

LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case

BX 955 .H56 1834 c.1

Shelf

Book

A history of popery

A DONATION

FROM

Rev. John Miller
Princeton, N. J.

Received

April 9th, 1878.





HISTORY OF POPERY,

INCLUDING ITS

ORIGIN, PROGRESS, DOCTRINES, PRACTICE,
INSTITUTIONS, AND FRUITS,

TO THE

COMMENCEMENT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY A WATCHMAN.

"I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their
peace day nor night."—Isa. lxii. 6.

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY,

BY SAMUEL MILLER, D. D.,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Ch. Government in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. HAVEN, 148 NASSAU ST.

1834.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1834,
BY JOHN P. HAVEN,
in the Office of the Clerk of the Southern District of New York.

THOMAS GEORGE, JR. PRINTER.

C O N T E N T S.

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY, Page 3

AUTHOR'S PREFACE, 18

SECTION I.

The Origin of Popery, 25

SECTION II.

Events preceding, and contributing to, the rise of Popery, 35

SECTION III.

An examination of the popish argument in support of the supremacy, &c. of the bishop of Rome, 44

SECTION IV.

Examination of historical testimony relative to the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, during the first six centuries, 50

SECTION V.

The progress of Popery during the twelve centuries succeeding its rise, 60

SECTION VI.

Doctrines of Popery, 153

CONTENTS.

SECTION VII.

Idolatry of Popery, 236

SECTION VIII.

Persecutions of Popery, 277

SECTION IX.

Superstitions of Popery, 336

SECTION X.

Prophetic views of Popery from the scriptures, . . . 404

SECTION XI.

Moral influence of Popery, 411

CONCLUSION, 415

BRISTOL
THEOLOGICAL

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY.

THE Popish controversy has lately assumed an aspect in our country which must render it deeply interesting to every sincere and intelligent Christian. Ten years ago, the revival of this controversy, as an object of general attention, and of zealous effort, would have appeared unreasonable, if not liable to the charge of something approaching to persecution. At that time, the adherents of the "Man of Sin," being regarded as not more than a *fortieth* or *fiftieth* part of our population, and maintaining generally that silent and inoffensive course which might have been expected in the nineteenth century, on the part of a small minority, who at once respected their own claims, and remembered what was due, in a free country, to the claims and the influence of a predominant Protestant community, gave little occasion for public animadversion. Of late, however, the aspect of things is not a little changed. The native and well known spirit of their sect is beginning with more distinctness to disclose itself. Feeling their body strengthened by large emigrations from the old world; enabled, by rich pecuniary contributions from various foreign sources, to multiply and invigorate their sectarian establishments; having received, with their recent importations, a considerable increase of that vulgar ferocity which might have been anticipated from the character of those importations, and imagining that the time had come when they needed nothing but a public controversy, and a confident tone, to ensure their triumph; they have lately assumed an attitude, and indulged in a language to which we have not

hitherto been accustomed; and have even ventured, in some memorable instances, after inviting discussion, to meet dignified and irresistible argument, with insolent threats or with brutal violence.

In these circumstances,—when the old and well known claims of these children of “Anti-christ” have been urged with more than wonted noise and offensiveness; when Protestants have been assailed, and challenged in a manner which indicated a fixed purpose, and the largest hopes, of encroachment on their ranks by proselytism;—it surely became a duty to show that the “faith once delivered to the saints” had friends willing and able to stand forth in her defence. The controversy, as it exists in the United States, originated with the Romanists. It is of their own seeking. It ought, however, to be matter of joy, not of regret. These votaries of the “mystery of iniquity” have provoked Protestants to do what ought to have been done before. They have been met with a spirit and a force of argument truly gratifying to the friends of apostolic purity. But there is yet room for much more to be written and published. The battle, as I take it, is but just begun. And now that Protestants have been compelled, in fidelity to their master in heaven, to gird on their armour, and to lift the weapons of consecrated warfare; I trust they will never be laid aside, until every family and individual in our land shall be distinctly put on their guard against the character and design of these foes of God and man. It is earnestly to be hoped, however, that all who enter the lists in this warfare will be careful with respect to the weapons which they employ. Our weapons must not, like theirs, be “carnal,” but “spiritual.” These alone will be “mighty through God to the pulling down of strong

holds." It was, therefore, with pleasure I learned that the author of the present volume intended to give a compendious view of the "*History of Popery.*" The truth is, the simple disclosure of FACTS is all that is necessary in this case. He who brings the corruptions of the Papacy to the test of God's unerring word, and presents a dispassionate and unvarnished HISTORY of their rise, progress, and practical influence, cannot fail of convincing candid and intelligent minds of their pestiferous character. All we want, under God, to effect the overthrow of this enormous mass of error and superstition is LIGHT. Let light pervade our land;—let the BIBLE and the SABBATH SCHOOL be placed within the reach of every adult and every child in the United States;—let compends of instruction in reference to the Papacy be every where circulated;—and let the watchmen on the walls of *Zion*, in the spirit of their Master, faithfully INSTRUCT and WARN;—and all will be well. It is only where gross ignorance, sensuality, and a willingness to be hoodwinked and deceived reign, that the Papacy can retain its power.

It is deeply to be deplored that the importance of suitable attention to this controversy is not more justly appreciated by the mass of our Protestant community. There are multitudes who think that there is not the least danger of the religion of the church of *Rome* gaining ground in our country; and, of course, that all efforts to prevent this mischief are unnecessary. Such persons forget that, although the system of Popery is directly opposed to enlightened reason, and to the word of God, it presents very strong attractions to all those who are more fond of a splendid and gaudy ritual, than of a self-denying and spiritual religion. They forget

that this system of miserable superstition has been, in all ages, the favorite resort of those who wish to bear the Christian name, and to cherish a hope of acceptance with God, without the sacrifice of a single lust. They forget that the plan of salvation revealed in the Gospel is of all proposals the most revolting to the proud heart of fallen man. They forget that the impenitent sinner is willing to undergo the heaviest drudgery of rites and ceremonies; to fast; to scourge and lacerate his body; to pay money; to submit to any prescribed penance or privation for a short time; if by these means he may be certain of gaining the heavenly paradise. *These* he may be, and often is willing to give for such an assurance. But to give his *heart* to God; to deny himself; to renounce his own righteousness in every form; to "crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts;" to follow the Saviour as his Prophet, Priest and King; as the Lord his righteousness, and the Lord his strength; as his justifier, his model, his life, his all;—this he is not prepared to do, and cannot yield.

"Now to relieve this proud and impenitent mind—which is the mind of all men by nature—the Roman Catholic system comes with promises and allurements of the most fascinating kind. It meets him with a scheme of most ingenious contrivances for satisfying every doubt, and removing every difficulty,—without any real holiness either of heart or life. It assures him, that if he live and die in communion with the Church of *Rome*, he is, of course, in real covenant and communion with Christ:—that there is no need of any radical change of heart, provided he will submit to the dictation and discipline of the constituted authorities of that Church:—that by the sacrament of Baptism, a priest can regenerate

him, and that no other change than that which Baptism includes, need be sought or expected:—that by this baptism, when regularly administered, all his sins are taken away, and he reconciled to God:—that by a regular attendance on the *sacrament* of Penance, all his sins committed, from time to time, after baptism, may be certainly forgiven:—and that by a regular confession and absolution during life, and the reception of Extreme Unction when he comes to die, he may be assured of everlasting happiness:—or that, at the worst, he will only be detained for a time in Purgatory; which, however, will be made as short and light as possible, if he bequeath a handsome sum to the Church; or if his surviving friends shall pay liberally for the prayers that may be said, and the masses that may be performed for his soul.”

“According to this delusive system, then, a man may live and die without any real holiness, and yet, in spite of all the scripture has so solemnly pronounced to the contrary, may be certain of seeing the Lord in peace. He need not trouble himself to read the Scriptures. The *Church* reads, judges, and engages for him. The *Church* has a stock of *merit* to dispose of, which, upon being properly *paid for*, she can set down to his account, and make available to his acceptance. So that, however multiplied and enormous his sins, and however obstinately and impenitently persisted in, to the last hour of his life; still if he submit to all the rites of the Church, and to all the penances imposed on him by the proper authority;—he is certainly safe; certainly secure of salvation. Such is the openly published and miserable system of these soul-destroying deceivers. In support of all these statements, testimony of the most unequivocal kind might be

adduced from Romish authorities of the highest character. We are aware, indeed, that most of the allegations above stated, have been either denied, or attempted to be explained away by ingenious apologists for Romish claims:—but we are very sure that, when the whole system, taken together, is compared with its highest official vouchers, our representation will be completely borne out in every particular.”*

In adopting the above quotation, as descriptive of the system of Romanism, no injustice is done to that system or its adherents. It is true, indeed, as the writer intimates, that several of the articles specified, are either wholly disowned, or artfully glossed over by ingenious Popish advocates, who wish to conciliate. But for every part of the statement, it is certain that high Romish authorities may be quoted; and when we go among the mass of the adherents to the Papacy, and examine the principles and confidence which they cherish, and which they are distinctly *encouraged* to cherish, facts are disclosed, on every side, which abundantly sustain the foregoing statement in all its extent. In fact, the whole system of the Church of *Rome* consists in putting a set of deified saints, and deified ceremonies in the place of Christ, as the ground of hope, while He is only *nominally* retained as the Saviour; and, at the same time, presenting their miserable idolatry in such language, and clothing it in such an attractive, and even bewitching dress, that it bears away the ignorant and the unsuspecting with scarcely a thought of resistance.

Is there no danger then, that this plausible, splendid, self-righteous system, so admirably adapted to dazzle and to captivate;—is there no danger that it will deceive and

* *Biblical Repertory*, vol. v. p. 504, 505.

lead away unwary souls? So far is this from being the case, that we may say with confidence, the danger is imminent. It is precisely that form of religious observance which best agrees with the proud, selfish and sensual nature of man. It has charms for the voluptuous, the gay, the dissipated and the worldly which scarcely any thing earthly can resist. It has exactly *that* to offer which the "carnal mind, which is enmity against God," will ever be found, while it remains such, to prefer to the pure, humbling, self-renouncing, and self-sacrificing plan of salvation through a crucified Redeemer;—in one word, to the "simplicity that is in Christ." Truly instead of considering it as wonderful that, in a Protestant land, and in the nineteenth century, proselytes to the Papacy are made, we ought rather to regard it as wonderful that they are not tenfold more numerous than we find them.

Can any enlightened Protestant, then, suppose that there is no need of putting his children and the community at large, on their guard against this most profligate, and at the same time most insinuating and delusive of all the systems of error which bear the Christian name? When the Papists are flooding our country with their ecclesiastics, their books, and their periodical papers;—when they are sagaciously erecting seminaries of imposing and highly popular character, in many districts of the United States very imperfectly, if at all, furnished with sounder ones of equal reputation;—when they are artfully opening these seminaries to students on *cheaper terms* than most others can afford, and in some cases insiduously offering to receive Protestant children into their literary institutions *free of all charge*;—when it is notorious that one great object of the seminaries in ques-

tion is to extend and facilitate the work of making proselytes to the Papacy;—when we see adults, as well as children, in considerable numbers, actually made the dupes and the victims of these accepted offers;—and when those high in ecclesiastical authority among them, are continually boasting of the number and importance of their converts;—when facts of this kind are daily presented to public view—I must say, if they are not serious and awakening in their aspect, I scarcely know what ought to be so deemed. If those who are “set for the defence of the Gospel,” cannot see, and will not give warning of such facts, it is difficult to imagine what would be sufficient to rouse them to a faithful discharge of their duty. The Papists themselves speak without scruple of their proselyting projects. Archbishop *Whitfield*, of *Baltimore*, in a late report to an association in *Vienna*, formed for the express purpose of spreading Romanism in *America*, says—“I cannot omit mentioning, that in this school, as in all the Catholic institutions for education, a large proportion of the children are *Protestants*; a circumstance which contributes not a little to the spread of our holy doctrine, and the removal of prejudices.” There are those, it seems, who will not believe them even on their own explicit and undisguised testimony!

Can Christians, or Christian ministers forget that this is a subject of the deepest interest to *their own offspring*, as well as to the whole Church of God in our land? Can they forget that those large districts in which Popery, if not resisted and exposed, may become predominant, may be hereafter the residence of their children, or their children’s children, where they may be ensnared and ruined forever? Can they forget that Popery is, in its own na-

ture, a system of tyranny over both the minds and bodies of men ; that it openly sets at naught the rights of conscience ; that where it reigns, it is essentially destructive of civil and religious liberty ; and that, if it should ever obtain the ascendancy in our beloved country, we may bid farewell to that liberty with which it has pleased Him who "sits as Governor among the nations" to make us free ? Surely every feeling of natural affection, of Christian benevolence, and of enlightened patriotism should inspire an interest in this subject of the most intense character.

Let it not be said, that, while Popery is, in some countries, a corrupt, and corrupting system ; while, for example, in *Spain*, in *Portugal* and in *Italy*, it holds a gloomy and a pernicious reign ;—it is, in the United States, a *harmless thing*, divested, in a great measure, if not entirely, of every formidable and threatening feature. Many Protestants are entirely deceived by impressions of this kind. They hear some plausible and artful Papist pleading the cause of his religion ; denying some of the most serious imputations against it, and disguising others under the most ingenious glosses ;—they hear these representations, and wonder why good people should be so much prejudiced against Roman Catholics ! This is an utter delusion. The spirit of the Papacy is the very same at this hour, that it was when *Luther* took his life in his hand, and went forth against the embattled hosts of superstition and sin. There *can*, indeed, be no change without an abandonment of her essential principles. It is her glory, her votaries tell us, that she is, in all respects, the same, in the United States, and in the nineteenth century, that she ever was. And they say the truth. It is even so. She has undergone no essen-

tial change. Like all systems, indeed, of profound and organized falsehood, she can alter her tones, her professions, and even her aspect, at pleasure ; but the moment she is placed in circumstances which allow her to act out her genuine spirit, we find it to be the very same spirit which established the Inquisition in the twelfth century ; which butchered the poor and pious *Waldenses*, in their secluded vallies, in the fifteenth and seventeenth ; which, for ages, imprisoned and burnt the objects of their cupidity or resentment, without mercy ; and which has never ceased, since she possessed the power, to deceive, cheat, oppress and destroy those whom she could subjugate to her will, under the pretext of conducting them to happiness here and hereafter.

And what principle or practice has the Papacy abandoned, in modern times, or in this country, which she was able to maintain ? Does she not to this hour continue to assert the infallibility of the Pope, and his right to pronounce what is the will of Christ, without appeal even to the Scriptures ? Does she not virtually contend for tradition, and for uninspired Councils and Fathers, as equal, or rather paramount, as a rule of faith, to the infallible Word ? Does she not maintain, as openly and zealously as ever, the doctrine of human merit, as the foundation of hope toward God ; of works of supererogation ; and of indulgences to sin purchased by the payment of money ? Does she not still hold the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, “that enormous outrage on every dictate of sense and reason, as well as of Scripture ?” Does she not still hold fast to her system of “auricular confession,” which opens a door to almost every species of licentiousness, and oppression ? Has she not, within a few years, deliberately restored the power and the cru-

elties of the *Inquisition*, an institution which, perhaps, has been the means of inflicting more injury and misery, and of bringing on individuals and families a larger amount of destruction to life, liberty, and peace than any other that ever bore the Christian name? Does she not, after all her multiplied denials of the fact, continue to lock up the Scriptures from the common people, and require them to read such parts only of the inspired volume as the *Church* allows them to see; and to put upon it that interpretation which the *Church* commands them to adopt? Has she not recently restored the order of the *Jesuits*, whose doctrinal and moral profligacy caused them, more than half a century ago, to be expelled from the territory of almost every state in *Europe*, not even excepting those under the dominion of *Rome*; and finally to be abolished by the Pope, as a disgrace to Christendom? An order, concerning which Mr. *Hume* has said, that "by the very nature of their institution, they were engaged to pervert learning; to refine away the plainest dictates of morality; and to erect a regular system of casuistry, by which prevarication, perjury, and every crime, where it served their ghostly purposes, might be justified and defended." Does she not insist as much as ever on the celibacy of the clergy, with all the appalling mass of abominations with which that restriction has been always connected? Does she not still endeavor, as far as practicable, to subject the intellectual powers, the consciences, the literary pursuits, the inquiries, and the property of men to her oppressive domination? Are these symptoms of returning moderation or purity? True, she does not practice some of her worst enormities in this country. The unbridled profligacy of her Monasteries and Nunneries; the heart-rending cruelties of the

Inquisition; the public sale of Indulgences to commit the most shocking crimes; the open claims of dominion over the consciences and the persons of men; and the fires of *Smithfield* and of *Constance* have not yet been re-acted in our happy land. But why? Simply because public opinion, and public law render it impracticable. That the Papal system itself is still favorable to all these enormities, it is no want of charity to say, because that "infallible and unchanging Church," in all countries in which she *dares* to do so, IS ACTUALLY STILL EXHIBITING THOSE ENORMITIES, WITHOUT RELENTING OR SHAME! As long, then, as this ecclesiastical power retains these principles, and practices these crimes, can we be mistaken in applying to it those tremendous titles which the Spirit of Prophecy evidently employs to designate his character;—"the Man of sin;" "the Son of perdition;" "the Anti-christ," who "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped?"

The character of the late Bishop *Watson*, as remarkably free from a spirit of bigotry, and what some are disposed to call "puritanical prejudice," is well known. Yet he, in reference to the subject before us, has expressed himself in the following terms:

"That the *Popish* religion is the *Christian* religion, is a false position; and therefore Christianity may be true, though the religion of the Church of *Rome* be, in many of its parts, an imposture. This observation should always be kept in mind by such as are sent to finish their education by travelling in Catholic countries. It may seem paradoxical to assert, that the corruptions of any religion can be proofs of its truth; yet the corruptions of the Christian religion, as practised by the Church of

Rome, are certain proofs of the truth of the Christian religion; inasmuch as they are exact completions of the prophecies which were delivered by *Daniel*, *St. Paul*, and *St. John*, concerning that apostacy from the faith, which was to take place in latter times. I have known the infidelity of more than one young man happily removed, by showing him the characters of Popery delineated by *St. Paul*, in his prophecy concerning the 'Man of Sin' (2 *Thess.* ii. 1) and in that concerning the apostacy of latter times (1 *Tim.* iv. 1.) Bishop *Hurd*, in his seventh sermon at Warburton's Lecture, has given a concise history of the charge of *Anti-christianism*, which has, at different times, been brought against the Church of Rome. Dr. *Whitaker*, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, in his exercise for his degree at the commencement in 1582, supported this *Thesis*—'*Pontifex Romanus est ille Antichristus quem futurum Scriptura prædixit;*' i. e. 'The Pope of Rome is that Antichrist whom the Scripture foretold as to come.' He had, before that time, refuted the forty arguments by which *Nicholas Sanders* boasted that he had demonstrated that the Pope was *not* Antichrist. *Whitaker's* works are very well worth being looked into by those who would know what can be said for and against the other principal points in controversy between Protestants and Papists, as well as against this PRIMARY PILLAR OF THE REFORMED FAITH—That the Hierarchy of the Church of Rome is the *Little Horn* of *Daniel*, the *Man of Sin* of *St. Paul*, and the *Antichrist* of *St. John*. The evidence arising from the completion of the prophecies relative to the *Rise*, *Character*, and *Fall* of the *Man of Sin*, is an increasing evidence. It strikes *us* with more force than it struck our ancestors before the Reformation; and it will strike

our *posterity*, who shall observe the different gradations of his decline, and his final catastrophe, with more force than it now strikes us.”*

There is one serious disadvantage under which Protestants labour in engaging in controversy with the Romanists, which it gives me pain to notice, but which cannot, in justice to the cause of truth, be overlooked. The professed morality of the former is pure and strict; whereas, that of the latter is radically corrupt and evasive. The doctrine, that “no faith is to be kept with heretics;” and that it is lawful to “do evil that good may come;” in other words, that there is no harm in denying, equivocating, concealing, deceiving, and uttering direct falsehoods, for the sake of bringing men into the “true Church,” or defending the character of that Church, is a doctrine so well known to be practically adopted by the advocates of the Papacy, that they require to be as diligently watched as a highwayman, or an assassin in the dark. The late controversy with the Romanists, as conducted in our principal cities, afforded specimens of these profligate and dishonorable arts, as numerous as they were revolting. Misrepresentations the most gross were not only made, but after their falsehood was demonstrated, were persisted in with a recklessness truly astonishing. With such adversaries, it is difficult for men of truth and of delicacy to carry on a contest. To employ their own weapons is inadmissible: while to follow them in all their subterfuges of evasion and falsehood, is as painful as it is tedious; and may, after all, fail of satisfying those

* *Theological Tracts*, Vol. V. Prefatory Remarks on *Benson's* Essay on the Man of Sin.

who are of such a temperament, as to be borne down by a brazen and insolent front.

I am aware that some, who profess to be fully convinced that Romanism is a corrupt and a mischievous system, are prejudiced against all *controversy*, as such, and deny that it is useful to employ it even in defence of the truth. They imagine that all animadversion on the religious tenets of others, and especially all denunciation of them, as unscriptural and dangerous, tend to evil only, and ought to be avoided. If the eye of any such Protestant should light on this page, he is earnestly entreated to ponder well the following questions.—Are there not really fundamental errors, which amount to “another Gospel,” and which the inspired apostle has pronounced “damnable heresies?” If this be so, ought not our children and neighbours, who may be assailed sooner than we imagine by these heresies, to be distinctly put on their guard against them? Is not all error mischievous in its tendency, and therefore to be avoided and opposed? Are we not enjoined to “try the spirits whether they are of God, seeing many false prophets are gone out into the world?” Nay, are we not expressly commanded, to “*contend earnestly* for the faith once delivered to the saints?” Can we, therefore, without unfaithfulness to our Master in heaven, suffer mischievous error to be propagated around us, without an effort to oppose and refute it? Does not the word of God represent the children of men as, universally, by nature, disposed to embrace error rather than truth; and does it not represent one great object of the institution of a Church on earth, as being to lift up a Standard, and bear a solemn, and a constant testimony against corruption in principle and practice? Have not Christians been called, in fact, in all ages to defend the truth against

gainsayers ; and has not controversy been ever the principal means, under the power of the Holy Spirit, of supporting and extending Gospel truth ? Is it not manifestly, then, one of the most important duties which we owe to God, and our fellow men—"to prove all things ;" to "hold fast that which is good ;" to warn the ignorant and unwary against the "instruction that causeth to err ;" and to be well established in the truth ? Nay, is it *possible* to avoid controversy, in such a world as this, without a dereliction of duty ? Truly, if there be any lesson taught in the Bible, it is, that Christians cannot witness the prevalence of corruption, whether in principle or practice, without lifting against it a warning voice, and employing for its overthrow all the authorized weapons of their hallowed warfare, unless they would sin against God, and "offend against the generation of the righteous."

With regard to the ensuing "History of Popery," my engagements as well as my situation in regard to the manuscript, and the press, have prevented my giving it an entire perusal. But my knowledge of the truly respectable character of the Author, as well as the cursory inspection which I have been able to give to some detached parts of the work,—satisfy me that it may be read with entire confidence, and that it is adapted to do much good. So far as my observation has gone, I am persuaded that no statement is made but on the best authority ; that in a number of cases, the picture might have been made darker without injustice ; and that the whole is executed in a manner, which, while it reflects honor on the writer, is well worthy of the careful perusal of all who wish to be able to "give a reason of the hope that is in them," and to warn their children, and others around them, against those delusions which destroy the soul.

SAMUEL MILLER.

Princeton, March 28, 1834.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

It will not be denied by any correct observer of the *signs of the times*, that the inhabitants of this land have occasion to inform themselves thoroughly respecting the merits of popery. This would be true, if we consider only the intrinsic importance of the subject. Popery has deeply affected the greater part of the visible Christian world, and spread its influence far and wide in the earth. Wherever it goes, it strikes its roots deep into all the interests and relations of life. It takes hold on civil as well as religious concerns: it insinuates itself into the retirement of social and domestic intercourse: it thrusts its meddling fingers into every transaction, and claims the right to control all that pertains to the body or soul, to time or eternity. Popery, therefore, it must be confessed, involves the interests and happiness of the human race to an immeasurable extent. For this reason it certainly ought to be well understood. If it is good, and calculated to promote the best interests of social and moral beings, then by all means let it be well known, that all may partake of its blessings. But if it be bad, it ought no less to be known, that its baleful influence may be avoided, and its dominion dissolved. Any cause which exerts so powerful an influence on the interests of man as popery, ought to be thoroughly explored and fully disclosed, that every one concerned may be able to form a correct opinion of its merits. And in this age, and this land of free inquiry, popery can expect no less. Her votaries will not be summoned before the tribunal of the inquisition, nor will they be examined by rack and torture. This regimen is peculiar to popery; but they are summoned to the bar of public opinion, from which there is no appeal. Let popery then prepare to lay off her cloaks and pretences, and to appear in her true character.

In addition to the above mentioned considerations of universal application, the people of this land have still more urgent motives to investigate the length, breadth, and depth of popery. Our country is blessed with a government of

perfect religious toleration. That is to say, every person is secure in such religious belief and practice as he prefers, provided he does not infringe on the existence and exercise of this right in his fellow-citizens. This principle of toleration, among those denominations which allow the benefits of it to others, as well as take advantage of it themselves, is perfectly safe and equitable. But under the dominion of popery we find a community of men, who claim the right to control, not only their own faith and practice, but that of all others. They are the oracles of truth : with them dwells infallibility : and all who differ from *them* are of course heretics : and as such, unworthy of the common civilities and rights of men. They claim it as their right, and regard it as their bounden duty, to compel by physical force, nay, by tortures and death, the assent of all their fellow-men to their belief, and conformity to their dictates. What, then, is the effect of toleration in regard to papists? It is simply this: they are protected and cherished in common with all other citizens, until they can gain power sufficient to subjugate and destroy all others. Popery takes advantage of toleration while circumstances require it, but it cannot, in consistency, extend that toleration to others. It takes advantage of a free government to gain power, but it must, to maintain consistency, destroy every free government, just as soon as it has the power in possession. It is like the serpent, benumbed with cold, which a countryman brought to his fireside. But no sooner did the reptile feel the genial heat restoring his wonted activity, than he fell to biting the children. The uniform practice of papists, in all countries where they have possessed the power, shows that they well understand what consistency, with their principles, demands. For when or where did any one ever hear of toleration or freedom in a government wielded by their hands?

The number of papists bound together, and to the pope of Rome, by a tie, and by sympathies, which in their view are paramount to every other, is rapidly increasing and spreading in our country. And while we cannot turn away our eyes from this fact, we ought to recollect that our government is not only one of toleration, but also that it is elective. In other words, that it is entirely in the hands of the people. If the views and principles of the people change, a corresponding

change of the government must follow. There is no spell or charm in republicanism that can preserve it a moment after the people become bent on oppression. Look, then, at the floods of immigration which are pouring in upon us from popish countries. Look at the natural inclination of men of all countries to embrace false religion. Look at the boldness and activity of the emissaries of the pope in this country: the treasures which are opened in Europe for their encouragement and support: and say, is it not possible that popery may, in an evil hour, by adroitly adjusting herself to some party interest, seize the reins of our government? Suppose it done, and all our free institutions would wither as leaves touched with frost. Suppose it done, and what is the prospect at once presented to every other class of citizens? What says the record of past ages, the experience of the exiled, persecuted, worn out servants of the Lord, in past periods of the world, to this question? What could any who differ from them expect but the dungeons of the inquisition, the fire and faggots of persecution? Popery has hitherto taken advantage of the want of information respecting it, which extensively prevails in this country. It has not made efforts or pretensions here until recently, and what has been known concerning it, has been derived from the stories and reports of other times, and other parts of the world, but in which we have felt no personal interest. But this scantiness of information is highly auspicious to the cause of popery. Darkness is her element. And where ignorance and apathy reign, where the press is silent, there she will come forth, not to show herself, but to exhibit her delusive pageantry. She will artfully conceal her designs, while she amuses with many things that bear the epithet *holy*. There is the *holy cross*, the *holy wafer*, the *holy water*, the *holy virgin*, the *holy saints*, the *holy priests*, the *holy pope*, and many other things as *holy* as these. There are the traditions of men, the orders and decrees of councils made for occasion, there are pictures, images, bones, garments, and hair of saints, and if you will implicitly believe, and ask no questions, there are miracles too. And while the attention of the ignorant and superstitious is rivetted by these shows, their bands are made strong, and like the heedless fly, they are implicated in a web from which there is little hope of

escape. But in all this, observe, popery shows only the fair side. She keeps back out of sight her apparatus of racks and tortures. She will mock at your fears of the blood-thirsty inquisition. And if you relate what popery has been in other countries and at other times, she pretends there is some relaxation of the system, and that popery has fallen violently in love with free government and republican institutions. Let this process go on without exposure, and who will venture to insure our own country against papal dominion? Moreover, this outside religion, this show and grimace, this buying salvation by bowing and muttering, and withal, by the virtue of the purse, is taking in our world. It is just what men will prefer, if their consciences and understandings are not too much enlightened to admit its moral deformity and its absurdity. What then is to be done? Shall popery be met with restrictive and penal statues, with the arm of civil authority or physical force? By no means. This would be utterly inconsistent with the genius of our free institutions, and the spirit of our religion. Popery may propagate her cause by fraud or blood, but no good cause can flourish by such means. How then shall it be met? The answer is, by evidence and argument. Let public opinion be enlightened, let popery be examined and exposed, leave no nook for it to hide. Pour in light upon its dark recesses. If it will intrude into our country, insist upon it, that it shall come in its true character. Tear away every mask, cloak and curtain, show it to the world as it is. Write, print, publish, read, converse, till the important facts respecting this subject have a general circulation in the community. If ship loads of papists are landed on our shores from lands of darkness, let them find that they have come into a land of light. If men and women will be papists in this land of freedom, they shall have no excuse. They shall know what they embrace, yes, and the world shall know likewise, and they shall take the responsibility of such a choice. To effect this purpose, however, the friends of truth and liberty must be on the alert. In several respects, misapprehension appears to prevail in this country in regard to popery. One is, that it is a branch of Christianity, and though a corruption, yet that it contains something of pure Christian principle. But attention to the facts in the case will show that this is an utter mis-

take. Popery has no more relation to Christianity than a dead carcass has to a living man. It has not so much. For it is not only destitute of vital energy, it is an apostacy, and an enemy to all evangelical principle.

Another respect in which the subject is misapprehended is, that in this land we have nothing to fear from it. And what are the grounds of this opinion? Are they, that popery changes its character by treading our soil, and becomes comparatively harmless? Fatal infatuation! Is not popery infallible and immutable? What change, then, can be expected, but that which is produced by present necessity, and is therefore temporary? Is it said the public mind will not bear its grosser parts, and therefore they will not be obtruded? But how long will it take popery to produce a state of public feeling that will bear all its enormities?

Another misapprehension is, that popery can be put down by railing and denunciation. This course favors popery, by exciting public sympathy, without enlightening public opinion. Popery may rail, and denounce, and banter, it will receive no injury. Like all error it has an affinity to such weapons. But truth cannot be defended by like means without a tarnish, if without a deep wound. And if the advocates of truth are provoked to take up these weapons, they should, as David did with the armor of Saul, lay them down again as soon as possible. Truth needs not such defence, error has no other. Some one has finely remarked concerning the course which Michael took, when disputing with Satan about the body of Moses, that he durst not bring a railing accusation, because he knew that he should then be on Satan's own ground, and that Satan, being an adept in the business, could outrail him. The rebuke of the Lord, and of this simple fact, is all the resort we need in meeting popery.

The foregoing views of this subject have had their influence in producing the following history. The plan is to give a connected narrative, in brief, of the rise, progress, and maturity of this power, and then to take a view of its leading doctrines and practices, as they have been exhibited in the course of events, and are to be gained from authentic sources.

The following history, of course, will lay in no claim to originality. It is a compilation and abridgment. And

though the statements are designed and believed to be strictly authentic, yet, as it is an object in this work to avoid prolixity and expensiveness, it is not deemed expedient to specify the authorities. Few of them could probably be referred to by the reader, if they were named, and those who have access to the authorities will not need the reference. It may be here observed, however, in general terms, that the works from which the compilation is principally made, are Mosheim's, and Milner's histories, McGavin's Protestant, and Cramp's Text Book of Popery.

That the truth will finally prevail there is no doubt. But that it will prevail by efforts and means, is equally certain. If the present effort shall in any measure subserve the cause of truth, the best interests of man, and the glory of the Redeemer, the intentions of the compiler will be fulfilled.

HISTORY OF POPERY.

SECTION I.

THE ORIGIN OF POPERY.

THE term Popery is derived from Papa, which signifies a Father. In its ecclesiastical use, it denotes the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, as the earthly head or father of the church universal, including all the professed followers of Christ on earth. It is true that the term pope has been applied, by some writers, to the bishops of Rome from the earliest times. But this is calculated to mislead the mind of the reader. For the truth is, the bishops of Rome were never designated by this title until after supremacy was achieved. And by modern writers only has this title been carried back and applied to bishops in the early days of Christianity. To call Peter or Clement I. a pope, is paying a modern compliment, which either of these men, or their immediate successors, would have little relished. It was not the mind of Christ that any among his disciples should be called Rabbi, or Father, by way of distinction. But he would have them esteem each other brethren, and the servants or ministers of Christ and the church. And Peter was content to follow this advice of his Lord and Master; for he styles himself, in one of his epistles, "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." Paul was of the same mind, when he says—"who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers (servants) by whom ye believed even as the Lord gave to every man." Again, "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers (servants) of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." Peter and Paul

therefore never aspired to any higher title of dignity than that of servant. The same is true of the primitive ministers of the church. And when we read of the popes of Rome in histories which relate to the early ages of the Christian church, we are exposed to imposition. This is mere artifice, to give the authority of antiquity to the name and usurpation which it expressed in after times. By this artifice many are doubtless led to suppose that the church of Rome and her bishops must have had, from the beginning, some kind of superiority. But the illusion will vanish when we reflect that, in primitive times, the bishops of Rome were not called popes, either by themselves or their cotemporaries; and that they receive this title from those who wrote about them, after the church of Rome, and the pope, as her head, had appeared as Anti-Christ, or the oppressor of the true church.

The origin of popery therefore, accurately speaking, must be found in the public announcement of the bishop of Rome as universal bishop, or supreme head of the church. This event occurred near the beginning of the seventh century, under the following circumstances.—After the conversion of the emperor Constantine to the Christian faith, and in consequence of the affluence of power and favor which some of the chief bishops experienced, they began to feel the movings of ambition. From their intimacy with the emperor, they were soon led to affect the pomp and circumstance of imperial dignity. The bishop of Rome, especially, as he was stationed in the imperial city, began to feel the powerful workings of this leaven. He would have all the world submit to him in matters of religion, even as they submitted to the emperor in civil matters. But the world, or the churches in different parts of the world, was not yet prepared for this domineering. Some bishops of the east held a council without asking leave of the bishop of Rome. Julius, the bishop at that day, stormed at this presumption. But the other bishops, knowing this to be

mere usurpation, treated the wrath of the bishop of Rome with contempt, and shortly after held another council at Antioch. But the pretensions of the bishops of Rome continued to rise and strengthen from year to year, until we arrive at the time of Gregory, commonly called the great. He, though in many respects better than most of his successors in the see of Rome, was still intent on extending the power of his office. And, though under great obligations to the emperor Mauritian, and bound by many professions of friendship, no sooner was the emperor murdered by Phocas the rebel, who made himself emperor, than Gregory acknowledged him, sent a legate to him, and afforded him all the assistance in his power. He received from this abominable tyrant all those offices which might contribute to his own greatness. And thus he raised the papacy to a higher degree of power and wealth than it had ever before possessed.

But in all his greatness and glory, the bishop of Rome had a powerful rival, who had also fixed his eye on supremacy; this was the bishop of Constantinople. The emperor Constantine had removed the seat of the empire to the city called after his own name. Constantinople became an imperial city, and the fact soon began to manifest its natural influence in the feelings and aims of its bishops. Violent, and for a time doubtful, was the struggle for supreme authority between the bishops of the two imperial cities. The bishop of Constantinople, however, appears at first to have taken the lead of his rival at Rome, in climbing the ladder of ambition. He assumed the title of universal bishop, and had at least the authority of one council and the consent of one emperor for this proceeding. But when these tidings reached the bishop of Rome, he became mightily alarmed. In this assumption the bishop of Rome could see blasphemy and diabolical influence: he even discovered Anti-Christ himself as near at hand. He saw the very religion of Christ in imminent danger, not because the bishop of the east had as-

sumed a higher title than was due to him, but because the very title itself implied every thing that was impious. The zeal of the bishop of Rome to withstand this approaching evil, knew no bounds. He wrote to his ambassador at the court, charging him to exert his influence with the emperor and empress, and with the bishop himself, to prevent the inroads of such a proud, profane, unchristian title as *universal bishop*. Gregory also wrote to the bishop of Constantinople, and remonstrated with him in a most urgent and pathetic strain, loading the title of universal bishop with most opprobrious epithets. He did not hesitate to call it vain, ambitious, execrable, anti-christian, blasphemous, infernal, and diabolical. He compares him who assumes this title to Lucifer, and pronounces the assumption an imitation of his arrogance. The Roman bishop also declares that Peter, Paul, Andrew, and John, were but members of the universal church, and none of them, or any of the apostles, presumed to be called its head or bishop. "And now," said he to his dear brother of Constantinople, "if none of the apostles would be called head of the universal church, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, who is himself the only universal Head? But this is the time," continues he, "which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride, that is, Anti-Christ, is at hand; and, what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him. For they who were chosen to point out to others the way of meekness and humility, are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition."

The attentive reader will here discover important testimony from this bishop of Rome concerning the nature of that assumption by which his successors have been distinguished. When he saw popery commencing in his rival, he could preach against it with all the point and power of a Luther or Calvin. And however inconsistent

with his own practice or that of his successors, the preaching was doubtless good, and deserving of careful attention. It cuts up popery, root and branch, without mercy.

But the exhortations of Gregory were lost on his dear brother the eastern pope, and he next addressed himself directly to the emperor Mauritius, and the empress, declaiming against the anti-christian title and bishop as disturbing the peace of the church, and the order of Christ. But he was no more successful with the emperor than with the bishop. The emperor, in fact, favored the designs of his bishop, as suitable for the bishop of what he wished to be considered the imperial city. And perceiving the emperor did not enter into his views, Gregory appears to have become disaffected towards him. And when the emperor and his children were murdered by Phocas, Gregory could not contain his joy. He wrote to Phocas in the most flattering style. "We," says he, "have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty hath chosen you and placed you on the imperial throne, to banish, by your merciful disposition, all our affliction and sorrows. Let the heavens therefore rejoice, let the earth leap for joy, let the whole people return thanks for so happy a change. May the republic long enjoy these most happy times. May God, with his grace, direct your heart in every good thought, in every good deed! May the Holy Ghost that dwells in your breast ever guide and assist you, and that you, after a long course of years, pass from an earthly and temporal, to an everlasting and heavenly kingdom."

Gregory probably considered the power of universal bishop safer to the church at Rome than at Constantinople. For that which called forth all this extravagant joy and adulation seems to have been, that the prerogatives of universal bishop were now in the way to be transferred from the latter to the former see. In the course of the transfer, the infernal, diabolical, blasphemous and anti-chris-

tian qualities of the odious title appear, in Gregory's view, to have fallen off. The mutual gratulations of the bishop and the usurper, seem to have been occasioned by their power to aid each other in their designs of elevation. Thus a holy father of Rome, virtually entered into a league with the traitor and murderer Phocas, to advance their mutual interests. And the papists are welcome to all the execrations and anathemas, which their holy father Gregory pronounced on that title, by which the bishops of Rome have been distinguished from the time of Phocas till now.

In the event, Phocas was proclaimed emperor, and though Gregory did not live to enjoy the fruits of this revolution, though he did not, in his own person, become universal bishop, yet Phocas conferred the title on a successor shortly after. This successor, who was properly the first pope, was Boniface III. He prevailed upon the bloody Phocas to revoke the decree of the empire which conferred the dignity of universal bishop on the prelate of Constantinople, and obtained a new decree conferring this title on himself and his successors. This was the origin of popery. Here commenced that system of spiritual domination, which has covered the church with sackcloth, and drenched the earth with blood.

But it is here very properly inquired, what validity had this grant or decree of Phocas to constitute a bishop of Rome universal bishop? What had Phocas to do with the church of Christ, which is not of this world, that he should presume to regulate her affairs? The transaction strongly reminds one of a grant which was attempted to be made on another occasion; when the tempter offered to our Saviour all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, if he would fall down at his feet in an act of worship. Our Saviour promptly refused an offer so absurd as well as impious. But the bishop of Rome, on the contrary, was satisfied to receive his grant of supreme authority in the church, from one who had as little right

to bestow the gift, as Satan had to give the kingdoms of the world. To a reflecting mind it must be matter of serious objection to the authority of the pope, that it was first derived from a traitor and a murderer. But with those who ground the claim to power on the ability to exercise it, such considerations will have but little weight. Whatever might have been the right or the wrong in the case, the power was real and effective; for it was backed by the forces of the empire, at the nod of a tyrant, and it has been in many cases exercised in a manner worthy of its origin:

The pope, in consequence of this grant, became a god on earth. He sat in the temple of God, showing himself as God. And no sooner did he find himself announced as head of the church, than he took measures to render this dignity something more than a sound or a title. He set himself at work to make the most of his grant, and secure his acquisition. He immediately called a council at Rome, and procured a decree that no election of a bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the people and clergy, approved by the prince or lord of the city, and *confirmed by the pope*. Thus the pope held a veto over all appointments in the church, and bound to himself all the bishops, and through them, all the inferior clergy, and through them again, all the people. So that the pope became absolute-monarch of the whole of Christendom. His power, however, was still restricted to ecclesiastical affairs. Another kind of power was necessary to satisfy his ambition, and enable him to fulfil all his designs. A temporal sceptre, and the command of an armed force, were deemed indispensable to his plans. To effect this purpose he resorted to another traitor, whose rebellion and usurpation he encouraged, and by whose favor he obtained the sovereign power over certain portions of rich territory in Italy, such as the kingdom of the Heruli, of the Ostrogoths, and of Lombardy, and the exarchate of Ravenna. The man who was the

instrument of this accession to papal power was Pépin, the usurping king of France. This Pépin was chief counsellor and commander under Childeric, the lawful king of the Franks. The king was a weak prince, and confided greatly in his chief counsellor, Pépin, who thought himself more fit to reign than his sovereign, and waited only for some pretext under which to execute his purpose. He resolved to take the opinion of the pope on the following abstract question, viz., "Who best deserves the honor of a king, he who has the power, or he who has only the title?" The crafty pope, to whom the question was proposed, at once comprehended its import, and declared that in his opinion he ought to be considered the king, who possessed the power, rather than he who had the title. The aspiring Pepin now had, what he considered, divine authority for dethroning his sovereign, which he did. As a natural consequence, the pope would now look to Pépin for aid in time of need. The occasion was not slow to occur. The pope, having a quarrel with the king of the Lombards, and being unable to resist that powerful prince, applied, with great earnestness, to Pepin for succour. The king of the Franks could not but acknowledge his obligations to his holiness the pope, and brought to his aid such a force as made the king of the Lombards quickly submit, and promise to give up the territory he had severed from the empire, not to its rightful owner, but to the pope. But no sooner had Pépin withdrawn from the scene of conflict, than the Lombard king violated all his engagements, and attacked the pope afresh. He laid siege to Rome itself, and was at the point of taking the holy city, when the pope, in his distress, sent the following epistle to the king of the Franks:—"To defend the church is of all works most meritorious, and that to which is reserved the greatest reward in the world to come. God might himself have defended his church, or have raised up others to defend the just rights of his apostle, St. Peter.

But it pleased him to choose you, my most excellent son, out of the whole human race, for that holy purpose. For it was in compliance with his divine inspiration and command that I applied to you, that I came into your kingdom, that I exhorted you to espouse the cause of his beloved apostle, and your great protector, St. Peter. You espoused his cause accordingly, and your zeal for his honor was quickly rewarded by a signal and miraculous victory. But St. Peter, my most excellent son, has not yet reaped the least advantage from so glorious a victory, though owing entirely to him. The perfidious and wicked Astulphus (the king of the Lombards) has not yet yielded to him one foot of ground; nay, unmindful of his oath, and actuated by the devil, he has begun hostilities anew; and bidding defiance both to you and St. Peter, threatens us and the whole Roman empire with death and destruction." The pope, however, dare not trust too much to the influence of his own eloquence upon the mind of the French king. He pretended to have procured an epistle from St. Peter himself, which he sent to Pepin as a genuine production of his great predecessor in the see of Rome. The following is an extract from the said letter of St. Peter:—"Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to the three most excellent kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman, (the two last were sons of Pepin,) to all the holy bishops, abbots, presbyters, and monks, to all the dukes, counts, commanders of the French army, and to the whole people of France, grace unto you and peace be multiplied. I am the apostle Peter, to whom it was said, thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c. Feed my sheep, &c. And I will give unto thee the keys, &c. As this was all said to me in particular, all who hearken to me, and obey my exhortations, may persuade themselves and firmly believe that their sins are forgiven them. Hearken therefore to me, Peter the apostle and servant of Jesus Christ; and since I have preferred you to all the nations of the earth,

hasten, I beseech and conjure you, if you care to be cleansed from your sins, and to earn an eternal reward, hasten to the relief of my city, of my church, of the people committed to my care, ready to fall into the hands of the wicked Lombards, their merciless enemies. It has pleased the Almighty that my body should rest in this city, the body that has suffered, for the sake of Christ, such exquisite torments; and can you, my most Christian sons, stand by unconcerned, and see it insulted by the most wicked of nations? No, let it never be said, and it will I hope never be said, that I, the apostle of Jesus Christ, that my apostolic church, the foundation of the faith, that my flock recommended to you by me and my vicar, have trusted in you, but trusted in vain. Our lady, the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, joins earnestly entreating, nay, and commands you to hasten, to run, to fly, to the relief of my favorite people, reduced almost to the last gasp, and calling, in that extremity, night and day upon her, and upon me. The thrones and dominions, the principalities and the powers, and the whole multitude of the heavenly host, entreat you, together with us, not to delay, but to come with all possible speed, and rescue my chosen flock from the jaws of the ravening wolves, ready to devour them. My vicar might in this extremity have recurred, and not in vain, to other nations: but with me the French are, and ever have been, the first, the best, the most deserving of all nations; and I would not suffer the reward, the exceeding great reward, that is reserved in this and the other world for those who shall deliver my people, to be earned by any other."—(*Bower's Lives of the Popes.*)

It so happened, however, that Pepin had begun his march toward Italy, before this letter of St. Peter reached him, so that the apostle, in a great measure, lost his labor. The king of the Lombards was subdued, and his territory bestowed upon the see of Rome. This completed the elevation of the Romish bishop, and changed

his church into an apostate church. For Christ expressly says, "My kingdom is not of this world." This event took place in the year 756.

SECTION II.

EVENTS PRECEDING, AND CONTRIBUTING TO, THE RISE OF POPERY.

ALTHOUGH the origin of popery was in the early part of the seventh century, yet the spirit and leaven of it had been previously working in the visible church, and the way had gradually been preparing for this apostacy. Paul says of his own time, "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." An ambitious spirit was even then creeping into the church, which the apostle foresaw would lead to the grand apostacy. But in the ages immediately preceding the rise of popery, several remarkable events occurred which greatly accelerated its advance to unlimited power. A few of these it may be profitable to mention.

1. The favor of secular power and influence under Constantine and his successors.

Until the conversion of Constantine, the visible church had to contend with the Beast of the Pagan Roman empire. By the persecutions of this power, the spirit of ambition in the visible church was in a great measure repressed, and the mystery of iniquity, which secretly worked in the breasts of individuals, was hindered from development. And thus according to the prediction of Paul: "He that letteth, (or hindereth,) will let, (or hinder,) till he be taken out of the way." But at length the Pagan empire, called the beast, received a deadly wound in the conversion of the emperor Constantine,

and the consequent subversion of paganism as the religion of the empire. This event occurred in the beginning of the fourth century. Then it was that worldly favor and wealth began to flow into the Christian church. Constantine built and endowed many churches in different parts of his dominions; he received the bishops into his confidence, and lavished upon them his gifts. To Sylvester, bishop of Rome, the emperor paid particular respect, and is said to have presented him with a rich crown, which he left to his successors. From that day, as every one will readily see, the bishop of Rome must have appeared in a new light in the view of the surrounding world. A crown of gold now took the place of the crown of martyrdom. And no one can be at loss which would most influence the carnal mind. Religion itself now put on a new and attractive dress, and was decked with the signals of imperial and courtly favor. Thus ample scope was given to ambition within the sacred enclosures of the church, and temptations were presented to unconverted men, those who were mere heathen in principle, to profess Christianity as a passport to places of power and honor. Especially were such men tempted to insinuate themselves into the ministry, that they might at least be candidates for the golden crown. The possession of a crown seems to have suggested to the bishops of Rome the idea of obtaining the power and authority of which the crown was an emblem. And certain it is that, from the days of Constantine, these bishops never lost sight of this object till it was fully attained.

But Constantine went still farther towards the introduction of clerical and papal supremacy, by uniting the civil and ecclesiastical power, or what is sometimes called church and state, in his own person. He declared himself the head of the church, especially as to the external administration of its affairs. He was present at the Council of Nice, and confirmed all its acts and decrees, and sent them back, thus confirmed, to the

bishop of Rome to be propagated. This course of the emperor, while it shows conclusively that the supremacy of the Roman bishop was not then admitted even at Rome, still suggests the possibility, and the temporal advantage, of uniting the secular and clerical powers in one person. And if the emperor might proclaim himself head of the church, much more might a bishop do it, if he could find a suitable occasion. And if the emperor might take the government of the church into his hands, why might not the bishop also grasp at secular power, and become a temporal prince, if he could? But Constantine did still more; he secularized the church, by fashioning its polity after the pattern of his empire. For the greater security of his government, he divided his empire into provinces, over which were placed princes that stood next in rank to himself. And he endeavored, we are told, to conform the government of the church, as much as possible, to that of the commonwealth. He divided the church into provinces, and thus had princes among the bishops. The bishops of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, after the imperial residence was transferred to that city, were denominated Patriarchs. Next to these came the exarchs, who presided over several provinces. And next were the metropolitans, who governed single provinces. After them were the archbishops, who had the oversight of particular districts; and last, the bishops, whose jurisdiction was more or less extensive according to circumstances. But first among the princes of the church was the bishop of Rome. And this pre-eminence was founded not only on popular feeling of long standing, but also on those grounds which commonly afford distinction. He lived in the imperial city, and from that single circumstance would be esteemed very naturally the primate of the church. He also exceeded all other bishops in his wealth and splendor, as being the companion and favorite of the emperor. And so attractive were these embellishments of

the office, that, even in this age, obstinate and bloody contests took place at Rome when a new Pontiff was to be chosen. Such was the contest in the year 366, between Domasus and Ursicinus, when many lives were lost, and many buildings burnt.

In the arrangements of Constantine we have the first example of a religious establishment, or an union of church and state. And it stands as a warning to all future generations. For, though well intended by the emperor, his system of church polity, and his favor injudiciously bestowed, was a greater calamity to the church, a greater injury to true religion, than all the preceding persecutions of paganism. A very natural consequence of the exaltation and grandeur of the officers of the church, and especially the bishop of Rome, was to lead them to desire an extension of power. And from being placed next to the emperor, the bishop of Rome would very naturally aspire to his place, and even to be exalted above him. In the course of events during a few succeeding centuries, the system thus put in motion resulted in popery.

2. Another event which prepared the way for the rise of popery was the decline of science.

Opulence in the church and among the clergy was followed by carnal indulgence, and that by sloth, and that by profound ignorance. The lamp of science began to grow dim just as soon as the treasures of the empire began to flow in upon the church. And as the cause and the effect continued to increase through successive generations, the lamp finally went out, and left the church in the gloom of the dark ages. Instead of mental cultivation, or useful knowledge, the minds of men were occupied and besotted with legendary tales of saints and their exploits, with traditionary records of visions and miracles, and with absurd dogmas of whining monks. In this way, while the pretensions and assumptions of the bishop of Rome were constantly increasing, the

power of the human mind to withstand these encroachments, and to detect the various and gross impositions by which the Roman pontiff insinuated himself into supreme power, was proportionably diminishing. It has indeed become a favorite maxim with papists, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, of such devotion they mean, as makes and secures devotees to popery. And no wonder they teach this, when ignorance is one of the grand pillars on which their system rests. If men had not become extremely ignorant, the pope would never have been able to persuade them that he was the official successor of St. Peter, and the vicegerent of Christ; that he held the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to open and shut it at his pleasure; that he could forgive sins; that he was infallible; and that all the followers of Christ on earth are bound to bow down to him. A rational mind that can believe this of any man, must be extremely debased.

Popery, true to her own interests, has ever been the sworn enemy to learning and science, except so far as they might be made subservient to her own aggrandizement. True, she has colleges and schools in great numbers, and generously offers to educate the children of protestants, if they may be sent to her cloisters. But what is her education, but an education in the principles of popery? And what of science or literature is found in her colleges, is so alloyed with her superstitions, as completely to neutralize its power. To know, think and judge for himself, is the last thing which popery will allow to one of her votaries. For no other crime than discoveries in science, and the adoption of the copernican system, Galileo was condemned to the prisons of the Inquisition, and was in imminent peril of being burnt at the stake. As popery has ever found the atmosphere of ignorance so congenial, there can be no doubt that the decline of learning and science, in consequence of the external prosperity of the church, had a material influence

in preparing the way for its advance and final establishment. She who cannot live in the light, certainly could not have arisen, and taken her seat of supremacy unless favored by darkness.

3. Another event which prepared the way for the rise of popery, was the neglect of the scriptures.

It is evident at first sight that popery must have some other standard of faith and practice than the revealed word of God. For at this tribunal, it is impossible for the greatest human sagacity to avoid conviction and condemnation in respect to the claims of popery. She has therefore contrived to erect another standard by the introduction of tradition, which is more flexible and accommodating; and which in fact may be made any thing or nothing, just as occasion requires. Without a standard of this kind, it is evident popery could never have gained a standing in the church. The scriptures therefore began to go into disuse, as prosperity and power began to accumulate in the church. And though the bible did not become at once a prohibited book, and though in the form of a translation into the latin language, it was tolerated for a season, yet it was in fact practically set aside by the introduction of other standards of faith, and other tests of piety. Thus the neglect of the scriptures prepared the way for the development of anti-christ. And the increase of this power was in exact proportion to the neglect with which the bible was treated, until at length the scriptures were virtually suppressed by being locked up in a dead language which none of the common people understood, and by being discountenanced as a book to be read or examined, if it was not positively forbidden. Thus the bible continued an exile from the church till the time of Peter Waldo, who gave a partial translation in the French language. After him Wickliffe, and then other reformers undertook the work of restoring the bible to the people of God, until at length Luther and his associates, brought

forth this lamp and put in the hands of the pilgrims to Zion.

Thus it is evident that the bible and popery have no common interest. For the rise of one has always been the fall of the other.

4. Another event which prepared the way for the rise of popery was the introduction of images and the rites of idolatry into the Christian church.

When the primitive Christians had to contend with paganism, they were strenuous to maintain the distinction between their religion and that of their heathen neighbors. They would not consent to the proposition to place Jesus among the tutelary gods of the Roman empire, and to worship him in common with the great family of the pantheon. For this singularity and esteemed obstinacy, the christians were hated and persecuted; and by this persecution they were purified and preserved from the leaven of ambition. But at length the tables were turned, Christianity was placed in the ascendant, and an order went forth from the emperor that all pagan temples should be demolished, and pagan rites be abandoned. This change led many pagans to seek admission to the Christian church. And so flattering was the fact to those who were then guardians to the interests of true religion, that they threw open the doors of the church, and admitted great numbers on their consenting to assume the name of Christian and be baptized. Thus it is related that Constantine, having vanquished various nations of Goths on the Danube, and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become Christians. But a still larger part of them remained pagans until the time of Valens, who permitted them to pass the Danube, and inhabit the countries on the other side, on condition they would become subject to the Roman laws, and would embrace Christianity. To this condition their king consented. And though real conversions may have taken place, yet in many instances, becoming Christians on the part of pa-

gans seems to have been a point of mere national policy. By this means the spirit of paganism was gradually transferred to the Christian church; and of course the rites of paganism would be likely to follow. Besides, the forms of Christian worship were found much too simple and unostentatious to suit these numerous converts from the splendid rites of idolatry. Their taste was for something more attractive to the senses, and the Christian bishops began to feel that they suffered some disadvantage from this quarter, and were desirous of conforming their ceremonies more to the taste of the age. Thus, in their judgment, not only the converts from heathenism would be better satisfied, but those who were not converted would be more likely to come over to the ranks of Christianity, when they saw her temples eclipsing the temples of idols in external pomp. On this ground the simplicity of the Gospel, which had been greatly maintained under the pressure of persecution, began to be abandoned, and various superstitious rites, to be introduced. The virgin Mary was brought forward as an object of veneration, and finally of idolatrous worship. In her train, a list of saints, was made to take the place of ancient heroes and demi-gods, and in the result, images were introduced into the places of Christian worship, and the whole apparatus of heathenism was revived, under Christian names and forms. To perceive the justness of these remarks, we have only to advert to a few historical facts.

In the fourth century the virgin Mary was worshipped by a sect called Collyridians, from the cakes which they offered to this supposed goddess. They held that St. Mary ought to be honored and appeased with libations, sacrifices and offerings of cakes. It was their practice to dress out a car, or square throne, spread it over with a linen cloth, and on a clear day, once a year, to place on it during the day a loaf of bread or cake, which they offered to the virgin Mary. These persons were supposed converts from paganism, and while pagans, they had

been accustomed to bake and present to the goddess Venus, or Astarte (the Moon,) certain cakes which were called *Collyrides*. And when they became nominal Christians, they supposed this honor might best be bestowed on Mary.

In the fifth century, that is the century immediately succeeding the conversion of Constantine, and the consequent change in the established religion of the empire, the rites and ceremonies of the church were so multiplied, that a learned historian remarks, "To recount all the regulations made in this century, respecting the mode of worship, and religious rites, and institutions, would require a volume of considerable size. The magnificence of the temples knew no bounds. Splendid images were placed in them; and among these, after the Nestorian contests, the image of the virgin Mary holding her infant in her arms, occupied the most conspicuous station. Altars and repositories for relics made of solid silver, if possible, were procured in various places, from which may easily be conjectured, what must have been the splendor and the expense of the other sacred utensils."

In the first century also, commenced the practice of celebrating the Lord's supper at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and at funerals, when arose the practice of saying masses, or prayers for the saints, and for the dead.

This practice it is well known, is derived from the heathen practice of sacrificing to the manes of the dead. The bread and wine were elevated before distribution, that they might be seen by the people, and be viewed with reverence and adoration. Hence arose the practice of elevating the host, and worshipping the *symbols* as a real divinity.

The ancient *Lupercalia* of the heathen, or the day of Proserpine, when her mother Ceres was represented to have searched for her with lighted candles, was called the day of the *purification of the blessed virgin Mary*, and fixed on the 2nd of February. And, as it was still cele-

brated by lighting candles, in imitation of the ancient lupercalia, it is called in the Christian calendar, *Candle-mass*.

Thus the business of introducing heathen rites and image worship in Christian temples, was a precursor of popery. This practice was indeed afterwards carried to much greater lengths, and will merit more particular attention when we come to speak of popish superstitions. But there can be no doubt that the influence of heathenism, introduced into the Christian church by a too hasty and indiscriminate admission of nominal converts, prepared the way for that corruption of Christianity, and that apostasy from its pure doctrines, and its spiritual worship, which have been the universal characteristics of the papal church.

SECTION III.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE POPISSH ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE SUPREMACY, &C. OF THE BISHOP OF ROME.

As the papists make a show of argument in support of popery, and as this argument is not destitute of speciousness and plausibility, it may be proper, before proceeding farther in historical statements, to give this argument a passing notice. The argument in question, if it be correctly apprehended, is founded on the following claims, viz. The claim of succession to St. Peter. The claim from the necessity of the case. And the claim from miracles and supernatural testimony.

1. It is claimed that the bishop of Rome is the official successor of the apostle Peter, and therefore the supreme head of the church on earth.

The premises in this claim are two, viz. That Peter

was constituted supreme head of the church. And that the pope is the official successor of Peter. Then follows the conclusion; ergo, the pope is the supreme head of the church on earth. The first thing to be done in analyzing this argument, is to direct our attention to the premises. How then does it appear that Peter was constituted supreme head of the church?

Why, says the papist, it is very plain from the words of our Saviour, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." The absurdity of supposing that this declaration of Christ, was intended to constitute Peter the supreme head of the church, is manifest from a single consideration. After this declaration of Christ, Peter denied his master; the gates of Hell did prevail against Peter; and, if he were the supreme head or foundation of the church, then, if the foundation was prevailed against, what must have become of the church itself. If Peter was worsted and overcome by the tempter, as he surely was, where was the church that was built on this rock? Surely if the foundation falls, that which is built upon it must fall with it. In a word, there is manifest absurdity in supposing that Christ meant to say, that his church was built on an erring imperfect man, as Peter proved himself to be. Another inconsistency of this supposition ought here to be noted, and that is its entire contradiction of the testimony of Paul. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, that is Christ." Now if the church was really built on Peter, then, not only can a man lay other foundation, but he can himself be this foundation. But what is the import of the passage, "Thou art Peter, &c." To answer this inquiry correctly, we must take the passage in its connexion. Christ had been asking his disciples what the general opinion concerning him was. They told him according to what they had heard. But says he, "who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, thou art

the Christ the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, blessed art thou Simon Barjonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, thou art Peter (Petros,) and upon this rock (Petra) I will build my church and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." In the first chapter of John we have a similar address to Simon in the following terms. "Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone." Cephas was a Syriac word, which was rendered in Greek by the word Petros, *i. e.* a stone. But there is a difference between *Petros* a stone, and *Petra*, a rock. One can be turned over and moved from its place, while the other is immoveable. To say then to Peter, thou art a moveable stone, and upon this immoveable rock, meaning Peter, would be to speak nonsense. The fact is, that the foundation of which Christ spake, was something as different from Peter, as a rock is from a stone. It was the truth which Peter had just stated, viz. "Thou art Christ the son of the living God." The following translation has been suggested as more agreeable to the original. "I say also unto thee, thou art a stone, but upon this, (truth,) the rock, I will build my church, &c." But says the papist, *the keys, the keys* of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter, as stated in the following verse. To this it may be replied, that though Peter was addressed because he had spoken, yet he had spoken in the name and behalf of the rest, and was therefore addressed in their name and in their behalf. In confirmation of this, see the address of Christ of similar import, on another occasion, to all the apostles without distinction. John xx, 21—23. "Then said Jesus to them again, peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this he breathed on them, and said unto them, receive you the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever

sins ye retain, they are retained." This is undeniably said to all the apostles ; but it could not be with propriety, if Peter had already received this power, in distinction from the rest, and as their superior. As to the power of the keys, it appears to have been the authority with which Christ invested his apostles to rule in the visible church, and to administer its discipline. But it had no more application to Peter than to the rest. To cut the matter short, however, if Peter was constituted head of the church by Christ on the occasion specified, then he doubtless would have exercised his authority afterwards. But we never read or hear of Peter's popery on any occasion. Philip went down to Samaria and preached Christ unto them. Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem, not pope Peter, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them *Peter* and John. Now if Peter were at this time pope, how came he to be sent by the other apostles. Why did he not thunder from the vatican, and order out some of his nuntios or vicars on this errand? Most egregious and blasphemous presumption was it, that the other apostles should presume to send his holiness pope Peter, on a mission to Samaria, just as if he was not their supreme head, or they did not know the fact. On another occasion, Peter seems to have fallen into dissimulation, and Paul withstood him to the face and rebuked him, because he was to be blamed. Presumptuous man ! What, shall the infallibility of Peter be questioned, or an inferior attempt to rebuke the vicar of Christ, the supreme head of the church ! In a word, the claim to supreme authority in behalf of Peter, can by no means be sustained. The first premise therefore of popery utterly fails. How is it with the other, viz. ; the bishop of Rome is the official successor of Peter." On what ground is this claimed? Forsooth, because the bishop of Rome holds the see of Peter. But how is this ? Who knows that Peter ever was bishop of Rome ? There is not a word to this effect

in the scriptures. And the traditions of persons living several hundred years after the time of Peter, can have no weight as testimony. If Roman bishops say, that Peter was bishop of Rome, we ask, how do they know? If they have any evidence of the fact let them produce it, but if they say it without evidence, they must not expect us to give implicit credit to mere assertion. Peter never was bishop of Rome. How then is the bishop of Rome his successor? If Peter were supreme among the apostles, and in the church, by what circuitous channel does that supremacy arrive at the pope's door? No, it is all imposition, and arrogance. Peter had no supremacy, the bishop of Rome is not in any sense his successor. Ergo, the bishop of Rome has no supremacy except that of arrogance and falsehood.

2. Supremacy is claimed by the pope on account of the necessity of the case. It is said that there must of necessity be some supreme head, some infallible arbiter, some living standard, and oracle of faith and practice. Otherwise every man's opinion will be his own rule, and the church will be rent into endless divisions. This we see is placing the system of popery on the ground of expediency, and if it were productive of union in faith, still there are some considerations to put in the opposite scale, such as despotic power, tyrannical oppression, venality and deadly corruption. And the question would return, is union in such a work, a blessing or a curse? But as to the simple question of union: Where have greater divisions, more bitter contention and animosity been witnessed in the world, than in the bosom of the papal church, and sometimes, between rival popes themselves? Talk they of union, let the endless broils of the Dominicans and the Franciscans, of the Jesuits and the Jansenists be the reply. If farther reply is required, we will show them contending popes, hurling thunders, and bulls, and curses at each other's heads; infallibility marshalled against infallibility; a rare com-

bat. We will show them two or three heads of the church in existence and function at a time, and these heads, instead of affording wisdom and guidance to the body, are biting and devouring each other. Truly, papists should talk little about the efficacy of popery in promoting union. But, says the papist, the scriptures cannot be a standard of faith and practice, because difference of opinion among men will produce endless variations in the standard. How so? The variations are in opinion, not in the standard. And different applications of a standard, do not imply a change or variation of the standard itself. In forming his opinions from the scriptures, every man acts on his own responsibility. If he misapply the standard so as to deceive himself, his own will the loss be. The standard is nevertheless true. Thus a person may have a correct standard of weight or measure, and he may so err in the application as to produce a wrong result, or two persons may so err in applying the same standard as to be wide apart in the conclusion. Does this vitiate the standard, or warrant us to say there cannot be such a thing as a correct rule? Rather should we say to every one applying the standard, take heed, be not deceived, let every man prove his own work.

But, 3. Another claim of popery is founded on supposed miracles and supernatural testimony. This claim will be speedily disposed of, by an unqualified denial of the facts alleged. There have been many tales of miracles wrought by the potency of relics, or at the tombs of departed saints or martyrs. But there is not one of all these wonders that possesses any authenticity. We remember the tale of the tragedy of Berne, in which St. Barbara, and St. Mary were supposed to appear to poor Jetzer, and relate to him the transactions of the invisible world, and confirm to him certain opinions of a particular order of monks. But these sainted spirits were discovered to have flesh and bones, and to be none else

than the prior and sub-prior of the monastery. And the only reality in the case was a painful one, for Jetzer had a nail driven quite through his hand, while receiving from the supposed saints the marks of Christ. That the popish church has exhibited many wonders to support her claims, will not be denied; but we shall have occasion to see, in the sequel, that they are lying wonders, and cunning craftiness, whereby her votaries have lain in wait to deceive. So much, then, for the claims of popery to divine origin, and divine authority.

SECTION IV.

EXAMINATION OF HISTORICAL TESTIMONY RELATIVE TO THE SUPREMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME DURING THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES.

THE origin of the church of Rome is involved in doubt. We have no authentic record to determine by whom it was gathered, or who was its first pastor. Scripture is silent on this point, which silence is indeed conclusive proof that this church was not destined by the Saviour to any pre-eminence in his visible kingdom, much less that it was destined to that absolute supremacy which it has since assumed. But whatever obscurity may rest upon the origin of this church, two points are very clear, viz. 1. *We have no satisfactory evidence that Peter gathered the church of Rome; and, 2. There is no evidence that he ever was the bishop of this church.* It may be admitted, for argument's sake, that Peter spent some time at Rome, and that he suffered martyrdom there in the reign of Nero. But these concessions prove nothing as to any particular connexion of Peter with the church of Rome,

either as its founder or its bishop. For Paul was also at Rome for a considerable season: he wrote an epistle to that church, and afterwards suffered martyrdom there under the same bloody Nero. If Peter then was bishop of Rome on the ground of the facts above mentioned, much more was Paul its bishop. But this would prove too much, as it would prove that the church of Rome had two supreme heads. In the absence, then, of all authentic proof, we are authorized to deny that the church of Rome was gathered by Peter, or that he was its bishop. And the burden of proof will rest on those who set up arrogant claims, as the successors of Peter, and whose prerogatives rest solely on the proof they bring. Let them prove, if they can, that the bishops or popes of Rome are the successors of Peter, and then it will be in season to talk about the power of the keys, and of absolution, if indeed Peter had any such power. But in the present state of the subject, the claims of popery, as founded on the prerogatives of Peter, are mere assumption. The bishops of Rome might with equal propriety claim, in the right of succession to Peter, supreme authority over the solar system.

In regard to the church of Rome and Peter, its supposed first bishop, very little is known during the first century, beyond what is found on sacred record. About the year 64, Rome suffered a general conflagration, which is supposed to have been the work of Nero, but which, to screen himself from public odium, he charged to Christians. On the ground of this charge the first general persecution commenced. Peter is supposed, by impartial writers, to have come to Rome the year previous. While there, he is supposed to have written his epistles; and when the persecution under Nero commenced, Peter is supposed to have been apprehended and crucified. Not a word do we find in any authentic history of this century, about the supremacy either of Peter or the church of Rome. But if that supremacy ever existed by divine

appointment, it must have existed then. Peter could not have been constituted the bishop of Rome, nor supreme head of the church, after he was dead. And if his supremacy did exist during his life, is it not unaccountable that all history should be utterly silent on the subject, that the church in the first century should have left no trace of pope Peter's reign ; and that even Peter himself should have been so sparing of the pompous assumptions and dignity of his pretended successors? If Peter was, at the time he wrote his epistles, vicegerent of Christ and supreme head of the church, (and he must have been then if he ever was, for his epistles were written but a short time before his death,) is it not remarkable that we hear him saying simply "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ," instead of "We, sovereign pontiff of Rome, apostolical vicar and supreme head of the church?" It is indeed manifest, either that Peter was not conscious of his papal dignity, or he did not value it very highly, otherwise he would not have passed it in silence. For no pope of Rome ever followed his example in this particular. For though, by an affected modesty, some of the popes may have styled themselves servants, &c., yet they have always been careful to insert something in the connexion, to show that they did not mean what the words would naturally import.

But the forms of church government during the first century do not admit of any such supremacy as that ascribed to the church of Rome, or to Peter as its head. In those primitive days, each Christian church was composed of the people, the presiding officer, and the assistants or deacons. The highest authority then was in the body of believers, for even the apostles themselves inculcated by their example that nothing of moment was to be done or determined on without the concurrence of the brethren. The rulers of the church were sometimes denominated elders or presbyters, a designation borrowed from the Jews, and indicative rather of the wisdom than

the age of the persons ; and sometimes bishops or overseers, for it is most manifest that both terms are promiscuously used in the New Testament for one and the same class of persons. Near the close of the first century, however, there began to be indications of some degrees of comparison among the pastors of the churches. The germ of ecclesiastical distinction and hierarchy was at first exceeding small, and is thus described by a certain author :—“ In the following manner Christians managed ecclesiastical affairs, so long as their congregations were small and not very numerous. Three or four presbyters, men of gravity and holiness, placed over these little societies, could easily proceed with harmony, and needed no head or president. But when the churches became larger, and the number of presbyters and deacons, as well as the amount of duties to be performed, was increased, it became necessary that each council of presbyters should have a president, a man of distinguished gravity and prudence, who should distribute among his several colleagues their several tasks, and be a kind of central point. He was first denominated the *angel*, but afterwards the bishop, (or overseer,) a term of Grecian derivation, and indicative of his principal business. But whoever supposes the bishops of the first and golden age of the church were like the bishops of the following centuries, must blend and confound characters that are very different.”

Where, it may be asked, in all this arrangement of the first century, was there room or place for his holiness the pope of Rome? If such an office, or such a title, existed in the first age of the church, how marvellous is it that we can find no trace of the matter, and that the holy apostolical vicar of Christ, who afterwards filled Europe and the world with his noise, should have then kept so entirely out of sight! But if no such office then existed, the lofty pretensions of the papists fall to the ground.

In the second century, the gradual advances of prelati- cal power and authority, which began to be developed towards the close of the first, were considerably increased and confirmed. As the churches multiplied and extended, it became necessary for them to meet together by their representatives for mutual consultation and united action. This gave rise to what the Greeks called **SY- NODS**, but the Latins, **COUNCILS**. In these councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of the second century, it became necessary for some one to preside, and it naturally fell to the lot of some to take the lead in the transaction of business. This, of course, gave some of the bishops a practical pre-eminence; and when once they had been elevated, it was natural for them to claim, and to endeavor to support that elevation. In this way arose, in process of time, metropolitan bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, and last of all the head of the whole, the pope of Rome. Another circumstance that served to advance the power of the hierarchy in the second century was, that after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Jewish system was totally abolished, the idea was started that the Christian ministry was designed to be modelled after the fashion of the Jewish priesthood. To make the resemblance complete, there must be a high priest, secondary priests, and Levites. The idea could not, at the time it was started, be carried to its full extent, but it served to prepare the way for the full attainment of the object by the gradual approximation of public opinion.

In the third century the form of church government, which had been gradually introduced, was still more confirmed. We find, in this century, bishops in the principal cities in the provinces, which were esteemed chief of their province. The limits of this distinction were not, however, accurately defined, nor was the precedence always given to the bishop of the chief city. But the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, appear to have been regarded in this century as chief men, and

were consulted on important matters. The bishop of Rome in particular, undoubtedly because he resided in the metropolis of the empire, seems, in the course of this century, to have taken the lead of all others, and to have had conceded to him a kind of primacy. This is admitted by Cyprian and other bishops of his time. But while they admitted a kind of primacy, chiefly as a matter of courtesy, they strenuously contended for the equality of all bishops in respect to dignity and authority. They did not hesitate to discard the judgment of the bishop of Rome whenever it appeared to them incorrect, and took the liberty to follow their own judgment. Of this truth Cyprian himself gave a striking example in his famous controversy with Stephen, bishop of Rome, concerning the baptism of heretics. On the whole, respecting the third century, we may say that though there was a considerable declination from the republican, and approach towards the monarchical form of church government, yet there was no appearance or pretence of any supreme head of the church. Plainly the pope of Rome, as understood by the assumptions of succeeding ages, had no existence in the third century.

