Philip solicited and obtained the co-operation of the Pope, who supplied him with money, and renewed the bulls of excommunication against the Queen; her subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and plenary indulgences were promised from the treasury of the Church to all who would act against England. In France a ballad was composed and sung in celebration of the victory, which they fancied themselves sure of gaining. It

* "The trick of conjuration about the Queen's death began early in her reign, and led to a penal statute against 'fond and fantastical prophecies,' 5 Eliz. c. 15. The Popish party made use of pretended conjurations and prophecies of that event, in order to unsettle the people's minds, and dispose them to another reaction."—*Hallam*, vol. i. 156.

would have been wiser to have waited the result of the enterprise; but it sometimes happens that the wicked are lulled into a false security preparatory to their destruction. The various attempts made by the fleet may be seen in any history of the period, and need not be detailed here. It may be sufficient to state, that the navy that had occupied three years in the preparation, was, within one short month after its departure from the Spanish ports, completely overthrown. Many were sunk in the ocean; some were taken by the English fleet; and so great were the straits into which the remainder were driven, that they were compelled to sail through the English Channel, and to endeavour to reach their own country through the northern ocean.* And of those who thus escaped from the English fleet and the violence of the sea, many were wrecked, some on the coast of Ireland, some on that of Scotland. Not more than one hundred lives were lost on the part of England, and only one single vessel; not one man was called away from his necessary occupation; nor was one single cottage burned, notwithstanding the vast preparations of Spain. It may

* Of 158 ships, not more than forty returned into the ports of Spain.

indeed be said that the Lord fought for England ; and the Queen and her subjects might with truth say, " If the Lord had not been on our side when men rose up against us, they had swallowed us up quick, when they were so wrathfully displeased at us." One of their leaders scornfully and impiously said on his return, that Christ was turned Lutheran.*

Before the expedition was actually undertaken, a most infamous pamphlet was published at Antwerp, in the name of Cardinal Allen, an Englishman. In this tract all the alleged crimes of Elizabeth are detailed in language which cannot be repeated with decency. After narrating the vices of the Queen, it is observed that the sentence of Pius V. had not been executed, partly in consequence of that Pontiff's death, and partly on account of her own great power : but now Sixtus V. the present Pope, calls upon

* To encourage the soldiers engaged in the expedition, they were accompanied with a certain number of priests, who assured them that they " should be assisted by the blessed patrons both of heaven and earth, with the guard of all God's holy angels, with our blessed Saviour in the sovereign sacrament, and with the dally most holy oblation of Christ's own dear body and blood, as it could not fall out otherwise, but that we must needs prevail." See *Considerations by the Secular Priests*, 275, a work which I shall notice in a subsequent page.

Philip to undertake the glorious enterprise, to which he consents.*

It may be asked, what induced the King of Spain to make this attempt, and what were his views therein? It was not an ordinary war, arising from the usual causes of disagreements between sovereign and independent states; but it was a war of religion—a war against the Church of England. Had the Queen been a Papist she might have remained in undisturbed security. It was stirred up by the papal court, and the design was to place Philip on the throne, and re-establish Popery. This attempt proves that the Pope's bull was no trifling matter. Pius V. in his excommunication of the Queen, had given her kingdom to King Philip; and on the authority of that donation did the Spanish monarch endeavour to take possession of her dominions in 1588. Hitherto the Popish enemies of England had been unable, from various causes,

* This tract was intended for distribution in England on the landing of the troops, and bore the following title: "An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland, concerninge the present Warres, by the highe and mightie Kinge Catholike of Spaine, by the Cardinal of Englande, Anno MDLXXXVIII." A large impression was printed, but as the invasion did not take place the greater number of the copies was committed to the flames. It bears the name of Cardinal Allen on the title, but its real author is supposed to have been the Jesuit Parsons.

to act upon the Pope's grant. Dr. Lingard admits that one of the objects contemplated in this invasion was the restoration of the Papal authority.* It is now the fashion to assert that Popery is harmless, yet its principles are identically the same as they were in the year 1588. It is true that Popery is more under restraint, but shall we trust to its fair promises and its specious appearances? Is the chained lion less fierce than he would be at liberty in his native forests? He may be unable to injure, but let him have his liberty, and those who approach him would be in jeopardy. Popery is unable to act on its own principles; but let it be invested with political power, and it will perpetrate the same deeds of cruelty and blood as in times past. Indeed, I cannot conceive how any man can argue that such results would not flow from the possession of political power. It is another thing to allege that it is impossible that Popery should ever gain such an ascendancy as to become dangerous to others. Even supposing this allegation to be correct, why should we be called upon to confide in men who are only prevented from carrying their worst principles into operation by the absence of political power?

* Lingard, viii. 323.

It may be affirmed that this was the only attempt at invasion in consequence of the Pope's bull; and this fact is readily admitted: but to what cause are we as a nation indebted for that freedom which we have enjoyed? Certainly not to the principles of Popery, but to the inability of the Papists to accomplish their nefarious designs. But though no public attempt at invasion was made subsequently to the defeat of the Armada, yet it is certain, as I shall show in another chapter, that the Pope and the Spanish monarch were privy to many plots, whose aim was the death of the Queen and the destruction of the Church of England.

CHAP. III.

Origin of the Seminary Priests—Jesuits—their Attempts to divide Protestants—A previous Design of the English and Continental Reformers for union frustrated—The Jesuits stir up differences among Churchmen—They assume the garb of Puritan Ministers—Parsons—Campion—Parry—The Pope implicated in their Treasons—Papists executed—Regarded as Martyrs by the Church of Rome—They are executed for Treason, not for Religion.

IN the preceding chapter will be found an ample detail of the practices of the Pope and of the continental Papists against the English Queen and the Church of which she was the illustrious protectress: in the present, however, it is my intention to enter upon those private plots and attempts which, throughout the reign of Elizabeth, were directed against her life by the Jesuits and seminary Priests. As I have so much to say of these parties, I will, before I proceed to their actions, beg the reader's attention to a few observations on their origin and institution. The seminary Priests, as they are designated in all the writings of this period, were Englishmen educated in the principles of the Church of Rome, on the Continent, in various seminaries supported for this particular purpose. The first seminary of this description owes its origin

to Cardinal Allen, an Englishman, who, about the year 1568, established an institution at Doway for the education of English priests.* At a subsequent period it was divided, and part of the residents removed to Rhemes and part to Rome, from which cities they issued forth in vast numbers during this and the next reigns, and, in conjunction with the Jesuits, were the fountain of all the treasons that were perpetrated in this country. Every year almost gave birth to some plot or other against Elizabeth. The Jesuits are of comparatively recent origin. Their founder, Ignatius Loyala, was an officer in the Spanish service, and having received a wound at the siege of Pampeluna, he, to wile away his solitary hours, occupied himself in the perusal of a life of the saints, to which circumstances the Jesuits owe their origin; for he now determined to devote himself to the church, and, being an enthusiastic individual, he conceived the idea of forming a new order. The wisdom of the Romish Church is in no instance more signally displayed than in the facilities which she affords to any of her members to institute

* The Pope assigned them a yearly stipend for their support. It appears that the designation *seminaries* was adopted in allusion to their employment, which was to sow the seeds of Popery in England; in other words the seeds of treason and rebellion.

new practices, to establish new rights and ceremonies, and to found new orders. Provided they are willing to submit to the authority of the church, they are at liberty to adopt whatever practices may strike their own fancy; and thus, notwithstanding the innumerable differences and points at issue between the various orders of the Romish hierarchy, an appearance of unity is preserved, by the subjection of the whole to the authority of the Church. Much opposition was, however, experienced by Ignatius from the Pope, in the first instance; nor was it till he added a point to the usual vows of the monastic orders, that the Pontiff yielded to his request. The members of all the monastic institutions are bound by three vows, of poverty, chastity, and obedience to the head of their order; to these Ignatius added another, that of obedience to the Pope, by which they engaged to go wherever his Holiness should command, without requiring any pecuniary support from the holy see.* At this time the Reformation was making rapid advances both in Germany and England, and already

* The oath of the Pope binds them to secrecy and to an implicit obedience in every thing to the will of the Pontiff. This oath is administered with the sacrament, and, to make it more sacred, some of the novitiate's own blood is mingled with the wine in the sacramental cup.

some of the fairest portions of Christendom were wrested from the grasp of superstition ; the offer therefore could not be resisted, and it must be confessed that the Jesuits have done more towards supporting a falling cause than all the other orders together.* The society was at once instituted, and Ignatius was appointed the first general of the order in the year 1540. In a very small space of time they had establishments wherever Popery was professed ; they were entrusted with the education of

* They were viewed with suspicion by some of the other orders, of which several amusing instances are recorded. A Jesuit told his audience in his sermon that he had seen a vision of hell, but though he fancied that he saw persons of all ranks and all orders, he did not see there one Jesuit ; and therefore he blessed God that he belonged to the society of the Jesuits. The preacher on the following Sunday was a Dominican friar, who told his audience that he also had seen a vision of hell, that he saw the souls of all classes of persons, and even of his own order, but not one Jesuit. This excited his surprise, and led him to inquire of one of the devils how it was that there was no Jesuit there. The spirit told him that the Jesuits were in another hell below that, and that they arrived in such numbers, that Pluto could with difficulty rule them. The friar advised that Pluto should take care lest they should blow up his kingdom with gunpowder, when the king of Spain would come and take possession of it. The devil laughed, and the friar awoke, and found it was a dream. These sermons were preached in the year 1600.— See a Tract in Italian, 1607, entitled *Condolanza de un Studente de Padua*.

youth, and in most instances became the confessors of the Papal sovereigns. It was not long, however, before several of the European princes were compelled to issue severe edicts against this order, whose members were found to be at the bottom of all the intrigues and plots by which the peace of their dominions was agitated. The Emperor Charles V. found it necessary to check their progress; and after being expelled from several, nay, from most of the countries of Europe, the order was totally suppressed by Clement XIV. in 1773. At the end of the late war, however, it was revived in Europe, and the Jesuits are now as active as ever in disseminating their principles.

It was from these two parties that shoals of priests issued, whose object was to overthrow the throne of Elizabeth, and destroy the English Church. They were the authors of all the treasons that were practised throughout this and the succeeding reign. Hence it was remarked at the time, there is no treason without a priest, a remark which was strictly true. Nor were their practices confined to England; for there was not one Protestant country which did not experience the evil influence of these active emissaries of the Roman See. Wickliffe's definition of a friar in his days was still more appli-

cable to a Jesuit in the reigns of Elizabeth and James: "Cadaver mortuum e sepulchro veniens, missum a demone inter homines;" for from the publication of the bull of Pius V. until her death, the Queen was never free from the treasons of these factors of Rome.

It is very remarkable, that notwithstanding the numerous attempts against her life, the Queen was preserved; while two of the continental sovereigns, who, though Papists, were considered to be lukewarm in the cause of the Church, fell a sacrifice to the malice of the Jesuits. After the bull had been issued, to adopt the language of a contemporary authority, "there passed never a year, never a month, never a week, I think I might say never a day, never an hour, but some mischief was intended against her person or her people." Sometimes these plots were overruled for good. To specify all the particular treasons of this reign would not be possible within the limits of this work. The Jesuits, those subtle and able supporters of the Papal hierarchy, resorted to all kinds of means for the purpose of undermining Protestantism, and even assumed on many occasions the garb of Protestant ministers. At this period the Church of England was agitated by those disputes concerning some of the ceremonies,

which eventually proved her overthrow. Though the greater part of the clergy were satisfied with the Reformation, as established at the commencement of this reign, yet there were some who advocated a nearer approximation to the discipline of the Church of Geneva, of which Calvin was the illustrious founder. In matters of faith both parties were agreed, while the points on which they differed were of comparatively minor consequence. Both parties, too, were men of zeal and piety. Those who were anxious to abolish some of the ceremonies were at length designated Puritans, and with them did the Jesuits unite in order that they might widen the breach among the English Protestants. They declaimed against the ceremonies as Popish, and recommended a purer discipline. Unless we had abundant and irrefragable proofs that many Jesuits were thus occupied in England at this time, we might be disposed to exclaim that such baseness was not possible. Upon this question, however, there is no room for doubt, as will appear in the progress of the narrative. Their object was to divide the Protestants, in order that by means of divisions they might promote the cause of Popery. The Church of England was a powerful bulwark against them; they were convinced that its

removal would open the door for the restoration of the Papal authority. "The disputes," says Bishop Pilkington, "were lamented by pious persons, while atheists laughed, and the devil blew the coals." Thus the Church and the Queen were the two objects of attack, and they could devise no likelier method for overthrowing the former than by destroying the latter. Hence their treasons against Elizabeth's life.

Before I specify any particulars, it may be desirable to mention a certain noble design of the Reformers, which, had it been executed would have prevented many of those divisions, by which the peace of the Church has been agitated, but which was frustrated by the activity of the emissaries of Rome. From the very commencement of the Reformation in this country, the English Church was viewed by the Romanists as the principal bulwark of Protestantism, and in consequence all their attacks were directed against her, for the purpose of accomplishing her ruin.* No sooner was the Reformation established in England, in the reign of Edward VI. than the Papists became alarmed

* In a future page I shall have an opportunity of shewing that she is still the great antagonist of Popery, and that on that account she continues exposed to the attacks of her adversaries.

at the regularity, order, apostolical discipline, and strength of the Church of England. On the Continent, the Reformation had been accomplished in a great measure by popular violence, and, in most cases, in opposition to the established authorities; the Court of Rome was therefore less alarmed in the first instance at the appearances of revolt in Germany, than it otherwise would have been, if the respective governments of those States into which the Reformed doctrines found an entrance, had concurred with the populace; but in England, everything was quietly and legally changed by the authority of the Government, and agreeably to the feelings of a large part of the community. This circumstance struck terror into the Papal Court! One consequence resulting from the manner in which the English Reformation was accomplished was the preservation of the episcopal order; whereas on the Continent, in some instances at least, the leading Reformers being Presbyters only were under the necessity of acting without their Bishops, and of erecting their churches on a Presbyterian platform. Though I will freely admit that the Reformed Churches on the Continent, in which Episcopacy is not retained, are true and lawful Churches, they having the plea of necessity to urge for what

they did, yet I must maintain that the episcopal is the apostolic practice, and that it is most desirable that this model should be retained in all the Reformed Churches. Nor ought we, in my opinion, to deem it one of the least of our privileges, that our Church is framed according to the primitive practice. This circumstance was indeed esteemed of great importance by the foreign Reformers, who, though from necessity they had rejected government by Bishops, would, as is evident from their letters, have been willing to have conformed to our practice. It was not until the minds of the foreign Protestants had been soured by controversies, that any of their number began to plead against the lawfulness of episcopal government.

The Papists were fully aware that many of the Continental Churches were irregular, and that in matters of discipline they had departed from the practice of the Church during the preceding fifteen hundred years. Of this circumstance, the defect in their ecclesiastical government, the Papists did not fail to take advantage; and but for the countenance and support of the English Church, and the English government, there is reason to believe that the efforts of the Church of Rome to crush the Reforma-

tion in Germany, would have been crowned with success. The seeds of discord were scattered by the Papists, and an abundant harvest would have been reaped, had it not pleased God to check the encroachments of Rome by the complete establishment of the Church of England, which both at that time and ever since has proved the chief bulwark of the truth against error and superstition. The English Reformers were anxious to form such a union with their brethren on the Continent, as should enable them to unite against the common enemy; and to effect this desirable end Cranmer opened a correspondence on the subject with Calvin, Melancthon, and other influential leaders of the Reformation. There can be no doubt that this design would have been accomplished, had not the Papists become alarmed, and put forth all their energies to counteract it. At this time, the Council of Trent was sitting, who immediately sent forth their emissaries with instructions to prevent this happy union of the Protestant Churches. Had this measure succeeded, Edward would have been constituted the head of the Protestant confederacy, while episcopacy would have been received in the Churches, and an agreement thereby established, not only in doctrine, as is still the case, but in discipline

and government too. Calvin and Bullinger distinctly offered to receive episcopal government, as it had already been established in England.* Such a union would have formed an impregnable fortress against the attacks of the Papacy. Of this the Papists were fully aware, and used every effort to prevent the projected union. The noble design was frustrated by the busy agents of Rome. And why did the Trentine Fathers set themselves to oppose the contemplated union? Simply, because they dreaded the order and the apostolical discipline of the Church of England. They were alarmed, lest the introduction of Bishops into the foreign Churches should unite all Protestants in one indissoluble bond, and reconcile many wavering Papists to the Reformation. Nor was this fear without foundation. On the contrary, the cunning of the old serpent was never more signally or successfully displayed than in their resolution to divide the Protestants, and to prevent the Continental Churches from receiving the English discipline. By the efforts of the Papists

* Strype's Cranmer, 206-7, 407-10. Also Grindal's Life. Strype remarks, "The Archbishop was now driving on a design for the better uniting of all the Protestant Churches, viz.; by having one common confession and harmony of faith and doctrine drawn up out of the pure word of God, which they might all own and agree in."

the seeds of discord were sown, and in consequence of the disputes thus stirred up, the minds of Protestants became embittered toward each other, their differences in each other's eyes were magnified, and the opportunity for union was lost.*

The course so auspiciously commenced by the Trentine Fathers was pursued with undiminished zeal and the most unwearied activity by the Jesuits and seminary priests. It was chiefly against the English Church that their subsequent efforts were directed. By the Papists she was then viewed as the chief obstacle to the realization of their hopes; and in a subsequent part of this little volume I shall endeavour to shew that she is viewed in the same light at the present day.

As soon as Pius V. had issued his bull against

* The accomplishment of this object would have deprived the Papists of one of their grand arguments against the Protestants,—their want of unity. This was what the Papists dreaded. "Whereupon," says Strype, "were sent two of their emissaries from Rotterdam into England, who were to pretend themselves Anabaptists, and preach against baptizing infants. And besides this, one D. G. authorized by these learned men dispatched a letter written in May, 1549, from Delf, in Holland, to two bishops, whereof *Winchester* was one, signifying the conduct of these pretended Anabaptists, and that they should receive them, and cherish them, and take their parts, if they should chance to receive any checks."—*Strype's Cranmer*, 208-9.

the Queen, the machinations of the Papists were commenced. It was the signal for attack. The Queen was assailed because she was a Protestant, and the chief support, under God, of the Church of England. The Jesuits and the seminary priests endeavoured to foment those divisions, that had sprung up in the Church respecting the episcopal habits. The first individual detected in the garb of the ministry was Faithful Cummin, a Dominican friar. When questioned by Parker, the metropolitan, he admitted that he had not received any license to preach from the bishops since the Reformation; but he stated that he could prove that, both in his prayers and sermons, he had declaimed against Popery and the Pope as much as any of the regular clergy. Before a second examination, however, he escaped from the country. The truth is, he had been authorised by the head of his Church to assume the character of an English clergyman, for the purpose of creating divisions among the Protestants.*

* Strype's Parker, 231. Gray's Auswer to Pierce, 32-40. Stillingfleet on Separation. "Many of these itinerant priests assumed the character of Protestant preachers, and it has been said, with some truth, though not probably without exaggeration, that under the directions of their crafty court, they fomented the divisions then springing up, and mingled with the Anabaptists and other sectaries, in the hope both

Very soon after, Heath, a Jesuit, arrived in England with the same object in view. He was sent over by his superiors, and was instructed to feign himself a Puritan, and to do all he possibly could to widen the breach among the Protestants. It happened that while preaching at Rochester a letter accidentally dropped from his pocket, which led to his detection. It had been addressed to him by a Jesuit of eminence on the Continent, and contained certain directions for the regulation of his proceedings during his mission into this country. On searching his lodgings the officers also discovered a license from the Pope, authorizing him to preach such doctrines as should appear calculated to divide the Protestants. Whatever means were deemed necessary for accomplishing the great object, were practised by the Jesuits without hesitation.*

of exciting dislike to the Establishment, and of instilling their own tenets, slightly disguised, into the minds of unwary enthusiasts."—*Hallam*, vol. i. 165.

* Sir Edward Coke testifies, that since "the Jesuits set foot in England there never passed four years without a most pestilent and pernicious treason, tending to the subversion of the whole state."—See *Gunpowder Treason*, p. 157. Burnet tells the House of Commons in a sermon, "that in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, our adversaries saw no hopes of retrieving their affairs, which had been spoiled by Queen Mary's persecution, but by setting on foot divisions among Protestants on very inconsiderable matters."

It appears that the Jesuits, Parsons and Campion, came over from the Continent in the year 1580. Of course they kept themselves secret, and to accomplish their purpose they assumed various appearances, and such as seemed most suited to the attainment of their object. Sometimes they appeared in the garb of soldiers, at other times in that of Protestant ministers. A letter of Campion's, addressed to the general of his order, fell into the hands of Walsingham, and became the means of revealing their plots to the government. Thus was it that many of their attempts were defeated; and it was clearly shewn that no plot can succeed against those who are surrounded by the Divine protection. Their want of success must be attributed not to human foresight, but to the providence of God. "On one day," says Fuller, "they wore one garb, on another a different one, while their nature remained the same. He who on Sunday was a priest or Jesuit, was on Monday a merchant, on Tuesday a soldier, on Wednesday a courtier; and with the sheers of equivocation he could cut himself into any shape he pleased. But under all their new shapes they retained their old nature."* In the letter that was in-

* Fuller, book ix. 130.

tercepted by Walsingham, Campion thus writes to his superior: "I am in a most antick habit, which I often change, as also my name." And again, speaking of the sacraments, "in the administering of them we are assisted by the priests, whom we find everywhere."* Many of the Popish clergy were permitted to conform to the English ritual, that they might secretly undermine the Reformation. They retained their livings, in order that by continuing at their posts, they might be able to take advantage of any favourable circumstance as it presented itself. This observation must be borne in mind, or the above expression in Campion's letter, relative to the exertions of the priests, will not be understood. The priests alluded to were some of the Popish clergy disguised as Protestant ministers, for the purpose of promoting the views of the Church of Rome. With them the Jesuits acted as with servants of the same master. In this way did these active agents of Rome employ themselves in England during the reign of Elizabeth; and in the next reigns we shall perceive, as we proceed, that they were the real authors and fomenters of those divisions which issued so fatally for the church and mo-

* Fuller, book ix. 115.

narchy. Amongst the Puritans the disguised Jesuits were the loudest in declaiming against the ceremonies of the Church; and to blind the people, they were the most strenuous opponents of the Church of Rome. Many of the clergy, whose views were at all unfixed on the questions then so generally agitated, were, by the influence of the Jesuits, altogether alienated from the Established Church into the ranks of the Non-conformists. It should be observed that the Jesuits did not attempt to make converts to Popery. The attempt at such a time would have opened the eyes of the public. Their sole object was to divide the Protestants: and to accomplish this scheme they saw no more likely method than to prejudice the minds of the people against the Church as established by law. They were men wise in their generation—men with the cunning of the serpent, but destitute of the harmlessness of the dove.

But besides their attempts to divide Protestants and to destroy the Church, they also directed their attacks against the Queen and her government; so that they were not merely mixed up with the divisions, by which the peace of the Church was rent, but they were engaged in treasonable practices against the state. The entire reign of Elizabeth was one continued

scene of deliverances from foreign invasions or domestic treasons. It would not be possible, within a narrow compass, to mention, however briefly, all the attempts against the Queen's life. It might be asked, why was she thus assailed? The reason is obvious. It was in consequence of her Protestant principles, and because she was the chief promoter and defender of the English Reformation.*

It has been shewn already that Elizabeth's person and government were exposed to the continual machinations of the Papal emissaries; but it is very probable that some Protestants of the present day may imagine that these attacks were merely the acts of individuals, and that the Popish party as a party was by no means implicated. There is not, however, one single instance on record of an attempt being made either against the person of the Queen or her government, which cannot be traced to the leaders of the party, and even to the head of

* Campion was executed, but Parsons escaped. In 1583, Somerville, who attempted the Queen's life, to prevent a public execution, hung himself in prison. In 1584 Throgmorton's treason was discovered; in 1585 that of Parry. Ballard, Savage, Babington, and others, suffered nearly at the same time. See Strype's *Annals*, v. 361-362; vol. vi. 339, 494; Camden, 497-502.

the church, his holiness the Pope. It is known to the readers of history that many Papists were put to death during this reign ; and the Church of Rome has ever since chosen to regard them in the light of martyrs in her cause. My object will be to shew to my fellow Protestants that not one Papist was executed in consequence of his religious creed, but on account of treasonable practices against the state. These transactions, however, were not the individual acts of the perpetrators ; they were, on the contrary, known to the Pope, and sanctioned by the Papal court. Parry came over with the avowed intention of taking the Queen's life. Providentially he was discovered, and received the due reward of his crime, suffering death as a traitor. Before he quitted the Continent, the Cardinal of Como wrote to him with the knowledge of the Pope, assuring him of the Pontiff's best wishes for his success, and conveying to him a full forgiveness of all his sins.* In the

* Parry confessed that he had been instigated by a Jesuit to kill the Queen. On coming over to England he revealed his purpose to Nevil, a Papist, in the hope of obtaining his aid in the attempt. Nevil was, however, struck with remorse of conscience, and revealed the treason to the Council. Dr. Lingard admits that there were some projects for assassinating Elizabeth. See vol. viii. 384.

year 1581, *Campion*, *Sherwin*, *Kirby*, and *Briant*, were taken and accused of treason; and after examination they were condemned as traitors, having come over to this country for the purpose of stirring up sedition. During the trial, *Campion* was interrogated whether *Elizabeth* was the lawful queen of England, and to this very reasonable question he refused to give any answer; but when he was asked if the Pope should send an army into this country, he would take part with the Queen or with the Pope, he hesitated not to reply, that he should feel it to be his duty to obey the latter. Can it be alleged that these men did not die the death of traitors? Yet this very *Campion* is enrolled in the Roman martyrology as a glorious saint.

As this question is now revived by the Romanists, who labour unceasingly to make it appear that the Papists who were executed under *Elizabeth* suffered as martyrs to the faith, and not as traitors, I shall devote the remainder of this chapter to the subject, and I undertake to prove that all the sufferers were traitors, and not martyrs, and that they were tried and condemned as traitors.

It has been noticed in a preceding page that the veracity of *Fox* has, ever since the publication of the work, been fiercely assailed by Popish

writers. Failing, however, in their attempts to shake the credit of that important work, they have long since adopted another course, and as a kind of set-off against Fox, they have produced a list of names of persons, who suffered during this reign for treason, and whom they dignify with the designation of martyrs. From the time of Elizabeth to the present period they have repeated the assertion that these men were put to death solely in consequence of their religious principles. Nor are there wanting individuals among Protestants, who, not having the means of disproving their assertions, give a ready credence to their statements, believing that as Protestantism had its martyrs in the days of Mary, so Popery had its sufferers in the time of Elizabeth, and that consequently the principles of Popery and Protestantism on the question of persecution, were at this period of a kindred nature. This is the very impression which the Papists wish to produce; and my present object is to show the fallacy of the Popish arguments on this subject. That certain Papists were put to death has been stated; and that these men were viewed as martyrs at Rome is certain; but that they were executed for religion, and not for treason, is a point which the Papists can never establish. They were

executed, not because they refused to unite with the Church of England, but because they plotted against the government;—not as Papists, but because being Papists they attempted the life of the Queen. In short, they were men, who, whatever had been their theological creed, would have been put to death as traitors. It is true that their Popish principles led them to commit the crime of treason; but their lives were forfeited, not on account of their principles, but on account of the actions which flowed from those principles. In the reign of Mary every Protestant was in danger,—in that of Elizabeth every Papist was perfectly safe, provided he acted as a peaceable subject. Yet the falsehood, that they were martyrs to their religion, has been recently revived by Mr. Butler and Dr. Lingard. The latter gentleman, feeling the difficulty of his position, makes an attempt at a reprisal, by asserting that some of the Protestant martyrs were also punished as traitors, and not for their religious profession. In support of this position, Dr. Lingard fastens upon the case of Cranmer, and attempts to prove that he was put to death for treason in supporting the cause of the Lady Jane Grey, though he admits that it was an unwilling support. The fact that he was committed to the flames is a sufficient refu-

tation of the Doctor's argument, to say nothing of the royal pardon for his share in that unfortunate transaction. Without entering into particulars the Doctor insinuates that the other martyrs were also put to death as traitors against the Queen's government. How he can have the hardihood to throw out such insinuations it is difficult to conceive, since the very mode of their death proves that heresy was their crime and not treason.

Failing to establish his position, he proceeds to the question of the Popish traitors, and labours to prove that they were martyrs. But, as if aware of the weakness of his arguments, he takes the opportunity of attempting to shew that the Reformers maintained the lawfulness of punishing heresy with death; knowing that if he could establish this point, it would not be difficult to induce the belief that they carried out their principles in the case of the Papists who were executed. That on one or two occasions supposed heretics were punished with death by the Reformers, or rather by the state, subsequent to the Reformation is admitted; but who does not see that in these instances the Reformers were acting on the principles of Rome, from which they were not at once emancipated. The Reformation was then in its infancy, and

it would have been too much to expect that the Reformers should instantaneously be freed from the influence of principles, in which they had been trained under Popery, and which had grown with their growth and strengthened with their strength. The Reformers were soon taught the unsoundness of this principle. All their feelings on this subject were the lingering remains of the principles of Popery, which very shortly were totally eradicated from their breasts. Of course I speak now, not of the lawfulness of persecution, or of not granting toleration, but of the lawfulness of putting men to death for their religious views, a doctrine which certainly was not received by the English Reformers. As Protestants, however, we need not be surprised at the slanders of the Papists, on this or any other question; their system is a system of error and its natural and appropriate supports are misrepresentation and falsehood.

For several years after the accession of Elizabeth the Papists enjoyed the greatest quietness. Nay, those Bishops who refused to comply with the Reformation, or to acknowledge the supremacy of the Queen, were treated with the utmost tenderness, being merely removed from their posts, yet with an ample allowance for their maintenance. That Papists

were not executed as Papists is notorious from the fact, that the savage and brutal Bonner, the man who had imbrued his hands in the blood of the saints, and who had been instrumental in putting hundreds to death, was permitted to live, and at last to die quietly in his bed. This case affords a triumphant refutation to the Popish slander that Papists were martyrs to their religion. Had the government deemed it necessary to execute the Papists as such, they would surely have made an example of Bonner. At that time the relatives of many who had been the victims of Bonner's cruelty were alive : and had it been consistent with the principles of Protestantism nothing could have restrained them from demanding his life as a sacrifice : yet he was spared, and survived many years. In the preceding reign no one could escape who made an avowal of his sentiments. Yet under Elizabeth, the very men who had put Protestants to death, were safe.* And this state of things continued during several years.

* The men who had been instrumental in bringing Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, to the stake, were never even questioned for the part they took in those sad transactions ; but, surely they could not have escaped, if the Government had contemplated the putting of Papists to death for their creed. Burnet's observation is pertinent. " It cannot be said to be any part of our doctrine, when we came out of

And now comes the question, why was not this state of things permitted to remain? To this question the Papists, if they choose, can furnish a reply. They themselves were the cause of the interruption of this quiet. Pope Pius V., in the eleventh year of his reign was pleased to excommunicate the Queen, and to absolve her subjects from their allegiance: nay, the bull required that they should by no means obey Elizabeth. And the Pope, therefore, conferred her kingdom on Philip king of Spain. In a life of this Pope, published in 1588, the author thus speaks, “Pius omni studio faciendum curavit, ut incolumarum animos ad Elizabethæ destructionem facta rebellione commoveret;” and the author tells us that Robert Fildolf, a gentleman of Florence, remained in England as a merchant for this very purpose.* And Gabutius, another Popish writer observes, “Cogitabat Pius reginam e medio tollere.” Can

one of the blackest persecutions that is in history, I mean Queen Mary's, we shewed how little we retained of the cruelty of that Church, which had provoked us so severely; when not only no inquiries were made into the illegal acts of fury, that were committed in that persecuting reign, but even the persecutors themselves lived among us at ease and at peace. This is an instance of the clemency of our Church, that perhaps cannot be matched in history.”—*Burnet's Eighteen Papers*, p. 86.

