

The Representative
of the
Church of St. Patrick,
the
CHURCH OF IRELAND
or the
CHURCH OF ROME
IN IRELAND—
WHICH?

By THE REV. J. W. CAMIER, B.D.



DUBLIN :
PRINTED BY THE CHURCH OF IRELAND PRINTING CO., LTD.
61 MIDDLE ABBEY ST.

1937.

Price One Penny.

PRESENT DAY QUESTIONS—No. 1

MARRIAGE

MY CHOICE: WHAT SHALL IT BE?

By REV. T. C. HAMMOND, M.A.

PRESENT DAY QUESTIONS—No. 2

ROME and MARRIAGE

A WARNING

By DUDLEY FLETCHER, B.D.

*Rector of Leighlin & Wells, Precentor of St. Laserian's Cathedral,
Canon of St. Canice's Cathedral.*

PRESENT DAY QUESTIONS—No. 3

SHOULD I JOIN

THE CHURCH OF ROME?

By THE REV. F. H. KINCH, M.A.

PRESENT DAY QUESTIONS—No. 4

THE REPRESENTATIVE

OF THE

CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND
or the

CHURCH OF ROME
IN IRELAND—WHICH?

By THE REV. J. W. CAMIER, B.D.

MOORE COLLEGE LIBRARY

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHURCH

of ST. PATRICK.

—o—
THE CHURCH OF IRELAND or THE CHURCH OF
ROME IN IRELAND—WHICH?

A GREAT statesman once wrote:—"Cooks and controversialists seem to have this in common, that they nicely appreciate the standard of knowledge in the appetites of those whom they supply. The cook is tempted to send up ill-dressed dishes to masters who have slight skill or taste for cookery; and the controversialist, occasionally, shows his contempt for the intelligence of his readers (or hearers) by the quality of his arguments or statements which he presents for their acceptance."¹

Independent thought on religious matters (and, indeed, on other matters too) is generally discouraged in the Roman Church. Its members are trained from infancy to believe, as Cardinal MacRory says, "with unquestioning obedience" what their clerical teachers are pleased to tell them. Such a "belief" lacks intelligence, and, for this reason, hardly deserves the name. To deprive a people of intelligent thought, and to reduce them to intellectual slavery is bad; but, to take advantage of that condition is unpardonable.

In an address delivered recently by His Eminence Cardinal MacRory at the consecration of the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Derry, he challenged the claim of the Church of Ireland to represent the Church of St. Patrick; and, with commendable dignity, he ridiculed such an idea.² The question may be viewed either (1) from an historical, or (2) from a doctrinal, standpoint. In this tract, we shall consider it from both, leaving the reader to judge which of the two churches—the Church of Ireland, or the Church of Rome in Ireland—has the better claim. We shall take the historical first.

The Historical View. Alleged Roman Mission of St. Patrick. It is said that St. Patrick received his commission to preach the Gospel in Ireland from Pope Celestine. For this

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 10102310 3

there is not a shred of evidence. The wish is father to the thought.

In the earliest accounts of the life of the Saint there is no mention of a Roman mission. Prosper, the celebrated writer and friend of Celestine, records the mission of Palladius the previous year, but makes no mention of St. Patrick. Platina, too, the librarian at the Vatican, the friend and chronicler of the popes, fails to record it. And it is the same for centuries. Neither in biography, nor in history, nor in chronicle, is there the slightest hint that St. Patrick was sent from Rome; and it was about four hundred years after the Saint's death that the statement was first made.

But let us hear the Saint himself. He tells us that his friends tried to dissuade him from coming to Ireland, and assailed his action and motive afterwards.³ Now, if St. Patrick had his mission from the Pope, all he had to do to justify his coming was to declare that he had been sent by the Pope. But he makes no such declaration. Instead he says, "I am a bishop appointed by God in Ireland. Most surely I deem that from God I have received what I am."⁴ In his writings the Saint never once mentions either Rome or its bishop. If sent by the Pope could he have refrained from referring to either? That he was not sent by the Pope has been admitted by Roman Catholics of standing, e.g., Tillemont, the celebrated priest-historian of the 17th century, wrote: "It is impossible to believe that Patrick was ordained by Celestine."⁵ Dr. Lanigan, the Irish historian, asserts that "our Saint was sent to Ireland not by the Pope but by Germanus."

EARLY IRISH CHURCH—INDEPENDENCE OF ROME.

