

holds the sacred importance of them equally with the Church of Rome, excepting anointing the sick with oil; which ^{the} practiced by the Apostles, as appears from the ^{New Testament} ~~was in the church~~. She does not consider as obligatory on Christians in general.

7th Auricular Confession and absolution, which, whether it be reprobated or not as a general usage by any of the constitutional articles of the church of England, I am not at this moment prepared to say; but which, as positively enjoined by her, is, I am well aware, confined to the particular case of Visitation of the Sick.

8th Supremacy of the Pope.

9th Indulgences and Dispensations

10th Infallibility.

It is only the four last articles that require any ~~further~~ ~~the~~ ~~examine~~ thing further to be said. We are not inquiring into the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the Romish faith, but whether there be any thing in it that prima facie should induce us to wish its professors under penal restraints. Now let any fair ^{thinkable} man ask himself this question - a set of Protestants should spring up among us, whose manners and practices were innocuous, and whose doctrines were in other respects unimpeachable, but who should profess a belief in Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Efficacy of prayers for the dead, Reliques, Images, should we wish the Legislature to exclude them from the full benefit of the constitution - should we wish penal laws to be enacted against them, incapacitating them from holding such & such situations - should we not wish that the wording of certain disqualifying laws might be so altered, as not, on account of the word transubstantiated to include these peccable & unsuspected subjects among the Roman Catholics? There is not a tolerant man in England but would give his vote in favor of my ~~to~~ ^{new} supposed

L 3

new sect of harmless Protestants being emancipated,
except so far as some of the most timid, & most haunted
with the idea of danger from Papists, might be afraid of
its being made a precedent for extending the same
grace to ~~them~~ ^{the latter}. That is, no tolerant man really thinks
it a fitting cause for excluding Catholics, that they be-
lieve in transubstantiation & purgatory - that they
pray before crosses, pictures & images - that they set great
store by relics; holding them to be a sovereign nostrum in
various cases of sickness; of peril, and misfortune - that
they esteem the entrance into holy orders, and into the holy
bonds of ~~wed~~ marriage, together with two or three other ^{sacred} passages
in life to be ^{of the nature of} ~~through~~ a sacrament. The Pope's supremacy
I shall examine in my next.

An Englishman.

chastise them by disqualifications, as they now have to
 chastise the Swedenborgians, or Johanna-Southcottians, or Shilehis
 Then we should see them ^{Catholics} zealous for the prosperity & spread
 of their opinions, and at the same time the protestants taking
 in good part, ^{take the honest zeal} that honest zeal, as they now see that, of the
 methodists or quakers, or anabaptists.

If the Pope, from the nature of his functions, ^{were} ~~was~~ incapacitated
 from interfering in temporal affairs, supremacy would be as harm-
 less as Image-worship; but suppose he should in the revolution of af-
 fairs become a ^{mighty} potentate, & as such quarrel with Great Britain -
 would it not be a pity to see the subjects of the King of England in spi-
 ritual thralldom to a man they were fighting against? It must
 have been pitiable to see the staunch catholics of Spain under Charles
 the 5th of Spain fighting against their spiritual head, invading
 his sanctuaries, & forcing him from his last retreats. If, for example,
 I considered it certain that in the next century the Pope would be King
 of France, I should think it almost certain that England would
 next century be at war with the Pope. I should ^{therefore} think it almost
 certain that the Irish Soldiers would in that case defend his Fling
 and country as heartily and loyally as any Spanish or French sol-
 dier has done in the like dilemma; & with as little regard to
 the Bulls of his Holiness. I should also hope that in case of any
 real State Danger - if from some unaccountable change in the
 disposition, feelings, interests, habits and actions of the catholics, Jesu-
 itical and treasonable intrigues should again arise, as in the
 time of Queen Elisabeth, tis not too much to expect, that the
 Legislature might possibly shew some portion of the providence and
 magnanimity of her times, in thwarting them; at least sufficient
 for the passing of penal laws suited to the case - that the ^{one} ~~one~~ ^{only} ~~only~~
 we now resent, because the color of the south end of a certain Edi-
 fice is changed from black to white, we should not have the im-
 becility to hesitate reestablishing, if it should change back from white
 to black. Really, from what one hears of the distant and possible
 dangers from popery, one would imagine that it was proposed to
 enter into a solemn league and covenant never in future times
 to enact any measure against any people in this country calling
 themselves Catholics, be their conduct what it will. As much as to
 say,