* Catena's Life of Pius V.

we doubt, after reading the bull of excommunication, of the necessity of making provision by law against those attempts that would be directed against the Queen's life? It is acknowledged by the above Popish writer, that the Pope laboured to stir up rebellion, and even to destroy the Queen. Indeed it was a doctrine of the Papists that it was lawful to put to death a Sovereign excommunicated by the Church.— This flowed from the admission of the Pope's deposing power, a doctrine which was insisted on by all Romanists. The Jesuit Parsons asserts that when a Prince deserts the Catholic faith, that is the creed of Rome, and labours to draw aside others, his subjects, if they are able, may endeavour to depose him, even before the excommunication has actually been issued by the Pope. This doctrine is in accordance with the notions of the Jesuits, respecting the authority of the sacred volume; for they assert that if the scriptures command one thing and the Pope another, the sacred volume must be rejected as doubtful, and the Pope believed, inasmuch as he is infallible.

After the bull had been issued, in consequence of the attempts to which I have alluded, and for which, and for nothing else, many suffered, it became absolutely necessary to enact new

laws, and to decide that certain offences should be considered and punished as treason. All the treasons were attempted in consequence of the Pope's bull; many of the sufferers alleged that as the Queen was a heretic, it was lawful to depose her. Books were written by the Jesuits against her title, and it appeared at their trials that several individuals were induced by these writings to enter into treasonable practices. Hence, it was enacted that to endeavour to draw subjects from their allegiance, and from the religion established by law, and also the introducing bulls from Rome should be treason, and it was under the operation of these statutes that the Papists suffered. But it is clear that such statutes would never have been framed, if the Papists had been loyal subjects, and the Pope had not interfered. They themselves, therefore, were the cause of the enactment of the new laws. Still any Papist was safe, who was ready to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen. For many years they lived quietly; but when his Holiness ventured to dispose of the kingdom, and when her subjects were actually endeavouring to execute the sentence of the Pope, the new laws concerning treason were enacted. Yet so merciful was the government, that, notwithstanding the various

attempts at rebellion, several years more were permitted to elapse before a single execution took place, under the new statutes. At length, however, it was necessary to put the laws in force : but even then no one suffered death who was ready to shew his allegiance to the Queen; and of the laity, none suffered who disowned the Pope's temporal power. Nay, so averse was the Queen to shed blood, that, on one occasion, seventy priests, who stood convicted of treason, were conveyed out of the country. It is observable, that much good resulted from the evil practices of the priests. They were caught in their own snare; for in consequence of their seditious proceedings these wholesome and necessary statutes were enacted.

The Jesuits, however, endeavoured to persuade the Continental Princes that the English Papists were put to death for their religion. To remove the erroneous impression, which such representations might create, a tract was published in 1583, by Cecil, Lord Burleigh, entitled "The Execution of Justice in England." In this work he fully establishes the fact that no Papist was executed except for treason, and that the moderation of the government was most conspicuous. Cecil very properly attributes all the treasons to the Papal Court, from

which they naturally flowed. From this work it is certain that even after condemnation many were set at liberty on their own acknowledgment of the Queen's supremacy: yet this lenity, so far from leading others to adopt a similar course, seems to have encouraged them to enter into new treasons, as if the Queen had been merciful from fear, and not from a desire to spare the lives of her subjects.* Many instances of the Queen's lenity might be adduced. Heth, Archbishop of York, and Chancellor under Queen Mary, enjoyed his own private property as long as he lived, without molestation. "An example," says Cecil, "of gentleness never matched in Queen Mary's days."† Pool, Tunstal, White, Oglethorpe, Thirlby, and Watson, all Bishops, with Feckenham, Boxall, Cole, and Reynolds, dignitaries in the Church, and many others of lower degree were treated with the utmost kindness by the Queen, and also by the Prelates of the Church.

I ask, why were these men spared, while others were executed? The case is a clear one.

* See Execution of Justice. Strype remarks, "It was found needful now to declare the true cause of the punishment of several Papist priests and others, as traitors. A state-book, therefore, was now set forth, called," &c. *Strype's Annals*, vol. v. 296.

† Execution, &c. p. 10.

These individuals, though still Papists, were quiet and peaceable, while the men who suffered were guilty of the crime of treason. Some of them from mere prudence were committed to prison ; but it was admitted, even by their own party, that they were treated with the utmost kindness.* The Pope had declared that Elizabeth was not the lawful Queen of England. The Jesuits disseminated this doctrine, and not only so, they proceeded to act upon the principle thus laid down. If Protestantism like Popery had hurried its victims to execution, the men whose lives had been so stained with the blood of the martyrs, would have suffered the extreme penalty. Yet these very men, provided they steered clear of treasonable practices, were permitted to live unmolested. It is undoubtedly true that some of those who suffered were less guilty than others who were spared, and that many were secretly abetted in their treasons by those who took care to save themselves by not venturing into England,

* Strype's Annals, i. 216; vol. ii. 296-8. Sir Edward Coke affirms, that in consequence of the determination of the Jesuits to enforce the bull, it became necessary to enact new laws. He states, that during this reign only thirty priests and five laymen were executed. Their crime, he further observes, was treason, and he adds that not one was executed for religion.—*Gunpowder Treason*, p. 111.

finding that they could act as successfully by remaining on the Continent: but this circumstance cannot be adduced as a proof of the severity of the proceedings of the government. It does not follow, however, that those who were discovered in the practice of treason should escape punishment, because they were perhaps less guilty than others who evaded detection. It is certain that the innocent never suffered.* Surely it was treason to endeavour to enforce the Pope's bull; and it was for this crime that the Papists forfeited their lives. Cecil remarks, "There were also and yet be a great number of others, being laymen of good possessions and lands, men of good credit in their countries, manifestly of late times seduced to hold contrary opinions in religion for the Pope's authority,

* I would challenge any advocate of Popery to produce his strongest cases to shew that the members of his Church were put to death in this reign for their religious principles, and I would engage to prove, in each individual case, that the sufferer was a convicted traitor, and that his life was forfeited in consequence of treason. If a man came over to England with the intention of putting the Papal bull in force against the Queen, and was actually proved to have made the attempt to carry his intention into practice, he was surely guilty of treason, and such a man would merit the punishment of death. The Papists who suffered under Elizabeth were of this description.

and yet none of them have been sought hitherto to be impeached in any point or quarrel of treason, or of loss of life, member, or inheritance, so as it may plainly appear that it is not, nor hath been, for contrarious opinions in religion, or for the Pope's authority, as the adversaries do boldly and falsely publish, that any persons have suffered death since her majestie's reign." After stating that many Papists who held that the Queen was not supreme in matters ecclesiastical, were yet permitted to live quietly under her government, because they acted peaceably, he adds, "If then it be inquired, for what cause these others have of late suffered death, it is truly to be answered, that none at all are impeached for treason, to the danger of their life, but such as do obstinately maintain the contents of the Pope's bull, which do import that her majesty is not the lawful Queen of England, the first and highest point of treason."* The Jesuits indeed constantly alleged that the sufferers were martyrs for their religion; but the statements of Cecil, which cannot be controverted, prove the contrary. Cecil admits indeed that they may be viewed as martyrs for the Pope, though they were traitors to the Queen.†

* See *The Execution of Justice*, p. 13, 14.

† *Ibid.* p. 15.

Towards the close of Elizabeth's reign, another very important tract, as bearing on this point, was published by the secular priests in England against the Jesuits.* In this tract, written by members of the Church of Rome, and by priests too, it is proved, as well as in the work of Cecil, that the executions were just, inasmuch as the individuals suffered for treason. These writers, after alluding to the practices of the Jesuits, hesitate not to avow their surprise that so many of their body were spared.† "It may be in our opinion rather wondered that so many are left alive in the realm to speak of the Catholic faith, than that the state hath proceeded with us from time to time as it hath done." The lenity of the Queen is fully admitted by the authors. "There is no king in the world, disgusting the see of Rome, and having either force or metal in him, that would have endured us, if possibly he could have been revenged, but rather (as we think) have utterly rooted us out

* It has this title: "Important Considerations, which ought to move all true and sound Catholics, who are not wholly Jesuited, to acknowledge without all equivocations, ambiguities, or shiftings, that the proceedings of her majesty, and of the state with them, since the beginning of her highness's reign, have been both mild and merciful—By the Secular Priests, 1601."

† Ibid. 52.

of his territories, as traitors and rebels both to him and his country. And therefore we may rejoice that God hath blessed this kingdom with so gracious and merciful a sovereign, who hath not dealt in this sort with us.”*

This is the language of Roman Catholics, who lived and wrote at the time when the executions actually took place. They concur with Cecil in stating that the men who suffered, suffered for treason only. They observe again that some were spared who were actually guilty. “Such priests as in their examination were found anything moderate, were not so hardly proceeded with, insomuch as fifty-five that by the laws (we acknowledge) might likewise have been put to death, were in one year, 1586, spared from that extremity, and only banished.”† We are also assured by Strype that many were spared, after condemnation, if they submitted to the government.‡ The authors of the “Considerations” repeatedly affirm that they were mildly treated as Papists, and that none were even imprisoned until the Jesuits commenced their pernicious practices.§ They state that the object of these emissaries of Rome was to place the crown “on

* Considerations, p. 64.

† Ibid. 77.

‡ Strype's Annals, vol. vii. 426. § Considerations, p. 57.

another head.”* Watson, the deprived Bishop of Lincoln, predicted “that their proceedings would certainly urge the state to make some sharper laws, which should not only touch them, but all others, both priests and Catholics.”† So that it is clear that the very laws against the Papists owed their origin to the treasonable practices of the Jesuits. The Popish writers compare their sufferers as to numbers with the martyrs under Queen Mary; and this circumstance is noticed by Cecil, who certainly had the best means of information on the subject of the Marian persecution. He observes that according to the calculations of the Papists themselves, sixty persons only suffered death during this reign for practices against the Queen, but he states the Marian martyrs at nearly four hundred.‡ There is another passage in “The Considerations by the Secular Priests,” bearing on the practices of the Jesuits, which I cannot refrain from quoting. “If the Pope and King

* Considerations, p. 63.

† Considerations, p. 62-66. “They themselves (say the writers) having been from time to time the very causes of all the calamities, which any of us have endured in England since her majesty’s reign.”—p. 72. They allege even that Phillip was persuaded to send forth his armada by the solicitations of English Jesuits.—p. 73.

‡ Execution of Justice, p. 22.

of Spain had never plotted with the Duke of Norfolk,—if the bull of Pius Quintus had never been known,—if Gregory the Thirteenth had not renewed the said excommunication,—if the Jesuits had never come into England,—if the Pope and King of Spain had not practised against her majesty,—if Parsons and the rest of the Jesuits had never been agents in those traitorous and bloody designments of Throgmorton, Parry, Collen, York, Williams, Squire, and such like,—if the Pope had never been urged to have thrust the King of Spain into that barbarous action against the realm,—if they themselves had not laboured greatly with the said king for the conquest of this land by the Spaniards, who are known to be the cruellest tyrants that live upon the earth, most assuredly the state would have loved us, or at least borne with us; there had been no speeches of racks and tortures, nor any cause to have used them, for none were ever vexed that way simply, for that he was either priest or Catholic, but because they were suspected to have their hands in some of the said most traitorous designments.”*

* Considerations, p. 88, 89. The following concession is made even by Dr. Lingard. † Their hesitation to deny the deposing power rendered their loyalty very problematical in case of an attempt to enforce the bull by any foreign power.”

—Vol. viii. 182.

No execution took place until 1578, some years even subsequent to the date of the Pope's bull, with the single exception of that of Felton, the man who ventured to affix the document to the Bishop of London's palace gate.* This single circumstance affords triumphant evidence of the leniency of the Queen's government. When however men were found who were ready to carry the Pope's sentence into execution, it became necessary to act with vigour and decision.† That the court of Rome was in earnest in its avowed determination against Elizabeth, is evident from the treatment, which the actors in the dark scenes received at Rome. They were caressed before their enterprises were undertaken, and of those who paid the forfeit of their lives for treason, some were canonized as saints for their glorious deeds, and all were enrolled as martyrs in a holy cause. Even the women in attendance on the person of the Queen were secretly exhorted to take her life, and yet they were treated with the utmost forbearance. No less than fifteen rebellions or treasons were stirred up during this reign.

There was one unfortunate individual, who fell a sacrifice during these eventful times, with

* Fuller, book ix. 110. Camden, 459.

† Ibid. ix. 130—134.

whose sufferings posterity, without even entering into the question of her guilt or innocence, must ever sympathize—I refer to Mary Queen of Scots. It was the wish of the Papists to place her on the English throne; and many of the treasons and conspiracies were entered into for that express purpose. “Repeated plots,” says an illustrious author, “discovered by the wisdom of Elizabeth’s councillors had almost always for their object the liberation of Queen Mary, and were usually connected with some scheme for placing her on the British throne.”* And in allusion to these plots he adds, “her name was not always used without her consent.”† Even Dr. Lingard admits that it was the wish of the Papists to place her upon the throne, and that the “very existence of the government and the Established Church was at stake.”‡ Mr. Hallam observes, “In Murden’s State Papers we have abundant evidence of Mary’s acquaintance with the plots going forward in 1585 and 1586 against Elizabeth’s government, if not with those for her assassination.”§ I do not allude to this question for the purpose of justi-

* History of Scotland by Sir Walter Scott, vol. ii. 228.

† Ibid. 247.

‡ Lingard, vol. viii. 74.

§ Hallam’s Const. His. vol. i. 216.

fyng Elizabeth, but merely to exhibit the practices of the Papists, during this reign, in their true character. Whatever may be asserted to the contrary, it is, I think, undeniably established in the preceding pages, that the men who suffered death in this reign were the victims of their own imprudence, being involved in treasons against the Queen and the Established Church.

It was made treason for any Englishman, ordained a priest by the see of Rome, since the first year of the Queen's reign, to come into England. And this statute was charged by the Papists with cruelty. It was, on the contrary, perfectly just and necessary. It originated in their own practices, and they could avoid its operation by keeping out of the country. The men who were engaged in so many attempts against the Queen, and in so many treasonable practices against the state, were English priests; men who went over to the Continent to be trained in the principles of the Jesuits. What then was to be done by the government? It was clear that those individuals came over with no other object in view than that of stirring up rebellion. In self-defence, therefore, the government was compelled to pass the statute alluded to, by which it was enacted that any English subject

who had received Popish orders on the Continent, should be deemed guilty of treason, if he entered his native country. It would indeed have been cruel to have consigned men to death who had come over to England with peaceable intentions, and who exhibited no proof of being any other than loyal subjects. The intentions, however of the English priests were not peaceable, or the state would not have interfered with them.*

* "Hitherto," remarks a distinguished writer, alluding to the Bull of Pius V., "the conduct of Elizabeth's Government towards the Romanists had been tolerant and conciliatory." After mentioning the new statutes respecting treason, he adds, "Still the government continued its forbearance till it was compelled by the duty of self-preservation, to regard its Papistical subjects with suspicion, and to treat them with severity." See Southey's *Book of the Church*—Last Edit. p. 396, 397. Again, speaking of Campion and his fellow-sufferers, he observes: "They died as Martyrs, according to their own views, and as Martyrs they were then regarded, and are still represented by the Romanists. Certain, however, it is, that they suffered for points of state, and not of faith, not as Roman Catholics, but as Bull-Papists, not for religion, but for treason." *Ibid.* p. 403.

CHAP. IV.

Means used in the time of Elizabeth to oppose Popery—The Pulpit—Sermons at Paul's Cross—The Press—Elizabeth's Injunctions—Homilies—The Homilies, the Paraphrase of Erasmus, with the Great Bible set up in Churches—The XXXIX Articles—Public Disputations—Nowell's Catechism—Jewell's Apology—His controversy with Harding—His Defence.

IN the preceding chapter it has been shewn that the plots against Elizabeth and the religion of the country were frustrated by the Providence of God, who watched over our country during the whole reign of this Princess in a manner that must strike every one who reflects on the dangers by which at various periods she was surrounded. Her wise ministers used all possible means to counteract the machinations of her enemies, and it pleased God to crown their exertions with success. But as it is important that we at the present day, should be armed against our Popish adversaries, I wish in this chapter to point out to my readers certain other methods, besides those which had a reference to the plots and treasons by which she was threatened, to which the advisers of the Queen and the Clergy resorted, for the purpose of securing

the Protestant Church against the encroachments of Rome. The men of that day viewed Popery as a system of lies, and hesitated not to condemn it as idolatrous ; consequently, every precaution was taken to prevent the population of the country from being led away from the "faith once delivered to the saints." For the benefit of professing Protestants, and to encourage them in perilous times to act vigorously against the foe, I will now detail some of the measures adopted at this period to check the progress of Popish principles.

At a subsequent period of our history, as will be hereafter noticed, a period of imminent danger, the pulpit and the press were the grand engines by which the victory of truth over error was achieved ; and in the reign of Elizabeth, both these weapons were used by the Reformers with overwhelming effect against their opponents. The Church of England, from the commencement of the Reformation proclaimed, by her acts and her recognized documents, eternal war against the corruptions of the Papacy. When the apostles of our Lord went forth in the name of their Master, they proclaimed war against error in every shape ; they rushed into the quarters of the enemy, and planted the

Standard of the Cross on the strongholds of sin and Satan: in like manner our Reformers fearlessly proclaimed the simple doctrines of the Bible, and this act involved on their part a condemnation of the peculiar tenets of Popery.* Our name is Protestant, a name that implies opposition to the errors of the Romish church. The Reformers were accustomed to protest against the corruptions of the Papacy from the pulpit: and as reading was not at that time by any means a common acquisition, the mass of the people could receive little instruction, except what was communicated to them through that medium. It is to the pulpit that the spread of the principles of the Reformation in the days of Edward must be attributed. All the celebrated preachers of that day were wont to address large masses of the people from the

* Some persons are constantly asserting that we are not called upon to oppose or condemn Popery. But I contend that as Churchmen we are pledged to do our utmost to oppose, not the persons, but the principles of the Papists. The very proclamation of the truth indeed, involves the condemnation of error. When for instance the member of the English Church declares the supreme authority of the sacred volume, he at once joins issue with the Papist. Should the Clergyman of the Church of England so manage his pulpit ministrations as to give no offence to the Papist, he would be a betrayer of that trust committed to him by his Divine Master.

pulpit at Paul's Cross, in the open air; and on almost every occasion the errors of Popery formed the topics on which they were led to expatiate. This course was blessed by Jehovah to the overthrow of the Papacy and the establishment of the Reformation. The same measures were resorted to, and with even more abundant success in the days of Elizabeth. Of the sermons delivered at the cross in this reign a vast number was published. They are still to be seen, some in the collected works of the divines of this period, others in a separate form, and almost all of them are on the questions at issue between us and the Romanists.* It was

* The pulpit at the cross was of stone. In the days of Popery the monks and friars addressed the multitudes from this place, on the virtue of relics, the legends of the saints, and the miracles performed by their various patrons. Subsequent to the Reformation this venerable pulpit was occupied by the most eminent of the Protestant clergy every Sunday, and among the audience were frequently the Court and its attendants, and generally the lord mayor and aldermen of the city. In the reign of Edward it was customary to order those clergymen who were suspected of an attachment to Popery, to preach at the cross on the royal supremacy, or on some other points at issue between the two churches. After Elizabeth's accession, those who had been sufferers or exiles under Queen Mary were appointed frequently to preach at Paul's Cross, "where," says Strype, "no question they took their opportunity to recommend the religion newly established."—Annals, I. 297. This venerable relic of antiquity

in this way that the people became acquainted with the principles of the Reformation. Many of the Popish clergy retained their posts in the Church, in the expectation of a return to Popery; and as these men were disaffected to Protestantism, the Queen's council prohibited all preaching, except under the authority of a licence. Every Protestant clergyman was permitted to preach, and a certain number even were commissioned to travel through the country, for the purpose of instructing the people, but the clergy who were attached to Rome were commanded to be silent. With what eagerness must the Reformed preachers have been listened to by men, who had rarely heard a sermon, and, who, when they did hear, were not instructed in the doctrines of the Bible, but amused with panegyrics on the saints. The incidental notices to be met with in the printed sermons of this period furnish ample evidence of the eagerness evinced by the people, as well as of the success with which the labours of the preachers were crowned.

Not only were the people instructed in the principles of Protestantism, and cautioned against

continued standing and was used for preaching until the year 1641, when the Long Parliament issued its orders against superstitious ornaments. It then fell a sacrifice to the fury of the rabble stirred up by the House of Commons.

the errors of Rome from the pulpit, but the oral discourses of the clergy were seconded by various productions of the press, by public documents put forth by authority, and by treatises published by private individuals. Some of these demand a notice, in order that we may discover the means so successfully adopted by our ancestors against the efforts of the Papacy.

As soon as Elizabeth was seated on the throne a series of injunctions were published, in which Popery is denounced, and the clergy and people are invited to use their most strenuous efforts to propagate the doctrines of the Reformation. The short preface or advertisement prefixed to the injunctions declares it to be the intention of her Majesty and council to suppress superstition, and to plant true religion. By these injunctions the clergy were required, at least four times in the year, to declare that the Pope's supremacy was abolished, and the grounds on which the abolition rested; to preach against the use of images, and relics, and Popish miracles; against the use of beads, candles at the altar, and other superstitious practices; and sincerely to declare the word of God. The 44th injunction must have inflicted a severe blow upon Popery: it is to this effect that every minister should catechise on every holiday; and on every second Sunday in

the year, for half an hour at least before evening prayer, in the Ten Commandments, the Articles of the Creed, and in the Lord's Prayer. There are some few among these injunctions which exhibit a lamentable view of the ignorance of the clergy and people in the days of Popery, and are calculated to lead us in the present day to prize the blessings we so abundantly enjoy. Thus the 43d relates to "unlearned priests." "Forasmuch as in these latter days many have been made priests, being children, and otherwise utterly unlearned, so that they could read to say mattins and masse; the ordinaries shall not admit any such to any call or spiritual function." The 53d is distinguished by this marginal reference—"curates to read distinctly;" and appoints "That all ministers and readers of public prayers, chapters, and homilies, shall be charged to read leisurely, plainly, and distinctly, and also such as are but mean readers shall peruse over before once or twice the chapters and homilies, to the intent they may read to the better understanding of the people, and the more encouragement of godliness."*

These extracts show what were the fruits of

* These injunctions were published in 1559. At the accession of King Edward a similar set of injunctions had been issued. Both may be seen in Sparrow's Collections.

Popery in England in the days of its prosperity. I quote them, in order that my readers may prize their present privileges. But I would remind them that had Popery continued in England the same evil would still have been experienced by us in the nineteenth century. In proof of this assertion, I need only refer to Ireland and other Popish countries. For though in Ireland the Priests may be better informed than they were prior to the Reformation, yet it is evident that they are indebted to the Protestantism of the country for their amelioration in this respect. It has become necessary that they should not be so grossly ignorant as heretofore ; but is the condition of the populace improved? Are not the poor Irish as ignorant and as degraded as the lower orders in England were, when Elizabeth's injunctions were issued in 1559? Sad must have been the moral and spiritual condition of England, when even priests were unable to read. Yet had Popery continued in its glory the same evils would also necessarily have remained, since they are inherent in the very system itself. It is clear that Elizabeth and her council were determined to strike at the root of the disease, by appointing men to parishes who could instruct the people in the great and important doctrines of the Bible.

It is often asserted in the present day that we are not called upon to expose the errors of the Papists; but I must contend that the faithful preaching of the gospel involves the condemnation of Popery. How indeed was the Reformation carried on but by the exposure of Popish errors, as well as by the proclamation of the truths of the Bible!

After the foregoing injunctions the Liturgy of King Edward was reprinted with some alterations, additions, and omissions. In its main parts it remained the same, but one clause in the Litany—"From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities,"—was struck out as savouring too much of a spirit of bitterness, and being a subject too not suited to the solemn act of prayer.

The publication of the Book of Homilies was the next important step in the Reformation. In the reign of Edward certain homilies were published by authority to be read in those churches in which the clergy were unable to preach; and how distasteful they were to the Popish party is evident from the language of Latimer in one of his sermons. The clergy in many parishes in the time of Edward, were secretly attached to the Romish creed, and though it was not possible to disobey the injunctions and refuse to

read the homilies, yet the minister "would," says Latimer, "so hawk it and chop it, that it were as good for them to be without it, for any word that could be understood." The homilies are divided into two parts, called two books; but during the reign of Edward, the former part only, containing twelve sermons, was published. At the end of this first book is an advertisement, announcing the speedy publication of the second part, which was prevented by the death of Edward. Immediately after Elizabeth was seated on the throne the first book was re-published, and with it was printed the second, comprising twenty sermons. The twenty-first discourse "On Wilful Rebellion," was not added until the year 1571, subsequent to the suppression of a rebellion in the north. These two books, with the exception of the single homily on rebellion, were the production of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Becon, and others among the early Reformers: those on Salvation, Faith, and Good Works, are ascribed to Cranmer: that on Salvation was ascribed to him by Gardiner, nor did the archbishop deny the authorship. Though, therefore, one book only was published in the time of King Edward, yet the whole, with the single exception before mentioned, were composed in the same reign; but in consequence of

the King's death they could not be printed until after Elizabeth's accession. The circulation of these homilies was one of the wisest courses that could have been adopted to open the eyes of the people to the debasing thralldom in which they had so long been held under the dominion of the Papacy. Many of the parochial clergy were still attached to the Church of Rome, and could not be expected to denounce her errors: others were actually unable to preach from ignorance: and to prevent the abettors of Popery from spreading error among the people, as well as to supply the deficiencies of the deficient, these homilies were commanded to be read in all churches, while no one was permitted to preach without a licence from the archbishop or bishops. Accordingly the reading of them is enjoined by one of the injunctions to which I have already alluded. The prohibition of preaching by Elizabeth has been severely censured by some writers, who form their estimate of her proceedings, not by the circumstances of the times, but by those of our own age. It must be admitted that it was the wisest course that could have been adopted; for it was better to have the homilies read than sermons preached by men who secretly favoured Popery, and would not therefore dispense true doctrine to the people. This is the secret of

the prohibition of preaching; and to censure it is a proof that the individuals who do so are ignorant of the critical state of the country at that period of our history.

In various portions of the homilies the errors of Popery are attacked in the most unflinching terms. A few extracts will serve to shew the anxiety of our Reformers to enlighten the minds of the people on the questions at issue between themselves and the Church of Rome. "Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testaments, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions, for our justification and salvation."*

On the subject of images the strongest language is employed. "The Bishops of Rome were the maintainers of images against God's word, and stirrers up of sedition and rebellion. Not only the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves being blinded by the bewitching of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell both into the damnable pit of idolatry. In the which all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age, by the space of above eight hundred years. So that laity and clergy have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all

* On Reading the Scriptures.

other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more."* Many other passages of a similar import might be quoted: but the above are sufficient to shew the views of the Reformers and to point out the steps which they adopted to frustrate the machinations of the Papacy. This measure was intended to cause all the pulpits to speak one uniform language, and not to utter an uncertain sound, nor to lull the people into the repose of the previous age. It serves too as an example to ourselves. The clergy of the Church of England are unfaithful sons, unless they proclaim the doctrines of the homilies, to which, by their subscription of the XXXIX Articles, they have assented.

Not only were the clergy commanded to read these homilies, but a copy was also ordered to be placed in every church, in order that the people, who could not purchase the volume, might resort thither to peruse it. The Bible and the Paraphrase of Erasmus were also placed by the side of the homilies; and thus the people were enabled to compare the doctrines of the last with the inspired word of God. In the present day this proceeding may not appear to deserve that commendation which

* Against Peril of Idolatry.

some are disposed to give; but in forming our estimate of its importance, we must remember that very few persons were in possession of the Scriptures, and that, therefore, it was an inestimable privilege, to be permitted to resort to their parish churches to peruse them. By the Queen's injunctions it is ordered, "That they shall provide at the charge of the parish one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume in English; and the Paraphrase of Erasmus, also in English, and the same set up in some convenient place within the said church that they have cure of, whereas the parishioners may most commodiously resort unto the same, and read the same, out of the time of common service."* These things evince the anxiety of Elizabeth's advisers to ameliorate the spiritual condition of the people.

In the year 1562, the XXXIX Articles of Religion were agreed upon in Convocation and set forth by authority, as the standard of doc-

* The degraded state of the mass of the clergy at this period is evident from another of these injunctions, by which every one under the degree of Master of Arts, is commanded "To have of his own the New Testament in Latine, and in English; with Paraphrases upon the same; conferring the one with the other. And the Bishops shall examine the said persons, how they have profited in the study of the Holy Scripture."

trine of the Church of England. It was found necessary at the period of the Reformation to declare what were the views, which were maintained by the Reformers, and how they differed from the doctrines of the Romanists. In our own age it is common with some writers to censure the practice of subscription to articles. Yet what would have been the fate of the Reformation, if such a practice had not been adopted. In all probability the successors of the Reformers, when the immediate danger from Popery was escaped, would have settled upon their lees, and departed from the faith, for which their predecessors contended. Facts certainly support this supposition; for the successors and descendants of the Non-conformists of 1662, being destitute of a standard of doctrine to which each one must subscribe, have in very numerous instances gone over to Arianism, or landed on the shores of cold Socinianism. A most striking illustration of this statement was furnished a few years since in the legal proceedings instituted concerning Lady Hewley's Charity. When the bequest was made the ministers to whom she entrusted it were orthodox Presbyterians; but when the decision of the Court took place, the charity was in the hands of Socinians. The fact is simply this, the Chapels formerly occupied by

Presbyterian Ministers are now possessed by Socinians: hence it became necessary to apply to a legal tribunal for the purpose of restoring the charity to men professing the principles of those to whom it was originally bequeathed. Now, with a public confession of faith to which every minister must subscribe, such a transformation from Calvinism to Socinianism could not have occurred. I rejoice, therefore, in the fact, that our Reformers erected their standard, and that we are able to appeal to it as the standard of doctrine in our Church.*

The articles were first published in the year 1553, under the authority of King Edward. The alterations are too slight to be noticed in this work. Several of them are pointedly directed against the errors of Rome; and as these articles are subscribed by every clergyman, he also pledges himself against Popery. The Sixth Article, "On the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures," was evidently levelled against one of the decrees of the Council of Trent, in which the Apocryphal books were declared to be canonical scriptures. The fourth session is thus headed:

* In the first year of Elizabeth, the Reformers set forth a declaration of their views to vindicate themselves from the slanders of the Papists. See Strype's Annals, vol. i. 167-172.

