

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE DANGEROUS

TO THE

RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

OF THE

AMERICAN REPUBLIC:

A Review

**OF THE SPEECH OF THE HON. JOSEPH R. CHANDLER, DELIVERED IN
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED
STATES, JANUARY 10TH, 1855.**

***DELIVERED IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MAYSVILLE, KY.,
ON SUNDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 11, 1855,***

BY THE PASTOR,

Rev. ROBERT C. GRUNDY, D. D.



MAYSVILLE, KY.:

PRINTED AT THE MAYSVILLE EAGLE OFFICE.

1855.

The Temporal Power of the Pope dangerous to the Religious and Civil Liberties of the American Republic.

If it be true, as we have no doubt, that the days of miracles are over, it is equally true that the days of strange things have not yet passed away. Of this we have full evidence in what has occurred within a few weeks past, in the deliberations and upon the floor of the American Congress. That upon the 10th day of the first month of the year current, a Representative of this free and republican nation should, as such, and in his place upon the floor of Congress, make a speech, the direct and avowed object of which was to defend the Papal church against the charge of being dangerous in its assumptions and exercises of power to the liberties of our republic, is certainly worthy of being chronicled as one of the strange events of the times. And what is still more strange is, that the honorable member who has done this, is from that State which, above all others, is so richly imbued with the old-fashioned Bible faith of the Reformation as to be styled "*the back-bone of Presbyterianism*," and whose position is so prominent in the great family of States as to be termed "*the Keystone State*." That from such a quarter, a bold and eloquent defender and advocate of the papal power should appear upon the floor of Congress, in the year of grace 1855, is surely an event worthy of some consideration. And the more so, from the fact, that the direct object and aim of this advocate is to make this nation believe that the Pope of Rome is not an enemy to republican liberty, and that the Roman hierarchy wields no power and breathes no spirit dangerous to our government! And still further, am I induced to give some special notice to this strange advocacy of the Papacy, from the fact that the present Representative of this district, and as yet a citizen of our city, has made himself a *minion* of the Pope in using the franking privilege to circulate Mr. Chandler's speech, which, although unsound as an argument, and totally false in its conclusion, may deceive many no better informed than our honorable franker, and whose hatred to the great Protestant and American movement of the day may be no less bitter and vindictive than his.

If the Pope of Rome has not in person taken possession of the American Capitol, he has at least been *heard* in the legislative hall of the nation, in regard to his claims upon the good people of this republic for a share of their confidence and esteem. This is claimed on the ground that the Pope of Rome, as the supreme and infallible head of the Roman Catholic Church, has no power, and imposes no oath upon his subjects, inconsistent with the obligations and duties of an American citizen; that devotion to the Roman Catholic Church and proper allegiance as such, to the Pope, is in no sense incompatible with the patriotism and fealty of an American citizen. From the tone and temper and drift of his speech, I am not disposed to doubt that Mr. Chandler is honest in this assumption. And yet he has taken a position so perfectly in the face of the facts of history, as to betray an ignorance which it is difficult to impute to one of his high position and character, and a position, too, which is directly in the face of the known and acknowledged authorities of his Church. This I purpose now to show.

And here let the true issue be stated. The Hon. Mr. BANKS, of Massachusetts, had made in a speech this statement:

"I will say that, if it be true that the Pope is held to be supreme in secular, as in sacred affairs, that he can absolve men from their relations with others not of the true faith, it is not strange that men should hesitate in support of his followers. I would not vote for any man holding to that doctrine, and, I doubt not, other gentlemen here would concur with me in that feeling."

To this and other similar remarks Mr. Chandler replies, denying that the Pope of Rome has claimed or exercised such a power, or that the Roman church has authorized or sanctioned it:

"The question" says Mr. Chandler, "raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, is one of political power, and that, I imagine, is the leading objection to Catholics and to Catholicity with gentlemen who venture on the dangerous movement of dragging religion into the political arena. I deny" says he, "that the Bishop of

Rome has, or that he claims for himself, the right to interfere with the political relations of any other country than that of which he is himself the sovereign! I mean—and I have no desire to conceal any point—I mean that I deny to the Bishop of Rome the right resulting from his divine office, to interfere in the relations between subjects and their sovereigns, between citizens and their Governments. And while I make this denial, I acknowledge all my obligations to the church of which I am an humble member, and I recognize all the rights of the venerable head of that church to the spiritual defence of its children; and I desire that no part of what I may say, or what I may concede, in my remarks, may be considered as yielding a single dogma of the Catholic Church, or manifesting, on my part, a desire to explain away, to suit the spirit of the times, or the prejudices of my hearers, any doctrine of the Catholic Church.”

So much for the position of the honorable advocate of the Papacy. It seems to be open and frank, and sincere, too. Let us see how it agrees with the facts of history and the authorities of his church.

1. The honorable gentleman fully admits that the Popes have dethroned Kings and absolved their subjects:

“Undoubtedly,” says he “the Pope has proceeded to dethrone kings, and thus to release subjects. History declares that more than one monarch has been made to descend from his throne by the edict of the Pope, and that the allegiance of his subjects has been transferred, by that edict, to a succeeding monarch, who, however he may have obtained his crown, might have been compelled to lay it down at the bidding of the same authority that deposed his predecessor.”

