

REMONSTRANCES

ADDRESSED

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT,

AND

TO THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF IRELAND ;

AS ALSO

To his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin

Against the Proceedings of a Consistorial and Metropolitcal
Court holden in Dublin, August, 10. 1822, contrary
to the most sacred Rights and Liberties
of his Majesty's faithful subjects ;

AND MORE ESPECIALLY AGAINST THE

ARBITRARY AND TYRANNICAL CONDUCT
OF

The Arch-Bishop

HIMSELF ;

WITH IMPORTANT HINTS TO

CANDIDATES FOR ORDINATION :

SHEWING THE DEGRADER CONDITION TO WHICH

THE BISHOPS

HAVE REDUCED THE INFERIOR CLERGY.

By a Clergyman

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

" In full-blown dignity see Wolsey stand,
" Law in his voice, and fortune in his hand,
" Still to new heights his restless wishes tow'r,
" Claim leads to claim, and pow'r advances pow'r."

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

AND SOLD BY G. BULL, REDMOND'S-HILL ; AND BY THE BOOKSELLERS
IN GENERAL,

1822.

REMEMBRANCES

ADDRESSED

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT

AND

TO THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF IRELAND

AS ALSO

COLLECTED BY THE REV. ARCHDEACON OF DUBLIN

Against the Propagation of a Constitutional and Political
Corruption in Dublin August 18 1832
to the most worthy Bishops and Clergy
of the Kingdom a faithful subject

AND MORE ESPECIALLY AGAINST THE

ARBITRARY AND TYRANNICAL CONDUCT

OF

THE BISHOPS

WITH INTENTIONS TO

CANDIDATES FOR ORDINATION

AS ALSO THE DECEASED OFFICERS TO WHICH

THE BISHOPS

HAVE REDDED THE INTERIOR CLERGY

AS A REMEMBRANCE

OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND

"In full-blown dignity see Woke's hand

"Law in his own and justice in his hand

"Still to new heights his noble stature rose

"Ours leads to glory and now a witness how

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR

AND SOLD BY G. BURL, REDMOND'S HALL; AND BY THE BOOKSELLERS

IN GENERAL

Remonstrances.

MR. ROBERT TAYLOR the victim in the present case of an extension of Spiritual Tyranny, utterly unexampled in modern times, is a regularly educated, ordained and licenced Clergyman of the Church of England. He took his degree in **ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE**; and visiting Ireland about two years since, became Classical Assistant in **NUTGROVE SCHOOL**. This situation introduced him to the acquaintance of the Minister of the Parish, and **MR. TAYLOR** was regularly solicited to assist in the duty of **RATHFARNHAM Church**.

During the summer of 1821, the Curate, with the allowance of Arch-Bishop **BERKELEY**, left his church and parish for two months to the ministerial care of **MR. TAYLOR**. In July, of the present year, the Rev. Curate left his parish as before to the approved care and faithfulness of **MR. TAYLOR**; nor would any interruption to **MR. T's.** ministrations have occurred, had not the archdiocese sustained an irreparable loss in the translation of its vigilant and faithful Prelate to the See of **ARMAGH**; a loss which it will not soon cease to bewail! **DR. WM. MAGEE**, formerly himself an assistant in a

school, and very frequently reading prayers for his clerical brethren without an especial licence so to do, (precisely as Mr. TAYLOR has done, and all other well-ordered clergymen are in the habit of doing) was inaugurated into his archiepiscopal authority and Prerogatives on Sunday, August the 4th, and the public will here see how this prodigy of fortune, *lords* it over his former self in the person of an usher at Nutgrove School.

On Sunday, August 4th, the very day of the new Archbishop's plenary investiture, and earlier in the day than that investiture could have been completed, just as Mr. Taylor had entered the reading-desk at Rathfarnham church, he was called out to speak to an entire stranger—the Rev. R. J. HOBSON; who, with all the politeness such a case admitted, explained that it was in consequence of the New Archbishop's commands, which had been sent to the Archdeacon, imperative on himself, to take the duty of Rathfarnham church; in which Mr. TAYLOR immediately acquiesced, and would have left the Church, to spare his feelings the mortification of appearing before a congregation which saw him thus suddenly and unaccountably deposed. But his supercessor was an invalid, and pleaded that he could not possibly do the duty without Mr. TAYLOR's assistance. Mr. TAYLOR, therefore, merging his feelings of personal mortification, to his pity for a sick brother,

was, by that feeling only—betrayed—caught and drawn in, to officiate that *once*, without a licence, in a diocese which had just at that instant fallen under the government of a **MAGEE**!—a fault which a *Jefferies* would hardly have condemned—which a *Bonner*, would not have punished.

On the Tuesday following, Mr. TAYLOR received the ARCHDEACON'S commands to wait on His Grace; and the next day met such entertainment at the Palace, as gave occasion to the following letter.

FIRST LETTER.

To the Arch-Bishop.

To the Most Rev. Father in God, His Grace the Lord William, by Divine permission Archbishop of Dublin, &c.