“*Sessio Quarta celebrata die viii. Men. April, MDXLVI. Decretum de canonicis scripturis.*” In this decree the Apocryphal books are enumerated, and an anathema denounced against all who should venture to reject them. This decree was issued in 1546, and was attacked by our articles in 1553, and again on their re-publication in 1562. All the peculiar errors of Rome are in like manner denounced in the articles, as will be evident to any one who will take the trouble to peruse them. It is somewhat remarkable that the Thirty-nine Articles were published by Queen Elizabeth nearly at the same time with the Decrees of the Council of Trent.*

Besides these authorized works, in which the Papacy was so fearlessly and faithfully exposed, public disputations were held in various places between the Protestants and the Papists, at which vast concourses of people were accustomed to assemble. They were common in London and in the two Uni-

* “These articles came forth much about the time wherein the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* were published, truth and falsehood, starting in some sort both together, though the former will surely carry away the victory at long running: many of which *Decrees* begin with *lying*, and all conclude with *cursing*, thundering anathemas against all dissenters.”

—*Fuller, b. ix. 72.*

versities. The effects were severely felt by the Romanists, for the people being now permitted to read the Scriptures, discovered that the peculiarities of Popery were not to be found in the sacred volume, but that they rested only on the traditions of men.* Such a course is loudly censured in the present day by many members of our Church; yet I cannot understand why our circumstances should not justify us in adopting the same means as were resorted to by our Reformers. If the distinctive tenets of Popery had been rejected by the Church of Rome our case would indeed be different; but as this is impossible with an infallible Church, we as Protestants are certainly justified in the use of all legitimate means to resist the encroachments of the Papacy. I again repeat that I mention these proceedings of our Reformers, for the purpose of pointing out to my fellow-Protestants the means, by which our ancestors successfully opposed their adversaries.

The press was a very important engine in this reign for resisting the Papists. I have mentioned the Bible, the Paraphrase of Erasmus, the Homilies and the Articles, all of which were eminently calculated to open the eyes of the

* See Strype's Annals, l. 128-128, for an account of these disputations.

people ; but the great men of that age were not content with these ; they prepared and published several other very important works, by which the cause of the Reformation was greatly furthered. In short, the press and the pulpit were the two battering-rams, by which the fortress of Popery was so successfully assailed. They are the weapons, too, with which in the present day we must enter upon the contest. In the year 1570, the Catechism of Nowell was first published. It had been drawn up by its author, and perused in 1563 by the lower House of Convocation, by whom it was recommended for public use.* It was not published, however, until 1570, when it was dedicated to the Archbishops and Bishops ; and, it may, therefore, be viewed as a work of authority in the Church of England. " It contains," says an eminent writer, " the sum of the religion lately Reformed in the English Church."† It was recommended by the Bishops to their clergy at their visitations, and is thus characterized by Bishop Cooper : " Here you may see all the parts of true religion received, the difficulties expounded, the truth declared, the corruptions of the Church of Rome rejected."‡

* Synodus Anglic. p. 215. Collier's Eccles. Hist. ii. 491.

† Strype's Grindal, p. 94. ‡ Strype's Annals, i. 228-9.

The Apology of Bishop Jewell may be considered in the same light, as a public exposition of the views of the English Church. It was one of those missiles sent forth from the engine of the press, by which the agents of Rome were so sorely harassed. It was first published in 1562. In this learned work—a work of most essential service in promoting the Reformation, the author states the grounds of our separation from Rome, refuting the charge of schism alleged by the Papists, and demonstrating that the English Reformers had only restored the Church to her primitive purity in doctrine and worship. As the work was set forth by the authorities of the land, it may be viewed as an authorized exposition of the principles of the Church of England. When Harding asserted that the work was merely an expression of the author's private opinions, Jewell replied that it had received the sanction of the whole Church.*

* In a book published the next year, and designated by Strype, a state-book, it is thus alluded to. "I refer you to the Apology, which our Church hath placed openly before the eyes of the whole Christian world, as the common and certain pledge of our religion." Strype's remark on this extract is as follows:—"So that it was written upon a state account, by the common advice and consultation, no doubt of the College of Divines, that were then met about reformation of the Church."—See *Strype's Annals*, i. 42.

In justification of the Reformation he observes, "We have departed from that Church, wherein neither the word of God could be heard purely, nor the sacraments rightly administered, nor the name of God, as it ought to be, called upon. We have departed from that Church that was in time past, and we have departed in such sort as Daniel did out of the den of lions, and as the three children out of the fire—yea, rather cast out by them with their cursings and bannings, than departed of ourselves." After an allusion to the infallibility of the Church, which he denies in pointed language, he adds, "And which we ourselves did evidently see with our eyes, to have gone from the old holy fathers, and from the Apostles, and from Christ himself, and from the primitive and Catholic Church of God: and we are come as near as we possibly could to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholic Bishops and Fathers."* The apology coming out before the Council of Trent had separated, was honoured with the anathema of that assembly. This censure furnished evidence of the effect produced by the work on the minds of the Papists, who were alarmed at the consequences that might result from its extended circulation. Two individuals were commanded by the Coun-

* See Apology in Jewell's Works, folio.

ell to prepare an answer, a task which they never accomplished.*

This work is remarkable as having given rise to one of the most memorable controversies in our ecclesiastical annals—the controversy between the author and Harding. It was not to be supposed that the Papists would remain silent. Accordingly, the notorious Harding, who had been a zealous Protestant in the days of King Edward, came forward in 1565 with “A Confutation of a Book called an Apology for the Church of England.” In the year 1567 Jewell published the “Defence of the Apology,” in which he replies to all the cavils of his adversary. Harding sent forth another work the very next year, entitled “A Detection of sundry foul Errors, &c.” In 1569 Jewell published a second edition of “The Defence,” containing also a reply to Harding’s “Detection.” Thus the opposition of Harding was the means of producing the most important work ever penned on the

* The Apology was written in Latin, and published in 1562, but the same year an English translation appeared under the auspices of Parker. Two years after it was translated by the Lady Anne Bacon, the wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, and mother of the great Lord Bacon. This translation was most faithfully executed, and so well satisfied was Jewell with its accuracy that, in replying to Harding, he adopted it instead of translating it himself from the original.

Romish controversy, and was productive of more injury to the Church of Rome than could possibly have resulted from the Apology itself. Every point was re-stated in the defence, and with an amplitude that was quite incompatible with the small compass of the Apology. Their proceedings recoiled on their own heads, and proved of essential service to the Church of England. As the Church has been indebted to the opposition of her adversaries for some of the ablest defences of divine truth, so the Reformation was more benefited by Harding's attack than it would have been by the total silence of the Papists, inasmuch as it produced the Defence of Jewell. So important was the work deemed at the time, that it was ordered to be placed in all parish churches with the Bible, the Paraphrase of Erasmus, and the Book of Homilies. "Concerning his book against Harding, three great Princes successively, viz., Queen Elizabeth, King James, and King Charles, and four archbishops, were so satisfied with the truth and learning contained in it, that they enjoined it to be chained up and read in all parish churches throughout England and Wales."* How diligent the Bishops and Council were in enforcing the order for setting up the "Defence" in

* Strype's Annals, iii. 147.

churches, may be gathered from Parker's letter to the Bishop of Norwich in 1572.* The placing of this work in the churches was a declaration of hostility to Popery in every parish in England and Wales—it was a public invitation to the people to canvass the errors of the Church of Rome—it furnishes the strongest proof that our Reformers deemed it necessary to watch and oppose the progress of Popery.

But this great champion of Protestantism commenced his warfare with the Papists in the pulpit a few years before he attacked them through the press. It was in his celebrated sermon in the year 1560 at Paul's Cross, where he challenged his adversaries to produce any testimony from the practices of the Church, or the writings of the Fathers, within six hundred years after the death of Christ, for any one of the articles respecting which the Church of England was at issue with that of Rome, and he would subscribe to the Popish creed. Twenty-seven points were enumerated, all of which he asserted were unknown during the first six centuries. "O Austin!" he exclaims, "O Jerome! O Cyprian! O Athanasius! O Irenæus! O Polycarp! O Peter! O Paul! O Christ! if we are deceived it is you that have deceived us."

* Strype's Parker, 368.

This challenge was attempted to be answered by the same antagonist, Harding. In 1566 Jewell replied to Harding, and confuted the twenty-seven errors ascribed to the Church of Rome by the most masterly reasoning. It was supposed at the time that no one thing gave the Papacy a more deadly blow than this famous challenge: and when, shortly after, the Apology was published, and then the Defence, the triumph was most complete. The writings of Jewell may be appealed to by the Protestant in the present day, for information respecting the mode in which our ancestors waged perpetual war with the Papacy.

CHAP. V.

James I.—The observance of the Fifth of November—The Powder Plot—The Jesuits implicated, also the Church of Rome—The treatment of the Conspirators by the Church—Reflections on the deliverances wrought out for England.

THOUGH James was the son of that Princess whom the Papists wished to place upon the throne of England, yet, because his principles were opposed to the Church of Rome, they did not, on his accession, forbear to enter into treasonable conspiracies: but, on the contrary, his reign witnessed one of the most horrible attempts at destruction to be found in the annals of the world. James was by no means disposed to persecute the Papists, and, had they been peaceably disposed, they would have enjoyed during his reign great quiet and favour. With the Papists of that day, however, peace and loyalty were out of the question: nothing seems to have given them satisfaction while their hierarchy was fallen. The Fifth of November has been, ever since this reign, a memorable day in the annals of England. It is appointed by the Church to be observed as a day of thanksgiving for the deliverance of this country from Popish cruelty. In many places, especially country villages, where

it would not be easy to procure a congregation in the morning, its observance has fallen into disuse: and in modern times there are not a few who affect to treat the subject with ridicule. The observance is stigmatized as a relic of persecution proceeding from the bad feelings of Protestants; and calculated to wound those of our Roman Catholic countrymen. Yet can any one deny the existence of the plot? or that its discovery was a signal deliverance, for which even the present generation ought to be thankful? If its discovery was a blessing, it behoves us to be thankful; and God requires that we should give evidence of our gratitude by outward acts. On what grounds its observance can be objected to, except on political ones, I cannot imagine,—and political reasons, I am quite sure, ought not with the Christian to be of so much weight as to influence him to neglect a sacred duty. It certainly cannot be unbecoming in Protestants to assemble in God's house to celebrate, on that day, the deliverance of the Church from the machinations of its enemies! It grieves me to think that the above objections are alleged by the majority of Dissenters, who, in very few instances, ever dream of assembling for worship on that day: yet the Dissenters of a former age never permitted the day to pass without a public ac-

knowledge of the mercy of which our ancestors had been the partakers;—they always met together for public worship. Throughout the reigns of Charles II., James II., William and Mary, George I. and II., and part of that of George III., their chapels were opened for worship, and the ministers addressed their congregation on topics suitable to the occasion. Scores of sermons by Dissenting ministers, preached on the fifth of November, were published, and are still to be met with; but now such a practice would be an anomaly. It would be censured by them as even something like that Popery from whose rage and cruelty we meet together on that particular day to celebrate our deliverance. When the practice ceased among Dissenters I cannot tell. I lament its discontinuance, and should hail their return to the custom of their fathers. With Churchmen, however, the practice is becoming more general; and I hope still to see the time when every church shall be opened on this day. In villages I would suggest to the clergy that they should make a point of assembling their parishioners together in the church in the evening. The effects of such a practice would be most beneficial: the people would be made acquainted with the practices and principles of Papists, and would thus

be armed for any attacks which might be directed against them. Were this practice common, I am certain that the inhabitants of our towns and villages would hail the return of the fifth of November as that of a solemn festival.

In the Act of Parliament, enforcing the observance of the day, the plot is termed "an hellish conspiracy of the Jesuits and Seminary Priests," a designation by no means unjust or uncharitable. As James was not disposed to establish Popery, they were determined, as far as they were able, that he should not oppose it. James had declared in 1604 that he would never tolerate Popery, and that he would spend his blood in defence of Protestantism; and this declaration appears to have instigated the conspirators to cut him off as soon as possible. In this squeamish age of ours it is pretended that the powder plot was a desperate act of a few individuals, and that it had no connexion with the principles of the Papists, who abhorred the deed equally with Protestants. I intend, however, now to shew, that, not only was this particular act of treason agreeable to Popish principles, but also that it proceeded entirely from the Jesuits, and was not the mere act of the individual conspirators. It had been stated by Campion, some years before, in a work published at Rome;

that the Jesuits had entered into a covenant to destroy all heretical kings ; and Creswell, another writer of the same stamp, insists that all Papists, when they have an opportunity, are required to kill heretics. It was asserted by Jesuitical authors that none of that society could commit mortal sin, since Ignatius, their founder, had obtained privilege of exemption for all the members of this order, for one hundred years, and that Francis Xavier had procured the continuance of the same exemption during the space of two hundred years more. The order was founded in 1540, and therefore the three hundred years will not expire till 1840. Whether the Jesuits, since the revival of their order, believe that the exemption is still in force, I know not ; but that the notion was believed and acted upon at the period in question, there can be no doubt whatever. These men would necessarily feel it to be their duty and their privilege to carry the decision of their superior into effect. That such principles would lead to the commission of crime I need scarcely attempt to prove. The particulars of the treason are so well known that I will not detail them—all that I wish to accomplish is to select such topics as may serve to illustrate the nature of Popery and the practices of its votaries.

That the Church of Rome is implicated in the treason of the 5th November, is proved by her treatment of the conspirators. How were such men received if they escaped? They were caressed and rewarded by the Court of Rome, and those who fell in the attempt were enrolled as Martyrs in the lists of Confessors and Saints. The conspirators engaged in the dark deed of the fifth of November were partly laymen; yet they were instigated by Jesuitical Priests. Garnet was of the order of Jesuits, and he held a conspicuous rank among the traitors. It was generally understood too on the Continent that an attempt was in agitation; at Rome the parties were known, and prayers were offered for their success.* Nay, the conspirators were absolved previously to the time fixed upon for the commission of the act. Parsons declares that Garnet suffered unjustly, while Ribadeneira the Jesuit has reckoned, in a work published with the approbation of the Church, Garnet and several other traitors among the Martyrs of the Society of the Jesuits. If a conspirator should fail in his attempts to cut off a heretical Sovereign, he

* The following are some of the petitions, which were offered up at Rome, while the plot was continuing. "Prosper their pains that labour day and night in thy cause." "Let heresy vanish like smoke."

was certain of having his memory embalmed as that of a Martyr. The Pope addressed a brief to Garnet during the reign of Elizabeth, which implies an approval of any attempt on the Queen's life; for it enjoined upon the Papists after the removal of the Queen, whether by course of nature or otherwise, that they should not recognize any successor who would not support the Church of Rome. It seems that some of the conspirators had some conscientious scruples concerning the destruction of the two Houses of Parliament, in consequence of the Roman Catholic Lords who would be present. The case was proposed to Garnet by Catesby, who wished to know whether it would be lawful to destroy those Romish Lords with the Protestants, and the former determined that if the advantages would be greater by destroying some even of the innocent with the guilty, it would be lawful to destroy the whole body.* Every thing was revealed to Garnet in confession, as he admitted on his trial; and not only were the conspirators absolved previous to the act, but even after the treason was discovered, the absolution of the Church was

* Widdington, a Roman Catholic writer, observes that Catesby founded his whole plot on this decision of Garnet's. Sir Everard Digby states in one of his letters that not more than three, who were worth saving, would have been lost.

bestowed by another Jesuit, though he was acquainted with all the circumstances.*

Can any one doubt that the Church of Rome herself was implicated in this dark deed? Is it not evident from her conduct towards the traitors? Nay, was not this act a full illustration of the Popish doctrine that faith is not to be kept with heretics?" "To keep faith with heretics, says a Jesuit Confessor to the Emperor in 1628, is to deny the Catholic faith and send souls post to the devil."† At one time the Papists pretended that the plot was a trick of Cecil's: and it is so designated in an almanack, published in 1662; but it is now the custom with Popish writers to affirm that it was nothing more than the act of a few desperate characters, and that it had nothing whatever to do with the principles of their Church or of the Jesuits. It appears too that such is the belief of many nominal Pro-

* Garnet heard their confessions and then absolved them, at the same time administering the holy sacrament. Yet he is called a Martyr at Rome. At Louvain he was addressed in prayer in the following words "Sancte Henrico intercede pro nobis." Widdington informs us that his bones were preserved as relics, and his image set up over altars. A portrait of Garnet was publicly sold at Rome by permission of the superiors, with this inscription. "Pater Henricus Garnettus Anglus, Londini pro fide Catholicâ suspensus et tectus 3 Maii, 1606."

† See the test of the Jesuits' loyalty.

testants of the present day: yet I am well assured that such a belief can rest only on one of two grounds—either on that of total ignorance of the subject, or on an entire disregard of the evidence of history.*

The Church of England was however preserved notwithstanding these secret machinations. In the discovery of the treason there was a remarkable interposition of Providence, for the traitors were the instruments of revealing their own project. One of the number was so unwilling to destroy a certain nobleman, the Lord Monteagle, that he could not rest until he had written the mysterious letter of caution, which issued in the discovery of the plot. This letter led to a search under the two Houses. The qualms of conscience, in the one individual, which induced him to write the letter, were the work of that God, who engages to protect his servants from the assaults of secret as well as open foes. That individual would not have hesitated to destroy the King, the Royal Family,

* One of the conspirators, when urged to repentance for his crime, asserted that, so far from deeming his conduct sinful, he firmly believed that it was sufficiently meritorious to make an atonement for the sins of his whole life. Subsequent to the discovery the traitors were consoled, by some of the priests who attended them, by instances of many glorious designs, which had proved unsuccessful.

and all the Nobility and Commons of England ; yet he was anxious to spare the life of one particular nobleman ; and thus the scruples of a single conspirator were over-ruled for the deliverance of the nation from ruin, and the two Houses from destruction.*

This conspiracy ended in the destruction of the parties engaged in it, but the practices of the Jesuits were by no means discontinued. It was still their object to cause the ruin of the Church and the restoration of Popery ; and though the discovery of the Gunpowder Treason was the means of checking the progress of their schemes, yet it did not change the nature of the

* The conspirators could not plead in justification of their conduct that they were driven to the rash act by desperation in consequence of the rigour of persecution, for it is well known that James was disposed to grant them all the liberty that was consistent with the safety of Protestantism. Nay, so indisposed was his Majesty to inflict any severity on his Popish subjects, that he incurred the charge of remissness towards the Protestant Church. How did the court of Rome shew by any act that it disapproved of the deed ? on the contrary, it was evident from the treatment of the conspirators, as has been noticed already, that its fullest sanction had been obtained. Two of the traitors, or rather two Jesuits, who were privy to the whole proceedings, were preferred to important posts in the city of Rome by the Pope himself ; and it was alleged that miracles were wrought by the relics of the conspirators. The whole series of circumstances proves that treason in England was deemed piety at Rome.

men, nor induce them to refrain from plots and treasonable practices.

The aggressive nature of the Popish system was well understood by our Reformers, as is evident from their actions, and also from the various public documents of our Church, compiled by their wisdom and skill. It never occurred to them that Popery was a peaceable creed, and that Protestantism would be safe while it existed and gained ground, as is reported by many nominal Protestants, who deem it highly inexpedient to utter a word against the Romish hierarchy. Would that the mantle of our Reformers might descend upon all the clergy of our church in these days of rebuke and blasphemy! We are told by some that it is sufficient to preach the Gospel without alluding to the errors of others—that we are to expatiate on the loveliness of truth. Such is the spurious liberalism of the age. A churchman cannot defend the homilies, the articles, and the formularies of his Church without acting in a hostile manner towards the Church of Rome. The service for the fifth of November still remains in the Book of Common Prayer, and will remain as long as the Church of England exists, for no one will be rash enough to propose that it should be expunged. I have recommended that this

day should be observed even in our country villages, and I would again enforce that recommendation, on the ground that Popery remains the same as it ever has been. The order of Jesuits is revived, nor is it probable that they have departed from the principles of their founder. It is a good old custom for the bells of our churches to ring annually on this day, in commemoration of our deliverance; and it is most desirable that we should assemble also for public worship, to bless God for the safety vouchsafed to us as a nation through so long a series of years, and to beseech him to avert the dangers by which our Church and country are threatened in consequence of the increase of Popery.

In reviewing the history of our Church during this and the preceding reign, exposed as she was to the unprincipled attacks of the Jesuits and others, we can scarcely fail to be struck with the watchful care which it pleased God to extend over her, and by which she has hitherto been protected. Though the emissaries of Rome in this country were supported by the Pope as the head of the Church, as well as by the King of Spain, the main supporter of the Papal throne, yet they did not succeed in one of their attempts against the Church. It pleased God to raise up

instruments during particular emergencies, and to fit them for their important work. When the poison is disseminated, an antidote is supplied to prevent the evil. The pages of history are pregnant with illustrations of the Divine dealings in this respect. On the very day on which Pelagius the heretic first saw the light in Britain, Augustine, his great antagonist, was born in Africa : and no sooner did the former begin to disseminate his poisonous tenets, than the latter began to supply the antidote, by which the evil that otherwise would have resulted was prevented. It is evident that whenever errors are propagated, Providence will raise up and qualify men for the special purpose of opposing their progress. Thus, in the second century, when Celsus set himself with a most malicious hatred to undermine the Gospel of Jesus, Origen, Justin Martyr, and Lactantius were raised up to defend the truth and to oppose error. So when the Arians attempted to impose their heretical sentiments upon the Church, the Council of Nice was assembled, which issued not only in the condemnation of error, but also in one of the noblest defences of the truth with which the Church has been blessed, and which still remains as an impregnable bulwark against the encroachments of the enemy. When the Romish emissary,

Tetzell, with a total absence of even the sense of shame, propounded the doctrine of Papal indulgences in Germany, Martin Luther had his spirit stirred within him by the shameless effrontery of the Papal agent; and immediately commenced an attack, which issued in the liberation of Germany from the degrading thralldom of ignorance and superstition. In the prophetic vision Zechariah saw four horns, which had scattered Judah: but he quickly perceived four carpenters, who were raised up to fray them.* Thus does Jehovah counteract the evil designs of his enemies. It has already been observed that, while the Trentine Fathers were preparing their decrees against the Reformation, the English Reformers were employed in framing and revising the XXXIX Articles, the bulwark of the English Church; and it is a remarkable circumstance that the decrees of the Council of Trent and the XXXIX Articles should make their appearance in the reign of Elizabeth nearly at one and the same time. Philip of Spain was the most powerful sovereign of the age: he was determined to establish Popery in England; and to prevent it Elizabeth was raised to the throne—a woman of remarkable powers, and one who, by her prudence and wisdom was enabled to

* Zechariah, i. 18, 21.

thwart those machinations by which a sovereign of inferior ability would have been involved in ruin. Thus, in various ways, does it please God to work out deliverances for his Church, of which most striking instances are to be found in the reigns of Elizabeth and James.

CHAP. VI.

Charles I.—The Jesuits enter the Parliament's Army—Evidence of their intrigues—Are concerned in the death of the King—The uses of history—Reasons for believing that the Jesuits are acting a similar part at present—The fatal consequences of Protestant indifference pointed out.

THIS was an eventful reign. Throughout the whole of it the Jesuits were exceedingly active in endeavouring to create divisions between the King and the Parliament; and with what fatal success the pages of history will inform the reader. It is an established fact, that many Jesuits were in the army of the Parliament under the character of Anabaptists and Sectaries, with whom, as is well known, that army abounded. In short, the Jesuits ultimately succeeded in producing that sad catastrophe, which was followed by so many evils. By their practices the country was deluged with the blood of its inhabitants, slaughtered by each other. That I am not writing without authority, or without being able to substantiate my charges, I shall now proceed to shew by a series of undisputed historical facts, all of which are illustrative of the principles and practices of Popery.

In the year 1628, a letter addressed by a Jesuit in England, to the Superior of his order at Brussels, was discovered, or intercepted, a few extracts from which will serve to shew what were the practices of this body at that time. The writer begs his Principal not to be astonished at the calling of a parliament, assuring him that they had rather furthered than opposed it: "We have now many strings to our bow, and have strongly fortified our faction, and have added two bulwarks more: for when king James lived he was very violent against Arminianism. Now we have planted that sovereign drug, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy, and it flourishes and bears fruit in due season. I cannot choose but laugh, to see how some of our own coat have accoutred themselves; and 'tis admirable how in speech and gesture they act the Puritans. The Cambridge scholars, to their woful experience, shall see that we can act the Puritans a little better than they have done the Jesuits. They have abused our sacred patron in jest, but we will make them smart for it in earnest."*

According to Rushworth, there were in London alone, more than fifty Jesuits, all actively

* Rushworth, 8vo. Ed. 1703, vol. i. p. 304. Neal's Puritans, vol. ii. 182-3.

employed in stirring up strife. "Scarce all Spain," he observes, "France, and Italy, can yield so great a number as London alone."* There is abundant evidence of their interference during the subsequent years of the war; and that they were concerned in the death of Charles I. there is great reason to believe. "That the Papists," says Calamy, "though they acted behind the curtains, had a considerable hand in these commotions, and their tragical issue, there is very good evidence." He then quotes the letter of Bramhall to Usher: "That in 1646, by order from Rome, above a hundred of the Romish clergy were sent into England, who had been educated in France, Italy, Germany, and Spain, who were most of them soldiers in the Parliament army. They wrote to their several convents, especially the Sorbonists, to know whether the taking off the King's head was a thing to be scrupled? The answer returned was this, that it might be done for mother Church's advancement."† The same fact is also stated on the authority of Peter Du Moulin, who informs his readers in his "Vindication of Protestantism," that "A select number of English Jesuits were sent to Paris, to consult with the faculty of Sorbon, then altogether Jesuited,

* Rushworth, vol. iii. 236.

† Calamy, vol. i. 57-8.

to whom they put this question ; that seeing the state of England was in a likely prospect to change government, whether it was lawful to work that change for advancing the Catholic cause, by taking away the King, which was answered affirmatively.* The same decision was given at Rome. Subsequent to the death of Charles, when the act was condemned by all the civilized world, the whole of the papers connected with the foregoing proceedings were ordered by the Pope to be collected and destroyed, lest the iniquitous transactions should be divulged, to the injury of the Church and court of Rome. It appears, however, that a copy was seen by a Protestant in Paris ; and in 1662, the preceding account was published by Peter Du Moulin, an eminent Protestant clergyman, whose veracity may be fully relied on, and who offered when a denial was published by the Papists, to produce witnesses of the truth of his statements. This offer was not accepted, the Papists preferring that the assertions should remain uncontradicted, rather than permit the French minister to produce his proofs. The undeniable inference is, that they were fearful of the consequences of an examination, and that the facts were correctly reported. It was stated by many

* Calamy, vol. i. 58. Baxter's Life, part ii. 374.

Presbyterian writers at the time, that the Papists cut off the King's head, by means of their emissaries in the army: and that such a proceeding was fully in accordance with the recognised principles of the Jesuits will be evident to any one who will take the trouble to peruse the preceding pages of this small volume. It was perfectly easy for the Jesuits to assume the character of Sectaries, to mix with the agitators in the army, to insinuate themselves into the councils of the Republicans, and thus to accomplish their object. From a state of commotion and confusion, such as might be expected from the death of the King, they had nothing to lose, but everything to hope. It is notorious too, that, not only in the army, but amongst the common people, many Jesuits were found pursuing various trades and occupations, in order that they might secretly undermine the faith of the wavering, and bring them over to Popery; and of the numerous preachers of that period many were Jesuits in disguise. The lawful ministry was denounced as an unchristian ordinance: and as the reins of discipline were relaxed, any man was at liberty to preach who could muster a few hearers. In the pamphlets of the period we find constant allusions to the gifted brethren, men, who without any preten-

sions to the ministerial character, exercised the gift of preaching, decrying all ordinances as Jewish, and yielding themselves up to the most extravagant and fanatical delusions. In the ranks of such men, the Jesuits were likely to reap an abundant harvest; in their ranks, accordingly, they were found in considerable numbers.

In the year 1648 there was a prospect of a reconciliation between the King and his Parliament, the former having consented to four bills proposed by the latter as the basis of a final settlement of their differences. Such a reconciliation would have destroyed the hopes of the Papists, who accordingly bent all their energies to the prevention of such an agreement. How the treaty was broken off by the interference of the army, need not be stated in this work: it may be sufficient to observe that, when the troops perceived that there was a prospect of a settlement, they instantly overawed the Parliament, expelled the refractory members, and brought the King to trial. The Jesuits hoped that, when his Majesty was no more, his son, who was on the Continent, would be so indignant at the treatment which his father had received at the hands of men professing Protestant principles, that it would be easy to prevail on him

to embrace the Popish faith. It is stated that the Queen's confessor was seen by Mr. Henry Spottiswood, in the habit of a soldier, near the scaffold on the day of the execution of the King. When Spottiswood expressed his amazement at such a spectacle, the Jesuit replied that there were at that moment fifty priests present in the same attire as himself. These statements were credited by Baxter: and when the views of the Jesuits are considered, it must be admitted that such practices are not inconsistent with their principles. Nor does it, in my opinion, involve the charge of uncharitableness to believe, that men, avowing such tenets, would not hesitate to carry them out into practice whenever a favourable opportunity should occur. That these men exercised a most material influence in the army, and over all the proceedings of those days, must be admitted by all who will carefully examine the history of the period.

Baxter tells us of a Mr. Atkins, who became intimately acquainted with a priest on the Continent, formerly the governor of one of the Popish colleges. Some time after the King's death Mr. Atkins met the same priest in London, and was informed that there were thirty Jesuits in the metropolis, who, under the instructions of Cardinal Mazarine, had debated the

question of the King's death, and that it was carried in the affirmative. Baxter remarks, "I would not print it without fuller attestation, lest it should be a wrong to the Papists. But when the King was restored I told it occasionally to a Privy Councillor, who not advising me to meddle any further in it, because the King knew enough of Mazarine's designs already, I let it alone. But about this time I met with Dr. Thomas Goad, and, occasionally mentioning such a thing, he told me he was familiarly acquainted with Mr. Atkins, and that he assured him that it was true."*

I am aware that some persons may affect to ridicule such statements. They are ready to allege that they are intended merely to serve a party purpose, and to render the Roman Catholics obnoxious to their fellow-subjects. But the facts which I record rest on as solid a foundation as many of the most notorious events in history,

* Baxter's Life, Part II., 373-374. See also Sharpe's (who was subsequently Archbishop of York) Sermon before the Convention, January 30, 1688.—"All those emissaries," says he, "and factors for the Church of Rome, had a mighty hand in our late commotions—nay, and even in bringing the King to the block, there is too much reason to suspect, though they did not act above board. Yet it is very suspicious they were under the curtain, and gave life and motion to those engines that played the part upon the open stage."

which to question would be deemed the height of folly. The pages of history are pregnant with instruction: and when we can trace the proceedings of Papists and Jesuits in the past transactions of our country, are we to be debarred the common privilege of standing on our guard? Are we to place confidence in men professing the same principles as those which led to such fatal consequences in former reigns? It is an admitted fact that the principles of Popery remain ever the same. Why, then, are we to lay aside all our caution, and hug the serpent to our bosom as a harmless thing? The principle of self-defence is implanted in our nature; and to be on our guard against Popery is nothing more than a proper regard to self-preservation.