say, if you change the state of the Law from Restriction to nonrestriction, now the papists are good subjects, & on that very ground, of course you must never change it back again from nonrestriction to restriction, if they should hereafter become bad subjects - because it would be inexpedient to fit the laws to the times after this year.

If these Fly protheses could be admitted - that is, if it ~~was~~ ^{were} sure that the Pope ~~would~~ ^{would} become a great King, and the catholics faction, and the English bewitched, and incapable of passing laws for their own protection against Jesuitism and intrigues, I for one, would certainly oppose the emancipation of the Catholics at the present day.

Why will not the Catholics give up ^{the} Supremacy? Because their church is infallible, and cannot unsay a thing. For this infallibility is ~~only~~ ^{the} ~~other~~ ^{doctrines} ~~doctrines~~ ^{of the Pope} that would be touched by such a renunciation. And must infallibility go, if supremacy goes! Not a whit. Why, then, not it? Let them still say the church is infallible and ~~will~~ ^{infallible words} be, as infallible as ever. Are not the Catholic doctrines on the subject of grace changed from what they were in the times immediately succeeding Saint Augustine?

Possibly this will be denied. For on such a subject what can pin a man down - how can the metaphysical Proteus be bound by a chain of words - but surely, ^{it may be said, that} the Molinists believed one way, with the sentiment of being in accordance with the church of Rome, which they allowed to be infallible. and the Jansenists the contrary, and with the very same sentiments of obedience; and does not this absurdity, ^{frequently} ~~perfectly~~ occur among the Catholics in various other forms? When we protestants argue upon ^{alleged} infallibility, & upon ~~data~~ ^{data} which are indeed found in our adversaries words, but which in the minds and actions of men are non-existent, and deduce what seem to be the legitimate consequences, we are but as in a dream; our labors are of no practical utility; we do but trouble the reveries and absurdities of the papists by mixing up with them absurdities of our own - tis arguing logically ~~from~~ ^{upon} impossible suppositions, than which nothing can be more illogical. If logic be used in any good sense, as allied to reason. Infallibility, to be any thing, must be absolute in all its members, curtail it in any limb, and it becomes lame & impotent throughout; find in it but a weak place to touch, & the

214

the charm is broken — the whole structure falls to pieces. How then can it be any thing more than a formal word. How can it have any strict meaning, as applied to written decrees, since language is always more or less indefinite, and, like man in all his works, imperfect!

As for indulgences, dispensations, auricular confession and absolution, though they, like many other tenets, in many other churches, ~~admit of a possible~~ ^{might be construed} ~~interpretation~~ into danger, yet, as they are not abstractions, but entirely practical, & admit of a more and a less, so the reality of the danger they may seem to threaten to the welfare of society, depends on the manner ~~the~~ in which they are dispensed — on the actual & habitual procedures of the times. The moderation with which they have been long practiced enables us to pronounce them, with reference to Catholic Emancipation, to be, now, no obstacle whatsoever. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.