I thank the gentleman for this admission, as it saves the time and trouble of proving from history what might have been denied by an advocate less candid. It is, then, admitted that the Popes have, in by-gone days, claimed and exercised the power in question. *Why then may they not “renew that exercise should they ever have the power?”* A most important question this! and how does Mr. Chandler answer it?

“That,” says he, “I suppose, Mr. Chairman, depends entirely upon the foundation of the right, and the demand which may be made for its exercise.”

And here the honorable gentleman undertakes to show two things, or rather to assert them:—

1. That far back and in the middle ages, when the Popes exercised the dangerous power in question, they did it by virtue of an express grant by the parties who may have suffered under its exercise. That, from the necessity of circumstances, emperors and kings

entered into a league for mutual protection, and conferred upon the Pope the *constitutional* power,—Yes, the constitutional power!—the exercise of which, therefore, became a duty under certain circumstances. And such being the case, the argument of our orator is, that the times and circumstances having passed away which conferred the power, the grant has fallen; and that now, outside of his own particular temporal dominions, he has no temporal authority whatever, and is purely clothed with spiritual power as the Supreme Head of the Church. Such is the miserable subterfuge by which the Hon. gentleman attempts to extricate himself and his church, from a position which deserves and is rapidly incurring the abhorrence and detestation of every true American citizen. Where is the evidence, in history, of any such league as that here asserted by the Hon. Mr. Chandler? *When and where* was the compact formed, by the civil governments of the earth, by which “*constitutional*” and universal temporal power was given to the Pope, and in virtue of which he might at pleasure dethrone Kings and absolve their subjects? What proof has Mr. Chandler furnished us? We read, it is true, of a Holy Alliance; but it was proposed by Alexander, Emperor of Russia, after the defeat and downfall of Napoleon at Waterloo; and with which the Pope of Rome had nothing to do. Says a reliable writer upon the subject:

“All the European sovereigns finally became members of the Holy Alliance, except the Pope, who, of course, could not be a member of a religious league, without being at its head.”

The other point made by our congressional orator, to save his church from the execration of the American people as a dangerous and deadly foe to American liberty, is this:—That the temporal power is not of *divine right*, or is not necessarily included in the spiritual office, and does not proceed from it; and hence the Pope can have no temporal authority, only by human grant, and as occasions and circumstances may confer it upon him and require him to exercise it.

“If” said Mr. Chandler, “it was a divine right—a right inherent in the *spiritual* office of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter—then, sir, I confess it may never, it can never lapse; and its exercise may be renewed with the reception of additional power.”

“But,” says he, “no where is the right to such power claimed, as of divine right, by the Catholic Church.”

Here is the argument and very gist of Mr. Chandler’s speech, by which, from high places, dust is attempted to be thrown in the eyes of

the American people; I do not say designedly by the gentleman himself, but by the Bishops who have deceived him, and who are the sworn servants of the Pope to do this very thing!

Let me again state the argument. It is this: That the spiritual power of the Pope by which he is the head of the Church Catholic, is *jure divino*, and cannot be laid aside; but the temporal power is not inherent in the spiritual office, and is not of divine right: That it is, therefore, of human grant, and is merely incidental.

Now by what proof does Mr. Chandler ask us to believe this? He gives us first the testimony of Bishop ENGLAND, Dr. KENDRICK, Archbishop of Baltimore, Dr. TROY, Archbishop of Dublin, Archbishop HUGHES, of New York, and a Council of the Catholic Church in Baltimore; and last, but not least, a treatise upon the subject, by my old friend Bishop SPAULDING, of Kentucky. These venerable dignitaries of the Papal hierarchy all testify substantially—

“That the deposing power of Popes never was an article of faith, or a doctrine of the Catholic Church, nor was it ever proposed as such by any Council, or by any Popes themselves who exercised it.”

In regard to this testimony of high dignitaries in the papacy, I have a few things to say:

1. That the nature and extent of the Pope's supremacy has ever been, even in the Roman Catholic Church itself, a matter of controversy; and is at this hour an open question! Nay, more; the Pope of Rome prefers that it should be an open question, and hence interposed his authority to prevent any infallible settlement of it in the Council of Trent. The Pope's legates were specially instructed to advertise the Council “that they should not, for any cause whatever, come to dispute about the Pope's authority.” And yet, incidentally, this great question was settled by this last infallible Council of the Church, by an enactment, “that any prince should be excommunicated, and deprived of the dominion of any city or place where he should permit a duel to be fought.” This enactment was afterwards complained of and declared against by the French clergy, as infringing the King's authority.

CHARLES BUTLER, in his book upon the Church, published in Baltimore in 1834, by Jas. Myers, and which is of approved authority, tells us that there are two great parties, or classes of divines in the Roman Catholic Church, upon the subject of the Papal power. The one, he designates the *Transalpine*, or those who dwell in or near Rome; and the other the *Cisalpine*, or those on the French side of the Alps. The *Transalpine* being nearest

the Pope, and composing his court, may be supposed to be sounder in faith touching the supremacy, than the *Cisalpine* or the French, who live at a distance from Rome. Mr. Butler says:

“*Transalpine* divines attributed to the Pope a *divine right* to the exercise, indirect at least, of temporal power, for effecting a spiritual good; and, in consequence of it, maintained that the supreme power of every state was so far subject to the Pope, that, when he deemed that the bad conduct of the sovereign rendered it essential to the good of the Church that he should reign no longer, the Pope was then authorized, by his *divine commission*, to deprive him of his sovereignty, and absolve his subjects from their obligations of allegiance.” [See Butler's Book of the Church, pp. 106, 107, edition as stated above.]