Were it necessary, many more testimonies relative to the practices of the emissaries of Rome during this reign might be adduced. It may be censured as an uncharitable act to rake up the remembrance of past actions, which ought to be buried in perpetual oblivion. To talk in this way is easy: but let the objectors prove that the same line of conduct, to a certain extent, is not pursued by the busy agents of the Church of Rome in the present day;—let it be shown that we are not exposed to any danger from Popish practices—that their former principles

are repudiated—that Popery is perfectly harmless, and then it will be time enough for Protestants to forget the past, and act in concert with Papists. To those who really direct their attention to the working of Popery, both in England and on the Continent, it will be evident that there is no slight ground for apprehension at their proceedings. While the Papists are all activity and zeal, is it wise, or even becoming, in Protestants to permit them to pursue their courses unmolested and unchecked? Why should our conduct be aspersed because we use our exertions to check the progress of errors, which we believe to be fatal to the souls of men, any more than that of the Papists; in disseminating, throughout the length and breadth of the land, those tenets which are peculiar to the Church of Rome? Much has recently appeared in the public papers relative to the removal of the Popish Archbishop of Cologne from a Protestant State. Of the necessity of such an interference on the part of the Prussian Government there can, in the estimation of unprejudiced minds, be no doubt. He evidently acted in a manner which no Protestant State could tolerate; and doubtless his conduct was the result of that general disposition of the Popish party throughout Europe to take advantage of the present circum-

stances of the world to propagate their own faith among the inhabitants of all Protestant nations. This individual had, previous to his appointment, assured the Government of his acquiescence in those measures which had been determined on for the regulation of marriages between Papists and Protestants; yet, as soon as he had been installed in his office, he turned round, and acted in opposition to his most solemn pledges. I will quote a passage or two from the *Times* newspaper, on the conduct of this prelate:—"Indeed the Church of Rome, as it truly contends, is and always remains the same. The daring blasphemy with which the most faithless avarice and ambition attribute their worst acts to duty to the God of truth, is a fearful defiance of him, which reminds us of the ages when the Church to which this arch-bishop belongs disdained the trouble of studying pretexts for deluding and enslaving mankind. This history, pregnant with instruction, tells anew and loudly to the Protestant Sovereigns of Europe that they can have no peace with Rome." The *Times* afterwards adds, "A distinguished foreign Protestant ecclesiastic, eminent in piety, talents, and acquirements, passed a year at Rome not long since, under circumstances highly favourable for observation of the conduct of its Court. The opinion

which he reluctantly formed was, that such are the means, the craft, the skill, the zeal, and the industry, which it employs against the Protestants, ignorant or careless of its devices as they are, lukewarm, divided into sects, and disunited, that it ultimately must and will prevail over its adversaries. He found the high clergy of Rome thus animated, and not labouring under the disadvantages of unconcealed corruption of morals and infidelity, under which it laboured in the time of Leo X. The Archbishop of Cologne is a man of narrow understanding, weak and bigoted, and fell an easy prey to the machinations of the Jesuits.”*

If such practices are common in Prussia, what security have we in England against the machinations of the Jesuits? for it is notorious, that, these artful and persevering emissaries of Rome, are straining every nerve for the purpose of seducing English Protestants from the faith of their fathers into the communion of that corrupt church. Let the reign of Charles I. prove a beacon to warn us of the arts of Rome, and of the consequences that must result from lukewarmness or indifference on our part. At that time, republican and levelling principles triumphed over the monarchy, and the church,

* See the *Times* of February 28, 1828.

and those principles were propagated chiefly by Jesuits. At the present moment, it is remarkable, that almost all Papists are democrats; and as the cry of liberty of conscience was used in this reign for the purpose of cloaking their nefarious designs; so at the present day, it is argued that all religious parties ought to be equal, in order that amid the confusion consequent on the introduction of the voluntary principle, and the struggle for pre-eminence among contending and rival sects, the Jesuits and other supporters of Rome, might succeed in establishing their own Church on the ruins of Protestantism. It is quite certain, that the classes at Maynooth are instructed in doctrines precisely similar to those which were entertained by the Jesuits in this, and the two preceding reigns. In short, it appears to me the height of absurdity, to pretend that Popery is changed, and that, consequently, Protestantism is in no danger from its increase, when not one single principle has ever been disowned by the Church of Rome herself. We are not accustomed to confide in those, whose conduct has been base or dishonourable, unless they appear to us to be truly sensible of their past errors, and ready to give any security against a repetition of the act, or acts, of which we have had reason to complain :

and why should we, in the very important concern of religion, be expected to trust in men, whose principles are exactly similar to those, by which the Papists of former days were influenced to the performance of those bloody deeds that stain the annals of our country ! The activity of the Jesuits, in the present day, has, I firmly believe, never been surpassed in any former age : nor is it possible to calculate the evil that may result from the indifference of Protestants on this alarming subject. It is, indeed, common with some well-meaning Protestants to comfort themselves, when they are told of the spread of Popery, by dwelling upon the goodness of their cause, and by referring to some of those expressions which are always at hand, such as—“ God will provide,” and “ the truth must prevail ;” but I would remind such persons, while I admit the truth of the words, that God requires his servants to be active in his service: they are not to sit still amid the rapid progress of error around them, and excuse themselves by saying, “ The truth must prevail.” Jehovah accomplishes his ends by the instrumentality of means, and if Popery is to be checked and Protestantism to prevail, the professed servants of God must be active and diligent, and not lukewarm and unconcerned ; or that gracious being, whom by

their inactivity they dishonour, may, at least for a time, surrender them to the tender mercies of those men, the diffusion of whose principle^s they have never attempted to check, and whose practices they have never denounced. Our ancestors yielded up their lives in a cause, for which many professing Protestants refuse to make a single sacrifice. How would the Martyrs of Smithfield exclaim against the expediency so openly avowed by numbers in the present age. Yes, Smithfield ought to remind us of Popish principles and Popish practices. The principles are still the same, and were there no restraint, no wholesome laws, the same practices would be the result. It was asserted by Bellarmine that if the Pope should "command vices and forbid virtues, the Church must believe that vices are good and virtues are evil." Hence it follows that consistent Papists must at any risk enforce the Pope's decrees; and though his Holiness is unable, in consequence of the state of the world, to impose any task upon the members of his Church, the execution of which would be incompatible with the peace of nations, yet in the event of Popery gaining its lost ascendancy, what guarantee have we, that the Pontiff, under the influence of revenge or blind zeal, might not again insist on the burning of heretics and the deposing of princes!

CHAP. VII.

Charles II.—The Popish party influence the Non-conformists in their views of a Toleration—Dispensing power—Papists change their course, and instigate the Bishops to enforce the penal laws—Parliament wishes to relieve the Non-conformists—The measure defeated by the Papists at Court—Duke of York—Liberty of conscience—Test Act—Danger of the Country—The secret treaty to favour Popery—Popery unchanged—Popish plot—Opposition to Popery—The fears of the people.

WITH the restoration of Monarchy was connected the re-establishment of the Episcopal Church, which, during the long space of twenty years, had been under a cloud. In the time of Elizabeth and James the Church had been the constant object of attack with the Papists, because she was in possession of what they deemed their own property, and was also a mighty bulwark, by her articles, homilies, formularies, and the zeal and activity of her clergy, against the aggressions of Rome. Nor was the situation of the Church altered in this respect at the Restoration. As in past days the Jesuits had insinuated themselves among the Puritans, so in the reign of Charles II. they made common cause with the Non-conformists, in order that by their as-

sistance they might undermine the Church of England.

That the Non-conformists were not comprehended within the pale of the Establishment at the period of the Restoration, must be regretted by all sincere Protestants; though perhaps at that time it was scarcely to be expected that the members of the Church of England, now happily restored, would be disposed so far to forget their past sufferings as to yield, for the sake of peace, to all the scruples of those who objected to the Book of Common Prayer. Into the question of the differences between the Church and the Non-conformists it is not my intention to enter in this work; my object being simply to trace the progress and point out the practices of Popery. I have now nothing to do with the Act of Uniformity—whether it was too severe, or whether, all things considered, it was impossible for the rulers of the Church to have acted otherwise, is a point which has no reference to Popery. The Act of Uniformity came into operation in 1662, when about 1800 ministers, who hesitated at the terms of conformity, quitted their posts in the Church. It is, however, on record that the Non-conformists were secretly supported in their determination to quit the Church, by some of the Popish advisers of Charles. That some of his

councillors were Papists is a fact that has never been denied. These men assured the Non-conformists, that if they adhered to each other, and formed a large and compact body of separatists from the Established Church, it would be materially for their advantage, since the King would, in such a case, exercise that power, with which it was contended he was invested, to dispense with the new law; while on the other hand, supposing the number of those who quitted the Church should be insignificant, it would not be possible for his Majesty to interfere in their favour.* By such persuasions many were induced to join the ranks of the Non-conformists, who otherwise would, in all probability, have remained in the Church. It is true that the great

* Burnet declares that Charles was implicated in a design of bringing in Popery from the very commencement of his reign. "It was thought, (he says,) a toleration was the only method for setting it a-going all the nation over. And nothing could make a toleration for Popery pass, but the having great bodies of men put out of the Church, and put under severe laws, which should force them to move for a toleration. So the Papists had this generally spread among them, that they should oppose all propositions for comprehension, and should animate the Church party to maintain their ground against all the sectaries."—*Burnet*, vol. i. 12mo. p. 260. He mentions elsewhere that the King was anxious to procure the passing of the Conventicle Act, and endeavoured to persuade Wilkins not to oppose it.—*Ibid.* i. 400.

majority continued in a state of separation ; but we know how difficult it is for men to retrace their steps, and to quit a party to whom they are once committed. Such a course brings upon them the charge of a desertion of their principles, and hence it comes to pass that most men, when they have taken an important step, abide by the consequences, which it involves, even though they may be injurious to their own interests. That this feeling exercised considerable influence over many of the Non-conformists I am fully convinced ; and that they were materially guided in the decision to which they came, by the Popish councillors of the King, is an undisputed fact. It was in this way that Popery commenced its proceedings in this reign. Whether his Majesty was actually a convert to Popery, or whether, as is more probable, he was equally indifferent to the Churches of Rome and England, is a matter of no consequence to our present argument ; but it is quite certain that the Papists believed that they had every thing to hope for from the King ; and that the Church of England was the grand obstacle to the attainment of their wishes.

It appeared, therefore, desirable to act on their old principles, and divide the Protestants,

as much as possible, among themselves.* They were delighted at the number of the Non-conformists, and endeavoured to keep them united together in one compact body against the Church. The Papists, however, were disappointed in their expectation of success, for the Parliament was animated by so strong a Protestant spirit as to set its face against that power of dispensing with the laws, which was claimed by the King, and which, it was said by some of his advisers, was inherent in the crown. Charles signified his intention, as soon as the Act of Uniformity came into force, of suspending its operations. This had been the aim of the Papists; but the Parliament acted with decision, and Charles was too wise to incur the risk of having his supplies stopped for the sake of gratifying a few Popish councillors. For the present, therefore, the notion of suspending the penal laws was laid aside. The Papists had flattered the Non-conformists into the belief that they were too large

* Burnet tells us that he met with a member of the Church of Rome, an able and honest man, well versed in the practices of the Jesuits. This individual stated that the Papists feared nothing so much as a union between the Church and the Non-conformists; and that "the Papists had two maxims, from which they never departed: the one was to divide us, and the other was to keep themselves united."—*Burnet*, vol. i. 285.

a party to be treated with severity. I would now beg the reader's attention to the following facts. When the notion of dispensing with the Act was dropped, and the expected toleration was not realized, the very men in the royal councils who, without openly professing Popery, were Papists in disguise, and who had advised the Non-conformists to continue firm in their determination, now secretly instigated the bishops to enforce the Act of Uniformity with all possible strictness, while at the same time they counselled the Dissenters to listen to no terms of comprehension short of those which were proposed at the Savoy conference, and to which they were told the bishops must eventually yield. Such was the conduct of the Papists at this period. These were the genuine fruits of Jesuitical principles. They first used their exertions to produce an act to exclude the Non-conformists; then they persuaded them to refuse to comply; and subsequently to its passing into a law they advised the bishops to insist on its rigorous enforcement. The King had also given his pledge, during his exile, to some of the Roman Catholic sovereigns, that he would indulge his Popish subjects in the exercise of

* Rapin, 632; Kennet, iii. 240; Collier, 830; Short, 261; Neal, iv. 346, 349—350.

their religion : a comprehension with the Church would have defeated his purpose, as both parties would, under such circumstances, be firmly united against Popery. The Papists, therefore, contended with the bishops for the enforcement of the Act, and with the Non-conformists they insisted on the necessity of acting in concert, in order that the Act might, in consequence of their numbers, be modified in their favour. It was anticipated that the cry for indulgence would be so powerful from the Dissenters that the King might with safety attempt the exercise of the dispensing power, and thus, under the pretence of favouring the ejected ministers, advance the interests of the Church of Rome.* That many of the Non-conformists, but for the false hopes with which they were continually inspired by the Papists, would have relinquished their scruples, and complied with the requirements of the Act of Uniformity, is pretty certain.†

At the commencement of this reign, and for several subsequent years, the Parliament was disposed to execute the penal laws against the Non-conformists, while the Court, being under the influence of the Papists in the council, was

* Hallam, ii. 463—8 ; Macpherson, vol. i. 52.

† Kennet, vol. iii. 248.

anxious to soften their rigour by the exercise of the dispensing power. Thus there was a continual struggle between the House of Commons and the Monarch—the latter wishing to claim and to exercise a power to set aside the laws, the former resolutely resisting such a claim as illegal, and destructive to the liberties of the country. In this state the affairs of the country were not destined to remain long; for within a few years the Commons evinced a disposition to compromise matters with the Non-conformists, either by comprehending them within the pale of the Established Church, or by granting a toleration for separate worship. Several attempts to effect this object were defeated by the activity of the Papists; but at last, the Commons actually passed a bill giving relief to the Dissenters, which was lost in the Lords, by the dissolution of Parliament; and, subsequently, a second bill was passed, and actually awaited the royal signature to give it the force of law; but, this was smuggled away by the command of the Court, and could not be found when his Majesty attended to sign such bills as should be presented to him. As long, therefore, as the Parliament evinced a disposition to enforce the penal laws, the Non-conformists were caressed by the Court, and induced to believe that the

King would eventually gain his point, and dispense with the laws in their favour ; but as soon as the House of Commons manifested a desire to relax the rigour of the penal statutes, and to grant liberty of conscience to the Non-conformists by due course of law, the tactics of the Court were immediately changed ; for the Papists perceived that if the Dissenters were tolerated, both parties would be united against them, and that their expectations of liberty for their own worship would be completely frustrated. It became, therefore, a grand point with them to keep, at any risk, and by the use of all possible means, the Church and the Non-conformists from uniting. Thus the Court, contrary to its former practices, began to insist on the necessity of enforcing the laws. Hitherto they had endeavoured to accomplish their object, which was a general toleration, by preventing the penal statutes from being executed ; but now, when the Parliament and the Church manifested a desire for a union of all Protestants, the Papists acting on the same maxim, that of dividing their enemies, found it necessary to alter their course. The Court refused to concur with the Parliament in the relaxation of the laws, and used every effort to procure their execution with severity. Popery in short was the great source of all the evils of this, and the subsequent

reign. Had there been no secret influence exercised by the Papists, the Church and the Non-conformists, after the first feelings of bitterness and anger had subsided, would have effected a reconciliation. The Papists cherished and fomented the differences, as they had done in previous reigns, acting on their old and recognized principles. They kept one point constantly in view, the advancement of the interests of their own Church.

About the year 1672, the Duke of York, the presumptive heir to the throne, made an open profession of Popery. Previous to this time it was not known, though strongly suspected, that the Duke was reconciled to the Church of Rome, for he attended the service of the English Church and received the sacrament at particular seasons with his Majesty. On one occasion, he heard a sermon in the Royal Chapel, from Tillotson, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, on the hazard of being saved in the Church of Rome, which gave so much offence, that from this time, "he forsook it, and never more appeared there."* Until now appearances were preserved, and, in name, though not in reality, the Duke was a Protestant. From the time that he thus avowed himself a member of the Church of Rome, the fears of the people, and of Par-

* Biographia Britannica.

liament respecting Popery were much increased, and the House of Commons began immediately to devise means for checking the spread of Popish principles, knowing that the King was at best indifferent to Protestantism, if not inclined to the Church of Rome, and that many would be influenced by the declaration of the heir presumptive. The Parliament, therefore, kept two objects in view—the one to check the growth of Popery by penal laws—the other to relieve the Non-conformists from those enactments which pressed heavily upon them. This proceeding was most unpalatable to the Court, who saw no hope of success in their scheme, but in a universal toleration, which the Parliament, knowing the object for which it was sought, would never grant. In 1672, Charles issued his declaration of indulgence, by which Dissenters from the Established Church were permitted to assemble for separate worship.*

* Since the failure of the former attempt at an indulgence, the magistrates were required by the Court to execute the laws against Non-conformists, with the greatest severity. This was intended to irritate them against the Church, and to prepare them for the indulgence, as men who suffer are ever ready to welcome ease. By this indulgence the Non-conformists were required to procure licenses for chapels; the Papists were permitted to hold their meetings under no restrictions, but in private houses.—*Nichol's Defence*, 86.

The attempt had been made, as already noticed, in 1662, when his Majesty was compelled to yield to the remonstrances of the Commons. Still the claim had not been relinquished. Again, was the King compelled to yield, since the Commons would have withheld the supplies, had not the declaration been recalled. The Court, however, perceiving that the Parliament really wished to relieve the Non-conformists, and fearing above all things, lest a union should take place between them and the Church, which would be destructive to the hopes of the Papists, were now determined that no relaxation of the penal laws should be permitted.

The Duke being a Papist, it became necessary, in the estimation of the Commons and the country generally, to devise measures for preventing those evils which were likely to result from the influence of the emissaries of Rome. It was this situation of affairs that gave rise to the celebrated Test Act. Hitherto Papists had held offices of trust, and occupied seats in Parliament; but the Protestants wisely judged that such a state of things was not calculated to preserve their civil and religious liberties.* To prevent the mischief that might arise, the Test Act

* Burnet admits that at this period "The Church party showed a noble zeal for their religion."—Vol. ii. 80.

was framed, by which Papists were prevented from holding any office of trust. It enjoined upon all persons holding office the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and enacted that they should receive the Sacrament in some parish church after Divine service, and subscribe a declaration against transubstantiation. It was soon carried through both Houses; and was absolutely necessary in the critical circumstances in which the country was then placed, when the heir presumptive was an avowed Papist, and the Court was under the influence of Popish principles. The sound sense and the Protestant feelings of the people saved the country at that time. They had not forgotten their former danger—the flames of Smithfield were remembered, and the cries of the martyrs had scarcely died away.* It must be mentioned, to the honour of the Non-conformists, that they supported the Test, though it subjected them to take the Sacrament in the church, as a qualification for office; but they perceived that it was necessary, and, to oppose the common enemy, they fought this battle side by side with Churchmen.

On reviewing this period of our history, we must be struck with the interposition of Provi-

* Persons were then living, who had heard their grandsires describe the cruelties practised in the reign of Queen Mary.

dence in our favour ; for it now appears that the country was placed in the most imminent danger. It is a matter of history that Charles and the Duke were in league with France for the advancement and establishment of Popery in England. This is a subject of great importance, as showing that Popery is ever the same, and that no peace can be kept with Rome. As the secret league with France was not discovered until within the last half century, and as it furnishes one of the most remarkable illustrations of the working of Popery, I intend to detail the particulars connected with it at some length. The narrative may serve as a beacon to Protestants in the present day, warning them of the abominable principles of the apostate Church of Rome. It is now the fashion to ridicule those who entertain fears of Popery ; yet at the period of the Restoration the Papists were not so powerful either in numbers or influence as they are at the present day. But what advances were made by them in a few years ! so that the Church and the liberties of the nation were placed in jeopardy. Had the people acted on the principles so lauded in the present day, that Popery is not to be opposed, what would have been the consequences ? The facts which I am now about to detail will prove that there was a deeply laid design for over-

turning Protestantism, which was defeated by the Commons in passing the Test and other restrictive laws, by which Papists were incapacitated from holding offices of trust. The facts to which I allude will prove that it was the intention of the King and the Duke, and the Popish party in the cabinet, to re-establish Popery, and also to introduce arbitrary government. And, whatever may be said to the contrary, it is an undeniable truth that Popish principles and despotism are closely allied. The Papists of that day would have destroyed the Church, and with it the liberties of the country; and, notwithstanding their present cry for liberty, they would, when their purposes were gained, revert to their old principles. Popery and liberty cannot exist together; for it is one of the characteristic features of the former, that it imposes fetters on the human mind, and prohibits free discussion.

The Test Act, as already remarked, was passed in 1672. The cause is to be sought in the following startling facts.

In the year 1669 a secret treaty was entered into by Charles with the King of France, for the purpose of obtaining military and pecuniary succours. It has been noticed that some of the members of the cabinet were Papists, among whom were Clifford and Arlington, who notwith-

standing certain differences of opinion, were soon brought into close alliance with the Duke. The King and the Duke held a secret consultation with these two ministers on the best means of promoting the Roman Catholic religion in England. His Majesty spoke with much feeling on the subject. "The result of the consultation," says the Duke, "was that the work should be done in conjunction with France."* Thus was it agreed to sacrifice the liberties of the nation to France and to Popery. The ministry, as has been stated, was divided between Papists and Protestants: this treaty was, accordingly, to be kept a secret from the Protestant portion of the cabinet; and, in order to cover this secret negociation his Majesty permitted a mock treaty to be entered on, which was of course managed by the Protestants. Such are the secret workings of Popery!

But though this intrigue was so secretly managed, it became partly known, or, at all events, was strongly suspected. It pleased God to reveal, in some degree, the designs of the enemies of the Protestant Church—not indeed fully, but sufficiently to allow the Parliament to make

* Macpherson's State Papers, 8vo. edition, vol. i. 32. *Life of James*, vol. i. 442. James says that the King spoke with tears in his eyes.

provision against the dangers with which the country was menaced. The illustrious statesman De Witt appeared to have been apprised of this secret treaty by means of an agent at Paris. Sir William Temple, our ambassador at the Hague, became convinced of its existence, and was ordered to return home.* Still the particulars were not known at the time; but the Parliament, being fully aware of some such design against the Church and nation, betook themselves courageously to the work of devising a remedy; and in two years after they carried the Test Act, which inflicted the severest blow on Popery that it had received during the whole of this reign.

It is true that differences afterwards arose between the two monarchs, which prevented them from pursuing their plan of introducing Popery into England by force of arms; but what success would have crowned their efforts, if God had not stirred up these differences, it is not possible for us to conjecture. The chief cause of safety was to be found, however, in the conduct of the Parliament, who now evinced a determined resolution, not again to yield to the superstitions and the cruelties of Rome. The secret treaty was generally believed at the time,

* Temple's Works.

and was the spring of the actions of the Parliament. At a later season further confirmation was obtained; for during the period of some misunderstanding between Charles and Louis in the year 1682, the latter, "in revenge," says Mr. Hallam, "let an Abbé Primi, in a history of the Dutch war, publish an account of the whole secret treaty. This book was immediately suppressed at the instance of the English ambassador. But a pamphlet published in London just after the Revolution, contains extracts from it. It is singular that Hume should have slighted so well authenticated a fact, even before Dalrymple's publication of the treaty; but I suppose he had never heard of Primi's book."* This was in 1682, and proved an encouragement to the Parliament to persevere in their course. They now saw that their fears were not groundless, and that there actually was a conspiracy to

* Hallam, vol. ii. 516. In an anonymous tract of the year 1689, now lying before me, the writer states, in allusion to this affair, that Mr. Garraway, a member, some years after, when there was a report of a war with France, as a blind to the people, rose in the House and stated that he had obtained a copy of the private treaty between France and the King; "which struck," says the writer, "the House with so great consternation, and the Privy Councillors in that horrid mystery of iniquity with such confusion, that they could not lift up their faces."

introduce Popery. How providential was this difference between Charles and Louis, since it led to the publication of the facts connected with the secret treaty, and proved that no confidence was to be placed in the King or the Duke. It was providential too on another ground, for it furnished the Parliament with a sufficient reason for several of their subsequent transactions, and caused them to adopt measures which, but for the discovery of the secret treaty, might not have been contemplated. It was suspected at the time, as already remarked, and the Test Act was the consequence; but the direct evidence furnished by the book of Primi, which, though suppressed, was still seen by a sufficient number of persons to prevent the government from inducing the belief that such a treaty never existed, was in 1682 a full justification of the previous proceedings of the Commons, and kept them from sinking into a state of apathy on the subject of Popery.

Half a century since the whole treaty was published by Dalrymple. It proves that the Commons were not influenced by unnecessary fears. "This memorable transaction," says Mr. Hallam, "explains and justifies the strenuous opposition made in Parliament to the King and Duke of York, and may be reckoned the

first act of a drama, which ended in the Revolution. It is true that the precise terms of the treaty were not authentically known; but there can be no doubt that those who from this time displayed an insuperable jealousy of one brother, and a determined enmity to the other, had proofs enough for moral conviction, of their deep conspiracy with France against religion and liberty. This suspicion is implied in all the conduct of that parliamentary opposition, and is the apology of much that seems violence and faction.”* I quote from Mr. Hallam, because he will not be accused of partiality towards the Church of England, nor of unfounded prejudices against the Papists. He writes as an impartial historian, as will be admitted even by the advocates of Popery. Mr. Hallam also supports my statements relative to the views of the Popish party in tolerating the Non-conformists. “The Court,” says he, “entertained great hopes from the depressed condition of the Dissenters, whom it was intended to bribe with that toleration from a Catholic regimen which they could so little expect from the Church of England. Hence the Duke of York was always strenuous against schemes of comprehension, which would invigo-

* Hallam, ii. 521.

rate the Protestant interest and promote conciliation. With the opposite view of rendering a union among Protestants impracticable, the rigorous Episcopalians were encouraged underhand to prosecute the Non-conformists.”*

The views in the preceding extract are exactly in accordance with those which I have already stated; and I feel the greatest pleasure in strengthening my opinion, formed after careful study of the history of the period, by the authority of so celebrated and so impartial a writer as Mr. Hallam, who, without reference to party prejudices, has from the same facts before him arrived at the same conclusion with myself.

These statements are not fabrications: they are strictly true in every particular; and it behoves us, as Protestants, to weigh and ponder them well. What is Popery? Is it changed since the reign of Charles II.? Would its adherents disdain to do now what its advocates hesitated not to attempt then? Are Papists more worthy of confidence now than they were

* Hallam, ii. 524. Mr. Hallam refers to the *Life of James*, whose words are even stronger than in the quotation. They are as follows. “The rigorous Church of England men were let loose and encouraged underhand to prosecute, according to law, the Non-conformists, to the end, that these might be more sensible of the ease they should have when the Catholics prevailed.”—*Life*, vol. i. 443-4.

at the period of this iniquitous treaty with France? Their designs were happily frustrated; but the characters of the actors in this business are as black as they would have been in the event of the accomplishment of their wishes. Now, since the principles of the Papists are not changed, for they are unalterable, and must be so in an infallible church, can any man of common sense believe that they would not resort to the very same practices to promote the cause of their Church, if circumstances should favour their designs. Every fact recorded in history relative to the treachery of the Papists ought to be regarded by Protestants as a beacon to guard them against confiding in men whose system leads them to keep no faith with heretics. That they do not keep faith with heretics, or rather that the Church of Rome proscribes and places Protestants without the pale of salvation is evident from a letter of Dr. MacHale's, published in the *Times* newspaper on the very day on which I write this page.* It was the desire of

* Dr. MacHale published a second letter to Lord John Russell on the Irish Education Board. This intolerant priest, alluding to the composition of the Board, states, that all sections of Protestantism are combined in a common league against the Church of Rome, and he adds, "not inconsistently, since the Catholic Church equally proscribes

the House of Commons to favour the Dissenters, but the Court ever interfered to prevent a union: they were willing to grant liberty by exercising a dispensing power, which by the same power might have been retracted, and doubtless would, as soon as Popery had been restored. With these facts before our eyes shall we believe that men professing the same principles, even though they declaim in favour of liberty, would consent to tolerate Protestantism a day longer than they were under the influence of fear or of prudential considerations? No! the thing is impossible from the nature of Popery. It is the design of Popery to establish itself wherever it can obtain a footing. And will any man say that the Papists do not now desire to establish it again in England! They may repudiate or disclaim the intention; but most assuredly no reflective person will be deceived by such a disclaimer. Let Popery gather strength and it will appear in its true colours; its object is to rule, and to rule alone; and to accomplish its aim at complete sovereignty it employs the fire and the sword to extirpate heresy. Its cruelty is one of its marks, together

them all."—*Times*, Thursday, Feb. 27, 1838. It would be well if our Dissenting fellow-subjects would consider this observation.

with perfidiousness. I speak of the system, not of individuals; and every one knows, or may know, that the Pope pretends that he has the power to dispense with oaths and promises made to heretics.

For some years the affairs of the country remained in the same state, the Parliament opposing, and the King secretly favouring the Papists, who used the most strenuous exertions to make proselytes and to propagate their doctrines. In the year 1678 the plot, known by the name of the Popish plot, was the subject that engrossed the attention of all classes in the kingdom. Into the various circumstances of this plot it is unnecessary to enter. Though generally believed at the time, it is now evident that the particulars given in evidence were destitute of any foundation; but still we must not suppose, because this particular plot was a fabrication, that therefore Protestantism was safe from the plottings of the Papists. This very plot was believed in consequence of the fears of the people respecting Popery; and even though it is not easy to credit the narrative of Oates, yet the whole affair is still involved in mystery, and will never be unravelled till the great day of account. It is singular that the Whigs were the chief supporters of Oates. They justly entertained the greatest

abhorrence of Popery. Would any member of the house of Russell in the present day adopt the sentiments of his illustrious ancestor on this subject ! It must be admitted that the constant plottings of the Papists were calculated to give a colour of truth to any plot that might be invented. Indeed, it is notorious that a plot for the establishment of Popery had long been in existence.* Hume observes that there is, from the spirit of proselytism in Popery, a conspiracy against all government. "There was really, says Mr. Hallam, "and truly, a Popish plot in being, though not that which Titus Oates and his associates pretended to reveal ; but one alert, enterprising, effective, in direct operation against the established Protestant religion in England. In this plot, the King, the Duke of York, and the King of France, were chief conspirators ; the Romish priests, especially the Jesuits, were eager co-operators."†

It was during the ferment created by the discussions on the Popish plot, that the Commons first conceived the project of excluding the Duke of York, as a Papist, from the succession to the throne, deeming the possession of the crown by a Popish Sovereign to be incompatible with the safety of the Protestant religion. I need not

* Kennet's History, iii. 299.

† Hallam, ii. 571.

detail the particulars of the Exclusion Bill ; it was several times passed, but as often defeated by the artifices of the Court ; until at length the King resolved to govern without parliaments, an object which, by various means that need not be specified, he was enabled to accomplish. The attempts at the establishment of Popery during the last few years of Charles' life could not be concealed. Subsequent to the dissolution of his last Parliament, called the Long Parliament, from its long continuance, he dismissed four others within a few years, because they were apprehensive of danger from Popery, and acted accordingly. Failing in accomplishing his object by means of a Parliament, he determined to effect it without one ; and his last years present a series of wanton attacks on the liberty of the subject, and of attempts to encourage Popery. Means had been used to procure Parliaments that would act in subserviency to the Court, but so strong was the Protestant feeling in the country, that every dissolution proved fatal to the royal plans, and every successive House of Commons appeared more determined against Popery than its predecessor. The growth of this feeling in the country was doubtless owing to the general belief in Oates's plot. That supposed discovery was the means of arousing the nation. It is re-

markable that the plot was entertained by the long Parliament, that very assembly which had made so many concessions to the King. This belief induced them to oppose the King in several of his measures, while their opposition led to their dissolution. The succeeding Parliaments pursued the same course; and by one of them, whose existence was of brief duration, it was voted that during the intervals of Parliament, the Popish designs were contrived with unparalleled insolence. At Court every thing was managed by the Duke and the Papists, and when the death of the King took place, the project for the re-establishment of Popery was nearly ripe for execution. From the first year of the King's Restoration, 1660, to the year of his death, 1685, Popery had been gaining ground in the nation. But the actual attempt at its complete establishment was reserved for the next reign, that of a prince, who, by his subsequent conduct, proved that he was a bigot to the corruptions of the Romish Church.