5th part

But the church of Rome, it is said, allows none to be saved out of her own communion. When this is urged against the Catholics, is it meant that such a doctrine is inconsistent with social tolerance; that its professors must have a restless desire of persecuting heretics? Facts upset this inference. 'Tis true that in ~~certain countries~~, & at certain times, Catholics have been intolerant. So has the church of England; witness the ~~the church~~ ^{court of high commission} - witness the cruel episcopalian persecution carried on in Scotland in Charles the 2^d's time - witness the act of uniformity passed in the year ~~1560~~ ¹⁵⁶² and not repealed till witness the conventicle act 1672. And the Presbyterians, those Doughty champions for religious freedoms, ^{they} who found the yoke of Episcopacy so intolerable; who have shown more rancorous intolerance than they? Who have been more strenuous in denying salvation to Catholics, and others not of their own sect? The bitterness of this spirit still tinctured the conversation of the elect godly in Scotland, even within the memory of some ~~still living~~ ^{yet alive}, whether it is now entirely absorbed in charity, I know not; ^{but} at any rate time has so diluted its ~~off~~ acrimony that it no longer offends. — 'Twas this spirit that burned Sinnetts ^{'twas this spirit} — that changed the innocent Quakers in America.

But if in other times and in other countries Catholics, genuine Catholics, have been and are tolerant, both in practice and in principle, it will follow that though they may have been more guilty of infractions of the spirit of tolerance than other Christians, ^{sects} ~~churches~~ — the that church may, from its nature and constitution, be somewhat more liable to fall into that error than others, yet intolerance is not her indispensable concomitant.

A glance at Switzerland will shew us whether zealous Catholics and zealous protestants can live together in peaceful political and civil union; a glance at Hanover, at Prussia, at ~~Holland~~ Saxony, at Holland, at France, at the Canadians, fellow subjects with ourselves, & whose church is by the British Legislature established to be Roman Catholics.

Or is it meant that the abstract belief in such a doctrine is so presumptuous and ungodly, that its professors ought to be marked by disqualifications? But a similar abstract doctrine is fully maintained by the church of England. The members of this church do at every year, at stated times, in the most solemn and public manner ~~say~~ affirm that not any man can be

71.



be saved who does not believe in the Trinity. Yet the Church of England is eminently tolerant; & Unitarian worship is ^{sanctioned} by the law. Again: the Church of England declares Baptism and the Lord's Supper to be generally necessary to salvation (and the Romish Church pushes the necessity no further; for in cases of overbearing obstacles to the celebration of these rites, as in martyrdom or other sudden deaths, early after conversion, or where water, or wheat flour, or ordained priests are not procurable, she bars not the gates of heaven; & both Churches do bar them in case of infants dying unbaptised) yet the Quakers, who scold these two ordinances at nought, is respected and amicably treated by the Church of England men; & by legislative enactments is entitled to most ample toleration.

It may be presumptuous to lay down laws for salvation that are not found distinctly in the Scriptures. It may be lamentable that speculative opinions, which experience shows to be compatible with piety to God & ^{honest} ~~virtuous~~ tenor of life, should be solemnly pronounced to be damnable & sinful; to be unredeemable disqualifications for heaven; but the members of a Church, whose written tenets deny salvation to a Clarke, a Newton, a Penn, a Lindsey etc. has no right to cast speculative intolerance in the teeth of the Romish Church, on account of the tenet we are now discussing.

If the Church of England men says that ^{among us} the charities of ~~their~~ social life are not disturbed by these speculations, neither, I say, are they among the Catholic swops & c. Do the clergy of the Church of England technically believe in the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, & in the improbability of an unbaptized infant's being saved? Say they do; ~~so may the Catholics on their side~~. Yet their actions and sentiments, as expressed in their daily conversations, are as if they did not - so may it be on the side of the Catholics; they may technically believe, though their actions & mind and actions are tolerant. Do they actually disbelieve them? So again may the Catholics on their side. We must mete out to others with the same measure we mete out to ourselves.

No moderate man of competent information will deny that the English Clergy are in general men of integrity, of exemplary lives and ~~of~~ sincerely religious. If they are entangled in errors of verbal inconsistency, they do but undergo the universal fate of the ministers of all ancient establishments. It is an evil that experience shows to be inherent in men's imperfect

F. 2.

perfect regulations. We act counter to the spirit of Christianity when we so invidiously spy out the mote in our brother's eye; when we stigmatize our neighbors for what is common to all mankind. The more or the less of these failings in different bodies may be a fit subject of enquiry and discussion; if in charity, & for the sake of amendment. And if ⁱⁿ each Sect, as its eyes open to its own errors, it reforms them, it will have done all that duty in this subject requires. The rest we trust God will pardon, - or who can be saved!