Please your Grace,

I, a Clergyman of the united Church of England and Ireland, myself in the Holy Order of its Priesthood, waited on you this day, upon an intimation from the Very Rev. the Archdeacon of *your own Diocese*, conveyed to me by the Rev. R. J. Hobson, an officiating Minister *also of your own diocese*, to request merely the continuance of an allowance which I enjoyed, *as you have been certified*, a long while under your Grace's most amiable and truly christian predecessor.

“The request was only rendered necessary by your recent inauguration into your new dignity.—The allowance requested, extended only to my being permitted, in the exercise of the sacred function which I hold in common with yourself, to supply a few weeks absence of the incumbent of the parish in which I reside—an absence occasioned by his sickness. When, deferring to your Grace’s very peculiar judgment, as to the formalities necessary on such an occasion, I most respectfully waited on you, with all proper documents of my being a fit and qualified person to be so allowed; You were pleased to accuse me of having already subjected myself to legal penalties—You charged me with *ignorance* of what you chose to say it was my duty to have known on the subject from my ordination engagements, and without admitting my most politely submitted remonstrance, You rang your bell, and pointed me the way to your door. You reiterated the unprovoked charge of ignorance in the most offensive and tyrannical cadence, and when I meekly observed that “I felt your treatment, *as a man*,” your answer was, you “cared not for my feelings.”

“Owing therefore so little to your Grace, I owe it to myself, to tell you more explicitly that I feel it as an Englishman whom even the Sovereign he would die to defend, should not irresponsively insult. Doing no wrong,

I can fear no judgment. To the charge of having incurred legal penalties, I answer,—inflict them if you *can*—if any such impend over me—*if you dare*; for I scorn to owe my immunity to your forbearance. I know no laws but such as will protect me. I bless God, Sir, that you CANNOT hurt me.

“With regard to ignorance of my ordination engagements: *You*, Sir, have subjected yourself by a gratuitous aggression to be reminded by me, that a Bishop also, by the same engagements is bound to “be unto the flock a Shepherd, not a Wolf;” and by much higher obligations, which towards me you have most grievously disregarded,—“to do unto all men as he would they should do unto him.

I am, Sir,

With due consideration,

He whom you this day insulted,

ROBERT TAYLOR.”

“*Rathfarnham,*
Aug. 7, 1822.”

In consequence of the preceding letter, which was committed to the Rathfarnham post Office on Wednesday evening Aug. 7th; On Saturday evening, Aug. the 10th, following, the annexed INHIBITION, in consequence

of which Mr. TAYLOR was immediately dismissed from his situation, was served at Nutgrove, by an Officer from the Archbishop, into the hands of Mr. THOMAS JONES, Mr. TAYLOR's employer.

COPY OF THE INHIBITION.

WILLIAM, by Divine Providence, Archbishop of Dublin, Primate and Metropolitan of Ireland, and Bishop of Glandelagh; to all and Singular Clerks and Literate persons within our Dioceses of Dublin and Glandelagh, Greeting:

WHEREAS the Rev. Robert Taylor, Usher at Nutgrove-School, near Rathfarnham, in the Co. of Dublin, hath taken upon himself to officiate in performing Divine offices in the Parish Church of Rathfarnham, within our said Diocese and Jurisdiction, without our Licence or Authority, contrary to the Laws and Canons of the Church of Ireland in that case made and provided; WE, therefore, by these presents, strictly charge and command you, that you INHIBIT peremptorily the said Robert Taylor, whom We also, by the tenor of these presents INHIBIT, that he presume not to preach or perform any other clerical office within our said Dioceses and Jurisdiction, without our special Licence and authority first had and obtained, un-

der pain of the Law and Contempt thereof. And that you certify to us, or our Vicar General, or some other Judge competent in this behalf, what you shall do in the premises, together with these presents. Dated under the Seal of our Consistorial and Metropolitan Court of Dublin, which we have caused to be affixed to these presents, the Tenth Day of August, in the Year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Twenty-two.

.....
Seal.
.....

THOMAS CLARKE,
D. Reg^r.

JOHN LEWIS,
Surrogate.

In consequence of the above INHIBITION, Mr. JONES wrote on Monday, August 12th, to His Grace the ARCHBISHOP, stating, that in submission to his Grace's authority, he had dismissed Mr. TAYLOR from his situation of Usher in Nutgrove School. He received an answer from His Grace, the same day, to which he responded on the next, Tuesday the 13th, to the effect of arguing with His Grace, "that Mr. Taylor's readmission into his former situation, under the circumstances of His Grace's still-impending Inhibition, was impossible; and that he (Mr. Jones) considered the fact

of Mr. Taylor's having incurred such an Inhibition, as itself alone, an absolute disqualification for his being a Classical Assistant in Nutgrove School." Mr. T. being no longer a member of the establishment at Nutgrove, put into the post-office at Dundrum, on Monday evening, August 12th, the following letter to the Archbishop.

COPY of Mr. Taylor's second Letter to the Archbishop.

"Judge me O God and plead my cause." Ps. 43.