Our next point is to show that the early Irish Church was entirely independent of Rome. There is abundant evidence that she neither acknowledged the supremacy of Rome, nor submitted to its authority. That, in common with the contemporary Celtic Church of Britain, she held certain practices and ritual, in opposition to those of Rome, and for centuries after St. Patrick's time, sometimes in conjunction with the sister Church of Britain, sometimes by herself, she steadfastly and successfully resisted every effort of the Church of Rome to

bring her into conformity, or to reduce her to submission. We shall quote Roman Catholic writers.

Testimony of Baronius. Cardinal Baronius, in his "Ecclesiastical History," states that "the bishops of Ireland were all schismatics, separated from Rome, and in close alliance with her enemies."⁶ And under the heading, "Schismatics punished by God," he writes: "It is plain that the Scots also" (which then meant the Irish) "were just in like manner tinged with the same dark dye of schism as the Britons, and guilty like them of separation from the Church of Rome."⁷ His strictures refer to the latter half of the sixth century.

Testimony of the Venerable Bede. The Church of Rome has a festival in honour of the Venerable Bede. He wrote his "Ecclesiastical History" in the seventh century, and in it we find a letter written by Laurentius, the Roman Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Irish bishops or abbots, from which it is clear that the bishops of Rome knew little or nothing about the British or Irish Churches till the arrival of Augustine in 597; that certain manners and customs of the Irish Church, pertaining to religion, were not in accord with those of Rome; and that an Irish bishop, named Daganus, and his companions on meeting the Archbishop and his fellow missionaries in Britain "not only refused to eat with them, but to take their repast in the same house when they were entertained."⁸ Could any testimony be more clear that the Church of St. Patrick was independent, and refused to submit to Rome? Though we may not approve of their exclusiveness, could these sturdy Irishmen have more vigorously asserted their independence, or more clearly shown their contempt for Roman supremacy? And yet, in spite of this evidence, Cardinal MacRory and his colleagues have told their people, and will continue to tell them, that the Church of St. Patrick was all along in subjection to Rome. Truly the dish is served to suit the palate.

Testimony of Popes. Again, the testimony of the bishops of Rome themselves corroborates what we have written. The Bull of Pope Adrian IV to Henry II, King of England, is acknowledged by many Roman Catholic writers as genuine. This document purported to give Henry authority to conquer Ireland on condition that he would "enlarge the borders of the Church,"⁹ (i.e., Church of Rome) and pay Peter's Pence. His

successor, Pope Alexander III, in a letter to Henry expressed his confident hope that Henry's object was "to extend the privileges of *the Church*" and to "*establish her jurisdiction.*"¹⁰ If the Church of St. Patrick was already a part of the Church of Rome, and in submission to her, how could the conquest of Ireland "enlarge the borders of the church," or "establish jurisdiction" which was already a fact?

But there is another and incontrovertible proof: The pall is the symbol of papal jurisdiction. Yet not before 1152 was the pall bestowed for the first time on an Irish bishop.¹¹

We have now arrived at this fact—that the Church of St. Patrick was entirely independent of Rome from the time it was founded to the middle of the 12th century—that is for the first 700 years of its existence. And our authorities thus far are two Roman Catholic historians and ecclesiastics; an Archbishop of Canterbury of early date; and two Roman pontiffs.

Ireland Loses Her Independence. But the ancient Church of Ireland was presently to lose her independence for the space of some centuries. At the instigation of the Pope, Henry conquered Ireland. And, after the conquest in 1172, at the Synod of Cashel, by the seventh decree of the Council, it was determined "that all things relating to religion for the future in all parts of Ireland be regulated *according to the Church of England.*"¹² The Church of England was then under the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome. Other decrees enacted that "Church lands should be free from all exactions of laymen," "that all the faithful should pay tithes for their cattle, fruits, and all other increase, and a third part of their movable goods for solemn burial."¹³ This was the bribe held out to the Irish bishops, and for it, in the words of Dr. Doyle, the famous J. K. L., at one time Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, "they sold the independence of their native country and the birthright of its people."¹⁴ It was a double loss; they lost their national independence, and became the subjects of a foreign King; they lost their religious independence, and became subject to the Roman pontiff; and, again to quote Dr. Doyle, "from the date of the Council of Cashel we may date the history of our misfortunes."¹⁵