~~F. 3.~~
346

Many of the friends of English liberty are prepossessed with the idea that the catholics are by the nature of their religion inclined to side with arbitrary government; and as such are unwilling to entrust them with power. These men are no enemies to their persons; their religious creed, they say, are between themselves & God - but no argument of abstract right, of justice can persuade them that tis not their paramount duty to guard the bulwarks of the constitution, & stop up every inlet to tyranny. Their manly and honest feelings are not to be overcome by logic and casuistry. May God grant that this race of men, whose honorable bosoms are the ^{granaries} of Liberty, may never have their ranks broken; but with untiring constancy stand forth, from generation to generation, the guardians of our laws & liberties! Better fight for a shadow than be off our guard! These men know too well that the attempts of the Jesuits in Queen Elizabeths time were no shadows; that the attempts of James the 2^d were no shadows. The prominent and fearful points of our history are ever before their eyes. The heart-rousing struggles for liberty absorb their attention. Those interesting passages are in-

delibly impressed on their minds by reading, by reflections, and by conversation with their ~~able-minded~~ fathers; and certain epochs actions and designs, which in fact do but belong to certain epochs, to certain men, to certain parties, to certain states, come to be considered as inseparable from the catholics, because they were once found in terrible conjunction with that name. The legislature has cooperated with this error; partly willingly, & partly unwittingly. There was a time when the catholics, as a general body, were justly subjected to restraint - not because they were catholics, but because they were disaffected to the government - partly to fall in with the humors of the reformation & of the zealous churchmen; & partly for the convenience of an appellation, the laws, which by the sounder states men were meant against disaffection, & not against heresy, designated their objects as catholics. The penalty fell on the right persons, & the legislature were careless about such distinctions and declarations, as should have rescued the rights of future catholics, if future catholics should be found loyal. not that they were ignorant that magna charta was the work of catholics; that the swiss republic was cemented by catholics

G. 1.

of the many
catholics; nor of any other transactions in history, which
prove that catholics may be the friends of freedom; but
it was difficult, if not impossible, to define the disaffection of
the times: Transubstantiation, like a cockade, was an ob-
vious symbol, convenient to designate, easy to be brought
to the test, and not unfair in its immediate application:
for the few well-effected catholics (and some few there were no
doubt, who were not drawn into the vortex of their party) would
have acknowledged that a temporary privation of their rights,
on account of the temporary sins of that party, was justified by
~~the necessities of the times~~ Times change; passion subsides;
loyalty takes place of disaffection - but the test remains - stat
norminis umbra. Those

g. 2.

3

Those pithy sayings that we hear sometimes, that Catholics cannot change, and the like, are founded on a wondrous ignorance of human nature; a sadly distorted view of the importance to be attributed to words - an importance, belied by the facts, as exhibited in the actions of men in all ages and all countries. They might as well say
A Roman cannot change - once a gladiator, always a gladiator.
A Dane or Saxon cannot change - once a pirate always a pirate.
A Columbian cannot change - once a slave, always a slave: for I do not hear that they have changed any of their ~~for~~ religious opinions; nor not even that of the personal infallibility of that pope, who so commonly decreed that all south America should belong forever to the Kings of Spain and Portugal!

TM/9/10/4

G.3

g.3

The insensible changes, which from time to time have introduced the present state of Catholicism, forms too diffusive a question for men in general to occupy their minds about; and this very circumstance, just mentioned, of the subsiding of the passions, has been a bar against any interest being taken in it.

Why should men think of the catholics and their proceedings, in connexion with the safety of our constitution, in any period after King William's times; or, at furthest, after the year 55? What new animosities have arisen; what are they to us (politically) after that period?