Throughout the whole of this reign the people in general manifested the greatest abhorrence of Popery, as was proved in the choice of four Parliaments, in which, notwithstanding all the influence of the Court, there was an overwhelming majority of men, who were determined to

make any sacrifice rather than that of their religion. One of the uses of history is to teach us how, in difficult seasons, our ancestors have acted, and how they have escaped from dangers. Our circumstances are at present perilous—Popery advances around us with rapid strides—practical infidelity, under the disguise of liberalism, joins with it hand in hand for the accomplishment of certain particular objects—and of those who profess the Protestant faith a large number seem totally indifferent, and regardless of those appearances at which the reflecting portion of the professing world is so much alarmed. Were our population generally alive to the errors and distinctive principles of Popery, I should entertain no fears of its increase; but when so many Protestants are content to view it as a harmless thing, I cannot but feel some alarm. This little volume is published for the purpose of pointing out to my fellow-countrymen the practices of the Papists in past times, and the means adopted by our ancestors to counteract those practices. The people, as has been remarked, were not silent spectators of the progress of Popery—they dreaded it as an enemy to their liberties, civil and religious—and used every exertion to check its growth; and if Popery is now to be checked the people must be

awakened to a sense of their danger, and they must act vigorously in the use of all lawful means to arrest its advances. May this small work contribute towards arousing the public mind on this momentous subject!

CHAP. VIII.

James II.—A Parliament—Views of the King and the Popish Party—Means adopted to counteract their designs—The Pulpit—The introduction of controverted points prohibited—The prohibition disregarded by the Clergy—The Priests preach in public—Ecclesiastical Commission—Measures of the Court to advance Popery—Declaration of Indulgence—The Army—The Press used by the Papists and by the Protestants—Renewal of the Declaration of Indulgence.

WHEN Charles II. determined to govern without a Parliament, the Popish party calculated that in a short space their plans would be ripe for execution. For several years no Parliament was summoned—nor was it intended that another should be convened until means should be devised for procuring the return of a majority of members who would concur in the measures of the Court. The proceedings of the last few years of Charles II. were of the most arbitrary character ; perhaps the invasion of the rights of the Corporations was the most iniquitous. As all the old charters were surrendered to the Crown, the corporate towns were re-modelled by the Court, and in such a manner as seemed calculated to suit its purposes. Under these cir-

cumstances, James, on his accession, believed that he might venture on a Parliament. It appears that this assembly was returned by improper influence exercised by the Court.* In his first speech, James promised to preserve the Church of England in all her integrity, a declaration which led many to believe that they had nothing to fear from the principles of the King: Had this promise been kept his throne would have been preserved; nor would he ever have been an exile in a foreign land. It is, however, clear that it was not intended to be observed. So awfully can the members of the Church of Rome trifle with the most solemn declarations.

Mr. Fox doubts whether James at his accession had conceived the design of injuring the Protestant Church; he appears to imagine that the King only intended to free the Papists from the operation of the penal laws. Mr. Hallam, a much better authority on such a subject, says, "But though the primary object was toleration, I have no doubt but that they conceived this was to end in establishment." Again, "It must at all events be admitted that the conduct of the King after the formation of the Catholic junto in 1686, demonstrates an intention of overthrowing the Anglican Establishment."† One cannot

* Hallam, iii. 70. Tindal, Introd. xvii. † Hallam, iii. 73.

but wonder how any doubt can be entertained on the subject, yet Dr. Lingard states that James aimed only at two points, "liberty of conscience, and freedom of worship."* It is very singular that Fox should entertain doubts on any points calculated to injure the character of James, whom he rarely spares ; it must, however, be remembered, that when he was occupied in the composition of his history, he was also seeking for the emancipation of the Papists ; and therefore it was his object to shew, that it was not necessarily the genius of Popery to use all possible means for its own establishment. Hence he denies that such were James's intentions in the outset, though he is compelled to admit that the establishment of Popery was ultimately his object. Being anxious to accomplish a favourite political project, Fox wished to induce the belief that Popery was not dangerous.

At the beginning of this reign the severities against the Dissenters were revived by the Court, who insisted on the enforcement of the statutes. In this matter the truly Jesuitical policy of the Papists was conspicuous. They intended to repeal the penal laws, and the Dissenters must become the tools for promoting their design. It was thought that the sufferings

* Vol. xiv. 13.

of the Dissenters would lead them to seek a general toleration, under which Popery might be introduced. Of course the odium of the penal statutes was cast upon the Church of England and upon the Parliament by whom the laws had been enacted; yet both were anxious to grant relief to the Non-conformists, and the five Parliaments of the late reign had actually attempted it, and were thwarted in their intentions by the Court. The peculiar nature of Popery was discovered in this fresh enforcement of the laws, which, though unrepealed, would, as the magistracy and the people were averse to severity, have remained unexecuted. But it suited the policy of James to execute the laws and to irritate the Dissenters, though he had so repeatedly declared himself against the infliction of the penalties, and had promised to grant them liberty of conscience. Two courses lay open to the King; the one was the removal of the Test and other penal enactments by authority of Parliament, and the other the suspension of the laws by the exercise of the dispensing power. It will soon appear that the Parliament would not listen to any proposition for the repeal of the Test Act. The people in general were anxious to relieve the Non-conformists, but they were determined not to repeal the laws which

had been enacted against the Papists. James, on the other hand, refused to listen to any proposition for relieving the Non-conformists, unless the Papists should also be included in the scheme.

During the first session of the Parliament, James found them sufficiently obsequious, though it must be remembered that his obnoxious measures were not proposed; but in the next session, when he fancied that he might bring forward his projects with safety, they resolutely refused to repeal the Test Act, though all the influence of the government was exerted in favour of the resolution. From this time James could no longer mould to his wishes that Parliament which was summoned under circumstances so favourable to the Court. This fact proves the universal dread of Popery at that time, since numbers who otherwise were disposed to support the Court, acted in opposition to it on the question of religion. Failing in his object relative to the repeal of the Test Act, James resolved to accomplish his purpose by the exercise of the dispensing power. Still it was necessary to proceed with great caution, and in the very teeth of all the promises and all the professions which had been so repeatedly made to the Non-conformists by the Popish party in the royal councils, it now

suiting their policy to suffer them to feel the weight of the laws, that they might eventually be induced to give their support to such measures as would favour the introduction of Popery.*

After the first bursts of loyalty had spent themselves, the fears of Popery increased among the people. One of the means used to counteract the influence of the Popish faction was the pulpit, and it may be questioned whether the people would have been animated with such feelings, if the pulpit had been silent. It is necessary to look back into the pages of history, to discover by what methods our ancestors were enabled to check the growth of Popery; and having discovered the means to which they resorted, it will be wise in the present generation to act on the same principles. The pulpit then, I repeat, was one of the principal means for awakening the nation and checking the progress of Popery.

* The Court had nearly carried some of its measures in the Parliament for the furtherance of Popery. Arthur Onslow the speaker, told Whiston that the question whether James should employ Popish officers in the army, was determined by a single vote. A courtier, who stood watching every voter as he entered the House, saw a gentleman, who had a regiment, going to vote against the Court, and he reminded him of his post under the king. He replied, "My brother is just dead, and has left me £700. a year." This vote saved the Church at that time.—*Whiston's Life*, p. 20.

Almost all the pulpits in the land were so many battering rams against the enemy. So alarmed was James at the effects produced, that, influenced by his Jesuitical advisers, he attempted to close the lips of the clergy. This was a proceeding quite in accordance with Popish principles; for as Popery places an embargo on the word of God itself, it cannot appear strange that it should aim at suppressing the preaching of the Gospel. James issued a declaration on March 25th, 1686, prohibiting any allusion in the pulpit to the points controverted between the two churches. The design was worthy of the system to which it owed its origin. The object of the advisers of the measure was to silence the pulpits of the Protestants, in the hope that Popery when unopposed, would gradually make its way in the nation, supported as it was by the Court; but the clergy of the Church of England of that day were true and faithful to their charge; they saw through the artifice; they were alive to the danger in which their Church was placed; and no earthly power could deter them from the path of duty.* May the clergy of England be ever animated by the same holy zeal!

* In this measure James followed the precedent of Queen Mary, who, on coming to the throne, issued a similar prohibition.

It was a striking proof of the superintending providence of God, that at this period of imminent danger, some of the greatest champions of the faith should have been raised up to fight the battles of Protestantism. Never did the Church of England contain within her pale a body of more holy, laborious, and learned men than at the period in question. The clergy did more at this time both by preaching and writing, than at any other period since the Reformation. Being men of zeal, of integrity, and piety, they resolved not to heed the royal declaration. The Popish priests in the royal chapel and in other places, continued to attack Protestantism, though the clergy of the Church of England were prohibited from touching on controversial topics. Such was the justice of the Sovereign and his Popish Council. The most eminent theologians of the Popish party were appointed to preach; and many of the sermons were subsequently printed by the king's printer, and with the royal sanction.* It appears that numbers at first

* They may be seen with this announcement on the title page: "Published by Authority." During the first year of James's reign the Protestants in France were subjected to a violent persecution. Burnet, in alluding to them, says "Here was such a real argument of the cruel and persecuting spirit of Popery, wheresoever it prevailed, that few could resist this conviction. So that all men confessed that the French

attended the preaching of these men, but more from the novelty of the thing than from any inclination to Popery. It was an unusual sight for a Popish priest to be seen preaching in his majesty's chapel. As soon as James ascended the throne he established the Popish worship in the palace, a step which had never been attempted since the days of Queen Mary; for even his brother Charles, however inclined to Popery, retained his Protestant chaplains, and frequented the worship of the Church of England. The proceedings of these preachers, however, recoiled upon their own heads. They ventured to attack the Protestant translation of the Sacred Volume, asserting that it abounded in lies, at which the people became so exasperated, that they abstained from that attendance at the chapel royal, which had originated in the mere love of novelty. Thus, while the Popish priests were attacking every thing which is most dear to Protestants, the English clergy were commanded to be silent. The command was not obeyed; and the results of their disobedience were most glorious; for to them, as the instruments, are we indebted, not only for

persecution came very seasonably to awaken the nation, and open men's eyes to so critical a conjuncture, for upon this session of Parliament all did depend."—Vol. iii.

the preservation of the Church of England, but also for that of Protestantism itself.

In the year 1686 another measure was adopted, which proves the deeply laid design of James and his Popish councillors to destroy the Protestant Church—it was the establishment of an Ecclesiastical Commission. It did not commence its proceedings, however, until August, next year (1687), the year that saw the developement of all James's measures for the destruction of the liberties of his subjects. In all his schemes James acted with a precipitancy fatal to himself. Several of his most attached friends, as the Earl of Rochester, and Admiral Herbert, were removed from their posts, simply because they refused to renounce Protestantism; while in other respects, they were prepared to yield a willing obedience. Nothing could have been more unwise. But so determined was the King on introducing Popery, that his zeal outran his prudence. Another most imprudent act was, the elevation of Father Petre, the Jesuit. Petre was made a member of the Privy Council; and was, in fact, the sole guide of the royal measures, as well as the director of the royal conscience. It was a strange sight to behold a Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury and a crafty Jesuit sitting down at the same council table. So

hasty was the King in his measures, that some of his own party complained of the rashness of his conduct. But James, with the true spirit of a bigot, replied, that, as he was growing old, it behoved him to act with promptitude. The Ecclesiastical Commission was another of those measures, which proved exceedingly injurious to his interests. In all these acts, however, the finger of God is seen. James proceeded with precipitancy, and the people became alarmed. Had he acted with more caution, he might have made greater advances towards the accomplishment of his purpose, and the people might have been less anxious on the subject. The proverb was verified in the proceedings of James, "*Quem Jupiter vult perdere, prius dementat.*"

As soon as the commission was established, it was resolved to use it as an engine to shut the mouths of the clergy, for the royal proclamation had been unheeded. The pulpit alarmed the King, and its cry must be silenced at all hazards. Accordingly, the most decided measures were resorted to. At that time Dr. Sharp, a man of learning, and a popular preacher, was rector of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. He persisted, as did many others, in preaching against Popery, contrary to the royal declaration. Though the same course was pursued by numbers, yet it

was deemed expedient to make an example, in the first instance, of one of the most distinguished of the clerical body. Accordingly, the Bishop of London, Sharp's diocesan, was commanded to suspend him for disobedience; and, doubtless, it was intended to pursue the same method with all other clergymen, who should venture to open their mouths on the prohibited subjects. The Bishop of London, like an honest man, refused to act, when he was summoned before the Ecclesiastical Commission. This was the first open rupture between the Church and the Crown. It is a glorious feature in the history of the Church, that she took the lead in opposing the introduction of Popery. It was owing to the conduct of her ministers at this period, that those decided steps were taken, which issued in the Revolution and the consequent salvation of this country from Papal tyranny. I need not detail the proceedings connected with the Bishop of London before the Ecclesiastical Commission. By the firmness of his conduct he encouraged the clergy, in the course which they had adopted, and though he lay under the ban of the Court, this measure was one of those events, which conspired, by opening the eyes of the public to the real designs of the Court, to produce the expulsion of

James from the throne, and the establishment of the Protestant succession.

Nothing, however, could deter James from his course. The proceedings against the Bishop were followed by others, of the most arbitrary nature. Massey, a Papist, was actually placed in the deanery of Christ Church; and another was attempted to be forced upon the Charter House. In the case of Massey, the King dispensed with the usual oaths; a circumstance, however, which was not known till the publication of "Gutch's *Collectanea Curiosa*," in the last century, where the dispensation may be seen.* "No one," observes Mr. Hallam, "was fully aware till the publication of this instrument, of the degree in which the King had trampled upon the securities of the Established Church."† I must here remark that the publication of this document is a providential circumstance, and I mention it, in order that I may direct the public attention to the iniquitous proceedings of the Papists in this reign. We may derive a useful lesson from every new discovery of this sort: it ought to teach us caution, in confiding in men whose principles lead them to act in a manner so inconsistent with the precepts of the Bible.

Papists were promoted to all offices of trust,

* Vol. i. 287.

† Hallam, iii. 89.

while Protestants were dismissed. The Nuncio from the Pope was publicly received; Jesuits and Priests appeared in the streets in their religious habits according to their orders; and funerals were celebrated with exactly the same ceremonies as in Popish countries. Romish Bishops were consecrated in the Chapel Royal and the priests at Whitehall, told the Protestants that they hoped soon to walk in procession through Cheapside. These things were very distressing to the people, who in some instances insulted the processions in the streets.

Still something more remained to be accomplished before the establishment of Popery; and the next step was that declaration of indulgence which proved so fatal to King James. Charles had attempted the same thing, and with the same purpose in view, and failed. James was not deterred by the want of success on the part of his brother. The Parliament had condemned the exercise of the dispensing power. It was pretended that the measure was intended for the relief of the Non-conformists; but the real object was to open the door for the admission of Papists into offices, civil, military, and even ecclesiastical. By suspending the operation of the laws, Papists could be promoted to any place of trust, without being subjected to any test or

oath. It was intended that they should be the chief gainers by this measure, though the Non-conformists were persuaded that their ease was principally consulted.

As soon as the King's intentions were promulgated, and even before the declaration was issued, the Papists openly exercised their religion in London and elsewhere. Jesuit seminaries were established in all the chief towns; and though the Church of England existed in name, her doom, in the estimation of the Papists, was sealed, and her days numbered. At this time, many ecclesiastical preferments were held by Papists; and after the ordination of the Romish prelates in the Royal Chapel, the writings of the party were printed and circulated by the King's printer. St. Paul's Cathedral was now in a progressive state, the building having been commenced by Sir Christopher Wren, some time subsequent to the fire of 1666, when the old church was destroyed. The work was carried on with greater vigour than ever, in the expectation that the Cathedral would be ready for Popish worship, on the re-establishment of the Romish Church.* Shoals of Jesuits and priests arrived

* James attempted to force a Papist into the see of York, but the Chapter, so far from complying with the *conge d'elire*, elected Lamplugh, Bishop of Exeter, in direct opposition to it.—See *Comber's Life*, p. 266-267.

from the Continent to assist in the work of converting England from her heresy.

During these proceedings the King assembled an army, and that it was his intention to use force, if necessary, in imposing Popery upon the nation, can scarcely be doubted. The Jesuits reminded him of the advances made by the French King in converting his Protestant subjects by means of the military power. At their suggestion the army was assembled and encamped on Hounslow Heath, where mass was daily said in public. A curious letter from one Jesuit to another was discovered, giving an account of the state of religion in England at this time.* The Jesuit tells his brother of one of their order, who, on his coming to England, was immediately ushered into the royal presence, while Lords and Dukes waited some hours for admission. When the Jesuit told the King that he had fifty candidates for orders, his Majesty replied that double or treble that number would be required to accomplish his designs. He also mentions the case of another Jesuit, who, on his introduction to the royal presence, kneeling down, was ordered by his Majesty to rise. The King remarked that the Jesuit had once kissed

* Echard, iii. 811.

his hand, but that, had he been aware that the individual was a priest, the follower of Ignatius himself should have been honoured with the royal kiss. To this man James declared that he would either convert England, or die a martyr. On this principle he acted, and though he did not die a martyr, he lost his crown.

Under the operation of the first declaration of indulgence the measures of the Court appeared successful. Means were also adopted to widen the breach between the Church and the Non-conformists; nor were there wanting hireling writers to prostitute their talents to this unrighteous design. The notorious Henry Care was employed to revile the Church, while the Dissenters were caressed.* The end purposed by the declaration was answered, and converts were daily made from Protestantism to Popery. As it was a profitable step to embrace the royal creed, so it speedily became a fashionable one among the ignorant and unprincipled, who, though denominated Protestants, had their faith

* Henry Care was the author of 'The Packet from Rome,' written during the late reign to expose the conduct of the Popish party, and especially of James himself, then Duke of York. He was the Trumpeter of the Exclusionists: yet he was now gained over by bribery to praise the royal declaration, and to vilify those who opposed it.

to choose, and were not averse to select a profession which was likely to be attended with so many advantages.

There are at all times vast numbers of individuals who, if Popery were the dominant system of worship, would be ready to conform to its practices. At the present moment there are many nominal Protestants who are perfectly indifferent on the subject, and who assert that one creed is as good as another. Now, in the event of the ascendancy of Popery, all these persons would be ready to comply with its requirements; especially, too, as it is a system so congenial to man's fallen nature. We frequently hear of marriages, in which one of the parties is nominally a Protestant. I must, however, contend that such Protestants are unworthy of the sacred name which they bear, and which would doubtless be readily cast aside in the event of the introduction of Popery.

Among the various methods resorted to for introducing Popery was that of the public press. Tracts, and pamphlets, and treatises, were constantly issuing forth under the auspices of the Jesuits and priests. The great printer of such publications was Henry Hills, who was also the printer to his Majesty and his household, as may be seen from the titles of

the productions of his press. It may be asked what is meant by his Majesty's household? It is clear that the Jesuits were intended. A Jesuit was his confessor, and Jesuits swarmed in the palace; and these men kept Hills's press fully employed against the Protestants. Hills himself was an apostate from Protestantism to Popery. The Jesuits had seen the success attendant on the labours of Protestants by means of the press, and they resolved to turn the same engine against their opponents. Popery, however, cannot endure the test of examination. The attempt was a failure:—nay, it was injurious to their cause, for it called forth the Protestant champions, and summoned them again to the battle. Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Tenison, Wake, Sherlock, and others, were ready at their posts. The efforts of the Jesuits completely failed, while those of the Protestant party were eminently successful.

But again the genuine spirit and the true nature of Popery were displayed. To prevent the clergy from publishing against the Church of Rome, a proclamation was issued prohibiting the circulation of all unlicensed books. The Church of Rome disdains any thing approaching to candour or fairness in her proceedings. The Papists, knowing that they cannot convince by ar-

guments, never hesitate to resort to violent means to shut the mouths of their opponents. In the present day they talk of liberty and a free press, but these are pretences only, for Popery is essentially opposed to free discussion. It has ever been their practice to put down heresy, not by the force of argument, but by the fire and the sword.

Intoxicated with his previous success, James issued a second declaration of indulgence in the beginning of the year 1688. Hitherto the clergy had calmly and quietly set themselves against the dispensing power: and now, in order to punish them for their opposition, they were commanded to read the declaration in their churches. The Bishops were ordered to forward copies to their clergy, and to enforce the command of the Court. It was intended to make them accessory to their own ruin; for, whether they read it or refused, it was supposed that their destruction was certain—for a refusal would expose them to the anger of the King, while the reading of the document would promote the general design for the introduction of Popery. Father Petre, in allusion to the reading of the Declaration, said, "that it was intended to make the clergy eat their own dung." The great majority of the clergy refused to comply with the obnoxious or-

dinance. It proved, too, a most unwise step on the part of the King, for it paved the way for his ultimate ruin. As, however, the proceedings consequent upon the attempt to compel the clergy to act in opposition to their consciences, were of so momentous a nature, I shall enter upon them more fully in the succeeding chapter.*

* Among other evidences of James's ultimate views respecting the establishment of Popery, may be mentioned the alteration in the plan of St. Paul's Church, in consequence of his interference. The side oratories were added at the command of the King, and in opposition to the remonstrances of Sir Christopher Wren, for the purpose of rendering it more convenient for Popish worship. That James contemplated the restoration of Popery is admitted by himself in his *Memoirs*, and that he expected to be able to accomplish his project is certain. In connexion with the alteration in the plan of St. Paul's, I will mention another circumstance, which strikes me as being strongly corroborative of the truth of the above statements respecting the King's intentions. In the year 1687 James presented a very splendid service of communion plate to the chapel of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea. There are two massive candlesticks, with wax candles, for the altar: and from a careful examination of them, as well as of the flagons, I am convinced that the King was contemplating the introduction of Popish worship, when the plate would have been considered a valuable gift to the Church. I rejoice to think that the royal intentions were never accomplished, and that the communion plate presented at such a season has been used in the celebration of divine worship according to the rites of the Church of England. The fact, however, in my opinion, deserves notice, as furnishing a sort of collateral evidence of the royal wishes and intentions respecting the introduction of Popery.

CHAP. IX.

Declaration resisted by the Clergy—The conduct of the Non-conformists at this period—Also of Dissenters in the present day—Opposition of the Bishops—The Prince of Orange invited over—The Flight of King James—His intentions—His conduct in Ireland.

THE narrative was brought down, in the preceding chapter, to the year 1687, when James ventured to command the clergy to become instrumental in circulating the royal declaration. Had the scheme been quietly acquiesced in, as James imagined it would have been, nothing could have saved the country from Popish domination: happily and providentially an unexpected resistance was encountered by the royal and papal actors in this iniquitous affair. The opposition arose from the Church of England, and from the Bishops of that Church. Sancroft assembled as many of the Bishops as were then in London, to devise such measures as the present alarming state of affairs rendered necessary. They resolved, in the first place, not to sanction the declaration, and therefore refused to forward it to their clergy; and, in the second, to petition his Majesty on the illegality of the proceeding. It should be remarked that these prelates were,

and long had been, in favour of repealing the laws against the Non-conformists ; but they were strenuous in retaining those which had been framed against the Papists : and they wished, that whatever was necessary to be done in favour of the former, should be effected in a legal manner in Parliament. In consequence of the decided conduct of the prelates, the declaration was read only in four churches in London and Westminster. Some few of the Bishops did indeed circulate the document, leaving it to the clergy to act as they pleased, and a small number requested them to publish it. Still the declaration was read but in very few pulpits : of the 1200 parishes in the diocese of Norwich it was read only in three or four. This was the first act of direct opposition to the Court—the first act of the drama, of which the last was the Revolution. The opposition was almost general in the Church, and completely puzzled the Papists, who were not prepared for such a steady and determined resistance. It was in this way that Popery was opposed at a moment of imminent peril. The pages of history may be consulted for examples of successful opposition to the aggressions of the Popish system ; and we ought to revere the memory of those worthies who were so instrumental in averting the danger

which had so long threatened our Church and nation.

It is however necessary to examine the conduct of some of the Non-conformists on this occasion. I enter upon this part of my task with pain, lest it should be supposed that I wish to reflect on the memories of men, for whose characters in general I entertain the highest veneration; but the truth must be told. Had the Church followed the example of the Non-conformists, the efforts of the Court would have been crowned with success. It is a fact that the measures of the Court were supported by many of that body. This is admitted by their own party. Mr. Hallam, who is never disposed to be unjust towards them, observes, "The Dissenters have been a little ashamed of their compliance with the declaration and of their silence in the Popish controversy."* It is clear that, had the declaration been unopposed, there had been no Revolution, and that it was not opposed by the Dissenters is equally clear. It is not therefore unreasonable to attribute our safety and our deliverance from Popish tyranny to the Church of England; nor is it uncharitable to assert that, the Dissenters in the part they took, adopted the very means, which were calculated

* Hallam, iii. 101.

to rivet the chains of Popery upon the whole nation. Numerous addresses were presented from various bodies of Non-conformists, thanking his Majesty for the declaration; and in some of these the Papists are styled "our brethren, the Roman Catholics." Mr. Alsop went so far in an address, which he penned for the Presbyterians, as to wish James success in "his great councils and affairs."* Calamy attempts to palliate, not to justify Alsop's conduct; he adds indeed that "he would gladly throw a veil over it."† Many of the addresses were filled with the most flattering declarations. It is necessary to allude to this subject, because, in the reigns of Queen Anne and George I. these very men, charged the Churchmen of that period with Popery, in consequence of their disapproval of some of the measures of the Court, forgetting their own subserviency at the Revolution, when, had not the Church aroused herself, Popery must have prevailed. Some of the more eminent Dissenters, as Baxter and others, disapproved of the indulgence on the ground of its illegality; but none of them acted in opposition to the Court. The sole opposition which the King experienced proceeded from the Bishops

* *Biographia Britannica*, Art. Alsop.

† Calamy's Abridgment, vol. ii. 488.

and clergy; the Non-conformists on the other hand were quiescent; they recovered indeed from their fall, for such it surely was, but not until they perceived, that the opposition commenced by the Church was likely to be successful.*

It is remarkable too that the Non-conformists were silent on the Popish controversy, while the clergy were using the pulpit and the press with the greatest effect. During the reign of James II. and the latter part of that of his brother, two hundred and thirty distinct works were published against Popery by members of the Church of England.† These were not mere tracts, but works of considerable size. Even the lists of the titles form pamphlets of no small bulk. During the same period two works only proceeded from the pens of Non-conformists,

* Some few of the clergy at the instigation of two or three bishops in the interest of the Court did address his Majesty; but their addresses were very cold, and as Mr. Hallam observes, "disclose their ill-humour at the unconstitutional indulgence."—*Hallam*, iii. 100.

† Lists of these works were published by Wake, Gee, and Peck. See Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, 127. Bishop Gibson collected a portion of them, and published them in three volumes, folio, with this title, "A Preservative against Popery." Gibson has arranged them under their proper subjects, and has added a valuable index.

who were most unaccountably silent at this critical moment. These writings were instrumental in the deliverance of the nation : yet the Dissenters of that day, when the danger was imminent, were unconcerned spectators of the struggle between the Church and the Papists. It is admitted that the Dissenters concurred with the Revolution when it actually took place ; but it must in justice be stated that they contributed nothing by their efforts towards its accomplishment. The men who first dared to oppose the illegal proceedings of the monarch, were bishops ; and by their efforts, seconded by those of the clergy and the members of the Church of England generally, was that glorious event brought about.*

No one, as far as I know, has ventured a justification of the Non-conformists in their silence at this eventful period.† Calamy offered

* Burnet says of the clergy who wrote the works alluded to in the text, " They examined all the points of Popery with a solidity of judgment, a clearness of arguing, a depth of learning, and a veracity of writing, far beyond any that had before that time appeared in our language."—Vol. iii. 79.

† Burnet, who was very moderate in his views, says of their conduct, " They had left the Church of England because of some forms in it that they thought looked too like the Church of Rome. They needed not to be told, that all the favour expected from Popery, was once to bring it in, under the colour of a general toleration, till it should be strong

an apology, but it is a very weak one. "And if, (says he,) they did not now preach so much against Popery as the Churchmen, they may the more easily be excused, because their people did not so much need it. They had little reason to fear that any of their persuasion would be perverted. And the truth of it is, though I have not the least word to say, to the lessening that glorious defence of the Protestant cause that was at this time made by the writings of the divines of the Church party, yet the Dissenters may be well allowed to have taken no small pleasure in seeing those gentlemen baffle the Papists, and in such a case to have offered to take the work out of their hands had been over-officious, and an indecent intermeddling."* It is painful to transcribe such language from so respectable an author as Calamy; but when many writers refer the Revolution to the acts of the enough to set on a general persecution; and therefore as they could not engage themselves to support such an arbitrary prerogative, as was now made use of, so neither should they go into any engagements for Popery. Yet they resolved to leave the points of controversy alone, and leave them to the management of the clergy."—Vol. iii. 121.

* Calamy's *Life of Howe*, 138-9. The Dissenters, to adopt the language of an eloquent writer, "stood aloof from the struggle, and left the clergy to maintain the Protestant cause from the pulpit and the press. The clergy were equal to this duty."—*Southey's Book of the Church*, p. 545.

Dissenters, it is necessary to shew what their conduct really was, and that the event was brought about by the instrumentality of the Church. The vigilance of the clergy was remarkable; scarcely a week elapsed without producing one or more works on Popery. When Popish pamphlets were in the press, they procured copies of the sheets from the workmen, as they were struck off, and thus when the work appeared, an answer was frequently ready to appear with it; so that the antidote was circulated as soon as the poison.* It would have been well if the Non-conformists, many of whom were well qualified for the task, had pursued the same course. Neal assigns some reasons for their silence, some of which may be admitted to possess force, while others are as weak as those of Calamy. He states that they had little time to study, and were not so well prepared with arguments as the clergy who lived in ease and retirement.† Yet on inquiry it will be found, that the men, who wrote most in this controversy, were men who neither lived in ease nor retirement—men with large parishes or in important stations, which required their whole time and their undivided attention. He then remarks

* Neal's Puritans, vol. v. 13. ed. 1822.

† Neal, *ibid.*

that they were not so much concerned as the Church party, as they had nothing to lose. This is a most marvellous assertion. Neal admits that the King's design was to introduce Popery. Surely then the Non-conformists had their liberty to lose—for no one can imagine that that would have been secured any longer than the period of the establishment of the Papacy in England.* Burnet very justly remarks, "it were great injustice to charge all the Dissenters with the impertinencies that have appeared in many addresses of late, or to take our measures of them, from the impudent strains of an *Alsop* or a *Care*, or from the more important and now more visible steps that some among them of a higher form are every day making." †

* See also for a similar apology Burnet's Memorial of the Reformation, p. 324 ; also Defence of Memorial, p. 165.