To the Most Rev. Father in God, by Divine Providence, His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, Primate and Metropolitan of Ireland, and Bishop of Glendelagh.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR GRACE, MY LORD,

"In consequence of my having incurred your displeasure, Mr. THOMAS JONES my employer and my friend, has deemed it incumbent on himself, as being subject to your authority, to dismiss me from the office I held under him, of Classical Assistant in Nutgrove School.

"Thus has your extensive power, ruined the man whom your imperious behaviour on an interview which was rendered necessary by your own purposes and business only, irritated to write to you the just remonstrance of an insulted gentleman.

“ When you shewed a Clergyman your door—a Clergyman whose visit you yourself had occasioned, who asked no favour, and who had committed no fault, you became Sir, ipso-facto in *that* fact, my inferior, who never myself deserved, nor ever gave such treatment to any man.

“ Because you found me incapable of brooking so cruel an indignity—because I did not take you for a very God, and without remonstrance or reply suffer an affront which no christian ought, which no englishman would endure ; because I have been so bold as to signify to an Archbishop, (though not without necessity—nor with intemperance) that HE HAD NO RIGHT TO INSULT ME, the Primate of Ireland, the Author of an immortal work on the Christian Atonement, on the Mercy of his God, brings forth the thunder of Metropolitcal power to crush an unpreferred clerk of his own church.

“ You have been at an expence that would have relieved some thousands of your starving countrymen, to circulate an INHIBITION against me, the effect of which you could not but know, and that which effect might not fail, you sent your officer with it, into the very NEST where all my affections, and hopes, and happiness were reposed.

“I have perhaps been temerarious in shewing that I prefer desolation to sycophancy, and death itself to dishonor. But you have your revenge. You have ruined me, and I walk the streets of Dublin, plucked from the bosom of an amiable family—unemployed—a friendless stranger, exhibiting to the clergy a fearful document that *William Magee is Archbishop of Dublin*:—to the public—that to write large volumes about Christianity is not necessarily a proof that the writer himself is endued with a christian spirit.

“It is not indeed, because you are the very highest, and I the lowest member of our Church, that my feelings find any alleviation in being thus *forced* before the public in conflict with you. It is this consideration, Sir, that is most grievous to me: for I have learned to “render to all their dues, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor,” and all who know me would testify to your Grace, that my whole life has exemplified what I have so learned. But you have called me to the exemplification of a far more trying duty. Imagine yourself “at one fell swoop” turned out of your honors and revenues, and that, so suddenly as that you had not provided yourself with the necessaries of life:—imagine this done to you by one so mighty and so proud, that “*he cared not for your feelings* ;” and ask your own heart, what its

sentiments would be in *this*, which is the situation in which you have placed me. You have left me nothing to lose, nothing to fear. You have put on me the greatest possible insult. You have done me the greatest possible injury. Sir, I am a christian, and therefore with no *allowed* wish in my heart towards you, which you ought not to entertain in your own,

I am, my Lord,

May it please your Grace,

Your Grace's humble servant,

ROBERT TAYLOR."

At Mr. KEEGAN'S,
No. 44, South George's-street,
August 12, 1822.

That Mr. TAYLOR's dismissal from his situation was occasioned by His Grace's inhibition *only*, not only does His Grace in his own conscience certainly know, from two letters which he received and answered on the subject—but Mr. JONES's certificate, bearing the same date as the inhibition, completely proves.

THE CERTIFICATE.

"I most sincerely certify that the Rev. R. TAYLOR lived with me as Classical assistant for about a year and a half;—that he fulfilled all the duties of his situation with zeal and

ability, and that his manners and conduct were in all respects correct and exemplary.

“ THOMAS JONES.”

“ *Nutgrove School,*
10th Aug. 1822.”

It might be thought, that this is as clear a case for the recovery of damages *in law*, as in all justice, honesty and equity it is entitled to them ;—but Mr. TAYLOR is a defenceless, friendless Englishman, and has no more means to prosecute his right, than his mighty oppressor has disposition to concede it. The Bishop has only to aver, that he *felt it his duty* to inhibit Mr. TAYLOR, and though the consequences be Mr. TAYLOR’s *entire destruction*, the Bishop’s *conscience* no more contemplates the consequences that affect Mr. TAYLOR, than his humanity respects his feelings. Convenient, sacred conscience!—Queen Mary graciously informed CRANMER that her *conscience*—her duty—and the interests of religion, required that he should suffer!

No notice having been taken of Mr. TAYLOR’s second letter to His Grace, Mr. T. delivered the following letter at the house of the Lord Chief Justice, on Wednesday evening, August 14, 1822.

To the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland,

My Lord,

"I, a poor and unpreferred clergyman of the established church, humbly implore justice and protection at your hand. Presuming that it is an essential attribute of exalted goodness to be accessible to the complaint of the oppressed, and of your high place especially, to redress wrongs. I, with profoundest deference entreat you to permit me to submit to your wisdom my very serious complaint against His Grace WILLIAM MAGEE, Lord Archbishop of Dublin; in which, I doubt not to make it appear to your Lordship's conviction, that His Grace is labouring under a very grievous mistake, not less prejudicial to his own and the church's honor, than to the poor fortunes of

Your Lordship's

Humble petitioner,

ROBERT TAYLOR."