From Gregory II., in the year 730, and onward, by his successors, we trace the deposition of Kings and the absolving of their subjects from their allegiance by the Popes of Rome. The most distinguished authorities of the Roman Catholic Church have taught, that the Popes have supreme temporal power by *divine right*. This has been and is now the doctrine of the *Transalpine* or Italian divines, and that portion regarded most orthodox because nearest the Pope and composing his court.

The celebrated THOMAS AQUINAS, who has ever been esteemed and is still regarded a most distinguished Catholic theologian, says:

“In the Pope is the summit of each power.” “When,” says he, “any one is denounced excommunicated by his decision on account of apostasy, his subjects are immediately freed from his dominion and their oath of allegiance to him.”

BARONIUS, the distinguished annalist and defender of the Church of Rome, asserts the same doctrine:

“God,” says he, “hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church.”

The distinguished BELLARMINÉ lays it down as the common opinion of Romanists, that

“By reason of the spiritual power the Pope, at least indirectly, hath a certain supreme power, in temporal matters.”

PETER DENS, a standard writer and distinguished divine, says: “The Pope hath the plenitude of power.” And if you would know what this means, read the bull of Pope GRIGOR V. against Elizabeth, entitled—“THE DAMNATION and EXCOMMUNICATION of Elizabeth, Queen of England.” It runs thus:

“He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth; committed only holy, Catholic, and apostolic church (but of which there is no salvation) to one alone upon earth, namely to Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to Peter's

successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fullness of power. *Him alone he made prince over all people and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build.*"

Mr. Chandler attempts to make GREGORY VII. a witness, to prove that he did not ground his authority to depose Henry IV. upon the divine right solely, but on laws both human and divine. But how much stronger could language express the divine right of Popes to depose kings and absolve their subjects from allegiance, than you have it here expressed by Pius V. in 1570? So in regard to Pope PAUL III., in excommunicating, cursing, deposing and damning Henry VIII. of England. It is remarkable with what unanimity all the Popes, from Gregory II. in 730 to the present day, base their authority upon the *divine right* to depose kings and absolve their subjects from their oaths of allegiance. But if you present Mr. Chandler and his Bishops with this array of proof; give them the long list of Popes who have claimed and exercised this power; show them the arrogant language of their bulls and edicts, by which they assert and claim the power as of *divine right*; they evade it all by telling you that the Popes are not the Church, and that "no where is the right to such power claimed, as of divine right, by the Catholic Church." So states Mr. Chandler.

"But nowhere is the right to such claimed, as of divine right, by the Catholic Church."

Oh, Sir, need I stop to show what a miserable evasion is this! Admitting that the Popes are not the church, what matters it if the church, technicaly defined, has never formally decreed the temporal power of the Pope, based upon divine right, a dogma of faith; if, from the earliest period, it has been thus claimed and exercised by her Popes, taught by her historians, and made a part of her faith by her ablest teachers and doctors? What need is there of any formal enactment of the church, when the thing to be taught and enforced by her authority has been already made a part of her practice and her faith, by precedent immemorial!

But Mr. Chandler undertakes to bring us a voice from the Vatican, rejecting the precedent and disavowing the doctrine. But what is the disavowal of which our orator boasts? Is it the Catholic Church in a General Council with the Pope, uttering her authoritative voice by formal enactment to the whole world? Is it even the Pope himself, issuing his bulls by formal edict to the whole world, as he is wont to speak when he would be authoritatively heard? Have you such a disavowal as this, Mr. Chandler? Is this your disclaimer, which,

as the humble servant of the Pope, you bring from the Vatican, and read to the American people? No, sir, no sir! Well, what then?

"I have a letter from a committee of Cardinals at Rome, appointed by his holiness to superintend ecclesiastical affairs, written in answer to a letter addressed by the Archbishops of Ireland to the Pope, at their meeting in Dublin in 1791."

And, sir, do you bring us this bit of private correspondence, between a few Archbishops in Ireland and a committee of Cardinals, and say to the world: There, Mr. BANKS, is, *in authoritative form from the Pope*, a disavowal of "*the right to control the members of the Roman Catholic Church in secular matters.*" Surely, Mr. Chandler, you ought to know; aye, you *do* know, that such a document is no authoritative disavowal, by the Pope, of the right and power in question—much less of the acts of his predecessors in the exercise of it.