† Burnet's Eighteen Papers, p. 85. These were written at the period when the Declaration for Indulgence was issued. I cannot forbear to quote another passage from the same papers, because Burnet has never been accused of illiberal conduct towards Dissenters. "To hear Papists declare against persecution, and Jesuits cry up liberty of conscience, are, we confess, unusual things. But it seems very strange to us, that some, who, if they are to be believed, are strict to the severest forms and subdivisions of the reformed religion, and who some years ago were jealous of the smallest steps that the Court made, when the danger was more remote, and who cried out *Popery* and *persecution*, when the design was so

I have another motive for entering upon this subject in the present little work. It is this:—The present conduct of a large majority of Dissenters. It strikes me, and will, I think, strike my readers, that the Dissenters, so far from opposing Popery at present, are really contributing by their actions towards spreading it among their countrymen. They will not oppose it from the pulpit nor from the press. Prior to the Revolution the Non-conformists sat still: the Dissenters are doing worse; for, to gain a political object—a purely political object—they will unite with the Papists, and support those men, who entertain notions on religious subjects bordering, to say the least of them, very closely on infidelity. We have an awful instance of the

masked that some well-meaning men could not miss being deceived by the promises that were made, and the disguises that were put on; that I say, these persons who were formerly so distrustful, should now, when the mask is laid aside, and the design is avowed, of a sudden grow to be so believing, as to throw off all disgust, and be so gulled as to betray all; and to expose us to the rage of those, who must needs give some good words till they have gone the round, and tried how effectually they can divide and deceive us, that so they may destroy us the more easily. This is indeed somewhat extraordinary. They are not so ignorant as not to know that Popery cannot change its nature and that cruelty and breach of faith to heretics are as necessary parts of that religion, as Transubstantiation and the Pope's Supremacy are."—Ibid. 84.

spirit that now animates even respectable Dissenters in the conduct of Dr. Pye Smith, in his apology for voting in favour of Mr. Joseph Hume. How few again will act in opposition to Popery in any way! Protestants, on the contrary, are called upon by Dissenters to leave the Papists alone? To what is this indifference to be attributed? Doubtless to the deteriorating influence of modern liberalism. The Dissenters of the last century would be horror-struck at such proceedings. In their estimation Popery was a deadly evil; and so far from joining for any purpose with its advocates, they contended that it was their duty to oppose it with all their might. I have expressed my readiness to excuse the Non-conformists for the part they took prior to the Revolution; but no possible excuse can be pleaded for Dissenters in the present day in combining with Papists for political purposes. Their conduct must be contemplated with deep sorrow by the sincere Protestant. I shall again allude to it in a future page.

To return to the proceedings of the Popish party in the Court. They expected to gain the assistance of the Dissenters; nor were they disappointed. The Declaration was artfully framed. "The Non-conformists," says Burnet, "are

now invited to set an example to the rest : and they who have valued themselves hitherto upon their opposition to Popery, and that have quarrelled with the Church of England, for some small approaches to it in a few ceremonies, are now solicited to rejoice, because the laws that secure us against it are all plucked up—it is visible that those who allow them this favour, do it with no other design, but that under a pretence of a general toleration, they may introduce a religion which must persecute all equally.”* Again he observes, “The Dissenters, for a little present ease, to be enjoyed at mercy, must concur to break down all our hedges, and to lay us open to that devouring power, before which nothing can stand that will not worship it.”*

The Bishops were determined to persevere in the course which duty marked out to them. James so far resented their conduct that he committed them to the Tower. This act, however, strengthened the cause of the Church, and inflicted a blow on Popery from which it did not recover. It opened the eyes of the people to the King's real designs against their religion and liberties. When the King levelled this

* Burnet's Reflections on his Majesty's Declaration.

blow at Sancroft and his brethren, he sealed his own ruin. How much are we indebted to those prelates for our present privileges! Whenever they appeared in public, after they were admitted to bail, they were hailed by the populace as the deliverers of the country, who surrounded them in crowds to supplicate their blessing. Clarendon tells us in his Diary, June 15th, that he found the Bishop of St. Asaph in the midst of a crowd, who deemed it a blessing to be permitted to kiss the hands of the imprisoned prelates. The congratulations of all classes were poured in upon them, even those of the Scottish Presbyterians.* Their acquittal was hailed by the country as a pledge of the preservation of those liberties in defence of which the prelates had provoked the wrath of the Sovereign: it was a circumstance that exercised a very material influence on the subsequent affairs of the nation; and the whole transaction must be viewed as one of the most impolitic of James's measures. Their conduct is deserving of imitation in seasons of difficulty and danger; and I trust that the bishops and clergy of our Church will be ever equally faithful to their sacred trusts. We may also learn

* See a letter in Doyley's Life of Sancroft, i. 313.

from the preceding facts an important lesson for the present. The pulpit and the press were eminently successful in awakening the nation to a sense of its danger: why should not the same means be equally efficacious in arousing the people to see the aggressions and encroachments of Popery at the present moment! Had the pulpit been silent and the press inactive, the complete subjugation of the country must have been the consequences. With the pulpits of the land loudly proclaiming the unscriptural and dangerous tenets of Popery, Protestantism is safe; but if the ministers of the Church should ever become lukewarm in the cause, or indifferent to the spread of Popish principles, it will be easy to predict what must speedily ensue.

James had issued his declaration of indulgence to win the Dissenters to his side, or at all events to induce them to remain neutral in the approaching contest. Nor was he disappointed in his expectations, since, as I have noticed, he experienced no opposition from that quarter. All his acts tended to the advancement of Popery. The clergy were convinced of the tendency of his measures, and like faithful watchmen sounded the alarm. Still the infatuated Monarch persisted in his course, until the Prince of Orange was actually in the country to defend

the religion and the liberties of the people. It is not necessary to give even an outline of the Prince's proceedings in our deliverance; as my object is simply to narrate the particulars connected with the state of Popery. He was invited over as a last resource by many of the Protestant nobility and gentry, who saw no other means of rescuing themselves from arbitrary power. It was a providential circumstance that there should have been at such a period of danger, a man, in so near a relation to the British Crown, to step forward in defence of all that Englishmen hold dear. James endeavoured to retrace his steps when his danger became evident; but it was too late: he had lost the confidence of his people, and no dependence could be placed on promises made in adversity, when even former engagements, solemnly ratified, had been set at defiance. In his distress, however, he summoned into his presence the very prelates whom he had imprisoned, whose advice, had it been followed in time, would have saved him his crown. He did indeed follow their advice, and revoked his former proceedings. These measures would, at an earlier period, have rallied his subjects around him, and restored him to their affections; but in his blind zeal for Popery he hurried forward in his headlong career, until

the period had arrived when concessions were unavailing. The Prince issued a declaration prior to his expedition, which was circulated in England, and in which he stated, that he was invited over to rescue the people from Popish domination, and to preserve the Church of England. This was one of the most critical periods in our history since the defeat of the Spanish Armada; and it is remarkable that the latter event occurred exactly one hundred years before the Revolution. It was in 1588 that England was delivered from a Popish invasion, under Elizabeth: it was in 1688 that England was delivered from dangers equally imminent by William, Prince of Orange, subsequently King William III. Both years were years of wonders: to both ought Englishmen constantly to revert. If we forget our mercies God may justly leave us a prey to our adversaries. It behoves the ministers of the Church and the prelates of the Church to contemplate the conduct of their predecessors at a moment of danger, and to dwell upon the signal deliverance brought about by their instrumentality. May the bishops and clergy be faithful to their charge as good stewards in their master's house!

James, as is well known, quitted his throne when he discovered that he could not introduce

Popery, thus verifying the truth of his assertions, that he would restore the Roman Catholic religion, or die a martyr in the attempt. William and Mary were speedily called to fill the vacant throne. Had James remained in the country, he would not have been dethroned; such an idea had never crossed the minds of any of his subjects. All they wished was the security of their religion, and the preservation of their liberties. He would indeed have been confined within the boundaries of the laws, but he would have preserved his crown, had he not deserted the government. What, however, were his designs? He expected to recover his crown by force, with the assistance of France, and perhaps of some other Popish sovereigns, and then to introduce Popery, and trample upon the rights of his people. That such were his intentions is evident from his subsequent acts; and his whole conduct proved that England could never have been safe under a Popish prince. Such a hold had his Jesuitical advisers obtained over the monarch, that they easily persuaded him to abandon the government for a time rather than submit to be bound down by laws, which would have restrained him from any future attempts at the introduction of the Papacy.

That it was James's determination to re-

establish Popery at any risk, and that even his misfortunes had not caused his opinions to undergo any change, nor shaken his former resolutions, is also evident from his subsequent conduct in Ireland. It is a providential circumstance that James was permitted to make an attempt in Ireland after his desertion of his throne, because it proves that he remained unchanged in his views and principles, and that not even adversity could teach him wisdom, so firmly had his false principles been rooted in his nature. I will now refer my readers to King James's proceedings in Ireland, for the purpose of showing that Protestantism can never be safe when supreme power is possessed by Papists. It is one of the principles of the Church of Rome that all must submit to her authority, and when her members possess the power, they deem it to be their duty to exercise it in subjugating all others to her domination.

James landed in Ireland in the year 1689, and during his continuance in that country the Protestants were subjected to the most violent oppressions and the grossest outrage. It might have been supposed that James would have grown wiser by experience, and that as he had lost England by endeavouring to thrust Popery upon his subjects, so he would proceed with

extreme caution in Ireland, and, at all events, preserve the liberties of his Protestant subjects. He had also published his declaration of indulgence in Ireland, in which he affects to speak as the decided advocate of toleration; and with this declaration staring him in the face, it might have been expected that he would have endeavoured to preserve his consistency by guarding the liberties of the Irish Protestants. His Popish principles, however, appeared in their true colours in Ireland. The mask was thrown aside, and the circumstance is valuable as an illustration of the nature of Popery. Though he had professed such regard for liberty of conscience in England, at a time when he hoped to succeed in his schemes by policy, yet in Ireland, when it was found that the people of England were not to be seduced by specious appearances and fair promises, and when he had resolved to recover his throne and to set up his religion by force of arms, liberty of conscience was denied, and he appeared in his real character, that of a Popish bigot, who, true to the principles of his Church, would keep no faith with heretics, but who would use all possible means to suppress them. From the commencement of his reign his acts in Ireland had been one continued series of attacks on the civil

and religious privileges of his Protestant subjects. His whole conduct demonstrated that every Popish prince, if sincere in his creed, feels it to be his duty to subdue his Protestant subjects; for every act of his government in Ireland tended to this end.

On arriving in that country he summoned a Parliament, and care was taken that both houses should be composed of Papists; and these men were to legislate for Protestants. Their measures were just such as might have been expected—such as were in strict accordance with the principles from which they emanated. In short, they were such as Papists, whenever invested with authority, must, from the nature of their principles, adopt towards Protestants—such as would again be practised in Ireland, if the sword of authority should ever be wielded by the Popish faction. The liberties of Protestants can never be safe under the ascendancy of the Church of Rome. As in England, he had commenced his attacks upon Protestantism by invading the rights of the universities, so in Ireland, the members of Trinity College, Dublin, were expelled, and a Popish Provost was appointed. Several Bishoprics became vacant by death during his stay in the country, but instead of nominating Protestants, he pursued the course

which he had adopted in England, by seizing upon their revenues, and appropriating them to the support of Popish Bishops in defiance of the laws of the land. It was not his intention to appoint any more Protestants to the vacant sees. Though the laws protected the Protestant Church, and remained unrepealed, yet the priests declared that the tithes belonged to them, and prohibited their people from paying any to the Protestant clergy. So tyrannical, indeed, had been the government of James in Ireland, that for two years even before the Revolution, the same practices had been resorted to by the priests and connived at by the state, and the clergy had been deprived of their legal income; but now when the Popish Parliament was assembled, an act was immediately passed taking away from the clergy all tithes payable by Papists, and awarding them to the support of the priests. The latter were allowed to recover them by an action at common law, yet the Protestant clergy were denied this privilege in those cases where tithes were still allowed to be paid to them, and they were told that no injury was sustained by them as they could still resort to the old means of recovery through the Ecclesiastical Courts. This was most insulting as well as cruel, since the power of the

Ecclesiastical Courts was completely paralyzed. Thus by this Popish Parliament the Protestant clergy could not receive tithes paid by Papists, but the Popish priests were permitted to receive them from Protestants. The Protestant clergyman could not even demand the payment of tithes from a Papist. Hence no clergyman had any means of support until the battle of the Boyne demolished the government of King James, and made way for the establishment of that of King William and Queen Mary.*

While occupied in writing the preceding paragraph, the conduct of the Papists in Ireland, on the question of tithes was strongly forced on my notice. A striking resemblance is discernible in the proceedings of the Papists at the two periods. In the present day the Popish priests command their people not to pay tithe, and numbers of Protestant clergymen have in consequence been placed in a state of starvation. The very same measures that were adopted by Papists in Ireland under King James were resorted to under the late King William, and are still practised under her present Majesty; and it is clear to demonstration that Popery in Ireland

* See Archbishop King's State of Ireland under King James.

is exactly what it was prior to the Revolution, and that if it possessed the power, it would still exercise the same tyranny over English and Irish Protestants.

The same parliament also passed another Act to render the Popish bishops and priests capable of holding bishoprics and benefices. Many Protestant churches were accordingly seized, though the Act did not award them to the Papists, and used for the celebration of Popish worship. But just as this Act was carried, the forces of Schomberg landed in the country, and prevented the Papists from carrying their intentions generally into operation. However, though their circumstances did not permit them to occupy all the churches, yet they stirred up the rabble to break in and deface them, destroying the windows, the pulpits, the communion tables, and their furniture. It was soon perceived, however, by James, that the seizing of the churches by the Papists was a violation of his promise for liberty of conscience, and a free toleration; and he began to imagine that it might have some influence in England and Scotland in alienating the affections of those Protestants, who might be disposed to depend upon his word; he, therefore, issued a proclamation, in which he acknowledges that the

seizure was a violation of the act for liberty of conscience, which also had been passed by his Irish parliament, and prohibits the Papists from taking possession of any more churches, though he does not command the restitution of those which they already occupied. Even in this business the genius of Popery was displayed; for the Papists were made acquainted with the proclamation before it was issued, and thus took the precaution to seize upon as many of the parochial churches as possible during the interval. The act for liberty of conscience had previously been pleaded by the Protestants to the King as being violated by the seizure of their churches; when his Majesty replied that they were seized during his absence, and without his consent; but that still his obligations to his Catholic subjects were so great, that he could not dispossess them, and that, moreover, they alleged a title to the churches which they had seized.

Such was the treatment which the Protestants of Ireland received from King James, who pretended to be the advocate of liberty of conscience. Popery is essentially opposed to religious liberty. In that age liberty of conscience was merely used as a cloak to cover over the designs of the Court; and in the present day it is a

moral impossibility for a true Papist, whatever may be his avowed sentiments, to be a sincere friend to religious toleration. He may adopt the sentiment for a season, and for a particular purpose ; but it cannot be the genuine feeling of his soul, because it is opposed to the very genius of Popery. In June, 1690, the Protestants of Ireland were prohibited from attending divine worship in the churches ; accordingly, all their assemblies were closed ; and it was intimated that in the event of victory crowning the efforts of James, they would no more be opened for Protestant worship. It was wisely ordered by Providence that the Papists, after all King James's professions in England, should have an opportunity of discovering their real sentiments, and thereby of undeceiving those Englishmen who might hitherto have been too ready to trust to the promises of the King. The churches and places of assembly were closed during the space of a fortnight, when it pleased God to open them, and to deliver the Protestants from their danger, by the glorious victory at the Boyne, a victory that banished James from the country. To this victory were the Protestants of Ireland indebted for the restoration of their churches and of the public worship of Almighty God. These facts certainly de-

monstrate an intention on King James's part to suppress Protestantism. They certainly prove, taken in connection with the proceedings in England, from the period of James's accession to the Revolution, that Protestants could never be safe, either in their liberties or their persons, under the ascendancy of Popery.

CHAP. X.

Gratitude of the people at the Revolution—The Protestant Succession—Papists excluded from power—Their intrigues and plots—Non-jurors—The preservation of William's life—Queen Anne—State of Popery in her reign—George I.—Designs of the Papists—Rebellion 1715—Do. 1745—George III.—Attempts to carry the Emancipation Bill—The Bill passes—Consequences.

THE Revolution was a most unexpected event. Even those who united in calling over the Prince of Orange had no intention of expelling James from the throne: all they required was the security of their civil and religious privileges. It was James's bigotry that lost him his crown; for he preferred leaving the country, and the hope of regaining his authority by force, to remaining and governing constitutionally. He would rather lose his kingdom than reign over a nation of Protestants. In his opinion everything was to be sacrificed rather than the loss of a supposed opportunity of establishing Popery. That his misfortunes did not produce any salutary effects in leading him to view Protestants with favour, is evident from his proceedings in Ireland, detailed in the preceding chapter. The country was amazed at the deliverance that had been so

signally wrought out for them. Their first act was an act of praise and thanksgiving to that Gracious Being, who had so manifestly interposed in their favour in rescuing them from the thralldom of the Papacy. A day of thanksgiving was appointed, and prayers were composed by the authority of the Church for the solemn occasion. A very few extracts will shew how strong were the feelings of gratitude by which our ancestors were influenced at this period. "We give glory to thy holy name, for the blessed reformation of this Church, in the days of our forefathers, from the detestable superstitions and corruptions of Popery, and for our deliverance from the intolerable load of the Romish Church." Again, "It was because thy compassions failed not, that our holy reformed religion was not overwhelmed with Popish superstition and idolatry." From this language it is evident that our ancestors were fully convinced that Popery was destructive to their civil and religious privileges; and had they not entertained an abhorrence of its principles and a dread of its practices the resistance to James would never have been contemplated.

Another step taken at this important period related to the security of their privileges for the future. Having discovered the designs of James,

and being fully aware that, under a Popish Prince, and with Popish legislators, no safety could be enjoyed, our ancestors naturally thought of devising means to prevent the recurrence of the same dangers. Two measures appeared necessary—the one to prevent the possibility of a Papist from succeeding to the throne; the other to exclude Papists from all offices of power and trust. The succession of the crown was fixed in a new line, and by the law of the land no Papist could possess it. This was a necessary step. The people had seen that their liberties would not be safe under a Popish sovereign; and it was a duty which they owed to posterity to prevent the recurrence of the danger from which they had escaped. The courtiers and flatterers of James quitted the kingdom with their master, intending to return by force, in the event of aid being procured from France. And as all Papists were naturally inclined to support the cause of the abdicated monarch, they could not with safety be entrusted with political power.

The practices of the Papists during William's reign were confined to intrigues with King James, and to plots against the life of our deliverer. The nature of Popery may be read in James's proceedings. His object was to return by force,

to enslave the people, and to overturn the Church, that the way for the establishment of the Papacy might be open. His views underwent no change in consequence of his misfortunes: it was his full determination to impose the yoke of Romish tyranny on Englishmen. His advisers, who were English Papists, concurred in the same views; and both the King and his ministers would, if Providence had not frustrated their attempts, have sacrificed our Protestant privileges, without any remorse, or any regard to the feelings of the people. Of the truth of these remarks there can be no doubt: every act of James's life, from his departure from the country to his death, demonstrates that he would not keep faith with his heretical subjects. His actions previous to his abdication could not be misconstrued: it was his intention to nominate Papists to vacant sees—to fill all public schools with Papists; and then, having made his preparations, to procure a Parliament subservient to his own views, and to re-erect the edifice of Popery that had been cast down by Elizabeth. Nor was his conduct changed subsequent to the Revolution: every attempt to regain his crown was made in conjunction with Papists, while every act of his life proceeded from principles which were at variance with the views of Protestants, and destructive of their privileges.

Under such circumstances the people of England were compelled to arouse themselves, unless they were prepared tamely to submit to the sacrifice of their rights and liberties. Nor could they any longer place confidence in Papists, who had conspired with James to overturn the Constitution in Church and State. For several years prior to the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill in 1829, a great outcry was raised by the advocates of that measure against the injustice of depriving our fellow-subjects of their rights on account of their religious creed; but was it not as unjust to deprive King James of his crown? Yet the most strenuous emancipationists will scarcely be ready to assert that the steps taken at the Revolution were unnecessary, or that there was no danger at that time to be apprehended from the Popish party, and from Popish principles. The exclusion of the Sovereign was absolutely necessary—nor was that of all Papists from offices of trust a whit less so. Our ancestors merely acted on the great principle of self-preservation, and not from a motive of revenge.

As long as King William lived the Papists were engaged in continual plots against his life. It is unnecessary to specify them in this work: they are described in all the histories of the pe-

riod. It was supposed that William was a tower of strength against the Popish party, and therefore to cut him off would have been deemed a meritorious act by thorough-going Papists. Accordingly we find that conspiracies were planned, and treasons devised, until the King was laid in the silent tomb. These proceedings were quite in character with Popery, and in strict accordance with its principles. As long as James lived the English Popish exiles formed around him a kind of Court, and with them the Papists in England maintained a secret correspondence; but the Government being exceedingly active, the plots were always discovered before they were ripe for execution. James, however, did not rely only on the conspiracies against the life of William: he intended to invade England, with the aid of France; but these attempts were in every case happily and providentially frustrated. The disposition of William was tolerant; and though he concurred with his Parliament in excluding Papists from office, yet he never treated them with severity. Though they plotted against his government, they were not harassed with new penal enactments. While they remained quiet they were unmolested, and could complain of nothing except their exclusion from Parliament and from power, which was brought upon them.

by their own conduct in attempting the overthrow of the Protestant Church.

It should be stated that, besides the Papists who adhered to James, there were others, and members of the Church of England too, who refused to take the oaths to King William, and are therefore known in history under the designation of Nonjurors. The Protestant Nonjurors, however, did not plot against the life of William : they were truly conscientious men, who, having taken an oath of fidelity to James, did not feel themselves at liberty to make a transfer of their allegiance to William. The Bishops, who first opposed James, and who were sent to the Tower by that Sovereign, were subsequently Nonjurors; and that they were truly honourable men is evident from the fact, that they sacrificed their preferments to their scruples. Whatever may be our views of their conduct, and however mistaken, in our estimation, were their opinions, yet we must reverence their conscientious scruples. These men were frequently designated Jacobites; but they must not be confounded with those who, under the same designation, were constantly plotting the death of William and the restoration of James. Nor must they be charged with entertaining Popish principles, for they were the very men who first opposed James in his crusadé

against the Church of England. They certainly did not wish to place William on the throne, though they desired the expulsion of James. They were the advocates of a regency, by which William would have conducted the government in the name of his father-in-law. They were, however, outvoted on this question, and the country has had abundant cause for thankfulness that the vote for a regency was not carried, as it would eventually have involved the nation in difficulties from which it might not have been speedily extricated; but still they are not to be denominated Papists, for all their actions give the lie to the insinuation. Their notions respecting kingly power were doubtless very lofty; yet they were determined opponents of Popery. Burnet attributes the rise of the Nonjurors as a party to the circumstance of the King's return to England, after his seizure when attempting to escape to France. He says that, until this event, James had no party except among the Papists; and that, had the King been permitted to depart in the first instance, all would have concurred in the new settlement. This reasoning, in my opinion, is unsound; for the same men would have entertained the same scruples respecting the oath of allegiance. It should be remembered that when William first entered the

country no one thought of placing him on the throne: the universal wish of the nation centered on one point, namely, that James should be compelled to govern constitutionally, and that Protestantism should be preserved.

I mention these topics to shew that the Nonjurors might be, and undoubtedly were consistent Protestants, even though they could not take the oaths to William and Mary. Many of them indeed concurred in the new settlement on the death of James, feeling that they were then released from the obligation of their oaths. It was insinuated at the time, and by some of the Non-conformists too, that the Nonjurors were inclined to Popery. This charge came with a very bad grace from men, who, in the time of James, when Popery was ready to overspread the land, had done nothing to oppose it. The truth is, that some of the Nonjurors were the ablest opponents of Popery, both before and subsequently to the Revolution. Leslie was one of this small party. He had acted against Popery in the time of James, and in the reign of William was one of its ablest antagonists. Nelson, the author of the work on the *Fasts and Festivals of the Church of England*, was another. His circumstances were peculiar and painful, for his wife, a lady of rank and talent,

and to whom he was tenderly attached, became a Roman Catholic, and actually wrote in defence of Popery, while her husband was engaged in defending Protestantism. After the Revolution he lived on the best terms with his brethren who took the oaths, and Tillotson expired in his arms.* However mistaken, therefore, in some of their views, the Nonjurors were not Papists.

The life of William was continued until the year 1702. As long as he lived he was exposed to the secret machinations of the Papists both at home and abroad. His firmness, however, defeated all their attempts; nor can it reasonably be doubted that, to the continuance of his life, we are indebted for the preservation of our Protestant privileges. He was an instrument raised up in an emergency to rescue the country from Popish thralldom; and his life was lengthened out until the government was fully established, and its enemies rendered less able, in consequence of William's victories on the Continent, to effect its overthrow. To the Revolution, and the elevation of William to the throne, the preservation of Protestantism must be attributed. Throughout the proceedings of the late reign, as well as those of the present, there was a manifest interposition of Providence in

* Birch's Life of Tillotson.

our favour. It was seen even in James's bigotry, which was of so strong a cast, that it did not permit him to conceal his designs against the Church of England. Had he proceeded with caution, without attacking the liberties of the people, and contented himself with making proselytes of those, who would have been ready to conform to the religion of the Court, he would gradually have strengthened his own party, and the consequences might have been fatal to the Church. His very zeal was overruled to prove his own ruin and the safety of Protestantism. It would not permit him to cloke his designs, but led him to attempt openly to establish Popery. In such circumstances it was admitted by all, that the interposition of the Prince of Orange was necessary; and that such a man, so nearly connected with the crown, should have existed at such a period of peril, and that his life should have been so long preserved, and his efforts on the Continent against the power of France have been crowned with such success, are circumstances which, even by the most unreflecting, must be deemed providential. Every effort of James was counteracted by William's prudence; while the power of France was curbed by his military talents. Towards the latter end of William's reign, James

indeed promised, if he was restored, to preserve the Church of England; and while some of the Nonjurors were disposed to place confidence in his professions, the larger and sounder portion of the community remembered that his principles had induced him to break former promises, and that their liberties would never be safe, if he were seated on the throne.

The reign of Queen Anne was of a less turbulent nature than the preceding. James was now dead, and consequently many of the Nonjurors no longer hesitated at taking the oaths. The Papists too were quiet, in the hope that the Queen was no friend to the Protestant succession, and that she would endeavour to leave the crown to her brother. The laws were also in force against the Papists, and being excluded from Parliament and from place, their party became gradually weaker. All these circumstances combined to render the reign of Anne, except so far as the divisions between the Whigs and Tories rendered it otherwise, quiet and calm. The plots of the Papists were suspended, or rather they were directed to another point, namely, to secure the accession of the Pretender to the throne on the decease of the Queen. Nothing, therefore, of moment presents itself in connexion with the object which I have pro-

posed to myself in this volume, during this reign. One curious circumstance, however, I would mention as illustrative of party feelings, and of their influence on the conduct of even men of integrity and principle. The London apprentices were accustomed formerly to burn the effigy of the Pope on the 17th November, the anniversary of Elizabeth's coronation. During the years when the ferment, excited by the discussions on the Popish plot in the time of Charles II. was raging, this exhibition became frequent. The year 1682 was signalized by a remarkable celebration of this day; and in 1711, when the Tories succeeded to office, the Whigs published the account of the proceedings in 1682, and revived the practice, which had recently been laid aside. Such was the conduct of the Whigs in 1711. How different their conduct in the present day—so far from wishing to recall the cruelties of Popery, they are anxious to induce the belief that Popery in the nineteenth century is a very different thing from what it was in the time of James II. So inconsistent are men. In the reign of Queen Anne, and also in those of the first two Georges, the Whigs constantly repeated the charge of a leaning towards Popery against the Tories, and many members of the English Church; but in the present day, the

men, who call themselves by the same name, and profess to be guided by the same principles, can and do act in concert with Papists, even though the latter are using all their energies to cripple the usefulness of the Church of England, whose security was deemed of such importance by the Whigs of 1688.

As soon as Anne was laid in the grave, and the Elector of Hanover was quietly seated on the throne, the Papists commenced their old trade of plotting against the government. The results of their intrigues are well known, and need only be slightly noticed. George I. ascended the throne in 1714, and in 1715 a rebellion broke out in Scotland. The Highlands of Scotland were the strong holds of the Papists, and consequently fixed upon as the scene for organizing the rebellion. The Pretender, the son of James II., born in the eventful year of the Revolution, came over into Scotland, with the avowed object of seizing the throne, and of establishing the Roman Catholic Church. It pleased God to frustrate the attempts of the Papists at this time, and the Pretender escaped to France. Many of his supporters paid the penalty of their temerity by the forfeiture of their lives. Some enactments too were devised, which bore hard upon the Papists on certain

points, but their own conduct was the source, from which the new statutes originated. It was absolutely necessary that the government should devise means to check that inclination to assail the Protestant succession, which was at this time universal, or almost so with the Popish party. The suppression of the rebellion crushed their hopes for a time ; but did not prevent them from engaging in private and secret designs against the government.

For several years no open attempt was made to restore the Pretender; but in the year 1745 another rebellion broke out in Scotland. This was headed by the second, or the young Pretender, as he was termed, the grandson of James. Again the same overruling providence extended its watchful care over our Church and nation. The rebellion was crushed, and its leaders, except those who effected an escape to France, perished by the hand of the executioner. These rebellions were supported by Papists, whose object was to seat a Papist on the throne, and to establish their own Church. They shew that the Papists were animated with great zeal, or they never would have incurred such risks. After the suppression of the rebellion in 1745 the adherents of James were not again able to appear in arms ; but these attempts are quite

sufficient for my purpose, which is to shew that as late as 1745 the principles of the Church of Rome were unchanged, as was proved by their practices. They would not only have placed the Pretender on the throne, but they would also have restored Popery. That glorious Being who defended this country from the attempts of Popish emissaries in the days of Elizabeth, James I. and James II. interposed also in her favour in the years 1715, and 1745.

During the remainder of the reign of George II. the efforts of the Papists were crippled by the vigilance and activity of Protestants; and the same remark will apply to the former part of the reign of George III. At length an attempt was made to relieve them from the operation of certain laws—laws that were absolutely necessary, at the time they were framed, for the preservation of Protestants. Several measures in their favour were passed during the reign of George III. But these did not satisfy the Popish party, nor those politicians by whom their claims were advocated. Their supporters insisted upon their admission to Parliament and to places of trust, from which they were excluded by the operation of the Test Act. Even Protestants concurred in many instances in advocating their cause. The principles and the former practices of the Papists

were alleged by the opponents of emancipation, as a sufficient reason for refusing to comply with their requests; but in answer to these allegations, it was argued by their Protestant advocates in Parliament that the Papists of the present day were actuated by different principles—that they were peaceable subjects, and not to be deprived of the rights of Englishmen. The space that had elapsed since the year 1745 was appealed to, and because no rebellion had broken out since that period, it was argued that they might be safely trusted with the exercise of political power. It is true that no open rebellion occurred subsequent to 1745; but the cause is not to be sought in the altered principles of the Papists, but in the circumstances of the times, and the strength of the government. It was even argued by some advocates of emancipation, as long ago as the period of Lord George Gordon's riots, that the Papists were so depressed and so insignificant a body, that no danger need be apprehended from the concession of their privileges, of which, in consequence of their own conduct, they had so long been deprived. The last few years however have completely discovered the shallowness of such reasoning.