Feeling ourselves safe and at large, we forget or refuse to examine whether the demoniac patient, who lies bound hand & foot, is dispossessed yet. He has been cured. The evil spirit left him long ago. He begs to be set free, sometimes gently, sometimes angrily; but we, who are slow to undo his fetters, answer him with "You are safe ^{where} you are & so are we". As the timorous throng that pressed round the dead body of the Dragon Sir Guy had slain, still saw signs of life in him, and little dragonets creeping out of his wounds, - all of which was but in their imagination, - so we attribute to Catholic possession the phantoms of our own courage and the shapings of our own fears and fancies: so difficult it is to distinguish the cessation of a cause, when the impressions have been vivid! In the mean time the patient perhaps, in a fit of anger or despair, struggles and vociferates in too high a tone; too very natural he should: but this we turn against him; we take it as a symptom of his old complaint, we fancy we see the cloven foot in it. Let us take care that we do not drive him mad indeed. Seriously, 'tis high time for the opposers of Catholic emancipation to open their eyes

G. 4

eyes; to rouse themselves, and cease dreaming of King
Williams times - of heats and burnings long since ex-
tinguished - of fires, whose last sparks went out in the middle
of the last century.

G. 5

If we look a little deeper into the causes that have in former times too much allied the Catholics with arbitrary power, we shall find that we are not warranted in drawing, from their temporary conduct, such inferences to the discredit of the natural and necessary spirit of their religion, as is usually done by many of those protestants, who holding in strong and just abhorrence the bigoted & barbarous practices their forefathers have had to contend against, still dread to receive the papists into political fellowship.

When the Reformation first dawned upon the world, the whole of Christendom was Catholic, obeying the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. Now, though reforms do sometimes emanate from a wise prince, and are by him promulgated to the people, yet it more frequently happens, as is well known, that they are wrested from governments by the more enlightened and active ^{portion} of the subject community.

Is not natural, ^{ever} desirable that public functionaries should ^{ever} show a strong tendency to uphold the present state of things: otherwise institutions would be the sport of caprice. Happy the country where this steadiness and slowness to change does not degenerate into obstinate selfishness, into impenetrable refusal to adjust things agreeably to the indications of that great changer of all things, time. Where, as in great Britain, the government is both willing to lead the people & be the first in view of improvement; and, in its turn, to meet ^{and satisfy} the wholesome wishes of the public, and adapt the laws to the temper ^{wants and} and wants of the age.

The spirit of the Reformation was mainly a spirit of throwing off a yoke. Such a spirit cannot be kindled in one compartment of the moral world, without communicating itself to all the rest. If it arises on religious ground, and overthrows abuses there, will it be possible for it to rest, & spare abuses in the state? How could princes calmly see a flame break out, which threatened to invade all the departments of government? Above all how could ~~have~~ despotic princes endure that the people should show a proneness to throwing off any yoke of authority? The spirit of the Reformation must, at every step, appear in their eyes as a spirit of rebellion and disobedience. And in fact did not rebellion, and disobedience, and

Fanaticism

H. 1.



fanaticism ~~do~~ enlist themselves among the advocates of the cause, as unhappily they will, more or less, in all popular reforms? The Reformation having the stamina of genuine piety, of real devotedness to the service of God and man, survived the dangers of this alliance, but was impaired and pulled back by it, and impeded in its course. Every arbitrary prince must have seen and felt instinctively, that if a people had ^{such} independence of spirit as to insist on a reform of religion, they could not be counted on as unconditional-ly obedient in any thing. Hence their alarm and sore dismay, hence their troubled thoughts, their impatience, bitterness and rancour. And if such prince had under him an obsequious servile people, the reformers would have that people for their unthinking enemy. Thus if we could suppose all Christendom at that time, instead of being under the see of Rome, to have been divided into independent churches, not holding the doctrines of transubstantiation &c, and that some fantastic new lights had sprung up, and misled the free-spirited portion of

Europe into the conscientious belief that it was ^{due} to God's service to set up one spiritual head to the Christian world, and to declare the consecrated elements to be the real body of Christ; and that it was the duty of mankind to follow these new lights, whether their rulers allowed them or not; I say, in this case, that Spain France, and Italy would have exhibited the same cruel zeal against catholicism, as in actual fact they did against protestantism. So true it is that though some unadvising princes and priests may have been betrayed by religious zeal into intemperance and even cruelties, yet the great body of persevering intrigues and plots, the treacheries, the massacres, and the violences, for which religion has been the pretext, and even appeared sometimes to the actors themselves to be the cause, has in fact been engendered, brought forth and nurtured by the love of arbitrary power, and hatred of independence.