Ireland Under Papal Rule. From this time on, for about four hundred years, till the Reformation the Irish Church was

subject to the Church of Rome, and, during these four centuries, enjoyed undisturbed the benefit of Papal sway. We cannot now delay to describe the nature of that sway and how it affected the Irish people. It is enough to say that during those 400 years the natives suffered intolerable miseries. On the one hand, they were harassed and plundered by the English nobles, and sometimes by their own chieftains; on the other hand, they were oppressed and taxed out of existence by the exactions of successive popes, or as Michael Davitt put it in his day, "Ireland was crucified between the tyrannies of Rome and London."¹⁶

The Pope Favours the English. During all that time the Pope invariably took the side of the English against the Irish. When the Irish in the North wished to throw off the yoke of the English, and to set up Edward Bruce as their King, the Pope banned with bell, book, and candle any one who should assist the Irish against the English.¹⁷ And this is only one instance; the policy was persistent. Pope Innocent VIII styles the Irish as a wild, mountainous race, who "harassed," "plundered" and "murdered" their neighbours; but he writes very nicely of the English: they were "English," "the Lord's flock," "beloved children," "virtuous," etc.

After the Reformation He Loves the Irish. But when the breach with Rome became complete, Pope Gregory, in 1577, could calmly affirm that "the nation of the Irish is one which the Apostolic See has ever embraced with singular love and affection,"¹⁸ "Love and affection!" It was "singular," indeed.

The Reformation. Now we come to the Reformation. That movement, begun in the reign of Henry VIII, was completed in the reign of Elizabeth in 1560. Then the Irish bishops assembled in Parliament, together with the nobility and gentry, passed the Act of Supremacy, abolishing the Supremacy of the Pope in Ireland.¹⁹ Of the twenty bishops who attended that parliament only two dissented, and, for this reason, were deprived of their sees.²⁰ This fact is supported by the Catholic Encyclopædia, in which it is stated that "the Marian bishops threw in their lot with Elizabeth."²¹ Besides this Act of Supremacy there was also passed an Act of Uniformity requiring all to accept the Reformed Services.²²

Now, apart from the question of doctrine or of worship, this one act alone, that is, the rejection of the Pope's Supremacy, severed at one stroke the Church of Ireland from Rome. Henceforth it is an independent and self-governing church, as it had been before the 12th century; its members are no longer Roman Catholic.

The bishops, who thus conformed, continued in their sees. The main body of the clergy, too, following the example of the bishops, conformed.²³ They continued to officiate in the same churches as before, where they were by law required to use the new Services. They had the same congregations, for the people, after the example of the chieftains, continued to attend.²⁴ So far there was no break—the same bishops in the same sees, the same clergy with the same congregations, and the same churches in which to worship. Thus there was no change, no transfer of churches from one body to another. And this state of things continued for some years until emissaries from Rome thrust themselves in among the people—secretly, and sometimes in disguise—and persuaded the majority to remain away from the churches and the Reformed Religion. Those who continued to attend—the minority—were the progenitors of the present congregations in the Church of Ireland.

Let us review :—

(1) We have seen that the Church of St. Patrick, from the time he founded it until 1172, was independent of Rome—a period of 700 years.

(2) This church accepts the Supremacy of the Bishops of Rome, and becomes a Roman Catholic Church from 1172 to 1560—a period of almost 400 years.

(3) In 1560 this Roman Catholic Church rejects the Supremacy of the Pope, and in so doing reasserts its former independence and becomes non-Roman and independent once more.

And here we note that there is still but one church in Ireland; but now we shall see that—

(4) About half a century later the Italian Mission established itself in Ireland, and from that time onward to the present we have side by side, on the one hand, the old Church of Ireland, having its origin in the Church of St. Patrick; and on the

other, the present Church of Rome, having its origin in a foreign Roman Mission going back only a little over 300 years.

Orders Traceable to St. Patrick. We of the Church of Ireland are the representatives and the successors of the bishops, the clergy and the people who conformed in the 16th century—bishops, who remained in the same sees; clergy, who remained in the same church buildings; and people, who attended the same buildings for public worship. It is from these bishops, who conformed in the 16th century, that the present bishops of the Church of Ireland receive their orders, and through them are directly linked up with the early Irish Church; and thus there is no break in the episcopal chain that binds her to the Church of St. Patrick.