And now, having failed to produce what he would, (and would to God that he could!) I now request Mr. Chandler, and in the name of the American people I commission him, to go to Rome, before he may attempt in Congress another speech in defence of the papal hierarchy, and there, in person, at the feet of his holiness, let him implore of the Pope from his own hand, and with the appropriate seal of his authority, a bull or authoritative edict to all the world, repudiating the conduct or precedent of his predecessors in claiming and exercising, as of divine right, universal secular power, for the good of the church. Let him distinctly disclaim the right of exercising authority in things temporal, outside of his own temporal dominions. Let him annul the act of Pope Paul III., by which up to this hour England stands cursed, her sovereign deposed, and all the subjects absolved from their allegiance to the crown. Let him also repeal and annul the bull of Pius V., by which Queen Elizabeth was deposed, and England is doubly cursed, and her subjects doubly absolved. Let him annul the act of his predecessor Alexander VI., who, in a pompous bull, made a present of America to the Kings of Spain and Portugal, to be by them held as a sacred trust, as a missionary field in which to propagate and establish the Roman Catholic faith. And, finally, let him condemn as heretics, and their books as without authority and unfit to be read, that host of historians, theologians and schoolmen, who have taught as a doctrine of Catholic faith, that the Pope has, by divine right and for the good of the church, universal temporal power! such for instance as Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, Turrescrema, Sanderus, Perron, Carraza, Cajetan, Aquinas, Campeggio, Bonaventura and the

like. And, especially, let him stamp with the seal of his condemnation, and close forever by his anathema, that celebrated book, the "*Ecclesiastical Dictionary*" of Ferraris, which is used as a standard for Roman Catholic divinity, and which asserts in its article on the Pope that "the Pope is of such dignity and highness, that he is not simply man, but, as it were GOD AND THE VICAR OF GOD." And which further asserts, as the common doctrine of the church, "that the Pope has by divine grant two swords, the *spiritual* and the *temporal*; and that infidel princes and kings, by the decision of the Pope, may be deprived, in certain cases, of that dominion which they have over the faithful." And now, Mr. Chandler, go and bring fresh from the Pope, some such authoritative disclaimer as this. You have utterly failed in your speech to do it, and by this failure you have proven to the world that no such disclaimer exists. Go and bring it, for your own sake, for the sake of your church, for my sake, and for the sake of my country.

But if the Popes have claimed the power and have exercised it, as of divine right, to rule in matters secular, for the good of the church and outside of their proper temporal dominion; and the ablest historians and theological writers of standard authority, have sanctioned this claim, and have taught it even as an essential dogma of faith; how comes it that Bishops England, Kendrick, and Spaulding, of this country, and others of Ireland, together with the Universities of Douay, Louvain, Alcalá, Salamanca and Valladolid, *all* unite in ignoring the doctrine, and denying such a right or power to the Pope? And how, too, could the Honorable Mr. Chandler say, that in the pursuit of information with regard to the Roman Catholic Church, it had been his chance to converse with every rank and degree of her hierarchy, Pope, Cardinal, Nuncio, Archbishop, Bishop and Priest; and that he had never heard one of them speak upon the subject who did not disavow any belief of its existence? To one unacquainted with the inner workings and tricks of the Papacy, it looks strange that such testimony and assertions can be made by high functionaries, directly in the teeth of the Popes, the history, and standard writings of the church.

But it can be explained; and the very explanation will show you that the Honorable Mr. Chandler has been deceived by his Bishops, or else he is himself a Jesuit.

In a former part of this lecture, I stated that the nature and extent of the Pope's supremacy had ever been, in the infallible mother church, a matter of controversy, and that it is

at this hour an unsettled and consequently an open question. So it is, in regard to the infallibility of the church. In regard to both these great doctrines or dogmas, there are at this moment two great parties or schools of theology in the Roman Catholic Church. These are termed, the *Transalpine*, Eastern or Italian, and the *Cisalpine*, Western or French.

The Eastern or Italian school tell us, that when the Pope utters his decision in regard to doctrine or morals, it is the voice of God. The French or western school say: No, it is the voice of a man. Thus the two great schools or portions of the Church directly contradict each other.

And so in regard to the power or supremacy of the Pope. The Italian or eastern school, including the Popes and their Court, have ever claimed, by divine right, universal and supreme temporal power for the Pope. The French or western school have ever disclaimed and rejected it. Now to this latter school belong all Mr. Chandler's witnesses, Bishops, Archbishops and Universities. And should the Pope send his Nuncio in this direction, he would, of course side with those whose views best suited the particular longitude and region.

Here you see how, on this great subject, Rome has two faces, and is at full liberty to speak to suit the direction in which she looks. For the east, she may speak in the stern dialect of despotism, and claim all power: For the West, England, Scotland, France and the United States, she may speak in much milder terms and language bland. Now, Mr. Chandler either knew this position of his witnesses, in making them testify for Rome; or he did not. If he did, by concealing it he has deceived the American people; if he did not, he has himself been deceived by his bishops. The whole, then, of Mr. Chandler's testimony will not suit the longitude of Rome; and hence an additional reason why, before he attempts again to play the orator for the Pope, in Congress, he should go at once to his feet, and bring us fresh from the Vatican the disclaimer we need.

But again: Not only is the testimony of the Bishops and Universities of the Western school, given us by Mr. Chandler in his speech, not suited to the longitude of Rome; but it is positively *not true!* Mark the testimony which we now question, and particularly its phraseology!

Mr. Chandler gives us the testimony of Dr. Kendrick in these words:

"The temporal power of the Pope was never claimed by the Church," says Bishop Kendrick.

as And so challenges his production of a *single decree or definition in which this power was propounded as an article of faith.* "Such," says the learned Bishop, "does not exist."