August 14, 1822.

At Mr. KEEGAN's,
No. 44, South Georges-st.

In order that no possible means might be left untried to accomplish Mr. TAYLOR's just redress, Mr. T. waited on the Rev. J. HOBSON at 7 o'clock on Saturday morning, and stated his whole case, proceedings and intentions;

commissioning the Rev. J. HOBSON, (who generously and nobly undertook the commission) to shew His Grace a copy of the letter already sent to the Lord Chief Justice ;—2d. To assure His Grace, that Mr. TAYLOR is not actuated by any feelings of vindictiveness, but only seeks and desires an absolute redress of an actual and substantial injury ;—3d. To demonstrate to His Grace, that the terms and charges contained in the inhibition, are utterly false and erroneous.—4th. To state that Mr. TAYLOR feels that the consequences of the inhibition, would to Mr. TAYLOR, be actually *murderous* ; that his feelings would not admit of his returning to his native country, or tolerating his life in this, under the stigma and disgrace which the inhibition (in all ordinary apprehension of it) puts upon him.—5th. That therefore Mr. TAYLOR will prosecute his redress to the tribunal of the Public—to the foot of the Throne—to the utmost extremity of legitimate vindication.

On Sunday, August the 18th, 1822, Mr. HOBSON having seen the Archbishop, waited on Mr. TAYLOR in Camden-street to inform him finally that His Grace's measures were irrevocable, and recommending Mr. TAYLOR to read the Bible. Mr. TAYLOR therefore delivered the following letter at Dublin Castle.

To His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of
Ireland.

May it please your Excellency:

“ With inexpressible pain to your petitioners feelings, but urged by imperious obligations of necessity, and of duty; your petitioner presumes to obtrude on your Excellency’s high consideration his solemn deposition

“ THAT a Consistorial and Metropolitan Court hath been holden in Dublin, on the tenth day of this present month, by His Grace WILLIAM MAGEE, Lord Archbishop, contrary to the most sacred rights and liberties of His Majesty’s faithful subjects.

“ 2. THAT this Court without admitting evidence which would have proved the utter falsehood of the allegations on which it proceeded, and without suffering your petitioner (who is a free and independent clergyman of the church of England, in the sacred order of its priesthood) to answer for himself, hath enacted a public measure of punishment, reprehension, and inhibition, utterly ruinous to the fortunes, honor and health of your Excellency’s petitioner.

“ Your Excellency’s private wisdom it is humbly hoped may cause the repeal of the injurious and iniquitous measure complained

of, in a way calculated to shield the church's honor from the animadversions which would follow its further notoriety. And your petitioner seeking only his most just and necessary redress under the grievous wrong he hath sustained will ever pray.

“The Rev. ROBERT TAYLOR,

“No. 32, Camden-st. Aug. 19, 1822.”

“*To the Lord Lieutenant.*”

Mr. TAYLOR has been honored with most polite notices of his communications, both from the LORD LIEUTENANT, and from the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.

It would have been in the highest degree indecorous for Mr. TAYLOR to have applied for a licence merely to assist the licenced Curate ;—no Licence was either wanted by Mr. TAYLOR, or necessary in the case. Had it been so, the law allows an officiating Minister three Months after his having received an appointment within which, to apply to his Diocesan for a Licence.

In the Ordination of Priests, though it be indeed stated, that he is to preach in the Church to which he shall be appointed, there is no sort of inhibition from preaching God's word either “in season or out of sea-

son," but contrariwise, he is solemnly exhorted to "seek for Christ's sheep which are scattered abroad in the midst of this naughty world." Mr. TAYLOR therefore, has not exceeded his commission.—He has indeed preached and prayed in the diocese of Dublin, but he never "*presumed* nor *took upon himself*" in doing so, nor can that be said, *truly*, to have been done without the Archbishop's licence, for which his licence was requested as soon as it could be known to have become necessary ;—as soon as the Archbishop himself had power to grant one ; and which was not continued one moment after it was known that that licence would be refused.

The Archbishop upon learning from the master of Nutgrove School, that Mr. T. was dismissed from his situation in consequence of the *Inhibition*, wrote repeated letters to the Master to induce him to reinstate Mr. T. and very earnest invitations were given by the Master to engage Mr. T. to return. But as the *Inhibition* was still to remain in force, and the invitations to return originated in the commands of the ARCHBISHOP, with a manifest view to prevent Mr. Taylor's legal claim for damages, as the situation was no more (to Mr. Taylor's feelings) what it had been, nor he in the same rank and respectability in which he had filled it, it became *absolutely* impossible that those invitations should

be accepted. To such a man as Mr. Taylor, whatever is not possible without dishonour, is absolutely impossible. Nor is the actual injury done to Mr. T. confined merely to the loss of his asylum in the earthly paradise of NUTGROVE; for if Mr. T's. dearest friend and benefactor, who had so long known the piety and innocency of his life, and had approved his classical attainments and qualifications, drew such an inference from the nature of the inhibition, as that he could not compatibly with the paramount interests of his establishment, retain Mr. TAYLOR's services, how is it supposable that persons who know not Mr. TAYLOR, will in any case venture on the strength of Mr. T's. representations of the matter, to give countenance and protection to an inhibited clergyman.