Origin of Church of Rome. But what is the origin of the present Church of Rome in Ireland? We have seen that at the Reformation the greater part of the laity was ultimately persuaded not to attend public worship in the reformed churches. These people were the progenitors, generally speaking, of the present Church of Rome in Ireland. But where did these people get their bishops and clergy? Let us see what the Roman Catholic writer, Phillip O'Sullivan, says in his *Catholic History* (1621). He writes: "In order that there may be priests in all parts of the Kingdom to attend to the care of souls, a salutary plan has been set on foot, for the better understanding of which we are to bear in mind that there are in Ireland four archbishoprics, and a great number of bishoprics, and at the present day *they are all held by the ringleaders of heresy*, and that Catholic prelates are not appointed to the titles belonging to them, unless in a few instances. On which account four archbishops, who have been appointed by the Pope, are appointing priests or clerks or persons of religious Orders for Vicars-general in the suffragan bishoprics with the sanction of the Apostolic See."

So, according to this Roman Catholic writer, the origin of the present clergy of the Romish Church, dates only from the beginning of the 17th century; that Church had its origin direct from a foreign source, and is, therefore, in no way connected with the Church of St. Patrick.

These four titular archbishops consecrated by the Pope, and not by the successors of St. Patrick, are the progenitors of

the present Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland. And from this on there are two Churches. It is clear then that the Roman Church in this country had its origin from an alien source somewhat over 300 years ago ; while the Church of Ireland can proudly claim regular, unbroken succession from the days of St. Patrick. After the Reformation Rome succeeded in drawing off most of the people, and to provide clergy for them she was compelled to ordain her clergy by means of foreign orders—orders that had no connection whatever with the ancient Irish Church.

And yet the Cardinal claims that the Church he represents is the Church of St. Patrick ! “Just think of it” ; a church with Orders only 300 years old, and originating from an Italian source, has the Orders of St. Patrick going back 1,500 years ! Wonderful, isn’t it ?

There should be only one Church in Ireland and that is the Church of St. Patrick. And this would be so to-day, if the emissaries of Rome had not drawn away the greater part of the people from the old heritage ; for as Mr. G. B. O’Connor writes : “Had the Irish persisted in the path they entered upon in the early stages of the dispute” (*i.e.*, the Reformation) “they would, like many neighbouring nations, have arrived at the goal of complete separation from Rome.”²⁵

The Doctrinal Standpoint. Let us now look at the doctrinal side. The Cardinal is reported to have said, “Just think of it,” (laughter) “Protestantism representing a Church that had the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, Sacramental Confession, the Liturgy in Latin, Prayers for the Dead, the Invocation of Saints, Fasting and Abstinence.” Now, if it is a help to the Cardinal to these we would add twice as many more : The Worship of the Blessed Virgin, Transubstantiation, Communion in One Kind, Doctrine of Intention, Purgatory, Indulgences, Celibacy of the Clergy, Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, Papal Supremacy and Papal Infallibility—a truly formidable list. All these doctrines are held by the Church of Rome, and the list is not complete. They are new doctrines, held neither in the Primitive Church, nor yet in the Church St. Patrick founded. Let us look at them briefly.

The Sacrifice of the Mass in Roman usage refers to the Lord’s Supper, but neither in name, nor in meaning was the Sacrifice

of the Mass held in the Primitive Catholic Church. The names of the Sacrament in Holy Scripture are :—the “Breaking of the Bread,” (Acts ii. 42) ; the “Lord’s Supper” (1 Cor. xi. 20) ; the “Communion” (1 Cor. x. 16) ; and, possibly, the “Eucharist” (1 Cor. xiv. 16). But by the Sacrifice of the Mass it was not known.

Originally the term “Mass” was not by any means restricted to denote the Office of Holy Communion. It was a “general name for every part of Divine Service,”²⁶ and the earliest application of the term to the Holy Communion is by Ambrose towards the close of the fourth century.²⁷ And, though from this on, the word was increasingly applied to the Holy Communion, centuries elapsed before the word came to be exclusively used of that sacrament ; for even as late as 1014 it was used to denote an office of prayer, distinct from Holy Communion, as well as that service itself.²⁸

Now, behind the “Sacrifice of the Mass” is the doctrine of the “Real” Presence. It is on this latter doctrine that the “Sacrifice of the Mass” is based with all its idolatrous implications and superstitions. But the doctrine of the “Real” Presence was only first formulated in the ninth century (831).²⁹ ; it was not till 1215 that it was made an article of faith under the title of Transubstantiation³⁰ ; while the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass itself was not officially imposed till the sixteenth century at the Council of Trent³¹—that is almost eleven centuries after St. Patrick’s time—and yet we are told that the Church of St. Patrick had the Sacrifice of the Mass !