10 Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, says:

11 "The deposing power of Popes never was an article of faith; or a doctrine of the Catholic Church, nor was it ever proposed as such by any Council, or by any Pope, themselves who exercised it."

12 Archbishop Hughes, says Mr. Chandler, "has expressed the same idea in the most emphatic terms."

13 Now, with due deference to these dignitaries, and more for the truth, I undertake to say that this testimony is *not true*. This power has been sanctioned by eight general, holy, apostolic Roman Councils.* These were the Councils of the Lateran, Lyons, Vienna, Pisa, Constance, Basil, Lateran, in 1512, and Trent. The Canons of these Councils, I will not detain you to recite. I give you that of the Lateran as a specimen of the rest. In its third Canon, the 4th Council of the Lateran enacted formal regulations for the dethronement of refractory Kings. The offending sovereign, according to these regulations:

14 "Is first to be excommunicated by his metropolitan and suffragans; and, if he should afterward persist in his contumacy for a year, the Roman pontiff, the viceregent of God, is empowered to degrade the obstinate monarch, absolve his subjects from their fealty, and transfer his dominions to any adventurer, who may invade his territory and become the champion of Catholicism."

15 Now how does it happen that Archbishops Kendrick, Hughes and Troy should unite in asserting—

16 "That the temporal power of the Popes was never claimed by the Church, and that there does not exist a single decree or definition in which this power was propounded as an article of faith." "That the deposing power of the Popes, never was a doctrine of the Catholic Church, nor was it ever proposed as such by any Council?"

17 How I say could these venerable dignitaries reconcile it with their consciences thus to ignore the councils and canons of their Church, by telling their convert, Mr. Chandler, that *not one council had ever decreed or sanctioned this power*, when it is notorious that no less than eight general and apostolic councils of the Church have formally enacted canons upon the subject. How can this be? Well, for the sake of truth and the information of Mr. Chandler, I will tell you how; It is a principle of the canon law of Rome, that any true son of the Holy Mother Church, who may solemnly as-

*See Dr. Samuel Edgar's Variations of Popery, page 229.

18 sert or swear any thing prejudicial to the church, commits thereby perjury. The third council of the Lateran, superintended by Pope Alexander, and clothed with infallibility, taught this principle both in word and deed. These unerring fathers, in the sixteenth canon, style

19 "An oath contrary to ecclesiastical utility, not an oath, but perjury."—[Non juramenta sed perjuria potius sunt dicenda, quic contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam attentantur.] Pith, 110, Labb. 13, 426; Gibert, 3, 504.

20 Here you have the true explanation of this strange conduct of these bishops, by which Mr. Chandler has been deceived, and thereby made an instrument in the hands of these papal prelates to deceive and ruin the American people. According to our American and protestant notions of law and religion, these men are guilty of perjury. But according to the canon law of the Roman Catholic church, they are worthy of all praise.

21 You have here, too, clearly laid down, the principle which is denied by the witnesses of Mr. Chandler—that faith, according to the Roman Catholic church, is *not to be kept with heretics, &c.* But this doctrinal fact, so explicitly denied by the witnesses of Mr. Chandler, is so clearly asserted in the standards of his church, and is so written in characters of blood by the acts of her martyrdom and persecutions of protestants, that he who denies it must be pitied for his ignorance or despised for his disregard of the truth. Volumes of proof might be here adduced, from unquestionable ecclesiastical documents of Rome; but the enactments of the Council of Constance, in regard to the martyrdom of John Huss and Jerome are enough.

22 The following are the facts which show sufficiently what Rome has taught and decreed, upon the subject of keeping faith with heretics:

23 The Council of Constance was called, by John XXIII, at the instance of the Emperor Sigismund and other kings and princes of Europe, at the city of Constance, in Switzerland, in the year 1414. It was a magnificent assemblage of the kind; and in view of the crisis which convened it, perhaps a more important council has never been convened. Rome and Avignon, with a Pope each, were contending for the seat of papal power. Both of the incumbents were displaced by the council of Pisa, called by their Cardinals, and a new Pope was appointed who assumed the title of Alexander the V. But the supplanted Popes refusing to abide the action of the council, Holy Mother had now *three heads* instead of one. To settle this difficulty was the chief and first ob-

ject of the council. Next to this is important was the perfidious trial and condemnation and burning of John Huss for heresy. In connection with this, they condemned and pronounced infamous the writings of the great John Wickliffe, destroyed his books and burned his bones. On the 14th of June, 1415, this same celebrated council of Constance passed the famous decree forbidding the cup to the people, and requiring that the Lord's Supper should be administered to the laity *in the element of bread only*. And the fact that to this day this is the custom and practice of the Roman Catholic Church shows that the authority of this council is still recognized and acknowledged.