But it is urged—the inhibition *only* hinders Mr. TAYLOR from exercising his clerical functions, and does not affect him as a scholar and a man. Alas! will a clergyman who is publicly forbidden and inhibited from doing a clergyman's duties, be considered worthy to be entrusted with the education of youth!—Had Mr. TAYLOR committed the greatest crime, an inhibition, is the only way in which His Grace could have noticed it. The Archbishop has done the worst he could do (and well he knew what he was doing) to injure Mr. T. He sends forth an inhibition addressed “to all clerks and literate persons,”

denouncing Mr. T. as having done what he never did, and inhibiting him from doing what he never intended to do, "taking upon himself," and "acting contrary to the canons."

Whoever considers His Grace as a good man, must infer that His Grace's mercy and compassion, induced him to state only so trifling a cause of the inhibition, in order that he might charitably conceal the real one ;— whoever considers His Grace as a great man, must conclude, that it could not be a small matter, least of all so small a matter as that alledged, that could bring down on so obscure an individual as Mr. TAYLOR, any sort of animadversion from him.

The motive which the world is to see for all this, is Archiepiscopal zeal to preserve the church from unknown intruders ; the string behind the curtain is—a resentment against some other individual, which not finding its meal in the immediate object, pounces on the first innocent victim which mischance throws in its way. This, the Archdeacon himself was sufficiently aware of, as he writes in his letter to Mr. HOBSON—"I fear this information proceeded from some enemy to MACLEAN. I understood that Mr. TAYLOR was well liked last year, and that he is a well regulated clergyman."

Mr. TAYLOR is indeed better known in Rathfarnham, than His Grace is ever likely to be, where the sin of poverty exists ;—tho'

not "familiar to a round of Ladyships," he is no stranger to the poor. His Grace has not taken the way to gain the widows and the cotter's blessing, in so rudely driving away a gentleman whom they regarded as their pastor, and knew to be their friend.

Had the duty of a Bishop required the instant inhibition of all un-licenced assistants, Why did Archbishop BERESFORD for two years neglect that duty? why is it MAGEE the first that ever discharged it, as it is hoped, he is the only Bishop that would have discharged it in such a manner.

Had the inhibition intended no further malice against Mr. Taylor, than to deprive him of that respectability in life, which he derives from being known and recognised as a Minister of the church of England, it would have been enough to have served it on Mr. T. himself, and in a private manner, without thrusting it into the hand of Mr. T's. employer, and addressing it to "all clerks and literate persons." 'Tis evident therefore, that the inhibition, dated on the 10th, was the consequence of Mr. Taylor's spirited remonstrance against His Grace's vandal manners on the 7th. Vindictiveness and revenge for the just rebuke which his tyranny had provoked, was the only cause and motive for the inhibition; any other supposeable or assigned, is supervacaneous and irrelevant.—

Nor is the inhibition confined in its effects to His Grace's diocese, or in its operation, to any limited time. Like the Inquisition, of which it is the very fac-simile, it is relieved by no compunctious mitigations or allowances, but every where, and for ever, it will envelope Mr. T's. innocent character with an atmosphere of mystery. All other Bishops will see reason enough to inhibit him whom Bishop MAGEE has inhibited. The mark of Cain is set on Mr. T.—The whisper of suspicion and of slander, pregnant with all cruelty to his feelings & to his fame, will tell wherever Mr. T. would fix his abode, that “this gentleman was certainly noticed by an Archbishop in a very unfriendly way—God only knows for what, but His Grace was a good and wise man.” And when, unhappy man! he shall in his poor defence produce the inhibition itself, and say—“See this was the cause assigned, and indeed this was *all* the cause”—will he not be repulsed at once, with the old adage, “wonders for fools”—it could not be. Will it not be answered—“A newly made Archbishop, could not be so weak a politician; a writer on the “Christian Atonement” could not be so bad a man.” And yet in the very teeth of this unexampled assumption of autocratorical power, is Mr. TAYLOR held by premier and paramount obligations to resist and offend against it. No Pope of Rome ever stretched or could stretch his spiritual domination to the over-topping of this usur-

pation of the Protestant Pope of Dublin. Mr. T. is indeed an Englishman and a foreigner in *his Rome*, yet no sooner is he seated on his Archiepiscopal throne in St. Patrick's Cathedral, than this Right Rev. Father in God, His Grace the Lord!—takes upon himself to *dispense* with those most solemn vows and engagements, in which Mr. T. is held to him who is the LORD indeed;—inhibiting Mr. T. from doing what God, his vows and the church have made it imperative on him to do;—making *that* to be unlawful and criminal which the laws of the Almighty—of his country and of his conscience, have made his bounden duty. “He shall never preach or pray in my diocese,” saith the newly appointed Archbishop. “He shall never cease his diligence, his labour nor his pains,” saith the ordination vow. And should Mr. TAYLOR (being as he is, a Priest rightly and canonically ordained according to the manner and form prescribed and used by the Church of England,) be called to baptize the new-born infant, or to administer the blessed sacrament to the dying penitent, being moreover requested to do so, by the minister of the parish in which he resides, is he to fear that this Father in-God will seize him by the throat and throw him into prison for his compliance; or will it justify his refusal to answer “our Protestant Pope, High-Priest MAGEE inhibits me!” Mr. T. is “ready rather to go to prison and to death!”