The fact is, that the “propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass” held in the Roman Church to-day does not represent the Lord’s Supper as instituted by Christ ; it is a totally different thing. A learned liturgiologist of the Roman Church candidly admits “that the ‘Mass’ in the fifth century at Rome was most simple, and that practically all the points which now give offence to Protestants as distinctively ‘Romish’ were not originally in the Roman Mass, but were late introductions, chiefly in the ninth century at the command of the Emperor Charlemagne.”³² There is also a very ancient form of the Roman “Canon of the Mass,” which actually bears witness against a belief in the Real Presence. We have modern testimony also.

The present day Canon of the Mass, as well as the con-

cluding doxology, contains language which could not be used of the Real Presence of Christ ; but, are suitable enough when applied to bread and wine. The Roman Mass Book is a standing witness to-day to the many errors of Romanism in connection with this sacrament. That Missal is of a composite nature. It was patched up according as error developed from time to time.³³ Certain idolatrous rubrics and superstitious interpolations, as well as some transpositions and omissions, were effected in order to bring it into line with the newer innovations. Yet, in spite of the patching, the purity of the old could not be hid ; here and there the phraseology bears witness against the "Real" Presence, and the many errors, and practices to which it gives rise.

Here then is a variety of evidence, all pointing to the fact that the "propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass" had no place even in the Roman Church many centuries after St. Patrick was dead and buried. And yet Cardinal MacRory will continue to tell his people that it was held in the Church of St. Patrick in the 5th century ! Once more the dish is served to suit the palate.

Let us look at the Doctrine of Purgatory. There is no authorised declaration that there is a purgatory, till it was made by Gregory the Great, who died in 604³⁴—nearly a century and a half after St. Patrick's time ; and it was more than 900 years after his death that it was made an article of the faith at the Council of Florence in 1439.³⁵ Even the "Memento," in the Roman "Canon of the Mass," denies the idea of a Purgatory, inasmuch as it still refers to the dead as those "who have gone before us with sign of faith and *do sleep in the slumber of peace.*" That the early Celtic Church did not believe in the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is attested by the ancient tract entitled "The Three Habitations." This Tract was attributed to St. Patrick by the Protestant Archbishop Ussher and the Rev. John Colgan (a Roman Catholic historian, who published the "Lives of St. Patrick") ; and though not composed by St. Patrick is of very early date, and its evidence goes to prove that the early Celtic Church believed only in two (permanent) Habitations, viz., Heaven and Hell.

And here I may incidentally mention that it is to paganism that the Church of Rome is indebted for a purgatory.³⁶ The

doctrine is entirely contrary to Holy Scripture ; but that does not matter ; what does matter is, that it is a fine source of income in the Romish Church : "an acre of Purgatory" is valuable. St. Peter once denounced the idea "that the gift of God may be purchased with money" (Acts viii. 20). Yet his alleged successors in practice encourage the belief that it can.

The Doctrine of Indulgences as held by the Church of Rome to-day was unknown in the time of St. Patrick, a fact that has been admitted by the learned Roman Catholic historian, Dr. Dollinger.

As to Celibacy of the Clergy, St. Patrick tells us that his father was a deacon, and his grandfather a priest.³⁷ Celibacy was enforced in the Roman Church only in the 11th century,³⁸ and when it was promulgated in different countries it was met by strenuous opposition ; and the clergy in the Church of St. Patrick continued to marry long after St. Patrick died, even up to the time of the Reformation.³⁹

Communion in One Kind dates from the year 1415, when it was decreed by the Council of Constance. Before this the practice of withholding the cup from the laity had begun in some places, and *it was severely condemned by four popes*,⁴⁰ yet this is conveniently forgotten, and the decree of the Council prevails to-day over the condemnation of these infallible heads of the Church !

Private Confession to a priest, called also Auricular Confession and Sacramental Confession, was unknown in the ancient Church. It was only a couple of years before St. Patrick's death that Pope Leo the Great decreed that Private Confession in the ear of a priest be substituted for public confession in the congregation.⁴¹ Then it was voluntary. It was not till 1215, i.e., 750 years later, that it was made compulsory in the Romish Church by Pope Innocent III.⁴² And yet the Cardinal asserts the Church of St. Patrick had Sacramental Confession !