In the commencement of the fourth century, as has been already stated, the external circumstances of the church were materially changed by the conversion of Constantine. And it is perfectly evident, that if the supremacy of the bishops of Rome, as successors of Peter, were then known and acknowledged in the church, it would have been respected by this Christian emperor. But far otherwise is the fact. For though Constantine did much to favor religion externally, and lavished many gifts on the officers of the church, yet he evidently had no idea of any such thing as papal supremacy. He even proclaimed himself the supreme head of the church, which he certainly would not have done, if there had been at that time any other known head. It is also added by the voice of history, that no bishop called in question the

right or propriety of what the emperor did. But the bishop of Rome certainly would have called it in question, if it had at all been questionable. At this period, therefore, we have ample evidence that popery had no existence or name in the government of the church. On the contrary, there is abundant testimony of history, that, though the Roman bishop was excessively aspiring, and was reaching after lordly power by all practical means, yet supremacy was not then even claimed by him, much less allowed by other bishops.

In the fourth century an event occurred which stands directly in the way of the pretensions of the Roman pontiff to supreme authority; and that was, the transfer of the seat of the empire from Rome to Byzantium, which was thence called Constantinople. This new imperial city soon became the rival of Rome, not only in civil affairs, but as the seat of ecclesiastical power. The bishop of so great a city soon began to conceive ideas of his own supremacy; and the very circumstances which had given the bishop of Rome his importance, now began to raise up a competitor, who desired, at least, to be esteemed equal to the bishop of Rome. The emperors did not disapprove of this ambition, because they perceived that it was nearly connected with their own dignity. Therefore, in the council of Constantinople, which was held in 381, by order of the emperor Theodosius the Great, the bishop of Rome being opposed to the measure, the bishop of Constantinople was by the third canon placed in the first rank after the bishop of Rome. But this was not long satisfactory; for soon the rival bishop began to dispute with the Roman pontiff himself the right of precedence, and in process of time proclaimed himself universal bishop. The alarm of the bishop of Rome at this step, and the signs of anti-christ which he discovered in it, have been already stated. But it is perfectly evident from all this, that the bishop of Rome could not at that time have been known and ac-

knowledged as the supreme head of the church. Peter could not at the same time have two legitimate successors in his office. One or the other must have been in error, as they both claim what, from the nature of the case, can belong only to one, and what we have abundant evidence belonged to neither. Their claims are both equally well founded, or rather are both equally destitute of foundation. The only rational conclusion then is, they are both false. This conclusion is confirmed by the proceedings of the council of Calcedon, which assembled about the middle of the fifth century. By the 28th canon of this council, it was decreed that the bishop of new Rome, or Constantinople, ought to enjoy the same honors and prerogatives with the bishop of old Rome, on account of the equal dignity of the two cities; and by a formal decree, the councils confirmed the exclusive jurisdiction of the bishop of Constantinople over the provinces which he claimed. Leo the Great, bishop of Rome at that time, strenuously resisted this decree, but his opposition was overruled, because the power of the Greek emperors supported the bishops. And from the time of the council of Calcedon in the fifth century, the bishops of Constantinople contended fiercely with the bishops of Rome for the supremacy.

From these historical facts the following conclusions are demonstrated, viz.: 1. A general council of the Christian church assembled at Calcedon in the fifth century, knew nothing of papal supremacy, for they passed a decree absolutely incompatible with it. 2. A general council of the church thus sanctioned the principle that clerical precedence in the church is not derived from divine appointment, or succession to the apostles, but from the dignity of the cities which were the seat of clerical influence and power. Thus, on the ground that Constantinople was equal in dignity to Rome, the council decreed that the bishop of the former ought to enjoy the same honors and prerogatives with the bishop of the

latter. This decision cuts up papal pretensions, root and branch. For if supremacy derived from Peter had been then known, such a decree would not have been passed. The supremacy of the pope then, as has been suggested, was founded on the supremacy of the city where he dwelt.

The rival pretensions which have been stated, gave rise to dreadful wars and abominable crimes. The bishop of Constantinople, elated with his success, and the favor of the imperial court under which he was protected, did not hesitate to attack the Roman prelate, and wrest from him some of his provinces. The Roman pontiff, in his turn, inflicted grievous wounds on the eastern bishop. And these quarrels about precedence between those who claimed to be fathers and pastors of the church, show beyond all question that both parties were merely wolves in sheep's clothing, for they wasted and devoured the church for their own aggrandizement."

The Roman bishop was, on the whole, most successful in his enterprizes of ambition. Notwithstanding the opposition of his rival, various causes enabled him to augment in no small degree his power. The patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, finding themselves incompetent to contend with the patriarch of Constantinople, applied to the Roman patriarch for aid. And the same measure was adopted by the inferior bishops, whenever they found their superiors encroaching on their rights. Rome thus became the common centre of attraction. By this means the Roman bishop, at the same time that he extended his protection, also extended and increased his influence. He thus acquired a practical supremacy, even before he dared openly to advance his claim to it, or before he could find a place for it in theory. In addition to this state of things in the bosom of the church, the state of the empire, in its civil aspects, was such as to give great facility for the accomplishment of the ambitious designs of the bishop of Rome. The emperors of

the western empire had become weak, indolent, and effeminate; they held the reins of government with a feeble arm, so that a field was open for the successful prosecution of the projects of ambition. The nations of barbarians also, about Rome, had begun to break in upon the empire, and were subverting its deep foundations. To the prejudices and superstitions of these barbarians, the bishop of Rome found it no difficult matter to accommodate himself. And he could adopt their heathen rites, provided they would adopt the Christian name, and be subservient to his purposes. The barbarous kings were intent on nothing but the establishment of their own power. When, therefore, they witnessed the influence of the bishop of Rome over the minds of the people, they deemed it good policy to secure his favor by granting him privileges and honors. In this way considerable accession was made during the fifth century to the see of Rome.

But after all these attempts at supreme power, and these gradual advances towards it, yet so late as the end of the fifth century, the bishop of Rome had not been able to obtain the acknowledgment of the church in favor of his pretensions, nor was he able to assume the title of universal bishop. In particular the churches of Africa could not be induced, either by promises or threats, to carry their causes and controversies by appeal to the tribunal of Rome.

In the sixth century there was no important change in the constitution of the Christian church, and no additional proof of papal supremacy. So late in the century as the year 587, John, bishop of Constantinople, attempted to have himself proclaimed universal bishop. On which occasion Gregory made the efforts and reflections which have been already stated. So late then as this period, the bishop of Rome did not even publicly claim that supremacy which, in a rival bishop, he declared to be a sign of anti-christ. Indeed the whole testimony of authentic history is, that six centuries of the Christian era

passed away without any open claim or acknowledgment of supremacy, as belonging to the bishop of Rome. Surely this must be a wide and fatal chasm to those, who make their whole cause depend on maintaining an uninterrupted succession to Peter, as supreme head of the church. Six hundred years the Christian church existed without a pope, in the proper sense of the term, and the papists may be asked, where was the true church in their view, before Boniface was declared universal bishop?

SECTION V.

THE PROGRESS OF POPERY DURING THE TWELVE CENTURIES SUCCEEDING ITS RISE.

HAVING ascertained, by the testimony of authentic history, that no trace of popery existed during the six first centuries of the Christian era, and having seen that it originated early in the seventh century, by the united influence of the tyrant Phocas, and Boniface III., bishop of Rome, in proclaiming the latter universal bishop; we now proceed to trace the progress of this grand apostacy from the Christian church, through the course of succeeding ages. In this survey it will be necessary to study brevity, as far as can be consistent with perspicuity of statement, as there are several other important topics relative to popery, which claim attention before reaching our prescribed limits.

The beginning of the seventh century was marked by three important events in the history of the church and of the world. The proclaiming of the bishop of Rome universal bishop, the establishment of image worship in the Christian church, and the rise of the Mahometan delusion.

In regard to the newly created and proclaimed pope, scarcely a year elapsed from the commencement of this sacerdotal empire, when the very idolatry which had been so strenuously opposed by preceding bishops, was publicly established and patronized by the sovereign pontiff. The ancient Pantheon, formerly the general sink of all the abominations of paganism, was now restored, though under a different name, to its original destination. The mediatory demons of corrupted christianity, occupied the vacant places of the mediatory demons of the gentiles. Instead of Jupiter and his kindred deities, the virgin mother of Christ, and all his martyred saints, received the blind adoration of the revived ten-horned beast. The holy city was trodden under foot of a new race of gentiles, differing from their pagan predecessors in name rather than in nature, and the witnesses began to prophecy in sackcloth, during the long period of 1260 years, the same period indeed as that, during which the saints were given into the hand of the little horn. (See Rev. xi. 2, 3.) From this period forward, therefore, the papal church must be considered as apostate from true christianity, because it renounced the essential features of the Christian church, and became the real and implacable enemy of all the true followers of Christ. This is not empty declamation, or unfounded assertion. Let the history of subsequent ages, for more than twelve hundred years, bear witness. Let every reader examine the subject carefully and candidly, and if he does not find evidence sufficient to satisfy his mind that the papal church is now, and has been for twelve centuries, a mere modified and concealed form of paganism, and an apostate body from the whole Christian faith, then evidence has no weight, and the powers of perceiving truth wholly fail and deceive. By this, however, is not meant that the papal church does not in theory admit some speculative truths. Pagans do this, and even devils believe in one God. But the meaning is, that the popish system,

taken as a whole, is radically corrupt and anti-christian ; that nothing is wanting but the universal prevalence of this system, to ensure the utter extinction of all true religion, and therefore, that whatever of truth is embraced in this system is held in unrighteousness, and practically perverted. This will appear to be the true state of the case from all authentic and impartial history.

With this general view, the chain of historical narrative will be pursued, until we have a comprehensive view of the progress of this apostate church. Then its influence and fruits will come under examination.

The elevation of the bishop of Rome to the station of pope, or universal bishop, was followed by a great increase of power and corruption, so far as his influence extended ; while vital religion, and all useful knowledge declined in the same proportion. Every writer of note, respecting the seventh century, admits that the clergy of inferior rank, and all who were entrusted with the sacred offices, as well those in the monasteries, as those without, lived in the practice of many enormities. In all places, simony, avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, insolence to the people at large, and even vices worse than these, might be seen reigning in the stations consecrated to piety and virtue. Between the monks and the bishops, many bitter quarrels arose in different places: For the latter laid their greedy hands on the rich possessions of the monks, that they might support their own luxury and dissipation. And the monks, feeling this very sensibly, first applied to the emperors and kings for redress, but not finding sufficient protection, they next resorted to the pope of Rome. He took them under his protection, and gradually exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops. The monks in return defended the interests of the pope as their own. They recommended him as a kind of god to the ignorant multitude, over whom their hypocritical sanctity gave them great influence. That these exemptions of the monks, were the cause of many

of their vices and disorders, is the opinion of many of the best writers. In the mean time the monks, from the favor of the popes, and the display of fictitious piety, were every where making great progress in numbers and wealth; especially among the Latins. Parents eagerly consecrated their children to God, with good portions of their property made over to the monasteries; that is to say, they devoted them to what was considered the highest bliss on earth, a life of solitude. Those who had spent their lives in guilty deeds, hoped to expiate their crimes by conferring the greater part of their property on some company of monks. And immense numbers, impelled by superstition, robbed their heirs of their richest possessions, to render God propitious to them through the prayers of the monks. Such was popery in the seventh century.

The history of the eighth century opens with the following humiliating testimony, respecting the votaries of papal superstition. Those who had the care of the church, both in the east and the west, were utterly corrupt in their morals. The eastern bishops wasted their lives in various controversies and quarrels; and, disregarding the cause of piety, they disquieted the state with their senseless clamors and seditions. Nor did they hesitate to imbrue their hands in the blood of their dissenting brethren. Those in the west, immediately under the jurisdiction of the pope, who pretended to be luminaries, gave themselves up to various kinds of profligacy, to gluttony, to lust, to sensuality and to war. Nor could they be reclaimed, though the civil rulers, such as Pépin, Carloman, and especially Charlemagne, enacted various laws against their vices.

The ninth century exhibits popery as in the ascendant, and that with increasing strength; and at the same time it shows a thicker and darker gloom resting on the morals and manners of the clergy, the church and the world. It is indeed a remarkable fact, that the greatest

increase and glory of papal power was witnessed in that age, when the lights of science and religion were most obscured; showing that ignorance and superstition are the congenial atmosphere of the papal dominion. Indeed, the supremacy of the pope has always flourished in exact proportion to the moral and intellectual degradation of man, and has always been an efficient agent in producing that degradation. The abettors of popery may be challenged to produce a solitary example of a country, brought under the full influence of popery, in which the principles of civil liberty, the blessings of social life, as well as the light of science and religion, have not been well nigh extinguished. In the regular course of historical events, we are now approaching a period which has been distinguished in the history of the world, as the *dark age*. And it will be proper to bear in mind the influence which popery exerted to produce this *dark age*; and thence to gather the evidence, that the prevalence of popery in any age or country, will certainly produce the same darkness.

The voice of history thus testifies concerning the state of teachers and the church, in the ninth century. The ungodly lives of most of those entrusted with the spiritual interests of men, and the government of the church, in this century, are a subject of complaint with all the ingenuous and honest writers of this age. The bishops attached to the papal dominion are described as hanging around the courts of princes, and indulging themselves in every species of voluptuousness. The inferior clergy of course were extremely sensual; and corrupted the very people whom they were set to reform. The ignorance of the clergy in many instances was so great, that they could neither read nor write. Hence, whenever a letter was to be penned, or any thing of importance was to be committed to writing, recourse was had to some one individual, who was supposed to excel common men, by possessing some dexterity in such matters. At the

council of Pavia, held in the year 850, it was ordained that all provocations to debauchery, should be removed from the conviviality of the bishops, and that no ludicrous shows, no vain garrulity, no buffoonery of wits, no scurrilous tricks should there find a place. At the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 836, bishops were forbidden to get drunk. We cannot suppose that these canons would have been passed and published to the world, without some occasion for them, and some very urgent occasion too. But that nothing may be left to conjecture, in respect to the occasion of the above mentioned canons; the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, according to Harduin, state the fact explicitly, that some of their order neglected their charge, and travelled here and there, not from necessity, but to gratify their love of avarice and pleasure. Of the presbyters and inferior clergy they complain, that they kept women in their houses, to the great scandal of the ministry; and this, notwithstanding the former attempts of councils and princes to remove the evil. They say of the nunneries, that in many places they seemed to be rather brothels than monasteries. It is here to be kept in mind, that popery forbade marriage to her clergy. For lawful wedlock, they would be deposed and excommunicated at once; but lewdness and debauchery, even in her sacred precincts, and among those professedly devoted to piety, were a trifle in her view, unworthy of notice; and not only so, but as will hereafter appear, even encouraged and sanctioned; and the price of which often went into the sacred coffers. Another cause which led to the general corruption of the papal clergy, was the ease and indifference with which men were introduced to the ministry, and the consequent venality of the whole order, from the highest to the lowest. The patrons of the churches, not wishing to have their vices reprov'd and exposed, gave the preference to weak and inefficient men. Thus, having itching ears they heaped to themselves teachers. And it is here worthy of very serious re-

mark, that whenever people are so far traitors to their own interests, as to encourage and support false teachers, who will flatter their pride and conceal their sin, they will always find men enough, who, for money, will be ready to perform the ruinous task. It was so in ancient times, when, as God says by his prophet concerning the false prophets, who spake lies in his name; "*And my people love to have it so.*" People must generally blame themselves for the ingress of false teachers. Such teachers would not intrude into the vineyard, if they did not meet with favor, and did not find many to welcome them, and extend to them a fostering hand. False teachers come not to labor, but to gain favor or emolument, and they will soon perceive where such fruit can be gathered. A corrupt community will therefore heap to themselves false teachers, and false teachers will render the community more and more corrupt. Thus the natural course is from bad to worse, deceiving and being deceived, corrupting by reciprocal influence, until all sink together to perdition.

In the midst of all this corruption, however, popery flourished and became more firmly seated. Just as noxious weeds and poisonous reptiles, always multiply and flourish in the impurities of the atmosphere. It is obvious to all who read the history of the ninth century, that popery greatly advanced in power, influence and wealth, from the age of Lewis the meek, and especially after the commencement of the reign of Charles the bald. Upon the death of Lewis II., a violent war broke out among the descendants of Charlemagne, each of them contending for the imperial dignity. Pope John VIII., and with him the Italian princes, eagerly seized the opportunity to exclude the voice of all foreigners, and make the election of emperors depend wholly on themselves. Hence, Charles the bald, king of the Franks, by a vast amount of money, and other presents, and by still greater promises, obtained from the pope and other Italian

princes, to be proclaimed emperor of the Romans. His successors in the kingdom of Italy, and in the imperial dignity—Carloman, and Charles the fat, were likewise chosen by the pope and his princes. After them troublous times came on, in which those who promised most, and gave most, generally ascended the royal and imperial throne by the aid of the popes. This is certainly a singular spectacle. A vicar of Christ, a successor of Peter, or one claiming to be such, is here found driving the trade of selling thrones and kingdoms to the highest bidder. In other words, the supreme head of the church has turned grand auctioneer in the sale of kingdoms. The Saviour would not meddle at all even with the smallest worldly concerns, because his kingdom was not of this world. His reply to applicants for worldly favor was, “who made me a judge or a divider over you.” Peter could say, even to one asking alms, “silver and gold have I none.” And it was not because he could not have obtained it if he would, by selling the gifts in his possession: for to an applicant of this sort he said, “thy money perish with thee.” But look at the popes for successive ages, and see them keeping offices of simony and venality, hoarding up treasures, and dealing in kingdoms; and mark the difference, the absolute contrariety of these characters, and the undeniable apostacy of the latter.

But the power of the popes in religious matters was augmented with a rapidity equal to that of their prosperity in temporal things, and nearly from the same causes. The wisest and most impartial even among papal writers admit, that from the time of Lewis the meek, the ancient system of ecclesiastical law in Europe was gradually changed, and a new system introduced by the policy of the papal court. The kings and emperors suffered their rights in matters of religion, which had been handed down to them from Charlemagne, to be insensibly wrested from them. The popes, exulting in their pros-

perity, and the daily accessions to their wealth, endeavored to instill into the minds of all—and they did, notwithstanding the opposition of the better informed, instill into the minds of many—the sentiment that the pope of Rome was constituted by Jesus Christ, a legislator and judge over the whole church, and therefore that all other bishops derive their authority from him; and that even councils can decide nothing without his direction and approbation. To bring men to listen to and receive this new system of ecclesiastical law, which was so very different from the ancient system, there was need of ancient documents and records, with which it might be enforced and defended against the assaults of opposers. Hence the popes procured the forgery, by their trusty friends, of conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and other documents, by which they might make it appear, that from the earliest ages of the church, the popes possessed the same power and authority which they now claimed. Among these fraudulent supports of papal power were the *Decretal Epistles*, (so called,) of the bishops of the first centuries. These were forged by the ingenuity of a man of obscure birth, who falsely assumed the name of Isidore, a Spanish bishop. Some vestiges of these fabricated epistles appeared in the preceding century. But they were first published and cited as authority in the ninth century. Of a similar origin and character were the decrees of a Roman council, said to have been holden under Sylvester, A. D. 324, but which was never known by any one till the ninth century, and than which nothing could have been more calculated to enrich and exalt the pope of Rome above all human authority. As to the spurious character of the epistles and decrees above mentioned, it is believed that at the present day, even the advocates of popery, who pay any regard to established truth, confess the cheat, and their authenticity is now universally abandoned even by papists themselves. And yet, these very epistles and decrees are in a great

measure the foundation of papal pretension and claim. For certain it is, past all question, that all the claims of popery to supremacy, derived from primitive usage or history, are utterly destitute of all foundation in truth. Nevertheless we hear, and probably shall continue to hear, of the holy apostolical church of Rome, as if this body could trace its origin to an apostolical source. When the truth is, the real source is a parcel of forgeries of the ninth century, bearing the name of apostolical. The pope obtained the liberty to style himself universal bishop in the seventh century, as we have seen. But he did not obtain full possession of his assumed rights until the ninth century, and that on the ground of the above forgeries. And while the light and intelligence of the present day have compelled even the votaries of popery to confess the spurious nature of these documents, is it not strange that men should be found in this day, and in this country, who are willing to uphold this dominion founded in deception? Have we not reason to expect that every papist in the world *now*, who has the least regard to consistency or truth, or a mind at all open to conviction, will confess that the power and pretensions of popery are all usurpation?

But, notwithstanding the deep gloom of the ninth century, its dark shades were greatly augmented in the tenth. The testimony of historians concerning this century is, that the history of the church and its officers, especially of the popes, is a history of monsters, a history of the most atrocious villanies and crimes. This is admitted by all writers without distinction, even by the advocates of popery. Benedict IV. died near the commencement of the tenth century, and Leo V. was elected his successor; but he reigned only forty days, when Christophanes dethroned and cast him into prison. In the following year, Sergius III., a presbyter of Rome, stripped Christophanes of the pontifical dignity. After the death of Lando, in 914, the rich and powerful mar-

quis of Tuscany, called Alberic, or, according to some writers, Adelbert, by the instigation of his wife's mother, Theodora, a very lewd woman, who controlled all things at Rome, made John, her paramour, the successor to the papal throne. For at this time nothing was conducted regularly at Rome, but every thing was carried by violence and bribery, and by the influence of the courtesans, Theodora and her daughters. The history of this John X. is briefly this. Peter, the archbishop of Ravenna, sent him, then a deacon, to pay his respects to his holiness the pope. John, being a comely person, attracted the attention of Theodora, who was then the presiding genius at Rome. She falling in love with him, engaged him in a criminal intrigue. While they thus lived together, the bishop of Bologna died, and this John was elected to fill his place. But before his consecration the archbishop of Ravenna died, and Theodora persuaded him to put in a claim to that vacancy. He was accordingly, at her request, consecrated by the pope. The pope died soon after, and Theodora, exerting all her influence, advanced John to the papal throne. Such was one of the holy fathers of Rome! Supreme head of the church! raised to that station by an abominable harlot!! The history of the remaining part of this century is little else than a history of violence, murders, rivalry, and corruption. So much was this the case, that probably no court on earth ever equalled that of the pope for its perfidy, cruelty, and pollution. It might well be called the seat of the *beast*, but how incongruous to call it the church of Christ? It was not only mystically, but really and literally, the "*Mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth.*"

Concerning this century, Baronius, himself a papist, says:—"It is usual to denominate it the iron age, on account of its barbarity, and barrenness of all good; also the leaden age, on account of the abounding wickedness by which it was deformed, and the dark age, on account

of the scarcity of writers. One can scarcely believe, nay, absolutely cannot credit, without ocular demonstration, what unworthy conduct, what base and enormous deeds, what execrable and abominable transactions, disgraced the holy catholic see, which is the pivot on which the whole catholic church revolves. Temporal princes, who, though called Christians, were most cruel tyrants, arrogated to themselves the election of the Roman pontiffs. Alas, the shame! Alas, the mischief! What monsters, horrible to behold, were then raised to the holy see, which angels revere! What evils did they perpetrate, what tragedies ensued! With what pollutions was this see, though itself without spot or wrinkle, then stained! What corruptions infected it! What filthiness defiled it, and hence what marks of perpetual infamy are upon it!" This, we must remember, is the language of a papist, which nothing but stubborn fact would have forced from him. He speaks, indeed, of the papal dominion in this country as in a state of perversion and abuse; but he ought to have known that popery was now in its glory, and had attained its maturity. These were its natural and legitimate fruits. And the only reason it had not arrived at this state long before, was the want of power and means.

Amidst all these commotions, and the reiterated crimes and contests of those who called themselves Christ's vicerents, so great was the prevailing ignorance and superstition of the times, so debased and blinded were the minds of men, that the power and influence of the popes were continually advancing. It is true that Otto the Great introduced a law that no pope should be elected without the knowledge and consent of the emperor, and this regulation continued to the end of the century. This emperor, with his son and grandson of the same name, held uniformly their right of supremacy over the city of Rome and its territory, as well as over the pope himself. And the more intelligent bishops of France and Ger-

many, throughout the century, were on the alert to prevent the usurpations of the pope. But still the popes, sometimes openly and directly, and sometimes by stratagem, invaded the rights of both emperors and kings; and it has been observed that there were bishops in this century, though never before, that called the bishops of Rome, bishops of the world; and some among the French clergy conceded, what had never before been heard of, "*that the bishops receive, indeed, all their power from God, but through St. Peter,*" (i. e. the Pope.) In this century, also, the inferior bishops began to seek worldly power and possessions, and actually obtained jurisdiction over cities and districts of country; and thus became, in fact, counts, marquesses, and dukes. Hence it was that from this time onward, so many bishops and abbots were to be seen sustaining also characters entirely foreign to their sacred functions, and enjoying the rank of nobles and princes; and beside their ignorance and avarice, which were extreme, the papal clergy were chargeable with two great vices, which are deplored by most of the writers of those times; namely, concubinage and simony. Not only the priests, but the monks also, connected themselves with women in an unlawful manner, and with these concubines, and the children born of them, they squandered the property of the church. And then, there was scarcely any such thing as the canonical election of bishops and abbots; but the kings, princes, and nobles, either conferred the sacred offices on their friends and ministers, for whom they had a partiality, or sold them to the highest bidders. Hence, often, men the most unfit and flagitious, sometimes soldiers and civil magistrates, were invested with spiritual offices of the highest dignity and importance.

Such was the holy mother church; as her votaries superstitiously and ridiculously call her, in the tenth century. But who can fail to see that this church had become an apostate harlot church, long before this time;

and that she was no longer to be considered a branch or part of the visible church of Christ? The first decidedly apostate act seems to have been committed in the seventh century, when the bishop of Rome was constituted a pope or supreme head of the church. The apostacy was continued, and the character of a harlot church still more fully developed in the eighth century, when, by the cession of the provinces of Italy by the king of France, the pope became a temporal prince. Christ is the only supreme head of his church. When, therefore, any man arrogates this honor, or when any church acknowledge any other head, they renounce their allegiance to Christ and become apostate. Christ says, "my kingdom is not of this world." When, therefore, his professed ministers become temporal princes, and that in the name and by virtue of their office in the church, they are apostates from the principles of the gospel. And when a church submits to such dominion, it becomes apostate, and instead of a mother church, is properly denominated a **MOTHER OF HARLOTS.**

The eleventh century is fruitful in events which concern the advance and grandeur of popery. The papal bishops, when raised to the rank of dukes, counts and nobles, and enriched with territories, castles and wealth of every kind, became devoted to their pleasures and magnificence. They hovered about courts, attended with splendid retinues of servants. At the same time, the inferior clergy, few of whom exhibited any virtue or integrity, gave themselves up without shame to frauds, debaucheries and crimes of various descriptions. At the commencement of this century, the popes exercised indeed very great power in ecclesiastical affairs. For they were styled by most persons, masters of the world, and universal fathers. Still, their authority had till now some few limits. But from the time of Leo IX., the popes labored incessantly to be acknowledged as sovereign in the church, not only as superior to all councils,

and the divinely constituted distributors of all the offices, and disposers of all the property in the church ; but also, they labored to be acknowledged as lords of the whole world, judges over all judges, and kings over all kings. The kings of Europe, though they might at times have resisted this arrogancy, did, on several occasions, very imprudently accede to these assumptions, to secure their own private ends. Thus, William the conqueror, when he was about to invade England from Normandy, is reported to have sent ambassadors to the pope, in order, as Matthew Paris says, that the enterprize might be sanctioned by apostolical authority. The pope, after considering the claims of both parties, would naturally side with him who was likely to be most able to return the favor, therefore he sent a standard to William, as a token of his approbation, and a harbinger of royal authority. And the Normans are said, humbly to have requested of Leo IX. to confer on them territories, which they now occupied, and those on which they might afterwards seize. Benedict IX. was a man of such flagitious character, that the Roman citizens could no longer endure him, but hurled him and his infallibility from the papal chair. But he was restored soon after, by the emperor Conrad. As he continued his base conduct, the Romans in six years again expelled him, and assigned the pope's seat to John of Suabia, who was called Sylvester III. But after three months, Benedict again forced his way to the papal chair, and Sylvester was obliged to flee. But finding the Romans implacable towards him, he sold the popedom to John Gratian, who took the name of Gregory VI. The question might here be started, where was the infallibility of popery, when these rival popes were struggling to subdue each other? Was this a struggle of infallibility with itself, or did this important quality stand by, waiting for the victor? At any rate, it would seem that the holy mother had now become a monster, for she had two heads! The emperor Henry at length

took up the matter, and to end the dispute he deposed both popes, notwithstanding their infallibility, and placed a man in the vacant chair who was called Clement II. But on the death of Clement, the flagitious and pertinacious Benedict IX. again assumed infallibility and seized the chair. The year following; however, he was obliged to flee, and leave the popedom to Damasus II. These transactions afford a striking illustration of papal prerogatives, as king of kings and lord of lords. The truth was, the pope was always disposed to exercise this supreme power when he could, and when he could not, he made a virtue of necessity and hoped for better times.

In this century, a very remarkable character appeared on the stage of papal Europe, whose name in common life was Hildebrand, but who at length became pope Gregory VII. This man filled the Christian world with feuds, conflicts and confusion. He was a Tuscan by birth, of obscure parentage; first a monk of Clugni, then archdeacon of the church of Rome, and for a long time he possessed a paramount influence in the councils of the pope, and in the year 1073, he was raised to the papal dignity. Hildebrand, according to the testimony of history, was a man of rare parts, competent to the greatest undertakings, intrepid, sagacious, and full of resources, but beyond measure proud, pertinacious, impetuous, untractable, and destitute of all true religious principle. The extravagance of his views, and the vastness of his plans, are discoverable in those noted propositions, which, from his name, are called the dictates of Hildebrand. These dictates, according to Harduin, are twenty-seven short propositions relating to the supreme power of the pope over the whole church, and over states. These propositions are found in the second book of the epistles of Gregory VII. These dictates are in part as follows, viz. "1. The Roman church was founded by our Lord alone. 2. The Roman pontiff alone is justly styled universal. 3.

He alone can depose bishops and restore them. His legate has the precedence of all bishops in councils, though he be of an inferior order, and he can issue sentence of deposition against them. 5. The pope can depose absent persons. 6. No person may live under the same roof with one excommunicated by the pope. 7. The pope alone is competent, as occasion shall require, to enact new laws, to gather new congregations, to divide rich bishoprics, and to unite poor ones. 8. He alone can use the imperial insignia. 9. That all princes should kiss his feet only. 12. It is lawful for him to depose emperors. 16. No council without his order is to be accounted a general council. 18. His sentence is not to be reviewed by any one, while he alone can review the sentences of all others. 19. He can be judged by no man. 20. No person may presume to condemn a person that appeals to the apostolical see. 21. The greater causes of every church should be carried up to that see. 22. The Romish church never erred, nor will it, according to the scriptures, ever err. 24. That with the pope's license subjects may impeach their sovereigns. 26. No one is to be esteemed a catholic who does not harmonize with the Romish church. 27. The pope can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous sovereigns."

Nearly the whole form of the church was changed by this pope. The most valuable rights of other men, and communities, were subverted and transferred to the pope. And not only did Hildebrand introduce a new code of ecclesiastical law, but he endeavored to introduce a similar change into the civil code. He wished to reduce all kingdoms to fiefs of St. Peter, (*i. e.* the pope,) and to subject all causes of princes and kings, and the interests of the whole world, to the arbitrament of an assembly of bishops, who should meet annually at Rome. He prescribed the following oath to be taken by all future emperors or kings of Rome, viz. "From this hour on-

ward, I will be faithful with upright integrity to the apostle Peter, and to his vicar pope Gregory, and whatever the said pope shall command me under the form, *by true obedience*, I will observe with fidelity. And on the day when I shall first see him, I will with my own hands make myself a vassal of St. Peter and him." Gregory pretended that the kingdom of France was tributary to St. Peter, and he directed his ambassador to demand an annual tribute from the French. "You must," said he, "declare to all the Franks, and command them *by true obedience*, that each family is to pay annually at least one denarius to St. Peter, if they recognize him as their father and shepherd, according to ancient usage."

He insolently addresses Philip I., the king of France, in the following manner. "Strive to the utmost to make St. Peter (i. e. the pope) your debtor, for in his hands are your kingdom and your soul, and he is able both to bind and loose you, both in heaven and on earth." The same pope contended that the kingdom of Spain was, from ancient times, the property of St. Peter, and righteously belongs solely to the apostolic see. And some of the Spanish princes appear to have allowed this claim, for they actually paid a tribute. The same audacious claims were made against others, and we may say most of the kingdoms of Europe. A prince of Russia is said to have come all the way to Rome, to obtain the kingdom which he inherited from his father, by gift of the pope. And Gregory most graciously granted his devout prayer, being certainly not backward to perform such offices; and, in behalf of St. Peter, committed the government of the kingdom to the Russian prince. If Gregory's success had been equal to his wishes or his purpose, all Europe would at this day have been one great empire of popery, tributary to the Roman pontiffs, and all kings and lords would have been vassals of the pope. But the attempts of Gregory, if they did not succeed to the full extent of his wishes, were not wholly in vain. For from this time

onward, the state of the whole of Europe was changed, and many of the rights and prerogatives of kings and emperors were either abridged or annulled. And, if Gregory was not as successful as he could have wished, in regard to the subjection of Europe, his triumph in Italy was equal to his most sanguine expectations. He persuaded Matilda, the daughter of Boniface, (a powerful and opulent duke of Tuscany,) a princess of great influence, with whom he was on terms of great intimacy, after the death of her husband and her mother, to make the church of Rome heir to all her estates, both in Italy and out of it. The popes, as historians relate, had to encounter much difficulty respecting this splendid inheritance, yet after various struggles, they retained no small share, which they hold to this day.

A contest having arisen between Gregory and Henry IV., king of the Romans, the pope proceeded to excommunicate the king, and absolve his subjects from their allegiance, and to summon the king to Rome, to answer before a council to the charges brought against him. Indignant at this message, the king called a council and proceeded to depose Gregory, and appointed a meeting for the election of a new pope. This raised the ire of his holiness, and both parties resorted to war. Henry was forsaken by some of his princes, and, though a brave man, was reduced to circumstances which rendered it necessary for him to make his submission to the pope. For this purpose he repaired barefooted, in the depth of winter, with his wife and child, to the city where the pope then was. There he remained at the gate from morning till night for three days together, fasting, and humbly craving admittance and audience. At length word came from the pope that he had no leisure to hold converse with him. The king patiently waited at the gate, until his request was granted, through the entreaties of Matilda, the pope's mistress. At length being admitted, as a token of his submission, he yielded his crown into the

popé's hands, desiring to be absolved and forgiven. He obtained absolution from the sentence of excommunication only, for the question respecting his restoration to the throne was deferred. Henry, however, was soon after in a condition to face his enemy. He entered Rome with an army, and besieged the pope in the castle of St. Angelo. The siege was raised by a Norman duke, but the pope no longer feeling safe in the city, left Rome; and in the year 1085, this most ambitious and audacious of all the popes that ever lived, came to his end.

The twelfth century opened with no brighter prospects for the church, and no improvement in the character of her officers and teachers. Concerning this century, the testimony of history is as follows. Wherever we turn our eyes we discover traces of dishonesty, ignorance, luxury, and other vices with which both the church and the state were contaminated, by those who pretended to be the guardians and leaders in all religious concerns. If we except a few individuals who were of a better character, and who lamented the profligacy and vices of their order, all of them disregarded the salvation of the people, were intent on following their base propensities, increasing their wealth and honors, encroaching and trampling on the rights of sovereigns and magistrates, and living in luxury and splendor. Bernhard, in his five books of meditations, addressed to pope Eugene, and in his apology addressed to Abbot William, censures and deplores the shameful conduct of the popes and bishops, and the base lives of the monks. Hume, in his history of England, chap. 10, says of Richard I., king of England, when about to enter on his crusade to Palestine, that he carried so little of the appearance of sanctity in his conduct, that Fulk, curate of Neville, a zealous preacher of the crusade, who from that merit had acquired the privilege of speaking the boldest truths, advised him to rid himself of his notorious sins, particularly his pride, avarice, and voluptuousness, which he called the

king's favorite daughters. You counsel well, replied Richard, and I hereby dispose of the first to the *Templars*, the second to the *Benedictines*, and the third to *my Prelates*. Such a sarcasm from the king shows the notoriety of clerical vice, as well as the direction it took in the principal classes of clerical persons. In the preceding chapter Hume says, "We are told by Giraldus Cambrensis, that the monks and prior of St. Swithurn threw themselves one day prostrate in the mire before Henry II., complaining with many tears and much doleful lamentation, that the bishop of Winchester, who was also their abbot, had cut off three dishes from their table. How many has he left you, said the king? *Ten only*, replied the disconsolate monks. I myself, exclaimed the king, never have more than three, and I enjoin your bishop to reduce you to the same number." The great object of the popes during the twelfth century, was to retain the possessions and power which had been gained by their predecessors, and to extend them still farther if possible. This state of feeling on the part of the priesthood brought them into continual collision with the civil power. The dispute about the right of investitures, which had armed Gregory VII. and Henry IV. against each other, did not cease with the death of the former. But Paschal II., who was created pope near the close of the preceding century, renewed the decrees of his predecessors against investitures, and again excommunicated Henry. The king resolutely resisted these attempts, until, two years after, his own son, Henry V., declared against him, and his cause was irreparably ruined. But the pope absolved the son of his oath of obedience to his father, and zealously supported him in his unnatural rebellion.

At length, however, a violent contest arose between the pope and this very Henry V., and the king caused his holiness to be seized, and, as a prisoner, to be conveyed to the castle of Viterbo. When he had lain there a

season, a new convention was formed, in which the pope conceded to the king the right of giving investiture to bishops and abbots with the staff and ring. The pope, however, being violently accused at Rome for making this concession, he, to gain the favor of the Romans, assembled a council in the lateran palace, and before that council humbly confessed his fault in forming such a convention with the emperor, and submitted the matter to the decision of the council. The result was, that the compact was rescinded, and the emperor or king, Henry V., was excluded from communion, and even classed among heretics, than which, nothing in that age was more dreadful. Soon after, the pope died. In succession, two popes were brought forward by different parties, which event exhibits the holy mother church again with two heads! One of these was set up by the emperor in opposition to the one elected by the Romans! The latter, finding himself unsafe at Rome, retired to France, and soon after died. At length, under Calixtus II., and after multiplied efforts, contests, excommunications, and threats of rival popes and pretenders, a peace was settled, and the question about investitures was put at rest by giving the right, substantially, to the pope.

A dispute arose between Hadrian IV., pope of Rome, and Frederick I., surnamed Barbarossa, emperor of Germany, on the ground that the pope required the emperor to perform the office of groom in holding his stirrups when he mounted his horse. This the emperor refused to do. An open rupture seemed about to take place, when the pope was removed by death. When a new pope was to be elected, the cardinals were divided into two factions. Each faction elected a pope, so that holy mother was again furnished with two heads! The emperor joining with one, the other was obliged to quit Rome and Italy, and retire to France. And when the successful competitor died, another was immediately put in his place. The exiled pope, however, found means to

return to Italy and prosecute his cause with some success in the lateran council at Rome. The emperor in the mean time marched his army towards Rome, intending to chastise those cities and provinces which had revolted from him. But he met with disappointments and reverses which materially changed the aspect of affairs. He concluded a peace with his rival pope, Alexander III. And it is said by some that the pope compelled the emperor to kiss his great toe in token of submission, and by others, that the pope, placing his foot on the neck of the suppliant emperor, repeated the words of David, "*Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder.*" The correctness of this account, however, is questioned by modern writers.

This same Alexander III. had also a contest with Henry II. of England, on account of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, the circumstances of which were as follows. A priest of the popish order had debauched the daughter of a gentleman in Worcestershire, and then murdered the father to prevent the effects of his resentment. The atrocity of the crime raised a spirit of indignation among the people, and the king insisted that the assassin should be tried by the civil magistrate. This Becket opposed, alleging the privileges of the church. In order to determine this matter, the king assembled a council of the nobility and prelates at Clarendon, to which he submitted this great and important affair, and desired their concurrence. A number of regulations were then drawn up, which were afterwards well known under the title of the Constitutions of Clarendon, and were then voted without opposition. By these regulations it was enacted that clergymen, accused of any crime, should be tried in the civil courts, that laymen should not be tried in the spiritual courts except by legal and reputable witnesses. Pope Alexander condemned these regulations in the most decisive manner, and finally annulled them. Becket took part with his holiness, and fled to the pope, who was

then in France. The pope and Becket were not remiss to retort their fulminations, and to shake the very foundations of the king's authority. Becket compared himself to Christ, who was condemned by a lay tribunal, and who was, as Becket represented, crucified anew under the oppressions under which the church now labored. But he did not rest in mere complaint; he issued a censure excommunicating the king's chief ministers by name, and all who obeyed or favored the Constitutions of Clarendon. At length, however, a compromise was effected by which Becket was permitted to return to England. But nothing could exceed the insolence of Becket on his return. Instead of retiring quietly to his diocess, with that modesty which became a man just pardoned by his king, he made a progress through Kent in all the splendor and magnificence of the pope himself. As he approached Southark, the clergy and laity, men of all ranks and ages, came forth to meet him, and celebrated his triumphal entry with hymns of joy. Thus being confident of the support of the multitude, he began to launch forth his thunders against those who had been his former opposers. The archbishop of York, who had crowned Henry's eldest son in his absence, was the first against whom he denounced sentence of suspension. The bishops of London and Salisbury he actually excommunicated. One man he excommunicated for having spoken against him, and another for cutting off the tail of his horse.

Henry was in Normandy while the primate was thus triumphantly parading through the kingdom. And it was not without the highest indignation that he received information of his turbulent insolence. When the suspended and excommunicated prelates arrived, his anger knew no bound. The archbishop of York remarked, that while Becket lived, the king could never expect to enjoy any peace. The king replied, that he had no faithful friends about him, or he should not so long have

been exposed to the insolence of that ungrateful hypocrite. These words, whatever may have been their intent, induced four of his courtiers to repair secretly to England, and slay the primate in the year 1170. The assassins immediately fled to Rome, where they obtained absolution, on condition of doing penance and going into perpetual exile. The king, after various altercations, and making such expiation as the pope required, a part of which was, that he should walk barefoot to Becket's tomb, and there be scourged on the naked back, obtained absolution. As for Becket, he was at once enrolled among the holy martyrs, and considered a glorified saint of the highest order, and so stands in the calendar of the popish church.

Thus it appears, that the popish priesthood of that age had renounced all subordination to the magistrate; they openly claimed exemption, in criminal accusations, from a trial before the courts of justice, and were gradually aiming at a like exemption in civil matters. Spiritual penalties alone could be inflicted on their offences. And as the priesthood had very much multiplied in England, and many of the popish priests were of very low character, crimes of the deepest dye, murders, robberies, adulteries and rapes, were daily committed with impunity by the priests. It had been found, for example, on inquiry, that no less than an hundred murders had, since the king's accession, (from 1154 to 1163,) been perpetrated by the servants of the pope, who had never been called to an account for these offences. Introduction to the priesthood had become a full protection for all kinds of enormity. The papal church was now in the plenitude of its power, the zenith of its glory. Such, then, must be considered its legitimate fruits. "By their fruits," saith our Saviour, "ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of Thistles? They come to you in sheeps' clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

The thirteenth century exhibits increasing disclosures of the deep and deadly corruptions of the apostate church. The testimony of history in regard to this century is, that both Greek and Latin writers censure and condemn, without reserve, the iniquities and vices of their bishops and religious teachers, nor can any one, acquainted with the history of this century, pronounce their complaints excessive. A lively picture of the truth in this respect, may be seen by reading the history of the popes. They uniformly and perseveringly urged with violence, menaces, fraud and force of arms, that fundamental principle of the papal canon law, that the pope is the sovereign lord of the whole world, and that all other rulers in church and state, have just so much power and authority, as he sees fit to allow them to have. Resting on this fundamental principle, the popes arrogated to themselves the absolute power, not only of conferring sacred offices or benefices, as they are called, but also of giving away empires; and likewise of divesting kings and princes of their crowns and authority.

In order to reign more absolutely and securely both in church and state, the popes claimed particularly the right of appointing all presiding officers in the church, of every rank and description, bishops, abbots, canons, &c., at their pleasure. Thus, they who had formerly contended so strenuously for the free election of presiding officers in the church, in opposition to the encroachments of emperors and kings, now themselves prostrated the whole right of free elections; and either reserved to themselves the richest benefices, or provided for the vacant churches by assigning to them their dependents or friends; and even set aside prelates who were duly elected, in order to substitute others in their places. The pretence was care for the safety of the church, and fear lest heretics should creep into the fold of Christ. Boniface VIII. declared boldly and distinctly, that the whole church is under the control of the pope; and that kings and patrons, and

religious bodies have the powers only which the vicars of Christ choose to give them. The legates sent into the different provinces by the popes, eagerly imitated their masters, for they unhesitatingly invaded the rights of religious bodies, and conferred the lesser benefices, and sometimes the larger too, at their pleasure, on such as they were partial to, on account of their money, or for other similar reasons. They extorted money in various ways, and often in such as were most iniquitous; they deceived the unguarded by forged papal briefs, and by other artifices. They not unfrequently disturbed the public tranquillity, and put themselves at the head of factions; they carried on a most scandalous and wicked traffic in relics and indulgences, and did other things even worse than these. Hence, all the writers of these times are full of complaints of the crimes and villanies of the papal legates. This evil extended so far that in 1256, pope Alexander IV. felt himself compelled to issue a severe edict against the fraudulent practices of legates. But men who had influence at the court of Rome could easily evade its force.

Pope Innocent III. who governed the papal church in the beginning of this century, though learned according to the standard of that age, and also laborious, was nevertheless rough, cruel, avaricious and arrogant. He adopted in full the maxims of Gregory VII., and claimed supreme dominion in the church, in respect to religious concerns, all over the world. Consequently he created kings when and where he pleased. In Asia he gave a king to the Armenians. He raised a duke of Bohemia, and a duke of the Wallachians, and Bulgarians, to the honors of royalty. And in person he crowned at Rome, and saluted as king, Peter II. of Arragon, who had rendered his dominions tributary to the church. Many other proofs of his claiming absolute power over the whole world, may easily be gathered out of his epistles.

But the event respecting popery, which above all

others, distinguishes this century, is the rise and establishment of the bloody and abominable court of the **INQUISITION**. Some account of the origin and progress of this institution, may properly be given in this connexion. But the character, practices, and persecutions of this bloody tribunal, will be the subject of a distinct section.

It was found by the friends of popery, that the extravagant pretensions of the prelates and popes, had opened the eyes of many to see the deformity of the existing system, and the opposition of some was excited against assumptions so vain and arrogant. Among these reformers, Peter Waldo, of Lyons, and his followers, called Waldenses were conspicuous. They were all branded as infamous heretics. These heretics were rapidly multiplying in all parts of the papal dominions. And now, that the cause of popery could no longer be defended by scripture or sound argument, it became necessary to resort to some new and extraordinary means, to support the fabric of the papal dominion. Innocent III., on learning the state of the case, sent extraordinary legates into those provinces, where the alleged heresies were breaking forth. The heretics were to be destroyed, root and branch, by all possible means. Among those who entered with great zeal upon this work of extirpating heretics, was one Dominic, a Spaniard, and founder of the order of preaching monks, called Dominicans. This man very strenuously assailed the heretics, and is generally considered the founder of the Inquisition. As this measure was found very effectual, and was entirely consonant with the genius of the papal church, and the spirit of its supporters, similar papal legates were sent into nearly all the cities, whose inhabitants were suspected of heresy. And that this tribunal, devised for subduing heretics, might awaken more terror, the popes prevailed on the emperors and sovereigns of Europe, to extend the arm of civil power in execution of ecclesiastical sentence,

and to enact severe laws against those called heretics, requiring the magistrates to punish with death, and particularly with burning at the stake, all such as should be adjudged obstinate heretics by the inquisitors. In regard to the proceedings of this tribunal, they were uniformly marked with the utmost injustice, cruelty, oppression, and deliberate malice. And thus, by means of this tribunal, more than by any other means, was the papal church prepared to fulfil an ancient prophecy, in which she is described as "*wearing out the saints.*" The people of God were in many instances literally worn out, in the dungeons, and under the tortures of the inquisition. Of these persecutions an account will be given in the sequel. In the mean time, it may be proper here to subjoin some statement of the principles and rules by which the proceedings of this tribunal were regulated. The power of the inquisitors was unlimited: they proceeded against whom they pleased, without any consideration of age, sex, or rank. However infamous the accusers, the accusation was deemed valid; and even anonymous information was regarded as sufficient evidence. The dearest friends or kindred could not, without danger, serve any one who was imprisoned on account of religion. To convey to those who were confined a little straw, or to give them a cup of water, was esteemed favoring heretics. No lawyer dared to plead even for his own brother, or notary dared to register any thing in favor of the reformed. The malice of the papists went even beyond the grave: they often dug up the bones of those accused of heresy, and burnt them to ashes, and strewed them in the river.

A person became suspected of heresy, if he said any thing that might offend others, if he misused the sacraments, or other sacred things, if he treated the images with disrespect, if he possessed, read, or gave to others to read, books prohibited by the inquisition, if he said mass or heard confessions without being in orders, if he at-

tended even for once the preaching of heretics, if he did not appear before the inquisition as soon as cited, if he showed any kindness to a heretic, or assisted him to escape. Abettors of heresy were those who harbored heretics or did not give them up. When the inquisition discovered a transgressor of their laws, either by common report or by their spies, or by an informer, he was cited three times to appear before them, and if he did not appear, he was forthwith condemned. It was safest to appear on the first citation, because the longer a man delayed, the more guilty would he be esteemed. And the inquisitors had their spies, and a thousand concealed ways for getting an absconding criminal into their power. When a reputed heretic was once in the hands of the inquisition, no one dared to inquire after him, to write to him, to intercede for him, or in any way to manifest any interest in his welfare. Friends must here abandon friends. Husband and wife must be put asunder, parents must abandon their children to the jaws of this horrid Moloch, and never open their mouths in complaint or sympathy. All this will be verified by facts hereafter to be related. The victim was first secured by a sudden and unexpected arrest, often in the silent hours of the night. And the announcement of the holy inquisition, by its officers, at any door, or under any window, would at once remove its bars, and cause the inmates of domestic quiet to spring from their beds, to hear and obey the mandates of the holy office. No barrier could avail here. The order must be instantly obeyed, or life was the penalty. When the victim was seized and all his effects secured, then the process began. But it was usually protracted in the most tedious manner. After many days, and perhaps months or years, which the accused dragged out in a loathsome dungeon, the keeper would ask him, as if it were accidental, whether he wished for a hearing. When he appeared before his judges, they would inquire, as if they knew nothing

about him, who he was, and what he wanted. If he wished to be informed what offence he had committed, he was admonished to confess his faults himself. If he confessed nothing, time was given him for reflection, and he was remanded to prison. If, after a long time allowed him, he still confessed nothing, he must swear to answer truly all the questions put to him. If he would not swear, he was condemned without farther process. If he swore to give answer, he was questioned in regard to his whole life, without making known to him his offence. He was, however, promised a pardon, if he would truly confess all his offences: in other words, if he would accuse and criminate himself. An artifice this, by which his judges often learnt more than they knew or suspected before. At last the charges were presented to him in writing, and counsel also was assigned him, who, however, dare not say a word in his favor, and whose sole advice was that he should confess fully his faults. The accuser and informer against him were never made known, but the charges against him, and these were often composed of things drawn from his own lips by the promise of pardon, were put into his hands, and he was required to prepare for defence. But what defence could be made in such a case? It was but the appearance of justice and equity of proceeding—it was all a piece of mockery, for no defence would be admitted—the victim must be sacrificed, and the spotless purity of an angel would avail nothing. If the answers of the accused in his defence did not satisfy the inquisitors, or if the allegations against him were likely to fail for want of ostensible proof, recourse was had to torture, to force the necessary confession from the criminal. The tortures in common use in the inquisition, for the purpose of forcing their victims to confess something for which they might condemn them, were, the *rope*, *water*, and *fire*. The *rope* was a strong cord passed under the arms, which were tied behind the back of the accused. By this rope

he was drawn up high into the air by a pulley, and there left to hang for a time. At length he was suddenly let fall to within half a foot of the ground, and frequently his joints were dislocated by the shock. If he still persisted in asserting his innocence, or would not confess any thing sufficiently heinous to justify his condemnation, the trial by water was next introduced. After making him drink a great quantity of water, he was laid upon a hollow bench, across the middle of which a stick of timber passed, which kept the middle of his body suspended, and caused most intense pain in the spine. But the last resort, and that the most cruel of all was, the torture by fire. In this, the feet were first smeared with grease, and then placed in near contact with a hot fire, or hot plates of iron, and the soles left to burn and crisp by inches, until the victim would confess all that they required. Each of these tortures was continued as long as the patient could bear it without dying; for they would not allow him the relief of death; and lest he should escape too soon out of their hands, they always had a physician of the holy office present, to feel the pulse, and watch the sufferer, and to slacken the severity of his torture, when it appeared to be more than he could live under. If the victim now confessed ever so much, still his tortures would be continued for a season, to discover his motives, and then to make him disclose all his accomplices. So great often was the severity of the suffering, and so strong the temptation to obtain relief by discovering accomplices, that the sufferer, frantic with pain, and hardly knowing what he said, would name innocent persons, because he knew no other to name, and because driven to phrenzy with his torture. On such a disclosure, the persons named were instantly apprehended, and in their turn subjected to all the tortures of this horrid tribunal, to draw from them similar disclosures. Thus, if persons once fell into the hands of these monsters in human shape, there was no relief. If

they confessed crimes, they were punished to the extent of human ingenuity for the crimes. If they did not confess, they were tortured with equal severity for not confessing. Turn which way they would, innocent or guilty, their destruction was inevitable, and that in a manner, the cruelty and barbarity of which no pen can describe. This was the ordinary course, the common law of this bloody court.

To form proper conceptions of the Inquisition, we must not view it in the distance, but bring it near, and make the case of its wretched victims our own. Suppose we lived in a community where its power was felt, and its mandates obeyed—nay, more, suppose we ourselves had fallen under its grasp, or that its ruthless hand were protruded into our families, to seize from our side, or force from our arms, a victim for its racks and dungeons. Suppose yourselves liable to hear, in the silence of midnight, the doleful rap at your door or your window, which is followed in dismal sounds by the annunciation of the **HOLY INQUISITION!** You spring from your bed, and in trembling haste, lest by delay you should be liable to accusation, you open your doors to the band of ruffians, who, without ceremony, take your wife or your child, and hurry off, without giving you time even for a last adieu, to the holy office. In the bitterness of your soul you dare not breathe an audible sigh, or whisper a complaint, much less dare you interpose any efforts for their rescue or relief. You may not even inquire after them, or ever mention their names. And after all your caution, the probability is, that the inquisitors, by the force of their tortures, will compel your dearest friends to implicate you so far, as that you may shortly have a call from the same banditti, and be hurried off to the same inevitable ruin. These are the blessings of popery; the blessing which countries under her influence have felt for centuries. And what completes the infernal hypocrisy of this court is, that when its victims are delivered

over to the secular power to be punished, the life of the criminal is earnestly pleaded for, on the ground that the holy church never thirsts for blood; when, at the very moment this plea is made, the civil magistrate knows that if he should pardon or spare, it would be at the peril of his own life. Such is the inquisition in its fundamental principles. No person could possibly escape destruction if an inquisitor were desirous of destroying him. A person charged with heresy, even if he had been acquitted by the pope himself, might still be condemned by the inquisition. An equivocal promise of pardon was often given to induce a confession, but the promise had no binding force when the object was obtained. And even death did not free a person from the jurisdiction of this court; for a deceased heretic must be burnt in effigy. The inquisitors do not deny that by such proceedings many innocent persons will suffer; but this gives them no trouble. "Better," say they, "that a hundred innocent persons, who are good catholics, should be cut off and go to paradise, than to let one heretic escape who might poison many souls, and plunge them into endless perdition."

A peculiar feature of popery, by which the thirteenth and the succeeding centuries were distinguished, was the establishment and prevalence of what were called the Mendicant orders of monks; that is to say, monks who had no possessions or revenues of their own, but who went about, living on the earnings of others. A class of persons of this description had become very necessary to the interests of popery. For the wealthy clergy, withdrawn from the care of the church by their opulence and their obsequiousness to the popes, and by indulging in idleness and voluptuousness, could no longer be employed in arduous labors, and the opposers of popery were taking advantage of this state of things, by reason of their superior activity and self-denial. They were, in consequence, acquiring great influence, and gathering congregations on every side. Moreover, it was a favorite sen-

timent with the opponents of popery, that voluntary poverty and suffering constituted a primary virtue in a servant of Jesus Christ. They therefore required their own teachers to live in poverty like the apostles, while they reproached the papal church for its riches, and for the vices of the clergy growing out of these riches. By the propagation of these sentiments, and the exemplification of them in their lives, the heretics, as the papists called them, gained favor with the people. A class of persons, therefore, was much wanted in the ranks of popery, who, by the austerity of their manners, and an apparent contempt of riches, and the ostensible sanctity of their rules of life, might resemble such teachers as the heretics both commended and exhibited, and whom neither their worldly interests nor pleasures, nor the fear of princes and nobles, could induce to neglect their obligations to the interests of popery, and the pope himself. Innocent III. was the first to discover this exigency. He had a manifest partiality for mendicant orders, for he sent these mendicant or begging monks into all parts of the world, as heralds of the papal power; and to increase their respectability and influence, he exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and declared them to be responsible immediately and solely to the pope himself. By this means the number of mendicant friars was so rapidly increased, that they became a burden to the people, and, as one pope afterward denominated them, an unbridled throng. As these orders were patronized by the pope, and were properly his scavengers, he gave them full liberty to go where they pleased. And as they made much more show of piety and self-denial than was common among the papists, all Europe was suddenly filled with admiration and reverence for religious beggars. The people would go to hear nobody but the beggars, and would seldom receive the sacraments or burial from any other hands. Indeed, such was the superstitious reverence felt for these begging friars, that in a short time

they found their way to the principal stations of influence, both in church and state. The orders of mendicant friars most known were four, viz., Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Augustinians. But of these, the Dominicans and Franciscans were most distinguished by their glory and power. For notwithstanding their professed poverty, which gave them their influence, no sooner did they gain the influence than they perverted it for their own emolument, and thus reverted to the very evils which they professed to avoid, viz., opulence and vice. And during three centuries these two orders of monks had the control of almost every interest and transaction in church and state. They held the highest offices both ecclesiastical and civil; they taught with absolute authority both in schools and churches, and defended the majesty of the popes against kings, bishops, and heretics, with untiring zeal and amazing success. From the thirteenth century to the reformation by Luther, they were the soul of popery, and the projectors and executors of every important enterprise.

Dominic, the founder of the Dominican order, was a Spaniard of the noble family of *Guzman*. He was a regular canon of Osma, a man of sanguine temperament, burning with zeal against heretics, who then, as before intimated, greatly disquieted the papal dominion. Dominic, with a few companions, went into France to wage war with the heretics who abounded in that country. There he engaged them with sermons and essays; but not successful in this warfare, he next resorted to military force, and finally to the tremendous power of the inquisition, of which he is considered the founder. With these carnal and anti-scriptural weapons he obtained celebrity for his success against the Waldenses and Albigenses. Then going into Italy, he readily obtained great favor with the reigning popes, and received permission to establish a new fraternity, the special object of which was to be the extirpation of heretics. Dominic was the

first general of this order, and so continued till his death, which occurred in 1221. In the year 1277, the order had thirty-five cloisters or monasteries for men in Spain, fifty-two in France, thirty-two in Tuscany, fifty-three in Germany, forty-six in Lombardy, thirty in Hungary, thirty-six in Poland, twenty-eight in Denmark, forty in England, besides some in other countries, and a large number of nunneries or cloisters for women.

Francis, the founder of the Franciscans, was the son of a merchant in Umbria, and was a dissolute and reckless youth. But on recovering from a dangerous sickness, brought upon him by his licentious conduct, he exhibited a kind of religious lunacy, or fanaticism. Having by accident heard these words of Christ repeated, "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey," &c., he conceived that the essence of the gospel, as taught by Christ, consisted in absolute penury in all things. This test he therefore prescribed to himself and his followers. However sincere he may have been in his intentions, he was greatly ignorant of the principles of the gospel, and weakened in his intellect by the force of his disease, and greatly perverted the gospel, as will be seen in the course of his history. The pope regarded this new order of paupers as peculiarly favorable to the interests of his dominion in these times, when he was greatly annoyed by the activity of his opponents. Francis was so humble, (at least in profession,) that he would not suffer his followers to be called by the name of *brethren*, but *little brethren* they must be, as taking a low place. He imagined that Christ appeared to him, and that he had visions and prophetic dreams. In a pilgrimage to Rome, he saw a multitude of beggars about the church of St. Peter, and exchanged clothes with one of the most shabby, and herded several days with their company. Praying one day near the walls of a decayed church in his native city, he fancied that he heard a voice, saying, "Go, Francis, repair my

house, which you see is decayed." He went immediately and sold a large quantity of cloth belonging to his father, and brought the avails to the priest of that church for its repair. His father was offended, and attempted to arrest him as a deranged person; in which light he was now generally viewed by his acquaintance. In the year 1206, his father took all property out of his hands, lest he should squander it. But he clothed himself in skins, and lived like a beggar, travelling the country, and exhorting all that came in his way to be religious. Some regarded him to be insane, and others as a distinguished saint. But he contrived to raise money enough to repair the old church above mentioned, and two others in the vicinity. At one of them he established his head quarters, and established an order of monks, about the year 1208. Absolute poverty, entire obedience, much fasting and prayer, with constant efforts to convert sinners, were the requisites for admission to his order. Francis travelled much, preaching and working miracles, and enjoying revelations. On a certain time, while preaching, he was greatly disturbed by the chattering of some swallows about the premises. He turned to them and said, "My sisters, you have talked long enough, it is time for me to speak, do you give silence while the word of God is preached." They instantly obeyed the exhortation, and gave no farther trouble. In the year 1219, it is said that no less than 5000 persons attended the general chapter of this order. The followers of Francis now increased with great rapidity, and the preachers of the order spread all over Europe. He would allow of no splendor in his churches, and his followers must not own even a psalter or hymn book. In 1220, five Franciscan missionaries were murdered in Morocco, which event contributed very much to raise the reputation of the order, and to increase its numbers. It is related by his followers, that Francis, after praying for greater conformity to Christ, had his prayer answered by the appearance of

scars in his hands, and feet, and side, representing the five wounds of Christ.

The two orders of the Dominicans and the Franciscans wonderfully supported the tottering fabric of popery. This they did by searching out heretics and putting them to death, by performing missions favorable to the interests of the papal empire, and by confirming the people in their loyalty to the pope. Sensible of their importance and their fidelity, the popes employed them in all the important transactions of their kingdom, and conferred on them the highest privileges and advantages. They were commissioned to preach, hear confessions, and grant absolution without restraint. They were also furnished with full power to grant *indulgences*, by which the pope aimed to put them in a way to live without begging, though it was a method altogether more degraded and flagitious. Thus it is said by Matthew Paris: "Our lord the pope now made the Franciscans and Dominicans, contrary to their wishes, I suppose, and to the injury and scandal of their order, his publicans and bedels. Our lord the pope has not ceased to amass treasures, making the Dominican and Franciscan monks, even against their inclinations, not fishers of *men* but of *money*." But the favors of the pope bestowed so liberally upon the Dominicans and Franciscans, while they weakened the ancient discipline, and infringed upon the rights of the regular clergy, produced also deadly hatred and endless contention between the mendicant orders themselves, by rendering them rivals. Violent commotions and struggles in every country in Europe, and in the city of Rome itself, were the consequence. And though the popes of this and the following centuries used various means to compose and terminate these commotions, yet they were never able wholly to extinguish them, because the interests of popery seemed to require that its faithful servants, the mendicant monks, should be in honor and safety. And the privileges conferred by the popes upon

these orders, excited a general odium against them, and deservedly too, for they were intolerably proud and arrogant on all occasions. They assumed to be divinely commissioned to explain (*ipse dixit*) the religion of Christ. They declared that they only understood the true way of salvation, they extolled the efficacy of their indulgences, and boasted beyond measure of their familiar intercourse with God and the virgin Mary. And being dependent on the charity of the people, or rather upon what they could wheedle from the people by their pretences, they were extremely indulgent to all who came to them for spiritual guidance. Their confessions were easy, their penances light, they would say masses for money, they would open their burial enclosures to the rich, for which they were amply rewarded. But these mendicant orders, while they were the chief support of popery, gave the pope immense trouble by their mutual contentions. They could not agree who should have the precedence. Both orders claimed it, and both were determined not to yield. They therefore attacked and warred upon each other by their publications, and with unceasing invectives and criminations. But in the next place the Franciscan order was also split into two factions, that contended fiercely with each other. The monastic orders generally adopted the policy of allowing the possession of property by the body collectively, while they denied the liberty to individual members. But Francis prohibited his followers from possessing any property, either individually or collectively. But, after the death of their founder, many of his followers departed from this rule. And in this they were encouraged by the pope, Gregory IX., who, in the year 1231, published a more mild interpretation of this law. But others of the order were greatly offended by the relaxation of their ancient austerity. These were called the spiritual part of the order. But pope Innocent IV. attempted to compose their differences by the following crafty exposition

of their rule. He declared that they might hold lands, houses, furniture, books, &c., and might use them freely, but that the right of property, the legal possession or ownership of the whole should belong to St. Peter, and to the church of Rome, (i. e. to the pope,) without whose consent nothing could be sold, exchanged, or transferred in any way to others. This exposition, however, did not satisfy the spiritual, who declared it to be a perversion, and some of them retired, and others were sent into exile. Thus the lax interpretation of the rule finally prevailed, and was solemnly confirmed by pope Alexander IV., and a new aspect given to the whole order.

But another contest of no less magnitude soon after arose to disturb the peace of this order of monks. From the beginning of the century there were circulated in Italy and other countries, various prophecies of the famous JOACHIM, who was generally considered as divinely inspired, equally with the ancient prophets. Most of these prophecies were contained in a book which was called the *Everlasting Gospel*, or the *Book of Joachim*. This true or fictitious *Joachim*, among other things, foretold in particular the destruction of popery, the defects and corruptions of which he severely censures. These predictions of Joachim were eagerly seized upon by the spirituals, as they were called, among the Franciscans; they applied these prophecies to themselves; and consequently they maintained that Joachim had taught the true gospel, and that he was the angel, which John describes in the Apocalypse, flying through the midst of heaven, &c.

At the time these contentions were at their height, one Gerhard, a spiritual Franciscan, published an exposition of this everlasting gospel, ascribed to Joachim, and entitled his work, "*An Introduction to the everlasting gospel.*" This work contained the following declaration, among other absurd and impious things: that the true gospel of God was exhibited to mankind by St. Francis,

and that the gospel of Christ would be abrogated in the year 1260, to make way for this new gospel, which would take its place. And that the ministers by whom this new dispensation was to be introduced, were to be itinerant barefooted friars. The University of Paris took strong ground against this book, and after many complaints and accusations against the mendicant monks, they prevailed to have the book publicly burnt. These dissensions among the Franciscans continued to increase, until they resulted, towards the close of the century, in open schism. The spirituals of Italy formed themselves into a distinct community, that they might live according to their understanding of the rule of Francis. But the lax party persecuted them with great severity. Many of them emigrated, but the fury of the opposite party pursued them, even in their exile. Down to the time of the reformation, these spirituals were engaged in the hottest warfare with other parties of papists, and numbers of them miserably perished in the flames of the inquisition.

The doctrine of transubstantiation as a doctrine of popery, belongs to a different section; but here in the order of historical events, in regard to the progress of popery, it may be proper to mention, that in this century, the consecrated elements of the eucharist as being the real body and blood of Christ, received divine honors and worship, even the same that were due to Christ himself. Splendid caskets were made, in which God, in the form of bread, might reside as in his house. These were carried from place to place, and lamps and other decorations were added to these divine habitations. The consecrated bread was also carried in procession through the streets to the sick. At length, a festival to the body of Christ was instituted, and a day set apart expressly for the worship of the body of Christ, as existing in the consecrated bread. One Juliana, a nun, who lived at Liege, in the Netherlands, pretended that

she had been divinely instructed that it was the pleasure of God, that an annual feast should be kept in honor of the holy supper, or rather the body of Christ, as present in the holy supper. The bishop of Liege supported her pretensions, and afterward, two popes confirmed the appointment of this festival, and thus idolatry, in respect to the elements of the supper, was fully established as a part of popery.

Another event occurring in this century serves to illustrate the genius of popery. In the year 1299, a rumor began to spread, that all who should visit the temple of St. Peter during the next year, would obtain the pardon of their sins, and as some supposed, for a hundred years. The pope, finding this popular delusion to take among the people, and that great numbers were hereby induced to visit Rome, to the no small pecuniary advantage of the papal seat, confirmed this observance, and published plenary indulgence to all who should visit the temple of St. Peter at Rome, during the centennial year. The throng of pilgrims in consequence was so great, that the public roads in Italy exhibited an almost continuous procession, from one end to the other. Nearly every day, 200,000 foreigners might be counted at Rome, and it has been estimated that two millions of people visited Rome in the year 1300. So happy a result, and so rich a harvest, made the pope wish that a century was not so long. And succeeding popes could not wait for a hundred years to come about. A Jubilee was repeated in 1350, and afterward, the festival was appointed to be observed at the close of every 25 years.

In the beginning of the fourteenth century, popery became so assuming and arrogant as to overact and weaken its own influence. Boniface VIII., in a very haughty letter addressed to Philip, king of France, maintained that all the kings and persons whatever, and the king of France among the rest, owed perfect obedience to the pope, and this not merely in religious con-

cerns, but in secular matters. The French king replied with severity. The pope repeated his assumptions with greater arrogance, and published the celebrated bull called *Unan Sanctam*, in which he asserted that Jesus Christ had established a two-fold power or sword in his church, a *spiritual* and a *temporal*—that the whole human race was subject to the pope, and that all who dissented from this doctrine were heretics, and could not expect salvation. The king of France did not relish this doctrine, but on the contrary, assembled his nobles, and through his attorney-general, *William de Nogaret*, he publicly accused the pope of heresy, simony, dishonesty, and other enormities; and urged the calling of a general council to depose the pope. His holiness was roused by this rough handling, and launched his anathemas and excommunication against the king and all his adherents. Again, Philip called an assembly of the states of his kingdom, and entered a formal complaint against the pope, and appealed to the decision of a general council. He moreover sent *William de Nogaret* into Italy, to bring the pope prisoner to Lyons, where he intended the council should be held. Nogaret was a man of resolution and energy, and little fearful of papal thunders. He raised a small force, and coming suddenly upon his holiness, he surprised him, and took him prisoner. The pope was wounded in the affray by the stroke of the iron gauntlet of his antagonist, and died shortly after from rage of mind. His successor made peace with the king of France, by restoring him to his honors and privileges. But he was unwilling to absolve Nogaret, who had so grievously offended against the papal dignity. The French lawyer, however, persevered in his attacks on popery. At length the pope died, and Philip managed to have the bishop of Bordeaux, a Frenchman, elected in his place. The new pope was Clement V. He remained in France as the king wished, and transferred the papal court to Avignon,

where it remained 70 years. This the Italian papists call the *Babylonish captivity*. This residence of the pope in France greatly shook the papal dominion in Italy. The popish authority was assailed by publications, the territories of the holy see were invaded, and several cities revolted. Rome itself became the seat of tumults and cabals, and the laws sent thither from France were treated with contempt, both by nobles and common people. And the inquisitors, though active in the discharge of their duties, were unable to keep down the various seditions that arose. The pope, in the mean time, found that his treasury was becoming empty, and his revenues were in a great measure cut off. He was therefore driven to new methods of raising money. Indulgences were sold more extensively, and a higher price was put upon all the instruments, letters or bulls, which issued from the papal court. Clément V. was governed all his life by the pleasure of the French king. This was a new era in the history of popery. He absolved Nogaret of his sin in striking and wounding pope Boniface, and abrogated all the laws enacted by that pope according as Philip required. On the death of Clement, 1314, there were violent contests among the cardinals, respecting the election of a new pope. The French demanding a Frenchman, and the Italians, an Italian. After two years' strife, the French again gained the victory, and the cardinal of Porto was elected. He assumed the name of John XXII. The emperor Lewis, of Bavaria, and Frederick, of Austria, having a dispute concerning the empire of Germany, the pope declared that the decision of this controversy belonged to him. But Lewis had conquered his rival, and assumed the government without asking the pope's leave. John was greatly offended, and divested the emperor of all right to the crown. Lewis, in return, accused the pope of heresy, and appealed to a general council. The pope, highly exasperated, laid the emperor under a decree of excom-

munication. The emperor returned the compliment by declaring the pope unworthy of his office, and placing a Franciscan monk in his stead, under the name of Nicolaus V. This pope crowned the emperor in despite of the opposing pope. Thus, was infallibility again arrayed against infallibility. On the death of John, new contests between the French and Italians arose, respecting the choice of a new pope. But the French again obtained their object, in the election of James Fournier, called Benedict XII. This pope seems to have been a man of honesty and of peace. Abating his superstition, which was the fault of the age, he may be pronounced a good man.

Gregory XI. transferred the papal residence again from Avignon to Rome. After the death of Gregory XI., the cardinals being met to choose a successor, the people of Rome, fearing lest a Frenchman should be elected, who would return the papal seat to Avignon, with furious clamor and threats, demanded the election of an Italian. The election was thus decided, and one was chosen, called Urban VI. But he proved so uncourtly in his manners, and so haughty withal as to disgust all his friends, especially the cardinals. They accordingly withdrew to a city of Naples, and elected another pope called Clement VII., alleging that Urban was elected only in pretence to appease the people of Rome. This was a kind of pious fraud which was common in those days. But which was the true pope, the connecting link between Peter and subsequent popes, remains to this day undetermined. Nor can it be ascertained from the *records* and *documents* which have been published in great abundance by both parties. Urban remained at Rome, while Clement removed to Avignon. The cause of Clement was espoused by France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus. While the other papal kingdoms of Europe acknowledged Urban for the true vicegerent of Christ. This is surely a stubborn

fact in the history of popery, too stubborn indeed for those who plead uninterrupted succession from St Peter, and for those who cry up popery as a system of unity. Where it may be asked, was the divine succession after the death of Gregory XI.? And where was the unity of popery after the same period? Was Urban VI. the true pope, then what were the successors of Clement VII. but schismatics, and vice versa? Let papists, while they accuse protestantism of being a system of disunion, and while they give credit to popery for the opposite quality, remember the *great schism of the west*, when for fifty years, popery had two or three heads at a time, and when opposing popes were hurling their curses at each others heads. But the detail of these events of confusion and distress would not be profitable. Suffice it to say, of the remaining popes of this century, that their dominion exhibited the spectacle of a house divided against itself, and in consequence it shook to its very basis.

In the mean time, superstition continued to gain ground. The mendicant monks were every where revered and caressed. So high was the reputation of these men, for sanctity and for influence with God, that the most distinguished persons of both sexes, some while in health, and others in near prospect of death, wished to be received into their orders for the purpose of securing favor with God. Many carefully inserted in their last wills, that they would have their corpses wrapped in a sordid Dominican or Franciscan garment, and be buried among the mendicants. For the amazing superstition and ignorance of the age, led men to believe that those would find Christ a gracious judge at the last day, who should appear before his bar in company with mendicant monks.