During the latter part of the reign of George III. the subject was repeatedly brought before

Parliament; but as long as that monarch retained the possession of his reason, he refused to listen to any plan for introducing Papists into the legislature of the country. It is not my intention to detail all the proceedings connected with this question, from the time when the point was first agitated to the year 1829, when the Bill in their favour was passed into a law. It may be sufficient to state, that the Papists themselves acted with considerable art, and repeatedly declared that they should be satisfied with a participation in the rights of their fellow-subjects, and that they entertained no wish to interfere with the Church of England, its ministers, or its revenues. The illustrious statesman by whom the measure was carried, doubtless believed those professions so frequently put forth by the Roman Catholics; or he never would have consented to the Emancipation Bill. They succeeded, therefore, in obtaining by craft what they had attempted to obtain by force in the reigns of George I. and II., and what they never would have obtained had they honestly avowed the same sentiments as are now unblushingly put forth by their political leaders. That the expectations of the most able supporters of the measure have been disappointed is obvious. The Duke of Wellington has indeed admitted

in Parliament that he was deceived in the opinion which he had formed in reference to the measure with regard to Ireland. What has been the state of that country since 1829? What but a scene of confusion and blood! The conduct of the Popish members of Parliament has been most turbulent. An oath was framed, which one would think, would bind honest men not to vote on questions affecting the Protestant Establishment; yet these gentlemen not only concur in the measures of other members, whose views are hostile to the Church, but actually originate schemes of their own, with a view to weaken and ruin Protestantism. But these same gentlemen are exceedingly angry at the charge of perjury, which has been brought against them. I am, however, fully convinced that if an oath was framed, couched in similar terms, binding honest Protestant members of Parliament not to do anything in their legislative capacity to weaken the interests of the Romish Church, they would never concur in measures of a similar tendency, with regard to Popery, to those which have, during the last few years, been introduced into Parliament respecting the Church of England, and which, if carried, would endanger her very existence. The Popish members are, however, annoyed at the

charge of bad faith which has been brought against them; yet what other term can be applied, by plain unsophisticated men, to their conduct, when it is contrasted with the terms of the Roman Catholic oath.*

Such are the consequences of Roman Catholic Emancipation. Ireland has been in a ferment ever since. Disorder and confusion prevail! It is indeed the reign of terror. How many unoffending Protestant clergymen have been savagely butchered! Yet emancipation was to be the harbinger of repose and peace, — the panacea for all the evils of that country; and a new scene—a scene of happiness, such as hitherto had been unknown, was to burst upon unhappy Ireland. In the estimation of many politicians it was deemed the day-star of Ireland's salvation. But, alas! the bubble is burst: the pleasing dream has vanished, and Ireland is the prey of all those evils which arise from the disordered and ungoverned passions of the worst of the human race. When I reflect on the conduct of many Protestants in supporting the Emancipation Bill, I am reminded of the chesnut in the fable. The fox used the

* See this point admirably stated in the speech of the Bishop of Exeter, delivered in the House of Lords, March, 1838.

monkey's paw to rescue it from the burning ashes: so Popery, since the days of Queen Mary, has been in the fire; and the Papists persuaded some Protestants to believe, that their principles were harmless, and induced them to use their influence to deliver them from the shackles of those laws, which a cautious and far-seeing public had imposed upon them. In short, they played over the game of the fox and the monkey; for the Protestants, in their support of the Emancipation Bill, were merely the monkey's paw to rescue them from the operation of the restrictive laws. A majority of Protestants in both Houses of Parliament came forward as sponsors to the Papists, who were about to be admitted to a participation of equal rights with the rest of his Majesty's subjects, and pledged themselves that the parties for whom they appeared, should observe the conditions, which a Protestant Legislature deemed necessary before they could be induced to remove the middle wall of partition, by which the two parties had been so long separated. These conditions, in order to render the obligation more sacred, were embodied into a solemn oath, by which the regenerated Papists were bound to preserve the Protestant Church in England and Ireland, in all her rights and im-

munities. Now that the terms of the compact, implied or expressed, have not been faithfully kept, must be admitted by all who can so far emancipate themselves from political partizanship, as to speak the whole truth. Those who have the most right to complain are the Protestant members of the two Houses, who acted the sponsorial part to the Papists. They are in reality placed in a most unenviable position: they have been the means of conceding certain privileges to the Papists on certain conditions; those conditions are not complied with; and consequently the mischief that may ensue must lie at their door. When they engaged that the Papists would make a proper use of their liberty, they took upon themselves a heavy responsibility, the weight of which must press upon their consciences with a continually increasing force. It must, I think, be admitted, that if the Papists acted with good faith, they certainly outwitted their Protestant supporters, or at least the major part of them, who undoubtedly imagined that the oath was couched in such explicit terms, that no conscientious Roman Catholic would ever entertain a thought of voting on any question that could in the remotest degree affect the interests of the Protestant Establishment.

When the opponents of the Emancipation Bill predicted the sad consequences, which would flow from that measure, they were regarded as alarmists and bigots; yet how completely have their predictions been fulfilled. As a specimen of the reasoning employed by the opponents of the measure, I will quote a passage from Southey, which, at the present moment, now that none of the hopes of its sanguine supporters have been realized, must forcibly strike the attention of every reader. The passage was written in 1826. "Had it lain within the scope of my immediate purpose, I would have shewn that what is insidiously termed Catholic Emancipation is not a question of toleration, but of political power: that the disqualifications which the Government is called upon to remove are not the cause of the disordered state of Ireland, and, consequently, that their removal could not effect the cure; that further concession would produce further demands, as all former concessions have done; and that, if the desperate error were committed, of conceding what is now required, the agitators would pursue their darling scheme of overthrowing the Irish church, and separating the two countries, with new zeal and heightened hopes; and with far greater probability, not indeed of ultimate success, but of

bringing upon Ireland the horrors of a civil and religious war !” He further adds, “The Romish church is, inherently, incurably, and restlessly intolerant.” And then, after stating that the Revolution was rendered necessary by the Popish principle, which binds all Papists to use every effort to advance the interests of their church, he proceeds, “It would, therefore, be a solecism in policy were we to entrust those persons with power in the state, who are bound in conscience to use it for subverting the church, for undoing the work of the Reformation and of the Revolution, for bringing us again into spiritual bondage, and re-establishing that system of superstition, idolatry, and persecution, from which the sufferings of our martyrs, and the wisdom of our ancestors, by God’s blessing, delivered us. . For as we may thank them for it, this is the consummation upon which their designs as well as their desires are bent. It is worthy of especial observation that they have for their immediate allies every faction which is banded against the state, every demagogue, every irreligious, and every seditious journalist, every open and every insidious enemy to Monarchy and Christianity. All these in their several stations write, speak, and act in favour of the Roman Catholic claims. And this alone ought to make those persons

hesitate, who, under the influence of very different motives, have engaged in the same cause."*

I hesitate not to express my most decided conviction, that the great majority of those, who advocated the Roman Catholic claims, entertained the firm belief, that the measure would be productive of great good to Ireland; the experience, however, of the last few years has shewn the fallacy of the arguments by which the Relief Bill was supported. The golden fruit has not yet been gathered: nor is there any prospect of peace for Ireland. In my opinion, the candid and honest supporters of that measure are ready to admit that, as far as the anticipated results are concerned, the experiment has completely failed. For many generations our ancestors were engaged in checking the progress of Popery; yet in the nineteenth century it is advancing amongst us with a rapidity never witnessed since the days of the second James. But any reflections on this topic must be reserved for the ensuing chapter.

* Southey's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, preface.

CHAP. XI.

Reflections on preceding Narrative—The Church of England a bulwark against Popery—The Papists and the Dissenters—The conduct of the latter contrasted with that of the Dissenters of the last age—The consequences if the Church should be destroyed—The pulpit and the press to be used by the Clergy.

HAVING carried my narrative through the various periods of our history down to the era of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, in 1829, I purpose in this chapter to offer such reflections as naturally arise from the foregoing observations, with some suggestions as to the means to be adopted in the present day to counteract the machinations of the Papists. I have given a pretty large abstract of Popish practices since the Reformation; nor have I hesitated to express my firm belief that their principles are unchanged. This conviction is founded on their practices, which do not materially differ from those of their ancestors. They do not, indeed, use the fire and the faggot, because they have not the power; but in Ireland they employ the lead and the dagger of the secret assassin. The working of the system in Ireland is an evidence of unchanged principles:

it proves that the safety of Protestantism would be endangered by their possession of political power; and their disregard of the spirit and letter of an oath shews, that the Papists of the present day cannot be trusted by Protestants any more than those of a preceding age. Should the reins of power ever be assumed by the Papists is there any reason to believe that they would be more observant of their oaths and promises than James II. was in Ireland, subsequent to his desertion of the English throne, when, as is related in a preceding chapter, all his professions of a desire for toleration were forgotten, and the most severe measures were practised against the Church, and against Protestantism. Would the Papists, on the supposition of their acquisition of power, be acting in opposition to their creed, if they should walk in the steps of King James, and find it convenient to forget their previous promises? No! They would be acting in strict accordance with the principles of Popery. It is constantly asked where is the danger from Popery? The persons who ask such a question must, however, be ignorant both of its principles as developed in the recognized works of the church, and also of its practices, as recorded in the pages of history. Is it not a fact, that it is labouring by all possible means to extend itself throughout

the length and the breadth of the British isles? And must not the most thoughtless be aware that its principles are destructive of those of the Protestant Church?

The readers of the preceding chapters will remember, that when James II. issued his treacherous declaration of indulgence, many of the Non-conformists, nay, most of them, were unaccountably silent on the subject of Popery, while some actually proceeded so far as to flatter James in their addresses, and thus give their sanction to those schemes which the King had in contemplation, and which, but for the opposition of the Church of England, would have been carried into effect. It is with pleasure that I record the fact, that the Non-conformists eventually recovered from this apathy, and united with the Church in counteracting the machinations of the Papists. But who does not discover a resemblance between the conduct of some of the Non-conformists prior to the Revolution, and that of many of our Dissenting brethren in the present day? I wish I could add that, like the Non-conformists, they had discovered their error, and were disposed to unite with Churchmen against the enemies of both. How few Dissenters objected to the Emancipation Bill? few, I mean, in comparison, for there were many

exceptions. But what is still worse, how many Dissenters concur in all the measures of Mr. O'Connell, and other Popish members of the House of Commons, and concur with them against the Church of England. It is to be feared that the religion of some amongst them consists in nothing but opposition to the Church, and the support of a certain party in politics. One Dissenting minister during the distresses of the Irish clergy, generously made a collection in his chapel, and forwarded the amount to the general fund; and for this act of brotherly kindness and Christian charity, he was persecuted by the leading members of what is termed the Dissenting interest, and at this moment there are but few pulpits in London into which he would be admitted by his brethren; yet this gentleman is a man of undoubted piety, but he was against Roman Catholic emancipation, and is altogether opposed to the liberalism of the age. Such circumstances as these are painful to record, but they are unfortunately too common in the present day.

It will be seen from the foregoing statements, that in all their attempts the emissaries of Rome aimed at the destruction of the Church of England. Why? because they dreaded her influence over the people; because she was the

chief bulwark in the reigns of Elizabeth and the four Stuarts against the re-establishment of Popery. When the Church of England was voted down in the time of Charles I. by the long Parliament, there were great rejoicings in the Popish councils at Rome. They hoped that the removal of the Church would lead to endless divisions among Protestants, and that the people would eventually take refuge in Popery. There is not a single sentence in Holy Writ more regarded by Papists than this: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Upon this maxim they have ever acted; nor did they conceive that any more effectual method of dividing Protestants could be resorted to than the destruction of the national Church, and the prevention of Non-conformists from uniting with its members.

There is scarcely any room to doubt that the Jesuits are resorting to the same practices as in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, for the purpose of undermining Protestantism. A circumstance of very recent occurrence may here be mentioned in corroboration of the above supposition. A clergyman wished to engage a gentleman to assist in the duties of his church, and, amongst other applications, was one of a young man from Ireland. The clergyman had adopted

a rule; from which he never departed, to inspect the letters of orders of the individual with whom he was about to enter into a treaty. On this particular occasion the letters of orders were required, when the applicant hesitated, and at length stated that he was not in Protestant orders, but that he had been ordained in the Church of Rome. He was asked if he had publicly recanted, and the reply was in the negative. The clergyman of course stated that he must apply to the bishop of the diocese, who would point out to him how he should act. However he heard nothing further on the subject. In this instance, but for the precaution respecting the letters of orders, the individual might have been appointed to the vacant post, as it was one in which the bishop's license was not necessary. Yet, as this man had never recanted, he was evidently a Papist when the application was made.

In short it is easy to perceive that the Papists are playing over their old game with our Dissenting brethren. They are not fearful of the Dissenters; while many of the latter have not shrunk back from an unholy alliance with Rome against the Church of England. I would remind these men of their departure from the principles and practices of the Dissenters of former gene-

rations. From the Revolution down to the commencement of the present century the Orthodox Dissenters, (for I leave the Socinians and other kindred sects out of the question), were animated with a spirit of unflinching opposition to Popery. Both Churchmen and Dissenters agreed in their opposition to the Church of Rome. Numerous sermons are extant, preached by Dissenting Ministers on the errors of Popery, in which they deprecate any alliance of whatever sort with Papists. Many extracts might be made to shew that Popery was the object of their abhorrence and dread. "Famine or pestilence, (says one,) is a less judgment than Popery, and we ought to be more solicitous to keep out the one than the other."* But what a change have we witnessed within the last few years! Dissenters can scarcely be said in the present day to offer any opposition to Popery. Whatever may have been the errors at various periods of some members of the English Church, the great majority of them have at all times been uniform in their opposition to the Church of Rome—though differing from each other on many other questions the most remarkable unanimity of sentiment has ever been evinced on this important subject; while, on the other hand, Dissenters are acting

* Benjamin Bennet, an eminent Dissenter, on Popery.

in concert with men, whose principles would have been viewed with grief by their ancestors, who would have shrunk back with horror from such an unholy alliance. The Papists have an end to accomplish, but the Dissenters can gain nothing by their union with the Church of Rome. As in the days of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, the Papists did not dread the Puritans, so neither in the present day do they entertain any apprehensions from the Dissenters; but as during the period alluded to they were alarmed at the influence of the Church of England, so now their fears arise from the very same quarter. Their efforts are consequently, as in time past, all directed against the Church of England; and were their exertions to be successful, they would reap an abundant harvest from those endless divisions, which would be consequent on the destruction of the Church, and which would lead many to shelter themselves under the wing of Popery. The Papacy is making rapid advances in England in the present day; but how much more rapid would they be, were it not for the existence and the efforts of the Church of England. In every town and in every village of the land, notwithstanding the unfaithfulness of some of her ministers, and the carelessness and indifference of others, the Church still in her

liturgy, her articles, and services, raises a bulwark against Popery, which all their efforts are unable to shake.

The Dissenters of the present day may not probably see any cause for apprehending danger from the destruction of the Established Church. They may perhaps imagine that they should unite in one common bond against Popery. In this expectation they would undoubtedly be deceived. The Jesuits are sagacious men, and they would easily succeed in creating divisions sufficient to occupy their undivided attention. There are in the very principles of Dissent, the elements of discord; and the Jesuits would speedily find the means of managing those elements so as to effect the destruction of Dissenters. Every one knows that the Dissenting body is a disunited body. The various sections of Dissent differ from each other on many points of material importance, as well as on many others of no consequence at all. And how fiercely has the war of controversy been frequently waged between different denominations, and even among members of the very same community. Witness the controversy on the subject of open and close communion among the Baptists. The crafty Jesuit would doubtless find abundant materials for strife in the various, and in many respects

conflicting, creeds of Dissenters to keep them in a state of perpetual war among themselves. Amid such scenes the Church of Rome would be the gainer; and in consequence of the divisions of Protestants, her ranks would daily be augmented by the accession of new converts. It may be asserted indeed that the points at issue among Dissenters are comparatively trifling, and that they would never be so infatuated as to waste their strength in unprofitable discussions. In reply to such a supposition it may be sufficient to remark that most of the controversies, by which the peace of the Church in all ages has been broken, have related not to fundamentals, but to points of minor importance. Have the Dissenters reflected on the consequences that would result from success in their present union with the Papists against the Church of England? They now act in concert with O'Connell, while they are blind to his ulterior objects. They imagine that all his efforts are directed towards nothing more than a perfect equality for men of all creeds; and that when this object is accomplished, O'Connell might be cast off. The agitator must smile at their simplicity. James II. found it convenient to talk of equality, liberty, and toleration; yet as soon as he landed in Ireland, the mask, being no longer

necessary, was thrown aside. Mr. O'Connell's professions would probably be forgotten when the object was gained. Having, by means of the assistance of Dissenters, accomplished the destruction of the Church, he would experience little difficulty in involving them in the same ruin. He has in public exclaimed, "Let us destroy the Church and we can easily dispose of the Dissenters." When the Spanish Armada was about to invade England, James of Scotland was applied to by some of Elizabeth's council to ascertain how he stood affected towards Spain. He signified his intention of rendering what assistance he was able, for, said he, it was quite certain that all the favour he should experience, if they should be successful in England, would be to be destroyed last. This is the favour, which the Dissenters would enjoy, in the event of the destruction of the English Church and the elevation of the Papists to power. The Romanists would take advantage of the divisions, consequent upon the fall of the Church of England, as they did in the days of the first Charles, and with equal, if not higher prospects of success. We learn from the pages of history that the divisions amongst the ancient Britons rendered them an easy prey to the Romans. "Dum singuli pugnabant omnes vincebantur,"

is the testimony of Tacitus; nor would the result be different, if the Church was removed, and the country left to the spiritual superintendence of contending sects.

Would that our Dissenting countrymen would recollect the principles and practices of their ancestors and unite with us against the enemy of both! The Papists are in reality as much opposed to the principles of the Dissenters as to those of the Church of England, though their designs are cloked under the transparent guise of an equality for men of all creeds. In the preceding pages I have pointed out some of those methods resorted to by our ancestors to counteract the machinations of the Papists. The pulpit was one chief means of awakening the people to a sense of their danger. Let the same engine be still employed, both by Churchmen and Dissenters. We may attack the errors of Popery while we feel the greatest tenderness towards the persons of the Papists.

While the pulpit is employed on the one hand, the press may be used with great effect on the other. The present is a reading age—not indeed a thinking one. Nor are the people generally disposed to read abstruse and profound treatises on any subject; but still certain works must be produced to satisfy the appetite that has

been created. It is an age for cheap publications: and a wide and very important field is open to Protestants. We may also rest assured that, unless we occupy the ground, it will be occupied by the emissaries of evil. If we do not sow the good seed, the enemy will sow tares. Hence the necessity of making use of the press to counteract the machinations of the Papists, and to make the people acquainted with Protestant principles. Tracts and cheap periodicals would find buyers and readers, if well-informed Protestants would take the trouble, in their respective spheres, to direct the attention of the people to them.

It may be well for Protestantism that Popery has begun to raise its head in our land; for it is possible that Protestants might have sunk into a lethargy more profound even than that, which evidently has seized upon numbers of our countrymen. The activity of the Papists must at length rouse the Protestants of this country to exertion: and perhaps, when the danger becomes imminent, our Dissenting brethren will recover from their present apathy, buckle on their armour, and fight, as in days past, side by side with Churchmen. It is the duty of every Protestant to stand on his guard against the enemy of his faith. That enemy may exhibit the

wisdom of the serpent, but his nature is the same as ever. The spirit of the Romish Church is well known. Let the opportunity arise, and its former practices will again be repeated. Her members are never found slumbering at their posts, but are ever vigilant and ready to take advantage of circumstances. In, short the Protestant would do well to take a lesson from the perseverance and activity of his adversaries.

Not should we view the principles of Popery with favour, from tenderness towards the individuals who may profess them. We are bound indeed to pity those who hold the tenets of Rome, but their views must be held in abhorrence, as dishonourable to the Saviour, and destructive to the souls of men. The least approximation towards the system of the Church of Rome is undoubtedly to be deprecated. Our ancestors were so sensible of the errors of the Papists, that they were extremely afraid lest a toleration of their worship should be deemed a countenance of their principles. It was this feeling that influenced Usher and the Irish prelates in 1628, when they signed the following declaration:—
“The religion of Papists is superstitious and idolatrous, and their Church apostatical: to give them, therefore, a toleration is a grievous sin, because it makes ourselves accessory to all the

abominations of Popery, and to the perdition of those souls that perish thereby."* This protestation was signed by Usher and eleven of his brethren; and it exhibits their views of the Popish system. If they were fearful lest even a toleration of Popish worship should involve them in the same guilt, it is surely incumbent on the men of the present generation to pause, and to ascertain whether the countenance which is given to Popery by many professing Protestants, is not only highly inconsistent, but also dangerous to their own souls. We have granted them emancipation, with which they ought to be satisfied: let us not seal our ruin by concurring with them in political measures, which, if successful, must endanger our Protestant institutions.

* Neal.

CHAP. XII.

The charge of Heresy and Schism advanced and proved against the Church of Rome.

THE most usual, and also the most successful method, resorted to by Papists in attacking Protestantism, is by alleging the antiquity and the unity of their own Church, and the distractions and divisions among Protestants. Too frequently they succeed in deluding the unwary—those who, though nominally Protestants, have never thoroughly examined the foundation of their faith. When the common question, “Where was your religion before Luther?” is put, it appears to carry with it the force of an argument in favour of Popery, and many are unable to answer it: hence they are ready to believe that their religion had no existence before the days of Martin Luther, and that consequently it is safer to hold communion with the Church of Rome than with Protestants. They are also persuaded that none of those differences exist among the members of the Papacy, which are so common with Protestants; yet the divisions among the various orders in the former are much more numerous than any that exist among the

latter.* They tell the poor and the ignorant that theirs is the old religion, and consequently the only true one. To furnish some ready and popular arguments on these and other kindred topics, the present chapter has been written. My object is to refute, in a simple manner, the arguments so frequently used by the Romanists in their intercourse with our Protestant brethren.

I undertake, therefore, to convict the Papists of novelty, heresy, and schism, the very things with which they charge us. Few of their peculiar doctrines are more ancient than the Council of Trent, which terminated its labours in 1564. At this celebrated Council, Popery, as it at present exists, received its beginning: it was then moulded into its present shape. The ancient fathers knew nothing of this new creed: hence we must make a difference between the Church of Rome, as it existed prior to the Council of

* The Popish boast of unity may, however, be easily disposed of. It consists in nothing more than the bare recognition of the authority of the Pope by all parties in the Church, while at the same time they are permitted to follow the particular rules, and to adopt the particular opinions, of their respective orders. How can it be shown that the adoption of one single point—the supremacy of the Pope—constitutes a centre of union more binding than that which is adopted by Protestants, namely, the recognition of the Sacred Volume.

Trent, and the Romish communion of the present day. Everything was changed in that assembly. They cannot even plead that they profess the same belief as their fathers; for the rule of faith was changed, the word of God was rejected, and traditions were brought in to occupy its place. It is admitted that the points at issue between us and the Papists were mooted before the Council of Trent; but it was not then necessary for an individual to believe them in order to hold communion with the Church. Many members of the Church of Rome rejected those novelties, which from age to age were introduced, and which were formed into a compact system by the Council of Trent, to be adopted as the standard of doctrine of the Church in future ages. By making these articles of faith, they set up a new religion in the world, and that new religion is Popery. This subject will be noticed more fully in another part of this chapter.

I shall first, however, shew that the faith of the Church of England, or Protestantism, is of the greatest antiquity; and my observations will, I trust, furnish a sufficient reply to that silly question—"Where was your religion before Luther?" Our faith is derived from the Holy Scriptures: on this foundation

we take our stand, and we can prove all our doctrines from that Holy Book. "The Bible, the Bible alone," says Chillingworth, "is the religion of Protestants." It contains the whole revealed will of God, and to resort to any other rule of faith is to reject its authority, is derogatory to the honour of Jehovah, and fatal to the soul. Our religion, therefore, we tell the Papists, was to be found in the Bible before the days of Martin Luther; it was just where it now is, and where it ever will be found as long as the Church continues in her militant state. As Protestants, we should not be driven from our foundation, if even all the Fathers from the apostolic age were against us, and in favour of the errors of Popery; for we are not over anxious on the subject, since they were, like ourselves, fallible men.

But the primitive Fathers are in our favour, and we can adduce them as witnesses in our cause, and against the Romanists. The writers of the Church, from the apostolic age down to the close of the sixth century, concur with one unanimous voice in teaching the same fundamental doctrines as are embodied in the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England. Though we are not, therefore, under any necessity of applying to the Fathers in support of Protest-

antism, the Scriptures being the rule of our faith; yet, when our adversaries make such a parade of antiquity, it is desirable that we should prove to the world the sandy nature of the foundation on which they build. By avoiding the writings of the Fathers we yield an advantage to the Papists, which really belongs to ourselves. We can trace our doctrines from the Bible through the writings of the early ages, while the distinctive tenets of Popery will be sought for in vain. In the works of the Fathers indeed we meet with some peculiar views, not, however, on fundamental points, but on those of minor importance; a circumstance of no more consequence than the fact that many shades of opinion exist among members of our own Church. We do not reject the writings of the divines of the Church of England, in consequence of certain peculiar views on points not essential; nor need we treat the Fathers in a different manner. We need not their aid, for we have the Bible, whose authority is paramount with us. We can appeal to their writings to shew that our Protestant doctrines were maintained in the early ages; but we would not by any means build upon them any article of faith. The authority of Cyprian was once urged upon St. Austin, concerning the baptism of heretics,

when he replied, that he did not hold the Epistles of St. Cyprian for canonical; and when Hierome had cited several Fathers in proof of a particular point, Austin replied, that he also could quote the Fathers, but he had rather appeal to the sacred Scriptures. While, therefore, we do not appeal to the Fathers to establish any doctrine or article of faith, it is extremely desirable that we should prove to the world, that their genuine writings render no support to Popery. To those who will examine the subject, it will appear that Fathers and Councils are against the Papists in all those questions on which they differ from ourselves.

During the first six centuries the writings of the Fathers are, on all fundamental points, in strict accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England. I am aware that some persons are uncomfortable at even the mention of the name of the Fathers, imagining that all the errors of the Church of Rome are to be found in their works; but this notion arises from ignorance of the subject; for, as I have already stated, they are witnesses against all the errors of the Papacy. My object is to rescue the Fathers from the Papists, who always claim them as their own, a point which has too frequently been conceded by Protestants. We

are ready to meet our adversaries on this ground. It is the ground on which the great men of the period of the Revolution met their Popish opponents; and though the Scriptures are all-sufficient, there is no reason whatever for yielding up the Fathers to the Papists, when, at the same time, they are against them. It has been remarked by a very acute writer, that the Papists have, within the last century, gained many advantages, in consequence of the ignorance of the writings and sentiments of the primitive Fathers, which prevailed among the clergy of the Church of England; and the same author asserts, that had the clergy, prior to the Revolution in 1688, been equally ignorant on the subject, Popery must have prevailed. While on the one hand I would say, with Austin, "*Paul shall serve me for all, to him do I fly, to him do I appeal from all the doctors,*" I would, on the other hand, contend that it is our duty to make use of all lawful weapons in the contest with the Romanists, and, consequently, to shew that the Fathers, of whom they boast so much, are so far from countenancing their errors, that they positively and pointedly condemn them. As Protestants we may study the Fathers of the primitive ages, not indeed to establish any doctrine, since the Bible is our sole authority, but

for the purpose of unmasking the Papists in their shallow pretence of antiquity. They surely cannot plead antiquity, when their doctrines were not even broached in the early ages of the Church.

Before the days of Martin Luther, we tell the Papists, our Church had an existence: for our doctrines are grounded on the Scriptures, and moreover they are supported by the concurrent voice of antiquity. As late as the middle of the sixth century, the whole Church professed the very same faith with ourselves. They had the same canon of Scripture, and the same creeds, namely, the Apostles' and the Nicene; and even at the close of the succeeding century, though many errors had crept in and subverted the faith of numbers, the truth was still preserved, and boldly avowed not only by individuals, but by General Councils. At the Councils held at the following times and places: Seville in 619; Toledo, 633; again at Toledo, 638; first Lateran, 649; Chalon, 663; Toledo, 675; and Rome, 680; it was determined that no innovations should be permitted; and the sixth Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, in 681, and the fourteenth Toledo, in 684, declare, in most explicit terms, that no innovations shall be made in the Apostles'

Creed, and that the Nicene Creed was perfect. During these periods the Church maintained the ancient faith, though errors had sprung up and caused divisions; and that faith was the very same, which is still professed by the Church of England. Hence it is clear that our faith is the same as that, which was maintained by the Church a thousand years before the time of Luther. The seed was sown by the apostles; it flourished during several ages; the tares at length sprung up, and continued to increase until the period of the Reformation, when they were weeded out.

In speaking of the primitive Fathers, however, whose works are so many witnesses to the truth of Protestant doctrines, I wish to remark, that I allude to their genuine and uncorrupted writings. Nor do I, of course, include those spurious works which from time to time have been imposed upon the world under the names of certain of the ancient writers. The Papists have committed two crimes, with respect to the Fathers, of no slight enormity. They have corrupted the text of the genuine Fathers; and they have fabricated spurious treatises, and published them as their genuine works. To these nefarious practices have they resorted, for the purpose of propping up a sinking cause: and it

would be strange indeed if, with so many shifts, they could not make a show of defence when the edifice of Popery is in danger. It has been incontrovertibly established by James, in his learned work on the Corruptions of the Fathers, that no less than one hundred and eighty-seven treatises have been forged by the Papists, and attempted to be palmed upon the world as the genuine works of ancient authors. The same learned writer points out fifty passages in the acknowledged works of the Fathers, which have been corrupted, mangled, or interpolated.* The celebrated "*Decretal Epistles*," as is well known, were fabricated for the purpose of supporting the spiritual authority of the Pope, while the treatise called the "*Donation of Constantine*," was intended to uphold the Pontiff's temporal power. Both were notorious forgeries. Thus it is only by corrupting and mangling the text of the genuine Fathers—by the authority of works which they never wrote, but which were forged in the cells of the monks; and by admitting into the list of primitive authors the names of men who have no possible claim to that distinction—that the Papists are enabled to make out any tolerable case. Once the attempt was made, and a most audacious act it was, to collect all the ge-

* See James's 'Corruptions of the Fathers.'

nuine editions of the Fathers, and destroy them. The intention was to publish new editions, with such omissions and additions as should be necessary to support the Popish errors. Providentially the attempt was frustrated; for though many printed copies were consigned to the flames, there were fortunately ancient manuscripts of all the Fathers existing in Protestant libraries.*

When therefore the Papists quote the Fathers in support of their errors, they quote either the spurious treatises published under their names, or those passages which have been corrupted in their genuine productions. It is only from these sources that the Romish system receives even the appearance of support from the Fathers. But when they meet us in the fair field of controversy, and are tied down to the uncorrupted works of the genuine Fathers, and those productions which have been fathered on them are rejected, the fabric, which has been raised with so much skill, falls to the ground, and it becomes evident to all reflecting persons that Popery re-

* In the Index Expurgatorius many passages of the Fathers are marked for erasure. Besides forging and foisting in new treatises as the productions of antiquity, they have in some instances entirely suppressed others because they made against their errors. In the Book of *Bertram* they read in one place *invisibly* for *visibly*; and a whole epistle of Chrysostom's is suppressed, because it confutes Transubstantiation.

ceives no more support from the writings of the primitive ages than it receives from the Word of God.