Mr. TAYLOR appeals to the bar of public opinion for the reparation of his wounded character, under a very painful apprehension that this is all that can be repaired. In an action for damages, he fears His Grace would only have to lay his hand on his breast and say, FALSE ! as the Bishop of Clogher did, and all evidence, complaint and proof would instantly be quashed. " In the corrupted currents of this world offence's gilded hand may shove bye justice." In the circle of sycophants and parasites that aspire to his patronage, His Grace's laconic and imperious summary of the matter, is deemed *oracular*. " Mr. T. officiated in my diocese without my licence, I inhibited him from doing so, that is all." This is the logic of a tyrant, with only so much of the face of truth as may give currency to the deceit it covers ;—nor, were it true, (which it is not) would it be the reasoning of a christian. Where, the Archbishop himself is a much greater offender he does not look to find so succinct a justice ; he hath hope, and may that hope be substantial ! that intermediate considerations may be found to stand in arrest of censure ; what he hath to offer for himself, or some *atonement* which another may offer for him, may be *respected*. Had His Grace so dealt with Mr. TAYLOR, this *brochure* would never have been published.

If it be asked wherein consists the tyranny of the Bishop's conduct ? the irrefragable

answer is—he has extended his authority over a free and independent clergyman of the church of England, who was not a member of his diocese, nor responsible to his jurisdiction.

Where is the injustice?—He has condemned unheard, and punished beyond measure, nor was any Bishop ever known to inflict so severe a punishment for so slight an offence.

Where is the cruelty? The inhibition, in being addressed not only to all Clerks, but “to all literate persons,” has actually deprived Mr. T. of his subsistence, and is designed to deprive him of the possibility of obtaining it in the same way, for ever. “This game may be sport to him, but ’tis death to us.” The thick mantle that conceals this dagger from the public eye, is the pretence of apostolic vigilance, the discharge of a Bishop’s conscience, his bounden duty, the glory of God, the good of souls, *and so forth*. The hand that strikes, is nerved by the sheerest malice and vindictiveness; the heart that prompts, is full of all uncharitableness, and seeks only to revenge the objurgation its measureless arrogance provoked and merited. He looked on Mr. TAYLOR, as he looks on all poor men, as the dirt under his feet; and Mr. T. “felt it as a man.” This is the true translation—this the vis and spirit of an inhibition, “that looks the saint where most it plays the devil.” And for the church’s honor, *forsooth*, Mr.

T. is told, that he should put up with his private wrong, and kiss the consecrated foot that spurns him. Our Protestant Bishops just at this crisis, stand under a weight of public obloquy almost as heavy as their revenues, and slander accumulates vituperations on them, scarce less sonorous than their titles; for their precious sakes therefore, he is instructed by his clerical brethren, that he should "endure grief, suffering wrongfully."

"The Bishop indeed cannot think of rescinding his inhibition, which he regards as no more than a general and necessary measure of church government, whatever its consequences real or apprehended may prove to Mr. T. He has nothing to do with Mr. T's feelings or views of his own case, nor is he responsible for any losses which Mr. T. may have incurred by his wilful resistance to ecclesiastical authority." But did any ecclesiastical despot ever carry the claim of INFALLIBILITY with a higher hand, than thus to deny retractation or revision, to measures once adopted, even when they are demonstrated to have been enacted in *passion*, in *ignorance*, and in *error*; and when their consequences are shewn to be destructive to the happiness of a fellow-creature? Can any pride be more intolerant than that which is indifferent to all consequences but such as affect itself? Can any tyranny be more intolerable than that "spiritual wick-

edness in high places," which will do what itself thinks right, though innocence bleed to death under its enactments;—which speaks in oracles, which acts in fate,

"His word the law; and he, the Lord of all."

If this be not tyranny, "killing is no murder." If it be no more than what he "thinks to be right," and the course he means to adopt towards others:—his *infallibility* should be shewn, that what he thinks to be right, is outrageous wrong. The sooner such unusual and arbitrary measures meet a spirited resistance the better. The whole body of the clergy to a man, should rise against this BORGIA, and petition the King no more to repeat the dangerous experiment of making "of the lowest of the people, priests of the high places."

The Archbishop may, it is probable, with that inquisitiveness which ever characterizes *exalted littleness*, have lent himself to the secret whispers or slanderous insinuations of some one, or two, of the Rathfarnham congregation, whose vices Mr. TAYLOR's discourses may have too boldly rebuked;

"Unpractis'd he to fawn, or seek for pow'r

"By doctrines fashion'd to the varying hour."