The monks were extremely odious to the bishops and doctors, and professors of divinity in the universities, on account of their popularity, and consequent arrogance and corruption. Among others who came out against

them in this century, was John Wickliffe, an English doctor, and professor of theology at Oxford, and afterwards rector of Lutterworth. The monks, whom he greatly offended by his boldness and honesty, commenced a process against him at the court of Gregory XI. But Wickliffe escaped through the protection of the duke of Lancaster. Forty years after his death, his bones were dug up and burnt by order of the papal council.

In the latter part of the fourteenth century, a violent contest arose between the university of Paris, and the Dominican order, concerning the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary. A certain Dominican, in the name of his order, publicly denied that Mary was conceived without sin; and maintained, that all who believed in her immaculate conception sinned against religion and the faith. The university of Paris condemned this opinion. For the university, influenced especially by the arguments of *John Duns Scotus*, had, almost from the beginning of the century, publicly adopted the sinless conception of the virgin Mary. The question was referred to the pope, but was not decided to the satisfaction of either party.

The fifteenth century opened with very general dissatisfaction, on account of the vices and corruption of the popish clergy. No teacher or writer of any eminence, can be named in that age, who does not lament the miserable influence of popery, and anticipate the ruin of the visible church, if God should not interpose for its rescue. At the commencement of the century, the papal church presented two heads, and those in fierce opposition to each other. Boniface IX. was pope at Rome, and Benedict XIII., at Avignon. The great schism of the west was still continued, and grew more fierce and unmanageable. At length, the papal dominion was divided between three popes, and these fiercely assailed each other with reciprocal excommunications and anathemas.

And surely, if there is any force in papal curses, these three popes must have been cursed many times over, and blasted beyond recovery. The popes could not be persuaded to prefer the peace of the church to their own glory, and no resort remained, but to call a general council of the whole papal kingdom, to take cognizance of this great controversy. Accordingly a council was called at Constance, in the year 1414. The principal object of this council was to extinguish discord among rival popes, and this object was at length accomplished. For the council set aside the whole triad of popes then reigning, declaring them all to be illegitimate, and elected another man to fill the vacated seat. This decision presents a fearful gap in the regular succession from St. Peter. If the decision of this council be correct, then the papal kingdom, called the holy mother church, was for a considerable season without a head. And how long she could live without a head is not told. But if the decision of the council of Constance was not correct, popery is hung on the opposite horn of the dilemma. Holy mother must have had three heads at once, which is little if at all better than to have none, for the question will arise, which of the three was the divine head. And this is a question which papists must answer, or yield their claim to divine right or regular succession. The dilemma here presented is, either three heads, or no head! Let papists choose for themselves. One or the other must be admitted. But though the council of Constance composed the discords of popery, they fixed a stigma of everlasting disgrace on themselves, by their treatment of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. The history and sufferings of these two martyrs of Christ, belongs to another section of the present work. But certain facts connected with their case, as illustrative of the genius of popery in this century, may properly be introduced in this place. John Huss, being summoned to the council, and being protected by a safe-conduct, or public pledge

of the emperor, that he should be suffered to return in safety, went thither for the purpose of demonstrating his innocence, and proving the falsehood of the charges brought against him. But his enemies, who were numerous in the council, so managed as that, in violation of the public faith of the emperor, he was seized and cast into prison; and when he would not confess guilt, he was, by order of the council, burnt alive on the sixth of July, 1415. Full of faith and the love of God, his death was a triumph, both to himself and the cause of truth. But the fact illustrates a doctrine of popery which we shall examine at length in the proper place, viz., that faith is not to be kept with heretics. At any rate, we here behold a solemn council convened in the name of the whole papal dominion, by a public act renouncing truth, and rendering itself liable to the charge of perjury in the face of the world. This fact must be admitted to be a fair specimen of the papal character in that age; and what it has been in other ages, facts will also show. The same fate was borne with the same pious fortitude and constancy by Jerome of Prague, the friend of Huss, who came to Constance to support and aid his friend. He at first, through fear of death, yielded to the council, and renounced his opinions. But being retained still in prison, he resumed courage, and was enabled to bear testimony to the truth at the stake, on the 30th of May, 1416.

After the council of Constance had disposed of the heretics, as they were called, though really the servants and martyrs of Jesus, it proceeded to take up the subject of a reformation of the church, *in its head and members*, according to the language of that day. All Europe saw and felt the need of such a reformation. Nor could the council deny that this was a chief object for which they had been convened. But the cardinals and principal men of the papal court, for whose interest it was that the disorders of the church should remain untouched, craftily

urged and brought the majority to believe that a business of such magnitude could not be managed to advantage without the previous election of a new pope. And when the new pope was elected, he evaded the design of reforming the church, and manifested by his public acts that he wished the church to remain as it was. The council, therefore, after deliberating three years and six months, and after covering themselves with indelible disgrace by the perfidious murder of two pious men, broke up and left the business of reform where they found it, only assigning the task to a council to be called at the end of five years. Accordingly, after some delay, the pope summoned another council, which was finally ordered to meet at Basil. In the mean time the existing pope died, but his successor confirmed the convocation of a council, and on the 23d of July, 1431, it commenced its sessions. A principal object of their meeting was understood to be the reformation of the church, in its head and in all its members, (i. e. in the pope and all orders of the clergy.) But the members of the council of Basil soon began to manifest a disposition to be in earnest in the business which they had undertaken. They made preparations to take hold on some of the corruptions of popery without ceremony. The pope became alarmed, and twice attempted to dissolve the council. This the members firmly resisted, and showed, by the decrees of the council of Constance, that a general council was superior to the pope. At length the pope, seeing himself so beset, and finding no present remedy, made a show of yielding; and professed to approve of the proceedings of the council. Some recent abuses of power on the part of the pope were corrected by this council, and they were about to proceed to more serious reform, when the pope concluded that this most audacious and troublesome council must be removed to Italy, where he could overawe the members, or be opposed and nullified by a rival council. Something, he saw, must be done to check the rising

spirit of reform, or his throne would soon tremble. The pope, therefore, by his legates, first ordered that the council should be removed to Italy. And when the members would not comply with this order, a violent conflict ensued. The council summoned the pope to appear before them at Basil, and give an account of his conduct. The pope, on the contrary, dissolved the council, and appointed another at Ferrara. But the members were firm, and continued their sessions, and pronounced the pope contumacious for his disobedience. The pope was equally obstinate, for he in person opened the council which he had called at Ferrara, and at once excommunicated the members of the council of Basil. The members of the opposing council returned the compliment by depriving the pope of his authority, and electing a new pope. The former pope issued a bull, anathematising the council of Basil, and rescinding all their acts. Here we have pope against pope, and council against council. Let papists look at these facts, and say no more about the unity of their community. Let them also look at these facts, and tell us where the infallibility of their church resides. Is it in the pope? Then it has been nullified by the acts of opposing popes. Is it in general councils? Then it has been nullified by the acts of opposing councils. For it is absurd to suppose that infallibility, on the same subject, at the same time, can operate in two opposite directions, and contradict itself. Take, then, pope Eugene IV., and pope Felix V., who thundered away at each other, and rolled heavy curses on each other's heads, and tell us which was infallible? Was Eugene? Then Felix could not be. But he was a pope, and must not a pope be infallible? If not, who knows that any pope is so, and what becomes of this mighty claim? Or take the councils of Basil and Ferrara, (or Florence, as it was afterwards called, on account of being removed to the latter city.) These general councils counteracted each other. Which was infallible? Was it the council of

Basil? Then the other must have been fallible. But it was a general council; and if one general council could err, who knows but others may? In a word, these historical facts demolish absolutely and forever the pretence to infallibility, either in popes or councils.

The above mentioned events awakened again the spirit of schism, which had been apparently allayed with so much toil at Constance. In the year 1458, the bishop of Siena ascended the papal throne, under the popish title of Pius II. When a bishop, by the name of Æneas Sylvius, he had strenuously maintained the rights of councils against the pope, and boldly defended the council of Basil against Eugene IV. But when made pope, he apostatized from himself, and denied all that he had previously written in behalf of councils. He severely prohibited all appeals to councils, and decreed that pope Pius II. was to be heard and obeyed, while Æneas Sylvius was to be condemned.

A Spaniard, whose name was Roderick Borgia, ascended the throne of popery, under the title of Alexander VI. His predecessors, some of them, had been men of moderation, and considerable worth. Especially was this true of Nicolas V., who was a man of learning, and a patron of learned men, under whom the schism of the church was healed. But Alexander VI. was called the Nero among the popes. For though they were all, with very few exceptions, flagitious men, yet this pope was able, by his extraordinary villanies and debaucheries, to gain a pre-eminence even among such men. He was a monster of iniquity in every sense. He died by poison which he had prepared for others. Such was popery in this century. And yet papists, to be consistent with their principles, must ascribe holiness and infallibility to every wicked wretch, who by any means can gain the chair of popedom.

The monastic orders followed the prevailing steps of the popes. They were mostly herds of ignorant, lazy,

dishonest, and debauched people. The monks that held property in their own name, such as the Benedictines and the Augustinians, were given to sensual gratifications. By the licentiousness of their lives, and disregard of their rules, they became extremely odious. The pauper or mendicant monks, (i. e. the Dominicans and Franciscans,) offended as much by their arrogance, their quarrelsome temper, their invasion of the rights of others, their propagation of superstition, and their vain and futile disputes, as the opulent monks did by their luxury, their laziness, and their hatred of learning. Thus the religion of the papal dominion contained nothing which could recommend it to the esteem of a pious mind. The worship of God consisted in empty ceremonies, which were puerile and silly. The sermons were filled with fiction. If a man revered the clergy as they were, and especially the pope; if he secured the favor of saints by frequent offerings to them, or what was the same thing, to their temples and priests; and if he had money enough to purchase the pardon of his sins from the papal venders, he was accounted a well informed, pious Christian. If he went beyond this, and inflicted some external severities upon his body, he was then eminent for piety, and sure of adoration. Very few had any just views of true religion, or the conformity of the heart to the laws of Christ; and these few, if they were known, with difficulty escaped with their lives. Under this miserable state of things did the Christian world groan. It was the galling yoke of Satan, through the instrumentality of popery. For popery, let it be remembered, had performed its perfect work for near eight centuries. Though occasionally disquieted with schisms and witnesses for the truth, yet genuine popery had maintained the ascendancy, and had subjugated the human mind, as well as the physical powers, to its control. To popery, then, belongs all the credit of that miserable, dark, degraded, and polluted state of Christendom, at the close of the fifteenth century.

The sixteenth century opened with very fair prospects for the papal dominion. The grievous commotions of the preceding centuries, occasioned by the efforts of the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Beghards and others had been suppressed by cruel persecution or crafty management. The Waldenses had been driven to the valleys of Piedmont, and stripped of power and resources. And those Bohemians, who were dissatisfied with papal doctrines, from their ignorance and poverty, were in no condition to make attempts against the gigantic power of the pope. All was comparatively quiet in the streets of the great city. But this state of things, by promoting the corruption of the papists, only served to prepare the way for a general explosion. The popes and the clergy gave loose reins to their evil propensities, and sought the gratification of their lusts without restraint. And the subordinate rulers and teachers of the church, eagerly followed the example of those at their head. Most of the bishops, and the canons their associates, led luxurious and jovial lives, in the daily commission of open sins, and squandered upon their lusts those funds which preceding generations had consecrated to God, and the relief of the poor. The greater part of the priests, on account of their indolence, their unchastity, their avarice, their ignorance and their levity, were regarded with utter contempt, not only by the wise and good, but by the common people. The immense swarms of monks produced great grievance and complaint. Some of their orders had become wealthy by the liberality of preceding generations, and now they abused their wealth to the worst of purposes, regardless alike of the design for which the funds were given, and of their own rules and professions. The different orders of monks practiced the grossest impositions not only on the community at large, but upon each other. Among many of the base artifices by which they compassed their pur-

poses, the tragedy of Berne, as it is called, stands conspicuous, and may serve as an example.

The Dominicans and Franciscans were engaged in a vehement controversy concerning the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary. The former denying, and the latter affirming the proposition respecting this subject. A Dominican monk, named *Wigand Wirt*, preaching at Frankfort, A. D. 1507, so violently assailed the above mentioned doctrine, that he was summoned to Rome to answer for his conduct. His brethren of the Dominicans, at their convention at Wempfen, formed a plan to aid him, and to convince the world that the doctrine of the *immaculate conception* was false. Berne was selected as the scene of their operations. The prior, sub-prior, preacher and steward of the Dominican cloister at Berne, undertook to get up miracles and revelations for the occasion. A simple hearted rustic, by the name of John Jetzer, who had just entered upon his noviciate in the monastery, was selected as their tool. The sub-prior appeared to him one night dressed in white, and pretended to be the ghost of a friar, who had been a hundred and sixty years in purgatory. He wailed greatly, and implored Jetzer to afford him some aid. Jetzer promised the aid to the extent of his ability, and the next morning reported the vision to his superiors. They encouraged him to go on, and to confer freely with the ghost, should he appear again. A few nights after, the ghost made his appearance, attended by two devils, his tormentors, and thanked Jetzer for the relaxation of his sufferings in consequence of his prayers and fastings. He also instructed Jetzer concerning the views entertained in the other world respecting the immaculate conception, and the detention of some popes and others in purgatory, for having persecuted the deniers of that doctrine; and further, he promised Jetzer that St. Barbara would shortly appear to him to give him particular instructions. Accordingly the sub-prior assumed a female garb on a succeeding

night, and appeared to Jetzer as St. Barbara. She revealed to him some parts of his secret history, which the preacher, his confessor, had drawn from him at his confessions. Jetzer was completely duped. St. Barbara promised that the virgin Mary herself would next appear to him. Consequently she, or the sub-prior personating her, did so, and assured him that she was not conceived free from original sin, though she was delivered from it three hours after her birth, and that it was a grievous thing to her to see such errors spread abroad. She blamed the Franciscans much as the chief cause of this false belief. She also announced the destruction of the city of Berne, because the people did not expel the Franciscans, and cease to receive a pension from the king of France. She appeared repeatedly and gave Jetzer much instruction. She promised to impress upon him the five wounds of Christ, which she declared were never impressed upon St. Francis or any other person. She accordingly seized his right hand, and actually thrust a nail through it. This was no vision, and the pain of the nail made Jetzer so restive, that she promised to impress the other wounds without giving him pain. The conspirators now gave him medicated drugs, which stupified him, and then impressed the other wounds upon him while in a senseless state. Hitherto the sub-prior had been the principal actor. But now the preacher undertook to personate St. Mary. Jetzer, however, recognized his voice, and began to suspect the whole to be an imposition. All attempts to hoodwink him after this became fruitless, and he was in a short time completely undeceived. They now endeavored to bring him voluntarily to join the plot. He was persuaded to do so. But they imposed upon him such intolerable austerities, and were detected by him in such impious and immoral conduct, that he wished to leave the monastery. They would not let him go, and were so fearful of his betraying their secret, which was now drawing crowds to their monastery, and

promising them great advantage, that they determined to destroy him by poison. Jetzer, by listening at their door, obtained knowledge of the fact, and was so on his guard that they could not succeed, though they used a consecrated host, or the bread in the sacramental supper as the medium of conveying the poison. At length Jetzer eloped from the cloister and revealed the whole transaction.

The sale of indulgences became, in the beginning of this century, very extensive, and was a principal means of opening the eyes of the people to see the necessity of a reformation. And as this is a practice in which the papal church still persists, it will be proper to give a particular account of its origin and results.

The origin of indulgences, says Schlegel, must be sought in the earliest history of the church. In the first centuries, such professors as were excluded from communion on account of their relapses in time of persecution, or on account of other heinous sins, had to seek a restoration to fellowship by a public penance, in which they entreated the brethren to forgive their offence, standing before the door of the church in a garb of mourning. This ecclesiastical punishment was sometimes remitted, and this remission was called *indulgence*. So that the original meaning of the term was merely the remission of the ecclesiastical penance or punishment imposed on the relapsed or other gross offenders. Had the practice extended no farther, or had it been laid aside when the occasion for it ceased, it would have produced comparatively little evil. But the practice was continued and extended. In process of time the doctrine was, that Christ had atoned for the eternal, but not the temporal punishment of sin. And the temporal punishment was divided into punishment in the present world, and that of purgatory in the future world. It was held that every man who would attain to salvation, must suffer the temporal punishment of sin, either in the present world, or in the flames of purgatory, and that the confessor to

whom a man disclosed his sins, had power to adjudge this temporal punishment according to his own pleasure. The punishment thus inflicted generally consisted in fasting, pilgrimages, flagellations, &c. But among those who were subjected to such penalties were often persons of wealth and consequence, who had rather pay a large sum of money than submit to the penalty. In the case of such, substitutes were admitted, and these were generally monks, who for a sum of money would endure the penalty in behalf of the rich. Whoever, for example, was condemned to whip himself for a number of weeks, might, by the payment of a certain sum of money, obtain release from this penance, or the same purpose would be answered by the conveyance of a piece of land. At first they released only from the punishment of sin in the present world; but in the fourteenth century, the release was extended to purgatory, and subsequently, as will appear in the sequel, the release was extended to all manner of crimes. Jesus, they said, had not removed all the punishments of sin. Those which he had not removed were either the punishment of the present world, that is, the penances which the confessors enjoin, or the punishments of the future world, that is, of purgatory. An indulgence, according to the original and professed object of it, frees from both these kinds of punishment. The first the pope remits by virtue of his office as sovereign lord of the church. The other he remits by virtue of his prevalent intercessions with God, who can deny nothing to his viceregent. Yet this release from the punishment of sin cannot, according to popery, be bestowed for nothing. There must be an equivalent, that is, a sum of money given to the pope for pious uses. Temporal princes usually wait till their subjects petition for indulgence. But the viceregent of Christ is more gracious, according to his own story, than all other princes, and offers his indulgences freely, that is to say,

freely for money enough, to the whole church, and to be proclaimed aloud to the whole Christian world.

The sale of indulgences drew immense sums of money to the papal coffers, and liberally supplied all the servants of the pope. He did not, indeed, sell these indulgences himself. To this his dignity would hardly condescend; and besides, he could not always wait for the slow process of selling at retail. He therefore commonly farmed out different provinces to those speculators who would give the highest price for them. There were rich merchants at Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburgh, who would purchase the right of selling indulgences in certain provinces or kingdoms, for a stipulated number of years, and who would pay to his holiness a round sum as the present worth. The speculators would employ skilful agents, hawkers, and pedlars of these indulgences, persons whose boldness and impudence bore due proportion to the eloquence with which they imposed upon the people. And to give these indulgences greater credit and currency, it was pretended that popery had come into possession of a common stock or great bank of merit, derived from the extra piety of confessors, saints and martyrs, who had performed works of supererogation, that is, more than the law or gospel demands. This stock of merit, it was pretended, had been accumulating for many years, till there was a superabundance, which was at the sole and entire disposal of his holiness, the pope; and which he was authorized to dispense to them who paid him most liberally. In this way, not only ecclesiastical censures, not only temporal and purgatorial penance were remitted, but the pope and his servants finally assumed the power to forgive sins of every description. However papists, when pressed, may deny the truth of the preceding remark, it is abundantly capable of proof, that the pope did assume and pretend to forgive sins of every kind. That he is generally understood by papists to take this ground, there can be no

manner of doubt. When they obtain that pardon, or absolution, which the pope sells for money, they are satisfied; they desire no other, the pope and his servants enjoin no other. Hence it is evidently understood by the great body of papists, that the indulgence or absolution which they obtain from the pope and his servants for money, is all that they need. This is strong presumptive evidence, that the pope does pretend to pardon all sin. But we have direct and conclusive proof of the remark in question, from some of the events which immediately preceded the reformation. The luxury and licentiousness of the court of the pope had exhausted all his treasures, and rendered necessary special efforts to recruit the exhausted coffers, and support the holy father, with his corrupt instruments. No expedient promised to be more effectual than the sale of indulgences. Consequently, one John Tetzel, a Dominican monk, devoid of shame, on account of his peculiar impudence, was hired by Albert, archbishop of Metz and Magdeburgh, to engage in this business. This shameless declaimer conducted the business, not only in violation of all modesty and decency, but in a manner which detracted from the merits of Christ. The pope offered, as a pretext for this new spiritual tax, the completion of the church of St. Peter, which had been begun by Julius II., and he appointed for his first commissary, Albert, archbishop of Metz and Magdeburgh, and margrave of Brandenburgh, who, from his own extravagance, was in great need of funds. Tetzel was employed as indulgence agent, in Saxony. He was a man of great profligacy, and cried up his merchandize in a very disgusting manner. He claimed openly to have power from the pope to absolve, not only from the censures of the church, but likewise from all sins, transgressions and enormities, however great they might be, even from those of which the pope only can take cognizance. He released from all the pains of purgatory, gave permission to

come to the sacraments ; and more than this, he promised to those that purchased his indulgences, that the gates of hell should be closed to them, and the gates of paradise or bliss be fully open. What more than this can be done, even by Deity ? It is evident, then, that the pope has expressly claimed the prerogative to pardon sin, in the place of God, and that he is now understood as having this power by the great body of his followers.

These claims, and this manner of asserting them, roused the spirit of Luther, and led to the glorious reformation of the sixteenth century. The apparent stillness with which the century commenced, was but the precursor of a tremendous earthquake, by which a third part of the city fell ; and by which we may hope, the way has been prepared for the fall of the whole system of papal corruption. And that the papists claimed for the pope the power to pardon sins of every kind, though frequently denied by them, was clearly demonstrated in the controversy with Luther and Tetzel. Luther admitted, then, that the pope had power to remit the human and temporal punishment for sin, or the punishment imposed by the church ; but denied his right to absolve from the divine punishments, either of the present or future worlds. This latter punishment, he maintained, could be cancelled only by the righteousness of Christ. Tetzel, on the contrary, asserted that the pope could release even from divine punishment, and from those of the future as well as of the present life. To this doctrine Luther made strenuous opposition, which resulted, as is well known, in shaking the throne of the pope to its foundation. The chancery regulations of the pope have been published by various authors, and from them it appears, that a Dean may be absolved from murder for twenty crowns. A bishop or abbot may, for three hundred livres, commit murder whenever he pleases. And for a third of that sum, any clergyman may violate the

law of chastity, under the most aggravated circumstances. These chancery regulations of popery were formerly published in a book, and circulated among the subjects of the pope. *Claude Espence*, a French popish divine, indignantly wrote concerning this book, as follows: "There is a book extant, which, like a venal prostitute, appears openly before the public here at Paris, and is now for sale, as it has long been, entitled, *Taxes of the apostolic chancery*, from which more crimes can be learned, than from all the writings concerning the vices, and in which license is offered to very many, and absolution promised to all purchasers. Provided money can be extorted," continues the same author, "every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden, that is not dispensed with for money, so that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime a man can be guilty of is to be poor. Shameful to relate, they give permission to priests to have concubines, upon paying an annual tribute. And in some places they oblige every priest to pay this tax, saying, he may keep a concubine or not, as he pleases." From the book of apostolic chancery published at Rome, and by papal authority, the following examples of the popish tariff of crime are extracted: "A layman murdering a layman, must pay a sum equal to about \$1,25. For him to kill his father or mother, wife or sister, he must pay 1,75. For laying violent hands on a clergyman, so as that no blood be shed, he must pay \$1,75." Thus it seems that to strike a priest, though the blow did not draw blood, was, in popish estimation, as great a crime as killing a parent, or a husband, or wife. For a priest to marry was a crime for which no money could atone, for this is not placed in the list of pardonable offences. But for a priest to keep a concubine, the penalty was \$1,75. For license to eat flesh in lent, \$1,75. With these facts in view, who can doubt that the pope claimed and exercised the right to

pardon sins, even those of the most aggravated nature?*

These things prepared the way for the reformation. But as a history of popery is the present object, that blessed event will be passed in silence; and the attention of the reader be directed to the feelings of papists in view of this event, and their consequent measures.

When the papists perceived that Luther was in earnest in his appeals to the Scriptures, and his exposure of their corruptions, their rage was greatly kindled. The pope, in compliance with the pressing solicitations of his advisers, issued a bull against Luther on the 15th of June, 1520, in which his tenets were condemned, his writings were adjudged to the flames, and he was commanded to confess his faults within sixty days, and implore the clemency of the pope, or be cast out of the church. Luther thought it expedient to withdraw himself from the papal communion before he was cast out, and for this purpose, he, on the 10th of December, 1520, caused a fire to be kindled without the walls of the city, and in the presence of a vast multitude of spectators, committed to the flames the bull issued against him, together with a copy of the pontifical canon law. By this act he signified publicly that he would no longer be a subject of the pope, and consequently, that the decree of excommunication which was daily expected from Rome would be useless. In less than a month, even on the 4th day of January, 1521, the second bull of the pope appeared, by which Luther was expelled from the papal church. In this event the genius of popery appears without disguise; evidently it is a system that agrees with darkness rather than light, because it cast out of its bosom one of its own sons, for nothing but a resolute and persevering appeal to the Scriptures as the standard of religious truth.

* Pope Leo X., on the 9th of November, 1518, published a special edict, in which he required all his subjects to believe that he had power to forgive sins, without any qualification. See Mosheim, Vol. III. p. 26.

We have now arrived at the period of the final separation of Luther and his followers from the papal church. The history of popery is therefore now to be pursued in distinction from that of the reformed communities. In these circumstances, popery, though it must of necessity be more circumspect and cautious in its external arrangements, and though it may appear somewhat circumscribed in power and territory, will yet be found to be no less anti-christian in its spirit and aims. And as the system of popery had at this period reached its full maturity, it may not be amiss, in this place, to state some of its principles of organization.

In the first place, in regard to the election of the pope, it was ordained that he should be chosen by a select number of the popish clergy. Six bishops in the neighborhood of Rome, fifty rectors or presbyters of Rome, and fourteen deacons of Romish hospitals, all of whom, on account of their eminence, were called cardinals, (or chiefs) were the electors. When they assembled for the choice of a new pope, they were shut up in a kind of prison, called the *conclave*, that they might proceed more secretly and expeditiously in the execution of their trust. None, but a member of this conclave, and a native Italian, could be a candidate for the popedom. Nor could all the Italian cardinals claim eligibility to this exalted station. Various circumstances of birth, and manner of life, would exclude those who might otherwise have stood high on the list of candidates. Moreover, the German Roman emperors, and the kings of France and Spain possessed, either legally or by custom, the right to exclude those whom they disapproved. Hence, there are not many among the cardinals that are *papable*, as the common phrase is, that is, so born, and in such circumstances that they can be invested with the dignity of pope. The methods of electing the pope in the conclave, are the following. 1. *By scrutiny*; that is by ballot. A golden cup is placed upon the altar, into

which each cardinal casts a sealed vote ; and to constitute an election, one candidate must have the votes of two-thirds of the cardinals. 2. *By access*. This method is resorted to, when a candidate has a plurality of votes, but not enough to secure his election by the former method. Attempts are made to bring the cardinals, who at first voted differently to *accede* to the election of the most popular candidate. This opens a wide door for management and corruption. 2. *By compromise*. That is, when the conclave continues long in suspense, and cannot agree, the cardinals at last transfer their right of election to two or three of their number, and resolve to abide by their decision. 4. *By inspiration*. When the cardinals have become weary of their long confinement, sometimes one or more will clamorously announce an individual as pope, and a party in his favor previously organized and prepared, will so zealously join in the measure, that the conclave is overawed, and all opposition is at length swallowed up in the general acclamation. This might properly be stiled the election by *mob*, rather than by *inspiration*. But the Italians are said to have a peculiar reverence for a pope chosen by inspiration, though they cannot but know that this is of all methods, the most disgraceful.

In the system of popery, the details of business are committed to the trust and management of certain classes of the pope's servants, called *congregations*, over which one or more cardinals preside. These *congregations* are properly *boards of commissioners*, meeting at stated times with full and definitive powers, within certain limits, to decide summarily all controversies, and to control and manage all business, that comes within their respective provinces. They have their own secretaries, keep records of their proceedings, may send for persons and papers, call on professional and learned men for their opinions, and are bound in certain cases, to consult the pope before they come to a final decision. The number

and specific duties of the several congregations vary from time to time, as the pope and his council see fit to ordain. Special congregations may be created by the pope, when occasion demands, which expire when their business is closed. In the year 1587, the pope established fifteen permanent congregations, composed, most of them of five cardinals, and none of them of less than three. They were, "1. *The congregation of the holy Inquisition*; or a supreme inquisitorial tribunal for the whole Christian world. In this court, the pope in person presided. 2. The congregation on letters of grace, dispensations, &c. 3. The congregation on the erection, union, and dismemberment of churches and bishoprics, &c. 4. The congregation for supplying the ecclesiastical states with corn, and preventing scarcity. 5. The congregation on sacred rites and ceremonies. 6. The congregation for providing and regulating a papal fleet, to consist of ten ships. 7. The congregation on the index of prohibited books. 8. The congregation for interpreting and executing the decrees of the council of Trent, excepting articles of faith. 9. The congregation of relief, in cases of oppression in the ecclesiastical states. 10. The congregation on the university of Rome, with a general inspection of all popish seminaries. 11. The congregation on the different orders of monks. 12. The congregation to attend to the applications of bishops and other prelates. 13. The congregation on the roads, bridges, and aqueducts, of the papal territories. 14. The congregation for superintending the vatican, or papal printing establishment. 15. The congregation on the applications of all citizens of the ecclesiastical states, in civil and criminal matters." It may here be remarked, that though the court of Rome is really a political body, which is governed, in substance, like other kingdoms subject to despotic power, yet in its system, every part has a different name from that adopted by common usage. Thus, the ghostly king or despot, instead of being called

king, czar, emperor or nabob, is called pope, (or father.) His ministers of state are called cardinals, instead of princes, dukes, lords, and chieftains. His ambassadors extraordinary, are called *legates a latere*, and those of a lower grade, *apostolical nuntios*. His chancery is called *dataria*; his boards of commissioners and judicatories, are called *congregations*; his supreme court of justice is called the *rota*; and his counsellors of state are called *officers of the rota*. The government of the pope is therefore nothing but a political despotism, under the garb and appellations of religion. It has no relation to Christianity or the Christian church, except through the medium of perverted names and titles.

Concerning the powers and prerogatives of this mock-spiritual despotism, its own subjects differ. And popery, though always manifesting a disposition to go to the extent of its means and opportunities in assuming power and prerogative, is still sometimes modified by circumstances. Where it cannot burn and destroy, it is obliged to be content with complaints and menace. Where it cannot reach to bite and devour, it must be satisfied with merely showing teeth. Like the tiger within grates, it can sometimes only gnash and growl. But its temper and pretensions are always the same. Thus Bunyan represents popery under the similitude of a giant called POPE, who in latter days, that is since the reformation, could only sit in his cave and snarl at the pilgrims that passed by on their journey to Zion. From such circumstances, it happens that the actual power of popery is not the same in all times and countries, though popery itself is invariable. The pope always claims, and all his true friends claim for him, the most absolute supremacy; for his holiness contends, that not only all spiritual power and majesty reside in him alone, and are transmitted from him, in given portions to inferior prelates; but that also his decisions made from the chair of popedom are infallible. This he claims in all situations, and this he

would claim on the throne or the dunghill, And his rule is to carry these claims into effect just so far as he may possess the means and the opportunity.

Popery, lost, indeed, much of its ancient power and splendor, from the time that Luther and his coadjutors exhibited before the nations of Europe the native simplicity and purity of true Christianity. Many opulent countries of Europe escaped from its thralldom under the light of the reformation, and its resources were thus greatly diminished. And even some of the kingdoms who do not choose wholly to abandon popery, have their views so corrected by the writings and discussions of protestants, that they will not submit to popery in all its former grossness. Still, where popery is unrestrained, it is still the same bitter enemy to all civil and religious liberty, the same destroyer of all social and spiritual happiness. The pope has still very extensive sway even in the kingdoms of Europe, and his resources and revenues are far from trifling or scanty. The pope, through his priests and minions, commands the purses of some of the most wealthy potentates and kingdoms of Europe, and indeed of the world. Though the common people are always degraded by popery, and no cause tends so powerfully to multiply beggars, yet the pope and his clergy always make sure of the fleece. The pope has many clerical livings at his disposal, none of which are given away. In particular, he disposes of all the livings, whose incumbents happen to die at his court, and also the livings of those who die in what are called the pontifical months. So that it behooved those who had rich livings to take heed how they visited the court of the pope, and to guard against the malaria of the sacred months, lest some fatal catastrophe might *happen* to them. The pope also confirms the election of cathedral chapters by the spiritual founders, with his bulls of confirmation, which was a source of great gain to him. He also draws *annates*, or the incomes of the first year of incum-

bency in the sees of bishops and archbishops. Again, he exacts a certain sum for the badge of spiritual knight-hood in the ranks of popery, or for what is called the *pallium* of archbishops and bishops. This is a neck-cloth, which corresponds to the ribbon or garter of secular knight-hood, and is worn by distinguished prelates when they say mass, and on great occasions. And further, there are certain cases of crime reserved for the pope, in which no father confessor can give absolution or dispensation, and in which the granting of dispensations brings large revenues to the pope. Such, for example, as matrimonial cases, the relinquishment of the clerical office, and of monastic vows. And finally, the pope has power to impose taxes upon his clerical subjects, which are called subsidies. The monks also must pay an annual sum to the pope for his protection. Thus the pope in fact lives in great wealth and luxury, even since the reformation; and his court, according to the testimony of recent travellers, is one of the most luxurious, effeminate, and dissipated, in the world.

To repair the losses in its power and fortunes which popery had suffered from the reformation, it soon began to make great efforts to extend itself over different and distant nations. Its arms reached beyond the seas, and by means of its instruments, it began to embrace nations in the extremities of the earth. India, China, and Japan, felt its fatal gripe. The Abyssinians, the Copts in Egypt, and the South Americans, were also taken in its toils. But these conquests were in most cases achieved by means and instruments of a different kind from those which had in preceding ages been successful. That most effectual method of subduing heretics by *crusades*, being of necessity abandoned, on account of the enlightened state of Europe, other means became necessary for the safety of popery. The inquisition, it is true, in countries where it was permitted, still continued to inflict its tortures, and to convert heretics by fire and sword. But it became ne-

cessary to regulate and fortify this tribunal with new regulation, lest the light which was dawning on the world should penetrate and demolish its strong holds. Colleges were erected, in which young men were trained by continual practice, not in the knowledge of truth, or useful arts, but in the best method of defending popery. Books were prohibited, except such as had first past the ordeal of popish examination. But as the popes had controlled, enlarged, and defended their empire principally by means of the orders of monks; and as the former orders, which had been most efficient, had by their indolence and vices lost their reputation, and become inert, it became necessary that some new order should be established, which would be wholly subservient to the papal interests, and make it their great object and care to recover, if possible, what had been lost, to repair what was injured, and to fortify and guard what was yet in possession. Such a new society as the necessities of popery required was found in that noted and most active and pernicious order of monks, which, according to the policy of the popish despotism, assumed the *name* of Jesus, and was called the Society of Jesuits.

The founder of this society was Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish knight, who was first a soldier and then a fanatic. He was born in 1491. Trained up in ignorance and vice at the Spanish court, he early entered on martial life. In defending Pampeluna he had a leg broken, and during his long confinement he amused himself with reading romances. A Spanish legend of certain saints being put into his hands, led him to renounce the world and become a saint. He first visited the shrine of the virgin Mary, hung his arms on her altar, and devoted himself to her as her knight. He next went, as a pilgrim, to a certain hospital, and spent a year among the poor. He next set out for the holy land, but he went by the way of Italy, that he might obtain the blessing of the pope. After his return from Palestine he went to Paris,

where he found several young men of kindred spirit, who united with him in a kind of monastic association in 1534. At first they had but seven, but soon after their number increased to ten. At length Loyola conceived the idea of forming a new peculiar order of monks. His companions came into the plan, and they applied to the pope to confirm their institution. This he did, with some limitations at first, but afterwards those limitations were removed. Loyola was chosen general of the order, and continued so until his death. The Jesuits hold an intermediate place between the monks and the secular clergy, and approach nearest to the order of regular canons; for while they live secluded from the multitude, and are under vows like monks, yet they are exempted from the most painful duties of monks, that they may have more time to devote to the active service of the pope. Indeed, this order was conformed to the spirit of the age. The spirit of inquiry and action was abroad among the protestants; and the whining cant of the mendicant monks would now excite nothing but ridicule and contempt. The Jesuits, therefore, found that the time which their predecessors had spent in pretended solitude and mortification, they must spend in action, in the instruction of youth, in writing books, and guiding the minds of their followers. The whole order was divided into three classes, viz., the *professors*, who live in houses of the professors; the *scholastics*, who teach youth in their colleges; and the *novices*, who reside in houses especially erected for them. The professors, in addition to the three common vows of monks, are bound by a fourth, by which they engage before God that they will instantly go wherever the pope shall at any time bid them; and they profess to have no revenues, but to live on the bounties of the pious. The other classes, especially the residents in the colleges, have very ample possessions. Compared with the other classes, the professors are few in number, and are generally men of prudence, skill, experience, and

learning ; in a word, they are true and perfect Jesuits. The others are Jesuits only in a looser sense, and are rather to be considered assistants and associates. The mysteries of the society are imparted only to a few of the professors ; men of years, and of the most tried characters. The rest are mere dupes. Popery, since the time of the reformation, owes more for its existence and resources to the single society of the Jesuits, than to all other means. This fraternity being spread abroad over the greater part of the world, confirmed those that were wavering, and restrained the progress of the heretics. It gathered into the number of the professed followers of the pope a great multitude from among the most distant nations ; it ingratiated itself into the favor of kings and princes ; and by an ingenious accommodation of the principles of the gospel and of morals to the propensities of men, or rather by converting the gospel to men, it made great numbers of converts, and obtained almost the sole direction of the consciences of kings and nobles, and every where most scrupulously guarded the interests of the pope from damage. All these circumstances procured for the society immense wealth, resources, and the highest reputation. The prudence, or rather the cunning of the order, avoided all difficulty, and silenced all opposition. They became, in the most unqualified sense, all things to all men ; and practiced, upon the largest scale, what Paul was accused by his enemies of doing—“Being crafty, they caught—with guile.” The secret instructions to the provincials, and to subordinate organs and members of the society, were totally unknown, for the most part, to any person, except those to whom they were addressed. The general rules and artifices by which individuals were to insinuate themselves into all places, and obtain for the society dominion and control over all persons and transactions, were among the mysteries of the society. Two copies of them, however, the one larger and more minute than the other, were said to

have been obtained, the first from a ship bound to the East Indies, and captured by the Dutch, and the other discovered in a certain college of the Jesuits. The genuineness of these books has of course been constantly denied by the Jesuits; but the best evidence which the world has of their genuine character, is their correspondence with the visible conduct of the order. According to these writings, nothing can be more crafty and void of all fixed moral principle, than the general policy of the Jesuits. The general of the order held his office for life, under certain limitations, and was to reside constantly at Rome, and had a select council to advise him, and to execute his orders. His authority over the whole order was absolute. He held despotic sway over every person, interest, and thing connected with the order. Nor was he accountable to any earthly power but the pope. Over each province is a provincial, whose power is equally despotic over his portion of the society. He must visit and inspect all the houses in his province, require regular monthly returns to be made to him from every part of the province, of all that was transacted, learned, or contemplated, and he must make similar returns every three months to the general. Every person belonging to the order is thus continually inspected, and trained to implicit obedience, secrecy, and fidelity. The whole fraternity is like a regular army, completely officered, trained to service, and governed by the will of one man, who stands at the pope's right hand.

Among the means by which popery sought to extend itself against the pressure of the reformation in the sixteenth century, several societies or congregations at Rome, in addition to those already specified, ought not to be omitted. In 1522, was established the celebrated congregation for the propagation of the faith, commonly called the "*popish propaganda*," and furnished with very extensive revenues. This body consists of thirteen cardinals, two priests, and one monk, together with a scribe,

and has for its object the support and the propagation of the faith in all parts of the world. Its revenues are such that it is able to make almost unlimited expenditures. Hence it sends out numerous missionaries to the most remote nations ; publishes books of various kinds, necessary for learning foreign and some of them barbarous languages ; maintains and educates a vast number of selected youth for missionaries, liberally educates young men sent to Rome from foreign countries, that they may become instructors of their countrymen on their return home ; takes up and provides for persons who have been banished for their constancy in defending the principles of popery, and plans and accomplishes various objects almost beyond belief to those not acquainted with their affairs. Devoted to its use, the institution has a very splendid and extensive palace, the delightful situation of which gives it exquisite charms. To this institution for propagating the faith, another was added in the year 1527, not indeed equally magnificent, but yet renowned and efficient ; this was called the college or seminary for propagating the faith (i. e. popery.) In this seminary, young men from almost all countries, are educated to become teachers of popery in foreign countries, and are instructed and imbued thoroughly with the spirit of their work. This seminary was founded by the liberality of an individual, who gave all his property to the pope for this purpose. Many others afterward imitated this liberality and to this day imitate it. At first this seminary was managed by a special board of commissioners, consisting of three canons of the patriarchal churches at Rome. But since 1641 it has been under the control of the *Congregation de propaganda fide*. In 1563, the congregation of priests for foreign missions was instituted by royal authority in France, and likewise the Parisian seminary for missions to foreign nations was founded by certain bishops and theologians, in which men might be educated and instructed to become preach-

ers of popery among heathen nations. From this seminary go forth, even to the present day, the apostolical vicars of Siam, Tonquin, Cochin China, the bishops of Babylon, and the apostolic vicars of Persia, and other missionaries to the Asiatic regions, and they derive their support from the ample revenues of the *congregation* and the *seminary*. But there has ordinarily been much contention between the common priests and the Jesuits about the prosecution of missions. The Jesuits pursue a course in making converts to their faith, or rather a profession of their faith, which gives great umbrage to their rivals. It is alleged by the other popish missionaries, that the Jesuits instill into most of their proselytes, not the pure principles of popery, but a lax and spurious system; that they connive at practices and opinions among their followers which are heathenish and profane; that they amass vast riches by traffic and other unbecoming occupations; that they are eager after worldly honor, and court the favor of the great by flattery and bribes; that they involve themselves too much in the political concerns of nations, and frequently excite seditions and civil wars. These allegations, it must be confessed, are but too true. But papists are the last people in the world who should offer such charges against each other. It reminds the reader of what he has doubtless sometimes witnessed in one drunkard complaining of another for fear he would swallow all the liquor. The sentiments of the Jesuits respecting the conversion of the heathen were substantially as follows.

“The Jesuits are of opinion that people sunk deep in superstition should be approached with art and policy; and that they are to be led with a cautious and careful hand to embrace popery. Hence they explain and interpret the received and established doctrines of the pagans,—as for instance the precepts of Confucius in China,—in such a manner that they may seem to differ as little as possible from the doctrines of popery. And

if they find any thing in the history or the religion of pagans, at all analogous to the faith and history of popery, they carefully apply it, to show how small the difference between the old and new religion. The rites and usages also which the pagans received from their progenitors, unless they are totally opposed to the rites and interests of popery, they tolerate; and, either by changing the form a little, or referring the rites to a better motive than before, they easily accommodate the two systems to each other. The natural bias and propensities of the people they cherish to the utmost, and carefully avoid whatever is contrary to their inclination. The leading men they labor by all possible means, even by pious frauds, to secure and bring over to their party. They court the favor and friendship of those in power, by presents, by the cultivation of various arts, mathematics, medicine, painting, and also by counsel and assistance in difficulty. These things are looked upon by their rival associates, as tricks and artifice, unworthy of the professed ambassadors of Christianity." The above account may satisfy the inquisitive mind of the reason why popery bears such a striking resemblance, in many respects, to paganism, and in fact differs so little in its general aspects and influence from paganism, except in the name. The truth is, popery has always been intent on converting men to the pope rather than to Christ; it has been more anxious to make its converts subservient to its own interests, than to lead them in the way of salvation. Hence the papal emissaries have not hesitated to concede to pagans every thing they wished respecting the principle and substance of their religion, provided, that in form and name, they would enlist under the pope. Thus popery has been gradually approximating to paganism, until it can scarcely be distinguished from the ancient superstitions of heathen idolaters. As an example of the foregoing statement, respecting the manner in which the Jesuits prosecuted their missions, the case of *Robert de Nobili* may be ad-

duced. He became a Jesuit at the age of 20, and in the year 1606, he entered on a mission to India. Robert, early perceiving that the Hindoo caste was a powerful obstacle in the way of his success, he determined to turn this insurmountable obstacle into a powerful engine of converting the Hindoos. Having obtained the approbation of his plan from the archbishop of Cranganore, he assumed the habits and garb of a brahmin, shut himself up in a cell, avoided society, learned well the Tamul and Sanscrit languages, and studied the sacred books of the Hindoos; and then came forth, avowing himself to be a foreign brahmin, and a reformer of the corruptions of the brahminical religion. His learning and eloquence were generally admired, and he soon gained one brahmin to his popish brahminism, and then others, till the number amounted to seventy. These suffered indeed some opposition from the ancient brahmins, and from the jealousy of the other advocates of popery. Robert, however, continued his labors in converting the Hindoos to a new form of Hindooism for nearly half a century, until the number of his followers amounted to more than one hundred and fifty thousand. This he might call fighting the devil with his own weapons; but if the result was only to convert men from one form of paganism to another, the devil would have no very serious objections to such a warfare, or such a victory. The policy of the Jesuits above stated, may be further illustrated by a consideration of the two great points of controversy, which for a time agitated the kingdom of popery, respecting the proper instruction to be given to converts from paganism.

The first point in this controversy respected the worship of God. The Chinese call the supreme God whom they worship TIEN, and SHANGTI, that is, in their language, *heaven*. The Jesuits transferred this name to the God they professed to worship, and thus seemed to say that there was no difference between the God of the Chinese and the God of papists; or that the Chinese at-

tach the same idea to TIEN, that Christians do to God, or Jehovah. But this is denied by the adversaries of the Jesuits, who aver, what is indeed very clear, that the Chinese understand by the words specified, merely the visible heavens, and are therefore idolaters. But the Jesuits found it for their interest to maintain the opposite opinion. They contend that these names were used by the ancient Chinese philosophers, who, they think, had just ideas of natural religion, to denote such a God as the bible reveals, and therefore that the Chinese terms in worship might with propriety be retained. They therefore allowed their converts to continue the use of the former terms of their worship; nay, the Jesuits, in becoming all things to all men, and in accommodation to the feelings of their heathen converts, used these terms in their own worship. Thus they converted the Chinese, by joining, in fact, in their idolatry.

The second point of controversy respected an ancient usage of the Chinese, in worshipping the souls of their departed ancestors. The laws of the Chinese require the people annually, at stated seasons, to honor their deceased ancestors with certain ceremonies, which appear to partake of religious homage. And besides, all the literati of the nation; at certain times, must pay a kind of worship, which appears to have a religious aspect, to *Confucius*, who is esteemed among them the father of all wisdom. Now the question is, whether this worship is to be considered as a civil or religious honor; whether they are real sacrifices, or only ceremonies established for state purposes. The Jesuits aver, according to their governing policy, that these rites were instituted merely to keep the people in order, and preserve the tranquillity of the state. They maintain that the Chinese do not offer religious homage to their departed relatives, nor to Confucius; but intend by these ceremonies to testify their grateful sense of the merits of their departed ancestors, and of their great lawgiver. Hence they con-

clude that it is allowable for papal converts to observe these ancient rites of their country, provided they understand the true nature and ground of them, and keep in view their object. If these reasonings are correct, it is to be regretted that the first Christian martyrs, under the emperors of pagan Rome, did not understand this policy of bringing Christianity and paganism to coalesce. For the same argument will apply to the rites of pagan Rome. Her idolatries were enjoined by public laws, and might therefore be considered as mere matters of state. And the early Christians, if they had regarded them in this light, might, by a compliance, have escaped the flames of martyrdom. Some of the more candid of the Jesuits are indeed so little satisfied with this plea, that they attempt to justify the practice on the ground of necessity and expediency. They say the advantages of the practice are so great, that the evils, if there are any, are not to be accounted evils. Thus much may suffice to exhibit the character and principles of the Jesuits, those emissaries of popery, who have undertaken to prop up its tottering foundation, and to defend its cause against the light of the present age.

In the commencement of the seventeenth century, the abettors of popery made violent struggles to recover the territories which they had lost by the reformation. These attempts were made by force and arms. A war of persecution began in the Austrian territories, which raged for thirty years, and proved exceedingly disastrous to Germany. The occasion of this war was as follows. Those who had renounced popery in the Austrian dominions, were, in the beginning of the century, oppressed in various ways by their adversaries with impunity, and were divested of all their rights. Most of them had neither resolution nor ability to defend their cause, though guaranteed by the most solemn treaties and laws. The Bohemians alone, when they perceived it to be the fixed purpose of papists to deprive them of all liberty to

worship God according to their own conscience, though that liberty had been purchased with immense expense of blood by their fathers, and but recently confirmed to them by royal charter, resolved to resist the enemies of their souls, force to force, and arms to arms. Therefore, having entered into a league, they ventured courageously to avenge the wrongs done to them and their religion. They went so far when opportunity offered, by the death of their former sovereign, as to elect for their sovereign, Frederick V. the electoral prince Palatine, who professed the reformed religion. But by this step, from which they expected security and peace in their religion, they brought ruin upon their king and themselves. And among other calamities, they suffered that which they most dreaded: the loss of a religion purged of popish corruptions. Frederick was vanquished, and became an exile. Many of the Bohemians were punished with imprisonment, banishment, confiscation of their property, and death; and the whole nation, from that time forward, was forced to receive the religion of the conqueror, and obey the decrees of the pope. The papists, elated with this success, did not fail to take advantage of the opportunity to display the genius of their religion. They were confident that the period had come, when they could either destroy the whole mass of heretics, or bring them again within the embrace of popery. They therefore carried fire and sword through a great part of Germany. In Hungary also, the citizens who were Protestants were tormented with various and innumerable vexations and persecutions for ten years. Of the evils which they suffered from the Jesuits, there was neither measure nor end. In Poland, all that dissented from the pope, experienced, to their very great sorrow and distress, nearly through the century, that no compact limiting the power of popery was accounted sacred, or at all regarded at Rome. And so long as it shall remain the established belief at Rome, that God has given to the

pope dominion over the whole Christian world, it can never be expected that those can remain in security who renounce that dominion. They will always be regarded as rebels, whom the lawful sovereign has a right to punish according to his pleasure, whenever he has the power and the opportunity. France and Spain were in this century completely subjected to the pope. And great efforts, devices, and plans, were put in requisition to bring the Britons under the papal yoke. And when the king of Britain, James I. espoused the cause of truth, the Jesuits determined, and actually attempted, to destroy him, his son, and the whole British parliament by gunpowder. The plot when ripe for execution, was most providentially discovered, and stands recorded on the page of history as a monument of the genius and tender mercies of popery.

At length the wiser patrons of the popish cause, perceived that they gained little by violence and war, and they concluded that the reluctant minds of the protestants might more successfully be overcome by trick and artifice. But they were not agreed as to the precise course to be adopted. Some resorted to public disputations, between distinguished men of the two communities, indulging an expectation that by such interviews, the more strenuous adversaries of papal supremacy might be either vanquished, or conciliated. Others thought that contests and disputes should be avoided, and that consultation under the name of compromise, should be attempted. Others yet thought more vigorous and skilful attacks by means of argument should be the course. But all of these projectors had one object in view, which was to deceive and dupe the friends of truth, and not to recede in the least degree from the claims of popery. The plan of those who recommended compromise, and reconciliation on that ground, was to persuade the protestants that there was no difference between the two parties, or that they did not disagree so much as they supposed. They

alleged that there was not so much need of argumentation of the points at issue, as of a careful and perspicuous explanation of the doctrines of popery, which were offensive to their opponents. They claimed that the advocates of popery were not *understood*, and that if a proper understanding could take place, all controversy would be removed, and all minds be united in the bonds of entire harmony. They therefore would discountenance all discussion as being divisory and polemic; and their cry was *peace, peace*. For their hope was, that, if they could prevail on the protestants to lay aside discussion, the differences between them would speedily disappear, and the attention of the people being turned away from principles to appearances, the way would be prepared to draw back the ignorant and unwary to the toils of popery. And let this plea of popery be carefully noted by all who are called to defend the truth against the inroads of error, of whatever kind. When the enemies of truth find the opposition too strong to be broken through by force of influence or argument, then they will always raise the treacherous cry of peace. "Come and let us meet together in the plains of *ono*," they say. They will pretend to agree in all important points, with those whom they have before denounced and persecuted to the extent of their power. They will decry discussion as savoring of a warlike spirit, and calculated to make divisions. They are for *peace*, all for *peace*. But mark, the peace must consist in their having their own way. Error never is more dangerous than when it assumes this appearance. The plea is specious, and highly calculated to decoy weak and credulous minds. The principal man among those who endeavored to draw protestants into this snare, was cardinal Richelieu, the politic minister of France, who spared no arts, persuasions, or threats, to bring the reformed back to the arms of popery. In more recent times, no one has entered on this course with more sagacity than

James Benignus Bossuet, bishop of Meaux. He published an exposition of the *popish faith*, which tends exclusively to show, that a short and easy way would be open to protestants to return to popery, if they would only judge of it according to its nature and principles as it really is, and not according to the representations made of it by its enemies. This was very plausible, but utterly delusive. At first the pope and his friends alarmed at its apparent concessions, condemned the book, and several popish priests were severely handled for preaching its sentiments. But being satisfied at length, that its concessions were merely apparent, and that it was a true Jesuistical performance, the advocates of popery changed their opinion respecting the exposition. But archbishop Wake, a protestant prelate of England, took the publication in hand, and with decisive effect unmasked the perfidious sophistry of this performance. An excellent answer to it was also given by M. de la Bastide, an eminent protestant divine of France. Of this answer Bossuet took no notice during eight years. At the end of that period, he published an advertisement in a new edition of his exposition, which was designed to remove the objections of la Bastide. But the latter replied with such a demonstrative and victorious argument, that the papal champion was driven from the field of controversy.

After him, John Dezius, a Jesuit of Strasburgh, undertook to demonstrate the same thing, though with less success, in a book, in which he endeavors to prove that there is no disagreement, *or but very little*, between the council of Trent and the Augsburg confession; than which no two systems can be more unlike. At length Christopher de Roxas, bishop of Thina, came forward clothed with public authority, or professing to be so, and visited the principal courts in Germany, not only holding out the promise of a new and more free council than that of Trent, but also giving assurance, that the pope would freely grant to his returning children, the

protestants, whatever privileges or immunities they might demand, if they would cease to decline the very mild government of the common father of Christians, the pope. But it was not difficult for the theologians and the more discerning laymen to discover that this was only a snare, and that the papal emissaries aimed not so much to effect an honorable peace, as to bring them back again under the ancient system of slavery. These perfidious peace-makers found some among the protestant divines, whose want of firmness and decision, or whose hope of obtaining favor and making their fortunes, induced them to listen to these overtures, and to assert that the points in dispute were not of such magnitude as to shut out all hope of reconciliation. These medium men, as they would be esteemed, were at first very much applauded by the papists, but in the end they obtained the reward which awaits all double dealers and traitors, they offended both parties, and drew upon themselves a great weight of odium.

It may be proper here to subjoin some of the terms on which the popish peace-makers proposed to effect an union. These terms demonstrate the duplicity of the papists, as they offer either from worldly policy or in mere pretence, to abandon principles which are essential to their whole system. The terms offered by the bishop of Thina above mentioned, were as follows. 1. A suspension of the decrees of the council of Trent, and the assembling of a new council, in which the protestants and papists should have an equal number of votes, and the decisions of Trent undergo a new and impartial investigation. 2. The acquittal of the protestants of the charge of heresy, if they would cease to call the pope anti-christ. 3. Communion in both elements; marriage of priests, continuance in their possession of church property, abolition of auricular confession, and public worship in the vernacular tongue. In respect to

the authority of the pope and tradition he was reserved. The archbishop of Mayence, after consulting the papists, made the following propositions to the protestants of Ratisbon; viz. 1. That twelve protestant and twelve papal divines should meet together, swear to act honestly and in good faith, without fraud, or subterfuge, as they should answer it to God. 2. That they should examine the religious disputes and decide them according to the bible only. 3. That to enable them to agree, they should first make a new translation of the bible. 4. That whatever a majority of them should agree to should be considered as valid articles of faith. 5. That both the decrees of the council of Trent, and the Augsburg confession, should be examined article by article, and judged of by the scriptures. As preliminary to this agreement it was proposed to yield, 1. Worship in the vernacular tongue. 2. Marriage of bishops and of secular clergy, but not of monks and nuns. 3. The abolition of auricular confession in Germany and other protestant countries, except Spain and Italy, where for certain reasons, it was held necessary. 4. Every one to be at liberty to pray to the saints or not. 5. Purgatory no longer to be an article of faith. 6. Communion in both kinds to be allowed. 7. The pope no longer to be regarded as universal judge, but only as the first priest or bishop of the church. Difficult questions of conscience are to be laid before him, but none shall be compelled to follow his decisions. 8. Christians hereafter to be divided into two classes, viz., ancient catholics, and reformed catholics, who should regard each other as brethren. Cardinals to be taken equally from both classes. These propositions were plausible, and could any expectation have been entertained that the papists would adhere to them, the case would have been different. But as no confidence could be placed in the declarations, professions or engagements of papists, the protestants rejected the proposals. But the question here is, how could papists,

with any consistency or honesty make such proposals? If the things which they proposed to concede were wrong, they ought of course to be abandoned, whether protestants would concede any thing or not. And if these things were right, and as the papists profess to consider them, essential truths, the denial of which is damnable heresy, how could they, in any conscience, compromise them. The very things which they offer to concede, are the things for the denial of which, heretics (as they call them) have been burnt by hundreds. Take the doctrine of purgatory for example. It is either true in the estimation of papists, or it is not. If it is true and matter of their sincere belief, how can they agree that it shall no more be a doctrine of their creed? And if it be not true in their estimation, how can they teach it and make it an essential article of belief? Here is a dilemma, and take hold of which horn they please the papists are lacerated. So of the marriage of priests. It is either wrong or it is not. If it be wrong, how could they concede to practice and countenance that which is wrong? And if it be not wrong how dare they forbid it, and pronounce those accursed who practice it? In a word, is it not perfectly manifest, from these proposals, that papists, at least their leaders and teachers, have no confidence in their own system; that they consider it a mere pageant, to answer temporal and political purposes, a mere nose of wax, to be moulded and shaped as circumstances require?

In the preceding century a violent contest had arisen concerning divine grace in the salvation of men. Lewis Molina, a Spanish Jesuit, in a book which he published on the union of grace and free will, endeavored to clear up, in a new manner, the difficulties in the doctrines concerning grace, predestination, and free will, and in some sort to reconcile the discordant opinions of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, the semi-Pelagians and others. The fundamental principles of the work of Molina are thus

stated. 1. A reason or ground of God's predestination is to be found in man's right use of his free will. 2. That the grace of God, which is bestowed to enable men to persevere in religion, may become the gift of perseverance, it is necessary that they be foreseen as consenting and co-operating with the divine assistance offered them, which is a thing within their power. 3. There is a mediate prescience (*scientia media*) which is neither the free nor the natural knowledge of God, and by which he knows future contingent events, before he forms his decree. Molina divided the knowledge of God into natural, free and mediate, according to the objects of it. What he himself effects or brings to pass by his own immediate power, or by means of second causes, he knows *naturally*. What depends on his own free will, or what he himself shall freely choose or purpose, he knows *freely*. But what depends on the voluntary actions of his creatures, that is, future contingences, he does not know in either of the above senses, but only mediately, by knowing all the circumstances in which those free agents will be placed, what motives will be presented to their minds, and thus inferring how they will act and what they will do. This he calls God's *scientia media*, on which he forms his decrees and election. 4. Predestination may be considered as either general or particular. General, when it relates to whole classes of persons; particular, when it relates to individuals. In general predestination, there is no reason or ground of it beyond the mere good pleasure of God, or none on the part of the persons predestinated. But in particular predestination, there is a cause or ground of it, in the foreseen good use of free will. Thus it appears that Molina embraced the leading principles of the semi-Pelagians, or the Arminians. And his *scientia media*, was only a new name for an old error, which makes God a mere spectator of his works and creatures. After some years of consultation, and attention to the arguments of

the Dominicans and Jesuits on these subjects, the board of select theologians, to which the decision was committed, signified to the pope, not at all obscurely, that the doctrine of the Dominicans, respecting grace, predestination, man's ability to do good, and the inherent corruption of our nature, were more consonant with the holy scriptures and the opinions of the fathers, than those of Molina, whom the Jesuits supported; that the former accorded with the sentiments of Augustine, the latter came near to those of Pelagius, which had been condemned. And, in the year 1601, the pope seemed ready to pronounce sentence in favor of the Dominicans. But the Jesuits, who perceived their cause to be in imminent peril, so harassed the aged pope, sometimes with threats, sometimes with complaints, and sometimes with arguments, that the next year he resolved to give the subject a re-hearing, and to assume himself the office of judge. For three years the pope presided over this trial, having for assessors, fifteen cardinals, nine theologians, and five bishops, and he held seventy-eight sessions, or congregations, as they were called, at Rome, in which he listened to the arguments of the parties, and caused them to be carefully weighed. To what result he came is uncertain, for he was cut off by death when about to pronounce sentence. But the divisions, thus about to be healed, were torn open again, when in 1640, a book of Cornelius Jansenius was published under the title of *Agustinus*. In this book, the author of which is allowed, even by the Jesuits themselves, to have been a man of solid learning, and apparently devout, the opinions of Augustine, respecting the native depravity of man, and the nature and influence of that grace by which only this depravity can be cured, are stated and explained, and for the most part, in the very words of Augustine. For it was not the object of Jansenius, as he informs us, to show what ought to be believed on these subjects, so much as to show what Augustine thought. But as the doctrines of Augustine dif-

ferred but little from those of Thomas Aquinas, which were embraced by the Dominicans, and were accounted almost sacred and divine among papists, on account of the high merits of the author, and at the same time were almost totally opposed to the common sentiments of the Jesuits; this work of Jansenius could not but appear to them as a silent, but most effectual confutation of their sentiments. Hence the Jesuits soon took the alarm, and attacked the new publication without mercy. They also endeavored to instigate the pope against it. The alarming book soon felt the weight of Jesuistical influence. First the inquisition took it in hand, and prohibited its being read. Then the pope issued his condemnatory sentence. But these things on the part of the Jesuits did not pass without observation and resistance. The doctors of Louvain, and the numerous admirers of Augustine in the low countries, opened the opposition. Speedily it spread into France, where many of the able and devoted men were strongly enlisted on the side of the Augustinian creed, and were of course the advocates of Jansenius. Especially was John du Verger de Hauranne, an intimate friend of Jansenius, and a man of an accomplished and elegant mind, and no less respected by the purity of his morals and the sanctity of his life, than for his erudition, considered the champion of the Jansenian system. This man had inspired a number around him with an attachment to Augustine, and an abhorrence of the Jesuits. And though the Jesuits could boast the greatest numbers, their opponents had the decided advantage in talents and piety. Thus commenced the great controversy of the seventeenth century, between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, which continued with great efforts for a century and more.

In the eighteenth century, the papists propagated the Christian name in different parts of the world. The Christian name—not the Christian religion. For it is evident that most of those whom the papal missionaries

persuaded to forsake idolatry, are Christians only in name, and in respect to certain forms and ceremonies. They never quit their superstition, but only exchange one form of it for another. Large congregations of such nominal Christians were gathered in the East Indies, especially in the kingdom of the Carnatic, Madura, on the coast of Malabar and in China, Tonquin, and other distant regions. But these missionaries, so far from effacing the former stain upon the character of the Jesuit preachers, rather deepened it. For they are represented as seeking their own honor and emolument, rather than the interests of Christ, and as ingeniously corrupting the holy religion of the Saviour to obtain the more proselytes.

The famous question, whether the Jesuit missionaries in China acted consistently among that people, so exceedingly attached to their ancient customs, was decided in the commencement of this century, in a manner adverse to the Jesuits. For the pope declared it criminal for the new converts to practice the rites of their pagan ancestors; especially those rites by which the Chinese do homage to their ancestors and to Confucius. At least this was the decision of the pope at first. But with a view to consistency and uniformity for which popery is remarkable, he afterwards altered and mitigated this decision to satisfy the Jesuits, till it was nearly abolished. The final decision was, that the teachers of the Chinese were allowed to designate the divine nature by the word *Tien*, provided they added the word *Tchu*, to remove the ambiguity of the former term. Thus it would stand, the Lord of heaven, and not heaven itself. The pope also allowed those rites to be practiced which gave so much offence to the adversaries of the Jesuits, provided all superstition and appearance of religion were avoided. Which is the same as to say they might be idolaters, if they would avoid all idolatry. This paradox, the Chinese converts would of course interpret according to their own inclinations. The Chinese converts, therefore, feel themselves

allowed to keep in their houses tablets on which are written, in gold letters, the names of their ancestors and of Confucius. They may lawfully honor them with lighted candles, with incense, and with tables set out with all manner of spices, fruit, and viands. They may address these tablets, and the graves of their ancestors as suppliants, prostrating themselves on the ground, and yet be good and consistent papists. Such was the decision of the pope in the case.

The reconciliation of protestants to papists seems, in this century, to have been abandoned. Former attempts of this kind were made chiefly on the ground of explaining away or softening down the most offensive doctrines of popery. But pope Clement XI. deprived the peace-makers of this subterfuge by publishing that famous decree, called *Bull Unigenitus*. This decree shows most clearly, that on most of the points which compelled the protestants to separate from popery, it remains the same that it has been, and that thus it must be expected to remain. This disclosure being made, it became manifest, that those who had formerly offered peace on very easy and conciliatory terms, had only spread a net by their pretended expositions of the papal faith, and that no confidence at all was to be reposed in the word of such men.

The intestine discords which greatly disquieted the papal community in the preceding century, so far from being composed and healed, were in this century revived with new strength, and urged with greater animosity. The Jesuits still contended with the Dominicans and others, though more covertly, and with more external decorum. The Franciscans, also, and the Dominicans, continued at variance. But the principal controversy which shook the papal empire, was that of the Jansenists with the Jesuits. Of the former party, Quesnel was the chief advocate. He translated the New Testament into French, and accompanied it with notes which were cal-

culated to awaken a sense of religion. To destroy the influence of this formidable enemy, the Jesuits besought the king of France to solicit its condemnation by the pope. The pope was obsequious to the French king, and issued the *Bull Unigenitus* already mentioned. The most violent contests were produced by this unhappy edict. Many of the bishops, and a vast number of influential and learned men, both among the clergy and laity, appealed from it to a future general council. Especially the archbishop of Paris manfully opposed it, regardless of the resentment both of the pope and the king. The popes, kings, and Jesuits, labored incessantly to prostrate these strenuous defenders of the religion of their fathers. They were visited with all manner of punishments and indignities, until they were at length in a measure overcome. Many became exiles, and retired to Holland; others were overawed to approve of the papal bull; and others, being deprived of their livings, their honors, and their offices, removed to foreign countries. The victory of the Jesuits was so complete, that this papal bull was finally declared to be the law of the land. Amidst these calamities, the Jansenists had two resorts for supporting their cause against their enemies, viz., the press and miracles. They did not fail to pour upon the pope and the Jesuits the influence of the press. Their publications were written with ability and elegance, and produced a powerful effect. And when human strength failed, they called in divine aid in the form of miracles. They persuaded the people that God had imparted to the bones and ashes of certain persons distinguished for their zeal in the cause of Jansenism, and who had appealed anew, in their last moments, to a general council, the power of healing the most inveterate diseases. Among those who had attained to this glory, the most distinguished was Francis de Paris, a deacon of the church in Paris, a man of noble birth, but of gloomy temperament, and excessive superstition, and one who had brought on his own

death by refusing food. To miracles, divine visions were superadded. Many persons, especially at Paris, pretended to be influenced by the Holy Spirit, and uttered predictions, often of the most ridiculous kind, by which, nevertheless, the multitude, as usual, was vastly affected. These events may serve to illustrate that unity and uniformity of popery which is so much boasted of by her advocates, and may show on how little of truth their statements and pretensions are founded. Thus concludes the regular historical narrative of popery from its origin to the close of the eighteenth century. Thus have we seen the rise, progress, maturity, and fruits of this mystery of iniquity, this scourge of the human race. It arose from temporal prosperity, was fostered by earthly possessions, and is consummated in sensual gratifications.

SECTION VI.

DOCTRINES OF POPERY.

THE proper source to which to resort for correct information respecting the doctrines of popery, is found in the decrees of the council of Trent. At the diet of Spise, held in 1542, it was agreed that a council should be holden in the city of Trent. A bull was accordingly issued, summoning the prelates of the Christian world to convene at Trent the following November. But circumstances were adverse, the council failed to convene at the time appointed, and was postponed. At the diet two years after, the affairs of religion were seriously discussed, and a general council, as the only measure calculated to answer the exigencies of the times, was again urged. Nothing could exceed the grief of the pope on this occasion. That any thing like equality of rights should be granted to heretics, and that a German diet should presume to legislate in regard to religious mat-

ters, without the concurrence of the pope, the head of the church, was an intolerable innovation. In a long and indignant letter, his holiness the pope reproaches the emperor with this conduct. He complained "that laymen and even heretics had been permitted to meddle with spiritual things, the exclusive province of the priesthood, and that in referring their disputes and grievances to a council, they had not so much as mentioned the successor of St. Peter, to whom only the right of convening such an assembly belonged. It resembled the sin of Uzzah, Dathan, Abiram, Korah, and Uzziiah. The judgments of God would fall upon him unless he revoked the decree. By such conduct he had not only endangered the peace and unity of the church, but also exposed his soul's salvation to imminent peril." So unwilling was the pope to have any council called, or the affairs and doctrines of the church subjected to any scrutiny. But when the emperor and the king of France made peace, and the subject of a general council began again to press, and became unavoidable, the pope, to make a virtue of necessity, did not wait for a request which was coming, but issued a bull summoning the princes and prelates of Europe to meet in general council at Trent, March 15, 1545. Many expectations were raised on this occasion. The reformed churches, indeed, could not hope for much from a council. They saw the corruptions of popery to be too deeply seated to be removed by such a superficial application. They therefore did not calculate much on the effects of this movement, and they were not disappointed. It turned out to be a manœuvre of popery. But those who had been less observant of the nature of popery, had very exalted hopes from this council. The sovereigns and states of Europe looked to this assembly with sanguine expectations. They resolved to exert all their influence to procure a thorough reformation of abuses. Then they expected that protestants would cheerfully return to the bosom of the church, and restore

harmony. The different orders of papal priesthood also hoped to have their respective interests placed on a better foundation. But the pope had very different views from all these. Having been compelled by circumstances to call this council, he now was intent to find the means of managing it to his own mind. He resolved to concede nothing, and to permit no change, unless for the advancement of his own power and affluence. Protestants, prelates, princes, and kingdoms, must all be duped and circumvented, and they were completely.

The beginning of the pope's management in the council was the appointment of three of his own legates to preside. They were furnished with a secret bull to remove the council to any other place whenever they should find occasion. On the 13th of December, 1545, the council of Trent was opened with all due solemnity. The pope, to secure a commanding influence in the council, and to prevent all intermeddling with his prerogative, appointed a congregation or committee of cardinals to superintend the affairs of the council, to watch its proceedings, and to aid him with their advice. The legates of the pope were instructed to begin with the discussion of disputed doctrines, and to put off the reformation of abuses, as a matter of secondary importance. Notes were to be taken and transmitted to him of any remarks or allusions touching his court, the reform of which he claimed for himself. To all letters and documents his own name, and those of the legates were to be prefixed, that it might appear that he was not only the author, but the head and ruler of the council. He also appointed the secretary, and other necessary officers, without consulting the members of the council, or permitting them to exercise their right of election.

The Council of Trent, therefore, was wholly under popish influence, and the foregoing circumstances have been recited to show this fact, and that consequently the decrees of this council are to be received as the accre-

dited sentiments and belief of papists universally. The Protestants who were invited to this council early perceived the situation of things, and retired from the council, or declined attending, and protested against its authority as a general council, representing the universal church. The papists, therefore, had no obstacle thrown in their way, and they proceeded to set forth their doctrinal sentiments in the following manner, viz :

1. THE SCRIPTURES AS A RULE OF FAITH.

In the debate which occurred in the council on this point, one of the papists did not hesitate to say, that the scholastic divines had so well expounded the doctrines of Christianity, that it was no longer necessary to take them from the sacred volume ; and that though the Scriptures were formerly read in the churches for the instruction of the people, they were now only used in the devotional exercises of public worship, and ought to be confined to that use ; and that at any rate, the study of Scripture ought to be prohibited to all who were not versed in scholastic divinity. For the Lutherans, he said, had succeeded only with those who had been accustomed to read the Scriptures. The decision of the council on this subject, was, as might have been expected, not in favor of free inquiry. The decree was divided into two parts. The first part, after placing oral tradition on the same level with the written word, in the following terms : “ Perceiving that this truth, (i. e. revealed truth,) and discipline are contained both in written books, and unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit, following the example of the orthodox fathers, this council doth receive and reverence with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well of the old as of the new testament, the same God being the author of both ; and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether

received from Christ himself, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the catholic church by continual succession ;” and after having enumerated the canonical books of the scriptures, including the apocrypha, contains the following denunciation : “ Whoever shall not receive as sacred and canonical, all these books and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the catholic church, and are contained in the old vulgate Latin edition, or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed.” The second part of the decree relates to the right of interpreting the scriptures, and of printing and circulating the sacred books, and is as follows : “ In order to restrain petulant minds, the council further decrees, that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest (i. e. to interpret) the sacred scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which has been held, and still is held by holy mother church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of sacred writ, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers ; even though such interpretations should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law. Being desirous also, as is reasonable, of setting bounds to the printers, who, with unlimited boldness, supposing themselves at liberty to do as they please, print editions of the holy scriptures, with notes and expositions taken indifferently from any writer, without the permission of their ecclesiastical superiors, and that at a concealed and falsely designated press, and, which is worse, without the name of the author—and also rashly expose books of this nature to sale in other countries ; the holy council decrees, and ordains, that for the future, the sacred scriptures, and especially the old vulgate edition, shall be printed in the most correct manner possible ; and no one shall be per-

mitted to print or cause to be printed, any books relating to religion without the name of the author. Neither shall any one hereafter sell such books, or even retain them in his possession, unless they have been first examined and approved by the ordinary, under penalty of anathema, and the pecuniary fine adjudged by the last council of lateran. Those who circulate such books in manuscript, without being examined and approved, shall be liable to the same penalty as printers, and those who possess or read them, unless they declare the authors of them, shall themselves be considered as the authors."