A writer of profound learning and great authority remarks:

"That this council's treatment of Huss and Jerome constituted the most revolting instance of its treachery. The martyrdom of these celebrated friends, indeed, was one of the most glaring, undisguised and disgusting specimens of perfidy ever exhibited to the gaze of an astonished world or recorded for the execration of posterity. John Huss was summoned to the city of Constance on the charge of heresy. His safety during his journey, his stay, and his return, was guaranteed by a safe conduct from the Emperor Sigismund, addressed to all civil and ecclesiastical governors in his dominions. Huss obeyed the summons. Plighted faith, however, could, in those days, confer no security on a man accused of heresy. Huss was tried and condemned by an ecclesiastical tribunal, which, in its holy zeal, 'devoted his soul to the infernal devils,' and delivered his body to the secular arm; which, notwithstanding the imperial promise of protection, and in defiance of all justice and humanity, committed the victim of its own perfidy to the flames. This harbinger of the reformation suffered martyrdom with the Emperor's safe-conduct in his hand. He died as he had lived; like a christian hero. He endured the punishment with unparalleled magnanimity and, in the triumph of faith and the ecstasy of divine love, 'sang hymns to God,' while the mouldering flesh was consumed from his bones, till the immortal spirit ascended from the funeral pile and soared to heaven."

"Jerome, also, trepanned by the mockery of a safe-conduct from the faithless synod, shared the same destiny. This man, distinguished for his friendship and eloquence, came to Constance, for the generous purpose of supporting his early companion, and died with heroism, in the fire which had consumed his friend. Huss and Jerome, says Aeneas Sylvius, afterward Pope Pius the second, discovered no symptom of weakness, went to punishment as to a festival, and sang hymns in the midst of the flames and without interruption till the last sigh."—[See Variations of Popery, by Rev. Samuel Edgar, D. D., tenth complete American edition, page. 228.]

And says another writer:

"There is no historical fact which modern Romanists have so much endeavored to conceal, obscure, or deny, as this well known act of perfidy on the part of the Council of Constance, in imprisoning and condemning Huss, in defiance of the Emperor's safe-conduct, and their own efforts to reconcile the conscience of Sigismund to this base and perfidious act. This is not to be wondered at. There is scarcely a fact in the history of this apostate church, which reflects upon her such indelible disgrace, and happily for the cause of truth, not one fact which rests upon more conclusive evidence."

To furnish this evidence, the following decrees of the council, passed after the burning of Huss, to silence the public clamors against the perfidy of the council, are given, an exact and literal translation from the original Latin. And I will here state, for the information of all concerned, that if Mr. Chandler, or any of his priests or bishops, may question the accuracy of my translation, I have in my possession the original Latin of these memorable decrees; establishing, as an article of faith in the Romish church, the doctrine *that no faith is to be kept with heretics*, as contained in the scarce, voluminous and expensive work of L'ENFANT.

The first of these decrees relates to the validity of safe-conducts in general, granted to heretics, by the temporal princes; and is as follows:

"The present synod declares that every safe-conduct granted by the Emperor, Kings, and other temporal princes, to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, in hopes of reclaiming them, ought not to be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith, or to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder; but such persons may, and ought to be examined, judged and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics refuse to revoke their errors, even though they should be arrived at the place where they are to be judged only upon the faith of the safe conduct, 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 whatsoever tie he may be engaged, because he has done all that is in his power to do."

2. The second of these decrees is perhaps more to the point, as it relates directly to the safe-conduct of John Huss. It is as follows, and is an exact translation from the original as given in L'ENFANT:

"Whereas there are certain persons, either ill-disposed or over-wise beyond what they ought to be, who in secret and in public, traduce not only the Emperor, but the sacred council, saying, or insinuating, that the safe-conduct granted to John Huss, an arch-heretic, of damnable memory, was basely violated, contrary to all the rules of honor and justice; though the said John Huss, by otsti-

nately attacking the Catholic faith in the manner he did, rendered himself unworthy of any manner of safe-conduct and privilege; and *though according to the natural, divine, and human laws, no promise or faith ought to have been kept with him, to the prejudice of the Catholic faith.* The sacred synod declares by these presents, that the said Emperor did, with regard to John Huss, what he might and ought to have done, notwithstanding his safe-conduct, and forbids all the faithful in general, and every one of them in particular, of what dignity, degree, pre-eminence, condition, state, or sex they may be, to speak evil in any manner, either of the council, or of the king, as to what passed with regard to John Huss, on pain of being punished, without remission, as favorers of heresy, and persons guilty of high treason."

This doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, so clearly set forth by the great and infallible council of Constance, was in 1421 reiterated in a bull by Martin V., who owed his elevation to this same Council. He declares the doctrine in these words:

"That he would be guilty of a mortal sin, should he keep faith with heretics, who are themselves violators of the holy faith."

And now hear his reason:

"Because, says he, there can be no fellowship between a believer and an unbeliever."

But this doctrine, *that faith is not to be kept with heretics*, Mr. Chandler proves is not the faith of the church, because Bishops Eng'and, Hughes, Kendrick and Spaulding, of the United States, the Irish bishops, and the six universities of Louvain, Douay, Paris, Alcalá, Valladolid, and Salamanca, have disavowed it. But has a bishop, or any number of them not convened in a general council, or a university or any number of them, power to annul an article of faith decreed and established by a general and infallible Council, and authoritatively proclaimed to the world by the bulls of Popes? Such, we have shown to be the abominable doctrine in question, and all such efforts to evade it, as the above, are without authority; and which Mr. Chandler, if he understands the laws and principles of his church, must know is only a Jesuit trick to deceive protestants, and nothing more.

Thus you see that if our orator, Mr. Chandler, should ever get a disclaimer from the Pope, such as we ask, it may in the end avail us nothing. So much for the speech of Mr. Chandler, and the evidence upon which he has relied.