But Mr. TAYLOR certainly knows that the Archbishop and the Archdeacon had previously corresponded on the subject of Mr. T's.

officiating at Rathfarnham, and that Mr. T.'s interview with His Grace was *concerted*, and *expected* by His Grace. In the fair truth of facts, Mr. TAYLOR was sent for, and sent for to be insulted. Mr. T. was in no respects under his Lordship's jurisdiction, nor responsible at all, to his authority. His Grace's high prerogative, at its utmost stretch might extend to inhibit his *own* clergy from inviting whom they pleased to assist them, but he could have no right to notice in any way of reprehension, the person who had been so invited:—least of all in a way tantamount to stripping him of his gown, and effectually robbing him of his means of subsistence.

What is an Usurper? Is he not one who assumes to himself to inhibit and command, to control and punish persons not justly subject to his authority?

What is a Tyrant? Is he not one who first insults and then injures; who sanctifies his oppressive measures under the pretext of discharging his high duties? who wrongs and distresses his fellow-creatures, and, “cares not for their feelings.”—“A Bishop should be blameless!”

Had His Grace, from any suspected or reputed pravity in Mr. TAYLOR's doctrine, held himself in conscience bound to prevent Mr. T. from preaching in his dioceses, the pre-

amblé of the inhibition, affecting to state its cause, should in common justice, have stated the *true* cause. There being no possible pravity of doctrine, or error of opinion, calculated to fix so foul a blot as the insinuated and indefinite one, which seems intended by pregnant implication, to associate Mr. TAYLOR'S name, with that of a BISHOP OF CLOGHER, A STONE, OR AN EYR.

Mr. T's. ministry at Rathfarnham was, (as he has reason to know) acceptable to all good men ;—his mode of preaching was characterized by that largeness of philanthropy peculiar to the christian philosopher ; which knows no distinction between men but that which vice or virtue makes, and forgetting the anfractuous discrepancies of the churchman, the catholic, the calvinist or the methodist, aims only to turn the wicked from the error of his way. No opinions or doctrines of his, ever made himself or others capable of distressing the feelings of a fellow-creature ;—of first insulting, and then injuring—of shewing the door, and then, inhibiting. Mr. TAYLOR therefore looks back on his ministerial labours, with feelings of satisfaction which no blame, nor praise of man can diminish or augment : He will not envy the mitre that rewards the metaphysical jargon of cabalistical theology, while he has hope of the crown promised to those who have sought to

“turn many to righteousness.” Mr. TAYLOR so far from being a person whom a *christian* Bishop might wish to hinder from preaching in his diocese ; so far from any tendency or approximation to what is absurdly called FREE THINKING, and impiously called DEISM ; hath ever been, as his sermons fully demonstrate, a most strenuous and never vacillating advocate of the “truth as it is in Jesus.” His voice was weak, and deafness might sometimes not hear—his arguments were strong, and dulness might often not understand ; the Scriptures were his *guide*, not his *reference*. He taught, what they taught him. He saw not christianity with the Archbishop’s optics in the mystical sacrifice of the ancient Phœnicians, in the barbarous immolations and bloody orgies of ‘a world lying in wickedness’, but where alone it is to be found, in the immediate and unsophisticated words of Christ himself.

Let not the sceptic therefore, nor the unbeliever, rest his conclusions to the disparagement of christianity, on the ground, strong and extensive as it lamentably is, which its Rev. and Right Rev. champions so rashly obtrude upon him ; the argument is an inverse one ; the best of causes has the worst of advocates ; and, as in the days of the Apostles the strength of God was manifested in human weakness—the inference points at once to the glorious and infallible demonstration, that, that

“work and counsel” which survives not merely the attacks of its enemies, but the far more dangerous and erosive sappings of the fools that contend for it, hath, (as it hath indeed,) “God for its author, happiness for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter.”

Had his Grace’s divinity, been derived from the source of all true divinity, the *Scriptures* only ;—had his spirit caught the mild genius of his suffering Saviour, and not taken its complexion from the bloody sacrifices and hideous expiations of mystical theology ;—had the Son of God and not the Son of KRONUS, or of OURANUS, been his great exemplar,* he might have learned, to care for a fellow-creature’s feelings ; His Bible would have sometimes opened in other places than the 13th of Romans ; he might have seen that a Bishop *owes* honor to all men, as justly as he challenges it from them. Had he studied something more than the sesquipedalian pomposity of his favourite moralist, he might have remembered the admonition of the dying ABAUSIAD—“In the height of my prosperity I said to detraction, who will hear thee? and to malevolence, what can’st thou perform? but my son, despise not thou the malice of the meanest ; remember that venom too often supplies the place of strength, and the lion may perish by the puncture of an asp.”

Divine Revelation regulates indeed and soothes the wounded feelings of humanity, but does not forbid, nor condemn them. It does not command forbearance and patience under the endurance of offences, with stronger emphasis than it denounces "woe to that man by whom the offence cometh." The great Author of divine revelation, in the constitution of the natural world, hath armed the feeblest insect with its sting, that none might be oppressed with impunity ; and tho' the aggrieved creature leaves its life in the wound that it inflicts, the satisfaction of revenge obtunds the pain of dissolution ; the last perception of its existence, is the joy of a conqueror, and triumph sparkles in its dying eye. This is the lesson of nature ; and revelation only adds—"let tyrants read that lesson and be wise."