The foregoing decrees of the council were received by the protestants with undissembled grief and indignation. They were greatly offended at the presumption of a council so inconsiderable in numbers, and containing so few men of talent and learning. To place tradition on an equality with scripture, was in their view an act of daring impiety. They were also surprised to hear that several books, such as the apocrypha, which had ever been regarded, at best, as of doubtful authority, and had only received the sanction of some provincial councils, and of two or three popes, should now, without adequate examination, be ranked among the acknowledged writings of inspired men, and constituted portions of the sacred volume. Great astonishment also was excited too, at the decision respecting the vulgate; in which decision that translation, though confessed to abound with errors, was made the authoritative and sole standard of faith and morals, to the exclusion of the Greek and Hebrew scriptures. It appears, indeed, sufficiently evident, that papists have a great dread of the word of God, as it stands on the pages of inspiration; for they have taken great pains to fence it in so that no harm shall come from it. In the first place they adopt the vulgate, which is a Latin translation made by Jerome, and which is far from correct. This, because it suits their purpose best, they declare to be the bible. And they add to this the

apocrypha, for the translator of the vulgate declares them not to belong to inspired books. Then they place the printing and distribution of this bible of their own adoption under the eye of superiors and ordinaries, who are to examine and license. And after all, no man must read even this bible and understand it for himself. He must still go to tradition and the holy mother church, that is, to the crafty priesthood, to know what meaning to give the sacred writings. And as the meaning is the thing and the whole of it, the result of the whole is, that the papist, though he may have a bible and read it, so far as the book and the words are concerned, must still go to his priest for the sense. In effect, then, he goes to his priest for his bible. Surely, no wild beast of prey was ever better guarded with bolts and bars, than is the bible among papists. And yet after all this caution, the papists find it most safe, as we shall presently see, to keep the bible, in every form, as much as possible from the hands of the people. But tradition, we see, has an important place in the decree of Trent. And well it may, for this tradition is of no small consequence to the papist. It is a kind of magic wand, by which he instantly sweeps away all evidence, argument, or objection. Where the scripture is silent, tradition comes in to fill the space. Say of any superstition, this is not authorized by the word of God, and the papist at once replies, it is tradition received from the apostles. This any one can say, though no one can prove it. This, as all discerning minds will perceive, is a crafty device, by which the authority of scripture is absolutely nullified. The ancient scribes and pharisees made void the law of God by their traditions, and they went on the same ground precisely with the papist. They taught that the written word must be interpreted according to tradition. In other words, tradition is the oracle, the final tribunal. Who does not see, that it were easy to invent and propagate vain traditions suited to any occasion? And who does not know

that no credit is due to tradition coming down through many generations, with no voucher for its authenticity, but the treacherous memory of men, even if they designed to be honest. Any one, then, who gives heed to these fables as his guide in spiritual things, must be out of all love for the truth, and regard to his own immortal interests.

But the papists not only garble and coerce the scriptures by their incorrect versions, and the supervision of priests and tradition; they are averse to the circulation or reading of the scriptures in any shape or manner. They regard the study of the scriptures as a kind of moral pestilence, which threatens destruction to their whole system. A genuine papist would as soon take up a serpent as a bible, and he would as soon swallow poison as to read or hear it. A few facts on this point may be seasonable.

Concerning the British and Foreign Bible Society, whose object was to circulate the holy scriptures *without note or comment*, pope Pius VII., in the year 1816, says, "It is a crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion, (i. e. popery) are undermined. A pestilence and defilement of the faith most dangerous to souls." Leo XII., in 1824, speaking of the same institution, says, "It strols with effrontery through the world, contemning the traditions of the holy fathers, and, contrary to the well known decrees of the council of Trent, labors with all its might, and by every means, to translate, or rather to pervert the holy bible into the vulgar languages of all nations. From which proceeding it is greatly to be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened to some passages, may also occur with regard to others; to wit, that by a perverse interpretation, the gospel of Christ be turned into a human gospel, or what is still worse, into the gospel of the devil." The popish priests in Ireland, to whom this was written, publicly avowed their full concurrence with these views of the

pope, and charged their flocks to surrender to the parish priests all copies of the scriptures received from bible societies, as well as all publications disseminated by the religious tract society. These are late transactions. And if we go farther back in the course of events, we find the case no better. The translation of the New-Testament in French, by Quesnel, with notes and moral reflections, has been already mentioned. Against this, Clement XI. launched the bull, called *Unigenitus*. In this bull the pope condemns certain propositions drawn from the above book, as "false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears; scandalous; rash, pernicious, seditious, impious, blasphemous." And what was it, the reader will be ready to ask, that called forth this wordy flood of denunciation? Why, father Quesnel presumes to say that "it is useful and necessary, at all times, in all places, and for all sorts of people, to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of the holy scripture." "The reading of the holy scriptures is for every body." "The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians, in reading pious books, and especially in reading the holy scriptures." This, in the view of the pope, was the direful heresy of the French father. In accordance with this, the popish vicars apostolic and their coadjutors in Britain thus write: "When the reading and circulation of the scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ, and when the scriptures, so read and circulated, are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual, then such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the catholic church, (i. e. popery) because the catholic church knows that the circulation of the scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law

to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the new testament was written—that it was not by means of the scriptures that the apostles converted nations, or any one nation to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be consistent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to error and fanaticism in religion; to sedition, and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms.”

In regard to the means instituted by Christ for the promulgation of his law to all nations, alluded to in the above communication, it may be remarked, when Christ said, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,” he evidently intended they should carry the gospel with them in some form as a common reference. The original word is *evangelize*, that is, bring all nations to the knowledge and obedience of the gospel, so far as you can do it as instruments. The commission of Christ to his apostles does not decide whether this shall be done by preaching, or by circulating the scriptures in a written form. Doubtless it includes both methods. Else why did Christ cause his gospel to be written? Was it not to be a standing record of the truth to which all concerned might refer? And if so, do not those to whom the gospel is communicated, and who are personally interested in a right knowledge of its truths, need this standard? How else shall they be certified that the gospel is preached to them? The circulation of the scriptures, then, in a written form, and the translation of them into different languages, are then a part, an essential part of the means instituted by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law to all nations. To say that Christianity was established

in many countries before one book of the new testament was written, and to apply this remark as an argument in force now, is extremely weak. The inspired apostles who received the truth direct from the Holy Ghost, and who attested their inspiration by miracles and prophecies, were not in need of written revelation. But what does this fact avail now, when we have no inspired men, no miracles, no prophecy, nothing indeed for our guide but the written word? But why is it here said, that the reading of the scriptures is *calculated* to lead them to contradictory opinions? How is it calculated, any more than any other subject of human judgment? The statement ought to have been confined to the simple matter of fact, that men do entertain different opinions respecting the meaning of the scriptures, and on religious subjects. This fact results from their different feelings, motives and prejudices in reading the scriptures, and not from any tendency in the scriptures to produce this diversity. A standard in weight or measure, as before remarked, may be erroneously applied through the negligence or unskilfulness of the agent, and in different cases, may lead to different results. But does this at all impair the utility of such a standard, or show that it is *calculated* to lead men to contradictory opinions? Admitting the fact to be as it is, that there are various and discordant opinions entertained by those who read and interpret the scriptures for themselves, or judge for themselves of a correct interpretation; does this prove that the bible is a dangerous book in the hands of men? Men must be responsible for their own opinions and judgment, as they would not be, if they had no correct standard. And what is the remedy which popery proposes for this supposed evil? It is, that the pope and tradition shall tell men what the bible means, in other words, shall give a bible to men. For to command the interpretation is to possess the key of knowledge, and in effect to make a bible. The question then is, whether men shall see for

themselves the book of God and judge of its contents, or go to the pope to know what it contains?

Papists, it seems, are afraid that the common people will corrupt the bible by reading it, and render the gospel of Christ a gospel of man, if not of the devil. But they seem to have no fears that popes and priests, and tradition, will corrupt the scriptures. They have no apprehensions that the devil may step behind the curtain, at the vatican, and give responses which are dangerous to souls. It may be well, therefore, to look for a moment at the state of facts on this point. Mr. Fisk, an American missionary, mentions the following occurrence, of which he had personal knowledge. When at Alexandria, he fell in company with a popish priest. The priest showed him a popish prayer-book in English, and also what he called the bible in Italian. But it was a history of the bible, written with omissions, abbreviations, and comments. There is a similar work in French called the "bible Royeaumont," the general plan of which is that of Jameson's Sacred History. The grand fault respecting these books is, that the priests give them to the people as the bible, and the latter do not know that there is any other, or that these books differ in any respect from the real scriptures. But the bible, as it is, must be kept from the people, lest they corrupt it. Another fact to illustrate the insincerity of this plea is the insertion of the books of apocrypha as divine inspiration. Another is the substitution of popish words and terms for scriptural phrases, in translating the bible. Thus the word *penance* is by papists substituted almost invariably for the scriptural term *repentance*. Job says, "I abhor myself and repent," &c. The popish scriptures say, "I reprehend myself, and do *penance* in dust and ashes." "If the wicked do *penance* for all the sin he has committed." Thus, the preaching of John—Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand—is, "Do *penance*," &c. Is this the gospel of men, or of the devil?

It surely is not the word of God. But a still more glaring fact respecting this point is the suppression of the second command of the decalogue, in popish bibles and catechisms. The popish decalogue stands thus: 1. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no strange gods before me. 2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. 3. Remember thou keep holy the sabbath day. 4. Honor thy father and mother. 5. Thou shalt not kill. 6. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 7. Thou shalt not steal. 8. Thou shalt not bear false witness. 9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. 10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods. This is copied from a catechism extensively used in Ireland. In the primary books used in Italy, the fourth command is omitted as well as the second, and in its place is the following:—"Remember to keep holy the days of festivals." This is done by men who are afraid, or pretend to be so, that common people will corrupt the scriptures. When the papists of France, in the seventeenth century, found that all their fire and sword would not extirpate protestants, they resolved on a new expedient. An edition of the New Testament was published, so translated that a papist might find scriptural authority for all he claimed. The book was printed at Bordeaux in 1686, and was entitled, "The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated from Latin into French by the divines of Louvain." The attestation of the archbishop of Bordeaux was prefixed to it, assuring the reader that it was carefully revised and corrected. Two doctors in divinity also recommended it as useful to all those, who, with permission of their superiors, might read it. A few examples of this translation are subjoined, to show how safe the bible is in the hands of the priesthood. Acts xiii. 2, "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted," is thus translated by the papists:—"As they offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the mass." Luke ii. 41, popish translation, "As his father and mother went every year in pil-

grimage to Jerusalem." 1 Cor. xi. 2, "Ye keep my commandments as I left them with you by *tradition*." Jude 5, "The faith once delivered to the saints by *tradition*." 1 Cor. ix. 5, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a woman to serve us in the gospel, and to remember us with her goods, as the other apostles?" 1 Cor. iii. 15, "He himself shall be saved, yet in all cases as by the *fire of purgatory*." But the greatest curiosity of the whole work is the translation of 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. This passage, one would suppose, must have been as gravel to their teeth. But tradition and the holy mother operate as an universal solvent to all knotty texts. The translation runs thus:—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some will separate themselves from the *Roman faith*, giving themselves up to spirits of error, and to doctrines taught by devils; speaking false things through hypocrisy, having also the conscience cauterized; *condemning the sacrament of marriage*, the *abstinence from meats*, which God hath created for the faithful, and for those who have known the truth; to receive them with thanksgiving." Many other similar examples might be given, but we have enough to satisfy every mind that the plea of papists for withholding the scriptures is utterly false and hypocritical. The truth is, they are afraid to put the bible, in any shape, into the hands of the people, lest it should disclose their secret abominations. "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd." The whole papal world may be challenged to produce any corruptions or alterations of the sacred volume by those who have free access to it, to be compared with those above cited, and a multitude of others. Such, then, is the doctrine and practice of popery concerning the sacred scriptures. And if they thus pollute the fountain, what must we not expect in the streams?

2. TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

This means, that in the sacramental supper, the bread

and wine used are, after consecration, turned into the real flesh and blood of Christ. And this they call the *real presence of Christ*. The decree of the council of Trent on this subject, in an abridged form, is as follows, viz. :—

“ In the first place the holy council teacheth, and openly and plainly professeth, that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained in the pure sacrament of the holy eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, and under the species of these sensible objects. Neither is it to be regarded as contradictory, that our Saviour should always sit at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to his natural mode of existence, and yet be sacramentally present with us in his substance, and in many other places, according to that mode of existence which, though we cannot express it in words, we can nevertheless, when thought is illumined by faith, conceive to be possible with God, and ought most firmly to believe. For all our ancestors, who belong to the true church of Christ, did most plainly acknowledge, when discoursing on this most holy sacrament, that our Redeemer instituted the same, when, after the benediction of the bread and wine, he testified, in clear and express words, that he presented to his disciples his own body and his own blood. It is therefore a most heinous crime that they should be turned, by certain contentious and wicked men, into pretended and imaginary figures, to the denial of the truth of the flesh and blood of Christ.” Such is the doctrine of popery concerning the sacramental elements. And while they construe the words of Christ literally when he says, “ This is my body,” they do not recollect that Christ said also, “ I am the way, I am the door of the fold, I am the true vine,” &c. If one declaration is to be understood as literal, why not the others? Neither do they appear at all to regard the gross inconsistency and nonsense of the real presence of the body of Christ in thousands of different places at the same time, and of

his real body being eaten, and his real blood being drunk, on many repeated occasions. If Christ gave his real body and blood to his disciples in the supper, they must have eaten him while he yet remained entire before them, nay, he must have broken his own body, and poured out his own blood, while personally present. But the papists not only pervert the ordinance by this strange conceit, they also pervert it by ascribing to it saving power, and sanctifying properties. The effects of the eucharist, or Lord's Supper, are thus enumerated in their catechism. 1. "It imparts grace; it is not like (ordinary) bread and wine changed into our substance, but in some measure changes us into its own nature. 2. It remits venial sins. Whatever losses the soul suffers by falling into some slight offences through the violence of passion, there the eucharist, which cancels lesser sins, repairs, in the same manner that natural food, as we know from experience, repairs the daily waste caused by the vital heat of the system. 3. It is an antidote against the contagion of sin, and a shield against the violent assaults of temptation. 4. It represses the licentious desires of the flesh, and keeps them in due subjection to the spirit. 5. It facilitates in an extraordinary degree the attainment of eternal life. The grace which it imparts gives peace and tranquillity to the soul; and when the hour shall have arrived, when he is to take his departure from this mortal life; like another Elias, who, in the strength of his miraculous repast, walked to Horeb, the mount of God; the Christian, invigorated by the strengthening influence of this heavenly food, shall wing his way to the mansions of everlasting glory, and never ending bliss." Thus we see the papists pervert the supper of the Lord, into an engine of superstition. They make it a substitute for Christ, and without any regard to the feelings or motives of the recipient, they ground his spiritual improvement and growth in grace, on the mere fact of an external reception of these ele-

ments. This, we may perceive, is what makes papists so anxious to receive the eucharist when about to die. They suppose that it has in itself, as being Christ in the form of bread, a power to heal the soul. If they receive these elements therefore by eating and drinking them, they suppose they have received Christ to salvation. What more dangerous and fatal delusion can be imagined? And yet thousands of souls, under papal guidance, go out of the world with no other hope.

Of the worship and veneration to be given to this sacrament, we shall treat in another section. It may be proper to add here, a brief description of the popish method of administration in this ordinance, and their method of preserving and carrying it to the sick. The following direction for receiving the communion, is from the pen of a popish doctor. "When the priest gives you the blessed sacrament, saying, the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, preserve thy soul to life everlasting, amen, receive with a lively faith, a personal humility, an heart enflamed with love." The communicant goes up to the rail of the altar, and having a towel held before him, then he proceeds according to the following directions of the above mentioned doctor. "At the time of your receiving, let your head be erect, your mouth opened moderately wide, and your tongue a little advanced so as to rest on your under lip, that the priest may conveniently convey the blessed sacrament into your mouth. Which being done, shut your mouth, let the sacred host moisten a little on your tongue, and then swallow it down as soon as you can, and then abstain a while from spitting. If the host should chance to stick to the roof of your mouth, be not disturbed, neither must you put your finger in your mouth to remove it, but gently and quietly remove it with your tongue, and thus convey it down; and then return to your place, and endeavor to entertain as well as you can, the guest whom you have received." The direction to abstain from

spitting after receiving the host or bread, is designed probably to prevent the ejection, by this means, of any part of the real body of Christ ; for this would be a fatal loss.

Concerning the preservation of the sacrament, and the conveyance of it to the sick, the council of Trent thus decreed. "The custom of preserving the holy eucharist, in the *sacristy* is so ancient, that it was acknowledged even in the age of the council of Nice. Moreover the practice of carrying the same holy eucharist to the sick, and carefully preserving it for that purpose in the churches, is not only perfectly agreeable to the strictest equity and reason, but has been enjoined by many councils, and sanctioned by the long standing observance of the catholic church. Therefore this holy council decrees that this very salutary and necessary custom be retained." The following description of the ceremony of carrying the sacrament to the sick, is from a resident in Spain. "When a priest carries the consecrated wafer, or bread, to a dying person, a man with a small bell accompanies him. At the sound of the bell, all who hear it are obliged to fall on their knees, and to remain in that posture till they hear it no longer. Its sound operates like magic upon the Spaniards. In the midst of a gay and noisy party, the word *sa Majestad*, (his majesty, the same expression being used both for God and the king,) will bring every one on his knees, till the tinkling dies in the distance. Are you at dinner, you must leave the table ; in bed, you must at least sit up. But the most ludicrous effect of this custom is to be seen at the theatre. On the approach of the host to any military guard, the drum beats, the men are drawn out, and as soon as the priest can be seen, they bend the right knee, invert the firelocks, and place the bayonet on the ground. As an officer's guard is always stationed at the door of a Spanish theatre, I have often laughed in my sleeve at the effect of the chamade upon the actors, and the company. Dios ! Dios ! (God, God,) resounds

from all parts of the house, and every one falls that moment on his knees. The actors' ranting and rattling of the castenets in the fandango, is hushed for a few minutes, till the sound of the bell, growing fainter and fainter, dies away, the amusement is resumed, and the devout performers are once more on their legs, anxious to make amends for the interruption." When the eucharist is administered to a dying person, it is called the "viaticum," because, says the papal catechism, "it prepares for us a passage to eternal happiness, and everlasting glory. Hence, in accordance with the ancient practice of the church, none of the faithful are suffered to depart this life, without being previously fortified with this living bread from heaven."

The council of Trent did not deem it sufficient merely to state truth, as they call it, but they proceeded to detect and denounce what they call error, in the following canons. 1. "Whoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein, only in a figure or sign, or by his power, let him be accursed. 2. Whoever shall affirm that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the catholic church most fitly terms transubstantiation; let him be accursed." This canon is directed against the consubstantiation of Luther, but which is now rejected by protestants. 6. "Whoever shall affirm that Christ the only begotten son of God, is not to be adored in the holy eucharist, with the external signs of that worship

which is due to God, and therefore, that the eucharist is not to be honored with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions according to the laudible and universal rites and customs of holy church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration, and that those who worship the same are idolaters, let him be accursed." 11. "Whoever shall affirm that faith only, is a sufficient preparation for the reception of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, let him be accursed. And lest so great a sacrament should be taken unworthily, and therefore to death and condemnation, the said holy council doth decree and declare, that previous sacramental confession is absolutely necessary, if a confessor is at hand, for those who are conscious of the guilt of mortal sin, however contrite they may think themselves to be. Whoever shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately assert the contrary, or to maintain opposite opinions in public disputation, let him be, ipso facto, excommunicated." No one can complain that these canons are not sufficiently explicit. Here the bread and wine of the supper are declared to be Christ himself, not only his body, but his soul and divinity. Consequently, that the same worship is due to these symbols which is due to Christ as God. And that no person conscious of mortal sin, as they speak, can properly come to Christ or his ordinance, on the ground of faith, or however contrite he may think himself to be, without first confessing his sins to a priest, a fellow sinner, and obtaining his absolution. It seems that this might be enough to satisfy every rational mind, of the true nature and tendency of popery. The council of Trent say, that the doctrine of transubstantiation has been the doctrine of the church always. But this is a false statement. Several eminent writers of the papal church, among whom we may reckon Scotus, and Bellarmine, Biel, and Cojetan, confess that this doctrine cannot be proved from the scrip-

tures. This doctrine was not started or heard of in the ancient church, until the year 750. A dispute arose, about that year, in the synod of Constantinople concerning the worship of images, in opposition to which, that synod thus reasoned. "That our Lord having left no other image of himself, than the sacrament in which the substance of the bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord." In answer to this argument the second council of Nice, in the year 787, did declare that "the sacrament after the consecration, is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood." Thus it appears, that the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, was first introduced to support image worship, and if it come in at all, it could not come on a more fit occasion. This took place in the Greek church. In the Latin or Roman church, the subject was first broached by the monk Paschosius, in the year 818. But the doctrine was not received till a long time after this. Indeed it was contested for about 300 years, until at length the monstrous absurdity became a settled doctrine of popery. The change of the elements from bread and wine, to the real body and blood of Christ, is supposed to take place immediately after consecration, before the bread is broken, when the priest pronounces in latin, "*hoc est corpus meum,*" in English, "*this is my body.*" These words are pronounced as a kind of spell or charm, by which the bread and wine are commanded to depart from the elements, and the body and blood, and soul, and divinity of Christ to enter them. On this account, as is supposed, a contraction of this latin phrase, into "*hocus-pocus,*" is usually repeated by jugglers, to give superstitious mystery to their tricks. And certainly the *hocus-pocus* of jugglers, is as well founded as that of papists.

But the popish priests do not and cannot believe this absurd doctrine, on which they lay so much stress.

They have burnt many at the stake for not believing what no rational mind can believe. As evidence of the hypocrisy of the popish priests in professing to believe this doctrine, the following anecdote may apply. "A protestant lady married a papist, on condition that he would never use any attempts, in his intercourse with her, to induce her to embrace his religion. Accordingly, after their marriage, he abstained from conversing with her on those topics, which he knew would be disagreeable to her. He employed the popish priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instill his popish notions into her mind. But she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and was advised by the priest to receive the holy sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare the bread and wine for the solemnity by the next day. She did so; and on presenting them to the priest, said, 'These, sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ, after you have consecrated them?' 'Most certainly,' he replied. 'Then, sir,' she rejoined, 'it will not be possible, after the consecration, for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; for says our Lord, my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; and he that eateth me shall live by me.' 'Assuredly,' answered the priest, 'they cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good.' The ceremony proceeded, the bread and wine were consecrated, the priest was about to take and eat the bread; but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him, saying, 'I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, sir, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it will of course do *you* no harm.' The faith of the priest was not sufficiently firm to enable him to eat the poisoned bread. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on that lady the doctrine of transubstantiation."

3. PENANCE.

The term penance had originally a two fold meaning. 1. Interior sorrow of heart on account of sin ; this is the virtue of penance. 2. Exterior indication of such sorrow ; this is the sacrament of penance. It consists of certain fruits or signs which may be considered significant of internal sorrow. In this view it means much the same thing as repentance, and fruits meet for repentance, and thus far is unobjectionable. But now come the popish glosses. It was supposed to be a difficult thing for a man to pronounce of the genuineness of his own sorrow, and the sufficiency of the fruits to manifest it. To remove this difficulty the papists teach, that Christ instituted the sacrament of penance, in which we are authorized to cherish a well grounded hope, that our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the priest, and the faith which we justly have in the efficacy of the sacrament, has much influence in tranquillizing the mind, and giving peace to the soul. The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, saying to the lame, " Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." " Moreover, as salvation is attainable only through Christ and the merits of his passion, the institution of this sacrament was in itself accordant to the views of divine wisdom, and pregnant with blessings to the Christian. Penance is the channel through which the blood of Christ flows into the soul, washes away the stains of sin contracted after baptism, and calls forth from us the grateful acknowledgment, that to Christ alone are we indebted for reconciliation with God." This is the popish account of the subject, from which we may perceive, that by magnifying the external fruit of repentance, or rather what they enjoin as fruit, and by magnifying their own importance in the matter, the priests gradually turned away the minds of their followers from sin, as a crime against God, and from all internal exercise of sorrow, to

certain external rites, by which they signified that sin was pardoned. If the priest judged that certain fruits were sufficient and pronounced them so, the offender was comforted. And thus all sorrow for sin became not repentance towards God, but towards the priest. Concerning this subject the council of Trent decreed as follows. "Now, in order to obtain grace and righteousness, penance was always necessary for all men who had defiled themselves with mortal sin, even for those who sought to be washed in the sacrament of baptism, that renouncing and amending their perverseness, they might regard so great offences against God with utmost abhorrence, hatred, and pious grief of mind. Whence the prophet saith, 'Be converted and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin.' The Lord also said, 'Except you do penance you shall all likewise perish.' And Peter, the prince of the apostles, recommending penance to those sinners who were about to be initiated by baptism, said, 'Do penance and be baptized every one of you.' Yet penance was not a sacrament before the coming of Christ, nor since his coming is it a sacrament to any before baptism." Here mark the popish perversion of the doctrine of repentance. If they are to be credited, men before baptism are not required to do works meet for repentance, or to give satisfactory evidence of that inward exercise. Christ certainly did not so teach men. But, proceeds the council, "The Lord especially instituted the sacrament of penance when, after his resurrection, he breathed on his disciples, saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye retain they are retained.' By this remarkable action, and by these express words, as the fathers have by universal consent always understood the same, the power of forgiving sins and retaining them, in order to reconcile the faithful, who have sinned after baptism, was communicated to the apostles and their lawful successors;

and the catholic church hath, with good reason, rejected and condemned as heretics the Novatians, who obstinately deny the power of forgiving." It is natural to remark on the above statement, that before the papist priests claim the prerogative of the apostles expressed in the above passage, whatever may be its meaning, it will be well for them to show the requisite qualifications, viz., that Christ hath breathed on them, and said, receive ye the Holy Ghost. It is not important now to stop to explain the words of Christ to his disciples cited above; for, whatever that meaning may be, the papists have no right to it, any more than when Christ said to his disciples, "If ye shall say to this mountain, be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done." The popish priests are not the lawful successors of the apostles, and if they claim to be, let them prove the claim. It appears, from the statements of papists, that baptism is to be considered as cleansing the unregenerate, and penance applies to the sins which men commit after they are baptized. And the form of absolution which the council of Trent prescribed, is in these words. "*I absolve thee from thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" "In these words its power and efficacy are said to reside. The great efficacy of penance, says the popish catechism, consists in this, that it restores us to the favor of God, and unites us to him in the closest bonds of friendship. There is no sin however grievous, no crime however enormous or often repeated, which penance does not remit." The council of Trent passed the following decrees against the opponents of penance in their sense of it. "Whoever shall affirm, that penance, as used in the catholic church, is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord, for the benefit of the faithful, to reconcile them to God, as often as they shall fall into sin after baptism, let him be accursed." 3. "Whoever shall affirm, that the words of the Lord our Saviour, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,'

&c., are not to be understood of the power of forgiving and retaining sins, in the sacrament of penance, as the catholic church has always, from the very first, understood them, but shall restrict them to the authority of preaching the gospel, in opposition to the institution of this sacrament, let him be accursed."

4. AURICULAR CONFESSION.

This, though properly a part of penance, it is expedient to consider under a distinct head. This means the confessing, in the ear of a priest, commissioned for that purpose, and called a confessor, of all the sins, public and secret, of which any one feels conscious, and which he can possibly recollect. "The universal Church," says the above mentioned council, "has always understood that a full confession of sins was instituted by our Lord, as a part of the sacrament of penance, now explained, and that it is necessary, by divine appointment, for all men who have sinned after baptism, because our Lord Jesus Christ, when he was about to ascend from earth to heaven, left his priests in his place, as presidents and judges, to whom all mortal offences, into which the faithful might fall, may be submitted, that they might pronounce remission or retention of sins, according to the power of the keys. For it is plain, that a priest cannot sustain the office of judge, if the cause be unknown to him, nor inflict suitable punishments, if sins are only confessed in general, and not individually and minutely described. For this reason it follows, that penitents are bound to rehearse, in confession, all mortal sins, of which, after diligent examination of themselves, they are conscious, even though they be of the most secret kind, and only committed against the two last precepts of the decalogue, (i. e. according to the popish arrangement, which divides the truth, in order to supply the absence of the second,) which sometimes do more grievously wound souls, and are more perilous than those which are open and manifest." Here we see that popery claims the right

to dive into the secrets of the heart, and to judge of what none but God can adequately know. But, proceeds the council, "Seeing that all mortal sins, even of thought, make men children of wrath, and enemies of God, it is necessary to seek from him, (through the priest,) the pardon of every one of them, with open, (that is auricular,) and humble confession. Moreover, it follows, that even those circumstances, which alter the species of sin, are to be explained in confession, since the penitents cannot otherwise fully confess their sins, nor the judges know them, and it becomes impossible to form a right estimate of the heinousness of the offence, or inflict a suitable punishment. Whence it is very unreasonable to teach that these circumstances are the inventions of idle men, or that it is sufficient to confess one circumstance only, as for instance that we have sinned against a brother." Concerning the persons who are authorized to receive confessions, the council goes on to say, "That even those priests who are living in mortal sin, may exercise the function of forgiving sins as the ministers of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost conferred upon them in their ordination, and that those who hold that wicked priests have not this power, hold very erroneous sentiments." In the catechism it is stated that the most inviolable secrecy is to be observed by the confessor. "All laws, human and divine, guard the inviolability of the seal of confession, (i. e. secrecy of it,) and against its sacrilegious infraction, the church denounces her heaviest chastisements." According to this law, Garnet, the Jesuit, concealed his knowledge of the gun powder plot, and justified his concealment, because he received the information at confession. The popish catechism proceeds to speak of confession. "In the minister of God, who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, (though the judge may be living himself in mortal sin,) the penitent venerates the power and person of our Lord Jesus Christ, for in the administration of

this, as well as of other sacraments, the priest represents the character, and performs the functions of Jesus Christ." If this is true, one would be led to say, at least, "Be ye holy that bear the vessels of the Lord."

The method of confession in common practice is the following: "The penitent kneeling down by the side of his ghostly (i. e. spiritual) father, makes the sign of the cross and asks his blessing, "Pray father, give me your blessing, I have sinned." Then he begins in Latin or in English to say what is called the *confiteor*. It runs thus: "I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever a virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my most grievous fault." At this place, the penitent accuses himself of his sins in particular, either according to the order of God's commandments, (omitting such as priests choose to leave out) or such other order as he may find most helpful to his memory: adding, after the mention of each sin, the number of times he has been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt; but carefully abstaining from such as are impertinent and unnecessary, and from excuses and long narrations. After he has confessed all that he can remember, he then concludes with this or the like form. "Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, ever a virgin, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, to pray to the Lord our God for me. For all these and my other sins, which I cannot at this present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry, purpose amendment for the future, most humbly ask pardon of God, and absolution of you, my ghostly father. So the penitent may finish his *confiteor*, and then give attentive ear to the instructions of his confessor, and humbly accept of the penance enjoined upon him. While the priest

gives him absolution, he must bow down his head, and with great humility call upon God for mercy, and beg of him that he will be pleased to pronounce the sentence of absolution in heaven, while his minister absolves him upon earth. After confession, let the penitent return to his prayers, and after having heartily given God thanks for having admitted him, by the means of this ordinance, to the grace of reconciliation, and received him like the prodigal child returning home, let him make an offering of his confession to Jesus Christ, begging pardon for whatever defects he may have been guilty of in it, offering up his resolutions to his Saviour, and begging grace that he may put them in execution." A certain popish doctor has furnished a list of questions to be used for the examination of conscience, on the ten commandments, before confession. The following may serve as examples: "1. Have you been guilty of heresy or disbelief of any article of faith, or of any voluntary doubts respecting it? How often? And for how long a time? Have you rashly exposed yourself to infidelity, by reading bad books or keeping wicked company? How often? 2. Have you, by word or deed, denied your religion, or gone to the churches or meetings of heretics, so as to join in any way with them in their worship? or to give scandal? How often?" Thus the first and second commands are passed by as if the whole meaning of them were, thou shalt have no other God but the pope. 3. (4.) Have you broke the days of abstinence, commanded by the church, or eaten more than one meal on fast days, or been accessory to others' so doing? How often? Have you neglected to confess your sins once a year, or to receive the blessed sacraments at Easter? Have you presumed to receive the blessed sacrament, after having broken your fast? 5. (6.) Have you committed any thing you judged or doubted to be mortal sin, though perhaps it was not? How often? Or have you exposed yourself to the evident danger of mortal

sin? How often? And of what sin? 9. (10.) Have you entertained with pleasure the thoughts of doing or saying any thing which it would be sin to say and do? How often? Have you the design or the desire of committing any sin? Of what sin? How often? Have you been guilty of eating or drinking to excess, so far as considerably to injure your health or your reason, or to endanger them? And with what scandal? Have you made others drunk, or sought to make them so? How often? Have you gloried in any other sin whatsoever? How often? And before what company? And what sin?" (*From a popish book called Garden of the soul.*)

The questions on the seventh command, (the sixth of papists,) are so indecent as to be unfit to be published. And the publication of such questions by papists, speaks volumes concerning the morality and delicacy of their confessions to the priest. The truth of this remark may be illustrated from the *Catholic's Manual*, a volume issued by John Power, popish vicar general of New York. As penitents, we are to confess "sins against ourselves by impurity. 1. *In thoughts.* In wilfully dwelling upon, or taking pleasure in unchaste thoughts. In confession, it must be mentioned how long, whether with desires of committing evil, whether they caused irregular motions in a holy place, whether the objects of unlawful desires were single or married persons, or persons consecrated to God? 2. *In words.* Speaking obscenely, listening with pleasure to such vile language, singing unchaste songs, giving toasts and sentiments contrary to modesty. 3. *In looks.* Viewing immodest objects, reading bad books, keeping indecent pictures, frequenting plays, and tempting others to sin by dissolute glances, gestures, or immodest dress or behavior. 4. *Actions.* Defiling the sanctity of marriage by shameful liberties contrary to nature. In touching ourselves or others immodestly—permitting such base liberties—certain sins of a lonely and abominable nature. What

were the consequences of these sinful impurities? explain every thing, the number of these bad actions, the length of time continued in the habit, and with whom we sinned." The following questions to be asked at confession, are found in the Philadelphia edition of the *Key to Paradise*, approved by Mr. Kendrick, the popish priest of Philadelphia. "1. Have you been guilty of adultery or fornication, and how often? 2. Have you desired to commit either, and how often? 3. Have you intended to commit either, and how often? 4. Have you taken pleasure in thinking on any improper subject, and how often? 5. Have you endeavored to excite your own passions, and how often? 6. Have you been guilty of indecent liberties, and how often? 7. Have you read indecent writings, or lent them to others, and how often? 8. Have you exposed indecent pictures? 9. Have you joined in indecent conversation, and how often? 10. Have you committed any gross sin against chastity?" It is painful to make a public record of such questions. But duty demands that the shameful indecency of confessions be known to the community.

The above is the most delicate form in which the subject ever came before the public. No one questions the propriety of penitence before God for all enormities which flow from the human heart, that sink of sin; but where is the propriety or morality of pouring all these things into the ear of an upstart priest, a fellow sinner, a man of like passions with others? Certainly, if he have any delicacy of feeling, he will not be highly edified by having his ears and mind made the common reservoir of all the filth around him. And then think of all the popish men and women, boys and girls, above twelve years of age, carefully studying the above questions, and truly answering them to the priest, on pain of being refused absolution, which is essential to salvation! What can such an exercise produce but the utter prostration of all moral principle? For the young are by these questions,

and the answers they must give, initiated into the knowledge of criminal practices, of which they would otherwise never have thought. The confessional, then, is truly a school of vice and defilement, whose catechumens are trained up for the service of Satan. And what must female character and sentiment be, formed under such an influence, and in such a school. Surely popish husbands are not to be envied respecting the confidence and complacency they feel towards their wives, whose *minds* have been polluted with this drilling in impurity, if nothing more is the effect. Surely, the female part of popish communities must be effectually guarded against the *loss* of any delicacy, or modesty, or purity, after a few years of such seasoning!

But we have not done with confessions yet. We have seen the fair side of the subject, in the light in which papists themselves present it. Injustice to the cause of truth would be done if the subject were here dismissed. A few well attested facts, presenting the dark shades of this picture, will now be stated; relying on the candor and patience of the reader that the demands of truth and duty in the case will be deemed a sufficient apology: "Mr. John Gordon, a native of Scotland, was, in his youth and against his will, sent to a popish seminary in the Highlands, and afterwards to the Scotch college in Paris, to be educated for the priesthood. Having no means of escape, for a long time he was obliged to conform to all the rules of the college. At length, however, he escaped, and returning to Scotland, renounced popery and embraced the protestant religion before the presbytery of Edinburgh. In his narrative, speaking of confessions, he says:—'After this, we were sent to our chambers to begin an examination of our consciences. Paper, pen, and ink, were given us, that we might write down all the sins we could think of. When they had given us sufficient time for examination, then they gave us some prayers to say, for obtaining contrition and sor-

row for our sins ; after which, Mr. — was placed in the confessional, to hear our several accounts. I must confess these proceedings did not well digest with me, but I was too well secured either to make off or disobey. So to the confessional I went, where I must own there was not a corner of my conscience that was not pretty well sifted by the impertinent interrogations he made, by which I learned more sins than ever I had heard of when conversant in the world. However, I came pretty well off, for the only penance I had imposed upon me, was to repeat every day, for two weeks, the seven psalms which are called penitential. And because I had apostatized from them, (which he called the sin against the Holy Ghost,) he ordered me to sleep in my clothes for the above mentioned time. I became acquainted with several confessors, and particularly with one Mr. Holdar, who was confessor to most of the English nuns in the monastery of Zion, by St. Victors. All our conversation ran upon the different stories he heard in confession, and of the nuns' scruples of conscience, which I am ashamed to rehearse. So that I would advise these ladies either to forbear frequenting confession, or at least to make choice of a discreet confessor. It is the ordinary discourse of the priests, when they meet, to inform each other what they have heard in confession, and how dexterously they behaved on those occasions. This I can assert, because I was often present at such conferences, where the conversation was so indecent that even an honest pagan would have blushed.' The confessional or confessional is the place where confession is made, where the priest sits in a chair in the darkest part of the chapel. The chairs generally have an iron grate at each side, but none at all before. On some days of devotion, or on a great festival, there is such a crowd of people, that you may see three penitents at once about the chair, one at each grate, and the other at the door, though only one confessing at a time, whispering in the confessor's ear,

that the others should not hear what is said. When one has done, another begins. But generally, they confess in front of the chair, one after another, for thus the confessor has the opportunity of knowing the penitent. And if any ladies, from bashfulness or modesty, endeavor to hide their faces with a fan or veil, yet they will be discovered by the confessor, who, if curious, will by crafty questions bring them to tell their names and houses, and this in the very act of confession; or else he examines their faces when confession is over, while the penitents are kissing his hand or sleeve. And if he cannot know them in this way, he goes himself to give the sacrament, and then, every one being obliged to uncover the face, each person is known by the confessor, who does this not without a private design, as will appear at the end of some private confessions." The priests can very easily accommodate themselves to persons and circumstances, so as to treat some with great lenity, and others with as great severity, just as one or the other will answer their purpose. If a poor countryman goes to confess, the confessor takes little pains with him, for he expects little or nothing from him. If a soldier goes to make his peace with God, (for so they speak of confession,) then the confessor showeth the power of a spiritual guide. He questions him particularly about theft, drunkenness, and uncleanness. If he is guilty of one, the confessor draws the inference that he is guilty of the rest; and terrifying him with the devils and flames of hell, he charges him to make restitution, and that he must pay so much money for the relief of the souls in purgatory, or he cannot obtain absolution. A month's pay must be given on the spot, (for absolution is a cash article,) to appease the confessor and obtain pardon. If a collegian goes to confess, he finds a mild and sweet confessor; and without being questioned, and with a small penance, he obtains absolution. In this case the confessor is called a deaf confessor, because, as if he did not hear, he gives

small penance, little correction, and never denies absolution. One such confessor has more business in lent than twenty others. All the great and habitual sinners go to the deaf confessor, who gives, upon agreement for so much, a certificate, in which he says that such an one has fulfilled the commandment of the church; for every person is obliged to produce a certificate of confession to the minister of the parish before Easter, or be exposed in the church. So, as it is a hard thing for an old sinner to get absolution and a certificate from other covetous confessors, without a great deal of money, they generally go to the deaf confessors. But such confessors must give two thirds of their income to the convent to which they belong. Two such confessors paid in one lent to the father of the convent, six hundred pistoles apiece. If a modest, serious, religious lady comes to confession, the confessor treats her in a different manner; for he knows that such ladies never come to confession without giving liberally for masses. His care, then, is to ingratiate himself into her favor, and gain her confidence. This he does by making a show of his goodness and devotion. He speaks gravely and conscientiously, and if she has a family, he gives her good advice for the management of her household, and to keep her children within the bounds of sobriety and decency in this *deceitful* world. By such means he gains confidence, and becomes the guide of her soul, and of her family; which confidence, when occasion serves, he fails not to use to his advantage, and most commonly for the ruin of the children, and often of the lady herself. Particular examples of this kind are mentioned by authors, and might be here recorded. But it may be better to present the general aspects of this practice, as the statement will then be less liable to the charge of partiality. The crime of *solicitant* became so common and public in Spain at a certain period, that the pope was compelled to issue a bull against it. *Solicitant* is a priest, who, at the time of confession,

solicits persons to indecent acts. The following are the words of the bull relative to this subject:—"Whereas, certain ecclesiastics in the kingdom of Spain and the diocesses and cities thereof, having the care of souls, or exercising this care for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity, as to abuse the sacrament of penance, in the very act of hearing confessions, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord God, and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke, females to lewd actions, at the very time when they were making their confessions."

When this bull was introduced into Spain, the inquisitors published a solemn edict in all the churches in the archbishopric of Seville, that any person knowing or having heard of any friar or priest's having abused the sacrament of confession, or in any manner having improperly conducted himself, during the confession of a female penitent, should make a discovery thereof within thirty days to the holy tribunal, on penalty of very heavy censures for neglect. When this edict was published, such a number of females crowded to the palace of the inquisitor, only in the city of Seville, to complain of the conduct of their confessors, that twenty notaries and as many inquisitors were appointed to minute down their several informations. But these being found insufficient, to receive the depositions of so many witnesses, and the inquisitors being overwhelmed with the pressure, thirty days more were allowed, and this period proving inadequate, a similar extension of the season was granted a third and fourth time. The ladies of rank and noble families had a difficult part to act on this occasion. On the one hand was a religious fear of incurring the threatened censures. This goaded their consciences so as to compel them to the disclosure. On the other hand, a regard to their husbands, whom they feared to offend, by

furnishing reasons of suspicion respecting their private conduct. To obviate these difficulties, they had recourse to the measure of covering their faces with a veil, according to the fashion of Spain, and thus went to the inquisitors, in the most secret manner they could adopt. Very few, however, escaped the vigilance of their husbands, who, on being informed of the discoveries and accusations made by their wives, were filled with suspicions! And yet, after all this parade of examination, and this accumulated proof, the holy tribunal, contrary to general expectation, put an end to the business, by ordering that all these transactions should thenceforth be consigned to perpetual oblivion. In doing this they made themselves partakers of the guilt, and fixed the stain indelibly on the cause of popery. The wives had still to bear the effrontery and insults of their confessors, and the husbands, poor helpless souls, must sit down contented with what popish priests were disposed to grant them.

A popish priest, in his dying confession, according to Mr. Gavin, acknowledged that, for twelve years, he belonged to a club of priests, six in number, residing in contiguous parishes. "Every one," he said, "had a list of the handsomest women in his parish. And when they had a fancy to see any one of them, the priest of the parish sent for her to his own house, under some religious pretext, and had her introduced to his brother priests. In this way," said he, "we have served each other for twelve years past. Our manner was to persuade their husbands and fathers not to hinder them any spiritual comfort, and to the ladies, to be subject to our advice and will, and we promised that in doing so, they should have liberty at any time to go out on pretence of communicating some spiritual business to the priest; and if they refused to do it, then we would speak to their fathers or husbands not to let them go out at all; or, what would be worse for them, we would inform against them to the holy tribunal of the in-

quisition." Such are some of the tragical and moral abuses of auricular confession. But the transaction often assumes a very ludicrous and comical aspect. The children in each parish are expected to come to confession from seven years old, at least once in a year. For this purpose the priest of the parish fixes upon one day of the week, about the middle of lent, to hear the children's confessions, and gives notice to the congregation the Sunday before, that every father of a family may send his children, both boys and girls, to church on the day appointed. The mothers dress their children in their best for the occasion, and give them the offering money for the expiation of their sins. That afternoon is a holy day in the parish by custom; for no parishioner, either old or young, man or woman, fails to go and hear the children's confessions. For it is reckoned among them a greater diversion than a comedy, as would appear from the following account.

"The day appointed, the children repair to the church at 3 o'clock, where the priest is waiting for them, with a long reed in his hand; and when all are together, the reverend father placeth them in a circle around himself, and then kneeling down, the children also doing the same, he makes the sign of the cross, and says a short prayer. This done, he exhorts the children to hide no sin from him, but to tell him all they ever committed. Then he touches with the reed the child who is first to confess, and asks him the following questions. How long is it since you last confessed? *Child.* Father, a whole year, or the last lent. How many sins have you committed from that time till now? *Child.* Two dozen. (*Here the confessor puts the question round.*) And you? *Child.* A thousand and ten. Another will say a bag full of small lies, and ten big sins. And so one after another answers many such childish things. *Confessor.* But pray, you say you have committed ten big sins; tell me how big? *Child.* As big as a tree. *Conf.* But tell me the sins. *Child.* There is one sin I committed,

which I dare not tell your reverence before all the people; for somebody here will kill me if he hear it. *Conf.* Well then, come out of the circle and tell me, Then both go out, and with a loud voice, he tells him that such a day he stole a nest of sparrows from the tree of another boy, and that if he knew it he would kill him. Then both come again into the circle, and the holy father asks other boys and girls so many ridiculous questions, and the children answer him so many pleasant things, that the congregation is kept in a laugh all the while. One will say that his sins are red, another that one of his sins is white, another black, and another green. In this trifling manner they spend two hours. When the congregation is weary of laughing, the confessor gives the children correction, and bids them not sin any more, for a *black boy* takes along with him the wicked children. Then he asks for the offering, and after he has got all their money, he gives them the penance for their sins. To one he says, I give you for penance to eat a sweet cake; to another, to go to school the next day; to another, to desire his mother to buy him a new hat; and such things as these. Then pronouncing the words of absolution, he dismisses the assembly with an AMEN. This is repeated year after year. Such is the popish sacrament of confession.

It still remains, under the head of penance, to say something of *satisfaction*, which is considered the third branch of penance. "Every species of satisfaction," says the popish catechism, "is included under these three, *prayer, fasting, and alms-deeds.*" The first of these respects God, and is easily gone through, by saying over so many *Ave Marias*, or *hail Mary*; and so many *pater nosters*, or *our father*. This is called prayer, and the efficacy of it depends on the number of times in which it is repeated. A small offender may get off with a few repetitions, but an old obstinate sinner, and especially one who has in any manner offended the priest, may

have to repeat them thousands of times, and to count his beads that he may keep a correct account. But fasting is a more serious business. For this is rendered more efficacious by self-torture, or the voluntary infliction of suffering. And the power of description fails to depict the forms and variety of these self-tortures. They will be more particularly considered under the head of popish superstitions. For the present suffice it to say, that open the popish breviary, at any of the pages containing the lives of the saints, and you will find uninterrupted abstinence from food, from ash Wednesday to Whitsunday, persevered in to admiration, and sanctioned too by the power of miracles. Sometimes satisfaction requires four years' confinement to a crevice of a rock, and every where the use of flagellation, lacerating bandages, iron chains about the body, immersions in freezing water, and every method of gradually and painfully destroying life. St. Theresa's ardor in punishing the body was so vehement as to make her use hair shirts, nettles, scourges, and even to roll herself among thorns, regardless of a diseased constitution. St. Rose bore day and night, three folds of an iron chain about her waist, a belt set with small needles, and an iron crown, armed inside with points. She made to herself a bed of the unpolished trunks of trees, and filled up the interstices with pieces of broken pottery. These persons are held up as examples and patterns of piety.

But the *alms deeds*, necessary for the satisfaction for sin, are the most difficult of all. For here the priest, in assigning the penance, does not forget that he has the bag, and bears all that is put therein. The poor sinner, if he has any money, must not expect to have his sins pardoned without the loss of the greater part. And if he has much money, or is in the way to get it, he may calculate at confession to have his pockets relieved of their burden. Money and women seem to constitute the grand desideratum with popish priests, and Solomon

might with propriety, and probably, would if he had known them, have added them to his list of things which never say, "*it is enough.*"

Indulgences, have an intimate connection with the subject of this section. The theory of indulgences, has been already stated in the history of their prevalence, and some account given of their effects. All that need here be said, is that these indulgences, are merely a device to extort more money from those who confess, as a substitute for the requisitions of penance. If a man pays money enough, he may hire a monk to pray for him, and fast for him, and endure all his other punishments. So that by indulgences, the whole of penance for sin is turned into the payment of money. And as these indulgences in the feelings of papists, clear them from sin and all its consequences, it may be truly said, that popery buys and sells salvation as an article of traffic for money. This, whatever plausible theories may be advanced to the contrary, will be found by all who examine the subject, the true state of the case. This doctrine of penance, including confession and satisfaction, arms the popish priesthood with a tremendous power. It makes them directors of the consciences of men, and arms them with all the sanctions of eternal retribution, or at least, of indefinite retribution in purgatory, by which they compel obedience to their commands. The awful majesty of the priest in this case, may well affright the trembling penitent. He stands in the place of God to him, and holds, in his apprehension, the keys of heaven and hell. The following letter will show that this is not all chimera, but sober reality. The letter is from father La Chaise, confessor to Louis XIV. of France, to father Peters, confessor to James II., in England, in 1688. It was taken from the manuscript papers in the library of Edward Harley, earl of Oxford.

"Worthy friend, I received yours of the 20th of June last, and am glad to hear of your good success, and

that our party gains ground so fast in England ; but concerning the question you have put to me, that is, ' *What is the best course to be taken to root out all heretics,*' to this I answer, there are divers ways to do that, but we must consider which is the best to make use of in England. I am sure you are not ignorant how many thousand heretics, we have in France, by the power of our dragoons, converted in the space of one year ; and by the doctrine of these booted apostles, turned more in one year, than Christ and his apostles could in ten years. This is a most excellent method, and far excels those of the great preachers and teachers, that have lived since the time of Christ. But I have spoken with divers fathers of our Society, who do think that your king is not strong enough to accomplish this design by such kind of force ; so that we cannot expect to have our work done in that manner, for the heretics are too strong for the three kingdoms ; and, therefore, we must seek to convert them by fair means, before we fall upon them with fire and sword, halters, goals, and other such like punishments. And, therefore, I can give you no better advice than to begin with soft, easy means. Wheedle them by promises of profit and places of honor. till you have made them dip themselves into treasonable practices against the laws established, and then they are bound to serve from fear. When they have done thus, turn them out, and serve others so by putting them in their places, and by this way gain as many as you can. And for the heretics that are in places of profit and honor, turn them out, or suspend them on pretence of misbehaviour, by which their places are forfeited ; and they subject to what judgment you please to give upon them. Then you must form a camp that must consist of none but catholics. This will make the heretics heartless, and conclude that the means of relief and recovery are gone. And lastly, take the short and the best way, which is to surprise the heretics on a sud-

den, and to encourage the zealous catholics, let them sacrifice all, and wash their hands in their blood, which will be an acceptable offering to God. And this was the method I took in France, which hath well, you see, succeeded; but it cost me many threats and promises, before I could bring it thus far; our king being a long time very unwilling. But at last, I got him on the hip; for he had the ——, for which I would by no means give him absolution, till he had given me an instrument under his own hand and seal, to sacrifice the heretics all in one day. Now, as soon as I had my desired commission, I appointed the day when this should be done; and in the mean time, made ready some thousands of letters to be sent into all parts of France, in one post night. I was never better pleased than at that time. But the king was affected with some compassion for the Hugonots, because they had been a means of bringing him to his crown and throne; and the longer he was under it, the more sorrowful he was, often complaining, and desiring me to give him his commission again. But that I would by no persuasion do; advising him to repent of that heinous sin, and also telling him, that the trouble and horror of his spirit, did not proceed from any thing evil in those things which were to be done, but from the wickedness he had done; and that he must resolve to undergo the severe burden of a troubled mind, for one of them or for the other, and if he would remain satisfied as it was, his sin being forgiven, there would in a few days be a perfect atonement made for it, and be perfectly reconciled to God again. But all this would not pacify him; for the longer the more restless. I therefore ordered him to retire to his closet, and spend his time constantly in prayer, without permitting any one to interrupt him; and this was in the morning early, when in the evening I was to send away all my letters. I did indeed, make the more haste for fear he would disclose it to any body; yet, I had given him strict charge to keep

it to himself. And the very things which I most feared, to my great sorrow came to pass. For just at the nick of time, the devil, who hath at all times his instruments at work, sent the prince of Conde, to the court, who asked for the king. He was told that he was in his closet and would speak with no man. He impudently answered, that he must and would speak with him, and so went directly to his closet, he being a great peer, no man durst hinder him. And being come to the king, he soon perceived by his countenance that he was under some great trouble of mind, for he looked as if he had been going into the other world immediately. 'Sire, said he, what is the matter with you?' The king at the first refused to tell him, but he pressing harder upon him, at last, the king with a sorrowful complaint burst out and said, 'I have given father La Chaise, a commission under my hand to murder all the Hugonots in one day, and this evening will the letters be despatched to all parts, by the post, for performing of it; so that there is but a small time left for my Hugonot subjects to live, who have never done me any harm.' Whereupon this cursed rogue answered, let him give you your commission again. The king said how shall I get it out of his hand? For if I send to him for it he will refuse to send it. This devil answered, if your majesty will give me an order, I will quickly make him return it. The king was soon persuaded, being willing to give ease to his troubled spirit, and said, 'well go then, and break his neck if he will not give it you.' Whereupon this son of the devil, went to the post-house and inquired if I had not a great number of letters there? And they said yes, more than I had sent in a whole year before. Then said the prince, by an order from the king you must deliver them all to me, which they durst not deny, for they knew well enough who he was. And no sooner was he got into the post-house and asked these questions, than I came in also after him, to give order to the post-

master, to give notice to all those under him in the several parts of the kingdom, that they should take care to deliver my letters with all the speed imaginable. But I was no sooner entered the house, but he gave his servants orders to secure the door, and said confidently to me, you must, by order from the king, give me the commission which you have forced from him. I told him I had it not about me, but would go and fetch it, thinking to get from him and so get out of town, and send the contents of these letters another time. But he said, you must give it, and if you have it not about you, send somebody to fetch it, or else never expect to go alive out of my hands. For I have an order from the king, either to fetch it or break your neck, and I am resolved, either to carry that back to him in my hand, or else your heart's blood on the point of my sword. I would have made my escape, but he set his sword to my breast, and said, you must give it me or die, therefore deliver it, or this goes through your body. So when I saw nothing else would do, I put my hand in my pocket and gave it him, which he carried immediately to the king, and gave him that and all my letters which they burned. And being all done, the king said, now his heart was at ease. Now how he should be eased by the devil, or so well satisfied with a false joy I cannot tell; but this I know that it was a very wicked and ungodly action, as well in his majesty, as in the prince of Conde, and very much increased the burden and danger of his majesty's sins. I soon gave account of this affair to several fathers of our society, who promised to do their best, to prevent the aforesaid prince's doing another such act, which was accordingly done. For within six days he was poisoned, and well he deserved it. The king also did suffer too, but in another fashion, for disclosing the design unto the prince and hearkening to his councils. Many a time since, when I have had him at confession, have I shook hell about his ears, and made him sigh, fear and tremble,

before I would give him absolution; nay, more than that, I have made him beg for it on his knees, before I would consent to absolve him. By this I saw that he had still an inclination to me, and was willing to be under my government, so I set the baseness of his sin before him, by telling the whole story, and how wicked it was, and that it could not be forgiven till he had done some good action to balance that and expiate the crime. Whereupon he at last asked me what he must do? I told him he must root out all the heretics from his kingdom. So when he saw there was no rest for him without doing it, he did again give them all into the power of me and our clergy, under this condition, that we should not murder them, as he had before given orders, but that we should, by fair means or force, convert them to the catholic religion. Now when we got the commission, we presently put it in practice, and what the issue hath been, you very well know. But now in England the work cannot be done after this manner, as you may perceive from what I have said to you, so that I cannot give you better counsel than to take that course in hand, wherein we were so unhappily prevented, and I doubt not but it may have better success with you than with us.

“I would write to you of many other things, but I fear I have already detained you too long, wherefore I will write no more at present, but that I am

Your friend and servant,

Paris, July 8, 1688.

LA CHAISE.”

Such is the power committed to the hands of a few popish priests, by what they call the sacrament of penance. Certainly it is one of the very worst features of popery. And those who can be reconciled to it, can be to any thing deceitful, inhuman, and diabolical. Perhaps some one may ask, why not flee from such influence at once? Do not some papists perceive the thralldom in which they live, and if so, why do they remain a day, or submit to

its tyranny? In reply to this inquiry, which is a very natural one for those who do not fully understand the toils of popery, the following letter from one who felt a desire to escape, and yet found it impracticable, may be of use.

“If every true born Italian, man, woman, and child, within the pope’s dominions, does not confess and receive the communion, at least once a year, before Easter, his name is posted up in the parish church; if he still refrain, he is exhorted, entreated, and otherwise tormented; and if he persist in his contumacy, he is excommunicated, which is a very good joke to us, (English,) but none at all to the Italian, since it involves the loss of civil rights, and perhaps of liberty and property, (if not of life.) Every Italian must at this time, (before Easter) confess and receive the communion. A friend of ours, who has lived a great deal in foreign countries, and there imbibed very heterodox notions, and who has never made any secret to us, of his confirmed infidelity of Catholicism, went to-day to confession with the strongest repugnance. What can I do? he said. If I neglect it, I am reprimanded by the parish priest; if I delay it, my name is posted up in the parish church; if I persist in my contumacy, the arm of the church will overtake me, and my rank and fortune only serve to make me more obnoxious to its power. If I choose to make myself a martyr to infidelity, as the saints of old did to religion, and suffer the extremity of punishment in the loss of property and personal rights, what is to become of my wife and family? The same ruin would overtake them though they are catholics; for I am obliged, not only to conceal my true belief, and profess what I despise, but I must bring up my children in their abominable idolatries and superstitions, or, if I teach them the truth, make them hypocrites or beggars.” “I shall not enter into the soundness of my friend’s arguments, or defend the rectitude of his conduct. But certainly the alternative is a hard one, and I believe there are thousands whose virtue

would not be proof against it. For this reason he would not live a single day in Italy if he could get out of it, but that is not in his power.’

The mystery after all is, how any man of sense and independence can value his wife, or family, or property, in popish countries; when neither one nor the other is at his command or enjoyment, only so far as the priests permit. And here the subject will be left to the serious reflections of the reader.

5. MASS.

The *mass* is the communion service, or consecration and administration of the sacramental supper. *High mass* is the same service, accompanied with all the ceremonies which custom and authority have annexed to its celebration. The origin of the term is this. In the early ages of the church, the congregation was dismissed by the officiating minister by saying, *ita missa est*, that is, the congregation is dismissed before the celebration of the Lord’s supper, so that none but communicants might be suffered to remain. In process of time, the solemn service to be performed, was in consequence of this practice called the “*missa est*,” or the dismissal; and finally, by contraction, the *mass*. The peculiarity of the mass as a doctrine of popery is, that the celebration of the Lord’s supper is not a commemoration of the death and sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, but that it is itself a renewed and real sacrifice of Christ, an actual offering of his body and blood by the hands of the priest. For this, it will be seen, the doctrine of transubstantiation prepares the way. The mass is then regarded by all true papists as a real sacrifice of Christ, as really such as when he was crucified. The following decrees of the council of Trent will explain the popish views of this ceremony, viz. 1. *Of the institution of the most holy sacrifice of the mass*. “Since there was no perfection under the first testament, as the apostle Paul testifies, because of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, it

behoved God, the father of mercies, to ordain that another priest should arise, after the order of Melchisedek, even our Lord Jesus Christ, who might complete and bring to perfection as many as should be sanctified. He therefore, our God and Lord, when about to offer himself once for all to God the Father, by his death on the altar of the cross, that there he might accomplish eternal redemption, knowing that his priesthood was not to be abolished by death, in the last supper, on the night in which he was betrayed, declared himself to be constituted a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek ; offered his body and blood to God the Father, under the species of bread and wine, and by these symbols delivered the same to be received by his apostles, whom he then appointed priests of the new testament, and commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer the same, saying, ‘ This do for a commemoration of me.’ Thus the catholic church always understood and taught this doctrine. And this the Saviour did, that he might leave to his beloved spouse the church, a visible sacrifice, such as human nature required, by which the bloody sacrifice made on the cross might be represented, the memory thereof preserved to the end of the world, and its salutary virtue applied for the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us. For, as the Israelites of old sacrificed the passover, in memory of their departure from Egypt, so the Redeemer instituted a new passover, wherein he is himself sacrificed by the church through the priests under visible signs. Finally, this is the sacrifice which was figuratively represented by the various sacrifices offered in the times of nature and of the law ; since it includes every good which was signified by them, and is the consummation and perfection of them all. 2. “ *The sacrifice of the mass is propitiatory both for the living and the dead.* And since the same Christ, who once offered himself by his blood on the altar of the cross, is contained in this divine sacrifice,

which is celebrated in the mass, and offered without blood, the holy council teaches that this sacrifice is really propitiatory, and made by Christ himself. For assuredly God is appeased by this oblation, bestows grace and the gift of repentance, and forgives all crimes and sins, how great soever; for the sacrifice which is now offered by the ministry of the priests, is one and the same as that which Christ then offered on the cross, only the mode of offering is different. Wherefore it is properly offered according to *apostolic tradition*, (not the divine word) not only for the sins, punishments, and satisfactions, and other necessities of living believers, but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet thoroughly purified, (i. e. in purgatory.)

5. *Of the solemn ceremonies of the sacrifice of the mass.* "Seeing that such is the nature of man; that he cannot easily be raised to the contemplation of divine things without external aid, holy mother church has instituted certain rites, as for instance, that some parts of the mass should be spoken in a low tone of voice, others in a louder. Ceremonies are also used, such as mystical benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and others of the same kind, gathered from apostolic discipline and *tradition*, whereby the majesty of this great sacrifice is set forth, and by these visible signs of religion and piety, the minds of the faithful are excited to the contemplation of deep truths, which are therein contained." Of the truth of this latter remark the reader will be better able to judge when he comes to see what these ceremonies are. That they will excite human nature is unquestionable; but they will excite any thing sooner than piety. It may be gratifying to the reader, before proceeding to a view of the ceremonies of the mass, to have a specimen of the argument employed in support of this doctrine. Melchior Cornelio, a Portuguese divine, reasoned thus:—"The devil is constantly endeavoring to alienate the minds of heretics from the *mass*, therefore the mass is not an abomination, as Luther affirms, because the

devil does not hate abominations, but cherishes them." One might turn this argument to a little better purpose, thus : The devil is constantly leading papists to the sacrifice of the *mass* ; therefore, the mass is an abomination ; for whatever the devil cherishes, is an abomination. Which argument is best founded ? If any doubt shall remain in any mind whether the papists consider the mass as a real sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, rather than a representation, the following passage from their catechism will probably remove that doubt :—

" We therefore confess that the sacrifice of the mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the cross ; the victim is one and the same, Christ Jesus, who offered himself once only, a bloody sacrifice upon the cross. The bloody and unbloody victim is still one and the same, and the oblation of the cross is daily renewed in the eucharistic sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord. The priest is also the same, Christ our Lord ; the ministers who offer this sacrifice consecrate the holy mysteries, not in their own, but in the person of Christ. That the holy sacrifice of the mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, but also a sacrifice of propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the pastor will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a general council of the church."

The following prayer is presented at the oblation of the host (or sacred elements) :—" Accept, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this unspotted host, which I, thy unworthy servant, offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences, and negligences, and for all here present, as also for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may avail, both for me and them, to life everlasting. Amen." The following may be added from popish authorities :—" May the intercession, we beseech thee, O Lord, of bishop Peter thy apos-

tle, render the prayers and offerings of thy church acceptable to thee, that the mysteries we celebrate in his honor may obtain for us the pardon of our sins." The offerings here mentioned is Christ himself in the mass, and the prayer is that the Redeemer's sacrifice may avail to procure the pardon of sins through the intercessions of Peter. That is, Christ is offered, and becomes acceptable through Peter. Is not this making the servant greater than his Lord? Is it, in a word, any thing less than blasphemy?

We now proceed to view the ceremonies of the mass. They are thus described by a late writer :*—"The mass includes almost the whole of the Roman Catholic (popish) worship, its singular antic gestures, and an endless invention of ceremonies. Hence, going to mass includes nearly all a Roman's (papist's) religion and piety. It is the grand test of discipleship, and the evidence of wearing the mark of the beast in the hands and in the face. Now, were we to view the mass as a comparatively innocent innovation, a mere idle ceremony, we should not say much of it. But it is that which (popery) has substituted for **THE ONE ONLY AND PERFECT ATONEMENT OF CHRIST**. It is a horrible invention, and the substitute of our **BLESSED REDEEMER'S PERFECT RIGHTE-
OUSNESS**. It takes the entire place of **THE ONE ONLY AND BLESSED SAVIOUR**. And it excludes his "finished work of satisfaction on the cross," as completely as does the Koran of Mohammed exclude our Lord from the Mosque. And our proof of this strong assertion is this. The **MASS**, as (papists) solemnly profess it to be, is the offering up of a sacrifice of human flesh and human blood, for the sins of the quick and the dead, to pacify God. And this substitute of our Redeemer's atonement is not only a horrid anti-christian piece of idolatry and superstition, as we have in former letters shown, it is a show at which grave Christians cannot but smile; and

* Rev. Dr. Brownlee, N. Y.

thus, in the language of the motto, it exhibits 'fables worthy of laughter and of tears.' The MASS, as viewed by a spectator, may be said to consist of five divisions. The first we may call the robing of the bishop in his pontificals, which must afford a highly intellectual and spiritual feast of soul to the spectators, and—*worshippers*—shall I call them? The bishop enters the chapel in a woollen pontifical cope, which has its tail borne up by a chaplain; and going to the altar, he kneels down and says the '*Introibo*, I will go in,' &c. He then goes to the place where the *paramenta*, or robes and ornaments, are placed, and seats himself, surrounded by the proper quota of chaplains and deacons, one of whom acts as his prompter, to tell him what to say, and to point with his finger to the place in the book where he is to read; near them lie the various paraphernalia and sacred vessels. The attendants having duly put on their sanctified copes and surplices, the bishop rises, and turning towards the altar, says the Lord's prayer secretly; then, crossing himself from his brow to his breast, he says, 'God be my helper.' And while the choir responds, he turns towards the altar, between two bearers of wax candles, and says, 'The Lord be with you,' and other prayers. Then gravely laying aside his *pluvial* or cope, he takes the ornament called his planet, and approaches the altar, and sits down, while the psalm of the hours is being sung. During the singing, the *holy sandals* are brought out, one deacon lifts up the corner of his cope, while another takes off the holy man's shoes; then uttering certain prayers, he at last says, 'Shoe me with the sandals of gladness.' The dutiful deacon then puts on the consecrated sandals. And thus he answers his prayer. Then standing up, he says, 'O Lord, strip the old man off me.' The scutiferus, or shield-bearer, answers this prayer by stripping him of his flowing cope. Then looking at his hands, he says, 'O Lord, give virtue to my hands.' This grace is answered by another, bringing a

basin of water to wash his hands while he sits. The towel and basin are held by the most honorable and exalted layman, who, throwing himself on his knees, and pouring out a little water into the basin, sips and tastes it. Meanwhile, another of the ghostly menials is taking the consecrated rings off the bishop's fingers; and then the distinguished layman, rendered immortal by this honor allowed him, with the aid of a deacon, washes the holy bishop's hands, and dries them, and then carries back the basin and towel to the *credentia*. The bishop's feet being shod with the gospel preparation by putting on sandals, and the old man being put off him by pulling off his old woollen cope, and having washed his hands in virtue and innocence by getting them washed in water, he approaches the robes and says, 'O Lord, put on me the helmet of salvation.' At this signal the paramenta, or robes and ornaments, are all brought forward with sanctimonious grimace—fifteen in number. The bishop approaches, bows, and kisses five of them, viz., the *amictus*, the *pectoral*, the *cross*, the *stole*, and the *pall*. All these the deacons receive from the chaplains, one by one, and put upon the bishop. And first, with holy solemnity, they take the *amictus*, and having all kissed it, they put it over the bishop's head, and fix it on him. His head being thus armed with the *shield of salvation*, he stands up and says, 'O Lord, clothe me in white.' Upon this they put on the white surplice. Then he utters another prayer, while all the people look on with wonderful edification and blessed instruction, saying, 'O Lord, gird me with the girdle of faith.' On this, in answer to his humble and devout prayer, the ghostly menials take his girdle, and place it round his holy corporation, and buckle it in front. Then addressing the cross, the bishop thus prays, 'Deign, O Lord, to fortify me.' On this, the deacon, in his sacred functions, takes the cross, and holding it up to the bishop to be kissed, hangs it round his neck, so as to make it rest upon his pure breast. Next,

the bishop, in his very holy devotions, says to the stole, 'O Lord, give me the robe of immortality.' The deacon, whose office it is to answer this solemn prayer, now puts on the robe, nicely adjusting it, as a mantua-maker's maid would do, on his sacred body. Next, the saintly man prays, as he looks on the *tunicella*, or little coat, 'Put me in the coat of jucundity, and clothe me, O Lord, with the garment of joy.' Here they put it on him, fitting it, with mantua-maker like exactness, to his holy neck and holy hands. He next prays thus, 'O Lord, clothe me with the garment of salvation.' Here they put on him the Dalmatick, or Episcopal vestment, with tasteful exactness. The holy man next fixes his devout eyes on the gloves, and prays, 'Clothe my hands, O Lord, with the purity of the new man.' On this, the deacon, whose office it is to answer all these devout prayers, first kisses his right hand, and then puts a glove on it; then kisses the left, and puts a glove on it; and so clothes his hands with heavenly purity. This being over, the bishop prays another new prayer, saying, 'O Lord, thy yoke is easy.' On this, the spiritual menials, who are illuminating the congregation by this display, take the bishop's ornament called the *planet*, and bring it back so as to give his arms full exercise. The pall is next brought; the deacon takes a hold of it by the cross on the right side, and the subdeacon, by the cross on the left side, and hold forth the cross in the middle, that the bishop may kiss it. Then they put it round his neck, making that part of it on the left shoulder to lie double, and the whole is so tastefully and so taylor-like put round his neck, that his arms are not hindered. Then comes the putting on of the three thorns with their jewels. This, none but the sanctified and initiated can well describe. The first thorn goes into the breast of the pall, the second into the cross on the left shoulder, and the third into the cross behind. And these thorns, by the orthodox dressing, must not go quite through the cross!

It is a great thing to be orthodox here. After this, the good bishop, speaking to the mitre, says, by the way of prayer, 'Put on me, O Lord, the mitre, and the helmet of salvation.' Here he sits down, and the dutiful, busy deacon, devoutly puts the mitre on the bishop's head, the sub-deacon as devoutly holding up the ribbons that hang from it. The bishop sitting, then prays, 'Decorate with virtue, O Lord, the fingers of my hand and body.' Here the deacons, in consummating his devout prayer, put the rings on his fingers. Next the gremial, a rich piece of silk to be held by two priests between the bishop and the people when he says mass, is laid on his lap. This done, he prays to the *manipulum*. Then the cloth, called by this name, is laid across his arm.

"At this stage of the religious manœuvre, the incense is prepared in the proper vessel, with about one dozen gesticulations and contortions. Then, with a nicely arranged procession, the bishop comes to the steps of the altar and makes a full halt. Here the deacon takes off his mitre, and combs and smooths down his hair. Then follows the *confession* of each of this holy confraternity. The bishop, bowing reverentially to the altar, begins the confession of his sins. The deacon, kissing the bishop's left hand, goes up to the altar with the *manipulum*, and the gospel open in his right hand. The bishop next, with suitable prayers, goes up to the altar and kisses it with deep solemnity, and also the book of the gospels. Having next approached the *horn of the epistle*, he takes the incense pot, puts incense in it, and causes the cloud of smoke to cover the altar. This holy and edifying service is done thus. Having adored with profound reverence the image on the cross, he whirls the pot of incense three times round it, then he whirls the pot twice round the image and sacred relics on the right, and then around those on the left as often. Next he gives three holy swingings of the pot round the image and relics near the *corner of the epistle*; and as many he gives to

the corner of the gospel. He then delivers the pot to the deacon, who swings it round the bishop himself, and smokes him effectually. After a number of other edifying gestures and motions, the bishop is helped up by the arms, as if he were suddenly become paralytic, and being on his legs, he as suddenly gets whole, and standing sturdily on his legs, he says, 'Glory to God,' taking care to join his hands on his breast at the word God. While the choir sings a hymn, he has his mitre and gremial brought to him; they are again taken off him, as the hymn ends. He is again helped on his legs by the sturdy deacons, and he cries out to the people, '*peace be unto you,*' and he keeps his hands before his breast until the edified and devout audience reply, '*and with thy Spirit.*' He then says let us pray; and then goes on with his prayer in Latin, to console and edify those who do not understand one word of what is mumbled by him. After an incredible number of similar gestures, and the burning of incense, and kissing of the bishop's hands, and bowing, and reading what they call the gospel, and after the bishop has been again perfumed with incense smoke, and has stood up without mitre and gremial, he sits down to listen to a sermon. The preacher comes up, and on his knees adores the bishop, kisses his hand, and asks his blessing. This he freely gives by making the sign of the cross over him. That finished, with much gesture and bowing the preacher gives the bishop his absolution.

“*Second.* The bishop or priest sings five psalms, then uncovers, combs down his hair, and washes his hands. Next comes the sprinkling of holy water, and singing of the introitus, as the bishop approaches the altar. After a great many gestures again adroitly performed, there is much chanting. A linen cloth, full of pictures, is carried as a canopy over the bishop, by four sturdy ecclesiastics. Here again follow incense and chanting. There is the *gradual* and the *hallelujah*, and the *tractus*, so called

from the long drawling tone and nasal twanging of the priests, affecting much sorrow as they sing it.