Vain, therefore, is the Popish boast of antiquity. Some of their errors, we grant, are some hundred years old; but the doctrines of our Church are more than 1800 years old. Ours is the old religion; it was founded by Christ and his Apostles, and has been preserved amidst afflictions, trials and persecutions. It contracted some rust in coming down to us, especially after the sixth century; but our glorious Reformers removed the rust, and preserved the metal. Our faith is the same as that of the primitive Christians and the martyrs—the same that was defended by General Councils. Sometimes indeed our Church passed under a cloud, and experienced reverses: her members during several ages prior to the Reformation were few in number; but still our Church, the Church of Christ, was preserved. Our Reformers merely cleansed the diamond, that had been covered with filth by the Church of Rome, and restored it to its former beauty and lustre. The Papists call our Church a new Church; but just as well might they allege that the Saviour erected a new temple, when he cleansed the old one by driving out the buyers and sellers from its precincts; or that

Hezekiah instituted a new passover when he restored that already appointed; or that the good King Josiah wrote a new law, when the book of the old law was found after it had been neglected and forgotten by the Jewish nation.

Time is like a river, which carries down its course those lighter materials which are cast into it, but leaves behind those that are heavier. In our Reformation we have merely recovered those things that were lost near the source, and this is termed by the Papists a new system, whereas it is that which was established by Christ and his Apostles.

It is evident to all who will examine this important point, that our faith was professed by the primitive Church during the first six centuries: but it may be asked how was it handed down through the ages that intervened between the sixth century and the Reformation. And here I would offer a remark upon that point on which the Papists lay so much stress—the Church's visibility in all ages. Doubtless the Church of Christ has ever been visible, but not at all times alike so. It is not always visible to the world. Sometimes it has been as the wheat not separated from the chaff, which is still in a certain sense visible, though not fully so. Wherever some faithful men are found, even though but

few in number, they are sufficient to render the Church visible. Whenever the fundamentals are retained—nay, whenever the one grand doctrine of justification by faith has been believed and propounded, the Church has been visible; and there never was a time, not even in the darkest ages of Popery, when there were not many faithful men to proclaim this important doctrine. The promise was to this effect, that the Church should never fail: it is never promised that she shall not be afflicted, or that she shall not be corrupted. Even in the Church of Rome there were ever to be found men who protested against the errors of Popery, besides those who at various periods quitted its pale, and this is sufficient to prove the visibility of the Church in every age. I have shown already that Protestant principles are the same as were maintained by the primitive Church; and though after that period the Church became very corrupt, yet in every century, even down to the Reformation, there were some faithful men who were not tainted with the errors of the Papacy.

We readily admit, therefore, that our doctrines descended down to us after the sixth century through the various churches then in existence, though they were become very corrupt. In short, our doctrines were transmitted through

the seventh, eighth, and following centuries in the same manner as they were handed down during the first six centuries, only with this difference, that during the latter period they descended pure and without additions, while in the former they were conveyed down to the Reformers with many errors, which by degrees had crept in. At the Reformation a separation took place, and the Church was restored to her primitive state. When, therefore, we are asked where was your religion immediately before the time of Luther, our answer is, that it was where it ever had been—it was among you, but was not of you. Those who, in the Church of Rome, prior to the Reformation, and some there always were, protested against the errors that had been introduced, held substantially the same truths with ourselves, and consequently, the true church did not cease to be visible.* On this subject I will quote a passage from an able writer, of the period of James I. “ We say it was where it now is. If they ask us where? We answer it was the known and apparent church in the world, wherein Luther and the rest were baptized, and received their Christianity, ordination, and power of ministry. If they reply that that church was theirs, for that the doctrines they now taught were taught then; we

answer, that none of those false doctrines and errors which they now maintain, and we condemn, were the doctrine of that church, constantly delivered, or generally received, but doubtfully broached or factiously defended by some certain only, who as a dangerous faction adulterated the sincerity of the Christian verity, and brought the church into miserable bondage."* Until the Reformation there were some in that corrupt church who retained and defended the true doctrines of the Gospel—a sufficient number to render the church visible, for in every age they are still to be traced, and their names are still recorded in the pages of history, while their extant writings testify a perfect agreement in doctrine between them and the English Church. This was mercifully ordered until the Reformation, when all the sound part of the church was broken off from the corrupt, which was then left in its apostacy. The doctrines of the Gospel were, therefore, preserved in the Church of Rome until the Reformation—not in the corrupt or Papal part of it, but in that portion, which constantly protested against the errors that had overspread the Papacy. We then are the successors of the faithful men of the Church of Rome prior to the Reformation,

* Field on the Church, p. 83.

the Romanists, the successors of those who corrupted the faith and introduced pernicious and destructive errors. "There is," says the author, just quoted, "a great difference to be made between the church wherein our fathers formerly lived, and that faction of the Pope's adherents, which at this day resist against the necessary reformation of the churches of God. Formerly the Church of Rome was the true church, but had in it a heretical faction; now the church itself is heretical."* We agree with the views of the sound part of the Church of Rome prior to the Reformation, and in that part was our faith preserved until the time of Luther. We now differ from the present Roman Church, as a well cultivated field differs from the same field overrun with noxious weeds—or as Naaman when cleansed in the waters of Jordan, differed from Naaman covered with leprosy. We are not separated from the Church, but from the Papacy, which was a mere domineering faction, or a disease in the Church. It has been abundantly proved in the pages of our unanswerable writers—the pages of Hooker, of Carlton, Field, White, and a whole host of later authors, that the Reformed churches separated from the Roman court, only so far as

* Field on the Church.

it had departed from the ancient and true Romish church.

In reply to such arguments, it is sometimes contended by some Protestant writers, that we are not to censure in unqualified terms the present Church of Rome, for that she still holds all the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. In profession it is admitted that she holds the foundation—she certainly does not condemn the doctrines of the Bible ; but, still in practice and by adding new doctrines she completely overthrows the foundation. This is the argument so successfully employed by Hooker, who contends that she destroys the foundation by her corruptions. As the Galatians (ch. v. 2-4), while they held the doctrine of salvation through Christ, completely set it aside by insisting on the necessity of circumcision ; so does the Church of Rome overthrow the faith by her addition of many things, and the corrupting of others. Speaking of those Protestants who maintain that the Church of Rome still holds the fundamentals, Fuller remarks : “ It is answered, if some Protestants be so civil, it appears thereby, that though they have left Rome, they have not lost their courtesy, nor their charity. But grant the errors of the Church of Rome not funda-

mental, they are *circa-fundamental*, grating on the very foundation.”*

The foregoing remarks are sufficient to prove that antiquity is with us; and, consequently, against the Romanists. Our Church is older than the age of Luther. Our doctrines are taught in the Bible, by the unanimous consent of the Fathers in the first six centuries, and by a noble army of martyrs and confessors, and others, in every succeeding century down to the period of the Reformation.† There was a Church in Ancient Britain long before the Papacy had its origin—a Church planted, if not by the Apostles, at all events by some one or more of the Apostolical Fathers; and this ancient British church was never willingly subjugated to the Roman see. The authority claimed by the Pope in England was an usurpation: it was introduced originally by fraud. The Pope, taking advantage of the civil commotions of the country, obtained a footing in England by the permission of its monarchs, who, for various

* Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. v. 195.

† We have only restored the Church to her original purity. We have not added one stone to the foundation; we have only removed the untempered mortar with which the sacred edifice had been covered through so many ages; and we have exhibited the ancient structure in all the beauty of its parts and proportions.

reasons were unwilling, or unable to resist the encroachments of the Papal see. By the ancient British church the Bishop of Rome was viewed merely as any other prelate; and under the sway of Gregory the Great, in 590, he did not know, on hearing of the Britons, whether they were Christians or Pagans, so far were they from owning, or he from claiming their subjection to the Papacy. And it is certain that none of the Popish tenets were received in the British Church.

Having proved the antiquity and the succession of our doctrines, I now proceed to establish the charge of novelty and heresy against the Church of Rome. They ask us, where our religion was prior to Martin Luther. We in our turn, ask, where were your Trent doctrines before the assembly of that Council? Where was the present Church of Rome during the space of 600 years after our Lord? They talk of antiquity, but old as their errors may be, they are much more recent in their origin than the sixth century. They are unable to trace the succession of their doctrines through those centuries. Of what use, therefore, is it to shew their descent through a certain period immediately preceding the Reformation, from an original many ages subsequent to the establishment of Christianity?

The creed of the present Roman Church is new in all those parts, in which they differ from us, and which are the points that constitute what is termed Popery: these errors sprung up at various periods, but as often as they appeared, even down to the Reformation, there were ever found faithful men to protest against their introduction.*

Since this volume has been in the press, and when I had proceeded thus far in correcting the proofs, two unpublished letters of Lord Clarendon's, the one addressed to James, Duke of York, and the other to his Duchess, were placed in my hands, with permission to make use of them in my little work. The character of the letters, and all the circumstances connected with the time at which they were penned by the illustrious exile, shall be stated in the preface; but I cannot refrain here from quoting a few passages

* For 600 years none of their errors were received. "Their Papal indulgencies were yet unhatched, their purgatory fire was yet unkindled; it made not (as afterwards) their pot boil, and their kitchen smoke: the mass was yet unmoulded; Transubstantiation was yet unbaked; the treasury of merits was yet unminted; the Pope's transcendant power was uncreated; Ecclesiastics were unexempted; and deposing of Kings yet undreamt of; the lay people were not yet cozened of the cup; communion under one kind, was not yet in kind; it was not then known that liturgies and prayers were made in a tongue unknown."—*Birkbeck's Protestant's Evidence*, p. 21, 1635.

on the controversy between us and the Romanists. The following remarks are selected from the letter to the Duchess:—

“ I presume you do not entangle yourself with the particular controversies between the Romanists and us, or think yourself a competent judge of all difficulties which occur therein; and therefore it must be some fallacious argument of antiquity and universality confidently urged by men, that know less than many of those you are acquainted with, and ought less to be believed by you, that can raise any scruples or doubts in you; and if you will with equal temper hear those, who are well able to inform you in all particulars, it is not possible for you to suck in that poison, which can only corrupt and prevail over you by stopping your ears and shutting your eyes.

“ The common argument that there is no salvation out of the Church, that there is but one Church, and that the Church of Rome is that only true Church, is both irrational and untrue. There are many Churches in which salvation may be attained, as well as in any one of them, and were many even in the Apostles times: otherwise they would not have directed their epistles to so many score of Churches, in which there were very different opinions received, and very different doctrines taught. There is indeed but one faith in which we can be saved;

the steadfast belief of the birth, passion, and resurrection of our Saviour ; and every Church that receives and embraces that faith is in a state of salvation, if the Apostles preached true doctrine. The reception and retention of many errors does not destroy the essence of a Church ; if it did, the Church of Rome would be in as ill, if not in a worse condition than most other Christian Churches, because of errors of a greater magnitude, and more destructive of true religion. Let not the canting discourse of the universality and extent of that Church, which has as little of truth as the rest, prevail with you. They who will imitate the greatest part of the world must turn heathens ; for it is generally believed that above half the world is peopled by them ; and that the Mahometans possess more than half the remainder, and there is as little question that of the rest which is inhabited by Christians, one part of four is not of the communion of the Church of Rome, and God knows, that in that very communion, there is as great a discord in opinion and in matters of as great moment, as is between any other Christians.”

Again, “ Those arguments which are not strong enough to draw persons from the Roman communion into that of the Church of England,

when custom and education and a long stupid resignation of all their faculties to their teachers usually shuts out all reason to the contrary, may yet be abundant to retain those who have been baptized and bred and instructed in the grounds and principles of that religion, which was in truth not only founded upon the clear authority of the Scriptures, but upon the consent of antiquity and the practice of the primitive Church ; and men who look into antiquity know well by what corruption and violence, with what constraint and continued opposition those opinions, which are contrary to ours, crept into the world, and how unwarrantably the authority of the Bishop of Rome, which alone supports all the rest, came to prevail : who hath no more pretence of authority and power in England than the Bishop of Paris or Toledo can as reasonably lay claim to ; and it is so far from being matter of Catholic religion, that the Pope hath so much and no more to do in France or Spain or any other Catholic dominion, than the crown and laws and institutions of the several kingdoms give him leave, which makes him so little, if at all considered in France, and so much in Spain. And therefore the English Catholics, who attribute so much to him, make themselves very unwarrantably of another religion, than the Catholic Church professes.”

These observations will be valued by all who honour my little work with a perusal. They present most powerful arguments against the peculiarities of Popery.

To shew however the fallacy of the Popish reasoning on the subject of the antiquity of their Church, I shall now proceed to select some of the chief corruptions of the Papists, and ascertain the date of their introduction. This method will shew that while our doctrines were maintained by the universal Church during six hundred years after Christ, the errors of Rome were not only not received, but positively unknown. Protestants should remember that the Papists endeavour to prove that their's is the only Catholic Church, and that all others are heretical assemblies. We on the other hand merely hold that the Church of England is a true Church, and a pure branch of Christ's holy Catholic Church. The term Catholic therefore is used in a peculiar sense by the Papists; it includes the Church of Rome alone, according to their interpretation of its signification. Its true meaning is expressed by the term universal—universal, not because it is spread over the whole world, but because it is not limited to any place or nation. It resembles the city of Jerusalem, as mentioned by the prophet Zecha-

riah, that should “ be inhabited as towns without walls.”* The Catholic Church is a collection of all Churches that hold the faith as it was once delivered to the saints without any mixture of human inventions. This Universal Church never fails, for to it is the promise made, “ Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.”

In selecting some of the principal errors of the Church of Rome, for the purpose of shewing what their age really is, I shall take first the *Papal Infallibility*, because this is the foundation on which the edifice of Popery rests. It is remarked by an acute writer, that all the Popish controversies have (what Caligula wished the Roman people had), but one neck; and that is Infallibility; and the destruction of this prop is the ruin of the whole. There are indeed many differences of opinion among the Romanists as to where the alleged infallibility is situated, some placing it in the Pope, others in a general council lawfully called, and others in the Pope and a general council united: but all the Papists agree, that infallibility is possessed by their Church. It is a point which they cannot relinquish, for if established, it follows as a natural consequence that all the doctrines taught by the

* Zech. ii. 4.

Church are true. They, therefore, cling to this as their stronghold. Some of their councils have decided that the Pope is above a general council, others that the council is superior to the Pope: but amidst all these contradictions they persist in asserting the infallibility of their Church. It is not my intention to enter into the arguments against this absurd notion, but merely to notice its origin. The doctrine is destitute of any foundation in holy writ. It is a novelty. It was not established as an article of faith until the year 1076, when the council held at Rome determined the point. The opinion had often been advanced prior to this period; but did not become an established doctrine of the Church.

The next point which I shall select is the *supremacy of the Pope*. This is the most ancient of their errors, but yet not of sufficient antiquity for their purpose, since it is subsequent to the sixth century. At the end of the sixth century the very notion of the supremacy was condemned at Rome itself by Gregory the Great, as devilish pride; and when it was at last received it was a mere usurpation effected by the Pope, with the aid of the Emperor. There was a constant struggle for pre-eminence between the Bishops of the two metropolitan sees of Con-

stantinople and Rome, the seats of the governments of the Eastern and Western Empires. The former was the first to claim the supremacy, but it was stoutly resisted by the latter. In this state did the matter remain at the commencement of the seventh century, when Boniface III., fearing his rival at Constantinople, obtained the title from Phocas, the reigning Emperor, who was guilty of treason and murder, by means of which he had mounted the throne. On condition, therefore, that the Pope should sanction his own usurpation, he agreed to sanction that of the see of Rome; and this was the commencement of the Papal supremacy, though many years elapsed before it arrived at its full growth. The doctrine is 1200 years of age, and it was conceived and nurtured in treason, rebellion, and murder.

We take next the doctrine of *Purgatory*. This is quite of modern origin, for it was not established as an article of faith until the fifteenth century. The smoke of the fire did not arise till after the sixth century, and it did not burn out until the Council of Florence in 1439, when the point was decided as an article of faith. So recent in its origin is the doctrine of purgatory, while the great Protestant doctrine of our Church of the purging away sins by the blood

of Christ was promulgated fourteen hundred years before.*

The question concerning *Traditions* was not settled until a much later period: not until the Council of Trent. This question involves in it another, namely, the Rule of Faith. We make the Bible the rule of our faith; to its precepts we yield obedience; to its authority we bow. We view it as a perfect rule; it contains all things necessary to salvation: on this ground we take our stand as on an immoveable rock. The Papists, on the contrary, contend that the Bible, because it condemns their errors, is not a perfect rule of faith; that it is very defective; and to supply its defects they bring in Tradition. One of their doctors divides the word of God into three parts. The *first*, what he wrote himself, the two tables of the law; the *second*, what he ordered to be written, namely, the Old and New Testaments; the *third*, what he neither wrote nor commanded, but what is handed down from father to son by tradition. At all events this is an ingenious division. Many matters of faith, it is asserted, by the Papists, are wanting in the first two parts, while the greatest part of the

* It was not indeed until the Council of Trent that the matter was so decided, that no one could hold communion with the Church, unless he believed this doctrine.

Gospel has come down to us by tradition. Now it will readily be admitted that the points taught by the Church of Rome as gospel, are not to be found in our rule of faith, the Bible, and on that account we reject them. To supply the defect the Papists contend that the traditions and decrees of Popes are of equal authority with the word of God; nay, that the Bible itself is to be expounded by them. The uncertainty, however, of tradition is notorious. In the second century there was a controversy between the Eastern and Western Churches about the observance of Easter: and both pleaded tradition; and what is more singular, traditions existed on both sides; so that the two contrary positions could both be proved by tradition. As Protestants, we are not left to such an uncertain rule: we have the unerring word of a faithful God, who would not leave his people in a state of uncertainty in so important a matter as the salvation of the soul. Still, though this question had been agitated in the Church, yet it was not decided until the Council of Trent, when it was decreed that, "unwritten traditions were of the same authority with the word of God."*

* The Fathers make the Scriptures the sole rule of faith; and in the ancient Councils, as is evident from *Cyril*, "*The Holy Gospels were placed on a throne, representing Christ*,

The people were not deprived of the *sacramental cup* until the year 1415, by a decree of the Council of Constance. Down to this time the laity had communicated in both kinds; for though the priesthood had made the attempt, they were not able to succeed until the above period.

Transubstantiation, was not even seriously maintained by any writer until the ninth century; as is confessed by Bellarmine himself, the Goliath of the Papists; but it was not established as an article of faith until the year 1215, in the Council of Lateran. The word even was unknown until then, when it was coined for the occasion; and though some men believed the doctrine prior to the assembling of the Council, yet it was merely received as a matter of opinion, on which the Church had pronounced no decision.

The Sacrifice of the Mass was a consequence of the preceding doctrine: for when once it was

as the head of the Council, and directing the Bishops to judge righteous judgment." The ancient Councils and writers quote the Scriptures, to confute heretics, and to confirm the truth; and when traditions are cited by them, it is only for the purpose of deciding on questions of rites and ceremonies, and matters of discipline, on all which subjects we recognise their authority of very great weight, but of none in matters of faith, in which their writings are only to be received when they are in perfect agreement with the Holy Scriptures.

established that the body and blood of Christ were actually present in the sacramental elements, the next step was easy, to declare that a sacrifice was offered whenever the Eucharist was administered. It is on the ground of this doctrine that we charge the Papists with idolatry in the mass; but this point was not firmly established till the Council of Trent decreed, "If any man shall say that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, let him be accursed."

Images were not even used in churches before the fourth century; nor was it till the eighth that they were worshipped. Nor were they then universally received.

Indulgences were never heard of for one thousand years after Christ, though they made so much noise in the world afterward. It was the sale of indulgences that first opened the eyes of Martin Luther, and paved the way for the Reformation in Germany. They were never so glaringly broached as at that time.

The Invocation of Saints, and Prayers for the Dead, have no foundation in Sacred Scripture, nor in the early Fathers; but in the fourth century passages occur which at first sight appear to favour the Popish doctrines on these two points. If, however, the Fathers in the fourth century

plainly advocated these doctrines, we should not be affected, because we do not pin our faith on the Fathers, but on the Bible, and in the Bible nothing of the kind is even hinted: but I contend, that all that the Fathers mean in the passages alluded to, is the view entertained in our burial service, in which we beseech God to hasten his coming, that both our felicity and that of departed saints may be perfect and complete.

The charge of *novelty* and *heresy* has been, I think, completely established against the present Church of Rome in the preceding pages, for it is surely heresy to impose articles of faith not to be found in the Bible. I have pointed out the periods when these errors were sanctioned by the Church: but it must be remarked that they were all re-established at the Council of Trent. The pedigree of the Papacy is not very ancient: neither the Saviour nor St. Peter was the author of its creed; but it is indebted for its origin to pride, interest, design, and ambition, on the part of the clergy, and to ignorance and superstition on the part of the people.* The Council of Trent was assembled for the reformation of errors ostensibly; yet by this

* Rome was not built in a day; nor did the Papacy spring up at once. The system of error adopted by the Church of Rome was a work of time.

Council the errors were confirmed. The Trentine Fathers gave a perfect form to the system, by establishing their erroneous doctrines, which were not before admitted by all the members of the Church. They made them legitimate, whereas until this time they were somewhat doubtful. The supremacy, purgatory, transubstantiation, and half-communion, were all unknown in the Spanish Church in the eighth century.* But not only did the Council of Trent establish on a firmer basis the errors already received into the Church—they also introduced other novelties, and imposed them upon the people as infallible doctrines. It was in this Council that the seven sacraments were established, and the necessity of the intention of the priest to render them valid. The latter notion had been broached a few years before, but was not received as an article of faith. According to this notion, it is impossible for the Papists to know when the sacraments are duly administered. Orders are a sacrament, and to be valid there must be a due intention in the ordainer, so that holy orders were not conferred unless the officiating prelate intended to confer them. No man can ascertain the intention of his ordainer; or, even if he was satisfied on this point, how can he be assured that the same in-

* See Geddes's *Mis.*, vol. i. 3.

dividual was duly ordained. On this principle, the Romanists are not certain that they have one priest in their Church.

Many other innovations were introduced at Trent. It was decided that the Latin translation of the Scriptures, called the Vulgate, should be received as the authentic text of the Word of God, instead of the original languages in which it was written. Yet this translation abounds in errors. So numerous indeed are they, that a learned Romanist many years since discovered eight thousand. The assembled Fathers further determined to keep the Scripture under lock and key; for no other translation is to be used, except under certain limitations, and then only a version sanctioned by the Church. The poor are not to read the sacred volume in their own tongue, lest they should wrest and pervert its meaning. The Papists are wise in their generation: they are aware that with an unrestricted use of the Scriptures Popery could not maintain its ground: hence they assert that the indiscriminate use of the Bible would do more harm than good—accordingly it is placed among the prohibited books in the Index Expurgatorius. The Council of Trent declares that “To ask whether more credit is to be given to the Scriptures than to the Church, is to ask whether more

credit is due to the Holy Ghost, speaking by the mouth of the Church, or to the Holy Ghost speaking in the Word of God. The Council has decided that those who read it without licence are incapable of absolution. The Church can pardon all other offences, but she cannot forgive the crime of reading the Bible without permission. This, according to the Trent decision, is the unpardonable sin. Moreover the Scriptures are to be received as the Word of God, on the sole authority of the Church—merely because the Church declares it;—and the Church, say the Fathers at Trent, is the sole judge of the sense of the sacred volume. If any one therefore should venture to interpret a passage contrary to the meaning affixed by the Church, he must be anathematized. So that individual responsibility is completely destroyed by the Romanists.

All these errors were confirmed at Trent, in the year 1564, when it was made unlawful to believe otherwise than was enjoined by that Council. These points were unknown in the first six centuries, and were condemned by many ancient councils of a subsequent date, till at length, through the corruptions of the times, they were one by one introduced, and received their final establishment at Trent. All their errors were gradually introduced; by degrees

they were refined and polished, and brought into a compact system, which received its last touch at this celebrated Council. During the dark ages, the grossest ignorance prevailed throughout the world; consequently, the sacred Scriptures were not generally read: and during this period the errors of the Papacy crept into the Church. To prevent the light of truth from breaking in upon the darkness, which was found to be so profitable to the priesthood, they decided that the Bible was not intended for the mass of the people, and that no doctrine deduced from it should be embraced until it should be sanctioned by the Pope, to whom the gift of infallibility was imparted. Thus the rejection of our Lord's injunction, "Search the Scriptures," was now established as a part of the Christian scheme. What was made a solemn duty by the Saviour, is rendered a heinous crime by the infallible Church of Rome. The Papists pretend that their errors are received on the authority of universal and uninterrupted traditions, which has been proved to be false. There is no early tradition for any one of these errors. They have forsaken the apostolic traditions, which prove that no doctrines were received in the early Church except such as were plainly declared in sacred Scripture. The articles of

the Apostles' Creed were, for instance, delivered by oral tradition to the Church by the Apostles. And this is the famous tradition sometimes spoken of in the writings of the Fathers. None of these points are even alluded to in the Apostles' creed, the Nicene creed, nor the Athanasian creed; nor is there a single intimation in these ancient and orthodox documents respecting the supremacy of Rome. All the articles of these creeds are drawn from the Scripture; and, consequently, in the primitive Church the Bible was the only rule of faith.

At the time when the Trentine Fathers were released from their labours, the points which had been established by the Council were embodied into a new creed by Pius IV., which is now imposed upon the Church of Rome. This creed was never heard of before the reign of him whose name it bears. It was drawn up at the close of the Council of Trent: and after mentioning the articles of the Apostles' Creed, it recites the new ones, which had been fabricated by the Tridentine Fathers, and imposes them on pain of damnation. As then the Church of Rome has coined new articles of faith, which it imposes as terms of communion, it must stand convicted of *schism*, as well as of *heresy*. Everything rejected by our Reformers was an innovation; and

the imposers of such things, not the rejectors, are the schismatics. The setting up of a new creed other than what is founded on the Bible is most assuredly a schismatical act. The twelve articles of the Creed of Pope Pius are of very recent date, but our doctrines are as ancient as the Scriptures. By the Council of Trent the most grievous errors were stamped as articles of faith; and from this period the Roman Church stands chargeable with the guilt of *schism*, in departing from the truth, and adulterating the faith. At the Reformation a separation took place between the tares and the wheat, the precious and the vile. The Reformers restored the church to her original purity, and from that moment the Papists became schismatics and heretics, while the truth continued with the Churches of the Reformation. Prior to the Council of Trent the errors that abounded were more properly the errors of the individuals who received them than of the whole church in her collective capacity, though the persons who admitted them constituted an overwhelming majority; now on the contrary, they are the errors of the Church. It was possible formerly to be comprehended within the pale of the Church of Rome, and yet not receive all the erroneous doctrines that had been propagated, for individuals might protest

against them ; but since the decision of Trent, they must be received on pain of damnation. That Council sealed the schism, heresy, and apostacy of the Romish Church. " Whatever," says Archbishop Bramhall, " doth leave its proper place in the body to usurp the office of the head is the cause of confusion, division, and schism among the members ; the Pope with his court doth seek to usurp the office of the head ; being but a branch doth challenge to himself the place of the root ; being but a stone in the building, will needs be considered as an absolute foundation." He then presses the argument, that, having coined new articles of faith, she must stand convicted of schism.*

The result of the decisions of the Council, however, evinces the infatuation under which the Papists laboured. It was assembled for the purpose among other things of checking the Protestant heresy ; yet it became the means of spreading and promoting it. In consequence of their decisions the ruin of their cause was sealed in many parts of Europe ; for from that time the Reformation gained strength by the accession of numbers, who would have continued within the pale of the Church, if they could have been permitted to remain without receiving all

* Bramhall's Reply to the Bishop of Calcedon, p. 318.

the newly coined doctrines. As the Council decreed that the new articles, which though received by the majority, had never been universally recognized, should thenceforth become articles of faith, the belief of which was necessary to communion with the Church ; thousands of individuals in various places, were compelled to separate from the Papacy, who would not have contemplated such a step, if they had been permitted to protest against what they deemed pernicious errors. The hesitating and the wavering were brought to a speedy decision ; they were induced to cast in their lot with the Reformers, and to quit a Church, which had now sealed her apostacy by stamping error with the mark of truth.

As long as the Church of Rome acts on the principles established by the Council of Trent, she must continue unchanged in her views. She cannot renounce a single iota, or her infallibility is overturned. It is remarkable that the assertion that the Papacy is changed is made only by their Protestant advocates, while the Papists themselves, perceiving the inconsistency of such an assertion, remain silent on the subject. Their conduct at the present moment, however, proves that Popery is unchangeable. As an illustration of its unchanged principles I will here

mention a fact, which was related to me by a friend of my own, who is the relative of the individual to whom the circumstance refers. An English gentleman had been some years resident in a certain city in Spain, at the period of the abolition of the Inquisition: and curiosity led him to examine the books of the secret tribunal, in which were recorded the names of those who had been denounced to the holy office, and who were consequently marked out as its victims. He was startled at finding that the very first name on the list was his own; but he was more startled at the discovery that the person who had denounced him to the Inquisition was a gentleman who was a frequent guest at his table, and whom he had long regarded in the light of a particular friend. In short, if there was one native of Spain upon whom he had imagined that he might rely, and whom he had distinguished by marks of confidence, the Spaniard in question was that person. Yet this was the very man who had denounced him to the holy office. The Spanish gentleman was a true Papist, and even the common charities of life, and the sacred ties of friendship were all sacrificed to what he deemed the interests of the Church of Rome. Such are the genuine fruits of the Popish sys-

tem, when disengaged from the restrictions of law or public opinion.

In the preceding pages will be found ample details of the practices of the Papists in England. My object in narrating the facts to which I have endeavoured to direct the attention of those who may favour my volume with a perusal, is a simple, but yet an important one. Popery is advancing with rapid pace amongst us; and Protestants are in too many instances indifferent. To check these evils is my object in this work. May the great Head of the Church bless it to the promotion of the great and glorious truths which were preached by our Reformers, and which had been buried, during so many ages, amid the rubbish of Romish superstitions!

THE END.

By the same Author, in 1 vol. 8vo. price 12s

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH EPISCOPACY ; from the period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity, with notices of the Religious Parties of the time, and a Review of Ecclesiastical Affairs in England, from the Reformation.

“ This volume has made a very valuable addition to the Ecclesiastical Literature of the day.”—*British Magazine*.

“ Mr. Lathbury has produced a book of much interest, and has really made an important addition to our historical knowledge.”—*Literary Gazette*.

“ He tells the tale perspicuously and dispassionately.”—*British Critic*.

“ An admirable and well digested history.”—*Frazer's Mag.*

“ He has investigated calmly, arbitrated firmly, and, in our opinion, produced a work which will place his name very high in the ranks of Ecclesiastical Literature.”—*Bath Chron.*

“ Mr. Lathbury has our thanks for endeavouring to illustrate in a popular form a most interesting period of our Church's annals.”—*Church of England Magazine*.

“ We recommend Mr. Lathbury's work to every member and lover of the National Church. Good sense, sound reasoning, and enlightened churchmanship are its distinguishing characteristics.”—*Protestant Journal*.

“ The sages of the north (in an article not to be exceeded by any of their happiest former efforts for flippant ignorance and vulgar coarseness) have traduced him as a high-flyer and malignant. No higher encomium can be desired for any work, than to say that it is the production of a writer who has earned such abuse.”—*Dublin Christian Examiner*.

“ The author has executed his task with very creditable skill, with very laborious research, and with a moderation and impartiality which entitle him to unqualified commendation.”

“ Let folks dispute as they will the conclusions he has drawn ; but will any person of veracity, any person of ordinary decency, say that he has deserved the accusation which the Edinburgh Reviewer, with a want of decency, peculiarly his own, has brought against Mr. Lathbury.”—*Times*.

19



Digitized by Google