The Doctrine of Intention as an article of faith dates from the Council of Trent, 1547. A child can see that it was unknown in St. Patrick's time.

As for the Worship of the Virgin Mary, St. Patrick never once mentions her ; he knew of only "one mediator between

God and men, the man Christ Jesus." If she is said to be an intercessory mediator, any plain Christian can, and should be that. Her corporal Assumption into heaven is a figment of the 6th or 7th century, and has its origin in a Gnostic fable, condemned by Pope Gelasius in 494.⁴³ The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was made an article of the faith only as late as 1854, and, therefore, I think we may take it that St. Patrick never heard of either.

Another belief cherished in the Roman Church is Papal Supremacy. And yet, towards the close of the sixth century, it was *disclaimed by two successive popes*.⁴⁴ Over one hundred years after St. Patrick's time, one of these popes, Gregory I, declared that "to consent to the adoption of that wicked appellation (universal bishop) is nothing less *than to apostatise from the faith*" and that whoever would adopt it was "*the precursor of Antichrist*." Strange, isn't it, that according to this Pope, *the present bishop of Rome has apostatised from the faith and is an Antichrist*? Surely there are difficulties in Romanism.

Lastly, we come to Papal Infallibility, the latest addition to the faith of the Church of Rome, the latest stone in that temple of error. It is young, as doctrines go; it is not yet, seventy years old, dating only from 1870. Yet, notwithstanding its youth, Cardinal MacRory would like to tell his people that it was held in the early Irish Church of St. Patrick! At one time, like Supremacy, it was vigorously denied, and declared to be "a Protestant invention."⁴⁵ But, lo and behold, such are the ways of "theologians" that, that which was yesterday "no part of the Christian faith," and a "Protestant invention," becomes to-day the crowning doctrine in the Romish Church! The Roman Church, after all, does owe something to Protestantism.

We see then that not one of these doctrines, with the exception of fasting or abstinence, was held by the Catholic or Universal Church from the beginning. Every one of them, with the one exception, was invented by the Church of Rome at various intervals through the centuries, from the beginning of the sixth century down to the latest invention of 1870, and are held by her now. All these, and other unscriptural doctrines (with the exception of Papal Infallibility), she has stereotyped in the

creed of Pope Pius IV put forth in the year 1564. Because this creed is not from the beginning it is a *non-Catholic* Creed! it was no part of the ancient deposit of the faith. Strange! A "Catholic" Church confesses a *non-Catholic creed*! And what is stranger, still claims to be the whole Catholic Church!

Now, as the question turns upon what the Church of St. Patrick believed, let us look at the Creed of St. Patrick, translated from his Confession by the Roman Catholic Archdeacon Hamilton. It runs thus:—"For there neither is, nor was, nor will be, before or since, any other God except our unbegotten God, the Father, without beginning from Whom is all beginning. For by Him all things visible and invisible were made. By Him was begotten His consubstantial Son, Who was made Man, and Who, having conquered death was assumed by His Father into heaven. He gave Him all power over every name of those that are in heaven, on earth, and in hell, that every tongue might confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the Glory of God the Father, Whom we believe and expect to come as the future Judge of the living and the dead; Who will render to every man according to his works, and pour out abundantly upon us the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the pledge of immortality, making those who believe and obey Him to become sons of God the Father, Whom we confess and adore as one God in the Trinity of the Holy Name."

Where in this creed of St. Patrick is to be found a single doctrine of those above referred to, and embodied in the creed of Pope Pius, "without which none can be saved?" There is not one. Yet the Cardinal tells his hearers in effect, that because the Church of Ireland does not hold the Sacrifice of the Mass, Auricular Confession, etc., which he alleges were held in the Church of St. Patrick, it is not the representative of that Church. Why, that is just the reason that it is! *It is because the Church of Ireland repudiates these doctrines that she is the true representative of the old Irish Church*, and, that for the simple reason that *the Church of St. Patrick never held them*. Rome holds these non-Catholic doctrines to-day; and her policy is to teach her people that the Church of St. Patrick held them also, and then to infer that, because of this, her Church represents the ancient Irish Church. This policy is persistent, and in adopting it for her

own ends, Rome shows a fine contempt for historical truth. The chief thing is to serve the dish to suit the palate.