“ *The third part*, is the consecration, more properly so called. The gestures, and particularly the bowings and adoration here, are not easily recounted. The sub-deacon puts on a long veil; takes the patine, with two choice hosts, or wafers, and the chalice, and covering them with the veil, goes up with them to the altar, following the bishop. Another brings the wine and water. The bishop now puts on his episcopal ring and mitre, and comes to the altar. At the altar his mitre is taken off and he adores with lowly bowing to the altar. The deacon now takes one of the hosts, and touching the patine and chalice with it, inside and outside, makes the sub-deacon taste of it. The other host he offers to the bishop, who takes it with both hands, and holding it up before his breast, repeats the prayer, ‘ O Lord accept it,’ &c. This is called the *offertory*, from its being offered to God, and from the priest’s making an offering of gifts to the priests. The priest, before he offers the host, washes his hands a second time. In the interim the deacon throws over the altar a clean linen cloth called a *corporale* or *palla*, because they say it covers Christ’s body. The chalice is also covered with another *palla*. The deacon having presented the *patina*, with the host upon it, to the bishop, also presents the chalice, in which the priest mixes wine and water and consecrates it. In the consecration the water only is blessed by the priest when mixed, not the wine, because the wine they say represents Christ, who needs no blessing. The host is placed on the altar, between the people and the priest, to intimate that Christ is mediator between God, who, they say, is represented by the priest, and the people, which the water in the chalice, as they imagine, represents. The priest again perfumes the altar and sacrifice three times in the manner of a cross, bows himself, and kisses the altar, and repeats very softly the prayer which they

call *secreta*. Though this prayer is said in silence, yet the conclusion of it is uttered in a loud voice, *per omnia secula seculorum*. Then follows what they call *prefatio*, which begins with thanksgiving, and ends with the confession of God's majesty. The minds of the people are prepared with these words, '*Lift up your hearts.*' The answer to which is, '*We lift them up unto the Lord.*' Then is sung the hymn, '*Holy, holy, holy, Lord God, &c. Heaven and earth is full of thy glory.*' Then follows the hymn *hosanna*, and the canon, which is also called *actio*, because it is a giving of thanks, which is uttered with a loud voice. The canon, besides thanksgiving, consists of various prayers for the pope, cardinals, bishops, kings, all orthodox Christians, gentiles, and Jews. Those also are particularly remembered for whom the sacrifice is to be offered, and their names rehearsed. Prayer is also made for those that be present at the mass, and for the bishop himself. Then mention is made of the virgin, the apostles, the evangelists and martyrs, and many crossings follows then the solemnity of the consecration of the host, by pronouncing aloud these words, '*Hoc est corpus meum.*' To this the people answer, '*amen.*' The priest now falls down on his knees before the consecrated host, and worships it, offers prayers to it, and rising up he elevates it that it may be worshipped by the people. Then, after seven several crossings of the host and chalice, this part of the mass is concluded with prayers for the dead, and the people's offerings of money to the priest, as a reward for praying in behalf of their dead friends, for their deliverance out of purgatory.

"The *fourth* part of the mass begins with the *pater noster*, and some other prayers. The sub-deacon delivers the patina covered to the deacon, who uncovers it, and delivers it to the priest, and kisses his right hand. The priest kisses the patina; breaks the host over the chalice, and puts a piece of it in the wine, to show that Christ's

Basil? Then the other must have been fallible. But it was a general council; and if one general council could err, who knows but others may? In a word, these historical facts demolish absolutely and forever the pretence to infallibility, either in popes or councils.

The above mentioned events awakened again the spirit of schism, which had been apparently allayed with so much toil at Constance. In the year 1458, the bishop of Siena ascended the papal throne, under the popish title of Pius II. When a bishop, by the name of Æneas Sylvius, he had strenuously maintained the rights of councils against the pope, and boldly defended the council of Basil against Eugene IV. But when made pope, he apostatized from himself, and denied all that he had previously written in behalf of councils. He severely prohibited all appeals to councils, and decreed that pope Pius II. was to be heard and obeyed, while Æneas Sylvius was to be condemned.

A Spaniard, whose name was Roderick Borgia, ascended the throne of popery, under the title of Alexander VI. His predecessors, some of them, had been men of moderation, and considerable worth. Especially was this true of Nicolas V., who was a man of learning, and a patron of learned men, under whom the schism of the church was healed. But Alexander VI. was called the Nero among the popes. For though they were all, with very few exceptions, flagitious men, yet this pope was able, by his extraordinary villanies and debaucheries, to gain a pre-eminence even among such men. He was a monster of iniquity in every sense. He died by poison which he had prepared for others. Such was popery in this century. And yet papists, to be consistent with their principles, must ascribe holiness and infallibility to every wicked wretch, who by any means can gain the chair of popedom.

The monastic orders followed the prevailing steps of the popes. They were mostly herds of ignorant, lazy,

dishonest, and debauched people. The monks that held property in their own name, such as the Benedictines and the Augustinians, were given to sensual gratifications. By the licentiousness of their lives, and disregard of their rules, they became extremely odious. The pauper or mendicant monks, (i. e. the Dominicans and Franciscans,) offended as much by their arrogance, their quarrelsome temper, their invasion of the rights of others, their propagation of superstition, and their vain and futile disputes, as the opulent monks did by their luxury, their laziness, and their hatred of learning. Thus the religion of the papal dominion contained nothing which could recommend it to the esteem of a pious mind. The worship of God consisted in empty ceremonies, which were puerile and silly. The sermons were filled with fiction. If a man revered the clergy as they were, and especially the pope; if he secured the favor of saints by frequent offerings to them, or what was the same thing, to their temples and priests; and if he had money enough to purchase the pardon of his sins from the papal venders, he was accounted a well informed, pious Christian. If he went beyond this, and inflicted some external severities upon his body, he was then eminent for piety, and sure of adoration. Very few had any just views of true religion, or the conformity of the heart to the laws of Christ; and these few, if they were known, with difficulty escaped with their lives. Under this miserable state of things did the Christian world groan. It was the galling yoke of Satan, through the instrumentality of popery. For popery, let it be remembered, had performed its perfect work for near eight centuries. Though occasionally disquieted with schisms and witnesses for the truth, yet genuine popery had maintained the ascendancy, and had subjugated the human mind, as well as the physical powers, to its control. To popery, then, belongs all the credit of that miserable, dark, degraded, and polluted state of Christendom, at the close of the fifteenth century.

wine is superfluous. But why the priests use this superfluity, when they as really as the people take the body of Christ, blood and all, in the wafer, they do not inform. But so much as this is certain, that in administering to the people only the bread, they do not administer the Lord's supper, which according to his appointment, was to consist of bread and wine. The consequence is, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper is never celebrated in the popish church. What they have substituted in the place of it is a mere human device, made up of fiction and superstition. Let papists well consider this. For the truth of it is manifest on two grounds. 1. They pervert the ordinance in its nature and design. That which was designed to be a mere ordinance of commemoration pointing to Christ, the only real sacrifice for sin, and calling him to remembrance in that view, they have transmitted into a substitute for Christ, a real propitiatory sacrifice. 2. They have changed the appointment of Christ by omitting an essential part of the ordinance. There is then in the popish church no sacrament of the Lord's supper.

From the view which papists take of the consecrated host, that it is the real body of Christ, and that those who swallow the host into their stomachs have received Christ, and have Christ in them, are united to Christ, &c., it becomes them, as will be seen, to be very careful of the host. The communicant must not spit soon after taking it, lest he should eject something of Christ with his saliva. Great care also must be taken that the consecrated host be not profaned by coming within the reach of any animal. A catastrophe of this kind once occurred at a Dominican's convent. A lady who had a lap-dog, which she always carried along with her, went to receive the sacrament with the dog under her arm; and the dog looking up and beginning to bark, when the friar went to put the wafer into the lady's mouth, he let the wafer fall, which happened to drop into the dog's

mouth. Both the friar and the lady were in deep amazement and confusion, and knew not what to do; so they went for the reverend father prior, who did resolve this nice point upon the spot, and ordered to call two friars and the clerk, and bring the cross and two candlesticks with lighted candles, and to carry the dog in form of procession into the vestry, and to keep the poor creature there with illumination, as if he were the host itself, till the digestion of the wafer was over, and then to kill the dog and throw him into the drain. Another friar said it was better to open the dog immediately and extract the fragments of the host; and a third was of opinion that the said dog should be burned and all there was in him, upon the spot. The lady who loved dearly her little cupid, entreated the father prior to save the dog's life if possible, and she would give any thing to make amends. Then the prior and friars retired to consult upon the case, and it was resolved, 1. That the dog should be called for the future, the sacrament's dog. 2. If the dog should happen to die, the lady was to give it burial in consecrated ground. 3. The lady must take care not to let the dog play with other dogs. 4. She must give a silver dog, which should be placed upon the tabernacle where the hosts were kept. 5. She must pay twenty pistoles to the convent. Every article was performed accordingly, and the dog was kept with a great deal of care and veneration. The case was printed, and so came to the ears of the inquisitors, and Don Pedro Guenero, first inquisitor, thinking the thing very scandalous, sent for the poor dog, and kept him in the inquisition to the great grief of his mistress. What became of the dog we are not informed."

The following rules and regulations respecting the administration and reception of the ordinance, arise from the same error of transubstantiation.

"If the celebrator after the consecration of the host, observe that it is corrupted or is not of wheat, he must

still take another and swallow it, after which, he must swallow the first, or give it to another to be preserved with great care and reverence." "If any remains of meat sticking in the mouth, be swallowed with the host, they will not vitiate the act of communicating, provided, they be swallowed not as meat but as spittle. The same is said, if, in washing our mouth a drop of water is swallowed, provided it be against our will." "If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament. For example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins, if there be no wax candles; if it be not celebrated between day break and noon; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds; or if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes, if these robes and napkins be not blessed by a bishop; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve, a woman for example; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold or silver or pewter; if the vestment be not of clean linen, adorned with silk in the middle and blessed by a bishop; if the priest celebrate with his head covered; if there be no missal present though he have it by heart." "If a gnat or spider fall into the cup after consecration, the priest must swallow it, if he can, otherwise let him take it out, wash it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings on holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, remain till it be dry, then be burned and the ashes thrown on holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted."

"If the blood, (i. e. the wine in the cup after consecration) freeze in winter, put warm clothes about the cup, if that be not sufficient, put the cup into boiling water. If any of Christ's blood, (i. e. the wine,) fall upon the ground by negligence; it must be licked up with the tongue, and the place scraped, the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground." "If a priest

vomit the eucharist and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the species do not appear entire, the vomit must be burnt and the ashes thrown upon holy ground." Such regulations as these speak for themselves. Miraculous powers have also been ascribed to the consecrated host, as the following "collection of miracles of the consecrated wafer, grounded upon the respects and acknowledgments which beasts, birds, and insects, on several occasions have rendered to the holy wafer." Petrus Cheniac reports, that "a certain peasant of Auvergne, a province in France, perceiving that his bees were likely to die, to prevent this misfortune, was advised, after he had received the communion, to keep the host and to blow it into one of his hives; and on a sudden all the bees came forth out of their hives, and ranking themselves in good order, lifted the host up from the ground, and carrying it upon their wings, placed it among the combs. After this the man went about his business; and at his return found that this advice had succeeded contrary to his expectation, for all his bees were dead. Nay when he lifted up the hive he saw that the host was turned into a fair child among the honey combs, and being much astonished at this change, and seeing that this infant seemed to be dead, he took it in his hands intending to bury it privately in the church; but when he came to do it, he found nothing in his hands, the infant having vanished away. This thing happened in the county of Clermont, which for this irreverence was a while after chastized with divers calamities, which so dispeopled those parts that they become like a wilderness. From this it appears that the bees honor the holy host divers ways, by lifting it from the earth and carrying it into the hive as it were in procession." Cantiprat writeth "that a certain poor man going to visit his bees perceived them to make a sweet harmony, he stood ravished a while with it, not

knowing what it meant. The night following as he went about some business, casting his eyes towards his bees he perceived them to rejoice and sport themselves, making an admirable melody. First he informed his curate of it, and afterwards broke up his hive, where he found a box made of wax, but of most admirable whiteness, that it looked like ivory, and within it the holy sacrament adored by the bees, who ranged themselves in two choirs and sang the praises of their creator. The bishop ordered a procession to carry back the holy host of the church, and in that place was erected a sumptuous chapel, which became a place of refuge for the sick and the afflicted. When no body knew whence and by whom that host had been brought there, two thieves of their own accord, discovered themselves, and confessed that; having stolen a box they had thrown the host against the hives. By which miracle we see that the bees adore the holy host, and sing the divine praises, dividing themselves into two choirs." Caesarius relates "that an old and simple priest of the parish of St. Colen, carrying the holy sacrament out of the town to a sick person, and going up a very rough hill, met some loaded asses descending towards the town, the way being very narrow, and the priest not being able to get past them, and fearing to be overturned by those beasts he spoke to them according to his simplicity in this manner. 'My asses! what do you mean? do you not see him whom I carry? Go aside and stop to make room for your Creator, which I command you in his name.' O admirable obedience! those asses which used not to stir but when they were beaten, presently went to one side where the hill was more steep, without apprehending any danger of letting fall their load. The town of Colen remembers this wonder to this day and mentioneth it with astonishment." But enough of this stupid mummery with which several pages might be filled. The asses and the papists are appropriate rivals for the honor of such a work of piety.

But the worst of all respecting the mass is the practice of selling it in behalf of the dead. This piece of abominable superstition and impiety is one principal source of the revenues of the popish priests. It is said very justly, that the revenue arising from the mass alone enables the church to keep more priests in pay than any prince in Christendom can keep soldiers. In Ireland, the sums which are raised by popish priests from the poor people by means of the mass alone are beyond all calculation. The following copies of receipts for masses said for the dead, which are from an authentic source may serve as specimens of this traffic.—“October 17, 1798. An account of the masses said for the soul of the late Mrs. Monaghan, viz.

St. James' chapel	50 masses.	£2 14 2
Denmark-st. chapel	20 do.	1 1 8
Stephen-st. chapel	20 do.	1 1 8
Ash-st. chapel	20 do.	1 1 8
total,		110 masses.
		£5 19 2

Received the above in full, M. M'GUIRE.

Dublin, July 11, 1809. Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds three shillings and four pence, for twenty masses offered up by the Rev. gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mr. Timothy Mahon.

JAS. JOS. CALLAN.

12th October, 1809. Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds three and four pence, for twenty masses, said by the Rev. gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the soul of Mrs. Mary Monaghan.

JAS. JOS. CALLAN.

Dublin, Oct. 31. Received from Mrs. Mahon, three pounds eight and three pence, for sixty masses offered up in St. James' chapel for the repose of the soul of Mrs. Monaghan.

JAS. JOS. CALLAN.

These documents will show the manner in which our poor deluded fellow men in Ireland are spoiled of their money by their professed spiritual guides. In popery

there is no free gift, every thing has its price in pounds, shillings and pence, or what is equivalent. It seems that money is demanded for procuring, by a given number of masses, repose to the souls of certain persons who are dead. Did they die in the faith of Jesus? Then their souls are at rest in heaven, and need not the money of their friends, or the masses of popish priests. Did they die in impenitence and unbelief, then it is not in the power of men or angels, much less of all the priests of popery, to procure by any means a moment's rest for them. To take money then for the purpose proposed is only another way of picking pockets.

In popish countries, such as Spain, when a person is dangerously ill, the priests and friars beset the house like so many harpies, waiting till they know the event, and if the person die they besiege the chief of the family with petitions for the job of saying masses for the dead. If the family be rich, the custom is to distribute a thousand or more masses among the convents and parishes, to be said on the day of burial. "When the Marquis of St. Martin died," says Mr. Gavin, in his *Master Key*, "his lady distributed an hundred thousand masses; for which she paid five thousand pounds sterling, besides a thousand masses which she settled upon all the convents and parish churches, to be said every year forever, which amounts to a thousand pistoles a year." But not satisfied with cheating the people out of their money, the priests also cheat them out of the masses which they engage, and for which they are paid. For it often happens that they receive more money for masses in a day than they can say in a month. But in this case they have a resort in a special licence of the pope, which the priests keep a secret among themselves. Mr. Gavin, who was once a popish priest, says it was a thing secretly understood among his brethren, that they had authority from the pope to make one mass serve for a hundred. This was called *centenaria mēsse*, or the hundred fold mass, for the

mass which was said in the place of an hundred, was understood to have as much efficacy as another mass said an hundred times. And truly, for one cypher has as much value as an hundred. But was it so understood by the people who paid their money? Not at all. They were made to believe that the efficacy of masses depended on their number and accumulation. Here then was a double fraud. We are farther informed by the author of the "*Master Key*," that the dealers in masses kept a kind of mass bank, accumulated before hand, so that they could draw upon it whenever occasion required. If the friends of a deceased person went to a father prior for a thousand masses and paid the money, he gave them a draft upon the bank, purporting that the masses had been said already and only need to be transferred to individual benefit.

6. PURGATORY.

Purgatory, according to the popish cardinal Bellarmine, is, "that place, in which after death, the souls of those persons are purified, who were not fully cleansed on earth, in order that they may be prepared for heaven, wherein nothing shall enter that defileth." In attempting to prove there is such a place, he mainly relies on a passage in the Apocrypha, which it is not necessary now to consider, because if the passage directly asserted the doctrine it would have no weight as authority.

In the following decree, the council of Trent sanctioned the doctrine of purgatory, and prescribed the duties which it involves. "Since the catholic church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, through the sacred writings, and the ancient traditions of the fathers, hath taught in holy councils, and lastly in this ecumenical council, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the mass, this holy council commands all bishops diligently to endeavor that the wholesome doctrine of purgatory, deli-

vered to us by venerable fathers and holy councils, be believed and held by Christ's faithful, and every where taught and believed. Let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the living faithful, viz. masses, prayers, alms and other works of piety, which the faithful have been accustomed to perform for departed believers be piously and religiously rendered according to the institutes of the church, and whatever services are due to the dead through the endowments of deceased persons, or in any other way, let them not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully by the priests and ministers of the church, and all others to whom the duty belongs."

The locality of purgatory, according to Bellarmine, is near the centre of the earth, or, rather, 2550 miles below the inhabitants of the world, and 15.750 miles above hell. Every child, who has studied his geography, knows that the diameter of the globe, from surface to surface, is but 8,000 miles. But no matter; the pope must be believed by his followers, let science oppose ever so many obstacles. But will he be believed in such absurdities by people of information, who have the right, and will exercise it, to think for themselves? The papists suppose the internal regions of the earth to be divided into four separate departments. The first or lowest is hell, where the damned are placed. The second is purgatory. The third is the residence of the souls of infants who died without baptism, and who endure the eternal punishment of loss, but not of sense. The fourth is called limbo, and was the abode of the pious who departed this life before the birth of Christ, and were delivered by him when he descended into hell. This last, they suppose, is now empty, as purgatory will be at some future period. The punishment endured in purgatory is said to be that of fire. And all that can be known of it in the present state, the papists say, is, that the pains of purification are horribly severe, so that no sufferings ever endured in this world are to be compared with them. How long they

will continue is not said, but it is thought they will be very gradual, and that some will not be thoroughly cleansed till the day of judgment.

The object and use of this doctrine of purgatory is to obtain money. And the popish priests have found it a most profitable speculation. As was remarked under the head of masses, they have a larger revenue from selling masses for the dead, than princes have for the support of their kingdoms. The priests diligently inculcate the sentiment that sufferers in purgatory may receive powerful relief from their brethren on earth, and that the duration of their pains may be considerably shortened by masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, called the suffrages of the faithful; but above all, by masses offered in their behalf by the priests. A readier and more effectual method of filling the coffers of popery could not have been invented; and that they have been filled to overflowing by this means, is an historical fact that cannot be disputed. Great care is taken to bring the subject constantly before the people. In every mass there is a general commemoration of the departed. Prayers are prepared to be offered at the moment of death, and at stated intervals after it, and at the anniversary returns of the day on which the event occurred. A solemn office for the dead forms part of the service of the church, and is usually recited once a month, and in lent once a week. On all-souls' day, extraordinary masses are celebrated for their relief. Arrangements may be made at any time with the priest, for the appropriation of his services to the relative or friend whose deliverance is the immediate object of concern. Besides which, for a small sum of money, a trifling penance, or some easy act of devotion, the zealous Catholic may always indulge his benevolent feelings, and contribute largely to the comfort of the whole body of sufferers in that dark and melancholy abode. But money is the essential requisite in all these operations; so that it is a

maxim in the history of popery, "No penny, no pater-noster." That is to say, no pay, no prayer. Philip V. ordered, by his will, all the priests of the place where he should die, to say mass the same day for the repose of his soul; besides which, they were to celebrate during three days, before privileged altars, as many masses as possible; and that he might not fail in his purpose, he further commanded an hundred thousand masses to be said on his behalf; the surplus of as many as were necessary to conduct him to heaven, to be reversible to poor solitary souls, concerning whom no person bestowed a thought. On the day of decease or burial, the following prayer is used:—"Have mercy, O Lord, we beseech thee, on the soul of thy servant N., for which we offer this victim of praise, humbly beseeching thy majesty, that by this propitiatory sacrifice, he or she may arrive at eternal rest. Grant, we beseech thee, O Almighty God, that the soul of thy servant, which this day hath departed this life, being purified and freed from sin by this sacrifice, may obtain both forgiveness and eternal rest." On the *third, seventh, or thirtieth* day after decease, the following form is used:—"Admit, we beseech thee, O Lord, the soul of thy servant N., the *third, seventh, or thirtieth* day of whose decease we commemorate, into the fellowship of thy saints, and refresh it with the perpetual dew of thy mercy. Mercifully look down, O Lord, on the offerings we make for the soul of thy servant N., that, being purified by these heavenly mysteries, it may find rest in thy mercy. Receive, O Lord, our prayers on behalf of thy servant N., that if any stain of the corruptions of this world stick to it, they may be washed away by thy forgiving mercy." In Italy and Spain, travellers are continually solicited for contributions towards the relief of the suffering souls in purgatory. The dependents on churches or convents are usually employed for this purpose. A man, bearing a large lantern, with a painted glass, representing two naked per-

sons enveloped in flames, entered the court, addressing every one of the company in these words:—" *The holy souls, brother, remember the holy souls.*" Few refuse the petitioner a copper coin, worth about the eighth part of a penny. This custom is universal in Spain. A man, whose chief employment is to be agent for the souls in purgatory in the evening, the only time when the invisible sufferers are begged for about the towns, parades the streets after sunset, with the lantern I have described, and never fails to visit the inns where the travellers, who generally entrust their safety from robbers to the holy souls, are always ready to make some pecuniary acknowledgment for past favors, or to engage their protection from future dangers."

"The pope has established eight or ten days in the year, in which every Spaniard, (for the grant is confined to Spain,) by kneeling at five different altars, and there praying for the extirpation of heresy, is entitled to send a species of *habeas animan* to any of his friends in purgatory. The name of the person, whose liberation is intended, should, for fear of mistake, be mentioned in the prayers; but, lest the order of release should find him already free, or perhaps within those gates to which no pope had ever ventured to apply his keys, we are taught to endorse the spiritual bill with other names, addressing it finally to the most worthy and most disconsolate. These privileged days are announced to the public by a printed notice placed over the basin of holy water, which stands near every church door. The words written on the tablet are plain and peremptory:—" *This is a soul-drawing day.*" A certain traveller remarks concerning Rome, "You may buy as many masses as will free your souls from purgatory for 29,000 years, at the church of St. John Lateran, on the festival of that saint, at Santa Bibiana, on all-souls' day, for 7,000 years; at a church near the Basilica of St. Paul, and at another on the Quirinal hill, for 10,000; and for 3,000 years, at a very rea-

sonable rate. But it is in vain to particularize, for the greater part of the principal churches in Rome and the neighborhood, are spiritual shops for the sale of the same commodity." Spain is peculiarly favored in the variety of her privileges. Among the rest is the bull called the compounding bull, by possessing which, and paying a certain sum of money at the discretion of any priest authorized to hear confessions, any property which has been obtained by robbery or extortion, and cannot be traced to its right owner, may be kept. This composition with the pope is made by depositing the sum appointed by the confessor in an iron chest, fixed at the outside of the doors of churches—a very comfortable resort for the consciences of speculators and extortioners, two very numerous classes in Spain. Another bull is called the defunct bull, because, as is supposed, the name of any dead person being entered on the bull, a plenary indulgence is, by this means, believed to be conveyed to his soul, if suffering in purgatory.

The arts and tricks which the popish priests practice upon their deluded followers, to extort from them their money, and to confirm them in belief of the efficacy of masses to deliver from purgatory, are almost innumerable. A few examples must suffice.

"A gentleman of Dublin called on a tenant for rent. The poor woman had been always punctual heretofore, she apologized for not being so now, by telling her landlord, that the priest came to her lately and asked her 'If she had heard from her husband?' she answered, 'how could she as he was dead?' 'O yes,' said he, 'but did you not hear that a great crowd was lately passing over the bridge from purgatory to heaven, that it broke down from the weight, that many were left on the wrong side, and amongst the rest your husband, that their lamentations had come to the priests to get the bridge repaired!' Therefore, he called upon her, who was so much interested, for a good subscription, as the job would be very

expensive." The following is a copy of the constitution of a purgatorian society instituted in Dublin, July 1, 1813, for the purpose of raising money to deliver souls from purgatory.

(COPY.) "*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

"It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins." *Maccabees*, XII. 46.

"The members who compose the society of the office for the dead, commenced on the above day at the said place, adopting the spirit and meaning of the above sacred text, and wishing, in conformity with the divine precepts of the holy Catholic church, to extend their charitable views beyond the grave, by relieving, as far as in them lies, the suffering souls in purgatory, and inviting all tender hearted catholics, who have a feeling sensibility of the duty they owe their departed parents, relations, and friends, who probably may stand more in need of their commiseration at present than at any period of their lifetime, to assist in the charitable and pious purpose of shortening the duration of their sufferings by the most easy means imaginable, have agreed to and adopted the following rules.

"Rule 1. That the affairs of this institution shall be regulated by the superior, rectors, and six of the members who compose the office for the dead, who shall attend on every Wednesday night at half past eight o'clock, through the year, at the above mentioned place, (i. e. St. James's chapel,) or any other place which may be hereafter appointed, and there, with attention and devotion recite the office for the dead, agreeable to the intention that shall then be mentioned.

"Rule 2. That every well disposed catholic, wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in purgatory, shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses to be offered up for

the repose of the souls of deceased parents, relations, and friends, and of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general.

“ Rule 3. That on the first Monday of every month, a mass shall be offered up in the parish chapel of St. James, at ten o'clock, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the subscribers of this society.

“ Rule 4. That the superior, rectors, and council shall continue in office for six calendar months, at the expiration of which time, candidates shall be nominated by the persons in office, who shall give the notice to the whole body of members who compose the office for the dead, that they may punctually attend on the first Wednesday night in July, at half-past eight o'clock, and on the first Wednesday night in January, for the purpose of electing a superior, rectors, and council, to serve the ensuing months, and so in succession.

“ Rule 5. That each subscriber on entering this society, do purchase a copy of these rules, in order to defray the expenses, incurred by printing and other contingences, and that the money arising from the weekly subscriptions shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who shall be required to give receipts for what they are paid.

“ Rule 6. That the spiritual benefits of this institution shall be conferred in the following manner, viz.—Each subscriber shall be entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months after their decease; also the benefit of masses, which shall be procured to be offered by the money arising from subscriptions, and which shall be extended to their parents, relations, and friends, in the following order. That is to say, their fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, and if married, husbands, wives and children, if they have any departed who lived to maturity.

“ Rule 7. That every member of the office for the dead,

who serves the society in the capacity of superior, shall at the time of his death be entitled to three masses, to be offered for the repose of his soul; and also every member who serves the office of rector, shall be entitled to the benefit of two masses, and every subscriber, without distinction, shall be entitled to the benefit of one mass each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a natural death, be six months a subscriber to the institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure. That care shall be taken by the surviving superior and rectors, that such soul masses are punctually obtained agreeably to the interest and meaning of this institution.

“Rule 8. That the superior, rectors, and council be empowered to make, as occasion shall require, such by-laws as they shall think expedient, provided they do not interfere with the spirit of these rules, said by-laws are to be laid before the body at large for their approbation, and that four shall form a quorum on the council.

“Rule 9. That the superior shall, on every all-souls’ day, advance to the parish priest of James Street chapel, whatever sum is necessary for obtaining an insertion into the mortality list of the altar, the names of the parents, relations and friends, of all the subscribers to this institution, to be recommended to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year.

“Subscriptions received, and subscribers registered, at the chapel every Wednesday evening, from seven o’clock till nine, and in the school room adjoining the chapel on the first Sunday of February, May, August and November, being quarterly days, from ten o’clock, until one.

“The books to be open for the inspection of subscribers. *Price three pence.* J. Coyne Printer, 74 Cook Street.”

Other societies of a similar character and object, have been established in other places. But this will suffice as a specimen. What we may ask is the object of these institutions? The answer is, to relieve suffering souls from purgatory by *the easiest means imaginable.* And

what are these means? The payment of a penny a week as the easiest way to raise money to pay for masses. And who receives the money? The priests, even the most necessitated. But cannot the priests, who have other means of support in abundance, say masses without pay? No, the suffering souls of their dear flocks may lie there for ages and suffer intensely, when they could relieve them by a few words of their lips, and yet they will not do it without money! What then becomes of those who have no money? Why they are prayed for in the lump at the conclusion. But will this praying for the aggregate of the poor relieve their souls without money, if so, why not the rich, why not all? The answer must be, the rich have money, and the priests love it better than their souls, and therefore must have it.

But what is still more remarkable concerning this system of swindling, is that even purgatory itself is graduated, so as to accommodate the different characters that go thither according to their rank, but more especially according to their purses, or those of their friends. According to the idle dreams of popery, there are eight different apartments in purgatory, of different degrees of intensity of heat.—One for kings, one for princes, one for grandees, one for noblemen, one for merchants and tradesmen, one for ladies of quality, one for gentlemen's and tradesmen's wives, and one for poor common people. The last contains the lowest degree of suffering, and therefore is not of much importance. But the degree of suffering rises as the scale of apartments rises, and the price of deliverance is in proportion to the rank of the sufferer and the apartment he occupies, in other words, in proportion to his supposed ability to pay. And what is amazingly accommodating to the feelings of surviving friends, they can, by paying the stipulated price, remove the soul of a departed friend from a lower apartment to a higher, and thus place it in more respectable company, though in greater suffering.

Thus a tradesman, by paying the fee, may have the soul of his departed wife prayed into the company of ladies of quality. And who would grudge a little money, or shrink from suffering to gain such an object? "I knew," says a late writer, "a shoemaker's wife, very ignorant, proud, and full of punctilios of honor, who went to a Franciscan friar, and told him she wished to know whether the soul of her father was in purgatory or not, and in what apartment? The friar asked how many masses she could spare for it? She said two. The friar answered, your father's soul is among the beggars. Upon hearing this, the poor woman began to cry, and desired the friar to put him, if possible, in the fourth apartment, and she would pay him for it. The *quantum* being settled, the friar did promise to put him there the next day. So the poor woman ever since gives out, that her father was a rich merchant, for it was revealed to her that his soul was among the merchants in purgatory." Now what can we say, but that the pope is the Pluto, or governor of this subterranean kingdom, the priests and friars are the quarter masters, who distribute the souls according to their own fancy, and have power to sell the different apartments, like so many stalls, in the market; to put, for money enough, the soul of a cobbler into the apartment of a king, and a washerwoman into that of her mistress.

When people have paid so much money for the relief of the souls of their friends in purgatory, it is natural for them to wish to know whether it produces any effect. To gratify this curiosity, the papist priests have a device, which is almost too ridiculous for sober narration, and yet, which fully satisfies the feelings of their ignorant, deluded followers. When inquiries of the above description are made, the priests bring the inquirers to the tabernacle of the altar, and cause them to look in, when they are told, that if they see the figure of a mouse within the tabernacle, it is the soul still in purgatory, and

must have more masses ; but if they see no such figure, then the soul is in heaven. When, therefore, the mass is over, the inquirer is brought to a little door, which has a glass light, through which he looks. And, O pitiful ! he sees a mouse, which the friars keep for that purpose, and then he must give money for more masses, till the mouse disappears. Thus the priests have the means of extorting the last shilling from their dupes. Another account of a similar device is thus given by a late author :—“ About seventeen years ago, a lady now living in Edinburgh, had occasion to be in Dublin, and through means of a gentleman from Scotland, was introduced to a popish chapel, on an occasion when a number of souls were to be translated out of purgatory. The place was very brilliantly lighted. The priest was seated on an eminence, with a table before him. The audience was in expectation, when a relation of each of the deceased persons whose souls were that night to be released, appeared ; and in passing before the priest, each laid an elegant well-filled purse on the table before him, who, after nodding satisfaction, most readily conveyed it to a receptacle, where it might be preserved till a fit opportunity of otherwise disposing of it. Having received his wages, the priest immediately began his operations, and soon intimated that the souls were translated, and would immediately make their appearance. Immediately a moveable part of the floor, unoccupied of course, opened, and there issued forth from it living creatures, as black as jet. When the little creatures began to move about, in order to prevent the deception from being detected, the lights were all extinguished, as if by magic. The lady had eyed the souls' representatives very narrowly, and had observed that there was one of them within her reach ; and with a degree of courage which would not have been exercised by every one in her circumstances, she seized and secured it. She took it home, and showed it to the gentleman who had introduced her to the chapel,

when it turned out to be a crab dressed in black velvet. I need scarcely add, that the lady was induced, by the entreaties of the gentleman, to destroy the animal, and maintain secrecy, at least in Ireland, as she valued her own life." The person who gave this information adds, "I have the story from a daughter of the lady who laid hold on the emancipated spirit, and I believe her entitled to the highest credit; otherwise, I would not have troubled you with the story."

The custom of soliciting contributions at funerals for the souls in purgatory, is also worthy of particular attention. Previous to the procession, mass is performed for the soul of the deceased; immediately after which, the priest takes measures to collect money from the persons assembled. The priest commences by saying, "Who gives for the soul of the faithful departed?" The persons nearest then throw in their offerings, and then others, as they can find occasion. The offerings are thrown into a metallic trencher placed on the coffin. When any one throws in a sixpence, the priest cries, "God bless you;" and when a shilling is given, he says, "God Almighty bless you," but takes no notice of coppers. As the sound of the coin in the trencher becomes less frequent, the priest becomes more vociferous. He cries aloud, "Who will give more for the soul of the faithful departed?" Some of those who had previously contributed make an addition, and others are provoked to follow the example; while the former, excited by the cries of the priest, give perhaps a third time. The priest still vociferates, "Will nobody give more for the soul of the faithful departed? oh! will no one give more?" until the clamor ceases to have effect. I hardly need add that the ceremony concludes by the priest's putting all the money in his pocket. This exhibition is by no means confined to the dwelling-houses of deceased persons. It is frequently repeated on the way to the place of interment. The object of this is to get more money from those who join the procession

after it leaves the house, the number of whom is much greater than that of those who assemble at the house; hence it is customary for the priest, who walks before the procession alone, with a white band on his hat, and a book in his hand, whenever he judges the assemblage to be at the highest point. A gentleman who has been in Ireland says:—"I was present at one of these public cantings in the neighborhood of Lurgan, in the county of Armagh, in the year 1802, when the coffin, having been taken from the hearse and laid upon the road, a few hundred yards before coming to the burial ground, the process which I have described took place, in presence of an immense multitude."

It will, perhaps, be asked by some, whence this doctrine of purgatory was derived. The answer is, surely not from the bible. For, though papists attempt to press some passages into the service, it is with such an ill grace, that to notice these lucubrations would be giving them too much importance. No person of the least sense, who gives any weight to scripture testimony, can fail to discover, from their own showing, that they are destitute of all foothold on the pages of inspiration. What they derive from apocryphal books they are welcome to, as it signifies nothing to the purpose. The true origin of this doctrine is unquestionably from the rites of heathenism. For, that the ancient heathen believed in such a state, and performed rites for the dead, to facilitate their progress after death to the fair Elysian fields, is undeniable. Virgil describes the rites of the funeral pile as requisite to the repose of the departed spirit; and thus he introduces the ghost of Palinurus as complaining of the neglect of his friends in this respect. It is related of Plato, that he divided departed souls into three states. Those who had purified themselves with philosophy, and excelled in morality of life, would enjoy eternal felicity in the islands of the blest, without labor or trouble. Others, having lived exceedingly wicked, and become incapable

of cure, he supposed, were at their death thrown headlong into hell, there to be tormented forever. But besides these, he supposed there was a middle sort, who, though they had sinned, had yet repented, and therefore seemed to be in a curable condition; these, he thought, went down likewise to hell, to be purified and absolved by grievous torments. But after that, he supposed they would be delivered again, and attain to distinguished honor and happiness. There is, therefore, no question whence the doctrine of purgatory originated. About the end of the sixth century, pope Gregory began to countenance the doctrine, and it gradually crept in among the other relics of ancient paganism, which corrupted the church. And from that time the dreams of superstition respecting the state of the dead began to prevail. The flames of *Ætna* and *Vesuvius* were supposed to have been kindled on purpose to torment departed souls. Some were seen, or supposed to be so, broiling on gridirons and spits; some burning in the fire; others shivering in water; and others smoking in the chimney. The very roads to purgatory were discovered; one in Sicily, another in *Pozzueto*, and a third in Ireland. One was found out by the help of an angel, and another by the aid of the devil. And yet it was a long time before this doctrine became fully established among papists. Even in the twelfth century it was questioned by some. But by degrees it has at last become an essential part of popery; and as such, it will now be left to the decision of an enlightened community.

Other doctrines of popery might be specified under this general head, such as justification by our own righteousness—extreme unction, celibacy of the clergy, &c. But the most important articles have been examined. And it is not necessary to view the minor points. Enough has been said to illustrate the spirit and genius of popery as to its theory or principles. It is now time

to turn our attention to its practice, which will be done in the following sections.

SECTION VII.

IDOLATRY OF POPERY.

HERE it may be proper in the first place to settle what is to be understood by idolatry. This point will be best settled by reference to the commands of the decalogue, which relate to this subject. These commands are two, viz., the first and second. The first prohibits the worship of rival deities under any form, or in any manner. No object of worship, besides the true and everlasting God was to be in any way allowed. The second command prohibits the worship of the true God by images or visible representations, or in any way which he has not prescribed. Idolatry then, according to the law of God, includes two branches, viz., the worship of rival deities, either supreme or subordinate, and the worship of one deity by visible representations. It is therefore utterly in vain to plead for the use of images, that they are not worshipped as God, or as containing a resident divinity, but as representatives of the invisible God. This is the very sense in which the second command forbids the use of images. And the reason is, that no proper visible representation of deity can be made. Every thing of this kind is false, and therefore instead of being a help to worship, it is a hindrance. All who worship God in this way worship him through a false medium, and therefore their views of God are false, their worship is false, and for this very reason forbidden. It may be added that all the idolatry of the pagan world originated in this improper use of images, and taking the liberty to multiply the objects of worship. The more

intelligent of the heathen, and especially in the early stages of paganism, will tell the same story. They say that they do not worship the idol as God, but in the first place as a representative of God, then as having a resident divinity in it, and lastly, when the course of degradation is finished, the image itself may be worshipped as God by the multitude. And it may be questioned very seriously, whether the body of papists understand the distinction which some make between allowable and idolatrous worship. Indeed it is very certain that many papists know nothing of God beyond what they see in the image. The papists will not clear themselves of idolatry by their subtle distinctions which have no practical influence. God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit.

The charge of idolatry lies against popery in two respects.

1. In multiplying the objects of worship in violation of the first command.
2. In worshipping God by means of images, in violation of the second command.

In respect to the worship of rival gods in violation of the first command, that paid to the virgin Mary, and to the saints, constitutes the substance. In whatever manner these objects are worshipped, whether by images, or direct prayer, it is all the same. Because, here the charge of idolatry is grounded not on the form but the object of worship. If then the image be considered a representative in this case, it represents what ought not to be worshipped.

The popish worship of the virgin Mary is **IDOLATRY**. And here it will not be disputed that the virgin is a creature, and simply a creature. The fact that she was the instrument of giving a human body to the divine Saviour, does not alter her nature or character. That this is correct is evident, because it agrees with the uniform testimony of scripture. Not a syllable is there recorded

concerning any peculiar honor being due to the mother of Christ. With this in view, let us now look at the practice of popery relative to the virgin Mary. It is a matter of notoriety that every devout papist, or who wishes to be esteemed so, pays her the most extravagant honor and veneration. Prayers are offered directly to her as if to a divine being, and blessings are supplicated from her, as from an almighty patroness. In all forms of devotion she has a share. The "*Ave Maria*," or hail Mary, accompanies the "*Pater Noster*" or our Father. "Evening, morning and noon" said the Psalmist, "will I pray unto thee and cry aloud." The papist transfers these devotions to Mary. In tender childhood, he is taught to cherish for her the profoundest reverence, and highest veneration. During his life she is the object of his regard, and five solemn festivals, annually observed to her honor, call forth his affections. In the hour of death he is taught to rely on her mercy. To the ignorant devotee she is more than Christ or than God, he believes she can command her son, that to her intercessions nothing can be denied, and to her power all things are possible. This view of the subject will be supported by the following extracts from popish books. The Breviary holds the following language. "O holy Mary, succor the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex, let all be sensible of thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration. Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, may enjoy perpetual health of body and mind, and, by the glorious intercession of blessed Mary, ever a virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joy, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

SALVE REGINA, OR HAIL QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

“Hail to the queen who reigns above,
 Mother of clemency and love,
 Hail thou, our hope, life, sweetness; we
 Eve's banished children cry to thee.

We from this wretched vale of tears,
 Send sighs and groans unto thine ears,
 O, then sweet advocate bestow;
 A pitying look on us below.

After this exile let us see
 Our blessed Jesus, born of thee;
 O merciful, O pious maid,
 O gracious Mary lend thine aid.”

The above may serve as a specimen of popish devotion. The following is a prayer of St. Bernard. “Remember, O most holy virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation, without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in your goodness, behold me a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation. Despise not, O mother of Jesus, the petition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer.” To this may properly be added a part of the litany of our lady of Loretto, (i. e. Mary.) “We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God, despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed virgin—holy Mary, holy mother of God, holy virgin of virgins, mother of Christ, mother of divine grace, mother most pure, mother most chaste, mother undefiled, mother untouched, mother most amiable, mother most admirable, mother of our Creator, mother of our Redeemer, virgin most prudent, virgin most venerable, virgin most renowned, virgin most powerful, virgin most merciful, virgin most faithful, mirror of justice, seat of wisdom, cause of our joy, spiritual vessel, vessel of honor, vessel of singular devotion, mystical rose, tower of David, tower of ivory, house of gold, ark of the covenant, gate of heaven, morning star,

health of the weak, refuge of sinners, comforter of the afflicted, help of Christians, queen of angels, queen of patriarchs, queen of prophets, queen of apostles, queen of martyrs, queen of confessors, queen of virgins, queen of all saints pray for us."

The popish school book says, "if you will be a true child and a sincere servant of the blessed virgin, you must be careful to perform four things. 1. Have a great apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin, and of afflicting her motherly heart by dishonoring her son, and destroying your soul. And if you chance to fall into that misfortune, have recourse readily to her, that she may be your intercessor in reconciling you to her son, whom you have extremely provoked. 2. Love and imitate her virtues, especially her chastity and humility. 3. Have recourse to her in all your spiritual necessities, and to that end offer to her daily some particular prayers. 4. Be mindful to invoke her in temptations, and in the dangers you find yourself in of offending God. You cannot shew your respect better, than by applying yourself to her in those urgent necessities, and you can find no succor more ready and favorable than hers. If you perform this you will have a true devotion to the blessed virgin, you will be of the number of her real children, she will be your mother, under whose protection you will never perish."

The following is a curious illustration of the effect of popery in respect to the confidence placed in the protection of Mary in the hour of death. Describing an Italian banditti, a traveller says: "Every robber had a silver heart, containing a picture of the Madonna, (or virgin Mary,) and child, suspended by a red ribbon to his neck, and fastened with another of the same color to his side. They talked pretty freely with their prisoners about themselves and their habits of life, which they maintained arose from necessity rather than choice. They shewed them the heart and picture of the Madonna, which each

had suspended about his neck, saying, ' we know that we are likely to die a violent death, but in our hour of need we have these, (touching their muskets,) to struggle for our lives with, and this, (kissing the image of the virgin,) *to make our death easy.*' "

The foundation of this idolatry seems to have been the belief, that the body of Mary, after her death, was in a miraculous manner, raised from the tomb and taken to heaven. The substance of the story is as follows. " She lived, as the papists suppose, to the age of 63. At the time of her death, as St. Dennis, and St. Damascene are said to testify, all the apostles, wherever dispersed, were miraculously brought together, except St. Thomas, who arrived the third day after. Both before and after her death, for several days, the angels and powers of heaven are said to have sung most melodious hymns. They buried her in Gethsemane ; but for the sake of St. Thomas, who desired to see and reverence the sacred body, they opened the sepulchre the third day, and finding it void of the holy body, but exceedingly fragrant, they returned, assuredly deeming that her body was assumed into heaven, as the church of God (i. e. popery) holdeth, being most agreeable to the singular privilege of the mother of God, and therefore celebrated most solemnly the day of her assumption." It is needless to say, that this is all modern invention, not indeed a *cunningly* devised fable, for it is so silly as to be sickening, but it is a fable. It appears from the whole evangelical history, that Christ never intended that Mary should be honored with any peculiar attention above his other followers. He always rebuked any intimation of such honor. It is therefore of comparatively modern date that this fable has been devised. Perhaps enough has been said to illustrate the idolatrous devotion of papists to the Virgin. But as this constitutes so large a portion of the entire mass of popish idolatry, justice to the subject requires a few more extracts.

It is related by Bernardine, that Mary herself once appeared to St. Thomas Becket, and spake as follows. "Rejoice and be glad and be joyful with me!" said the virgin Mary, "because my glory doth excel the dignity of all the saints, and all the blessed spirits, and I alone have greater glory than all the angels and saints together. Rejoice, because, that as the sun doth enlighten the day, and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world! Rejoice, because the whole host of heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoreth me! Rejoice, because my son is always obedient to me and my will, and my prayers he always heareth!" or as others do relate, "the will of the blessed Trinity and mine is the same, and whatsoever doth please me, the whole Trinity, with unspeakable favor, doth give consent unto. Rejoice, because God doth always, at my pleasure, reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come! Rejoice, because I sit next to the Holy Trinity, and am clothed with my body glorified! Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys will always stand, and never be finished nor fail! And whosoever, by rejoicing with those spiritual joys, shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence, and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it, in the sight of my son, that it may possess joys with me." They tell us that many that would not sin on Saturday, for the reverence of the virgin, whatever they did on the Lord's day, seem to have blessed the virgin in greater veneration, than Christ her son, moved thereunto, out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the son of God doth bear with the simplicity of those men and women, because he is not ignorant that the honor of the mother doth redound to the child. They argue farther, that if a cardinal have this privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of any one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby, then by an ar-

gument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the blessed virgin is able to deliver us from all evil, her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown, (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship,) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils, she would presently rescue him, and not permit that any one should have any evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown. They add moreover, that for every one of these crowns, a man shall obtain two hundred and seventy three thousand, seven hundred and fifty-eight days of indulgence; and that Pope Sixtus IV. granted an indulgence of twelve thousand years for every time that a man, in a state of grace, should repeat this short orison or salutation of the Virgin, which by many is inserted in her crown, viz. "Hail most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of heaven, the gate of paradise, the lady of the world, thou art a singular and pure virgin, thou didst bear Christ without sin; thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the world, in whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil and pray for my sins. Amen."

In the crown composed by Bonaventure, the following is one of the orisons prescribed to be said. "O empress, and our most holy lady, by the authority of a mother, command thy beloved son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly things unto heavenly desires, which is suitable unto that verse which we read in the 35th Psalm of his lady's Psalm. Incline the countenance of God upon us, and compel him to have mercy upon sinners." It must here be stated by explanation, that a Psalter has been composed by papists for the express worship of Mary, in which those passages that are usually directed to the only wise God, are applied to the virgin. The above quotation is from this book. The expression *compel*, seemed a little too harsh for modern ears, so that it has been

qualified in some editions, so as to read, compel him by thy prayers, to have mercy on sinners.

It is here to be remarked that the papists are highly offended at being called idolaters, and it may not be amiss to spend a few moments in examining the plea by which they endeavour to avoid this charge. They pretend that when they pray to the virgin Mary, they mean only to ask the benefit of her prayers, as one Christian friend asks the prayers of another. And that when they worship her, they mean only to give that civil respect which is due to a superior. They have accordingly different words for expressing their different degrees of worship. *Latria*, they say, means divine worship, which they give to God alone. *Doulia*, signifies that inferior sort of worship which is due to saints and angels. And beyond this, they have their *Hyperdoulia*, which signifies that superior kind of inferior worship which is due to a creature so exalted as the virgin Mary. This may look specious in theory. But of what use are these capillary distinctions to the great body of men? If a man is seen on his knees praying to the virgin Mary as the source of all good, and trusting his salvation to her hands, who will feel that he pays her only civil respect? Where, in Christian countries, is such respect shewn to superior creatures? Even angels refused to receive such homage. Who ever asked the prayers of Christian friends in this manner? Suppose one Christian neighbor should go to the house of another, and should fall on his knees and utter the language addressed to the virgin Mary, would he not be esteemed mad? Besides, the terms *Latria*, and *Doulia*, in the original, have no such distinction in their meaning as that made by papists. They are used indifferently for divine worship, and when one is used to denote civil respect, it is connected with other words, which limit its meaning, and guard against idolatry. Whatever then may be the theory of popery on this subject, its practice is downright idolatry, such as no

created being can be justified in receiving. Take the following prayer from Cardinal Noailles as an example. "Give us access to thy Son, Mary, who has found grace before the Lord, who art blessed among women, who hast brought life into the world, and art the mother of salvation. Let him who hath been given us by thee, receive us by thee; let thy purity excuse to him our corruption, let thy humility, which hath been so agreeable to God, obtain pardon of our vanity, let the abundance of thy charity cover the multitude of our sins, and thy glorious fruitfulness shed on us a happy fruitfulness of merits and good works. Thou art our queen or mediator, our advocate. Reconcile us with thy son, recommend us to thy son, present us to thy son. See again we come to thee, fruitful mother, mother without spot, in whom, God the master of the universe, who dwelleth in other saints spiritually, hath dwelt bodily."

Though it may be said that this prayer is as remarkable for blasphemy as idolatry, yet who will say there is no idolatry here? Is not divine perfection requisite, and supposed to exist in a being to whom such requests are made? If Mary were regarded merely as a departed saint, how is she to hear or gain a knowledge of these requests? Do departed saints hear human language? Moreover, how is Mary, as a saint, to attend to all the different prayers of her votaries in various parts of the world at the same time? On some of her festivals, there may be supposed to be millions of prayers ascending to her from different parts of the globe at once. Now if she is a mere saint of higher order, how is she to hear these prayers? and if she cannot hear them, why are they made? No, the worship of Mary implies that her votaries esteem her to be divine, to possess omniscience and omnipresence. Otherwise their worship would be too barefaced an absurdity to obtain credit even with papists. A few additional examples to illustrate the grossness of this worship, will close this branch of papal idolatry.

Bernardine relates a vision which he says was shown to St. Francis. He saw two ladders that reached from earth to heaven, the one red, upon which Christ leaned, and from which many fell back and could not ascend; the other white, upon which the holy virgin leaned, the help whereof, such as used, were by her received with cheerful countenance, and so with felicity ascended into heaven." The purport of this story must be obvious to every reader, it is nothing less than that the help of the virgin is more efficacious and sure, than the help of Christ. Must her votaries then not regard her as divine? But St. Anselm, and after him other popish authors, directly assert, that "more present relief is sometimes found by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ her only son." This needs no comment. "If popish tales are true," says McCulloch, "the popish church is under very strong obligations, to pay all this homage, and a great deal more, to the virgin. There is scarcely any favor which she has withheld from her devout worshippers. She has delivered them from sickness, restored their eye sight, preserved them from dangers, saved them from the gallows, and even raised them from the dead, and what must peculiarly tend to the consolation of papists, she is not at all squeamish in the choice of her votaries. Sinners, being her subjects, make up her crown and glory." "Know thou," said the virgin, (if we may credit papists,) to St. Bridget, "my dearest child, that there is no man in the world so lewd or accursed of God, that he is entirely forsaken of him while he lives, no sinner so desperate but he may return, and find mercy with him, provided he has recourse to me." This benevolence of the virgin does not operate to deliver men from their *sins*, but from the *deserved punishment*. If they pray to the virgin at last, or have, amidst their iniquities, honored her, all is right and will end in peace. A certain Gascon soldier is said by papists, to

have spent his fortune, and afterwards, for particular reasons, to have sold himself to the devil, and renounced the Saviour. No temptation, however, could induce him to sacrifice his interest with the virgin. This confidence in her protection secured him from his old acquaintance the devil, who began to be troublesome, notwithstanding his former friendship. On prostrating himself before an image of the virgin Mary with the child Jesus in her arms, he was greatly comforted by the following dialogue between the two idols. "*Virgin.* O, my sweet son, have mercy on this man." "*Christ.* Why, mother, what would you have me do with this wretch, who has renounced me?" The virgin then prostrated herself before her son and again demanded his pardon. This was irresistible. The little image raised the large one from the ground and replied, "I never yet refused my mother anything she asked, I grant it for your sake, and for yours alone." Should any sceptical reader inquire how these images held this conversation, or how the little image could leap from the arms of the great one and raise it up from the ground, he must go to papists for an answer, remembering that this is the least marvelous part of the story. Again, a certain wicked fellow is said to have fallen into the Danube, and remained under water three days. In ordinary cases there would have been some danger of drowning. But to the rogue's great surprise, he was addressed in his watery retreat in the following terms. "Thou well deservest, base rascal, to lose thy life, and be condemned forever for thy sins; but because thou art a servant of the virgin Mary, thou shalt be delivered from this danger, that thou mayest go and be confessed." Up he came accordingly, and made the above declaration to the priest. St. Bridget is said to have had a son, who followed the profession of a soldier, and died in the wars. Hearing the news of his death, she was much concerned for the salvation of her son, who had died in so dangerous a condition. And

as she was often favored by God with revelations, of which she has composed a book, she was assured of the salvation of her son by two subsequent revelations. In the first, the blessed virgin revealed to her that she had assisted her son with a particular protection at the hour of death, having strengthened him against temptations, and obtained all necessary grace for him to make a holy and happy end. In the next, she declared the cause of that particular assistance she gave her son, and said it was in recompense for his great and sincere devotion which he had rendered to her during his life, wherein he had loved her with a very ardent affection, and had endeavored to please her in all things. Is anything less than omniscience implied in these accounts? Must not the virgin Mary see and know the hearts and thoughts of all that worship her? Must she not be acquainted with the temptations to which every young man and woman is exposed, that she may provide a remedy? Such knowledge belongs to God only. And to ascribe these attributes to creatures, and to worship them for the supposed possession, is idolatry beyond controversy. It will be said, perhaps, that these stories are all fictions and fables. Be it so. Still they show the practice and feelings of papists, and the practical influence and tendency of popery, as much as the fables of paganism illustrate its qualities.

Another item in the account of popish idolatry is the worship paid to St. Ann, the mother, or supposed mother, of Mary. This personage constitutes the second goddess in the papal pantheon. "I give," says a late writer, "the following extracts from an abridgment of the prerogatives of St. Ann, mother of the mother of God, which has the approbation of the popish doctors of Paris. If my readers should feel shocked by the grossness and impiety of it, I can truly say that I sympathize with them, and that, though I feel it my duty to expose the abominable wickedness of popery, I have no pleasure in making

such an exposure as the following :—‘She (St. Ann) was the mother of the mother of God, the grandmother of God himself. Figure to yourself, chaste spouse of Christ, a royal eagle flies from mountain to mountain, to choose a tree which may serve the design, to feed there, and breed her young ones. Imagine, now, that God is this eagle, who, running over with his eyes, as it were, so many beautiful trees, all the women who were to be found from the first to the last, perceived not any one so worthy to receive the glorious virgin, who was to be the little germ of the heavenly eaglet, who is the WORD, incarnate, as St. Ann, in whom he rested himself as in the tree of paradise, which he knew to be the tallest in devotion, the deepest in humility, the largest in charity, and of the most pleasant odour in sanctity. So if, in one word, you would know the price of that crown which St. Ann bore on earth and in heaven, it must be said, and this is to say all, that her treasure and her crown was the giving being to her, who gave it to God, which is to be crowned with the merits of Mary, like the tree with its flowers and fruit. Whence it is to be concluded that the dignity, the grace, and the holiness, of this *only* and perfect daughter, ought to reflect back on her mother, even to a point. That she rendered her incomparable in her sanctity as she was in her dignity. For of two things, one must necessarily happen; either that this holy virgin had not the power, or that, having the power, she communicated to her whatever we can fancy, greater in grace. So that it is true in some sort, and good divinity to say, that the felicity of the saints is derived from Mary, and that there is nobody who is not obliged to her for the fortification of his patience, for the victory over his temptations, for preservation from falls, for augmentation of his merits, for his final grace, and finally for his glory. This principle supposed, who will doubt that St. Ann was the masterpiece of the workmanship of Mary, and that the power of this last was the measure of the excellence of the

former? And it is one of the greatest miracles of mysteries of our religion, that the children give life to their parents; and those who are not yet, give admirable advantage to those that already are. Thus Jesus is the son of Adam according to nature, and his father according to grace. Thus, St. Ann is, in the state of grace, the daughter of her daughter, the holy virgin, by a plenitude of grace which she from her received. Which ought not to be thought strange by him who has tasted the sense and universal consent of the fathers, who assert that what was given in plenitude to Christ, ought in proportion to be attributed to the holy virgin. The glory of Jesus Christ, the fourth reason of the prerogatives of St. Ann, requires that St. Ann be such to be his worthy grandmother. St. Ann having been chosen in the ideas of eternal predestination, to be the grandmother of Jesus Christ, ought not this step to comprehend as many excellencies as demonstrate the sublimeness of this saint's perfection? There need be used only the dignity of her name as grandmother of Jesus Christ. This is an argument which the apostle uses to prove the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ above the angelic natures, for that he was the Son of God. The dignity, therefore, of St. Ann, consists in her having, by the conception and nativity of the virgin, entered into the economy of the incarnation, and into the state of the hypostatical union. She was by this her daughter exalted into so dazzling a throne of glory, that there are only above it, the trinity of uncreated persons, the humanity of Jesus Christ, and the holiness of her daughter, mother of God. In our indigencies and our wants, we must address ourselves by St. Ann to the virgin, and by the virgin to Jesus Christ, and by Jesus Christ to God the Father, who can refuse nothing to his Son, no more than he can to his mother, or she to her's, who is St. Ann.'” Thus it appears that this St. Ann is a kind of door-keeper in heaven; she moves the virgin, and the virgin moves Christ, and Christ moves

God ; and it might be premised, that the pope moves St. Ann, and money moves the pope. St. Ann, then, is the *primum mobile* in heaven, money and the pope on earth. The other characters in the papal catalogue are passive in their movements, acting under the influence of strong attachment to each other, rather than from any moral considerations. St. Ann is, then, the all important character and advocate ; if you gain her, you gain the rest of course. The whole heathen world may be challenged to produce a family of deities more perfectly humanized than this. Though the sacred names of God and of Christ are used in this compound, they are used profanely, and associated with characters and actions altogether derogatory to deity. The whole is therefore a family of idols, and the whole papal worship is idolatry. This is true of their chief gods and goddesses. But not contented to bring the mother and grandmother of Christ, after the flesh, into the list of deities, the papists have a long list of inferior deities, like the *Lares* and *Penates* of the ancient pagan Romans, or like the *Tees*, *Woden*, and *Thor*, of the ancient Britons. To these lesser gods and goddesses the papists pay homage and worship, which is a direct and palpable violation of the first command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The details of this idolatry are tedious and gross, and must be disgusting in the extreme. A summary view, however, is necessary to place the subject in any just light. Let the reader, then, summon his patience to the task of exploring more perfectly the interior of this papal pantheon. And here it is hardly necessary to say, that "WORSHIP GOD" is the distinguishing principle of true religion ; and that every practice which differs from this, or gives any degree of worship or homage to creatures in any form or manner, is idolatry. And it may promote a right understanding of the subject here to remark, that the systems of pagan idolatry have always had their retinue of inferior deities or demigods. These have,

in the original Greek, been denominated *Daimones*. This class of deities is referred to in the New Testament in the following passages:—1. Tim. iv. 1, "Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of *devils*." The word here translated *devils* is *daimones*, and literally means *demons*, or the numerous inferior deities of the heathen. True devils are at the bottom of it, as they are of all false religion; but the term denotes a particular form of idol worship. The same word, *daimones*, is, in Acts xvii. 18, rendered gods: "Others said he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods;" literally, *demons*, because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection." The idea of the Athenians evidently was, that Paul, by preaching Jesus, was going to add to their list of inferior deities, or that he set forth some hero as worthy of divine honors, whom they had not known. This class of *demons* was composed of departed heroes, who had been renowned in their day, and who, when dead, were supposed to exert a kind of tutelar care over certain places, persons, and things. Such were Hercules, Esculapius, and many others. This feature of ancient idolatry appears to have suggested to the papists the idea of deifying, or what they call canonizing, certain saints, or eminent persons in the history of the church, and giving to them certain honors and homage which partake of idolatry. In fact, as will more fully appear at the conclusion of our present examination, popery, in this respect, is nothing more or less than ancient paganism under a new name and in a new dress. And further, it will be seen, that when prosperous days visited the church, and she began to taste the sweets of earthly things, and to be actuated by a desire to extend her limits and influence, that to conciliate and allure the heathen around, and bring them within her pale, she by degrees adopted the substance and spirit of paganism, retaining only her own forms and names. A great and fatal mistake this, of which all reformers and missionaries ought to be aware, lest, in their zeal to make con-

verts, they convert the gospel to the heathen and the impenitent, instead of converting them to the gospel. Such has been the error of popery; and in all her forms and ceremonies, she is only a great shell of Christianity, filled with the spirit and abominations of pagan idolatry.

The first fact in support of these remarks is, that the Rotunda at Rome, now devoted to the virgin Mary and all the saints, is the very temple which was anciently dedicated by Agrippa to Jove and all the gods. For this reason it was called the *Pantheon*, which term is of Greek derivation, denoting an edifice dedicated to all the gods, or the temple of all the gods. It is the most distinguished heathen temple now remaining in the world. "And," says Middleton, "with this single alteration, (of occupants,) it serves as exactly for all the purposes of the popish, as it did for the pagan worship, for which it was built. For as, in the old temple every one might find the god of his country, and address himself to that deity to whose religion he was most devoted, so is it now, every one chooses the patron whom he likes best; and one may see here different services going on at the same time, at different altars, with distinct congregations around them, just as the inclinations of the people lead them to worship this or that particular saint. And what better title can the new demi-gods show to the adoration now paid to them, than the old ones, whose shrines they have usurped? Or how comes it to be less criminal to worship images erected by the pope, than those which Agrippa or Nebuchadnezzar set up? If there be any real difference, most people, I dare say, will be apt to determine in favor of the old possessors; for those heroes of antiquity were raised up into gods, and received divine honors, for some signal benefits of which they had been the authors to mankind; or the invention of arts and sciences; or of something highly useful and necessary to life. Whereas, of the popish saints, it is certain, that many of them were never heard of but in their own legends and fabulous

stories ; and many more, instead of any service done to mankind, owe all the honors now paid them to their vices or their errors ; whose merit, like that of Demetrius in the Acts, was their skill of raising rebellions in defence of an idol, and throwing kingdoms into convulsions for the sake of some gainful imposture. And as it is in the Pantheon, it is just the same in all the other heathen temples that still remain at Rome. They have only pulled down one idol to set up another, changing rather the name than the object of their worship. Thus the little temple of Vesta, near the Tiber, mentioned by Horace, is now possessed by the Madonna of the Sun ; that of Fortuna Virilis, by Mary the Egyptian ; that of Saturn, where the public treasure was anciently kept, by St. Adrian ; that of Romulus and Remus, in the "*via sacra*," by two other brothers, Cosmus and Damianus ; that of Antonine, the godly, by Laurence, the saint. But for my part, I had sooner be tempted to prostrate myself before the statue of a Romulus or an Antonine, than that of a Laurence or a Damian ; and give divine honors rather with pagan Rome to the founders of empires, than with popish Rome, to the founders of monasteries." With this general view of the popish worship of demons, and its exact correspondence with that of ancient paganism, it is proper to give some more particular description, that the subject may be understood somewhat in detail, as without such a particular account, very little indeed will be known. For this purpose, as limits will not allow a particular account of all, or a considerable number of popish saints, it will be proper to give the history of one or two individuals as samples of the rest.

The following is an abridged account of St. Wenefride, the tutelar deity of Wales. This example is selected, because the history of this popish heroine has been lately published by a popish author, and is therefore an example more fresh from the mint of popery. The work alluded to is entitled, "The Life and Miracles of St. We-

nefride, virgin, martyr, and abbess, patroness of Wales, to which are added the litanies of the holy saint. Printed by W. E. Andrews, 1817." This history is indeed very ridiculous, and brings to view one of those idle, worthless, and useless beings, called holy virgins by the papists, who effect nothing for their own age or subsequent ages, worthy of imitation or praise. If such a person ever existed, she has been nothing but a nuisance to the world, by the great expense of time and property which her worship occasions, and for which the world receives no equivalent. But, if we would form any correct idea of popery, and of its fruits in the practice of all who come under its influence, we must hear the story gravely published by a recent papal advocate, puerile and absurd as it is.

"In the seventh age of man's redemption flourished many saints of both sexes. Among these was St. Beuno, the glorious instrument of St. Wenefride's second life and sanctity. He was born of noble parents in Montgomeryshire. This zealous monk, St. Beuno, having finished his monastery at Clynoc Vaws, in Carnarvonshire, found himself powerfully inspired to visit his relations in Flintshire. It is true that he had long before bid adieu to all the ties of flesh and blood, but he understood this call as a voice from heaven. A rich and potent lord in that part of North Wales where Holywell now is, had married the virtuous and noble lady Wenlo, sister to St. Beuno: His name was Thewith. These parents of St. Wenefride, by an exemplary and truly Christian life, surpassed their high extraction. St. Wenefride, the glory of West Britain, was born in the troublesome reign of king Cadwallawn. And St. Beuno made his visit to his brother-in-law's house in the reign of king Elwith the second. The venerable monk, having much humility and great modesty, made himself known, told them he was sent by Almighty God, to honor him there, as he had done in other places; and that he neither expected nor craved any other favor than a small parcel of his large territo-

ries, sufficient to build a church on; 'where others with myself,' said he, 'will daily pray for your safety and happiness.' Thewith was not in the miserable catalogue of those thoughtless, blind worldlings, who are prodigal in vanity and ostentation, but start and frown at the first proposal of parting with small matters for the advantage of their souls. In short, he received the proposal with gratitude, and immediately conveyed to the holy father the manor in which he then lived. And he asked in return but one favor, which was, that his only child, a tender virgin, his special comfort, might be instructed by the monk in heavenly documents, that her life and conversation might be holy, pleasing to God, and joyful to her parents. The nobleman, after this gift, retired to another seat, which overlooked the holy church, where the servants of God praised their Maker.

"As to St. Wenefride, it was the intention of her parents to marry her to some nobleman of the country, and bestow on her a most plentiful fortune; but, by St. Beuno's frequent discourses, she understood how great, how good, and how glorious, the heavenly Spouse was; that voluntary virgins are like angels upon earth; that they follow the Lamb wherever he goeth. She understood that the honors of the world, and its pleasures, are short-lived, so that the very thought of an earthly husband became hateful unto her. Wherefore she resolved to keep herself undefiled, and to consecrate her pure virginity to the Lord of heaven and earth. One main difficulty, however, was to render her parents favorable to this heavenly call. St. Beuno, she knew, was honored by them as a saint, and therefore that he had great power and authority with them. To him, therefore, she resolved to communicate her resolution, and to solicit his agency in bringing the subject before her parents. Finding him alone one day, and at liberty, she acquainted him with the holy fruits of his moving discourses; and after a very pathetic manner, humbly petitioned for his zealous con-

currence in preserving the rich treasure of her virginity, which she had resolved never to part with for all the offers the flattering world could make her. The saint was most agreeably surprised at this most welcome news, and he undertook the work of mediation with the parents. No sooner had St. Beuno delivered his message, and explained the nature of the offering, that it would be a sort of holocaust, to sacrifice their affections, and bequeath to their God the dearest creature in the world, than, contrary to the weakness of other parents, tears of joy came trickling down Lord Thewith's cheeks, who, with his spouse, broke out in the praises of Jesus Christ for so highly favoring their only child. They then called for their daughter, and gave her full and free leave to forsake the world, wishing her a happy progress in the way of perfection. They likewise declared that as the heavenly Spouse had made choice of her, they intended to make him heir of what they designed for her dowery, by disposing of the same to his great honor, in pious and religious uses. The pious virgin receiving the coveted grant, concluded that she could never return sufficient thanks to God for the favor.

“The virtue of this holy virgin was however assaulted by a cruel Welch prince named Cradocus, who found her at home and alone, one day, while the rest of the family were at church. The holy virgin by a false pretext escaped, and made the best of her way to the church. But Cradocus overtaking her, and being scorned, as he thought, gave such a deadly blow with his sword to her neck, that the first stroke severed the head from the body. The head falling on the descent of the hill, rolled down to the church, where the congregation were kneeling before the altar. As they were terrified at the bloody object of her head, so they were astonished to behold a clear and rapid spring, gushing out of the spot of ground her head had first fallen upon, which to this very day is visited from all parts, by devout pilgrims. The place of

her martyrdom had before her death, the name of dry valley, or barren bottom, which was changed into the title of Finhon, which in old Welch signifies a fountain or well. It was also observed that the stones of the well were tinctured with drops, as it were of blood, to perpetuate the memory of what she had shed for the love of Christ, and in process of time it was taken notice of, that the moss about the well had a very fragrant smell, as an emblem of the odour of her angelic virtues.

“ To close the last act of this inhuman tragedy and to relate the dreadful stroke of divine justice on the cruel tyrant, we are to premise with brevity, that the first grief of the holy virgin’s parents, is not to be expressed, seeing their dear child so villanously butchered almost before their eyes. St. Beuno’s virtue was also put to the test, to bear the loss of so devout a creature. Tears came trickly down his cheeks at the sight of the horrid murder. The afflicted people with united voices called upon heaven for speedy execution against him who had committed that heinous outrage. Indignation accompanied compassion, when they beheld the unrelenting assassin wiping his bloody sword upon the grass, and glorying in the detestable deed, without any fear of God or man. St. Beuno was preparing to offer up the unbloody sacrifice of our redemption, but being inspired by him, who declares vengeance belongeth to me, I will repay, he left the altar, and taking the blessed martyr’s head in his trembling hands, he mounted the ascent towards Cradocus. He feared not such a blow as was given to the tender virgin. On the same account, for the love of Christ, he would have bid it welcome. Faithful servants of God dread nothing, sin only excepted. Being come up to him he said, ‘thou wicked man! who, without any regard to innocence or beauty, hast massacred a princely virgin, no less nobly born than thyself. Nor dost thou repent, or seem sorry, as thou oughtest to do for this horrid sacrilege. I here beseech my heavenly

Lord, that for an example to others, he will be pleased to execute his divine judgment against thee, who hast murdered his spouse, troubled his people, violated his sabbath, and besprinkled this holy house with blood, which I consecrated to his service.' As the earth swallowed up rebellious and perverse Korah, so some affirm, that at Beuno's last words, Cradocus not only dropped down dead, but also that the earth opened to give passage to the luxurious body to sink towards his monstrous soul; or that the master whom he had served, the devil, carried it off, for it is certain, that the carcass of the cruel murderer never afterward appeared. The faithful glorified God in his justice, but could not curb their grief. St. Beuno earnestly exhorted the parents and people to turn from lamentations, and to address the Creator of souls, and raiser up of dead bodies, that as he commanded Lazarus back to life, so to his great honor and glory, and for the comfort of the sorrowful parents, who had so generously dedicated this darling child to his service, he would graciously vouchsafe to restore her to life. He then joined the sacred head to the pale body, covering both with his cloak, after which he offered up the holy sacrifice of our redemption, (i. e. the mass.) After mass was ended, he lifted up his hands to heaven, and made the following prayer.

“ O Lord Jesus Christ, for whose sake this holy virgin contemned the world, and languished after thee, by the tender bowels of thy mercy, love and bounty, be graciously pleased to grant us the effect of our vows and prayers, humbly offered unto thee. We are fully persuaded, that this godly virgin, who lived holily and died for thee with great constancy, is now highly exalted, and wants no more the society of us mortal and miserable creatures. Yet to manifest thine omnipotence and supreme dominion, which thou has over our souls and bodies, which are never dead to thy power of reuniting them, as also to multiply the merits of that body which

lies here before us, we crave a second life for her, to the end, that after a long and plentiful harvest, laden and enriched with new merits, she may return unto thee her eternal spouse, and the beloved of her heart, who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, rulest on earth, and reignest in heaven, for ever and ever.' The pious people drowned in tears, and having with sighs and moving sobs, answered devoutly, AMEN—the virgin arose as newly awaked from sleep. She wiped her eyes and face to clear away that glorious dust which had settled on her lovely head when it tumbled towards her dear St. Beuno. When her parents and others fixed their eyes upon her neck, they observed a pure white circle, no larger than a small thread quite round it, denoting the place where the separation had been made, which always afterward remained. From this, the great veneration of the people for her, changed her name, which was Brewa, into that of Wenefride, (i. e. white circle.) In the many apparitions after her second death, when she shewed herself to her devout clients, they always took special notice of the aforesaid white circle, which intimated to them the indelible mark of her spouse's affection, for suffering that mortal wound so courageously for his sake." It may here be inquired in view of the popish tale, whether any thing surpassing it in superstitious fable can be found among all the marvellous stories of paganism. Take the labors of Hercules among the Greeks and Romans, or the abduction of Proserpine, or a thousand other silly conceits of heathen nations, such as the incarnations of the gods of the Hindoos, and the various adventures of their divine heroes or heroines, and do they not compare exactly in spirit, and tendency, and authenticity with this history of St. Wenefride. And yet the papists stoutly contend that this saint did work miracles, and was deserving of religious homage. The account above given is followed by some, as they are called, pious reflections which still more ex-

hibit the spirit of the system. They are as follows. "Whatever this incredulous age may think of this great miracle of our saint's return to life, it appeared so evident to the West Britons, and redounded so much to the honor of God's church, St. Beuno's sanctity, and the power he had with his creator, that many pagan people remaining in those parts, came to hear the holy man's instructions in the catholic faith, and to receive baptism." There surely was no wonder in this, for pagan people would of all others be most likely to be attracted by such devices, so exactly similar to their own. But continue the pious reflections. "Saint Wenefride according to her former practice, like Mary at the feet of Christ, sat on a low seat before him, (St. Beuno.) She was never satisfied with the heavenly manna which fell from his angelic tongue. She counted as nothing what she had already done or suffered, and restless to be more strictly united to her beloved spouse she aspired to the height of perfection. Wherefore she most humbly begged upon her knees to be solemnly veiled, according to the custom of the primitive ages, that by entering into a religious course of life, she might put hell to great confusion, which had fiercely attempted to dishonor God and herself; but mostly that she might pour forth her soul in the presence of her eternal spouse, with a flaming and disengaged heart, entirely his, and say, 'Behold I have left all things and have followed thee.' St. Beuno, with tears of joy complied with this religious request and performed the ceremony in a numerous assembly, He knew to what a degree of sanctity the spirit of God would raise her, for his own glory and the improvement of others, therefore he spent whole days in cultivating her soul in what regarded a religious state. She as an apt scholar, took in so fast the frequent lessons, and put them in practice so punctually, that it struck her master into admiration. He, finding her so far advanced in an interior life, that she was even able to direct and govern others in the way

of perfection, one day called her parents, and after the following manner delivered unto them his sentiments and resolutions.”