Protestantism was a self-willed change, a setting up against authority: therefore the arbitrary spontaneously acted together, as if in league against it: and as their fears for authority were

H. 2.

were unbounded, so was the cruelty of their measures for stifling its new enemy: as their hatred to disobedience was intense, so was their eagerness for crushing its germs. and as the bold and ~~disobedient~~ ^{rebellious} spirits branding themselves among the reformationists, and so obscured and embarrassed that cause, so the timidly pious, together with all those whose zeal for old obedience was overpowerful, lent their assistance, and (such the delusion that misleads the unwary, such the empire that the worldly and interested obtain over the minds of the simple) often conscientiously lent it to catholic intolerance and even persecution: and so by making it very difficult to distinguish how far permanent religious feeling entered into that intolerance, here clogged the cause of emancipation, by affording an objection that is easy to make, plausible to support from ~~history~~, and *bona fide* believed in by many, who would otherwise be glad to conciliate their fellow subjects in Ireland, and who have no wish to dominate unjustly, merely because they

they have it in their power. viz. the objection, ~~that the~~ tendency of the catholic faith to generate slavish and intolerant feelings. The reformation was from catholicism. Reformation implied danger to all abuses, and to all claims to unconditional obedience. Hence despotic princes with ~~colored~~ ^{appeal from a suddenly different point of view} subjects ~~and its enemies~~ and despotic prelates with all those they could influence were its enemies ^{justly that they perceived the cause of Rome} who were zealous for arbitrary power & for catholicism at the same time, not because the catholic faith is naturally united to arbitrary government, but from the circumstances of the christian world, previous to the reformation, being catholic.

Lewis the 14th united religious bigotry with love of arbitrary power; but this love was, after all, the leading principle of his conduct. Under its influence he disliked the boldness of the English Parliaments, and other Princes might join in these sentiments. but do not all despotic rulers bear a like hatred to English freedom? And is it confined to catholic princes? Let us look abroad and into history and see if we cannot find it as well without as within the pale of the Romish church.

H. 3.

Do the catholic cantons of Switzerland bear us this illiberality? They, no doubt, wish us to become reunited to the Romish church - ^{where} would be their sincerity, their charity, if they did not? but would scorn to supplant our institutions by treacherous intrigue. So we wish them a speedy conversion from the errors of their faith, with the like abhorrence of employing unfair means to effect it.

Established churches naturally encourage obedience. They inculcate subjection and submission to the laws. This love of order and uniformity is often pushed too far; even into the limits of intolerance. It has been so pushed by the church of England; by the church of Rome even. Granting that it is inherently stronger in the church of Rome than in most others, yet to attribute all the intolerant practices of the catholics to any thing peculiar in their faith, is not to the peculiar circumstances of the times, ^{the enforced character of the court of Rome with the natural spirit of Catholicism} would be as unfair as to attribute the temporary persecutions under Arch bishop Laud & under the ^{court of high commission} ~~ecclesiastical~~ ^{ecclesiastical} ~~ecclesiastical~~ to the natural and indelible spirit of our church Establishment. If the church of Rome is set too high against conception and liberal indulgence of conscience, tis a good reason for us to endeavour to convert, and bring down her members to a milder strain - to induce them to temper their faith with some natural infusion of doubt and consciousness of the hopelessness of man's being exempt from error: but tis no reason for our holding on disqualifying statutes against them, after we are convinced that they are loyal subjects, that they have really no wish of treacherously subverting our Establishment.

Pl. 4.