On the other hand, let us look at the Church of Ireland. She holds the ancient and Catholic Creeds—the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed. With these the creed of St. Patrick is in agreement; it is not so full, but it contains nothing contradictory whatever. Having these facts before us, can we doubt for a moment which of the two Churches can rightfully claim to be the doctrinal representative of the early Irish Church?

The Cardinal is a learned man; he cannot be ignorant of these facts; and yet he ridicules and tries to dismiss, as absurd, the idea "that Protestantism represents the early Irish Church." "Just think of it," began the Cardinal, and it is reported that there was immediate "laughter." The audience did not wait for his statement; they laughed in anticipation, expecting something good, and they got it. But the ridicule and the laughter are on the other side. "Just think of it," Cardinal MacRory asserts that the early Irish Church of St. Patrick had doctrines that had not yet seen the light, but were invented from time to time, many of them, hundreds of years after the Saint was laid in his grave! Why the Cardinal might as well say, and with as much truth, that Christopher Columbus and his crew flew across the Atlantic in 1492 in a fleet of aeroplanes! No wonder the Roman Catholic Bishop Gratry said in his day, that the works of Romish authors are "absolutely gangrened with fraud."

Thus far are the claims of both Churches viewed from the historical and the doctrinal standpoint; let the reader calmly review, take a little trouble, think for himself, and judge from the facts, which of the two Churches—the Church of Ireland, or the Church of Rome in Ireland—is the true representative of the early Irish Church of St. Patrick.

NOTES.

AUTHORITIES QUOTED.

- ¹ *Vaticanism*, W. E. Gladstone, p. 82.
- ² *Derry Journal*, 27th April, 1936.
- ³ *Confession*, translated by the Rev. N. J. D. White, D.D., pars. 26, 27, 37, 46.
- ⁴ *Letter to Subjects of Coroticus*, par. i.
- ⁵ *Hist. Eccl.* XVI., p. 784.
- ⁶ *Annals for 506 A.D.*
- ⁷ *Annals for 604 A.D.*
- ⁸ *Eccl. Hist.*, Bk. II., Ch. IV.
- ⁹ *Church History of Ireland* by King, Vol. III., p. 1,045.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.* Vol. III., p. 1,090.
- ¹¹ *History of the Church of Ireland*, Vol. II., p. 41.
- ¹² *Ibid.* Vol. II., p. 54.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ *Vindication*, p. 33.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶ *Letter to Canon Ardill in latter's Closing of the Irish Parliament.*
- ¹⁷ *King's Eccl. Hist.*, Vol. II., p. 633.
- ¹⁸ *De Burgo, Hibernicae Dominicana*, p. 440 ff.
- ¹⁹ *History of Church of Ireland*, Vol. II., p. 303.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.* Vol. II., p. 307.
- ²¹ Vol. IV., p. 439.
- ²² *History of Church of Ireland*, Vol II., p. 303.
- ²³ *Ibid.* 308, 309.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.* 309.
- ²⁵ *Elizabethan Ireland*, p. 180.
- ²⁶ *Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 569.
- ²⁷ *Ambrose Ep. 20 Ad Marcellin*, p. 583, *Ed. Bened.*
- ²⁸ *Outlines of Prayer Book History.*
- ²⁹ *Burnett on the Articles*, p. 440.
- ³⁰ *Browne on the Articles*, p. 699.
- ³¹ *Ibid.* p. 700.
- ³² *Outlines of Prayer Book Hist.*, p. 35.
- ³³ *Ibid.* p. 33.

- ³⁴ *Browne on the Articles*, p. 501.
³⁵ *Ibid.*
³⁶ *Burnet on the Articles*, p. 294.
³⁷ *Confession*, par. 1.
³⁸ *Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.*, p. 362.
³⁹ *History of Church of Ireland*, Vol. II., pp. 93, 198n, 280.
⁴⁰ *Littledale's Plain Reasons*, p. 85 ff.
⁴¹ *Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.*, p. 196, par. 3.
⁴² *Ibid.* p. 469.
⁴³ *Protestant Dictionary*, p. 64.
⁴⁴ *Romanism Analysed*, by J. M'Donald, p. 60.
⁴⁵ *Keenan's Catechism*, p. 112, earlier editions.