What follows is a high commendation for their distinguished liberality, and an announcement of his determination to go to another place. “ This intelligence greatly affected the saint Wenefride. And to comfort her in such deep affliction, St. Beuno took her by the hand, and led her to the crystalline fountain, the place of her martyrdom, where they, sitting together on a stone, bearing to this day the name of St. Beuno’s stone, which lieth now in the outward well, you see, said he, the monument here of your sufferings. Behold also the stones, as tinctured with your blood, which was shed for the glory of your heavenly spouse. Be you, therefore, attentive and mindful of what I do foretell you concerning three special favors, whereby your glorious spouse, Jesus Christ, will hereafter honor yourself, and, by your prayers, benefit others. The first is, that these bloody spots shall never be washed off from the said stones, but ever remain, as triumphant signs of your blood spilt in defence of your chastity. The second is, that any person who shall devoutly ask temporal blessings, or freedom from spiritual or corporeal distress, to be obtained by your merits and intercession, the same shall compass his request, if it be to the honor and glory of God, by paying their devotions three times at this well. If what he petitions be not for the advantage of his soul, and therefore is not granted, at his death, by your prayers, he shall reap more ample fruit, and in the next world everlasting blessings. The third, that after my departure into a more remote part of this island, God will give me a cell near unto the sea shore, so that whenever you send any letters or tokens to me, as I entreat you to do at least once a year, only cast them into the stream of this fountain, and they will come safe unto me ; which wonders will be gloriously divulged of you to the end of the world. He then conducted her back to the church,

where he added: Behold this church and buildings round it, which have been raised by the munificence of your parents, these I leave unto you to be converted into a monastery of chaste and holy virgins, who, moved by your pious instructions and exemplary life, may put in practice those divine lessons, which I have often delivered unto you; that is, the contempt of the world, and an entire abnegation of themselves, which are the foundation of religious perfection. Strive, therefore, dear child, in all things to exhibit yourself as a lively pattern of virtue. As to my poor self, I will go whither the Spirit of God shall direct me, and shall ever retain in my heart and soul a most fatherly and loving memory of you."

In the foregoing account we see that petitions and worship were to be offered at the holy well, called by the name of this saint Wenefride, and that petitioners were to expect an answer. And if their petitions were not immediately answered, they were to rest assured that the real interests of her votaries would be promoted, and that they would certainly obtain eternal blessings. What more can be said of Deity? Is not this paying divine honor to a creature, and can any man look at this example and say that popery is not chargeable with rank idolatry, in having other gods, before or in the presence of the true God, as his rivals in the affections and services of men? Miraculous powers were also ascribed to this saint. Diseased persons, in great numbers flocked to her for miraculous cures. And by such cures, it is said, "the spreading fame of St. Wenefride was wonderfully dilated." They are declared to have been frequent, and divulged through all parts of Wales.

Enough, in all conscience, probably the reader will say, of this silly story about saint Wenefride. But the object of this history, be it remembered, is not so much to gratify the reader, as to present a faithful picture of popery. And as the story of this saint is taken as a sample; and as the particulars of no other of the many idols

of popery, all equally silly and disgusting, will be given, the patience of the reader is entreated, while, in a few paragraphs more, the legend of this Welsh idol is rendered complete.

St. Beuno and St. Wenefride, as has been stated, before their separation, agreed on a novel method of correspondence. Any article or communication from the latter to the former, need only to be deposited in the *holy well*, and it would be wafted directly, free of freight or postage, to the vicinity of St. Beuno's residence, which was far off on the seashore.

St. Wenefride was not tardy in putting the matter to the test of experiment. Impelled by a grateful sense of his goodness, who, by his prayers, had obtained for her a second life, and whom she honored as an eminent servant of God, and as her own spiritual father and master, she wished to make some small return in token of her remembrance and gratitude. About a year after his departure, therefore, with the help of her religious sisters, she finished a curiously embroidered vestment, and wrapping the same in a woollen cloth, she went down with her religious sisters and others to the well side, and casting the bundle into the water, said, "Holy father, according to your command and my promise, I send you this small token of my love." To the great astonishment of numerous beholders, the bundle passed down the stream into the river, then into the sea, and finally landed near the monastery where saint Beuno dwelt, many miles distant from the holy fountain.

The holy man, St. Beuno, walking on the seashore, discovered the bundle, and wondered what it should be. But, opening the package, he remembered the charge which he had given to St. Wenefride. The bundle, as appeared on examination, as he had predicted, came to him without any wet or moisture. This vestment he preserved with great care in the church for the celebration of holy mass. He likewise received, according to popish

narration, "fresher lights of her present and future sanctity; how much Almighty God would be honored by her, not only at Finhon, but in other places whither divine providence should direct her to go. The virgin never intermitted to send him a yearly present, till his most happy death, which was revealed unto her, and the glorious reward he was crowned with in heaven." The memory of this event is authenticated, in popish estimation, in the following manner. In Carnarvonshire, eight miles distant from the city of Carnarvon, there is a little creek, running up from the sea, called *Porthy Casseg*, which is a corruption of *Porthy Cassul*, which means the port of the vestment. Here it is supposed that the first package of St. Wenefride landed, after its miraculous passage, and gave a name to the little port, which it retains to this day. This the papists consider as ample evidence of the fact related in the story. Near this creek, it is said, was a large parish church, called Clynog, in which St. Beuno was buried, his last founded monastery being there. His tomb, say popish writers, is still extant, and held in great veneration by the inhabitants. On the windows of this church, the history of St. Wenefride is said to be curiously wrought by paintings, though now so defaced as to be scarcely perceptible. The whole of this wonderful history, however, is based on tradition. And as this, in papal estimation, is the unwritten word of God, a late popish writer thus concludes. "Let it be lawful for me to say, that as to human faith, uninterrupted tradition, from father to son, for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history." Thus the whole is proved, and thus any thing can be proved by tradition.

Here we have a specimen of the common herd of popish idols or demons. These ordinary demons cannot, like the virgin Mary, do every thing, and be in all places at the same time; therefore, the popish church has found it necessary, for convenience sake, to make a distribution

and division of labor among the demons which she worships, just as a master-workman distributes his laborers. Thus, St. James has the care of Spain, St. Sebastian of Portugal, St. Denis of France, St. Mark of Venice, St. Nicholas of Muscovy, St. Barbara of Germany. Before the reformation, St. George had charge of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, and St. Patrick of Ireland. But the papists not only divide their demons in reference to different countries, over which they are said to preside, but also in reference to different employments. Thus, St. Nicholas and St. Christopher have the care of seamen; St. Catherine presides over students; St. Austin takes charge of theologians, St. Luke of painters, St. Ivo of the lawyers, St. Eustachius of hunters, St. Crispin of shoemakers; St. Magdalene and St. Afra have charge of vicious women. Some of these worshipful demons are put to the most servile employments, and are mere drudges in the business of popish deities: St. Anthony, for example, has charge of swine, and is thus a standing hog-hayward; St. Pelagius has the care of the cows, St. Eulogius of horses; St. Vendeline and St. Gallus have the care of the sheep and geese. Thus also papists direct their votaries to pray to St. Peter for the gift of submission, to St. Agnes for continency, to lady St. Ann for wealth, to St. Margaret for child-bearing, to St. Rochus for protection against the plague, to St. Petronilla against the ague, to St. Apollonia against the toothache. Bachelors must not go to St. Peter, for he was a married man; nor married men to St. John, because he was a bachelor. Every one must apply to a saint in his own profession; just as you would go to a tailor for a garment, or a blacksmith to shoe your horse. This is what the papists call a discreet variety in her worship, honorable to the church, and advantageous to her poor members. The advantage of this arrangement, however, it is presumed, falls to the lot of the priests, whose business and emolument is increased in proportion to the number of deities.

But who can fail to discover in this an exact copy of the ancient heathen demonology? The heathen of Greece, Rome, and Britain, had their tutelary deities, presiding over different countries and places, and patronising different employments. They had also their days devoted to their several deities, and called by their names. Of this the present names of the days of the week are a remarkable example, viz. : Sunday, the day of the Sun; Monday, the day of the Moon; Tuesday, the day of Tues; Wednesday, the day of Woden; Thursday, the day of Thor; Friday, the day of Fries; Saturday, the day of Saturn. The heathen had also their seasons of the year, or annual festivals, in honor of their deities; for which reason, those seasons or days were named after the demon worshipped: thus, the day called *Easter* was a day devoted to the worship of a Saxon demon, named *Estern*, or *Oestern*. This festival was observed early in the Spring, and, in accommodation to nominal converts from the heathen, the papists named their festival of the resurrection of Christ *Easter*. This term has very improperly found its way into our translation of the bible, in Acts xii. 4. The original word in this passage is *passover*; and this error in translating serves to show the overwhelming influence of popish habit, even upon those who have thrown off the papal yoke. But, in accordance with the above mentioned practices of heathenism, we find that papists have their days devoted to particular demons, called by Christian names. Of this our common calendars and almanacs will afford evidence; for, though printed in protestant countries, and by protestant hands, yet they are generally filled with these remains of popish idolatry. A memorable example of this truth may be found in the festival called candlemass, which occurs on the second day of February. This festival, among the ancient heathen, was called *Lupercalia*, and was designed to celebrate the fabled search of Ceres for her daughter Proserpine. In this search, the mother

used candles, the better to enable her to examine every retired corner. With most stupid servility, the papists honor this day with a procession of lighted candles, and call the day *candlemass*.

Such is the idolatry of popery as it stands opposed to the first commandment of the decalogue, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," (or in my presence.) The papists, as we have seen, do have a multitude of deities, of different grades and employments, from the virgin Mary down to the tutelar gods of geese and swine.

But there is another ground on which popery is liable to the charge of idolatry, and that is the use of images in worship. To constitute idolatry in this respect, as we have already seen, it is not necessary to worship the image as God, or as containing a divinity, but to use images as representatives of deity, or to worship them as such is a direct violation of the second command. And a most impressive evidence that the papists feel themselves to be vulnerable on this point is, that they have omitted the second command in their statements of the decalogue, and supplied its place by dividing the tenth into two. This is the same as to acknowledge that they cannot meet the charge of idolatry with any hope of success, while the second command has a standing in the moral law of God. It can be nothing less than a tacit admission, that their use of images is a palpable violation of this command. With this fact in view, let us examine the popish practice of image worship.

The following constitution was established by Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, in a provincial council held at Oxford, 1408, viz. "From henceforth let it be taught commonly, and preached by all, that the cross and the image of the crucifix, and the rest of the images of the saints, in memory and honor of them whom they figure, as also their places and relicts, ought to be worshipped with processions, bendings of the knee, bowings of the body, incensings, kissings, offerings, lighting of candles,

and pilgrimages, together with all other manners and forms whatsoever, as hath been accustomed to be done in our, or our predecessors' times." In the popish catechism, authorized by the council of Trent, the parish priest is directed to instruct the people as follows. "Not only that it is lawful to have images in the church, and to give honor and worship unto them, (forasmuch as the honor which is done unto them is referred unto the things which they represent,) but also that this hath still been done to the great good of the faithful; and that the images of saints are put in churches, as well that they *may be worshipped*, as that we, being admonished by their example, might conform ourselves to their life and manners." In regard to the nature of the worship offered to the images, we are taught, "It must not only be confessed, that the faithful in the churches do adore *before* the images, (as some peradventure would caute- lously speak,) but also *adore the image itself*, without what scruple you will, yea they do reverence it with the same worship, wherewith they do the thing that is represented thereby. Wherefore if that ought to be adored with *latria*, or divine worship, this also is to be adored with *latria*; if with *doulia*, or *hyper-doulia*, this is likewise to be adored with the same kind of worship. And so we see that St. Thomas Aquinas doth directly conclude that the same reverence is to be given to the image of Christ as to Christ himself; and by consequence, seeing Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria*, or divine worship, his image is to be adored with the adoration of *latria*." Here it is to be observed that the common plea of worshipping the image as a mere representative of absent deity is not true. For here it is distinctly avowed, and sanctioned by the name of Thomas Aquinas, than which no higher popish authority can be adduced, that the image itself is to be worshipped, and to be worshipped in the same manner as that which it represents. The consequence of this is, that when the

image is consecrated, it possesses a portion of divinity in itself, and is therefore to all intents and purposes a god. A great divine in Spain has declared, concerning the above doctrine of Thomas Aquinas, that the image and the sampler represented by it are to be worshipped with the same act of adoration, that it is most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith. This he says "is the doctrine not only of St. Thomas, and his disciples, but also of all the old schoolmen almost." It is then to be received as an established and authorised doctrine of popery, that images are not only to be used in worship, but that they are really to be worshipped. And the practice of papists is in strict conformity with this doctrine.

In speaking of the mass, the fact has been stated that popery teaches its votaries to believe that the bread and wine, in the Lord's supper, are changed into the real flesh and blood of Christ. Consequently, the host, as it is called, or the consecrated bread is Christ himself, in popish estimation. In accordance with this idea, those who receive the consecrated bread into their stomachs are viewed as receiving Christ, and as being spiritually united with him by that act. And when the consecrated host is elevated in the view of the people, they all worship before it, and worship it, as they would Christ himself. This is plainly idolatry. For though the bread bears no likeness in form, yet it is a material substance, and being such is worshipped as a real deity. All the bowing and kissing and adoring, therefore, directed to the elements used in the Lord's supper are most flagrant idolatry.

Popery has made an image of God the Father, in the form of an aged man, to denote wisdom and eternity. Thus papists have evidently changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like the corruptible man. For to represent eternity by the age of man, be he ever so old, is highly absurd; and to denote divine

wisdom by the wisdom of aged man is equally inconsistent and ridiculous. The image of Christ is usually that of a body extended on a cross. The Holy spirit is represented by a dove, probably from a mistaken apprehension of the passage in which the descent of the spirit is described. John i. 32. "I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." This passage does not say that the spirit descended in the bodily shape of a dove, but its descent was attended with some visible sign, in the manner of a dove, hovering over and alighting upon him. If one should say that a man fell from some height to the earth like a stone, would he mean that the man had the form and appearance of a stone? And here, it cannot be amiss to remark, that all those representations of deity by pictures and forms visible to the eye, such as a dove to represent the spirit, or an *eye* in the clouds, to represent the all-seeing God, or any other similitude, even if not designed for worship, are in degree a violation of the second command, and are false and dangerous; consequently should be avoided in all protestant countries. A style of crockery has lately appeared, called the *millennium pattern*, which is liable to severe reprehension on this account. It is but a remnant of popery.

But papists have not been content with single representations of the persons in the Godhead, they have gone to such lengths of impiety, as to make an image of the Trinity, in the form of a man with three faces. It is then matter of truth that the papists do make images of the invisible God, images of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and worship them, in direct contravention of the second command. They also make images of men, and women; which are set up and worshipped in their assemblies. In Rome is an image of St. Peter; the great toe of which is said to be actually worne away by the kissing of devout worshippers, in the course of ages. It must be no common worship or zeal that can wear

away inches of solid marble by application of the lips. The following is the form of prayer used in the consecration of images as authorised by pope Urban VIII. "Grant O God, that whosoever, before this image, shall diligently and humbly upon his knees, worship and honor thine only begotten son, or the blessed virgin, (according as the image is, that is consecrated,) or this glorious apostle or martyr, or confessor, or virgin, that he may obtain, by his or her merits or intercession, grace in this present life, and eternal glory hereafter."

In Loretta is an image of the virgin Mary, who is in fact the idol of the place. Middleton relates, that in the high street of Loretta, which leads to the holy house, the shops are filled with beads, crucifixes, lambs of God, and all the trinkets of popish superstition, where he observed printed certificates or testimonials affixed to each shop, declaring all their toys to have been touched by the blessed image; which certificates are provided for no other purpose, but to humor the general persuasion, both of the buyer and the seller, that some virtue is communicated by that touch, from a power or divinity residing in the image. "For what else," says he, "can we say of those miraculous images, as they are called, in every great town in Italy, but that some divinity or power is universally believed to reside in them? Are not all their people persuaded, and do not all their books testify that these images have sometimes moved themselves from place to place, have wept, talked, and performed many miracles, and does not this necessarily imply an extraordinary power residing in them?" The above mentioned author also relates from the journal of a certain traveller, that in one of the churches of Lucca, they show an image of the virgin with the child Jesus in her arms, of which the following story is told. "A blasphemous gamester, in a rage of despair, took a stone and threw it at the infant; but the virgin, to preserve it from the blow which was aimed at its head, shifted him instantly from

her right arm into the left, in which he is now held; while the blasphemer was swallowed up by the earth upon the spot, where the hole, which they declare to be unfathomable, is still kept open, and enclosed only with a grate, just before the altar of the image. The virgin however received the blow upon her shoulder, whence the blood presently issued, which is preserved in a chrystal, and produced with the greatest ceremony by the priest in his vestments, with tapers lighted, while all the company kiss the sacred relic on their knees." On this account Dr. Middleton justly inquires. "Now does not the attestation of this miracle naturally tend to persuade people that there is an actual power residing in the image, which can defend itself from injuries, and inflict vengeance on all who dare to insult it?"

St. Dominic was the founder of the Inquisition, and of course has been a great favorite in the ranks of popery. "One of the most celebrated images in Italy," says Dr. Middleton, "is that of St. Dominic of Surriano, in Calabria; which, as their histories testify, was brought down from heaven about two centuries ago by the virgin Mary in person, accompanied by Mary Magdalene and St. Catharine. Before this glorious picture as they affirm, great numbers of the dead have been restored to life, and hundreds from the agonies of death; the dumb, the blind, the deaf, the lame have been cured, and all sorts of diseases and mortal wounds have been healed; all which facts are attested by public notaries, and confirmed by the relations of cardinals, prelates, generals and priors of that order, and the certainty of them so generally believed, that, from the 9th of July to the 9th of August, the anniversary festival of the saint, they have always counted above a hundred thousand pilgrims, and many of them of the highest quality, who come from different parts of Europe to pay their devotions and make their offerings at this picture." Aringhus, as cited by Middleton, makes the following remarks respecting images

in general, and respecting the image of St. Dominic in particular. " Within these few years, under every pope successively, some of our sacred images, especially of the more ancient, have made themselves illustrious, and acquired a peculiar worship and veneration by the exhibition of fresh signs; as is notorious to all, who dwell in this city. But how can I pass over in silence the image of St. Dominic, so conspicuous at this day for its never ceasing miracles, which attract the resort and admiration of the whole Christian world. This picture, which, as pious tradition informs us, was brought down from heaven, about the year of our redemption 1530, is a most solid bulwark of the church of Christ, and a noble monument of the pure faith of Christians, against all the impious opposers of image worship. The venerable image is drawn indeed but rudely, without the help of art or pencil, sketched out by a celestial hand, with a book in its right hand, and a lilly in its left, of a moderate stature, but of a grave and comely aspect, with a robe reaching down to the heels. Those who have written its history, assert that the painters, in their attempts to copy it, have not always been able to take similar copies, because it frequently assumes a different air, and rays of light have been seen by some to issue from its countenance, and it has more than once removed itself from one place to another. The *worship*, therefore, of this picture is become so famous, through all Christendom, that multitudes of people, to the number of a hundred thousand and upwards, flock annually to pay their devotions to it, on the festival of the saint. And though it be strange which I have now related, yet what I am going to say is still stranger, that not only the original picture, not made by human but by heavenly hands, is celebrated by its daily miracles, but even the copy of it, which is piously preserved in this city, in the monastery called St. Mary's above the Minerva, is famous also in these our days, for its perpetual signs and wonders, as the numberless vo-

tive offerings hanging around it, and the bracelets and jewels which adorn it, testify."

Such is the worship of St. Dominic's images by papists; and, as he was a blood-thirsty, cruel man, their high estimation of his character, shown in their worship of his image, proves that such a character is consonant to the prevailing feelings of papists. The worship of Bacchus and Venus by the ancient heathen, indicated their own licentiousness: so the popularity attending the worship of St. Dominic, the Moloch of modern idolatry, shows the prevalent spirit of popery. The story of the picture of St. Dominic being brought down from heaven, is evidently borrowed from the ancient heathen tradition concerning the image of Diana of Ephesus, that it fell down from Jupiter out of heaven. It was a favorite notion of the heathen, that they had shields and swords made by the gods; and old Vulcan, the divine blacksmith, had a great deal of custom from this nether world. And it would seem, from the foregoing heathenish tale about the picture of St. Dominic, that there are painters in heaven, who can represent, though but rudely, earthy bodies, and give their paintings earthy substance. How this can be, the credulous worshippers of Dominic do not inform us. But it is vain for any advocate of popery to tell us after this that images are only worshipped as visible representatives of absent divinity, when they are believed to have consciousness and the power of working miracles.

It must be evident, therefore, that popery stands, in the face of the world, chargeable with open and authorized idolatry. And there is no plea by which she attempts to shelter herself from this charge, which would not be equally valid in defence of the idolatry of the heathen. Is it said that images and pictures are calculated to impress truth upon the mind? So said the Hindoo who once visited London. He very much censured the want of images in the churches of protestant Christians. He said the worshippers had nothing upon which they could

fix their attention, and hence they were often gazing at each other, and often at mere inanity. "We," said he, "have in our temples an image of the Deity to look at, with large eyes, huge ears, great hands, and long feet. Not that we believe this very image to be the Deity, but we use it only to fix our attention, and to remind us that the being whom it represents, can see every thing, and hear every thing." Who does not see that this argument, though coming from a heathen, is equally applicable to the practices of popery?

Will it be said that there is something specious in the canonization and festive honor of eminent men. The same may be said, and doubtless has been felt in all its force; by the heathen. The worship of the calf in the wilderness, by the Israelites, was esteemed and treated as downright idolatry. But there were many plausible reasons for this worship, more perhaps than we at first imagine. The worship of the calf is supposed to have been suggested by the worship of the god Apis, in Egypt. This god was represented by the figure of an ox, and the ox is supposed to have been chosen in reference to the service rendered to Egypt by Joseph, the great deliverer of the nation from famine. The years of plenty and of famine had been represented in the dream of Pharaoh, each by seven kine. On this account probably, the ox, or kine, which is the female of the same species of animal, became a symbol of the deliverance of Egypt, and of Joseph the deliverer. The Israelites understood this. And when Moses had been absent so long as to lead them to despair of his return, what would be more natural than for them to think of Joseph, the illustrious benefactor of their race, whose bones they were transporting with them; and, thinking of him, what would be more natural than to think of his representative, in the worship to which they had been witnesses in Egypt? And what more plausible, in the absence of Moses, than to attempt to invoke the presence of Joseph, by the worship of the

young ox? This is all plausible, and perfectly consonant with the feelings of the carnal mind. But it was rank idolatry nevertheless. The principle was wrong. They were not to look to any finite power or deliverer, but to God only. Him they were taught to worship, and to have no gods before him. The heathen might have many plausible things to say in favor of their idolatry. They honor and celebrate eminent men, heroes, and deliverers. Hercules destroyed various monsters that desolated the earth, and who could refuse him divine honor? What better can be said of popish saints, who make up the list of demons in the worship of popery? What more, for example, can be said of St. Patrick, the tutelar demon of Ireland, supposing it true that he cleared that island of venomous reptiles, as tradition relates? Indeed the worship of creatures for their real or imaginary virtues or benefactions all stands on the same principle, whether it be papal or pagan. It is loving and serving the creature rather than the Creator, and this is idolatry. The same principle, followed out, will lead to the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, and indeed to the worship of four-footed beasts and creeping things. It is all idolatry from first to last. And popery is almost as deeply involved in this guilt as paganism.

SECTION VIII.

PERSECUTIONS OF POPERY.

It has been the boast of the advocates of popery, that the church of Rome never persecuted. The manner in which this conclusion is reached is so much of a curiosity, and affords so choice a specimen of popish logic, that it deserves a particular statement. The papists define persecution to be, violence used towards the friends of the truth, and the true church of Christ, whereby they

suffer for righteousness' sake. The bearing of this definition will be seen by every reader. The papists consider themselves the only friends to the truth, and their nominal church as the only true church of Christ. Consequently there can be no persecution, in their view, but what is directed against themselves. All who differ from them are heretics, as they say, and to use violence with heretics, even to imprison and destroy them, by any means, or to any extent, is no persecution; because it is, as they say, their duty to suppress heretics, and to support the true faith. If any measure is taken to restrict papists, or to limit their power, this is persecution, awful violence against the friends of the truth. Papists must have full liberty to think, speak, write, and publish as they please; and all who differ from them, however conscientiously or justly, are enemies to the truth, and deserving of utter destruction. On this ground the papists allege, that none but their opposers have ever persecuted. But papists do not appear to reflect, that this principle would prove that there is, and can be, no such thing as persecution. The heathen of old pagan Rome held that their religion was the only true religion, and consequently, that all who opposed, or adopted any new system, were contemners of the gods, and enemies to religion. On this ground they proceeded to use violence. And if Rome papal is correct in her position, Rome pagan was correct in hers, and there never has been any such thing as persecution. The fallacy of this reasoning lies in the principle assumed in the definition of persecution. The truth is, every accountable agent is his own judge as to what true religion is; and no one has the right to judge for another. Persecution, therefore, consists in using violence or constraint with men, for believing and practicing what they conscientiously judge to be truth and duty. This is the right of conscience, and so long as it keeps within its proper sphere, and does not infringe on the rights of others, or the public welfare, it

must be held sacred. To deny this right is persecution. And the papists, by assuming to themselves the right of controlling the consciences of their fellow-men, assume the principle and attitude of persecutors.

Another principle of persecution adopted and carried into practice by papists is, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. This is as much as to say, that all who do not receive their doctrines and opinions implicitly, are to be disfranchised, and not entitled to any of the rights of moral beings. The most solemn promises and treaties, in these circumstances, have no binding force in the estimation of papists. This sentiment, indeed, is nothing less than a sentence of universal outlawry, passed against the human family if they do not choose to become papists. But, as the adoption of this principle by papists is sometimes denied, the first illustration of popish persecution may properly be the proof, that popery maintains the sentiment that no faith is to be kept with heretics.

Here it may be remarked, that the doctrine of indulgences, when carried out to its legitimate consequences, implies this sentiment. For if the pope, or his priests, can commute crimes and punishments; if they can grant absolution at all; they can do it in respect to breaches of faith, as well as to any other offences, and thus nullify at a blow the most solemn obligations and engagements. That the doctrine of indulgences is understood by papists themselves to have this extent of application, is evident from the dispensation given to the king and queen of France, and to their successors forever, by pope Clement VI. It is as follows, viz:—"Clement, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear son and daughter in Christ, John and Joan, king and queen of France, greeting, and our apostolic benediction. Your desires we willingly approve of, and especially those, wherein may God graciously give you that peace and repose of soul you piously seek after; hence it is that we, ready to answer your humble request, do, by our apostolic au-

thority, grant by these presents, an indulgence forever hereafter, to you and your successors, that for the time being, shall be kings and queens of France, and to every of you and them; that such confessor, regular or secular, as you and they shall choose, may *commute*, for such vows as you may have already made, or which, by you or your successors, may be hereafter made; (vows touching the holy land, the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and of chastity and continence only excepted;) and also such *oaths* by you taken, and by you and them to be taken, in all times coming, that you and they *cannot profitably keep*; by other works of piety, as to him shall seem expedient towards God, and for the peace of your and their souls. Be it, therefore, utterly unlawful for any upon earth to annul this our grant, or by any act of temerity to controvert the same. And be it known to any one that presumptuously attempts so to do, that he forthwith incurs the wrath of Almighty God, and of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul. Given at Avignon, May 12, 1347."

This indulgence, every one can see, saps the foundation of all faith, by allowing men to disregard their solemn oaths, when they cannot *profitably* keep them. Of course, oaths and engagements to heretics can be dispensed or commuted. But direct evidence of the sentiment in question is abundant. Gregory VII. made a decree prohibiting all to keep faith with excommunicated persons, until they made satisfaction. And as all heretics were excommunicated of course, this decree reaches the point in question, and not only allows papists to break their faith with heretics, but requires them to do it. Martin V. says, in one of his epistles, "Be assured that thou sinnest mortally if thou keep thy faith with heretics." Gregory IX. made the following law:—"Be it known to all who are under the jurisdiction of those who have openly fallen into heresy, that they are free from the obligations of fidelity, dominion, and every kind of

obedience to them ; by whatever bond or means they are tied to them ; and how securely soever they may be bound." On this law, a popish bishop makes the following comment :—"Governors of forts, and all kinds of vassals are, by this constitution, freed from the bond of the oath, whereby they had promised fidelity to their lords and masters. Moreover, a catholic wife is not obliged to perform the marriage contract with a heretical husband. If faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other robbers, who kill the body, much less with obstinate heretics, who kill the soul. Aye, but it is a sad thing to break faith. But, as saith Merius Salomonius, faith promised against Christ, if kept, is verily perfidy. Justly, therefore, were some heretics burnt, by the most solemn judgment of the council of Constance, although they had been promised security. And St. Thomas, also, is of opinion, that a Catholic might deliver over an intractable heretic to the judges, notwithstanding he had pledged his faith to him, and even confirmed it by the solemnity of an oath." Saith Bonacina, "Contracts made against the canon law are invalid, though confirmed by an oath ; and no man is bound to stand to his promise, though he had sworn to it." Pope Innocent, in his bull against the Waldenses, in 1487, declares on the strength of his apostolical authority, that "all those who had been bound and obligated by contract, or any way whatever, to grant or pay any thing to them, should not be under any manner of obligation to do so for time to come." Pope Pius V., by his legate, endeavored to persuade the emperor, "that no faith or oaths were to be kept with an infidel." The emperor Charles V., having given his promise and safe conduct to Luther in attending the diet at Worms, was urged by papists to violate it, by arresting Luther on the spot, which he refused to do. But this great point need not be rested on the declarations of individuals. We may cite the authority of the council of Constance, which assembled in 1414, to which papists

allow the greatest deference. The theory of this council in regard to the point in question, is as follows, viz:—

“ The holy synod of Constance declares concerning every safe conduct granted by the emperor, kings, and other temporal princes, to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, in hopes of reclaiming them, that it ought not to be of any prejudice to the catholic faith, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder but that such persons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, although they shall have come to the place of judgment, relying on their safe conduct, and without which they would not have come thither. And the person who shall have promised them security, shall not in this case be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may have been engaged, when he has done all that is in his power to do.” This was the deliberate sentiment of the council of Constance. And this sentiment they proceeded to put in practice, in a manner and under circumstances which demands the execration of the whole civilized world. John Huss of Bohemia, being summoned to the council, to answer to a charge of heresy, and he with his friends fearing violence, the *safe conduct* of the emperor Sigismund was given him, in which the emperor pledged his word and honor that Huss should be protected from all violence till he returned to his place of residence. He accordingly came to the council. There he was found to be, in the judgment of the council, a heretic. He was accordingly condemned to the stake, and, without any regard to the solemn pledge of the emperor, publicly burnt. The emperor, indeed, endeavored to interpose, and manifested some conscience about his engagement; but the holy fathers taught him, as in the decree above cited, that faith with heretics is not to be observed. Jerome of Prague, who was condemned and burnt by the same council, had a *safe conduct* from the council itself. So, in this case,

the pitiful subterfuge resorted to in regard to Huss, that he had only the pledge of the emperor, would not apply. The council violated their own solemn engagement, and burnt an innocent man at the stake, after they had assured him, by a deliberate promise, that his person should be safe among them. These facts establish the points in question, and fix the sentiment on the whole body of papists; because these things were done at a general council, composed of the highest dignitaries of their community; and its decisions have always been considered binding upon papists. In this council, according to popery, dwelt infallibility, and therefore papists of the present day, though they may shrink from an open avowal of this obnoxious sentiment, from which the intelligence of the present age revolts, must, by some shifts, defend the holy council, or bring it off, the best way they can. But to confess any thing wrong in the matter is out of the question, and would at once dissolve the charm of popery.

The council of Trent, which met subsequently to the reformation, and more than a hundred years after the council above mentioned, distinctly recognized and sanctioned the decree of the council of Constance. This council of Trent is the last general council which has ever convened under the auspices of popery. It is plain therefore that the ordinance of Constance, has never been revoked by any competent authority, and that the ordinance now stands valid as a law of popery in all countries. It may however be deemed expedient not to advance the doctrine in all countries, and at all times. This however so far from making any thing in favor of popery, only shews, to use a vulgar proverb, that she has learned to conceal, as occasion requires, the cloven foot.

Limborch in his history of the inquisition, brings many popish authorities to shew that it is a rule universally understood by papists that, "Subjects, when a prince or magistrate is a heretic, are freed from their obedience."

Kings, whom the pope has pronounced heretics, have, with all their posterity, been deprived of all their dignities, jurisdictions, and rights, their subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance and fidelity, and their dominions given as a prey to others. And finally they are deprived of their natural rights, and lose all property in every thing which they have.

But more especially is this persecuting principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics, illustrated by the practice of the inquisition. This court, as we have seen, is established on the pure principles of popery, and has always been to her as a right hand. When persons suspected of heresy are brought before this court, they are generally tempted to accuse themselves. And to induce them to do this, they are allured by promises, that if they frankly confess, they shall receive mercy. The faith of the holy office is thus pledged to the person under examination. But no sooner is confession made, than the faith is violated, and the criminal is consigned to punishment. If no confession is made, which answers the purpose of the inquisitors, though it may be the whole truth, yet the accused is subjected to the tortures of the rack until he will confess enough to ensure his destruction. An example of this sort occurred at Seville, as related by Limborch, from Gonsalvius. "About the year 1559, among others who were seized at Seville by the inquisition, was a certain pious matron, with her two virgin daughters, and her neice, by her sister who was married. As they endured those tortures of all kinds, by which their enemies endeavored to make them perfidiously betray their brethren in Christ, and especially to accuse one another, the inquisitor at length commanded one of the daughters to be sent for to audience. There he discoursed with her alone for a considerable time, in order to comfort her as she needed. After the conversation the young lady was remanded to prison. After a few days he repeated the scene, and so from time to time, telling her how much

he was grieved for her afflictions, and then intermixing familiarly other pleasant and agreeable things. All this was designed to gain the confidence of the young lady, and make her feel that he sympathized with her in her calamity, and was disposed, as a father, to consult her safety and that of her mother and sisters, if by any means it could be affected. After a few such interviews of sympathy and kindness, when he perceived that he had gained the young lady's confidence, he began cautiously to persuade her to discover to him what she knew of herself, her mother, sisters, and aunts, who were not yet apprehended, promising *upon oath*, that if she would faithfully discover to him all that she knew of that affair, he would find a method to relieve her of all her misfortunes, and to send them all back again to their houses. The young lady, being blinded by the promise, began to tell the holy father something relating to the doctrine she had been taught, and about which they used to confer with each other. When the inquisitor had thus got a clue, he dexterously endeavored to find his way through the whole labyrinth, sometimes calling the young lady to audience, that what she had deposed might be taken down in a legal manner, always persuading her that this would be the only certain means of removing all her evils. But at length when he had drawn forth what he could, and what he had not before extorted by torture, he determined to bring her again to the rack, and compel her to discover the whole. Accordingly she was made to suffer the most cruel tortures of the holy office, and in the extremity of her agony she accused her mother, sisters, and several others, who were all taken up, tortured and burnt in the same fire with the young lady, who had been the victim of this treachery." This case is only one among thousands which are almost constantly occurring in the proceedings of the holy office. The usual practice with the inquisitors has been to promise their prisoners mercy, and to confirm this promise by their

solemn oaths, that they might by this means extort something either against the prisoners or their friends, and then to violate these oaths without hesitation or reserve.

The persecuting principles of popery being thus established, it is time to proceed to the examination of the black catalogue of facts, in relation to this subject. But before this is done it may be proper to give a specimen of the sentences pronounced by the popes against those who offend them. From the spirit manifested in these, the reader will be in a measure prepared for what follows. The example chosen relates to the following case. The pope was the proprietor of some alum works on the continent. One of the workmen eloped, came to England and revealed the secrets of the trade. The pope sent after him an excommunication, which, it is needless to say, but poorly comports with the example of him who said "*bless and curse not.*"

"By authority of God almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and of the holy canons, and of the immaculate virgin Mary, the mother and patroness of our Saviour, and of all the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubim, and seraphim; and all the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of all the apostles and evangelists, and of the holy innocents, who in the sight of the holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song; of the holy martyrs and holy confessors; and of the holy virgins and all the saints together with all the elect of God, we excommunicate and anathematize this thief, or this malefactor N——, and from the thresholds of the holy church of Almighty God, we sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed, and delivered over with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord God depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways, and as fire is quenched with water, so let his light be put out forever, unless he repent and make satisfaction. Amen. May God the Father, who made man, curse him. May God the son,

who suffered for us, curse him. May the Holy Ghost, who was given to us in baptism, curse him. May the holy cross, which Christ for our salvation triumphantly ascended, curse him. May the holy and eternal virgin Mary, curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May St. John, the chief forerunner and baptist of Christ, curse him. May St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all the other apostles of Christ, together with the rest of his disciples and the four evangelists, curse him. May the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their holy works are found pleasing to God, curse him. May the holy choir of the holy virgins, who for the honor of Christ have despised the things of this world, curse him. May all the saints, who from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages are found to be the beloved of God, curse him. May the heaven and the earth, and all things therein remaining, curse him. May he be cursed wherever he may be, whether in the house or in the field, in the high way, or in the path, in the wood, or in the water, or in the church. May he be cursed in living and in dying, in eating, in drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, in waking, in walking, in standing, in sitting, in lying, in working, in resting. May he be cursed in all the powers of his body. May he be cursed within and without. May he be cursed in the hair of his head; may he be cursed in his brain. May he be cursed in the crown of his head, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his eyebrows, in his cheeks, in his jaw bones, in his nostrils, in his foreteeth, in his grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his wrists, in his arms, in his hands, in his breast, and in all the interior parts of the very stomach, in his reins, in his groin, and in his thighs, in his hips, in his knees, in his legs, in his feet, in his joints and in his nails. May he be cursed in the whole structure of his members. From the crown of his head to

the sole of his feet, may there be no soundness in him. May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him. And may heaven and all the powers that move therein, rise against him to damn him, unless he repent and make full satisfaction. Amen.”

This, it must be confessed is bitter cursings, though exceedingly vain, and withal very profane. What ideas must the pope have of heaven and the powers that move therein, that he should venture to invoke them all in this tirade of curses against a poor mechanic respecting a little alum! But the purpose for which this specimen of popish anathemas was introduced, is to illustrate the persecuting spirit of popery, not only for religion's sake, but for filthy lucre's sake. If the pope could follow a fugitive laborer with such a torrent of passion and malice, what would the laborer have to expect should he fall into the hands of this fiendlike pope. And what have others to expect who awaken this spirit of vengeance, but all the cruelty of which human nature is capable, and all the tortures which human ingenuity and malice can invent? Such has been the uniform state of facts, as we shall perceive by recurring to the history of the proceedings of popery against its opponents.

The persecuting spirit of popery was early manifested towards those who ventured to differ in sentiment, however peaceable and useful in other respects. But the first occasion for the general and violent exhibition of this spirit, occurred in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the eyes of many people, particularly in France, began to be opened to perceive the idolatry and absurdity of the popish worship. They labored for a long time under many disadvantages, as the Latin Vulgate translation of the bible was the only edition of the scriptures at that time in Europe, and very few of the people were able to read it. But, through some faint rays of light which they obtained, a multitude of persons, called at first the *poor men of Lyons*, arrived at some saving know-

ledge of the truth, which they maintained at every hazard and sacrifice. At length Peter Waldo came forward, as an instrument in the hand of God of making known more perfectly the truths of divine revelation. He translated, or caused to be translated, the four gospels into French, and thus laid the foundation of a permanent secession from popery, and sowed the seeds of a future reformation. His followers, and those who afterwards joined them, were called Waldenses. But no sooner did this people begin to refer to the scriptures as their standard, than they were impelled to forsake the superstitions of popery. This raised against them a storm of persecution. The intolerant spirit of popery could not brook any question concerning its infallibility, and the only alternative presented by it was, entire submission, or instant destruction. The persecutions which the Waldenses experienced, and their triumphant death, as martyrs for the truth, renewed the scenes of the second century, when pagan Rome let loose her malice against the persecuted followers of Jesus. Concerning Waldo some account has already been given. A few particulars concerning the treatment his followers received from papal Rome will be appropriate in this place. In 1181, the pope issued a decree against heretics, which begins as follows, viz: "To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies which are lately sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to the church should be awakened, that, by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and malpertness of the heretics, in their false designs may be crushed, and the truth of catholic simplicity, shining forth in the holy church, may demonstrate her pure, and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son, Frederick, the most illustrious emperor of the Romans, always increaser of the empire, with the common advice and counsel of our brethren, and other patriarchs,

archbishops, and many princes, who from different parts of the world are met together, do set themselves against these heretics, who have got different names from the several false doctrines which they profess—by the sanction of this present decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated. More particularly we declare all Catharists, Patorines, and those who call themselves the poor of Lyons, the Passagines, the Josephites, and the Arnoldists, to be under a perpetual *anathema*. And because some, under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority of preaching; whereas the same apostle saith, ‘How shall they preach except they be sent?’ We therefore conclude under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema, all those, who, either being forbid, or not sent, do notwithstanding, presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority derived from the apostolic see, or from the bishops of their respective diocesses. As for any layman, who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, (that is, preaching or speaking improperly of the sacraments,) unless by abjuring his heresy, and making satisfaction, he immediately return to the orthodox faith, we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment, according to the quality of the offence.” This giving over into the hands of the secular power, was a devise of popery by which she attempted to conceal her own thirst for blood, by charging all executions on the secular arm. But the truth was, the civil as well as the ecclesiastical power was virtually in her hands, and the secular magistrate understood well the consequence of neglecting any such intimation of the papal pleasure.

The king of Arragon so understood this reference to secular power, for he followed up this decree of the pope

by one of his own, in which he ordains, "that all heretics found in his dominions be condemned and persecuted everywhere." And that persons who should receive any of them into their houses, or be present at their pernicious sermons, shall be punished, as if they were actually guilty of high treason.

The emperor FREDERICK also published a similar decree, concerning those that might be found in his dominions. "The care of the imperial government," says his majesty, "committed to us from heaven, and over which we preside, demands the material sword, which is given us separately from the priesthood, against the enemies of the faith, for the extirpation of heretical pravity, that we should pursue, with justice and judgment, those vipers and perfidious children, who insult the Lord and his church, as if they would tear out the bowels of their mother. We shall not suffer these wretches to live, who infest the world by their seducing doctrines, and who, being themselves corrupted, more grievously taint the flock of the faithful." In another decree the emperor accuses them of savage cruelty to themselves. "Since besides the loss of their immortal souls, they expose their bodies to a cruel death, being prodigal of their lives and fearless of destruction, which, by acknowledging the true faith, they might escape, and what is horrible to express, their survivors are not terrified by their example. Against such enemies to God and man, we cannot contain our indignation, nor refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance, but shall pursue them with so much the greater vigor as they appear to spread wider the crimes of their superstition, to the most evident injury of the Christian faith, and of the church of Rome, which is adjudged to be the head of all churches."

In consequence of these papal and imperial edicts, the whole power of popery, both ecclesiastical and secular, was rallied against the unoffending people of God, whose only crime was that they read and interpreted the word

of God for themselves, and refused to receive all the absurdity taught by the popish priesthood. The bishops of Mentz and Strasburgh denounced vengeance against all heretics in their precincts. In the latter city eighty persons were committed to the flames. The pope despatched preachers throughout all Europe to engage his followers in this crusade against heretics. He promised paradise, and the remission of all their sins to those who should serve forty days in this holy warfare. After telling his people that they are not to keep faith with them that do not keep faith with God, he says: "We exhort you that you would endeavor to destroy the wicked heresy of the Albigenses, and do this with more rigor than you would use towards the Saracens themselves; persecute them with a strong hand, deprive them of their lands and possessions, banish them and put catholics in their room." The emissaries of the pope went forth preaching for recruits, and their text generally was, "Who shall rise up for me against the evil doers; or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?" And again, "If thou shalt hear say, in any one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, to dwell there; saying, let us go and serve other gods which ye have not known, thou shalt smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword." By perverting these passages of scripture, the pope and the priests made the people believe that they were doing God service, while they imbrued their hands in the innocent blood of their neighbors. The consequence was, that by the fire and sword, those weapons of popery, in which her great strength lies, the armies employed by a single pope, murdered above two hundred thousand in the space of a few months. This work of extirpation was continued for many years, and the strength of Europe was exhausted in destroying her best population. For even their enemies bear testimony, that the Waldenses and Albigenses were peaceable, industrious, and moral citizens. Even

an inquisitor, who wrote against them, was constrained to make the following concession. "These heretics are known by their manners and conversation, for they are modest and orderly in their behaviour and deportment. They avoid all appearance of pride in their dress, they neither indulge in finery of attire, nor are they remarkable for being mean and ragged. They avoid commerce, that they may be free from deceit and falsehood. They obtain their livelihood by manual industry, as day laborers or mechanics, and their teachers are weavers or tailors. They are not anxious about amassing riches, but content themselves with the necessaries of life. They are chaste, temperate and sober. They abstain from anger. Even when they work they either learn or teach. In like manner also their women are very modest, avoiding backbiting, foolish jesting, and levity of speech, especially abstaining from lies or swearing, not so much as making use of the common asseverations, '*in truth,*' '*for certain,*' or the like, because they regard these as oaths,—contenting themselves with simply answering *yes or no!*"

The archbishop of Turin, also says of these men, "Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians. In their lives and morals they are perfect, irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves with all their might to the service of God." A Dominican also, speaking of the Waldenses of Bohemia, says, "I say that in morals and life they are good, true in words, unanimous in brotherly love, but their faith is incorrigible and vile, as I have shewn in my treatise." A Franciscan friar, speaking of them, explicitly confesses in what respect their faith was incorrigible and vile, when he says, "that all the errors of the Waldenses consisted in this, that they denied the church of Rome to be the holy mother church, and would not obey her traditions." In the time of the hottest persecution of the Waldenses, in certain provinces of France,

a certain monk was deputed by a bishop to hold a conference with them, that they might be convinced of their errors, and the further effusion of blood prevented. But the monk returned in confusion, owning, that in his whole life he had never known so much of the scriptures, as he had learned during those few days, that he had been conversing with the heretics." The bishop, however sent among them a number of doctors, young men who had lately come from the Sorbonne, which at that time was the great school of popish subtlety. One of these publicly owned that he had understood more of the doctrine of salvation from the answers of the children in their catechisms, than from all the disputations which he had ever before heard. These testimonials are conclusive as to the moral character of these victims of popish persecution. And they are the more important to be known, because the papists of latter times have endeavored without ceasing to blacken the characters of these people, and to accuse them of various enormities and immoralities, that thereby they might conceal the true cause of their unrelenting persecution. But the testimony of all credible history is on the other side, and shews their only offence to have been, a refusal to submit to the pope. For this crime they were hunted like wild beasts, they were driven from their homes to suffer with famine and nakedness; and in great numbers they were destroyed by fire and sword. The following as one of a thousand examples of equally refined cruelty may serve as an illustration,—“About the year 1400, a violent outrage was committed upon the Waldenses, who inhabited the valley of Pragella in Piedmont, by the popish party resident in the neighborhood. The attack, which seems to have been of the most furious kind, was made towards the end of the month of December, when the mountains were covered with snow, and thereby rendered difficult of access, so that the inhabitants of the valleys were wholly unapprised that any such attempt was meditated, and the persecutors were in actual

possession of their caves, before they seem to have been apprised of any hostile designs against them. In this pitiable plight, they had recourse to the only alternative which remained of saving their lives. They fled to one of the highest mountains of the Alps, with their wives and children; the unhappy mothers carrying the cradle in one hand, and in the other leading such of their offspring as were able to walk. Their inhuman invaders, whose feet were swift to shed blood, pursued them in their flight, until night came on, and slew great numbers of them before they could reach the mountains. Those who escaped however, were reserved to experience a fate not more enviable. Overtaken by the shades of night, they wandered up and down the mountains, covered with snow, destitute of the means of shelter, or of supporting themselves by any of those comforts which Providence has destined for that purpose; benumbed with cold, they fell an easy prey to the severity of the climate, and when the night had passed away, there were found, in their cradles or lying on the snow, fourscore of their infants deprived of life, many of the mothers also lying dead by their sides, and others just upon the point of expiring." But it may be said perhaps, why bring these things which were done by papists hundreds of years ago, against those of the present day? The answer is, because papists now justify all that has been done by their predecessors. They must do so, if they adhere to the principle of papal infallibility. If they would come forward and frankly condemn what their predecessors have done that is wrong, no one would consider the present generation responsible. But while papists, though they have not the power to do so now, pertinaciously defend such wholesale murder as has been perpetrated by their community, while they say it was all right and proper, all according to duty to exterminate those who differ from them, they must submit to be held responsible for the principle, and to be considered as restrained from such proceedings at the present day, only

by the stern hand of necessity. Those that will justify these murders, would, if they had the opportunity, commit them. This is a conclusion sanctioned by our Saviour when he says, "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets, wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which kill the prophets.—That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias the son of Barachias whom ye slew between the temple and the altar."—Let papists condemn the pope and his legions for the innocent blood which they have shed, and then they may hope to escape the imputation. But who ever heard a papist utter the most distant intimation that the pope, whose hands are stained, and whose garments are crimsoned with the blood of martyrs, ever did, or ever can do wrong.

With this exposition of the propriety of drawing testimony to the persecuting spirit of popery, from former and distant events in view, we proceed in the narration of particular facts.

In the twelfth century some of the true disciples of Christ fled to Britain, from the persecutions of Germany. But they found no relief. The popish rulers of England were actuated by the same spirit with their brethren in Germany and France. A council was called by the king to meet at Oxford, to try these heretics, whose number amounted to no more than about thirty. They were condemned by the haughty prelates of popery, they were branded on the forehead, publicly whipped out of the town where they dwelt, and being turned into the fields in the depth of winter, when all were forbidden to relieve them, they perished. Even their enemies allow that they behaved with great calmness and moderation,

and when the inhuman sentence was executed upon them, they sang, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you and persecute you." At Glasgow, in Scotland, in 1422, James Betby was burnt, for denying that the pope was Christ's vicar. In 1431, Paul Craw, a Bohemian, apprehended in the university of St. Andrews, suffered death there. His enemies put a ball of brass into his mouth, that what he said for the truth in his last moments, might not be heard by the people. Under archbishop Beaton, the first who was called to suffer was Mr. Patrick Hamilton, abbot of Ferm, a man nobly descended, and not much past twenty-three years of age. This young man had travelled in Germany, and falling into familiarity with Luther, and other reformers, was by them instructed in the knowledge of true religion. In this he was so well established and so happy, that he determined to return to his country and communicate the knowledge he had obtained. On his return he spared not to expose the corruptions of the Roman church, wherever he came. The popish clergy, offended at this, under pretence of a conference, enticed him to the city of St. Andrews, and when he came there they appointed friar Campbell to keep company with him, and to endeavour to draw him from the opinions he had adopted. After staying in the city several days, where he suspected no evil, he was one night seized while in bed, and carried prisoner to the castle. The next day he was brought before the bishop, and accused of maintaining the doctrines substantially of the reformation. Confessing that he held some of them as undoubted truth, he was put on trial, condemned as a heretic, and delivered over to the secular power. The same day, (for the execution was hastened lest the king, who was then absent, should return and interfere) he was condemned by the secular judge, and in the afternoon led to his place of suffering, which was appointed to be at the gate of St. Salvator's college. Being come to the place he put off his outer garments,

and gave them to his servant, saying, "I have no more to leave thee but the ensample of my death, which I pray thee keep in mind. For though the same be bitter and painful in man's judgment, yet it is the entrance to everlasting life, which none can inherit who denieth Christ." Then was he tied to the stake, about it a great quantity of coal, wood and other combustible matter was heaped, whereof he had no fear, but seriously commending his soul into the hands of God, he held his eyes fixed towards heaven. The friars all the while were vexing him with their cries, bidding him to turn, and pray to the virgin Mary. Among them none was more troublesome than friar Campbell, who kept company with him when he first came to the city. Often he besought him to depart and not to vex him, but when the friar would not cease his crying, the martyr said, "wicked man thou knowest that I am not an heretic, and that it is the truth of God for which I now suffer, so much thou didst confess to me in private, therefore I appeal thee to answer before the judgment seat of Christ." By this time the fire was kindled, after which with a loud voice he was heard to say, "How long O Lord, shall darkness oppress this realm? How long wilt thou suffer this tyranny of men," and then he closed with these words, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." His body was quickly consumed, for the fire was vehement, but the patience and constancy he shewed in his dying, stirred up such compassion in the beholders, as many of them doubted not to say that he suffered an innocent, and was indeed a martyr of Christ.

Soon after the above execution, one Henry Forrest was apprehended for saying that Mr. Patrick Hamilton died a martyr. He was brought to St. Andrews, but because the proof was not clear, a certain friar was appointed to confess him. The simple man, thinking no harm, being asked by the confessor what was his opinion of Mr. Hamilton, answered that he thought him to be a good man,

and that the articles for which he was condemned might well be defended. This confession the friar disclosed, and it was taken as evidence, and the poor man was forthwith condemned to be burnt as an heretic. As he was led out, he complained grievously of the friar who had betrayed him, crying out, "Fie on falsehood! Fie on false friars, revealers of confession! Never let any man trust them after me. They are despisers of God, and deceivers of men." While they were consulting on the manner of his execution, one John Lindsay, a plain man, who attended the bishop, gave advice to burn him in some hollow cellar; "for the smoke," said he, "of Patrick Hamilton, hath infected all those on whom it blew."

About the year 1543, there was in the university of Cambridge one Mr. George Wishart, who was born in Scotland; and after having received a grammatical education at a private school, finished his studies at the University of Cambridge. He was a modest, temperate man, fearing God and hating covetousness. Being desirous of propagating the true gospel in his own country, he left Cambridge in 1544; and in his way to Scotland, preached in most of the principal towns to the great satisfaction of his hearers. On his arrival in his native land, he first preached at Montrose, and afterwards at Dundee. In this last place he made an exposition of the epistle to the Romans, which he went through with so much grace and eloquence, as delighted the reformers and alarmed the papists. In consequence of this exposition, one Robert Miln, a principal man of Dundee, went by command of cardinal Beaton, to the church where Wishart preached, and in the midst of his discourse publicly told him, "not to trouble the town any more, for he was determined not to suffer it." This treatment greatly surprised the preacher; and after bearing suitable testimony to the truth and against such proceedings, he left the pulpit and departed. He then went into the west of Scotland, where he preached the word of God, and was

gladly received by many. But here he was interrupted again by order of the popish cardinal. But the preacher of Christ went to the market-cross, where he preached to the great satisfaction of his hearers, and the confusion of his enemies. Cardinal Beaton became so exasperated by his popularity, that he was determined to have him taken out of his way. This he attempted at first by secret assassination. Before Wishart left Dundee the second time, a desperate popish priest, named John Weigh-ton, was engaged to kill him, which was attempted as follows:—After sermon, on a certain day, Mr. Wishart was about stepping out of the pulpit, when he discovered at the bottom of the stairs this priest, with a dagger under his cloak, waiting for him to come within his reach. Mr. Wishart cautiously approached, and saying, “My friend, what would you have?” he clapped his hand upon the dagger suddenly, and took it from the priest. He being terrified, fell upon his knees, confessed his object, and begged pardon. A noise being raised, the populace were ready to tear the assassin in pieces. But Mr. Wishart defended him, and brought him off. Soon after this, on his return to Montrose, the cardinal caused a letter to be conveyed to him, purporting to be from an intimate friend, who begged him to come to him without delay, as he was dangerously sick. Mr. Wishart commenced his journey, but suspecting some treachery, he turned back, and thus his life was saved, for a number of armed men were concealed by the wayside to take his life. When the discovery of the ambush was made, Mr. Wishart remarked, “I know I shall end my life by that bloody man’s hands, but not in this manner.” After this, cardinal Beaton being informed that Mr. Wishart was at the house of Mr. Cockburn, of Ormiston, in East Lothian, applied to the regent to have him apprehended. The earl accordingly went, with proper attendants, to the house of Mr. Cockburn, which he beset about midnight. The master of the house being alarmed, put himself in a

posture of defence, when the earl told him it was in vain to resist, as sufficient force was at hand. But if he would deliver Mr. Wishart, he would promise upon his honor that he should be safe, and that the cardinal should not hurt him. Wishart immediately said, "Open the gates, God's will be done." Bothwell coming in, Wishart said to him, "I praise my God that so honorable a man as you, my lord, receive me this night; for I am persuaded that for your honor's sake, you will suffer nothing to be done to me but by order of law; I fear less to die openly, than secretly to be murdered." Bothwell replied, "I will not only preserve your body from violence that shall be intended against you without order of law, but I also promise, in the presence of these gentlemen, that neither the governor nor cardinal shall have their will of you; but I will keep you in my own house, until I either set you free, or restore you to the same place where I receive you." This agreement being made, Mr. Wishart was delivered into the hands of the earl, who immediately conducted him to Edinburgh. As soon as the earl arrived at that place, he was sent for by the queen, who, being an inveterate enemy to Wishart, prevailed on the earl, notwithstanding the promises he had made, to commit him a prisoner to the castle. Cardinal Beaton being informed of Wishart's situation, went to Edinburgh, and immediately caused him to be removed to the castle of St. Andrews. The inveterate and persecuting prelate having now got our martyr fully at his disposal, resolved to proceed immediately to try him as an heretic. For this purpose he assembled the prelates at St. Andrews' church, February 27, 1546. At this meeting the archbishop of Glasgow gave it as his opinion, that application should be made to the regent, to grant a commission to some noblemen to try the prisoner, that all odium of putting so popular a man to death might not lie on the clergy. To this the cardinal readily agreed. But on sending to the regent, he received the following answer:—"That

he would do well not to hasten this man's trial, but delay it until his coming; for as to himself, he would not consent to his death before the cause was well examined; and if the cardinal should do otherwise, he would make protestation, that the blood of this man should be required at his hands." The cardinal was extremely chagrined at this message from the regent; however, he determined to proceed in the bloody work which he had undertaken, and therefore sent the regent word that he had not written to him about this matter because he was in any way dependant on his authority, but from a desire that the prosecution and conviction of heretics might have a show of public consent; which, since he could not this way obtain, he would proceed in that way which to him appeared most proper. In consequence of this, the cardinal immediately proceeded to the trial of Wishart, against whom no less than eighteen articles were exhibited, which were in substance as follows, viz:—"That he had despised the holy mother church, had deceived the people, had ridiculed the mass, had preached against the sacraments, saying there were not seven but two only, viz. baptism, and the supper of the Lord; that he had preached against confession to a priest; had denied transubstantiation and extreme unction; would not admit the authority of the pope or of councils; allowed the eating of flesh on Friday; condemned the prayers to saints; spoke against the vows of monks, saying that whosoever was bound by such vows, had vowed themselves to the state of damnation, and that it was lawful for priests to marry; and finally, that he had avowed his disbelief of purgatory." Mr. Wishart answered these several charges with great composure of mind, and in so learned and clear a manner, as surprised those present. A bigotted priest named Lauder, at the instigation of the archbishop, not only heaped a load of curses upon him, but treated him with the most barbarous contempt, calling him renegade, false heretic, traitor, and thief; and not satisfied with

that, spit in his face, and otherwise maltreated him. On this Mr. Wishart fell on his knees, and after making a prayer to God, thus addressed his judges:—"Many and horrible sayings unto me, a Christian man, many words abominable to hear, have ye spoken here this day; which not only to teach, but even to think, I ever thought a great abomination." After the examination was finished, the archbishop attempted to prevail on Mr. Wishart to recant, but he was too firmly fixed in his religious principles, and too much enlightened in the truth of the gospel, to be in the least moved. In consequence of this, the archbishop pronounced on him the dreadful sentence of death, which he ordered should be put into execution the next day. As soon as this cruel and melancholy ceremony was finished, our martyr fell on his knees, and thus exclaimed:—"O immortal God! how long wilt thou suffer the rage and great cruelty of the ungodly to exercise their fury upon thy servants, which do further thy word in this world? Whereas, they on the contrary seek to destroy the truth, whereby thou hast revealed thyself to the world. O Lord! we know certainly that thy true servants must needs suffer, for thy name's sake, persecutions, afflictions, and troubles, in this present world; yet we desire that thou wouldst preserve and defend thy church, which thou hast chosen before the foundation of the world, and give thy people grace to hear thy word, and to be thy true servants in this present life." Having said this he arose, and was immediately conducted by the officers to the prison from which he had been brought in the castle. In the evening he was visited by two friars, who told him he must make his confession to them; to whom he replied, "I will not make any confession to you;" on which they immediately departed. Soon after this came the sub-prior, with whom Wishart conversed in so feeling a manner on religious subjects, as to make him weep. When this man left him, he went to the cardinal, and told him he came not to intercede for the pri-

soner's life, but to make known his innocence to all men. At these words the cardinal expressed great dissatisfaction, and forbid the sub-prior from visiting the martyr any more. On the morning of his execution, there came to him two friars from the cardinal, one of whom put on him a black linen coat, and the other brought several bags of gunpowder, which they tied about different parts of his body. The windows and balconies of the castle opposite the place where he was to suffer, were hung with tapestry and silk hangings, with cushions for the cardinal and his train, who were from thence to feast their eyes with the torments of this innocent man. There was also a large guard of soldiers, not so much to secure the execution, as to show a vain ostentation of power, besides which, cannon were placed on different parts of the castle. All the preparations being completed, Wisheart, after having his hands tied behind him, was conducted to the fatal spot. In his way thither he was accosted by two friars, who desired him to pray to the virgin Mary to intercede for him; to whom he meekly replied, "Cease! tempt me not, I entreat you." As soon as he arrived at the stake, the executioner put a rope around his neck, and a chain about his middle; upon which he fell on his knees, and thus exclaimed:—"O thou Saviour of the world, have mercy upon me! Father of heaven, I commend my spirit into thy holy hands." After repeating these words three times, he arose, and turning himself to the spectators, addressed them as follows:—"Christian brethren and sisters, I beseech you be not offended at the word of God for the torments which you see prepared for me; but I exhort you that ye love the word of God for your salvation, and suffer patiently and with a comfortable heart for the word's sake, which is your undoubted salvation and everlasting comfort." After this he prayed for his accusers, saying, "I beseech thee, Father of heaven, forgive them that, from ignorance or an evil mind, forged lies of me. I

forgive them with all my heart. I beseech Christ to forgive them that have ignorantly condemned me." As soon as he had finished his speech, the executioner fell on his knees before him, and said, "Sir, I pray you forgive me, for I am not the cause of your death." In return to this, Mr. Wishart took the man cordially by the hand, and kissed him, saying, "Lo! here is a token that I forgive thee my hurt, do thine office." He was then fastened to the stake, and the faggots being lighted, immediately set fire to the powder that was tied about him; and which blew into a flame and smoke. The governor of the castle, who stood so near that he was singed with the flame, exhorted our martyr, in a few words, to be of good cheer, and to ask pardon of God for his offences. To which he replied, "This flame hath occasioned trouble indeed to my body, but it hath in no wise broken my spirit. But he who now so proudly looks down upon me from yonder lofty place, (pointing to the cardinal,) shall ere long be as ignominiously thrown down, as he now proudly lolls at his ease." When he had said this, the executioner pulled the rope which was about his neck with great violence, so that he was soon strangled, and the fire gaining strength, burnt with such great rapidity, that in less than an hour his body was totally consumed. Thus died, in confirmation of the gospel of Christ, a sincere believer, whose fortitude and constancy during his sufferings can only be imputed to the support of divine grace, in order to fulfil that memorable promise, "As thy day, so shall thy strength be," and whose death is a lasting monument of the persecuting spirit of popery."

The reign of bloody queen Mary is proverbial, and a blot on the page of history, while it illustrates the true spirit of popery. After destroying those who had sinned politically by espousing the cause of Jane Grey; she next turned her hand, by the instigation of her popish advisers, against the faithful servants of the Lord. The first martyr was the Rev. John Rogers, minister of St.

Sepulchre's church. The crime of Mr. Rogers was that he had assisted in giving a translation of the bible to the people. He was a zealous preacher of the truth, and an opponent of popery. Consequently he was arraigned, condemned and burnt. When on his way to execution he was asked by the sheriff "if he would recant his opinions"—He replied, "what he had preached he would seal with his blood." "Then" said the sheriff, "thou art an heretic." To which Mr. Rogers answered, "that will be known when we meet at the judgment seat of Christ" After the death of John Rogers followed that of Hooper, Taylor, Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, and a multitude of others, men of eminent talents and pure lives, who fell victims to the bigotry and cruelty of bloody Mary and her popish advisers, Gardiner and Bonner. The particulars in this dismal history would exceed the limits of the present work. Suffice it to say, they are of the same kind with those already stated. All the invention of man was put in requisition to find out and refine cruelties for those who refused to bow to the pope.

But after all these efforts of cruelty and malice, those who dissented from popery continued to increase and spread on every side. Some more effectual measures therefore became necessary for the extirpation of heretics. The device of popery to meet this exigency, was the **INQUISITION**, the rise and character of which have been already narrated. It remains however to give some account of the inquisition as an engine of persecution, for in this respect it stands pre-eminent. Persecution was the field of its glory, and all its emblems are dyed in blood.

In the year 1714, Mr. Isaac Martin, an English protestant merchant resident at Malaga, was arrested by order of the inquisition, on charge of being a Jew. The grounds of this charge were, that his own name was Isaac, and he had a son named Abraham. This charge he answered, by assuring the papists that he was an

Englishman. Moreover, he told them that Abraham and Isaac were not Jews, but patriarchs who lived long before the term Jew was ever used. But the inquisitors would believe neither one nor the other plea. Perceiving himself beset, he came to the resolution to leave the place with his family. This became known, and one night about 9 o'clock, he heard a loud knocking at his door. He inquired who was there, when entrance was demanded, which he refused, desiring the persons without, to come next day. But the doors were immediately broken open, and about fifteen persons entered attended by a commissioner of the holy office. Mr. Martin spoke of going to the English consul, but they told him the consul had nothing to do with the business. He was now arrested on the charge of being an heretic. His books and papers were seized, his watch, money and other things taken from him, and he carried to the bishop's prison, and a pair of heavy fetters put on him. His family, in the deepest distress, was turned out of doors, until the house was stripped. About four days after his confinement he was told he must go to Grenada to be tried. He earnestly begged to see his wife and children before he went, but this was denied. Being doubly fettered he was mounted on a mule and sent forward to Grenada. By the way the mule threw him upon a rocky part of the road and nearly broke his back. On his arrival at Grenada, after a journey of three days, he was detained at an inn till it was dark, for they never bring any one into the inquisition during day-light. At night he was taken to the prison, and led along a range of galleries till he arrived at a dungeon. The gaoler nailed up his books, which had been brought from Malaga, saying they must remain in that state till the lords of the inquisition chose to inspect them, for prisoners are never allowed to read books. He then said to Mr. Martin, "you must observe as great silence here as though you were dead; you must not speak, nor whistle, nor sing, nor

make any noise that can be heard. And if you hear any body cry or make a noise, you must be still and say nothing upon pain of 200 lashes." Mr. Martin asked "if he might walk about the room;" the reply was, "he might, but it must be very softly." In about a week he was brought to audience. He followed the gaoler, and coming to a large room, saw a man sitting between two crucifixes, and another with a pen in his hand, who he afterwards learned was the secretary. The chief lord inquisitor was the man between the crucifixes, and appeared to be about sixty years of age. He ordered Mr. Martin to sit down upon a little stool that fronted him. A frivolous examination then took place. The questions related to his family, their religion, and to his own faith. He admitted that he was a protestant, told the inquisitor that the religion of Christ admitted of no persecution, and concluded by saying he hoped to remain in that religion. He underwent five examinations without any thing serious being alleged against him. In a few days he was called to his sixth audience, when after a few unimportant questions, the chief inquisitor told him the charges against him should be read, and he must give an immediate answer to each respective charge. The accusations against him were read, and were twenty-six in number, though principally of the most trivial nature, and the greater part wholly false, or if they had any reference to facts, they were so distorted and perverted as to bear little or no resemblance. Mr. Martin replied to each of them firmly and discreetly, exposing their weakness and detecting their falsehood. At length two of the lords of the inquisition visited him and asked many trifling questions, concluding with their usual declaration, "We will do you all the service we can." Mr. Martin complained of their breach of promise in not allowing him counsel to plead his cause, or such counsel as was of no use to him. To which one of the inquisitors gravely answered, "Lawyers are not allowed to speak here." About a month

afterwards he had a rope put round his neck, and was led by it to the altar of the great church. Here his sentence was pronounced, which was that for the crimes he stood convicted, the lords of the holy office had ordered him to be banished out of the dominions of Spain, upon penalty of 200 lashes, and being sent five years to the galleys. And that he should at present receive 200 lashes through the streets of the city of Grenada. Mr. Martin was sent again to his dungeon that night. The next morning the executioner came, stripped him, tied his hands together, put a rope about his neck and led him out of the prison. He was then mounted on an ass, and received his two hundred lashes amidst the shoutings and peltings of the people. He remained a fortnight after in prison, and was then sent to Malaga. Here he was put in gaol for some days, until he could be put on board an English ship. His wife and children then came to him, and they escaped barely with their lives, all his effects being seized by the inquisition. All this, be it remembered was inflicted for the sole charge of being an heretic, in other words of differing from them in his belief. For all their twenty-six accusations amounted to this only. It is supposed however, that Mr. Martin was guilty of the heresy of being rich, and that his money was the principal object of these proceedings. The most lawless banditti would not have treated a fellow creature more barbarously.

In the year 1559, there was an *Auto da Fe*, at Valladolid in Spain, when twenty-one victims were roasted alive, by order of the inquisition. Among them was a young lady named Donna Maria de Borhoques. She was daughter of Pedro Garcia Borhoques, and had just completed her twenty-first year, when she was arrested on suspicion of Lutheranism. Her education was very superior, being perfectly acquainted with the Latin, and having made considerable proficiency in Greek. She knew the gospels by heart, and was thoroughly read in

Lutheran commentaries. This lady was confined in the secret prison of the inquisition, where she avowed the doctrines imputed to her, defended them against the arguments of the priests who visited her, and boldly told the inquisitors, that instead of punishing her for her creed, they would do well to adopt it. In regard to the depositions of her accusers, though she allowed some points, she persisted in denying others which related to the belief of other persons. This denial gave the inquisitors an opportunity which they desired of putting her to the rack. By the torture of the rack they only extorted from her the fact that her sister, Joanna Borhoques knew of her sentiments, and had not disapproved of them, and as she persisted in her profession of faith, sentence was passed upon her as an obstinate heretic. In the interval between her condemnation and the *Auto da Fe*, at which she was to suffer, the inquisitors made every exertion to bring her back to the popish faith. They sent to her successively two Jesuits and two Dominican priests, who labored with great zeal to shake her faith; but they returned without having effected their object, full of admiration at the talents she displayed, and regretting the obstinacy with which she persisted in what they called damnable heresy. The evening before the *Auto da Fe*, two Dominicans joined in the attempt, and were followed by several theologians of other orders. Donna Maria received them with civility, but dissuaded them from attempting a hopeless task. To the professions which they made of being concerned for the welfare of her soul, she answered that she believed them sincere, but that they must not suppose that she, being the person chiefly interested, felt a less concern than they. She told them she came to the prison fully satisfied of the orthodoxy of the creed which she held, and that she had been confirmed in her belief by the evident futility of the arguments used against it. At the stake, a certain man named Ponce de Leon, who had just abjured the Lutheran faith,

exhorted her to follow his example. The weakness of this apostate for a moment put her off her guard, and she answered him with contempt rather than with pity. But recollecting herself, she told him coolly that the time for controversy was past, and that their wisest plan was to occupy the few moments which remained to them in meditating on the death of their Redeemer, in order to confirm that faith by which alone they could be justified. The rule of the inquisition is, that if a condemned heretic renounce his heresy at the stake; he was not burnt alive, but first strangled, and then burned. This was all poor Ponce de Leon gained by his apostacy. On this occasion the attendant priests, moved by the youth and talents of Maria, offered her this milder death if she would merely repeat the creed. With this offer she readily complied, and having finished it, she immediately commenced an explanation of its articles according to the sense of the reformers. This confession of faith was at once interrupted. Donna Maria was strangled by the executioner, and her body was afterwards consumed to ashes.

It has been mentioned that the only confession extorted from Donna Maria by the rack was, that her sister knew her religious sentiments, and had not disapproved of them. This sister, whose name was Joanna, was married to Don Francis de Vargas, lord of Hegera. She was immediately arrested on the confession of her sister, and though six months advanced in pregnancy, was confined in one of the common dungeons of the inquisition. In this dungeon she was delivered of a child, with no assistance but that of a young woman confined in the same cell, on charge of Lutheranism. Eight days after its birth, the child was taken from her, and soon after her friendly nurse, having been tortured, returned to the prison with dislocated limbs; and Donna Joanna, though still feeble, was called upon to repay the charitable attentions she had received. Before her health was established,

she also was subjected to the torture of the rack. Her enfeebled frame sunk under its sufferings, a blood vessel burst while she was on the rack, and in two days, she was delivered by death from further persecutions. After perpetrating this foul murder, the inquisitors thought it a sufficient reparation to declare Donna Joanna innocent at the next Auto da Fe. This was a practice with the inquisitors, after they had tortured and murdered innocent persons, on mere suspicion, or for their own diversion; their acquittal was to pronounce them innocent after they were dead, or injured beyond recovery. In fact, therefore, no distinction, as to the persons or interests of the accused was made between the innocent and guilty. They must all alike suffer. Cases of the same nature with those above stated might be multiplied to almost any extent. But the limits of this work admit only of examples. The secrecy with which the orders of the holy office were executed is very remarkable. No grand Turk or eastern Nabob, ever had his servants trained to more exact precision and secrecy of movement, than were the servants of the holy office. A father and three sons, and three daughters, were once apprehended and carried to the prison of the inquisition, and though they lived in the same house, they knew nothing of each other's imprisonment, until seven years after, when those of their number that were still alive, were brought out to Auto da Fe. Persons nearly allied to each other, may be confined in contiguous cells, without any knowledge of the fact. For the merciless turnkeys are constantly on the watch to prevent the utterance of any sound, lest it should reveal some secret. If a person bemoans, or prays, or sings, in an audible voice, he is instantly silenced. No man is allowed even to cough in the damp cells of the inquisition, lest he should be discovered. A prisoner in the cells of the inquisition once coughed. The gaolers came and admonished him to desist. He told them he could not refrain. And because he did not

refrain, they stripped him and beat him cruelly. This however only increased his cough. For which they actually beat him till he died.

The prisons of the inquisition are emptied at regular intervals, by the recurrence of what they call, an "Auto da Fe." The literal meaning of this phrase is, *an act of faith*. But the real import of it is, a general burning at the stake of the condemned criminals found in the dungeons of the inquisition. In other words, it is the season of execution, when a great procession is formed, and a great concourse of people assembled, and the prisoners are taken from their dungeons, where they have lain in suffering, and after having been subjected to all manner of cruelties on the rack, and marched into the field prepared for the purpose, where scores are burned alive at the stake. And this generally for no other crime, than a difference of belief respecting the doctrines and duties of religion. The inquisition, it will be recollected, was established for the purpose of extirpating heretics, consequently almost all its proceedings, and executions are persecution, or the torturing and destroying people for their conscientious belief. This is the proper and ostensible business of the holy office. But persecution, in the proper sense of the term, is not the only employment of the inquisitors. Their unrestrained power in searching out heretics, gives them opportunity to indulge in the most flagitious practices, and friends as well as foes are often rendered subservient to the gratification of their licentious passions. "The grand Turk," says McGavin, "has not a more splendid seraglio within the walls of his palace, than these holy fathers have been known to have kept within the walls of the inquisition; and these very fathers would without scruple have sent any man of their own order to the flames, if he had presumed to commit the heresy of marrying and living honestly with one woman." This, though not strictly persecution for truth's sake, yet, is

such a monstrous abuse of power, and so illustrates the savage character of popery, that one example on this point will not be deemed inadmissible. It is taken from McGavin's Protestant, vol. ii. p. 146.