And were the evidence by which he has been deceived true and reliable, should not the fruits of the Papacy, past and present, in relation to civil and religious liberty, cause him and us to hesitate in giving it our patronage

in this country? "*By their fruits ye shall know them,*" is the test which the great teacher has given us. How can Rome, an ecclesiastical and temporal despotism, uniting the church and the state, favor and foster republican liberty? Where has she done it? The Pope by authority has again and again in his encyclical letters and bulls denounced, condemned and anathematized, *Liberty of conscience*, the very liberty for which our fathers fought and bled. So has he treated the Press, and denounced its liberty in which we glory. So has he deplored the severance of the church from the state, and advocated their union as essential to the prosperity of both. Now how can we separate the advocacy of the Papacy, from the approval of these things? And be it remembered, that these are not things of history far back, but they live and breathe in the encyclical letters and bulls of the 19th century.

Again: The oath and confession of faith of every member of the Roman Catholic Church, is inconsistent with the obligations and fealty of an American citizen. It is as follows; [I give the translation of the 13th Article to the close, with the original Latin before me.]

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolic Roman church, THE MOTHER AND MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES, AND I PROMISE AND SWEAR TRUE OBEDIENCE TO THE ROMAN BISHOP, the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

14. "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church.

15. "This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N—, promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen."

In regard to the above creed and oath, the latter part of which I have quoted entire, Mr. Butler, in his book of the Roman Catholic church, which is of standard authority, remarks as follows:

"This celebrated symbol of Catholic faith was published by his holiness in 1564, in the form of a bull, addressed to all the faithful in Christ. It was immediately received throughout the universal church; and, since that time, has ever been considered, in every part of the world, as an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman Catholic faith. Non-Catholics, on their admission into the Catholic church, publicly repeat and testify their assent to it, without restriction or qualification."

Of course, then, Mr. Chandler, as a non-Catholic, on his admission into the Catholic church, publicly adopted this creed, and by it was pledged and sworn. Thus is the whole body of the church of Rome—laity, as well as clergy—in the United States, as elsewhere—a sworn unit to the church and Pope of Rome.—According to this creed every Roman Catholic is not only bound to his church as a MOTHER, but as the MISTRESS of all churches. And not only so; but he is the sworn subject of a foreign prince and potentate, directly in the face of, and contrary to the express language of obligation and fealty of an American citizen.

“And I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Bishop.”

This is the oath of allegiance to the Pope, which the creed of the church imposes upon every lay member of the church, even in these United States. Well, in every encyclical letter and bull he issues, he anathematizes Bible societies, liberty of conscience, freedom of opinion, and the liberty of the press; and declares the union of church and state as necessary to the permanent prosperity of both. How compatible such an oath, as the above, to a foreign spiritual and temporal prince, holding and promulgating such sentiments, is with the obligations and fealty of an American citizen, judge ye!

The Bishop's oath to the Pope is different from the above; and I aver that no man who has taken it can be at heart and in good faith an American citizen. There is in it, in our judgment, treason both implied and expressed. Here it is. Read it carefully. It is an exact translation from the original Latin as I have it, Bishop Purcell's quibble about the meaning of *persequar* to the contrary notwithstanding:

“I, N——, elect of the church of N——, from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord, the Lord N——, Pope N——, and to his successors canonically entering. I will neither advise, consent, or do any thing that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands in any wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretence whatever. The counsel with which they will intrust me by themselves, their messengers or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to keep and defend the Roman papacy, and the regalities of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolical see, going and coming I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavor to pre-

serve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman Church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my utmost, and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the apostolical decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. *Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, I will, to my utmost, persecute and oppose.* I will come to a council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the apostles every three years; and give an account to our lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people; and, lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and I will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolical commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto especially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage, or, in default of these, by a priest of the diocese, or, in default of one of the clergy [of the diocese] by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediments I will make out by lawful proofs, to be transmitted by the aforesaid messengers to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman pontiff; and if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God, and these holy gospels of God.”

The above is the oath which every Roman Catholic bishop and archbishop in these United States has taken.

Observe the designation of him to whom allegiance and fidelity is sworn—“OUR LORD THE POPE.”

“His rights, honours, privileges and authority, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, INCREASE AND ADVANCE.”

Again:

“And if I shall know any thing prejudicial to his right, honor, state, or power, to be treated or agitated by any, whomsoever, I will hinder it to my utmost, and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said Lord.”

Thus is every Bishop and Archbishop a sworn spy in this country for the Court of Rome. Let the Know Nothings take care!

3. "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will, to my utmost persecute and oppose!"

Is the Inquisition still an institution of Rome? And is there here no pledge that if the Pope had the power it would be established in this country? As a protestant government and protestant citizens, we are "heretics and rebels" against the Pope political and religious, and as such every Bishop and Archbishop of Rome in this country is a sworn agent to oppose and persecute. Tell me not that such can be true and loyal citizens of our republic, and that there is nothing in the papacy dangerous to our liberties!