“About the beginning of the last century, there happened to be a sort of civil war in Spain, in which the troops of the king of France were actively engaged on one side. In their victorious career, they came into possession of the city of Saragossa, in Arragon, in which were a number of convents, particularly one of Dominicans. The French commander, M. Legal, found it necessary to levy a pretty heavy contribution upon the inhabitants, not excepting the convents. The Dominicans, all whose friars were familiars of the holy inquisition, excused themselves in a civil manner, saying that they had no money, and if M. de Legal should insist on the demand of a thousand pistoles, which fell to their share, they could not pay him in any other way than by sending him the silver bodies of the saints. The friars imagined that the French commander would not have the heart to demand such a sacrifice; and they thought, that if he should insist upon it, they would, by raising the cry of heresy against him, raise the mass of the people to take their part. The Frenchman, however, felt no qualms of conscience about the matter. He signified that the silver saints would be very welcome visitors. The friars, seeing they could not mend the matter, carried their gods to the governor in solemn procession, and with lighted candles. The governor, having heard that it was their intention to make a procession, and raise a mob if they could, ordered out four companies of grenadiers, well armed, to receive the saints in the most respectful manner, so that the design of raising the people entirely failed. The saints were forthwith sent to the mint, and the holy fathers applied to the inquisition, to interpose its supreme power in order to save them from the furnace. This power was readily exercised in the way of

excommunicating M. Legal. An instrument to this effect having been drawn up and signed, the secretary of the holy office was commanded to go and read it to the governor. Having performed his duty, the excommunicated governor, instead of expressing displeasure, with a mild countenance took the paper from the secretary and said, "pray tell your masters the inquisitors, that I will answer them to-morrow morning." The governor then ordered his secretary to draw a copy of the excommunication with the simple alteration of inserting the names of the holy inquisitors instead of his own name: and the next morning he ordered four regiments to be sent along with his secretary to the inquisition, with command to read the excommunication to the inquisitors themselves, and if they made the least noise, to turn them out, open all the prisons, and quarter two regiments there. The orders were obeyed, and the holy fathers were amazed deeply, and confounded, to find themselves excommunicated by a man who had no authority for it; and they began a hue and cry against the governor as a heretic, and as having publicly insulted the Catholic faith.—"Holy inquisitors," said the secretary, "the king wants this house to quarter his troops in, so walk out immediately." And having no alternative they were compelled to obey. The doors of the prisons were thrown open, and then the wickedness of the inquisitors was exposed to the world. Four hundred prisoners got liberty that day, and among them sixty well dressed young women, who were found to be the private property of the three inquisitors, and of which they had robbed the families of the city and neighborhood. The Archbishop, seriously concerned for the honor of the holy tribunal, desired M. Legal to send these women to his palace, promising that he would take care of them and in the mean time he published an ecclesiastical censure against all who should defame by groundless reports, the holy office of the inquisition; that is, all that should mention

the fact thus brought to light. The governor professed his willingness to comply with his grace's request, but as to the young women, that was not in his power, they being rescued and taken away by the French officers. In fact they were chiefly young ladies, beautiful and accomplished, who had been forcibly carried away at the pleasure of the holy fathers, from the most opulent families in the city; and who probably would never have been seen without the walls of the sacred building, but for such a deliverance as that which was effected by the French soldiers. Some of them were afterwards married to their deliverers, one of whom furnished Mr. Gavin, from whom I abridge this statement, with a narrative of her own case, which I am sure will be interesting to my readers. I shall give the substance of it, without adhering strictly to the author's phraseology. Mr. Gavin had been a popish priest.

Travelling in France sometime after the event above referred to, and after he had renounced his situation as popish priest, he met one of the ladies at Rochfort, at an inn where he happened to lodge. She was then the wife of the innkeeper's son, who had been a lieutenant in the French service in Spain. Though she did not know Mr. Gavin in his secular habit, yet he recognized her as the daughter of counsellor Belabriga, in Saragossa, with whose family he had been acquainted. Her father, it seems, had died of grief after having lost her, without the comfort of revealing the cause of his trouble even to his confessor, so great was his dread of the inquisition. From this lady Mr. Gavin obtained a full account of the manner of her abduction, and of the treatment which she received in the holy office.

"I went one day," said she, "with my mother to visit the countess of Attarass, and I met there Don Francisco Torrejon, her confessor and second inquisitor. After we had drank chocolate, he asked me my age, my confessor's name, and so many intricate questions about religion that

I could not answer him. His serious countenance frightened me; and perceiving my fear, he desired the countess to tell me that he was not so severe as I supposed, after which he caressed me very kindly. He gave me his hand which I kissed with great respect and modesty, and when he went away he told me, "my dear child I shall remember you till the next time." I did not know what he meant being quite inexperienced, and only fifteen years old. Indeed he did remember me, for that very night, when in bed, hearing a hard knocking at the door, the maid who lay in the room with me went to the window and asking who was there, I heard the reply, 'the holy inquisition.' I could not forbear crying out, father, I am ruined forever. My dear father got up, and inquiring what the matter was, I answered him with tears, 'the inquisition.' He, for fear the maid would not open the door so quickly as such a case required, went himself to open the door, and like another Abraham, to offer his child to the fire; and as I did not cease to cry out, my dear father, all in tears, stopped my mouth to shew his obedience to the holy office; for he supposed I had committed some crime against religion. The officers gave me time only to put on a petticoat and a mantle, they took me into the coach, and without allowing me the satisfaction of embracing my father and mother, they carried me into the inquisition.

"I expected to die that night; but when they carried me into a noble room well furnished, I was quite surprised. The officers left me there, and immediately a maid came in with a salver of sweetmeats and cinnamon water, desiring me to take some refreshment before I went to bed. I told her I could not, but that I should be obliged to her if she could tell me whether I was to die that night or not. 'Die!' said she, 'you do not come here to die, but to live like a princess, and you shall want for nothing but the liberty of going out; so, be not afraid, but go to bed and sleep easy, for to-morrow you shall see wonders in

this house; and as I am chosen to be your waiting-maid, I hope you will be kind to me.' I was going to ask some questions, but she told me she had not leave to tell me any thing more till the next day, 'only nobody shall come to disturb you;' so she left me for a quarter of an hour. The great amazement I was in took away the exercise of my senses to such a degree, that I could neither think of my parents nor of my own dangerous situation. In this suspension of thought, the maid returned, and locked the chamber door after her. 'Madam,' said she, 'let us go to bed, and be pleased to tell me at what time in the morning you will have the chocolate ready.' I asked her name, and she told me it was Mary. 'Mary,' said I, 'for God's sake tell me whether I come to die or not.' 'I have told you,' said she, 'that you come to be one of the happiest ladies in the world.' I went to bed, but the fear of death prevented my shutting my eyes, so that I arose at the break of day. Mary lay till six o'clock, and was surprised to find me up. She said but little, but in half an hour she brought me, on a silver plate, two cups of chocolate, and biscuits. I drank one cup, and desired her to drink the other, which she did. 'Well, Mary,' said I, 'can you give me any account of the reasons of my being here?' 'Not yet, madam,' said she; 'have a little patience.' With this answer she left me, and an hour after came again, with a fine Holland shift, a Holland under petticoat, finely laced round, two silk petticoats, and a little Spanish waistcoat, fringed all over with gold, and combs and ribbons, and every thing suitable to a lady of higher quality than I; but my greatest surprise was to see a gold snuff-box, with the picture of Don Francisco Torrejon in it. Then I understood the meaning of my confinement. I considered with myself that to refuse the present would be the occasion of my immediate death, and that to accept it was to give him too great encouragement against my honor. But I found, as I thought, a medium in the case. So I said to Mary,

‘Pray give my service to Don Francisco Torrejon, and tell him, that as I could not bring my clothes with me last night, honesty permits me to receive what is necessary to keep me decent; but since I do not take snuff, I beg his lordship to excuse me if I do not accept this box. Mary went to him with this answer, and came again with a picture nicely set in gold, with four diamonds at the four corners of it, and told me that his lordship had mistaken, and that he desired me to accept that picture. While I was musing what to do, Mary said, ‘Pray, madam, take my poor advice, accept the picture and every thing he sends you; for consider, if you do not comply with every thing he has a mind for, you will soon be put to death, and nobody can defend you; but if you are obliging to him, he is a very complaisant gentleman, and will be a charming lover, and you will live here like a queen. He will give you another apartment with fine gardens, and many young ladies will come to visit you; so I advise you to send a civil answer, and desire a visit from him, or you will soon repent it.’ ‘O dear!’ cried I, ‘must I, then, abandon my honor without remedy? And if I oppose his desire, he will by force obtain it.’ So, full of confusion, I bid Mary give him what answer she pleased. She was very glad of my humble submission, and went to give Don Francisco an account of it. In a few minutes she returned with great joy to tell me that his lordship would honor me with his company to supper. In the mean time he desired me to mind nothing but how to divert myself, and to give Mary my measure for some new clothes, and order her to bring me every thing I wished for. Mary added, ‘Madam, I may now call you my mistress, and must now tell you that I have been in this holy office these fourteen years, and know the customs of it well; but as silence is imposed on me under pain of death, I cannot tell you anything but what concerns your person; so, in the first place, do not oppose the holy father’s will; secondly, if you see

some young ladies here, never ask them any questions, neither will they ask you, and take care you never tell them anything. You may come and divert yourself among them at such hours as are appointed. You shall have music and all sorts of recreations. Three days hence you shall dine with them; they are all ladies of quality, young and merry. You will live so happily here, that you will not wish to go abroad; and when your time is expired, the holy fathers will send you out of this country, and marry you to some nobleman. Never mention your name, nor Don Francisco's, to any. If you see here some young ladies you have formerly been acquainted with, no notice must be taken, and nothing must be talked of but indifferent matters.' All this made me astonished, or rather stupified, and the whole seemed to me a piece of enchantment. With this lesson she left me, saying she was going to order my dinner. Every time she went out, she locked the door. There were but two windows in my room, and they were so high that I could see nothing through them; but hunting about, I found a closet, with all sorts of historical and profane books; so I spent my time till dinner in reading, which was some satisfaction to me. In about two hours she brought dinner, at which was every thing that could satisfy the most nice appetite. When dinner was over she left me alone, and told me if I wanted anything, to ring the bell; so I went to the closet again, and spent three hours in reading. I think I was really under some enchantment, for I was in perfect suspension of thought, so as to remember neither father nor mother. Mary came and told me Don Francisco was come home, and she thought he would come and see me very soon, and begged me to receive him with all manner of kindness.

"At seven in the evening Don Francisco came, in his nightgown and cap; not with the gravity of an inquisitor, but with the gayety of an officer. He saluted me with great respect, and told me that his coming to see me

was only to show the value he had for my family, and to tell me that some of my lovers had procured my ruin, having accused me in matters of religion; that the informations were taken, and the sentence pronounced against me, to be burnt alive in a dry pan with a slow fire; but that he, out of pity and love to my family, had stopped the execution of it. Every word was a mortal stroke to my heart. I threw myself at his feet and said, 'Ah! Seignior, have you stopped the execution forever?' 'It only belongs to you to stop it, or not,' said he, and with this bade me good night. As soon as he went out I fell a crying, but Mary came and asked me what made me cry so bitterly? 'Ah! good Mary,' said I, 'tell me what is the meaning of the dry pan with the gradual fire, for I expect to die by it.' 'O! madam,' said she, 'never fear. You shall, ere long, see the dry pan and the gradual fire; but they are made for those who oppose the holy father's will, not for you who are so obliging as to obey it. But pray, was not Don Francisco very obliging?' 'I do not know,' said I, 'for his discourse has put me out of my wits. He saluted me with great civility, but he left me abruptly.' 'Well,' said Mary, 'you do not yet know his temper; he is extremely kind to people that are obedient to him; but if they are not, he is as unmerciful as Nero; so, for your own sake, take care to oblige him in all respects.' She bade me be easy, and go to supper; but the thoughts of the dry pan so troubled me, that I could neither eat nor sleep any that night. Early in the morning Mary got up, and told me that nobody was yet stirring in the house; and that if I would promise secrecy, she would show me the dry pan and the gradual fire. So, taking me down stairs, she brought me into a large room with a thick iron door, and within it was an oven burning, with a large brass pan upon it, with a cover of the same with a lock to it. In the next room was a great wheel, covered on both sides with thick boards, and, opening a little window in the centre of it,

she desired me to look with a candle on the inside of it. There I saw that all the circumference of the wheel was set with sharp razors. After that, she showed me a pit full of serpents and toads. 'Now, my good mistress,' said she, 'I will tell you the use of these three things. The dry pan is for heretics, and those who oppose the holy father's will and pleasure. They are put naked alive into the pan, and the cover of it being locked up, the executioner begins to put a small fire in the oven, and by degrees he increases it till the body is reduced to ashes. The second is designed for those that speak against the pope and the holy fathers, for they are put within the wheel, and the little door being locked, the executioner turns the wheel till the person is dead. And the third is for those who contemn the images, and refuse to give due respect and veneration to ecclesiastical persons; for they are thrown into the pit, and become the food of serpents and toads. Then Mary said to me that another day she would show me the torments for public sinners; but I was in so great agony at what I had seen, that I desired her to show me no more places; so we went to my room, and she again charged me to be very obedient to all the commands of Don Francisco, for I might be assured if I was not, that I must undergo the torments of the dry pan. I conceived such a horror of the gradual fire, that I was not mistress of my senses, so I promised Mary to follow her advice. 'If you are in that disposition,' said she, 'leave off all fear, and expect nothing but pleasure and satisfaction.'

"About ten o'clock, (in the morning,) Mary came and dressed me. We left Don Francisco in bed, and she carried me into another chamber, very delightful and better furnished than the first, for the windows were lower and I had the pleasure of seeing the river and gardens. Mary then told me that the young ladies would come and pay me their respects, before dinner, and would take me to dine with them, and begged me to re-

member her advice. She had scarcely finished, when I saw a troop of young beautiful ladies, finely dressed, who came one after another to embrace me, and to wish me joy. My surprise was so great that I was unable to answer their compliments. But one of them seeing me silent, said, 'Madam the solitude of this place will affect you in the beginning, but when you feel the pleasures we enjoy, you will quit your pensive thoughts. Now we beg of you the honor, to come and dine with us to-day, and henceforth three days in a week.' I returned them thanks, so we went to dinner. That day we had all sorts of exquisite meats, delicate fruits, and sweetmeats. The room was long, with two tables on each side, and another at the front of it, and I reckoned in it that day fifty-two young ladies, the eldest not exceeding twenty-four years. After dinner, we went up to a long gallery, where some of us played on instruments of music, others at cards, and some walked about three or four hours together. At last Mary came up ringing a small bell, which was, as I was told, the signal for us to go to our own rooms. But Mary said to the whole company, 'ladies to day is a day of recreation, so you may go into what rooms you please till eight o'clock.' They all desired to go into my apartment with me. We found in my antechamber, a table with all sorts of sweetmeats upon it; iced cinnamon, almond milk, and the like. Every one ate and drank, but nobody spake a word about the sumptuousness of the table, or the inquisition, or the holy fathers. They retired to their respective apartments at eight o'clock, when Mary came to conduct me to Don Francisco, with whom I was to sup and spend the night. In the morning when I returned to my own chamber, I found ready two suits of clothes of rich brocade, and every thing else suitable to a lady of the first rank. I put on one, and when I was quite dressed, the ladies came to wish me joy, all dressed in different clothes much richer than before. We spent the second and the third day in the same sort of

recreation ; Don Francisco continuing in the same manner with me. But on the fourth morning after drinking chocolate, which it was the custom to do in bed, Mary told me that a lady was waiting for me in her own room, and with an air of authority desired me to get up. I thought this was to give me some new comfort, but in this I was much mistaken ; for Mary conveyed me into a lady's room not eight feet long, which was a perfect prison, and told me this was my room, and this young lady my bed-fellow and companion, and without saying any thing more she left me there. 'What is this, dear lady,' said I, 'is it an enchanted place, or hell upon earth. I have lost father and mother, and what is worse, I have lost my honor and my soul for ever.' My new companion, seeing my agitation, took me by the hands and said, 'dear sister forbear to cry and grieve ; for such extravagant behaviour will only draw upon you a cruel death. Your misfortunes and ours are exactly of a piece. You suffer nothing that we have not suffered before you, but we dare not show our grief for fear of greater evils.' She advised me to show no uneasiness before Mary, who was the only instrument of their torments or comfort. I was in a most desperate condition, but my new sister Leonora prevailed so much upon me that I overcame my vexation, before Mary came in to bring our dinner, which was very different from what we had had for three days before. After dinner another maid came to take away the plate and knife, for we had but one between us both, and after she had gone out and locked the door. Leonora told me that we should not be disturbed again till eight o'clock ; and that if I would promise to keep secret what she should tell me while I remained in that house, she would reveal all that she knew. I promised all that she desired, upon which she began as follows:—

"My dear sister you think your case is very hard, but I assure you all the ladies in this house have gone through the same ; in time you will know all their stories,

as they hope to know yours. I suppose Mary has been the chief instrument of your fright, as she has been of ours, and I warrant she has shown you some horrible places, though not all, and at the mere thought of them you were so much troubled in your mind that you have chosen the same way we have to redeem yourself from death. By what has happened to us we know that Don Francisco has been your Nero, for the three colors of our clothes are the distinguishing tokens of the three holy fathers. The red silk belongs to Don Francisco, the blue to Guerrero, and the green to Aliaga. We are strictly commanded to make all demonstrations of joy, and to be very merry for three days, when a lady first comes here, as we did with you, and as you must do with others; but afterwards we live like prisoners, without seeing a single soul, but the six maids, and Mary, who is the housekeeper. We dine all of us in the hall three days in a week. When any of the holy fathers has a mind for any one of his slaves, Mary comes at nine o'clock and conducts her to his apartment. Some nights Mary leaves the door of our rooms open, and that is a sign that one of the fathers has a mind to visit us, but we do not know whether it is our patron or not. We have at present fifty-two young ladies, and we lose every year six or eight, but where they are sent we do not know. We always get new ones in their places, and I have seen here seventy-three ladies at once. Our continued torment is to think that when the holy fathers are tired of us, they will put us to death, for they never will run the hazard of being discovered in their villany. So, though we cannot oppose their commands, yet we continually pray to God to pardon those ills, which we are forced to commit, and to deliver us out of their hands. So my dear sister arm yourself with patience, for there is no other remedy."

By this discourse of Leonora the young captive was prevailed on to make the best of her condition. She found

every thing to be as had been told her. She continued in durance eighteen months, in which time the company lost eleven ladies, and gained nineteen new ones. When the French soldiers threw open the doors of their prison, "M. Faulcant," says she, "happily for me, opened the door of my room, and from the moment he saw me shewed me great civility." He took Leonora and me to his own lodgings, and hearing our stories, for fear things would turn to our disadvantage, he dressed us in men's clothes, and sent us to his father's. So we came to this house, where I was kept two years as the old man's daughter. till M. Faulcant's regiment being broken up, he came home, and two months after married me. Leonora was married to another officer and went to live at Orleans."

"From the above it appears," says Mr. Gavin, "that about once a month upon an average, a family in Saragossa was robbed of a daughter to recruit the seraglio of the holy fathers of the inquisition. This narrative does not refer to the dark ages of popery, the thing took place but about a hundred years ago, and who can tell the misery that was thus inflicted on many a family?—In fact there could be no such thing as domestic comfort in any country where the inquisition was established. It is not enough that every young lady kept at home, that she did not so much as show her face at a window, this would certainly have made her a victim to any member of the holy office whose spies might have been passing. Every exposure of this kind therefore was most carefully avoided. But this did not serve the purpose of concealing such as might be desirable inmates of the inquisition. For every lady was required to make confession to a priest twice, or at least once every year, the priests were all dependants of the holy office, they were in short the panders of lewdness to the lords, the inquisitors, and becoming, by means of confession, acquainted with the name and circumstances of every individual in every family, it was easy for them to inform their superiors.

where they might obtain a victim to be sacrificed at the shrine of their lusts."

The holy fathers sometimes required parents to be the informers against their own children, and sometimes to banish them from their homes from parental affection for alleged heresy. The following account of the conversion of a papist to protestantism, and his consequent banishment from the parental roof, will illustrate the persecuting spirit of popery in this respect. Patrick Bradley, the person in view, says of himself: "In my sixteenth year, I was by the advice of my parents and the priest, admitted to the communion of the church. I had then, and once afterward, a specimen of auricular confession; to these two events of my life I look back with horror. If auricular confession be at all times conducted as it was when I was engaged in it, I have no hesitation in saying, that I consider it one of the most abominable and corrupting institutions of popery. If a person confessing hesitates for a moment through defect of memory, or through the feelings of shame, the father confessor proposes a leading question, on the various kinds and degrees of iniquity, and thus stimulates the reluctant devotee, and drags from him or her the inmost secrets of the heart. To say a single word in explanation of the questions which a father confessor will thus propose to a young man or woman, to husband or wife, would be to imitate his vile example. You will perceive at a single glance, that they tend to increase the knowledge of the young and simple in the ways of transgression, and to render vices of the most disgusting and injurious kind familiar to all. About the time I mention, a protestant friend lent me three sermons, which he had bought from some person selling tracts. The perusal of these sermons produced a deep and painful impression on my mind. All my former views of religion were distracted and confounded, and new views of sin and duty were forcibly pressed upon my attention. In these sermons the scrip-

tures seemed to me to speak a new language, and to present to my mind an entirely new scene of contemplation. I determined to read the sermons again with the bible in my hand. This second perusal increased the pain I felt in a very high degree. From the scriptures I found I could not refute the doctrines taught in these sermons, and to admit these doctrines to be true, was, according to the lessons I had been taught from my infancy, to expose myself to all the horrors of eternal damnation. In this state of mind I knew not what to do. I dared not consult my parents; for to do so I knew was to bring on myself their high displeasure, and perhaps all the sarcasm and censure of my ghostly father. And to apply to any protestant, I felt was in some measure to commit myself, without being fully persuaded in my own mind. By my manner of conducting myself for some time I had attracted the attention of my mother. Observing my absence from mass, and hearing of my attendance at protestant places of worship, she began to dread the very worst of me that a popish parent can dread of a child—heresy. It was on sabbath morning that she first spoke to me on the subject. She began by asking me if I was going that day with the rest of the family to prayers? At that moment my whole frame shook, and through fear and anxiety I found myself wholly unable to speak. I had long wished for such an opportunity as this, to speak to my tender hearted and affectionate mother, on a subject that engrossed my whole attention, yet when it presented itself to me unexpectedly I found myself quite unable. She saw my confusion and was grieved to the heart. The sorrow I saw in her face was the first thing that roused me from the stupor into which I had sunk, and I said to her,—no, I am not going with the rest of the family to prayers to day. She said, why? I had been reading in the new testament when this conversation commenced, and holding it out to her—I said, because I find no authority for mass in this book. She

quickly asked what book it was I was reading? And I told her. She then felt all that a tender-hearted, affectionate Roman Catholic mother could feel in such circumstances. And I find sir, nineteen years after this interview, that I have not nerves to proceed with the story of it.

“Of the part I had now acted, the priest was soon informed, and with the mild and merciful spirit of his order, he passed sentence upon me, without ever condescending to converse with me, and without ever making a single effort to enlighten my mind, and reclaim me from my supposed heresy. The sentence which he passed, I was informed, was, ‘That I was a heretic, and must be banished from the family;’ sagely adding, ‘that the clean must be kept from the unclean.’ This sentence, to be communicated to me, my parents, influenced by strong affection, hesitated to carry into execution. But a popish priest knows nothing about parental affection, and cares less about it in such a case as this. He therefore repeated the sentence, and accompanied the repetition with considerations fitted to command an immediate compliance. A popish priest in Ireland is never at loss for considerations to influence the conduct of his flock in matters connected with their religion. In obedience, therefore, to the repeated commands of a man who called himself a minister of the gospel of peace, and who professed himself a disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, I was banished from my father’s house for no crime but that of desiring to worship the God that made me according to the dictates of my own conscience. I believe my parents thought that the very attempt to banish me from the family would bring me to immediate submission, and that they, on that account, yielded the more easily to the commands of the priest. In the affair my father took no direct hand; the painful task devolved upon my mother, and I believe was devolved upon her in the hope that her tenderness and affection would so work upon my feel-

ings, that I would not be able to part with her. On the day fixed for this banishment, she rolled up a small parcel of linens, and desired me, with an aching heart, to accompany her on a short journey. I did so; and when about a mile from the village, she stopped suddenly, and made the last appeal to my feelings. She did every thing which reasoning, and prayers, and tears, could do, to induce me to return to the bosom of the church, out of which she believed and declared there is no salvation. I felt deeply and wept bitterly, but God enabled me to remain faithful. After some minutes of great suffering on both sides, we parted, and I was not permitted, for about two years, to enter my father's house, though I had often occasion to pass very near it. After my banishment from my father's house, the Lord provided for my temporal support in a manner wonderfully gracious. 'When my father and my mother forsook me, the Lord took me up.' Indeed, when I look back, which I frequently do, upon the way by which God has led me, I must consider myself as in a peculiar manner the child of providence. God has often brought me, when blind, by a way which I knew not, and led me in paths that I had not known; he has often made darkness light before me, and crooked things strait."

In addition to the foregoing examples of popish intolerance and persecution, two memorable events may be mentioned, which are, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day at Paris, and the revocation of the edict of Nantz by Louis XIV., king of France, as illustrative of the spirit of popery as developed in proportion to opportunity and means. With a brief account of these two events, the present section will be closed. The former event, viz., the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, is so connected with preceding events, that we shall need to take a concise view of those antecedents.

At the death of Henry II. of France, in 1559, Francis II., a youth of sixteen years, feeble both in body and

mind, succeeded. His mother, Catherine de Medicis, the duke of Guise, and his brother the cardinal of Lorraine, all decided papists, ruled the nation, and were zealously bent on crushing the reformation, and extirpating all heretics. The king of Navarre, the prince of Conde, and the admiral Coligni, on the other hand, were friendly to the reformers, and with others were in league to overthrow the influence of the Guises. But, as usual in such conflicts, the friends of the reformation were betrayed, and the protestants were generally involved in persecution. Many perished, numbers fled from the country, and still more were imprisoned, robbed of their property, and variously harassed for seventeen months. In 1560, Charles IX. commenced his reign, and being only eleven years old when his brother died, their mother still continued regent. To secure her power she sought the friendship of the king of Navarre, and of the protestants. She needed money, and the states general were assembled the following year; but they did nothing but wrangle. The papists demanded the extirpation of all heretics, and the protestants demanded toleration. The court issued a decree forbidding religious disputes, releasing imprisoned protestants, and allowing toleration to all who would externally conform to the established religion, unless they chose to quit the country. In 1562 a national convention assembled at St. Germain, and agreed that the protestants should be allowed to hold private worship, till a general council should decide all religious disputes. The protestants were not quite satisfied with this, but the papists were outrageous. Tumults ensued. The king of Navarre, to gain an addition to his territory, abandoned the protestants, and summoned the duke of Guise to the capital to suppress the tumults. He obeyed, and passing through Vassy in Champagne, he found an assembly holding worship in a barn. His soldiers commenced a quarrel with them, and then murdered 260 of their number. A civil war now broke out. The pro-

testants made Orleans their head-quarters, and had the prince of Conde and admiral Coligni for leaders; while the papists were commanded by the duke of Guise, the king of Navarre, and the constable Montmorency. Much blood was shed, many towns were taken and ravaged. The king of Navarre fell in battle, the duke of Guise was assassinated. Montmorency and Conde were both taken prisoners. After some other changes, a peace was concluded in 1570, on the principle of amnesty for the past, a free toleration of the protestants everywhere, a limited right to except against popish judges, and the possession of four cities for two years, to be garrisoned by protestants. This treaty on the part of the papists was a lure; and to lull the protestants the more into security, the court now enforced the treaty with much apparent zeal; for they were resolved to effect by treachery what they could not effect by power. A marriage was proposed between the young king of Navarre, who, since the death of his father, had espoused the protestant cause, and the sister of the king of France. By this means the king of Navarre, the admiral Coligni, and the young prince of Conde, were drawn to the court as guests. This was a step preparatory to the tragical scene which was to follow, which was no less than the murder of all these illustrious personages and their friends in the city, while they were put off their guard, and were reposing confidence in the pledged faith and hospitality of papists. The bloody work began at midnight, on St. Bartholomew's day, August 22, 1572. The signal was the tolling of the great bell of the palace, and the butchery continued three days. Coligni was the first victim. With him, five hundred noblemen, and six thousand other protestants, were murdered in Paris alone. Orders were despatched to different parts of the kingdom for a similar massacre. More than thirty thousand, and some say seventy thousand, perished by the hand of the assassins. The pope, hearing of this glorious news, was

so delighted, that he proclaimed a jubilee throughout all Christendom. He also ordered a medal to be struck off in commemoration of this event, so sweet to his feelings. On one side of the medal was a well defined profile of his own face, and on the other the figure of an angel descending from heaven, wielding a great sword in the blessed work of mowing down protestants. This, it is presumed, must have been a popish angel; the departed spirit of Nero, perhaps; for good angels never have been known to engage in killing men for their religious belief. They are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them that shall be heirs of salvation. But no doubt the pope might find those among his demons whom he worships, that would readily join him in such work.

But nothing could exceed the rejoicings of the papists when they saw their opponents thus basely betrayed, and barbarously murdered. They imagined that in this carnage they saw the subversion of the protestant cause, and their own triumph. In this, however they were sorely disappointed. The protestants were weakened but not crushed, and the horrid deed accomplished little else than to illustrate the genius of popery to all future generations.

The protestant chiefs losing all confidence in papists, and in the government under their influence, entered into combinations for their own safety. The prince of Conde, who had been imprisoned, escaped, and went into Germany to form alliances in behalf of his friends. Charles the IX. died and was succeeded by Henry III., a dissolute man and a violent papist. Civil war again raged. But in the result, the protestants gained more freedom of worship. The papists grieved at this, entered into alliance with the king of Spain and the pope, and obliged the king to abrogate his decrees in favor of the protestants. The war was renewed, and again in the result, the protestants gained their point. This led the papists again to the king of Spain with whom they formed a

league to extirminate the protestants and overturn the government. After the death of Henry III., the king of Navarre was next heir to the crown, which he assumed under the title of Henry IV. To effect a peace, he professed the popish faith, but gave a free toleration to all his protestant subjects. In 1598, he published the edict of Nantz, as the basis of protestant liberty, and by it he confirmed all the privileges ever before conceded to them; gave them equal civil rights, equal privileges in the universities and public schools, made them eligible to all public offices, and allowed them to establish places of worship, in places of a particular description throughout the realm. He also gave them an annual stipend of about 40,000 crowns for the support of their ministers. And though the papists murmured and endeavored to infringe on these privileges, Henry protected the protestant cause to the end of his reign.

This edict of Nantz was an occasion of as great grief to the papists as the massacre of St. Bartholomew had been of joy. But they never found an opportunity to procure its abrogation till the reign of Louis XIV., grandson to Henry IV., who granted the edict. Cardinal Richelieu the prime minister under Louis XIII., set himself to accomplish the ruin of the protestant cause in France. He made war upon the protestants contrary to former treaties. And at length reduced their principal fortress, Rochelle. Not satisfied with this success, he next attacked their religion, demanding that they should return to the papal church, or be considered enemies to the state. At first, milder measures were resorted to, such as promises, and conciliatory expositions of doctrines, particularly offensive to the reformed churches. Richelieu spared no pains or arts which he thought would have any influence, to draw the reformed by strata-gem and deception to return to the popish church. But as little was effected by these measures, the popish bishops resorted to the most unrighteous laws, and all

possible measures of vexation and persecution which were in their power; gradually to exhaust the people, and compel them from necessity if not from choice to join the popish standard. Many yielded, being overcome by their grievous sufferings, others left the country, but most remained firm in the religion of their fathers. At length under Louis XIV., after all artifices had been exhausted, the popish prelates and the jesuits, who then bore sway in the counsels of the king, determined that this people, the protestants of France, must be exterminated by violence, and crushed by a single stroke. Overcome by their arguments and solicitations, the king, in the year 1685, with the approbation and applause of the Roman Pontiff, in violation of all laws human and divine, revoked the edict of Nantz, and commanded his reformed subjects to return to the arms of popery. This was the signal for distress and violence to the protestants throughout the kingdom. Vast multitudes of French people were compelled to leave their country and to wander into various parts of Europe, and into the wilds of America, to find an asylum from cruel persecution. Soldiers were despatched into all parts of the kingdom to make converts to popery at the point of the bayonet. Every species of torture, vexation and suffering was inflicted on the poor persecuted protestants; to make them profess with their lips, and adopt in outward forms, a religion which they abhorred in their hearts. Great pains were taken to prevent their escape from the country, for the papists would admit of no alternative but to submit, or die. But after all their vigilance, from half a million to a million are supposed to have found means to reach foreign countries. And some of the best families in these United States came to this country and adopted it as their own in consequence of this persecution. And those who could not escape, were butchered in great numbers, or compelled to abjure their faith to save their lives. Thus treaties and oaths, and promises the most solemn that

man can make, was violated by the papists without compunction, when the opportunity offered, and their interests seemed to demand. Such is the genius of popery. It has always invariably manifested a persecuting and intolerant spirit, so far as circumstances would admit, and has carried its persecutions to all the extremes of barbarous cruelty and savage malignity. No one has ever been able to live peaceably with a papist, in the exercise of his own rights of conscience, without the shield of civil power, constantly over him for protection. And from observation, as well as from the very nature and principles of popery, it is very certain that no one ever will enjoy toleration from popery only as a matter of necessity.

SECTION IX.

SUPERSTITIONS OF POPERY.

UNDER the above general denomination, it is proposed to treat of a variety of institutions and practices of popery, which have not yet come into view. And the first of these is

MONASTICISM.—By this term we understand a practice, adopted very extensively by papists, and at length by a law of general council, erected into a permanent institution of popery, wherein persons of both sexes separate themselves from the common duties and relations of life, to a life of perpetual celibacy, poverty, and as they say, devotion. Monasticism involves three vows which are considered essential to its existence, and binding on all its devotees. These are, *poverty, chastity and obedience to a superior*. Males who assume the monastic vows are called monks. Females who assume these vows are called nuns. There have been many different orders of monastic persons in the papal church, some of

the principal of which have been already mentioned in the preceding historical sketch. What is now in view, is to give an outline of the origin, nature, and consequences of monasticism in general. "Among the corruptions which were early introduced into the Christian church," says a late writer, "monasticism holds a prominent place; an invention which is equally incompatible with the constitution of man, the welfare of the social system, and the design of Christianity. The religion of the gospel is an active religion, adapted to the existing state of society, and never intended to interfere with the ordinary relations and duties of life. The Saviour did not pray that his disciples might be taken out of the world, but that they might be kept from the evil. Instead of withdrawing from his fellows, and thinking to serve the divine being better by mere acts of contemplation and devotion, the Christian is commanded not to be slothful in *business*, while they are fervent in spirit serving the Lord; to combine the active with the contemplative, to abide in his calling with God, and to fulfil the respective obligations arising out of the domestic and social state. The religion of the bible, is not hostile to the laws of nature, or to the general intentions of divine providence."

To the above remarks may be added, that God has expressly commanded, "that if any man do not work, (i e. contribute by his own exertions of body or mind, to his own wants, or the public weal), neither shall he eat." This law of course applies to all who have physical power of compliance. If then monks and nuns can live, and are willing to abide the consequences of living without food or clothing, there would be more consistency in the course they adopt; though even then it would be wholly unjustifiable, as a dereliction of duty to God. But while the monk is engaged in his solitary contemplations, if he really do so, some body must be laboring so much harder to furnish him with the necessaries of

life. If he then gains any thing by this course, he gains it by another's loss. And what propriety or utility is there in this arrangement which adds nothing to the general good. This however, is viewing the subject in the fairest light. Does the monk really gain any thing to himself? Facts will answer this question. So far from gaining any thing, monasticism has done incalculable mischief to its own votaries, as well as to communities. Monks and nuns have made vows indeed of chastity and poverty; but have they kept them? In a general view, it is well known to every reader of ecclesiastical history, that these vows have been systematically and shamelessly broken. They have professed to live in contemplation and devotion and self-mortification. This in a few instances may have been the fact. But in general they have been notorious for vice, for being busy-bodies in other men's matters, and shamefully luxurious and licentious. The whole concern, then has been worse than a dead loss to the world. Better, far better both to themselves and the world, had it been if most who have devoted themselves to monasticism, had never been born. Besides, God created man male and female, and this he did for some important purpose. Have men a right to annul this arrangement of divine providence, and to frustrate its design; and are they warranted to suppose that such a course is peculiarly acceptable to God, unless indicated by some special manifestation of the divine will? What pleasure does the Deity take in the celibacy of men or women, by which his arrangement in creation and in providence is desecrated from its proper use and diverted from its proper channel? Is this the way to please God or to render ourselves acceptable to him? The system of monasticism is all founded in pride and self-righteousness. Popish convents it is true are often filled with females, whose choice of that life is apparently influenced by a powerful feeling of devotion and deadness to the world. But what are the motives set before them

to induce this feeling? They are told, in the presence of an admiring assembly that they are to become the spouse of Christ, and to enter on a state of almost angelic purity, and that separated from the temptations and sins of the world, they will possess every facility for accomplishing their salvation, and increasing their merit in the sight of God. Now, supposing this to be their real motive when they enter on this course of life, and that they are wholly unacquainted with the depths of Satan into which they are about to plunge, yet what is their motive, to say nothing of its delusion and its gross irreverence, what is it but a piece of self-righteousness? What better in spirit or principle than the practice of the Hindoo female who devotes herself to the funeral pile, or of him who casts himself before the wheels of the car of Juggernaut?

With these preliminary remarks, we proceed to examine the features of monasticism more in detail.

The monastic spirit first appeared in a sect of fanatical Jews, called Therapentae, who claimed to be disciples of Moses, notwithstanding their wide departure from him. They gave up all their property and retired to solitary places, where they lived in huts, without any external worship, and without labor; mortifying their bodies by fasting, and their souls by contemplation, in order to bring the heaven-born spirit, now imprisoned in the body, into light and liberty, and fit it for the celestial mansions after death. They assembled together every seventh day of the week, and after religious ceremonies, they ate together, feeding on salt with bread and water. This meal was followed by a sacred dance which continued through the night. At first the men and women danced apart, but at length, guided, as they claimed, by inspiration, they joined together in this exercise, and labored by violent outcries, songs, and movements, to express the love of God working in their hearts.

We next find the monastic spirit operating in the sect

of professing Christians called mystics, which arose in the second century. Origen imprudently attempted to mingle the Platonic philosophy with Christianity, and thus produced a spurious mixture called mysticism. Ammonius Saccas, the leader of the Platonic school, taught the wise who aimed at superior attainments, that they must, by means of contemplation, elevate their souls, which were the offspring of God, above all earthly things, and to weaken and emaciate their bodies, which were hostile to the liberty of their souls, by means of hunger, thirst, labor, and other austerities, so that they might in the present life attain to communion with God, and ascend after death active and unincumbered, to the universal parent, and be forever united to him. This scheme infected at length the Christian church, and laid a foundation for the idea that piety was greatly promoted by ignorance and idleness. This sentiment was afterwards adopted by the orders of monks, and became the inlet to many of the superstitions of popery. After this sentiment had gained influence among professed Christians, in the beginning of the fourth century, a vast multitude of monks and sacred virgins spread themselves with astonishing rapidity over the whole Christian world. In a short time the east swarmed with persons, who abandoning the occupations and conveniences of life, and all intercourse with society, pined away amidst various hardships, hunger and sufferings, in order to attain to a more close communion with God and the angels. The Christian world would have remained free from these tortures of mind and body, had not that great, fascinating doctrine of ancient philosophy obtained influence among Christians, that, to attain to happiness and communion with God, the soul must be freed from the influence of the body, and for this purpose, the body must be subdued by severity. From this time, monasteries in the east and west, began to arise, and orders of monks to be formed, and the system in its moral tendencies began to be

unfolded. The monks were early divided into the *Coenobites* and the *Eremites*. The former dwelt together in the same house under a common leader or father, who was called abbot. The latter led a cheerless, solitary life in the wilderness, dwelling in hovels and among the wild beasts. Another class or order called *Anchorites*, went still further in their austerities. They had no kind of shelter, fed on roots and plants, and had no fixed residence, but lodged wherever night overtook them. They were vagrants who roamed about the country, and obtained their living by practising various impositions. The *Coenobites* were notorious for their vicious, profligate practices. Their social intercourse soon degenerated in bacchanalian revels, and scenes of debauchery. The other orders of *Eremites* and *Anchorites*, were either fanatics, or knaves and impostors. And yet on account of their professions merely, they were accounted persons of great sanctity, and so great was their reputation in this respect, that though they had been originally laymen; many of them were received into the order of the priesthood, and the bishops were often taken from their ranks. The erection of edifices, where monks and nuns might serve God was carried beyond all bounds. As they became popular they became rich, and as a natural consequence, vicious; so that as early as the fifth century the licentiousness of monasteries became proverbial.

When popery had developed itself, and had taken full possession by the grant of the tyrant Phocas and some of his successors, as has been narrated, it seized upon monasticism as one of its chief supports, and has ever since found the monks and nuns a kind of standing spiritual militia, or life-guard. "The partiality of the pope for the monastic orders," says a late writer, "is easily accounted for. They constitute a peculiar and distinct body, so estranged from society that they can give undivided attention and solicitude to any object that is presented to their notice; and that object has universally

It is related by Bernardine, that Mary herself once appeared to St. Thomas Becket, and spake as follows. "Rejoice and be glad and be joyful with me!" said the virgin Mary, "because my glory doth excel the dignity of all the saints, and all the blessed spirits, and I alone have greater glory than all the angels and saints together. Rejoice, because, that as the sun doth enlighten the day, and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world! Rejoice, because the whole host of heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoreth me! Rejoice, because my son is always obedient to me and my will, and my prayers he always heareth!" or as others do relate, "the will of the blessed Trinity and mine is the same, and whatsoever doth please me, the whole Trinity, with unspeakable favor, doth give consent unto. Rejoice, because God doth always, at my pleasure, reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come! Rejoice, because I sit next to the Holy Trinity, and am clothed with my body glorified! Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys will always stand, and never be finished nor fail! And whosoever, by rejoicing with those spiritual joys, shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence, and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it, in the sight of my son, that it may possess joys with me." They tell us that many that would not sin on Saturday, for the reverence of the virgin, whatever they did on the Lord's day, seem to have blessed the virgin in greater veneration, than Christ her son, moved thereunto, out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the son of God doth bear with the simplicity of those men and women, because he is not ignorant that the honor of the mother doth redound to the child. They argue farther, that if a cardinal have this privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of any one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby, then by an ar-

gument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the blessed virgin is able to deliver us from all evil, her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown, (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship,) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils, she would presently rescue him, and not permit that any one should have any evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown. They add moreover, that for every one of these crowns, a man shall obtain two hundred and seventy three thousand, seven hundred and fifty-eight days of indulgence; and that Pope Sixtus IV. granted an indulgence of twelve thousand years for every time that a man, in a state of grace, should repeat this short orison or salutation of the Virgin, which by many is inserted in her crown, viz. "Hail most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of heaven, the gate of paradise, the lady of the world, thou art a singular and pure virgin, thou didst bear Christ without sin; thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the world, in whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil and pray for my sins. Amen."

In the crown composed by Bonaventure, the following is one of the orisons prescribed to be said. "O empress, and our most holy lady, by the authority of a mother, command thy beloved son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly things unto heavenly desires, which is suitable unto that verse which we read in the 35th Psalm of his lady's Psalm. Incline the countenance of God upon us, and compel him to have mercy upon sinners." It must here be stated by explanation, that a Psalter has been composed by papists for the express worship of Mary, in which those passages that are usually directed to the only wise God, are applied to the virgin. The above quotation is from this book. The expression *compel*, seemed a little too harsh for modern ears, so that it has been

shameless inconsistency, to which the history of man affords few, if any, parallels. But so great was the superstition about the mortification of the body, and such the fame of sanctity attached to the bare profession of abstinence, that very soon it became essential, in public estimation, to a life of religion. A prejudice against married clergymen began extensively to prevail. And this was carefully cherished by the popes. Those priests who had wives were at first deemed inferior to their brethren who had not; and finally, they were deemed unfit for their office. Long and arduous were the struggles which ensued; but the pope and Satan finally prevailed on this point, and the celibacy and professed chastity of priests were the established law of the popish kingdom.

The following decrees show the light in which the council of Trent viewed the subject now under examination:—"IX. Decree. Whoever shall affirm that persons in holy orders, or regulars, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry, who feel that, though they should make a vow of chastity, they have not the gift thereof; let him be accursed. For God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above what we are able. X. Decree. Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a state of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity or celibacy, than to be married, let him be accursed." Concerning the divine injunction—"Be fruitful and multiply," &c.—the popish catechism has the following comment:—"This injunction does not impose on every individual the obligation to marry; they declare the object of the institution of marriage; and now that the

human race is widely diffused, not only is there no law rendering marriage obligatory, but on the contrary, virginity is highly exalted, and strongly recommended in scripture as superior to marriage, as a state of greater perfection and holiness." If this is true, then surely every person ought to aim at it, and is under obligation to practice it, because every one is bound to aim at a state of the greatest attainable perfection. And if celibacy is that state for man, what can exonerate every man and woman from the obligation? Where, then, in a few years, would be the wide extension of the human race? Even popery itself must become extinct for want of subjects, if this rule of holiness were universal. It cannot, then, be the general rule of holiness; nor is it a state most favorable to holiness, especially when voluntary without any special occasion in providence. God has fixed the law of marriage in the physical constitution of man, and it is a law which cannot, in ordinary cases, be neglected or avoided, without exposure at least to moral evils of the greatest magnitude. This is enough to demonstrate the obligation so far as circumstances will permit. And notwithstanding the curses of popery, even if they were multiplied an hundred fold, every man of sense and honesty will affirm that a conjugal state is greatly to be preferred to a state of celibacy, both as a means of happiness and holiness. God does not keep us from temptation when we voluntarily run into it, and expose ourselves to the devices of Satan.

The laws of popery respecting monasteries and convents, and those who assume vows, are very rigid and severe. They say that nunneries shall be kept carefully closed, and egress be absolutely forbidden to the nuns under any pretence whatsoever, without special license, on pain of excommunication. Magistrates being enjoined, under the same penalty, to assist the bishops, if necessary, by employing force; and the latter being urged to their duty by the fear of the judgment of God, and the

eternal curse, "That if any monk or nun pretended that they had taken the vows under the influence of force or fear, or before the age appointed by law, they should not be heard, except within five years of their profession; if they laid aside the habit of their own accord, they should not be permitted to make the complaint, but be compelled to return to the monastery, and be punished as apostates, and in the mean time, deprived of all the privileges of their order."

It may be said, perhaps, that none came under these regulations but by their own voluntary act. But we are to keep in mind the flattering motives that are held up to the young and inexperienced to engage. And when once engaged, or having stepped over the threshold, there is no retreat but with utter disgrace. A female who should return to the world after having experienced the delusion of her hopes, and the exposure of her condition, would be met with universal contempt and neglect. Her family and friends would consider themselves dishonored, and probably would refuse to receive her. Her acquaintance would refuse to associate with her. No man would ever regard her as a candidate for marriage. She would be an object of universal scorn. Such is public opinion and the strength of superstition in popish countries, that it operates with the force of the Hindoo law of caste, or that by which the widow is impelled to the funeral pile of her husband, to which her own son puts the torch.

But after all the severity of the above and similar rules by which communication with the exterior world in general is cut off from nunneries, yet there are ways and means found by which unrestrained intercourse with certain parts of the world is enjoyed. Though the nuns have no egress on pain of excommunication, yet there are those who have ingress whenever they please, and it is said, by means of a subterranean passage attached to the nunnery for that purpose. The prioress of the con-

vent of St. Catherine, at Pistoie, says, "with the exception of three or four religious persons, all the monks, now dead or alive, whom I have ever known, were of the same character. They all made the same profession, and adopted the same conduct. They live with the nuns on more familiar terms than married people live together." For endeavoring to suppress these disorders, Ricci was stigmatized by pope Pius VI. as a fanatic, a liar, a calumniator, seditious, and an usurper of other men's rights. This is the testimony of one who knew the facts. Is it asked, what is the object of those severe laws above mentioned, if these convents are so corrupt? The answer is, the priests are jealous of their fellow men, and guard their prey with the same feelings that the grand Turk keeps a watchful eye over his harem. These nunneries are in fact the harems of the priests and monks. The following definition of a monk is by a baron of Hungary:—" *Monk.* An animal, greedy, filthy, impure, unprofitable, slothful, more inclined to endure hunger than toil. They live by rapine and gain; they think the world was created for their use alone; they indulge in secret intercourse with women; they do not celebrate the rites of marriage; they expose their offspring; they treat their own species with cruelty, and deceitfully ensnare their enemies. *Use.* An unprofitable burden to the earth, created to devour the fruits thereof."

The ceremony of introducing an applicant for a place in the convent, is thus described in an Irish journal from the mouth of popery. "Miss Joyce, daughter of Walter Joyce, Esqr. of Mervieu, was received to-day, amongst the pious and exemplary sisterhood of the Presentation convent; scarcely have we ever witnessed a scene more sublimely imposing. The young and promising daughter of one of our most respectable and esteemed citizens, presenting herself at the altar of her God, in the abandonment of every earthly consideration—in the sacrifice of every thing that could bespeak permanency to social life

and to social happiness, in the dedication of her exalted talents, of her young and innocent loveliness, of the world's promise and the world's hopes, must indeed be capable of awakening in the breasts of all, a generous and a dignified association, whilst it affords an important coloring to the completion of her future existence, and her ultimate destiny. At half past nine the '*O gloriosa Virginum*' was sung from the highest choir, in the masterly accompaniment of select musical performers. The procession then began to move from the vestry, through the lower choir to the chapel in the following order. 1. The Thuriferere. 2. The Acolytes. 3. The master of ceremonies, the Rev. Mr. Daly. 4. The subdeacon, the Rev. Mr. Gill. 5. Deacon, the Rev. Mr. O'Donnell. 6. The high priest, the Rev. Mr. Finn. 7. The celebrant, the very Rev. Warden French, and his train bearer.—The Rev. Warden French having been conducted to his faldastorium, under a rich canopy, the high priest and his officiating ministers, retired to their places at the gospel side of the altar. And now all was breathless expectation; the young postulant (applicant) appeared in the attendance of the Rev. mother, and her assistant, robed in all the gaudy extravagance of fashionable splendor, and beaming in the glows of youthful modesty, which taught us to believe, that had she remained in the world she forsook, she would have moved the attraction of every heart, the leading star of every eye. The very Rev. Celebrant was then conducted to the platform of the altar, and the postulant and her attendants having genuflected, (knelt,) the ceremony of reception began with the preparatory prayers and responsories. When the novice was seated, and the celebrant was reconducted to the faldastorium, high mass commenced with peculiar dignity, and with a strict precision in all the various ceremonies, which always render the Catholic service sublime."—(The reader can judge for himself of the sublimity by turning back to the description of the celebration of mass.)

“After the gospel, the Rev. Mr. Daly delivered an excellent sermon, addressed peculiarly to the novice, and prefaced by a text admirably pertinent to the subject he handled! ‘Harken O daughter and see, incline thine ear; thou shalt leave thy people and thy father’s house, for the king hath greatly desired thy beauty, and he is the Lord thy God.’ Ps. 45. After mass the novice retired, whilst the clerical choir chanted in full tone the Psalm, ‘*in exitu Israel de Egypto.*’ At the conclusion of the Psalm she appeared disrobed of her worldly habiliments and vested in the simplicity of penance and retirement. In the different answers to questions put to her by the celebrant, she was clear and decisive, like one whose determination of embracing a life of religion and of chastity was that of long and conclusive reflection. The ceremony on the whole created a deep and general interest. The chapel and lower choir were crowded with the first of rank and distinction in our city and the vicinity. We recognized among them the respectable families of his grace the archbishop of Tuam, collector Reilly, and our worthy mayor, Col. Carey.” This puff is probably from the pen of some popish priest. Be that as it may, to every enlightened mind the ceremony here described is all mummery and nonsense. If it were just as it appears, what is the amount? Why a young sprightly damsel, to whom God has given talents and powers to be extensively useful, a comfort to her friends and a blessing to the world, resolves under the tuition of popery to throw away these talents, or bury them, and retire into solitude, and for what? Ah, who can tell? This is the best of it. But taking the affair, divested of external glare, just as it is, and as she will find it in the result, and what is it? Why this fair unsuspecting damsel is persuaded, under the forms of superstition, to become a victim to the craft and villany of a few designing men. By superstitious rites she is drawn from the paternal roof, and from maternal watchfulness, and placed

beyond the reach of parental fidelity, at the mercy of wolves in sheep's clothing. And to grace the transaction, a passage of scripture, which is figuratively written of the church, is perverted and applied to this damsel, and the most blasphemous suggestion made, by a literal application of the language to her. If the preacher, instead of reading, "the king hath greatly desired thy beauty," had put the priests in the place of the king, he would have been much nearer the truth. Let the papists gloss this transaction over ever so much, or call it by what name they will, it is really a human sacrifice, as really so as the burning of Hindoo widows, and it involves precisely the same principle. In the words of another, "Here a silly young creature is represented as devoting herself to a life of celibacy, and perpetual seclusion from the world, which must be a life of delusion or misery, or both, because it is contrary to the appointment of God, who requires no man or woman to relinquish the advantages of domestic and social intercourse, or to become thus secluded from the world, but who rather commands all to occupy the sphere which in his providence he assigns them in the world, for his glory and the good of their fellow creatures." What right has a female or any other person to devote their lives to perpetual seclusion, any more than they have to take away their own lives? And when God shall require an account of their stewardship what can they say more than was said by the unprofitable servant, and what can they expect to hear from the judge different from what he heard?

In regard to the profligacy of the popish priesthood and monasteries, in consequence of monasticism and celibacy, it will doubtless be said by the friends of popery that the sins of a few are charged upon the whole, and that this is very unreasonable. They will say there was one Judas in the family of Christ, an Ananias and Sapphira among the first disciples, and if a few priests,

monks and nuns should violate their vows, that should not in justice be charged to the whole community of papists. To this plea there are two grounds of reply. First, the bad conduct of a few members of any community must be charged upon the whole body, if that body do not take proper measures to cast out the polluted members. Suppose the apostles had continued to consort with Judas after his character was known, suppose they made common cause with him, and continued to support and encourage him; would they not have been justly chargeable with aiding and abetting him in his crimes? The same inquiry will apply to Ananias and Sapphira. Is it not the general sentiment of all reasonable men that the church which harbors and retains malefactors, knowing them to be such, becomes a partaker in their guilt? If so, then it is asked when or how has popery ever cleansed herself of the admitted pollution of her members? When has she ever cast out a priest, a monk, or a nun for known profligacy? and even some of her popes have been men of grossly immoral lives, when has popery ever frowned effectually at these things? No, in general she has defended her profligate sons, and when covered with the stains of sin she has pressed them more closely to her bosom. And if any have undertaken to disclose the facts or produce a reform, they have been arraigned as rebels. Take the case of Ricci already mentioned, who brought to light enormous wickedness in his own precincts and sought to apply a remedy, but he was frowned from papal presence. Can papists then complain that they bear the reproach of many when they make common cause with the workers of iniquity? But there is no necessity to enlarge here, for in the *second place*, it is not true that the delinquents and offenders among the orders of celibacy is an inconsiderable number, a small proportion of the whole. Celibacy has been followed in all ages by very general and almost universal corruption so much so as to demonstrate that the

whole system is one of corruption, and if one in a thousand escapes, he is a kind of prodigy. The evidence of this truth is abundant on the page of history, even from the writings of popish authors themselves. For many of them have seen and deplored the evil, which with their system in operation, they could neither avoid nor cure. The detail of the evidence is a thankless and odious task both to the writer and readers, and cannot now be admitted to any considerable extent. Some things touching this point have been stated. In addition, it must suffice to state a few unquestionable facts.

From the book entitled, "Taxes of the Apostolic chancery," it appears that a priest was allowed to keep a mistress for the small sum of half a guinea. If this was allowed by the highest authority in the papal community it is fair to infer that it was generally practiced. But we do not rest the charge on inference. Claude de Espence, a divine of great note in the papal church, says, "Shameful to relate, they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots, who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And in some places they oblige the priest to pay this tax, saying 'they may keep a concubine if they please.'" This testimony is not the less valid from having been before cited to illustrate a different point.

Dr. Henry in his history of Britain, gives the following account of the fifteenth century. "At the king's command, the university of Oxford drew up a catalogue of those abuses in the church which needed reformation, to be laid before the council of Constance. This catalogue consists of forty-six articles, which though drawn up by priests, gives a most odious picture of the manners of the clergy at this time, particularly of their avarice and debauchery. Of each of these an example may be given. The 27th article is as follows. 'It is notorious, that when a pagan or Jew, abandoning his former errors, desires to be purified in the fount of baptism, all his tempo-

ral goods are confiscated to the church, which, it is believed, prevents many Jews from being baptized. It would be pious and meritorious in the council to remedy this abuse. For when Philip baptized the eunuch, he did not seize his chariot, or other goods he might have about him at the time of his baptism.' The 38th article represents, 'that the carnal and debauched lives of the clergy in our days, and their public fornications, which are never punished, (except perhaps with a small fine in private, probably the half crown tax,) set an evil example before others; it would therefore be a holy thing, and contribute to the reformation of the church, if priests of every rank and order, who were public fornicators were obliged to abstain from saying mass for a limited time.' In this article it will be observed, the complaint is not concerning a *few* cases of criminal conduct here and there, but the article speaks of the clergy generally. Archbishop Bouchier, as related by the same historian, in a commission which he granted to one of his commissaries to attempt some reform, says, 'that many of the clergy were ignorant, illiterate blockheads, or rather idiots, and that they were as profligate as they were ignorant, neglecting their cures, strolling about the country with bad women in their company, spending the revenues of the church, in feasting and drinking, in fornication and adultery.' " The successor of this worthy primate of England, viz. John Morton, in a letter to the abbot of St. Albans, which has been published, charges him and his monks with the most odious vices, of which he says they were notoriously guilty. One of his crimes was, that he had "turned all the modest women out of the two nunneries of Pray and Sapwell and filled them with prostitutes, that they were esteemed no better than brothels, and were frequented as such publicly by him and his monks." Such was the condition of these holy seminaries of popery in the fifteenth century.

When the reformation came on, Henry VIII. ordered

a visitation of certain monasteries as preparatory to their suppression. The following is Dr. Henry's account of the result. "The visitors having received their commission and instructions, were despatched into different parts of the kingdom at the same time, that the monks might have as little warning of their approach as possible. They executed their commissions with zeal and diligence, and made some curious discoveries almost in every house, not much to the honor of the inhabitants. In making these discoveries they were greatly indebted to the violent factions which reigned among the monks and nuns, who informed against one another, and against their superiors. Accounts of their proceedings were transmitted by the visitors to the vicar-general, and contained sufficient materials to render the monasteries completely infamous, and the objects of universal detestation for their gross, absurd superstition and idolatry, their infernal cruelty, their shameful impositions on the credulity of the people, their abandoned unnatural incontinency, their drunkenness, gluttony, and other vices. Some of the old abbots and friars did not attempt to conceal their practices. The holy father, the prior of Maiden-Bradley, produced a dispensation from the pope, permitting him to keep a mistress, and he assured them he took none but young maidens, and when he was disposed to change he procured them husbands. Though he had no wife, and could not have agreeably to the rules of popery, yet he had already given portions out of the goods of the priory to six sons and one daughter who had been married, and several more of his children were nearly grown up." These investigations led to an act of parliament of which the following is the preamble, which gives a general view of the subject at that time.—"Forasmuch as manifest sin, vicious, carnal and abominable living is daily used and committed in abbeys, priories, and other religious houses of monks, canons, and nuns; and albeit, many continual visitations have been heretofore had, by

the space of two hundred years and more, for an honest, charitable reformation of such unthrifty, carnal, and abominable living, yet nevertheless, little or no amendment is hitherto had, but their vicious living shamefully increaseth and augmenteth." In Scotland the state of things was no better. M'Crie, in his life of Knox, says, "The lives of the clergy exempted from secular jurisdiction, and corrupted by wealth and idleness were become a scandal to religion and an outrage to decency. While they professed chastity, and prohibited, under the severest penalties, any of the ecclesiastical order from contracting lawful wedlock, the bishops set the example of the most shameless profligacy before the inferior clergy. They avowedly kept in their houses harlots, provided their natural sons with benefices, and gave their daughters in marriage to the sons of the nobility and principal gentry, many of whom were so mean as to contaminate the blood of their families by such base alliances, for the sake of the rich doweries which they brought!" Cardinal Beton, the primate of Scotland, already mentioned as the murderer of Mr. Wishart, settled with the earl of Crawford the preliminaries of a marriage between the earl's eldest son and his own natural daughter, named Margaret, with whom he gave a very large fortune. The lives of the popish clergy in Ireland at this day, says the Rev. Charles Bóurke, as well as on the continent, are not much more correct than at the reformation of Luther. The mistresses and children of reverend gentlemen can be shewn whenever they choose to put it to trial. They themselves know that this can be proved incontestibly. The above examples are taken chiefly from England and Scotland, because they were more free from the pollutions of popery, than most other countries that were subjected to its influence, and therefore exhibit, at least, a fair sample of the general fruits of popish monasticism.

The next item of popish superstition which will come under consideration relates to **RELICS**. And no part or

portion of popery is more sottish and ridiculous than this. If the facts concerning it were not entirely incontestible, they would be utterly incredible. That men can become very wicked, and be led to great extremes by their selfish and carnal feelings is easily believed. But that they can be made such dupes and fools, as to believe the legends of popery contrary to their own eyes and ears, is marvellous.

The following decree of the council of Trent, may serve as a proper opening to the subject.

“ Let them (i. e. all bishops and others, who have the care and charge of teaching) teach also, that the holy bodies of the holy martyrs, and others living with Christ, whose bodies are living members of Christ, and temples of the Holy Ghost, and will be by him, raised to eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, since by them God bestows many benefits upon men. So that *they* are to be wholly condemned, as the church has long before condemned them, and now repeats the sentence, *who* affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of the saints, or that it is a useless thing that the faithful should honor these and other sacred monuments, and that the memorials of the saints are in vain frequented to obtain their aid and assistance.”

By relics we are to understand certain remains of the bodies, dress, furniture, clothing or appurtenances of persons or saints who have been renowned either before or after death. It is difficult to determine the precise degree of virtue or divinity which papists ascribe to these things, and therefore the consideration belongs to superstition rather than to idolatry. Superstition it certainly is, it may be more, but this is the least that can be said. The objects themselves called relics are very multifarious as we shall have occasion to observe. Some appear to be regarded with religious veneration. For St. Thomas Aquinas says, “ If we speak of the very cross upon which Christ was crucified, it is to be worshipped

with divine worship ; both as it represents Christ, and touched the members of his body, and was sprinkled with his blood, for these reasons we both speak to the cross and pray to it as if it were Christ crucified upon it." This of course can be nothing less than idolatry. "But other relicts, such as are designed to frighten witches, cure the diseases of cattle, kill vermin, and serve other necessary purposes, must receive a veneration suited to their respective uses."

The council of Trent, it will be observed, has declared, that "by these relics God bestows many benefits upon men." This, of course, every papist must believe. If the holy fathers are to be credited, many benefits truly have been enjoyed by monks, priests and popes, through the intervention of relics. The church which can obtain a tooth or bone of some famous saint, or any fragment of the instrument of his death, must be happy indeed. This is a capital device, if it can be forced upon the credulity of men, to obtain money. By this many churches glitter, and many a treasury is filled with gold and silver. Who can wonder that the pope should so pathetically urge the faithful to visit Rome at the jubilee, that they might see the cradle in which the Saviour was laid, a piece of the true cross, the nails used in the crucifixion, &c. By this means the pockets of the faithful are emptied, and the coffers of the pope filled. Thus, one writer remarks in writing of Rome in the nineteenth century, "They shew at Rome the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul encased in silver busts, set with jewels, a lock of the virgin Mary's hair, a phial of her tears, and a piece of her green petticoat. Also a robe of Christ sprinkled with his blood, some drops of his blood in a phial, some of the water which flowed from the wound in his side, some of the sponge, a large piece of the cross, all the nails used in the crucifixion, a piece of the stone of the sepulchre on which the angel sat, the identical porphyry pillar on which the cock crowed after Peter denied Christ, the rods of Moses

and Aaron, and two pieces of the wood of the real ark of the covenant. At the extremity of the great nave of St. Peter's, behind the altar, stands a sort of throne composed of precious materials, and supported by four gigantic pillars. This throne enshrines the real, plain worm-eaten, wooden chair, in which St. Peter, prince of the apostles, is said to have pontificated, (i. e. acted the pope.) When the French were at Rome, they removed its superb casket, and discovered the relic. Upon its dusty and mouldering surface were traced carvings which bore the appearance of letters. The chair was quickly brought into a better light, the dust and cobwebs removed, and the inscription faithfully copied. The writing is in Arabic characters, and is the well known confession of Mahometan faith, viz.—“There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet.” It is supposed that the chair was brought from Palestine by the crusaders. But here it has been for ages worshipped by the faithful papists as the real identical chair in which Peter played the pope. The church of St. Lorenzo in Genoa, possessed a most sacred relic, viz., a dish declared to be of one entire and perfect emerald, said to be that on which our Lord ate his last supper. It was guarded by knights of honor, and exposed to view only once a year. The French seized it, and most sacrilegiously sent it to the laboratory. Instead of submitting it, with its traditional glory, to the council of Trent, they handed it over to the Institute of Paris, and chemists, geologists, and philosophers were called on to decide the fate of that vessel, which bishops, priests, and deacons had pronounced to be too sacred for human investigation, or even for human touch. The result of the scientific inquisition was, that the emerald dish was “a piece of green glass!” In the church of the escurial, in Spain, there are eleven thousand relics. A few extracts from an account of them, printed in Spain, in 1764, will probably amuse the reader. The account says, “We will first begin with the relics of our Saviour,

who, as he gave himself to us, left us some of his precious jewels, which are incomparable and divine, viz: "A sacred hair of his most holy head or beard, is preserved here, with the utmost veneration, in a precious vase, and opportunity can never offer us a better hair to obtain glory by. Several pieces of his most holy cross, all admirably garnished with gold, and silver, and jewels, especially that which is adored on good Friday. Thirteen thorns out of his crown, which pierce the soul with their points, when we consider them as in the delicate temples of that most lovely king of glory. Some pieces of the column to which he was bound, and of the manger in which he was born, to die for us, which invite hearts to break in pieces through compassion and gratitude.

"In the next place are the relics of his most holy mother, which gladden the hearts of those who seriously consider their incomparable value. Three or four pieces of the habit which adorned the most pure and virginal body, in which was formed that of Jesus Christ our Lord, her son, are placed in one case. Also a piece of the handkerchief with which she wiped her tears at the foot of the cross, when those tears, as precious as the gems of Aurora, joining themselves with the rubies of the western sun, incorporated themselves with the treasure of our redemption." The reader is begged to remember that this is popish description, else he may think the writer mad. "Besides these, we possess a hair, which may be suspected to be that, which, flowing down her neck, enamored her spouse."

"We possess also a thigh bone of the glorious martyr, St. Lawrence. It is entire, but the hair is singed; the holes that were made in it, (what, the thigh bone?) by the prongs by which he was turned on the gridiron, are yet very visible. One of this saint's feet is also in possession; the toes are entire, though contracted; between two of them is a small cinder, which, in the eye of piety, shines like a carbuncle. In order to protect the building

which contains these precious remains from lightning, there are several relics, especially those of St Lawrence, its patron, in metal cases, inserted into the balls and crosses which are on the tops of the towers."

The use of the *Agnus Dei*, as it is called, from the fact that the image of the Lamb of God is impressed on the face of it, may be inserted here, as nearly related to the use of relics. The *agnus Dei*, is made of clear wax, balsam, and chrism, according to the form prescribed in the popish ritual. The spiritual efficacy or virtue of it is gathered from the prayers that the church make use of in the blessing of it, which is "to preserve him who carries an *agnus Dei*, or any particle of it about him, from any attempts of his temporal or spiritual enemies; from the dangers of fire, of water, of storms and tempests, of thunder and lightning, and from sudden and unprovided death. It puts the devils to flight, succors women in child-birth, takes away the stains of past sins, and furnishes us with new grace for the future, that we may be preserved from all adversities and perils, both in life and death, through the cross and merits of the Lamb, who redeemed and washed us in his blood." The pope consecrates the *agnus Deis* the first year of his pontificate, and afterwards on every seventh year, on Saturday before low Sunday, with many solemn ceremonies and devout prayers. And yet this popish quackery, this puffing of spiritual nostrums and specifics, is believed by men in England and America.

But we have not done with relics yet. "There is no part of popery," says McGavin, "that depends so much on downright lying and imposition as this. When the prophet Ezekiel saw in a vision the idolatrous Jews worshipping every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, he saw little more than what is practiced every day in popish countries, where the wretched and deluded people pay their devotion to rotten rags, to the decayed bones of

human carcasses, and to all manner of nastiness, the very mention of which would fill with loathing the mind of every human being, that is not brutified by an abominable superstition. The least offensive are the arms, fingers, legs, and toes of certain saints; some of whom must have had as many limbs as a centipede; for in Flanders, Spain, and France, there are no less than eight arms of St. Matthew, which would of course produce forty fingers. The author of one catalogue, in my possession, assures his readers that himself had seen "three arms of St. Luke, and he could not tell how many St. Thomas a Becket had." In the church of the lateran at Rome, they have the entire table on which our Lord ate the last supper with his disciples; and yet there are said to be pieces of it in both Spain and Flanders. At Rome, as already mentioned, they show the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul; and yet, in possession of the Augustines at Bilboa, there is a great piece of the skull of Peter, and another piece of that of Paul in the keeping of the Franciscans of the same city. The Augustine friars at Burgos are said to have the virgin Mary's chamber pot, which they esteem a very precious relic. In St. Peter's they have the cross of the good thief, somewhat worm-eaten; Judas' lantern, a little scorched; the dice the soldiers played with, when they cast lots for the garment of Christ; the tail of Balaam's ass, St. Joseph's axe, and saw, and hammer, and a few nails he had not driven, (mem. St. Joseph was a carpenter,) St. Anthony's millstone, on which he sailed to Muscovy. Pieces of the true cross are in many different places, and in sufficient numbers to supply a town with fuel for a winter. Part of the manna which fell in the wilderness, some blossoms of Aaron's rod; an arm of St. Simeon, poorly kept; the image of the blessed virgin, drawn by St. Luke, all the features visible; one of her combs, and twelve combs of the twelve apostles, very little used; some relics of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the arm and part of

the body of Lazarus, poorly kept, and smells ; a part of the body of St. Mark, a part of his gospel, in his own hand writing, almost legible ; a finger and arm of St. Ann, the mother of the blessed virgin ; a piece of the virgin's veil, as good as new ; the staff delivered by our Lord to St Patrick, with which he drove all the snakes and toads out of Ireland ; some of Joseph's breath, which an angel inclosed in a phial as he was hewing wood violently, which was so long adored in France, and since brought to Venice, and from Venice to Rome ; the head of St. Dennis, which he carried two miles under his arm, after it was cut off, even from Montmatre to St. Dennis ; a piece of the rope with which Judas hanged himself ; large parcels of the blessed virgin's hair—some of her milk—some butter, and a cheese made of it, which never decays." These precious relics are all certified solemnly to be what they are said to be, and popish priests will maintain their authenticity with more confidence than they maintain any article of revelation. And the pope himself is not ashamed to lend his authority to sanction this palpable falsehood and absurdity. The great object of the popish priesthood is to excite the superstitious reverence of their followers for these relics, and by that means to extort their money. Still, in any emergency where impossibility attends the supposition that these relics should be what they profess to be, the papists have a resort. They then say, it is not essential whether the bones which are worshipped as the relics of any particular saint, should actually have belonged to that saint, or to any saint, provided the worshipper really believes the story, and worships them with an intention to honor the saint in view. They may be the bones of horses or dogs, and yet, if he intends to honor a particular saint by cherishing these bones, the act is accepted for its intention. Under the sanction of this principle the manufactory of relics has become a great business with skilful papists ; for they can thus untomb whole catacombs of

bones, and, by an easy process, turn them all into sacred relics of more value than gold or gems. Of this business we have the following account of a traveller, entitled, "Observations on a journey to Naples." The author was himself at one time a good papist, and therefore knew whereof he affirmed.

"These catacombs, in the sense they take them in, are subterraneous places, where believers assembled themselves in the times of persecution, and where they buried the corpses of their martyrs; but they also indifferently buried there the bodies of all Christians; so that as those places served them for temples or places to meet in, they served them also as church-yards, or places to bury their dead. The popes having, in these last ages, taken into mature consideration the great gains they reaped from the bones of their saints, had recourse to these places as to inexhaustible mines, and indifferently seized all the bones they met with there. Yea, their avarice lashed out to that degree, that, either not knowing, or not being able to distinguish the true catacombs, they have gone to search for bones in the common sewers or subterranean vaults, which were the sinks to carry off the filth of the city, and where, in ancient times, they used to fling the bodies of malefactors after their execution. The popes not being able to distinguish the one from the other, and to spare themselves trouble, by the power of God, which they professed themselves to have, changed them all into saints by word of mouth. The heathen also had caves and vaults, where they caused themselves to be interred with their whole families; and the greater part of all these bones are now upon the altars of papists, under the name of saints, taken out of the catacombs. And, forasmuch as the popes are ignorant of their names, they baptize them anew, and give them a name as best pleases them. This is the cause of so many contests between the priests and the monks, who all pretend to be the sole possessors of the primitive saint

of this or that name. These contests must be determined at Rome, and by virtue of money, which excites the popes to a greater zeal to send as many as they can of these saints into all parts, which will furnish them matter of trial so gainful to them; yea, we may affirm that there are almost as many trials at Rome about relics, as about beneficial matters. The use which the priests and monks of the church of Rome make of these principles is this, that there are no bones whatsoever, no, not the bones of an ass, or a horse, but they may make relics of them. They need only break a piece of them, and tell you that it is a relic of one of the eleven thousand virgins that suffered martyrdom at Collen; or else one of the soldiers of the Theban legion, who were all cut in pieces at the passage of the Alps, for refusing to sacrifice to Mars the traveller. They may show you the rib of a sucking pig, and tell you it is a relic of one of the little innocents who were massacred at our Saviour's birth; or, lastly, tell you it is the bone of a saint taken out of the catacombs.