But why has Mr. Chandler been so silent in regard to this oath? The answer is obvious. The oath of allegiance and fidelity, which every bishop in this country has taken, to the Pope, is perfectly and eternally irreconcilable with the oath of allegiance and fealty to this government. And here I would beg leave to make a query. Is there a Roman Catholic Bishop or Priest, a foreigner, in this country, who is a naturalized citizen? Do they vote at our elections? We know that they understand controlling votes and influencing our elections for the interests of Rome, in strict compliance with the nature and obligation of their oath to the Pope; but do they vote themselves? And if they personally abstain from voting, is it not because of their sworn purpose to "oppose and persecute" in this country, until the Tiara and the cross shall have become the emblems of power, and the President of the United States shall hold his office at the will of the Pope?

I am aware how Bishops Hughes and Purcell have answered the question touching their naturalization. Bishop Purcell says he took the oath of allegiance to the United States before he did that of the Bishop! He never has, as a bishop, taken the oath of allegiance! These venerable prelates have by no means satisfied me; and I repeat the above query, and invite attention to the question.

But, suppose it true, that all Bishops, Archbishops and Priests who are foreigners in this country have been naturalized—that they have taken the oath of allegiance to our government. What does it amount to, compared with their oath to the Pope? The latter is above the former, and so overrides it as to make it a nullity. I know very well that this has been denied, but what avails the denial with-

out proof? Every American citizen can read the two oaths and judge for himself.

Having given the oath of the Bishop to the court of Rome, I now give you the oath of allegiance to the United States. It is—1st. An act of Intention, requiring the applicant to swear

"That it was *bona fide* his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce forever, all allegiance and fidelity to any FOREIGN PRINCE, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatsoever; and particularly by name, to the Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whereof he may at the time be a citizen subject.

2. He is required to take the following oath of renunciation of fealty:

"That he will support the constitution of the United States, and that he doth absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatever; and particularly by name to the Prince, Potentate, State, or Sovereignty whereof he was before a citizen or subject.

Now observe, that Bishops Purcell and Hughes, when driven to the wall on this subject, tell us that they took the oath of allegiance to the United States *first*, and the Bishop's oath *afterwards*! Why so? The reason is evident. By the bishop's oath, every bishop in this country is made a subject of the Pope, who is a foreign Prince and a potentate, and his oath to him is an oath of allegiance paramount to all others. This oath, you see, he would be required to *renounce* by the above oath of allegiance, which positively requires that we renounce *all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatsoever*. Hence, they take this oath, if at all, *first*, and the bishop's oath afterwards. But the Pope is a European sovereign in every sense of the word, a potentate who has dethroned kings and issued bulls and edicts which, at times, have made the world to tremble. How, then, can the Bishop's oath, which is one of allegiance to the Pope absolutely and forever, be made consistent with the above oath of allegiance? Impossible, *impossible!* In the language of Mr. Campbell,

"If a person can be sworn to support two antagonistic constitutions, governments, powers—two masters, as opposite as the poles: then may he without perjury swear to our government, and to that of Papal Rome."

But again: Look at the spirit and position of the Papacy in our country, on the subject of Education. It was the public and unmistakable demonstration of this, by a Hughes in the East, and a Purcell in the West martialing their foreign hosts to the polls, in compliance

with their oath of allegiance to Rome, to control our education and thereby subvert our free institutions, that first aroused with fear the American people and thrilled with alarm the American heart. And what is the language of this position and its true meaning? Is it not a broad declaration that republican education is dangerous to Rome, and will not be tolerated by those who have sworn allegiance to the Pope, although they *may* have assumed the name and the garb of American citizens? Is it not a broad declaration and avowal that they consider our protestant and *Bible* education as dangerous to Rome, as we regard the *anti-Bible* and infidel education of Rome dangerous to us? What say you, Mr. Chandler?

But, even in our own city of Maysville, has Rome taken her stand, and is, upon this subject, doing her utmost to rule or ruin us. Formerly, the Catholic children of our city enjoyed the benefit of our free schools, *now* not one. The Priest here, the sworn *minion* of the Bishop and the Pope, has, in obedience to his masters, established a school for the purpose of giving to their children, isolated from us, an education *anti-republican* because *anti-Bible*.

And now, in conclusion, I have done my duty. I have not gone aside and sought this discussion, for the sake of controversy. If my well has been poisoned, I am bound to warn my fellow-citizens not to drink the water. It is the high duty of my office and calling to

warn my fellow citizens—by whosoever it may be thrown broadcast among us—against error which is alike dangerous to the church and the state. I have taken this subject in hand because, "*in high places*," it has been so discussed as to endanger my liberty of office and my privileges of citizenship. In the language of Mr. Chandler,

"I have dealt in no street rumors, I have confided in no idle gossip. I have adduced no testimony not of my own knowledge, or from those who are authorized to speak to the question at issue, and with reference thereto. With my hand upon my heart, and my eye on Heaven, I call this audience, and (I speak with reverence) I call my God, to witness the truth of all the assertions made from my own conviction and knowledge, and my entire confidence in the credibility of all the testimony which I have adduced from others."

Note.—By the recent settlement and proclamation, by the Pope, of "THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION" as a doctrine of the Church, the western or French school, according to the views of which Mr. Chandler's bishops and universities have testified, have been overwhelmed by the prevailing voice of the Ultramontane or Italian doctrine as we have set it forth. So that now Rome is a unit—the Pope is infallible, and has by divine right all power and authority, secular as well as spiritual!!!