“I was once in the abbey of the Trinity at Vendome, in France, when they exposed their treasury of relics. They showed us, among other things, a jaw bone, which the monks told us was that of St. Magdalene. A very able physician being present at the time, was ready to maintain to their face, and would forfeit his head if he did not prove to them by the texture, scaling, and largeness of the bone, that it never belonged to a human body, but it was a piece of the jaw bone of some beast or other. But the fathers were so far from desiring him to disabuse them in the case, that they presently popped up another relic, to put him by his displeasing discourse. This latter relic was what they call the holy tear, which is so famous in that country. The tradition they pretend to have concerning it runs thus: That when our Saviour wept over Lazarus, an angel gathered up his tears in a small crystal phial, and that having preserved them a long time, he gave them to St. Mary Magdalene, who

was then doing penance at a place which is called *La Sainte Baume*, near to Marseilles; that in process of time this relic was carried to Constantinople, where it continued during the reign of the Greek emperor; and being afterwards fallen, together with all the riches of that great city, into the hands of the Turks, a Turkish emperor presented it to Godfrey, earl of Vendome, who deposited it in this abbey. It seems by this tradition it took many turns before it came thither; and above all, that which I consider is, that it passed through the hands of infidels and enemies to the name of Christ. But for all this, the Roman Catholics, and above all, the monks of that abbey, have not the least doubt or scruple concerning it, but bestow upon it the worship of *latria*, even the same they give to Jesus Christ himself. We viewed this crystal very attentively, holding it up against the light, and afterwards took a view of it at the light of a wax taper, but we could discover nothing of what they pleased to tell us. They have recourse to this relic in all maladies of the eyes, and upon this account it brings a vast income to these fathers.

“If all the false relics which at present are adored in the church of Rome, had voices and could speak, what strange stories should we hear? Some would say, we are the bones of heathens or of malefactors; others, of horses, asses, dogs, &c. And yet I question, after all this, if they would quit them. They would say, it is like that these voices are only the illusions and artifices of the devil, who is envious at the glory which is bestowed upon the saints; and that their church, being infallible, having proposed these relics to believers to be worshipped, she can neither err in matter of right, or matter of fact.” “Many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adoration upon things that are so very vile and contemptible, but it is only by reason of their ignorance of what passeth in those countries where popery is rampant, for there may be seen things yet far

more ridiculous; such as a lantern of Judas, a shoe of St. Joseph, hair, parings of nails, and all manner of excrements of their saints and saintesses. The treasures of their churches are filled top full with this kind of precious relics, and protestant travellers may make themselves very merry in Italy if they will give themselves the leisure to go and see the treasures in their churches, and more especially in the country where the Capuchins and other mendicants take care to have great store of them. At least they may be sure to find there those implements the papists call *Agnus Dei*, and almost in every parish, one of St. Margaret's girdles." The *Agni Dei*, as has been remarked, are pieces of white wax, on which is impressed the figure of a Lamb carrying a cross. They are made to represent what John said of Christ, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." "They, (the papists,) believe, therefore, conformably to this, that these *agni Dei* do forgive sins, at least those that are not very heinous ones indeed; and they pay almost as great respect to them as they do to the host itself. They carry them in procession, they kneel before them, they pray to them. Secular persons may not touch them with their fingers; they must be priests, or monks, or nuns, to whom the bishop gives this permission and privilege. The nuns make it a great part of their employment to furnish enclosures of silk for them, very neatly wrought with a needle into all manner of figures, and then they bestow them upon such seculars as present them highest for the sanctification of their souls. And besides the remission of sins, these *agni Dei* are over and above very good to preserve a Roman Catholic from all the evil and accidents of life."

The relics of popery are not only worshipped but they are supposed to possess peculiar potency to cure diseases, to eject evil spirits and to afford protection from harm. The superstitious reverence with which many regard them on this account is equalled only by the

shameless impositions of the priests by whom it is encouraged. The following narrative illustrates this remark. " Prince Christopher, of the family of the dukes of Radzeil, having gone a pilgrimage to Rome to kiss his holiness' toe, received as a reward of his piety, a box of very precious relics. These, on his return home, became the consolation of the afflicted, and the terror of the devil. Even the most stubborn of those evil spirits, over whom ordinary relics possessed no influence, acknowledged *their* virtue in bellowings of submission.

" Scarcely had a few months illustrated their power, when some monks with humble entreaty, requested the use of them for the benefit of a man into whom the devil had entered. As the foul fiend stuck to his new habitation with the utmost stubbornness, and disregarded their most cogent conjurations, the prince readily complied; and no sooner were they applied to the body of the demoniac, than the devil was forced to decamp. The spectators exclaimed, ' a miracle ! a miracle ! ' and the prince lifted up his heart to God in pious gratitude for having bestowed upon him such a holy and powerful treasure. Some time after when the prince was relating to his friends this wonderful deliverance, and extolling the virtues of his relics, one gentleman, who had been in his retinue at Rome, discovered an uncommon incredulity. Being posed to account for rejecting such plain evidence as attended this transaction, he told that, in returning from Rome, he had unluckily lost the box of relics entrusted to his care. To screen himself from resentment, he had provided another exactly similar and filled it with bones and trinkets, and this was the identical box which had wrought such wonders.

" Next morning, the prince sent for the monks, and asked if they knew any other demoniac who needed his relics. A person of this description was easily found; for the devil in popish countries is remarkable for his spirit of opposition, and is generally to be found nestling

in the neighborhood of relics. When the monks produced the demoniac, the prince caused him to be exorcised in his presence, but without effect. The devil kept his birth with all the obstinacy of a mule, and would neither be moved with threats nor coaxing. The prince then ordered the monks to withdraw, and delivered the said demoniac to some Tartars whom he kept about his stable, with orders to give the devil his due. At first the devil thought to terrify them with his horrible gestures and grimaces. But these Tartars used their whips with such faithfulness as the devil had never before witnessed. Having never dreamed of such a method of exorcism, he was taken on his weak side; and therefore, without the use of either relics, hard words, or holy water, he began to cry for quarter, and confessed that the monks had hired him to personate a character which he was ill qualified to sustain.

“The prince again requested the presence of the monks, and produced to them the man, who threw himself at his feet, and acknowledged the imposture. The monks at first declared this to be only an artifice of the devil, who employed the organs of this man to propagate such a falsehood, to the discredit of religion. But when the prince told them how necessary it was to exorcise the father of lies out of them also, they began to repent, and acknowledged that they had been guilty of this imposition, with the view to stop the progress of Lutheranism, and save the souls of all good papists in the country. He then dismissed them, at the same time telling them that such pious frauds were only diabolical inventions, and that he would no longer trust his salvation to men who used such means to support their religion. He accordingly began to turn his attention to the scriptures; and notwithstanding their obscurity he understood as much of their meaning as showed him the absurdity of popish principles, and induced him to make an open profession of the reformed religion.

“ The reader may perhaps be curious to know what the pope had put into this wonderful box. But the loss of it has for ever deprived us of this important piece of information. For his satisfaction, however I can give him an abstract of the catalogue of images and relics which formerly belonged to the cathedral of Glasgow. At the reformation, there were treasured up there, an image of our Saviour in gold, the twelve apostles in silver, and two silver crosses, enriched with precious stones, and small portions of the wood of the true cross. There were likewise five silver caskets containing the following articles for adoration. 1. Some hair of the blessed virgin. 2. A piece of the hairy garment worn by St. Kentigern, a part of the scourge with which he flogged himself, and a part of the scourge used by St. Thomas a Becket. 3. A piece of St. Bartholomew’s skin. 4. A bone of St. Ninian. 5. A piece of the girdle worn by the virgin Mary. In a crystal was found a bone of St. Magdalene. There were also four crystal phials, containing a part of the virgin Mary’s milk, a piece of the manger in which Christ was laid, some bones of St. Eugene and St. Blaise, and a part of the tomb of St. Catharine. There were six hides containing very precious relics, such as a piece of St. Martin’s cloak, part of the bodies of St. Kentigern and St. Thomas a Becket. Two linen bags were filled with saints’ bones, and a vast assemblage of small relics were lodged in a wooden chest.

“ When the reformation rendered relics and images useless in Scotland, the archbishop of Glasgow retired to France carrying along with him this precious treasure. Though I cannot at present give the reader a full view of the uses of relics in religion, there is one, which it would be doing injustice to the subject to omit. Like oral tradition they have been found of vast importance in explaining obscure passages of scripture. Of this many edifying illustrations might be produced, but one will serve as a specimen of the whole. Five devout pilgrims,

happening to meet on their return from Rome loaded with these excellent helps to religion, each began to extol his acquisitions. After much conversation highly characteristic of their faithful simplicity, they produced their riches, and lo ! to their amazement, each one was honored with a foot of the very ass upon which Christ rode to Jerusalem. Now the reader may recollect that the scriptures do not even tell us that this ass had a foot, but here is decisive proof of the existence of five, and if five were collected by five pilgrims only, let the reader conceive how many must be travelling through other parts of the church, to assist the simple faithful in their exercises of devotion.

“ When papists maintain the usefulness of relics, as a means of devotion, it is merely a cloak of the priests for the most selfish purposes. Wherever these appendages of superstition have abounded, they have always been connected with swarms of monks, remarkable only for their vices, and for impoverishing the bigotted and ignorant. Mistaken views introduced them at first into the church, and afterwards they have been used to render mankind subservient to popish priests. The advice given to pope Julius III. by the bishops assembled at Bononia, discovers the light in which the crafty ecclesiastics of popery view the relics of the saints. ‘ When any bishop,’ said they, ‘ sets himself to officiate in any divine service, with pomp and solemnity, he ought to have many ornaments to distinguish him from ordinary priests ; such as the bones and relics of some dead man. Do you command him to hang a whole leg, arm, or head of some saint about his neck, by a good thick cord ; for that will contribute very much to increase the religious astonishment of all that behold it.’ The truth is, that these ceremonies were all invented and continued by popes.”— Among the medicinal relics on which popery greatly depends, it is said a pope’s shirt is regarded as very efficacious. It is taken off and without washing, for that

would extract its virtue, it is cut in small pieces, and distributed to the faithful as a special favor. These portions are again cut fine, and strewed into food, as a specific in certain cases, or a general preventive. Whether this dose is called an essence, or a tincture of popery, we are not informed; but surely it is evidence of strong confidence in its virtue.

Nearly allied to this subject is another of the superstitions of popery, and that relates to **PIOUS FRAUDS** and **PRETENDED MIRACLES**.

The doctrine, that to lie or deceive for the glory of God, and the promotion of religion, is right, early found its way, from heathen sources, into the Christian church. And when the popish apostacy occurred, this was one of the corruptions of the church and of the gospel, which was found well suited to the purposes of popery, and was therefore adopted and cherished by her. Various stories and legends of saints and their works have been invented and propagated, which have no foundation in truth, and are no better than the fables of the heathen. But a more serious form of this fraud is the promulgation of books, ascribed falsely to ancient saints or fathers, and bearing their names, but which were produced for some occasion, and these names falsely appended to give them currency and weight. Some examples of this kind have been mentioned in the preceding historical sketch. But these forgeries were numerous, and constitute no inconsiderable share of popish authority.

Another form of these frauds was the statement of wonders and miracles that never occurred, or an attempt at imposition, in making use of false appearances to deceive the credulous. Of the former class is the fable of St. Winnock, that his mill, when he let go of it, to say his prayers, would turn of itself; and that when an inquisitive monk looked in through a crevice, to gratify his curiosity, he was struck blind for his presumption. The biographer of St. Pardulphus makes a child's cradle to

rock day after day without hands, while if touched, it stopped and remained immovable. In the life of St. Guthlock, of Croyland, it is stated, that while the saint was praying at his vigils, a vast number of devils entered his cell, rising out of the ground and issuing through crevices, of direful aspect, terrible in form, with huge heads, long necks, pale faces, sickly countenances, squalid beards, bristly ears, wrinkled foreheads, malicious eyes, filthy mouths, horses' teeth, fire-emitting throats, lantern jaws, broad lips, terrific voices, singed hair, high cheek bones, prominent breasts, scaly thighs, knotty knees, crooked legs, swollen ankles, inverted feet, and open mouths, hoarse and clamorous. These bound the saint fast, dragged him through hedges and briars, lifted him up from the earth, and carried him to the mouth of hell, where he saw all the torments of the damned. But while they were threatening to confine him there, St. Bartholomew appeared in glory to him, the devils were affrighted, and he was conducted back to his cell by his celestial deliverer." All this, it is needless to say, is barefaced falsehood. It is invented for effect. All this show of raw head and bloody bones is got up to set off St. Bartholomew, and the efficacy of his aid, and to induce poor deluded, affrighted bigots to worship him.

Again. "St. Anselm records, that a famous robber entered one morning into the cottage of a poor widow, with an intention of robbing her; but judging her unworthy of his rapine, he began to accost her in a familiar and merry strain: 'Have you breakfasted yet, my good woman?' 'I breakfast, sir,' said she, 'God forbid that I should so violate the vow I have made, to fast every Saturday of the year.' 'Every Saturday, and why that?' replied he. 'Because,' answered the widow, 'I have heard from a preacher, very famous in doctrine, and still more so in the sanctity of his life, that whosoever fasts on Saturday, in honor of our lady, cannot die without confession.' The robber at these words felt compunc-

tion, fell down on his knees, and promised and swore to the queen of angels to fast every Saturday too; which promise he kept inviolably ever after. But as he still continued his robberies, he was one day surprised by some travellers, who with one stroke of a sword, severed his head from his body. His executioners, thinking they had done his business for him effectually, withdrew from him a few steps; when lo, the head of him that was killed fell a crying, 'Confession, masters, I beg that at least I may have confession.' After they had a little recovered from the astonishment and panic, which such a prodigy caused, they ran to the next village, to advertise the curate, who immediately came, accompanied by a great number of his parishioners, desirous of beholding the miracle; and having joined the head to the body, he gave him confession as he desired. This being done, the penitent having thanked him for his good office, said to him with a voice so distinct and high as to be easily heard by all present, 'Masters, I never did any good thing in all my life time, but fast every Saturday in honor of the mother of God. In the very instant I received the deadly blow, a frightful troop of devils, surrounded me, for to seize my soul; but the blessed virgin coming to my aid, she drove these forthwith far from me by her divine presence, and would not suffer my soul to leave my body, till I should be sufficiently contrite and make confession of my sins.' He spoke thus, and having entreated the attendants to pray for him, he passed from this life into one more happy and glorious."

The object of this fable is sufficiently manifest, for its cloak is thin; it serves to magnify the idol Mary, and to encourage the superstitious fast of every Saturday, in the view of all who believe it. But it is all a lie, a barefaced falsehood made for the occasion. Many miraculous adventures are related of saint Xavier, who is called the (popish) apostle of the Indies. It is related of this saint, that being on a voyage at sea, with a holy crucifix

which he valued above all things in the world, he had the misfortune to lose it overboard, and was quite inconsolable. After landing at the country whither he went, and walking on the sea-shore, he saw his favorite image coming towards him, elevated above the surface of the water. Gazing with astonishment and delight, and going to the water's edge, "it was most reverently laid at his feet by a crab, who had borne it in his claws through the ocean, to the very spot, where the saint was miraculously brought to receive it." Who, that is not besotted with superstition can believe such a story as this? And yet, under the influence of blind superstition, the effects of such a fable are wonderful. But a more scandalous form of pious frauds under pretence of miracles, is to endeavor to impose upon people by false appearances. Lying wonders have been practised by papists in every age. In the history of the lives of the protestant reformers in Scotland, as cited by McGavin, is the following example.

"About the year 1549, a poor friendless boy, of whose birth his parents had probably been ashamed, tended the sheep belonging to the nuns of Sienna, about a quarter of a mile south of Edinburgh. It was one of his childish amusements to turn up the white of his eyes, and in doing it, he succeeded so well, as to be able, at his pleasure, to appear entirely blind. The nuns observed him in his amusement, and spoke of it to some priests and friars who were their visitors. It immediately occurred to them, that if proper care were taken of this young person, he might, in course of time, become the fit subject of a miracle. The innocent child was secreted from public view, it has been said, seven or eight years, and mostly in one of the cells, or in some retired apartment of the convent. At the end of that number of years, his stature and features were so much altered, that he could not easily be recollected by the few persons who formerly had known him. He was now judged to be of a proper age to be sent forth as a blind mendicant, and to receive

instructions how he should behave. A person was hired to conduct him, who believed him to have been born blind, and to have been hitherto supported chiefly by charitable contributions from the ladies of Sienna. This simple young man, who scarcely knew any other people in the world, than those under whose tuition he had been held, readily promised to obey their injunctions. They bound him by a solemn but rash vow to affect blindness, and beg alms, till they should advertise him to the contrary. He kept his promise, and for a considerable space of time was led through the country, receiving such alms as benevolent people were disposed to give him. At last the period arrived when those priests and friars who were in the secret of his not being really blind, thought it expedient that he should be relieved from his hard condition.

At the east end of the village of Musselburgh, in Mid-Lothian, was a celebrated chapel, dedicated to the honor of the virgin Mary. Its proper name was Loretta. There was also a chapel of the same name in Perth, and many credulous people in the Lothians, and at Perth, as well as the people of Loretta, in Italy, believed that their chapel contained within it the small brick built house, in which the blessed mother of our Lord dwelt when at Nazareth; and that it had been conveyed and upheld entire from its original seat by the ministration of angels. It was in the well-frequented chapel at Musselburgh, and where miracles were most commonly expected to be seen, that the pupil of the nuns was to receive his sight. Public intimation of the miracle to be performed, was given in Edinburgh, and in the neighboring parts, and on the day appointed, a prodigious number of people were assembled. They found that there was a stage erected on the outside of the chapel. Having waited a little while, they beheld, led forward upon this stage, the seemingly blind young man, whom many of them knew, and whose blindness they had probably often pitied. He

was attended by priests and friars, and, no doubt also by Thomas the hermit, a famous worker of miracles, if he was then alive. After some time spent in prayers and ceremonies, his eyes, to the satisfaction of the multitude appeared to be perfectly restored. The young man, who had long been restricted from employing honest means for his subsistence, now sincerely rejoiced. He returned thanks to the priests and friars; and when he came down from the stage was caressed and congratulated by the people, some of whom gave him money. A protestant gentleman present, detected the cheat, and took the young man into his service."

The above is a fair specimen of popish miracles, and shews that, however fair may be their pretences and appearances, no confidence can be placed in their statements. Their miracles are mere tricks and cheats, which prove that they utterly disregard the truth and stick at nothing which will accomplish their purposes. But there is still more serious ground for the charge of fraud and falsehood in the popish system, and that is found in the precepts, maxims, and doctrines of popery. Lying and perjury are not only practised by papists, but they are allowed and encouraged if not enjoined. There are indeed three general principles of popery, which sanction the commission of any crime when occasion requires. The first is, that the allegiance of papists to the pope is paramount to every other, and must be maintained at the expense of every other. The second is their obligation at all times, and by any means, to do that which shall be for the interests of popery. The third is, the ability of the pope and the priests in the view of their followers, for they are to their votaries in the place of God, to dispense with any obligation, to absolve from any sin, or to sanction any act, however contrary to religion, justice or truth. These principles, as all will see, make the end justify the means, and make the nature of virtue to depend on the will of the pope and

the priests. By a single nod, the pope, as papists believe, can change the essential attributes of right and wrong. On this ground the teachers of popery have ventured to promulgate maxims in morals, which would have shocked many of the ancient heathen. The doctrines of the Jesuits, for example, are replete with the most abhorrent dissimulation and falsehoods. The vilest crime if performed with an intention to benefit the church and injure heretics, is according to them, changed into a virtue.—That no faith is to be kept with heretics, we have already seen, is a favorite maxim with them, and one which has been followed by every species of fraud and treachery. A few examples of morality from Jesuistical writers are subjoined.

Sanchez says, “An oath obliges not beyond the intention of him who takes it, because he that hath no *intention to swear*, cannot be obliged in conscience to anything at all.”

Escobar. “By means of a bull, a person may change the vow he hath made not to sin.”

Escobar inquires, “Is a person who makes a vow not to commit fornication, upon pain of some pilgrimage, and afterwards not remembering his vow, goes on in the sin, obliged to accomplish his vow?” To this *Sanchez* answers. “He is not obliged, because his blameless forgetfulness is equivalent to ignorance.”

Escobar. “A person addresseth himself to a confessor to make general confession of sin to him. He is not obliged to declare all the mortal sins he hath committed, for although he lie, it is of small concern to the judgment the confessor is to make of him.”

Sanchez. “A person who hath promised marriage to another whether it were made sincerely or only in appearance, is discharged by any reason from holding his promise. Being called before a judge he may swear that he hath not made the promise, meaning that he hath not made it so as to be obliged to observe it. Because he

may persuade himself in conscience that he is not obliged."

Sanchez. "St. Francis lawfully used the equivocation which is attributed to him, when being interrogated by the officers of justice, if a malefactor whom they sought after had gone that way, he answered, putting his hands in the sleeves of his gown, he is not gone this way, meaning where he had his hands. He might also have answered, he hath not passed this way, intending the particular place where his foot or his hand was."

Sanchez. "A man may swear, understanding secretly, that he hath done it as far as he is obliged to speak clearly and to expound himself, or by forming some other thoughts which may make his answer true. Because he is not obliged to answer the thoughts and intentions which he hath who examines him, but to that which he ought to have; his answer is true, following the intention and the thought which he ought to have."

Layman. "He who by inveterate custom, a sort of imperious necessity is transported to do evil, and to speak perjury, *sins not at all*, because a man cannot sin without rational knowledge and deliberation."

Bauny. "He who maintains an heretical proposition, without believing it, or who is a communicant among protestants without having his heart there, but out of pure derision or to comply with the times, or to accomplish his designs; ought not to be esteemed a protestant, because his understanding is not infected with error."

Taberna. "Is a witness bound to declare the truth before a legitimate judge? No, if his deposition will injure himself, his family, or property; or if he be a priest, for a priest cannot be forced to testify before a secular judge. He who is not bound to state truth before swearing is not bound by his oath."

Layman. "It is not sufficient for an oath, that we use the formal words, if we have not the intention and will to swear."

Filiucius. "A priest who hath received a large sum of money to say masses, may hire other priests to sing them as cheap as he can, and retain the surplus to himself."

Escobar inquires, "Is it lawful to suborn any person to swear a false thing? "To which popish writers answer in the affirmative."

Filiucius thus replies; "Any one upon a lawful cause, may request a man to swear, though he will be forsworn, and this thing is not evil in itself, to require an oath of a person whom we know will forswear himself."

The above rule, it will be observed, sanctions false swearing to any conceivable extent. Because, as every person estimates his own cause good and lawful, so if he may suborn witnesses to swear to what he judges a good cause, then every man in his own cause or any other in which he takes an interest and forms a judgment, may procure all the false witnesses he can influence. This principle it will be seen saps the foundation of civil government, and makes a court of justice a mere mart of perjury and corruption. But these are maxims openly taught by the great masters of popish morals. This principle they unblushingly avow. What then must we expect to find, if we look behind the curtain and observe the secret instructions and rules by which this community is governed?

The *Secreta Monita* of the Jesuits, or their secret rules and instructions, have been already mentioned, as having providentially come abroad to the knowledge of the world, and as having disclosed the duplicity of this order of papists. A few extracts from this book may perhaps form a proper conclusion to the present topic. The second chapter of this book has the following caption. Chap. II. "In what manner the society must deport, that they may work themselves into, and after that preserve a familiarity with princes, noblemen, and persons of the greatest distinction." 1. Princes and persons of distinction every where must by all means be so man-

aged, that we may have their ear ; and that will secure their hearts, by which way of proceeding, all persons will become our creatures, and no one will dare to give the society the least disquiet or opposition. 2. That ecclesiastical person gain a great footing in the favor of princes and noblemen, by winking at their vices, and putting a favorable construction on whatever they do amiss ; experience evinces, and this we may observe in their contracting of marriages with their near relation, and kindred or the like. It must be our business to encourage such, whose inclination lies this way, by leading them up in hopes that through our assistance they may easily obtain a dispensation from the pope ; and no doubt he will readily grant it, if proper reasons be urged, parallel cases produced, and opinions quoted which sanction such actions, when the common good of mankind, and the greater advancement of God's glory, (which are the only end *and design* of the society,) are pretended to be the sole motives of them. 3. The same must be observed, when the prince happens to engage in any enterprize, which is not equally approved by all his nobility, for in such cases he must be edged on and excited ; whilst they on the other hand, must be dissuaded from opposing him, and advised to acquiesce in all his proposals. But this must be done only in *generals*, always avoiding *particulars*, lest on the ill success of the affair, the miscarriage be thrown on the society. And should ever the action be called in question, care must be taken to have instructions ready, plainly forbidding it ; and these also must be backed by the authority of some seignior members, who, being wholly ignorant of the matter, must attest upon oath, that such groundless insinuations are a malicious and base imputation on the society. 4. It will also very much further us in gaining the favor of princes, if our members artfully insinuate themselves, by the interest of others, into honorable embassies to foreign courts in their behalf, but especially to the pope and great mon-

archs ; for by such opportunities, they will be in a capacity both to recommend themselves and their society. To this end therefore, let none but thorough zealots for our interests, and persons well versed in the schemes and institutions of the society, be ever pitched upon for such purposes. 5. Above all, one care must be taken to curry favor with the minions and domestics of princes and noblemen ; whom, by small presents, and many offices of piety, we must so far bias, as by means of them, to get a faithful intelligence of the bent of their masters' humors and inclinations, thus will the society be better qualified to chime in with all their tempers. 6. How much the society has been benefitted from their engagements in marriage treaties, the houses of Austria, Bourbon, Poland, and other kingdoms, are experimental evidences. Wherefore let such matches be with prudence picked out, whose parents are our friends, and firmly attached to our interests. 7. Princesses and ladies of quality are easily to be gained by the influence of the women of their bed-chamber, for which reason, we must by all means pay a particular respect to these, for hereby there will be no secrets in the family, but what we shall have fully disclosed to us. 8. In directing the consciences of great men, it must be observed, that our confessors are to follow the opinion of those who allow the greater latitude, in opposition to that of other religious orders ; that their penitents being allured by the prospect of such freedom, may readily relinquish them and depend wholly upon our direction and counsel."

Chapter IV. (for room cannot be afforded for all these secret directions) relates to the chief things to be recommended to preachers and confessors of noblemen. 1. Let the members of our society direct princes and great men in such a manner, that they may seem to have nothing else in view but the promotion of God's glory ; and advise them to no other austerity of conscience, but what they themselves are willing to comply with ; for their

aim must not, immediately, but by degrees and insensibly, be directed towards political and secular dominion. 2. We must therefore often inculcate into them, that honors and preferments in the state should always be conferred according to the rules of justice; that God is very much offended at princes when they in any wise derogate from this principle, and are hurried away by the impulse of their passions. In the next place, our members must with gravity protest, and in a solemn manner affirm, that the administration of public affairs is what they with reluctance interfere in, and that the duty of their office obliges them often to speak such truths as they would otherwise omit. When this point is once gained, care must be taken to lay before them the several virtues persons should be furnished with, who are to be admitted to public employments; not forgetting cautiously to recommend to them such as are sincere friends to our order. But this must be done in such a manner as not to come immediately from us, unless the prince enjoin it, for it may be effected with far better grace by such as are their favorites and familiars. 3. Wherefore, let the confessors and preachers belonging to our order be informed by our friends of persons proper for every office, and above all, of such as are our benefactors; whose names let them always carefully keep by them, that when proper opportunities occur, they may be palmed upon princes by the dexterity of our members or their agents. 6. Immediately upon the death of any person in post, let them take timely care to get some friend of our society preferred in his room; but this must be cloaked with such cunning and management, as to avoid giving the least suspicion of our intending to usurp the prince's authority; for this reason we ourselves must not appear in it, but make a handle of the artifice of some faithful friends for effecting our designs, whose power may screen them from the envy which would otherwise fall heavier upon the society."

Chapters VI. and VII. relate to the proper method of inducing rich widows not to marry again, and to be liberal to the society of Jesuits. "1. For the management of this affair; let such members only be chosen as are advanced in age, of a lively complexion, and agreeable conversation; let these frequently visit such widows, and the minute they begin to show any affection towards our order, then is the time to lay before them the merits and good works of the society; if they seem kindly to give ear to this, and begin to visit our churches, we must by all means take care to provide them confessors, by whom they may be well admonished, especially to a constant perseverance in a state of widowhood, and this by enumerating and praising the advantages and felicity of a single life; and let them pawn their faiths and themselves too, as a security that a firm continuance in such a pious resolution will infallibly purchase an eternal merit, and prove a most effectual means of escaping the otherwise certain pains of purgatory. 4. Care must be taken to remove such servants, particularly, as do not keep a good understanding with the society; but let this be done by little and little; and when we have managed so as to work them out, let such be recommended as already are, or would willingly become our creatures; then shall we dive into every secret, and have a finger in all that is done in the family. 5. The confessor must manage his matters so, that the widow may have such faith in him, as not to do the least thing without his advice, and his only; which he may occasionally insinuate to be the only basis of her spiritual edification. 6. She must be advised to the frequent use and celebration of the sacraments, but especially that of penance, because in that she freely makes a discovery of her most secret thoughts, and every temptation. 8. Discourses must be made to her concerning the advantages of a state of widowhood, the inconveniences of wedlock, especially when it is repeated, and the dangers to which mankind expose themselves to by it; but

above all, such as more particularly affect her. 9. It will be proper, every now and then, cunningly to propose to her some match; but such an one, be sure, as you know she has an aversion to; and if it be thought she has a kindness to any one, let his vices and failings be represented to her in a proper light, that she may abhor the thoughts of altering her condition with any person whatsoever. 10. When, therefore, it is manifest that she is well disposed to continue a widow, it will then be time to recommend to her a spiritual life, but not a recluse one, the inconveniences of which must be magnified to her, but such an one as Paula's or Eustochius'; and let the confessor, having as soon as possible prevailed with her to make a vow of chastity, for two or three years at least, take due care to oppose all tendencies to a second marriage; and then all conversation with men and diversions, even with her near relations and kinsfolks, must be forbid her, under pretence of entering into a stricter communion with God. As for the ecclesiastics, who either visit the widow or receive visits from her, if they all cannot be worked out, yet let none be admitted but what are either recommended by some of our society, or are dependants upon it. When we have thus far gained our point, the widow must be, by little and little, excited to the performance of good works, especially those of charity, which, however, she must by no means be suffered to do, without the direction of her ghostly father, since it is of the last importance to her soul that her talent be laid out with a prospect of obtaining spiritual interest; and since charity, ill applied, often proves the cause and incitement to sins, which efface the merit and reward that might otherwise attend it."

The seventh chapter teaches "*how such widows are to be secured, and in what manner their effects are to be disposed of.*" "They must not be suffered to let a week pass in which they do not, of their own accord, lay somewhat apart, out of their abundance, for the honor of

Christ, the blessed virgin, or their patron saint ; and let them dispose of it in relief of the poor, or in beautifying of churches, till they are entirely stripped of their superfluous stores and unnecessary riches. If they have made a vow of chastity, let them, according to our custom, renew it twice a year ; and let the day wherein this is done be set apart for innocent recreations with the members of our society. Let them be frequently visited and entertained, in an agreeable manner, with spiritual stories, and also diverted with pleasant discourses, according to their particular humors and inclinations. They must not be treated with too much severity in confession, lest we make them morose and ill-tempered, unless their favor be so far engaged by others that there is danger of not regaining it ; and in this case great discretion is to be used in forming a judgment of the natural inconstancy of women.

“ Let women that are young, and descended from rich and noble parents, be placed with those widows, that they may by degrees become subject to our directions, and accustomed to our way of living. That the widow may dispose of what she has in favor of the society, set as a pattern to her the perfect state of holy men who have renounced the world, and forsaken their parents and all they had, and have, with great resignation and cheerfulness of mind, devoted themselves to the service of God. Let several instances of widows be brought, who thus in a short time became saints, in hopes of being canonized if they continue such to the end. And let them be apprised that our society will not fail to use their interest with the court of Rome for the obtaining of such a favor. If a widow does not in her life time make over her whole estate to the society, whenever opportunity offers, but especially when she is seized with sickness and in danger of death, let some take care to represent to her the poverty of the greater number of our colleges, whereof many, just erected, have hardly as yet any foundation.

Engage her by winning behaviour and inducing arguments to such a liberality as will lay a certain foundation for her eternal happiness."

The eighth chapter relates to the manner in which the children of widows are to be treated, that they may embrace a religious or devoted life.

"Let the mothers be instructed to use their children harshly, even from their cradles, by plying them with reproofs and frequent chastisements. And when their daughters are near grown up to discretion, let them be especially denied the common dress and ornaments of their sex, at all times offering up prayers to God that he would inspire them with a desire of entering into a religious order, and promising them with very plentiful portions, on condition they will become nuns. Let them lay before them the many inconveniences attending every one in a married state, and those in particular which they themselves have found by woful experience; often lamenting the great misfortune of their younger years, in not having preferred a single life. And lastly, let them persist in using them in this manner, that their daughters may think of a religious state, being tired of leading such a life with their mothers.

"Let our members converse familiarly with their sons, and if they seem fit for our turn, introduce them occasionally into the colleges, and let every thing be shown with the best face, to invite them to enter themselves into the order; as the gardens, vineyards, country seats, and villas, where those of our society pass an agreeable life. Let them be informed of our travels into several parts of the world, of our familiarity with princes, and whatever else may be agreeable to youth. Let them see the outward neatness of our refectories and chambers, the agreeable intercourse we have one with another, the easiness of our rules, which yet have the promise of the glory of God; and lastly, the pre-eminence of our order above

all others, not forgetting, amidst our discourses of piety, to entertain them also with pleasing, diverting stories."

These secret rules the Jesuits will of course deny, as it is previously agreed among themselves that they will do. But there is one source of evidence which they can neither gainsay nor resist. And this is their practice. They have long practiced according to the rules of their order as given above, and thus given most conclusive evidence that these rules are from the established regulations of their order. And surely Satan has here transformed himself into an angel of light. It is not uncommon to find men that will deceive, to promote their own interests. But to find deception and imposition reduced to a regular system, and inculcated as a trade, is very rare, even in this degenerate world. And if any are disposed to be the dupes of this villany, they must act for themselves, but let them do it with their eyes open, let them see what is before them, and duly appreciate the servitude into which they are about to plunge.

A most remarkable example of the pious fraud of the Jesuits occurred in Scotland, after the reformation had been carried a considerable length, in the minority of James VI. The duke of Lenox, having acquired a great ascendancy over the mind of the young king, came near to overturning the reformation. The people becoming alarmed by the arrival of several Jesuits, and by the open revolt of some from the protestant faith, the duke to effect his purpose, was obliged to have recourse to Jesuitical wisdom. After a conference with some of the ministers, he declared himself a convert to the protestant faith, and openly renounced the religion of papists. But letters were still intercepted which served to increase the public alarm, and to render the proceeding of the duke suspicious; and especially as these letters contained a dispensation from the pope to the papists, "*to profess the protestant tenets for a time, provided they preserved an*

inward attachment to the ancient faith, and embraced every opportunity of advancing it in secret."

Another item in the account of popish superstition is their use of *excommunication*. As they use it, excommunication is a kind of retribution which they deal out to all that are not in their interests, whether man, woman, beast, or reptile. It is a fulmination of wrath against all their supposed enemies, an assumed vengeance, as if they were in the place of God, and were intrusted with the power of final decision.

"On holy Thursday (as it is called) the papists annually excommunicate and give over to the devil all protestants throughout the world, who at Rome, and among papists are known by the name of heretics. The pope is then clothed in red, and stands upon a high throne, the better to be seen by the people. The sub-deacons, who stand at the left hand of his holiness, read the bull, and in the mean time the candles are lighted, and each of them takes one in his hand. When the excommunication is pronounced, the pope and the cardinals put out their candles and throw them among the crowd, after which the black cloth that covered the pulpit is taken away. But the church of Rome does not confine her excommunications or censures entirely to men and women, for even animals and reptiles must be subject in their turn. When it happens that much of the fruits of the earth are damaged by rats, mice, locusts, or caterpillars, then the church censures become necessary. The priest is obliged to transmit to the bishop an account of the damage done by these creatures, and then the bishop orders the priest to ascend to an eminence in his parish, where he is to put on his surplice, and sprinkle himself and his clerks with holy water in form of a cross. He then commands the rats, mice, &c., to depart from the place immediately, otherwise, they are to be "excommunicated and accursed," and have the lot of poor heretics. In the year 1738, Provence, in France, was much in-

fested with locusts. Application was made to the pope, who sent his bull to the bishop, ordering them all to be excommunicated. The bishop obeyed the order, but the locusts refused to comply, which gave no small uneasiness to the farmers; it surprized them much to find that the locusts refused to comply with the apostolical order, but one more sagacious than the rest, observes that the bishop was a Jansenist. An account of this was sent to the pope, who, from the whole of his conduct, seems not to have been a fool, for he sent an injunction to the bishop, who was orthodox in the faith, (a Jesuit probably,) to let the locusts alone till the beginning of November, and then to go out with his priests and excommunicate them. Here the pope acted a very wise part, for locusts seldom survive the first week in November, whereas had he excommunicated them sooner, the ceremony would not have had its proper effect. This however was considered as a miracle, because it served to point out that the Jansenists are not to expect the divine blessing upon their works; whereas all those who are orthodox, are certain God will hear them whenever they call upon him, and that he will in a most signal manner grant their requests."

Another particular of popish superstition is, **THE APPLICATION OF BAPTISM TO THE BELLS USED IN THEIR CHURCHES.** The following is an account of this ceremony from a gentleman who was an eye witness.

"It was my fortune last year to visit Canada, where I had an opportunity to witness some of the delusions of popery. While in Montreal, in the month of November, last year, I learned that two new bells were about to be placed in the steeple of the principal church, and that previous to their being suspended, it was necessary that they should be baptized. The baptism of a bell, a piece of inanimate matter, was to me a novelty. I had often seen the ordinance administered both by those who believe in infant baptism, and by those who do not, but such

a profanation of that sacred rite being no longer heard of in my native country, I never expected to have had an opportunity of witnessing it. 'Surely,' thought I, 'these priests are either themselves most pitiable dupes of the deceiver, or they are most barefaced impostors. Common sense seems by them to be laughed at; and they appear to put their ingenuity to the stretch to discover the way of most effectually insulting the understandings of the ignorant Canadians, and of most openly degrading and ridiculing the institutions of the kingdom of Christ.' As it happened to be on a week day, I resolved to be a spectator. Had it been on the Lord's day, I should not have felt myself justifiable in so appropriating holy time. About two o'clock, the principal bell, (for there are several in the steeple,) began to ring, and I repaired to the church. The people were assembling in considerable numbers, and from the eagerness with which they scrambled over the pews to get into a good situation for seeing, I suspect the greater number present even of the papists were more influenced by curiosity than devotion; one proof among many that the popish religion consists chiefly of ceremonial mummery, incapable of instructing the understanding or touching the heart, and is not intended to regulate the affections, or influence the conduct of those who profess it. The two bells were suspended from a temporary erection of wood in the centre of the church, in the vacant space round them, a table and chairs were placed for the principal performers. The candles on the altar at the upper end of the church were lighted to be in readiness for the exhibition, and in a short time a door on the left of the altar opened, and forth came the procession. At the head of it were two boys dressed in white carrying two immense candles, each of which, with the candlestick might probably measure seven or eight feet. After them came the priests, some in gorgeous silken robes, some in white, others in black, some flaring in bright colors and

gold; other boys also in white followed, one of whom bore a silver vase with water, and another a small vessel of oil. Some of the priests in black took their seats near the altar, the rest came forward to the bells. The large candles were placed on the table, and beside them the vase and vessel of oil. One of the priests, an old man dressed in white, then got up into the pulpit at the side of the church to address the people. But he seemed not a little offended with the want of decorum that appeared in the assembly, for there was a good deal of pushing and squeezing, and most were standing on the seats, that they might see over the heads of those before them. He told them in a pretty long harangue, in the French language, that this was a religious ceremony, and must be attended to with solemnity and decorum. He talked to them of the pious feelings which ought to be produced in their minds by seeing bells baptized, and the veneration and awe which it was to be expected they would feel. The people, however, were far from being so profoundly devout as he wished them, and a little noise still interrupting his reverence, he clapped his hands, and very angrily told them, if they did not behave better he would turn them all out. Descending from the pulpit, he put on a robe of various bright colors, and proceeded to the ceremonial. After chanting a hymn, he read Latin prayers over the water in the basin, and thus I suppose consecrated it. Another of the priests then carried the water to the bells, and the first dipped a pretty large brush in the water, and with it made the form of a cross upon the bell, pronouncing words which I could not hear, but which could be nothing else than the solemn form used on such occasions, '*In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.*' That is to say, '*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*' A third priest, with another brush, completed his work, making cross after cross, and then carefully brushing the intermediate spaces till the bell was wetted all over. The se-

cond bell was crossed and re-crossed in the same manner, and immediately large clean towels were produced, and the bells were carefully wiped dry. Returning to the table, singing and reading of prayers succeeded, and the oil was next blessed and made holy; the principal priest then dipped his finger in the oil and made the sign of the cross in one place on each bell, carefully wiping the place with cotton wool; he then repeated it on a great many places on the bells, both inside and outside, carefully wiping them as before with cotton. During the singing which followed, one of the boys went out and brought in a silver censer with red coals in it. A small box of incense stood on the table, out of which the priest took a spoonful and threw it on the coals, reading prayers over it as before; the incense smoked up and perfumed the air; then, after waving the censor with great solemnity three times, he carried it first to one bell and then to the other, holding it under them till they were filled with the smoke.

“An important part of the ceremony yet remained. The bells had to get their names, for without that step they could not be Christian bells; and as the baptismal vows could not be taken by themselves, the holy infallible church thought it necessary that sponsors should do it for them. Accordingly, a godfather and godmother to each bell were in waiting—two reverend old couples, who were sitting with the priests beside the tables; these were now brought forward and stationed, the one gentleman and lady at the one bell, and the other couple at the other. The principal priest then put some questions to the first old gentleman and lady, which they answered, but I was not near enough to hear what they vowed on behalf of the bell. The bell then received its name, and the priest taking the clapper, gave three strokes against the side; the old godfather then took hold and did the same; and last of all, the old lady, the godmother. The priest, leaving them, went through the same ceremony with the

couple at the other bell, and thus the two bells were baptized, got their names, and were made to speak. The name of the one, as I afterwards learned, was Pierre Marguerite, with some addition which has escaped me. I do not know that I heard the name of the other. All was not yet over. The godfathers and godmothers, to crown the whole, produced their presents to their adopted children, and certainly nothing could be more suitable than clothes to the orphans; a large piece of linen was given to one of the priests, who, with much solemnity, wound it several times round the bell; next, a large piece of crimson silk, which was put over the linen; and last of all, fringes and white silk ribbons, which served to tie all on. The other couple were not to be outdone in generosity, and their linen, silk, and ribbons, were also produced, and the second bell duly and decorously clothed. It was even somewhat gayer than its neighbor, for the silk bestowed upon it was very richly figured. Thus ended the sacrilegious rite of baptizing church bells. The boys elevated the large candles, and the procession of priests departed as it had entered.

“ In a day or two after, the bells were suspended in the steeple, fully qualified to ring souls out of purgatory, and perform all the other important duties of popish bells. Let not your readers start at the idea of bells effecting the release of the souls of the departed from the fangs of the tormentor. I believe, indeed, that this is far beyond the ability of our heretical presbyterian bells, but nothing is too hard for a bell that has received papistical baptism. While I remained at Montreal, *all-saints'* day came round, which is one in which the bells have their hands full of work. Prayers are then offered up for the souls of all departed saints, high mass is performed for their benefit, and the bells are rung long and loud to effect their release. Passing the door of the church in the evening, I stepped in to see what was going forward. The services of the day were over, and there was no light in the

church, except from the glimmering of a small oil lamp, which is kept continually burning before the altar. In different places were several of the poor ignorant Canadians on their knees, praying for the souls of their dead relations, crossing themselves with great fervor; taking care, as they went out and came in, not to omit a daubing with holy water. In the middle passage a platform was erected, painted black, adorned with skulls and crossed bones, and on the top of it lay a coffin. This was emblematical of the dead for whom they were praying, and was intended to increase the fervor and efficacy of their prayers. The bells were kept ringing almost the whole day, for according to the time they were rung, and the number of masses and prayers that were said, a proportionate number of the dead were to be released from purgatory. That afternoon the bells were allowed to be rung by all who chose, and the poor creatures pulled away without intermission, vainly believing that the harder and the longer they rang, the sooner they would get their friends emancipated from Satan's house of correction. Next day, and for several days after, I saw a painted board suspended on a church door, inscribed, '*Indulgence pleniere pour les mortes,*' i. e. '*Plenary indulgence for the dead;*' and I was informed that whoever, during these days, confessed to a priest, should have forty days remission, after his death, of the pains of purgatory. These are some of the doctrines of devils which are taught by the (self-styled) holy Roman Catholic church. And this is a faithful account of some of the rites and ceremonies of which I was an eye and an ear witness."

An English traveller wrote the following letter concerning the same ceremony at Naples in 1780:—"A noble lord was godfather to the bell, and a lady of quality was godmother. Most of the prayers said on the occasion ended with the following words, 'That thou wouldst be pleased to rinse, purify, sanctify, and conse-

crate these bells with thy heavenly benediction.' The following were the words of consecration:—'Let the sign be consecrated and sanctified in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' The bishop then turning to the people, said, 'The bell's name is Mary.' He had previously demanded of the godfather and godmother what name they would have put upon the bell, and the lady gave it this name."

Another particular in the list of popish superstitions is the use of **INCENSE** and **HOLY WATER**.

"The very first thing" says Middleton, "that a stranger must necessarily take notice of, as soon as he enters their churches, is the use of incense or perfumes in their religious offices. The first step which he takes within the door will be sure to make him sensible of it, by the offence which he will immediately receive from the smell, as well as smoke of this incense, with which the whole church continues filled for some time after every solemn service. A custom received directly from paganism, and which presently called to my mind the old descriptions of the heathen temples and altars, which are seldom if ever mentioned by the ancients without the epithet perfumed or incensed. In some of their principal churches, where you have before you in one view a great number of altars, and all of them smoking at once with clouds of incense, how natural is it to suppose one's self transported into the temple of some heathen deity, or that of the Paphian Venus, described by Virgil. In the old basreliefs, or pieces of sculpture where any heathen sacrifice is represented, we never fail to observe a boy in a sacred habit, which was always white, attending on the priest, with a little chest or box in his hands, in which this incense is kept for the use of the altar. - And in the same manner still, in the popish church, there is always a boy in surplice, waiting on the priest at the altar, with the sacred utensils, and among the rest a *thuribulum*, or vessel of incense, which the priest, with many ridiculous motions

and crossings, waves several times, as it is smoking, around and over the altar, in different parts of the service."

"The next thing," says the same author, "that will of course strike one's imagination, is their use of *holy water*. For nobody goes in or out of a church, but is either sprinkled by the priest, who attends for that purpose, on solemn days, or else serves himself with it from a vessel, usually of marble, placed just at the door, not unlike one of our baptismal fountains. Now this ceremony is so notoriously and directly transmitted to them from paganism, that their own writers make not the least scruple to own it. The Jesuit La Cerda, in his notes on a passage of Virgil, where this practice is mentioned, says, "hence is derived the custom of holy church, to provide purifying or holy water at the entrance of their churches."

"*Aquaminarium*, or *Amula*," says the learned Mont Faucon, "was a vase of holy water placed by the heathen at the entrance of their temples, to sprinkle themselves with. The same vessel was by the Greeks called *Perrir ranterion*, two of which, the one of gold, the other of silver, were given by Cræsus to the temple of Apollo, at Delphi. And the custom of sprinkling themselves was so necessary a part of their religious services, that the method of excommunication seems to have been, by prohibiting the offenders the approach and use of the holy water pot. The very composition of this holy water was the same among the heathen that it now is among the papists, being nothing more than a mixture of salt with common water. And the form of the sprinkling brush is the same with that the priests now make use of."

"I do not at present recollect whether the ancients went so far, as to apply the use of the holy water to the purifying or blessing of their horses, asses, and other cattle, or whether this be an improvement of modern Rome, which has dedicated a yearly festival particularly to this service, called, in their vulgar language, the bene-

diction of horses, which is always celebrated with much solemnity in the month of January, when all the inhabitants of the city and neighborhood send up their horses, asses, &c. to the convent of St. Anthony, near St. Mary's the great, where a priest in surplice, at the church door sprinkles with a brush, all the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner, a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and ability. Among the rest, I had my own horses blessed at the expense of about eighteen pence our money, as well to satisfy my own curiosity, as to humour the coachman; who was persuaded, as the common people generally are, that some mischance would befall them within the year, if they wanted the benefit of this benediction. Allowing the popish priests to have taken the hint from some old custom of paganism, yet this however must be granted them, that they alone were capable of cultivating so coarse and barren a piece of superstition into a revenue sufficient for the maintenance of forty or fifty idle monks."

The next and the last item in the account of popish superstition, which will be brought to view, is the claim of **INFALLIBILITY**.

The claim of infallibility by finite and erring creatures is the height of arrogance, and stands opposed to the whole history of human conduct. Indeed, so manifold are the evidences of ignorance, prejudice, and liability to error in the greatest and best of mere men—so numerous and unquestionable are the facts which illustrate the frailty of the human character, that the claim to infallibility seems to be little else than a farce. It is deliberate trifling, a burlesque on man. The ascription of infallibility, to any man or any collection of men is presumption, and the belief of the existence of such infallibility is the grossest superstition. These views and conclusions lie on the very face of the subject, and need no evidence or argument for their support. The claim, the admission, the ascription are all self-evident folly; as

much as to say that a creature is omniscient, or omnipotent. But this claim has been put forth by popery in the most decisive manner, and it has been admitted, and is now believed in by papists. They all admit and claim that such infallibility has its seat somewhere in their church. They are not agreed, it is true, what is the precise location of this prerogative. Some contend that it resides in the popes, some, in general councils, and others that it is found in pope and general council united. But sure they are, there is infallibility somewhere within their precincts. And there is an advantage in not determining precisely its locality. For if its residence were distinctly pointed out, it would afford the wicked heretics an opportunity to show it is not there, and thus the faithful would be staggered. But by shifting the ground all evidence may be evaded. If, for example, the errors of the popes be made to appear beyond dispute, then the pliant papist has nothing to do but to say, infallibility is not here, but in councils. Bring up the errors of councils, and then infallibility has another refuge. This is the course when infallibility is assailed or required to give an account of itself. But when it is wanted for the purposes of popery, it is then forth coming on all hands. Popes, church, councils, and tradition, all are right, past the possibility or suspicion of error. If any one attacks this imposing prerogative, he finds himself at once in the situation of the Trojan hero, who drew his sword in bloodless contest with ghosts and shades. The piercing steel left no permanent wound but was no sooner withdrawn than all was healed. Such is the infallibility of popery, though it frown horribly on opposition, threatening to crush arguments, testimony, and facts, at a single blow, yet no sooner is a pass made at it in good earnest, than it vanishes into thin air, and cannot be found.

But infallibility is the claim of popery, and the belief of its adherents.

The popish catechism says, "the church cannot err in

faith or morals." And all that the disciple of popery need to say or know in regard to faith is expressed as follows. "I believe in all things according as the holy catholic church believes." He must swear obedience to the pope, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of apostles and vicar of Jesus Christ, and professes, and undoubtedly receives all things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy council of Trent, and condemns, rejects and anathematizes all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned and anathematized by the church."

This doctrine virtually includes the infallibility of the pope, and is so understood for all practical purposes, since, according to the council of Florence, the pope is the head of the whole church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and to him, in St. Peter, was delegated by our Lord Jesus Christ, full power to feed, rule and govern the universal church. It is also implied that general councils, representing the universal church, are also infallible. There are however some difficulties attending this subject from the unquestionable facts that councils and popes have opposed and condemned each other, as has been stated in the preceding historical sketch.

It is proposed now to give the testimony of some popish writers concerning this article of papal superstition.—"It is maintained in the decretals that the pope can be judged by none; that his judgment, whether respecting faith, manners, or discipline, ought to be preferred to all things; (not even excepting the bible it seems,) that nothing is true except what he approves, and every thing which he condemns is false." "We believe nothing," says Lewis Copsensis, "unless we believe with a divine faith, that the pope is the successor of St. Peter, and infallible." Says Baronius, "It depends upon the pope to ratify decrees, and to alter them when ratified." Says Bellarmine, "the pope is absolutely above the catholic church, and above

a general council ; so that he has no judge above him on earth." The same author also teaches, "that the pope when he instructs the whole church in things concerning faith, cannot possibly err ; and whether he be heretic himself, or not, he can by no means define any thing heretical to be believed by the whole church." Another writer on this subject says. "The very doubt whether a council be greater than the pope seems to be absurd, because it would involve a contradiction, namely, that the supreme pontiff is not supreme." "He cannot err, he cannot be deceived," says another, "it must be conceived concerning him, that he knows all things." "O Rome," exclaims Cornelius Mussus, bishop of Bitonto, "to whom shall we go for divine counsels, unless to those persons, to whose trust the dispensation of divine mysteries has been committed ? we are therefore to hear him, who is to us instead of God, in all things that concern God, as God himself. For my part, I confess, in things that belong to the mysteries of faith, I had rather believe one pope, than a thousand Augustines, or Jeromes ; not to speak of Richards, Scotuses, and Williamses ; for I believe and *know* that the pope cannot err in matters of faith, because the authority and right of determining whatever relates to faith resides in the pope." The assembly of cardinals, prelates, and clergy of France, 1625, declare, "that his holiness is above the reach of calumny, and his faith out of the reach of error." In the thesis of the Jesuits in the college of Claremont, it was maintained, "that Christ hath so committed the government of his church to the popes, that he hath conferred on them the same infallibility which he had himself, as often as they speak *ex cathedra* ; and therefore there is in the church of Rome an infallible judge of controversies of faith, even without a general council, whether in matters of right or fact." "Three or four councils have ascribed infallibility to the pope, particularly that of Florence, under pope Eugene, in opposition to the council of Basil. The last council

of Lateran, and that of Trent, may also be considered as acknowledging this superstition. At the time of the latter council, however, the pope declared that he would rather shed his blood than part with his rights, which had been established upon the doctrine of the church, and the blood of martyrs; and the legates were charged not to allow the council to make any decision on the subject of infallibility, and they accordingly avowed that they would rather lose their lives, than to allow a thing so certain to be called in question. The bishop of Grenada maintained before the council, that the pope was God on earth, and therefore not subject to a council."

Ravaillac, the assassin of Henry IV of France was a papist of the genuine stamp. He believed it lawful for any man to kill the king, because he was too favorable to the heretics, and because he had been told that the king designed to make war on the pope. And said he to his judges, "to make war against the pope is to make war against God; seeing the pope is God, and God is the pope." And, Bellarmine, who is of high authority among papists, adds; "It may be affirmed in good sense, that Christ gave to Peter power of making sin to be no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin. If the pope should command vice and prohibit virtue, the church would be bound to believe vice to be good and virtue to be evil, unless she should sin against conscience." The popish canons teach "that the pope hath a heavenly power, and therefore changes the nature of things, applying the essential attributes of one to the other; that he can make something of nothing, and that in those things he wills, his will is instead of reason, nor is there any one that can say to him, '*what doest thou?*' for he can dispense with law; he can make justice unjustice, by changing and correcting laws; and in a word that he hath a plenitude of power." Thus the pope actually exalts himself above all that is called God. It is quite usual for papists to address the pope as a God, and in-

stead of finding fault with any of them for this impiety, he receives their homage as the sweetest incense. Angelus Politianus thus addresses Alexander VI. "We rejoice to see you raised above all human things, and exalted even to divinity itself, seeing there is nothing except God, which is not put under you." Clement VII, with his cardinals of Avignon, writing to king Charles VI, says, "As there is but one God, in the heavens, so there cannot nor ought to be of right, but one God on earth." "It is evident," says the canon law, "that the pope, who was called God by Constantine, can neither be bound nor loosed by any secular power, for it is manifest that God cannot be judged by men." A little before the time of Luther, the question was agitated in the schools of popery, whether the pope did not participate in both natures, the human and divine, with J sus Christ. Among the arguments by which this divine prerogative of the pope is attempted to be supported, the following may serve as a specimen, it is founded on the passage of scripture, Luke, 22. 31, 32. "And the Lord said, 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren.'" It would nearly puzzle a Jesuit to find popish infallibility in this passage. But let us hear the exposition which papists give to this passage. "Lastly to put them (the disciples) out of all doubt, he calleth Peter twice by name, and telling him the devil's desire to sift and try them all to the uttermost, as he did that night, he saith that he had especially prayed for him, to this end that his faith should never fail, and that he, being once converted, should after that for ever confirm, establish, or uphold the rest in their faith. Which is to say that Peter is the man, whom he would make superior over them and the whole church. Whereby we may learn, that it was thought fit in the providence of God, that he who should be the head of the church

should have a special privilege by Christ's prayer and promise, never to fail in faith, and that none other, apostle, bishop, or priest may challenge any such singular or special prerogative, either of his office or person, otherwise than by joining with Peter, and by holding of him." So much of the argument as it respects Peter. But the papists consider that whatever is proved of Peter is proved of the pope as his successor. So then this caution of Christ to Peter concerning his fall, which pointed him out as an object of special prayer is thus gravely brought as a proof his infallibility. And what is still more, all this logic is finally brought to bear upon the pope of Rome to prove that he cannot err! Concerning this argument a late writer observes: "They must be doctors of more than ordinary acuteness, who can find in the words addressed to that apostle, in reference to his fall, a proof that he was infallible; and it must require still more acuteness to find in these words a proof of the infallibility of the pope, who, they say, sits in Peter's chair."

Several links in this chain of argument seem to be weak or wanting. The fact that Peter was made prince of the apostles is not so apparent as might be wished, and that he was appointed supreme head of the church is still more questionable, and last of all and least evident is it that he fixed his seat at Rome, and made the popes his successors in office and prerogative. But the papists have one proof, which to them is incontrovertible, that Peter was head of the church, and fixed his seat at Rome: "They say a principal design of his coming to Rome was to oppose Simon Magus, who by his juggling tricks had procured the favor of both emperor and people. At their first interview, the magician engaged to ascend into the air in the presence of him and the whole city. With the help of the devil he accordingly performed his promise. But Peter invoking the name of Jesus, the devil was so terrified, that he left Simon Magus to shift for

himself. And the consequence was, that his body, having a much greater predilection for earth than heaven, made such haste downwards as to break both his legs. Were any person to question the truth of this narration at Rome, the impression of the apostle's knees in the very stone upon which he kneeled on this occasion would be shown him, and another stone still tinged with the blood of the magician."

On such slender ground as this is founded the high prerogative of popish infallibility. But though in itself this claim is highly ridiculous and absurd, yet, in its relations to popery in all ages, it is of great consequence. For while papists make this pretence, popery can never be expected to change its essential features. And by making this claim, papists of the present age assume the responsibility of all that popery has ever been or done. If popery has infallibility attached to it, then it must always have been right, and those who say this shew that the spirit of genuine popery is in them, however its outward exercise may be restrained or modified by circumstances.

But it will be asked probably by some, Have the scriptures said nothing about this great and deadly defection in the visible church? Can it be that such an apostacy should occur, and continue for such a long time, even more than twelve centuries, and no prophetic account of it be found in the sacred volume? This is a very important inquiry, and will be the subject of a brief consideration in the following section.

SECTION X.

PROPHETIC VIEWS OF POPERY FROM THE SCRIPTURES.

It cannot be denied that the scriptures predict a general state of corruption in the visible church, and a great

apostacy as its consequence. And from what we have now before us concerning the nature, and operations, and effects of popery, every one will be able to judge for himself whether this is indeed the great apostacy of the last days.

In the prophetic dream of Nebuchadnezzar we have a very clear delineation of an apostate, persecuting power, which would arise in the last days of the Christian church. It is agreed on all hands, that the image which the king of Babylon saw in vision denoted four universal empires which were to exist on earth. And it is equally a matter of general agreement, that the Babylonish empire is denoted by the golden head of the image; the Medo-Persian empire, by the silver arms and breast; the Grecian empire, by the brazen belly and thighs; and the Roman empire, by the legs, which were of iron, and the feet and toes, which were of iron and clay. The last great empire here symbolized was to be at first very strong, like iron, and afterwards to become weak and disunited, like iron and clay. Likewise, near its close it was to be divided into ten minor kingdoms, like the ten toes of the image. So far is very clear; for the history of events has affixed her seal to these symbols, in attestation of their truth. But in the seventh chapter of his prophecy, Daniel was enabled to carry forward the prophetic history of the fourth, or Roman empire, and thus to describe some collateral events.

“After this, I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns; and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.”

The interpretation of this vision, in the subsequent part of the chapter, thus describes the character of this little horn. "And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings; and he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of time."

In the above prophetic description we find delineated a power, which would arise in the last days of the Roman empire, and which would exhibit the following distinguishing marks:—1. It would come up, small in its beginning, among the ten kingdoms of the Roman empire. 2. It would have eyes like the eyes of a man; i. e. it would be remarkable for sagacity and policy in regard to its own interests. 3. It would have a mouth speaking great things against the Most High. That is to say, it would be a preaching or ecclesiastical power, and would arrogate to itself divine prerogatives, and blasphemous names and honors. It would, for example, claim infallibility, and set itself up as God upon earth. (See the preceding section.) 4. It would make war upon the saints of the Lord, and wear them out by cruel persecutions, during the continuance of its power. That is to say, it would be a persecuting power, and would have liberty to prevail against the people of God for the time appointed, which would be a period denoted by a time, times, and the dividing of time. Or, as interpreters understand it, three prophetic years and an half. That is, as many natural years as there are days in three years and an half, reckoning three hundred and sixty days to the year, which would make twelve hundred and sixty natural years. 5. It would pluck up, or subvert three of the constituent kingdoms of the Roman empire.

All that will be necessary to give a proper application

of this symbolical description to the events which have been brought to view in the preceding history, is to consider the course and connexion of facts. And here we may say, that this prediction must, in the course of events, have progressed far towards its completion. Its connexion with the Roman empire shows that the power here denoted must long since have arisen and fully have developed itself. Now, the only question to be solved is, what power, among those which have existed since the rise and decline of the Roman empire, answers most exactly to the description here given? What power is it that came up from small beginnings, among the ten kingdoms of divided Rome? What power has been remarkable for all manner of craftiness and watchfulness, in promoting its own designs? What power has placed itself on a level with God, and become a competitor for divine honors? What power has made war upon the saints by most cruel and unrelenting persecution, for more than twelve centuries? What power have we seen, in the course of events, subverting the three kingdoms of the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards in Italy, and reigning in their stead? Can there be any hesitation as to the answer to these questions?

But we have further light from the scriptures. In the thirteenth chapter of the Revelation of John, we have described a vision, in which a beast was discovered rising out of the sea, "having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy." This beast evidently denotes the temporal Roman empire. Its seven heads are supposed to mean the seven hills on which the city of Rome was built, and the seven forms of government which existed in Rome in the progress of its history. The ten horns mean the same as they do in the prophecy of Daniel, the ten kingdoms into which the empire was finally divided. After all this, and in immediate sequence, the Apostle saw another beast coming up out of the earth, and he

had two horns, like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and all that dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast, saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by the sword and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast, should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."

In this passage we have a clear prediction of a power that would arise from the earth, which means the Roman empire in its quiescent or nominally Christian state, and which would arise after the ten horns, or after the ten kingdoms had become extant. This power would also co-exist with the secular ten-horned beast, so as to perform wonders in its presence, and to aid in its ambitious projects. This latter, or ecclesiastical power, would also have two horns like a lamb. That is to say, its power, or instruments, would be divided into two branches, which would appear harmless, or would assume a name and professed employment, which would look harmless as a lamb. This symbol denotes the two orders of popish clergy, the regular and the secular, or the monks, and the parochial clergy. These orders, in their name and profession, were harmless as a lamb, and yet they spake and acted as a dragon. They are wolves in sheep's clothing.

This last beast exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and they that dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed. The first beast was the secular Roman empire. The second, or two-horned beast, therefore, must be some ecclesiastical power rising up in the Roman empire, in agreement with it, and exercising all its power for the accomplishment of its own purposes. For example, if the two-horned power should be a persecuting power, as it is afterwards declared to be, it would use the power of the first, or ten-horned beast, to execute its vengeance, delivering over its victims to the secular power. But not only does the second beast use the power of the first, but it causeth the inhabitants of the earth to worship the first beast. In other words, there is a league between these two powers, existing within the bounds of the Roman empire. They help each other. The second beast, by its power over the consciences of men, causes them to serve the first, and thus is a co-adjutor to secular ambition and tyranny, the enemy of civil as well as religious liberty, the opposer of all means and measures to enlighten the human mind. The dominion of these beasts, therefore, would produce an universal gloom and darkness. Let the reader look to the history of the crusades, and to the history of popery in the reigns of Pepin and Charlemagne of France, for an explanation of the above prophecy. How did popery cause the inhabitants of the earth to worship the secular power, in the crusades? But the two-horned or second beast, we are informed, doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven in the sight of men. According to Faber, heaven, in the symbolical language of prophecy, means the church, and the earth means the temporal or secular dominion. To cause fire to pass from one to the other, may denote the sending forth from the church of bulls and edicts, and sentences of excommunication against those who should in any manner re-

fuse obedience to the ten-horned beast. It may represent those threats of the fire of divine wrath which would be denounced against those who should presume to think for themselves. It may denote those fires of persecution which, though kindled by the secular power, were always sent forth from the church. It appears, also, that the second beast would deceive men by claiming the exercise of miraculous gifts. This last mark of the second beast is a very decisive one, because the pretension to work miracles, since the days of the apostles, has been rare. It will not be difficult, therefore, to decide, at first sight, what power in modern times has set up claims to the possession of the power of working miracles, and has by this means practised great deception on men.

Again, another mark of the second beast given in the prophetic account, is, that he would introduce into the empire the worship of images, or a new modification of ancient idolatry. The first beast had been an idolatrous power in its form of pagan Rome. In the conversion of the emperor Constantine it received a deadly wound; in that, idolatry was suppressed. But in process of time, the deadly wound was healed, by the empire's relapsing into idolatry in a different form. And this latter idolatry would be brought forward by the second beast. Now, the question is, what power, in connexion with the Roman empire, has been chiefly instrumental in introducing the worship of images? To this, there can be but one answer; it is popery.

Once more, another, and the last mark of the two horned beast in this vision, which we shall bring to view, is, that it causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their forehead. By this is denoted a power which would have some visible token or emblem always conspicuous about their persons. What this mark, or sign was we are not informed; but it is a well known fact that the papists have a visible sign, or mark, which is always

conspicuous. Every papist carries with him in some conspicuous place the sign of the cross, either by a visible cross suspended upon his person, or by crossing himself before others as a mark of his religion.

One instance more we find in the Revelation of John, of the mention of this apostate power: it is in the seventeenth chapter. There an ecclesiastical apostacy is brought to view under the symbol of the GREAT WHORE, who is said to have committed fornication with the kings of the earth; and the inhabitants of the earth are said to have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. This power John saw represented as a woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of the names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. The woman was arrayed in all the costly things of the earth, having in her hand a golden cup, to denote her command of the wealth of nations. The woman also was drunken with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. Can there be any question in candid minds what power is here represented? Where can we find an antitype, if not in the popish church? Those that question the application of these predictions to popery, are bound to point out the predicted apostacy some where else.

SECTION XI.

MORAL INFLUENCE OF POPERY.

HAVING taken a comprehensive view of the system of popery, in its origin, its progress, its doctrines, its practice, and its fruits, it now remains that some results be deduced. These, however, must be very brief. We might here speak of the influence of popery on the intellectual improvement of man, and show that it is, and always has been, a determined enemy to the diffusion of knowledge of all kinds. It admits of nothing but what

can be made subservient to the interests of popery : and most assuredly neither literature nor science, in their true and genuine character have any such subserviency. The schools and seminaries of which papists boast, and to which they invite the attention of parents, are only nurseries of popery. There children are environed with an influence and a supervision which can hardly fail to secure them while they live. The children of protestant parents are there literally imprisoned, under the plausible pretext of education ; they are persuaded or compelled to become papists, and they may communicate nothing to parents but what passes the inspection of their masters. Indeed, when we find Gallileo arraigned and condemned by the inquisition for scientific discoveries, who can have any hope of a propitious influence from that quarter. But this is not the point on which I would now insist. There are interests more important than those of science. And the question is, what influence does popery exert over the morals of men ? To answer this question correctly, look first at her principles. Hear her teach, that all kinds of deception, fraud, and lying are justifiable, when the glory of God and the good of the church require them ; that no faith is to be kept with heretics, or those who differ from her ; hear her teach that the pope can change the essential nature of moral good and evil ; that he can make, by his fiat, sin to be holiness and holiness to be sin, and that he can dispense with all laws human and divine, and pardon all transgressions, and that what he does is infallibly correct. Taking this view of popery as to its moral, or rather its immoral principles and maxims, and who could expect any consequent influence but that of the most deadly character ? Men will not rise higher in their practice than their standards, and they generally fall greatly below them. If then such are the standard principles of popery, what must be her practice, what her moral state, and her moral influence ? Concerning this point we have only to revert to facts

which have been detailed, to obtain a complete answer. From Rome, the seat of life to popery, with her hundreds of licensed brothels, of the profit of which the pope participates, with her gambling, drunken cardinals, and her carnival soirees, we may go down through all the channels of her influence, and what do we find but a mass of moral corruption and putrefaction. Outwardly, she is fair and splendid, like the woman on the scarlet colored beast, she is gorgeously arrayed, she has a golden cup, and garments decked with jewels, and attracts the wonder and admiration of a credulous multitude. But enter her courts, go to the secret place of her sorceries, and you discover her real name and character; it is, *Mystery Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth.*

She has been zealous to spread her influence, and enlarge her dominion; and because her proposals are suited to the natural feelings of men, who love darkness rather than light in respect to religion, she has been vastly successful. But what has been the consequence? Who has not been made worse by her coming? Go to Asia Minor, go to the peninsula of hither India, go to South America, go to Canada, for an answer. Even paganism blushes at the corruptions of popery. Plato, Seneca, Confucius, and Socrates, would be degraded by a comparison with the morality of the pope, with all his holiness. Protestant countries and cities are wicked enough in spite of the influence which their religion exerts to check them; but they are paradise, to countries and cities which lie under the influence of popery, which gives vigor and license to all the corrupt propensities of human nature. Indeed, popery has nothing vitally moral about it. It is a carcass of pretences, forms, show, epithets, and every holy thing that can be put in language or represented by grimace; but inwardly, it is all rottenness; and practically, it is the very smoke of the bottomless pit. Does any one ask, is not this a railing accusation?

I answer, no—it is the fair deduction from premises furnished by the whole course of authentic history for many ages. Papists may flutter and equivocate, but they are challenged to disprove the facts from which these consequences unavoidably flow.

Such being the moral influence of popery, it is almost needless to say that its civil influence is most pernicious. For all experience testifies that correct morals are the essential basis of good society and civil liberty. Not only will immoral persons be enemies to all wholesome laws and restraint, but their example will be spreading the pestilence around them, till the whole community becomes corrupt. Popery then, being a system of immorality, must be essentially inimical to all civil liberty and free institutions. They cannot be papists, who advocate, or even tolerate republican principles in sincerity, any more than a man can serve two masters. All papists, from the nature of the case, must consider their allegiance to the pope as paramount to every other, they are then really the subjects of a foreign power, and the vassals of despotism, and all oaths of allegiance contrary to this are among their dispensable lies and frauds, and will be so found in the hour of trial. They will always side with any faction that is most favorable to their master the pope. This is the testimony of observation. So it has been in Spain, so it is in Portugal, so it has been and is in the states of South America. The fruits in that fair field of liberty have been blighted and withered by the influence of popery. And though they talk of liberty, they know it not. In a word, show me a country, or a state on which the sun ever shines, where popery is in the ascendant, or where it is predominant, that enjoys any thing like civil liberty, or has any rational prospect of such enjoyment. Produce a solitary example of desirable civil society, that is, desirable for its equal rights, its free institutions, its enlightened population, under the baleful influence of popery. Show me a free press, or a trial by jury, in all the domains of popery,

No, as soon might you hope to find healthful and vigorous vegetation under the deadly shade of the BOHON UPAS. Popery and civil liberty cannot co-exist.

CONCLUSION.

THUS has an attempt been made to present an authentic and candid statement of the facts respecting popery. The votaries of this corrupt system will doubtless cry out, that this is all a libel, all false and malicious. But as they hold it right to lie for the glory of God and the interests of popery, and as the denial of a statement of facts in regard to their system, will doubtless be deemed by them essential to the interests of popery, it is to be expected that they will deny whatever can be stated, however true. But who will believe those who license pious frauds, and say one thing when they mean another. The statement is true and can be substantiated, let papists deny as much as they will. They deny that they worship a bread god when they worship the bread in the eucharist. And the evasion by which they make good this denial, is, that when the bread is changed into the body of Christ, as they suppose it is when they worship it, it is no longer bread, and therefore not a bread god. Still their eyes tell them it is still bread, and therefore must be bread and god too, and a bread god. But with their system of prevarication and deception, they can deny or affirm any thing they please. But in this age and country of light, who will be dupe enough to believe all that papists tell him, even against the testimony of his own senses?

It remains, then, for the inhabitants of this land of freedom, to say whether they will yield themselves to the cold and withering embrace of this system of moral corruption. Shall popery be welcome to our shores? Shall it rear its serpentine crest over our goodly heritage? Shall our children be sent to its halls for instruction, our daughters be committed to its sisterhood of impurity? Shall our charities be poured out to nourish this scorpion in our houses, which will, as soon as opportunity presents, requite our kindness by the thrust of his fatal sting? Shall the dungeons of the inquisition ever darken these vallies and plains? Shall the fires

of martyrdom ever gleam in our horizon? Shall the souls of them who are slain for the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus, ever cry from under the altar, against this blessed land, saying, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell in these United States? 'O, my soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly mine honor be not thou united. Instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.'"

Will it be said, all this is idle fear? It may be, but if it prove so, one thing is certain. It will not be so through any lack of exertion on the part of papists to support and propagate their faith in this land. We already see and feel the fruits of such exertion. A society was formed at Vienna in 1829, called the Leopold Foundation, for the purpose of raising funds to propagate popery in this country, by supporting missionaries, founding cloisters, monasteries, seminaries, &c. This society raised in about a year, nearly fifty thousand florins, between thirty and forty thousand of which have been remitted to the diocese of Ohio. The popish chapel at Hartford, Conn. is said to have been paid for by the Austrian consul. If, then, popery does not gain the ascendancy in this country, it will not be for want of effort on her part. What, then, shall be done? Here the answer returns, which was suggested in the introduction. We must not persecute—we must not assume carnal weapons—we must act in entire consistency with the gospel we profess—but we must be on the alert—we must pour light upon this kingdom of darkness—we must inform our population of the wiles of this enemy of man—we must endeavor to protect our own families and friends from the contagion—we must leave no corner of the land where popery can hide. And while we make these efforts according to manifest duty, we must look unitedly and importunately to HIM who will yet be inquired of by the house of Israel, and who has never said, seek ye me in vain; that HE will be pleased to pour out his spirit of light and truth; that he will shorten the reign of error and delusion, and that he will hasten the day of glory, when Zion shall arise and shine, her light being come and the glory of the Lord being risen upon her, and when Satan shall be bound that he go out to deceive the nations no more for a thousand years. "Even so, come Lord Jesus, come quickly." Amen.







BW851 .H674
A history of popery, including its

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 4312