32 Camden-street.

HINTS TO CANDIDATES FOR ORDINATION.

YE, who more than all the race of earth, “listen with credulity to the whispers of fancy, and follow with eagerness the phantoms of hope;” whose gay anticipations apprehend no mortifications that can lodge under the sacerdotal cassock, nor conceive how dishonor can possibly attach to the indelible character; learn from those who best know—from those whom experience has taught, the severe realities which attend the life of the poor clergyman.

Contemplate, not merely the flowery course of the aspiring dignitary—the lordly rector, or the princely prelate,—but for your own sakes and safety, ’ere the step be taken which cannot be retraced, turn your view to the condition which must be that of nine out of ten of you—the condition of the poor curate, or mere clerk in orders;—See him, learned, without honour—laborious, without profit:—See him wearing out his life in ministrations for which others receive the reward;—the slave of his rector—the scorn of his Bishop—the every-thing of his congregation;—never beneficed—many years unpreferred—at length perhaps, INHIBITED!

It is not Bishops, Dignitaries and Rectors that know the true state of the church, or that can possibly form any correct idea of it. The Bishops and Prebends sleep in the stalls of their cathedrals, and seldom or never come forth from bed and banquet, but to enact measures of severity and persecution against poor curates. One or two glorious exceptions there are :—the light of an Archbishop of Tuam shines in a dark horizon, and here and there the gloom is relieved by a ray of episcopal influence that is not malign towards the lower members of the Church ; but the general economy is—the most unequivocal OPPRESSION. To be in the Church, without a living, or without an independent fortune, is to be in the most degraded and humiliated situation that any man of gentlemanly feeling could possibly endure.

The Rectors and Vicars whose observations are necessarily confined to the parishes from which their tythes are derived, who hear no doctrines but their own, and who within these last few years jealously watch their pulpits from the intrusion of Preachers who might deliver any thing else than the echo of themselves—are each perfectly satisfied with his own standard of orthodoxy, and know not, or heed not, the diametrical contradiction which their statements receive in the adjoining pa-

rish. Within six miles of the Metropolis, in an establishment proud of its uniformity, and secured by its Thirty-nine Articles, are preached, doctrines as opposite to those articles, and to each other, as the antipodes.—In one parish church—'tis justification by faith only; in an other, by works only. Here, by both together—there by neither;—these, are Calvinists—those, Arminians. Trinitarians, Arians, Unitarians, all alike conscientiously, have subscribed the Articles, all repeat the creeds, and all with a brave neglect of those *lets* and *saws*, preach what they severally hold to be Gospel-truth.

Nor is this incongruity, characteristic of our schismatical times, or peculiar to our own Church; we find one of its pillars and brightest ornaments, Dr. H. MOORE, avowing, that “there’s scarce any Church in Christendom at this day, which does not obtrude not only plain falsehoods, but such falsehoods as will appear to any free spirit pure contradictions and impossibilities, and that, with the same gravity, authority and importunity, as they do the holy oracles of God”† In such diversity, and in so great a variety and contrariety of opinions, ('tis the declaration of a Bishop—Bishop Jeremy Taylor, *pol. works*, p. 521,) as “has made it impossible for any man not be deceived,” surely

† “Mystery of Godliness,” p. 491.

humility and self-diffidence become the Christian, and now, when we can no longer assure ourselves, by the sensible illapses of the Holy Spirit ;—to refuse all review to the opinions which we have once espoused—to be very certain that we are the few that “know when thousands err,” may serve to gratify the pride of the human heart, and sanctify its most unamiable propensities ; but it is not the temper which Christianity enjoins ; it is not the temper of its divine Author, who, being “ONLY WISE,” was meek and lowly in spirit.

Poverty and Martyrdom are tolerable in speculation to the wealthy and happy enthusiast who knows no more of either, than what poetry describes, or imagination portrays. Such an one can “afford to keep a conscience,*” and judging his own conceits to be Gospel, may boldly challenge the conformity of his dependents, and preach damnation against his opponents : but the poor Curate who would sacrifice to his notions of orthodoxy, the comforts of an affectionate wife, the sustenance of a numerous family, who for want of the conformity required, would lose the only curacy he might have a chance of obtaining—must have a heart of no penetrable stuff. Surely Heaven itself might pardon a little heresy, or a good deal of hypocrisy in such a cause ;

* Archdeacon Paley's expression.

“the recording angel that writes it down, will drop a tear upon it, and blot it out for ever.”

But how degrading beyond all names of degradation is the condition of the poor Clerk in orders.—He has spent the time which would have made him a scholar, the fortune which would have made him a gentleman, to obtain what the Church calls—the “so high a dignity” of the Christian priesthood—in which at last he finds himself like Bacon “the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind,” In spiritual office none so honourable, in the gloomy realities of life, none so wretched. He is assured that he has received the Holy Ghost, he has been told by his Bishop, that “whose sins he doth remit they are remitted and whose sins he doth retain, they are retained,” and yet, in passing from one diocese to another, He has to go begging a character for honesty and sobriety, and begging it from his greatest enemies, with humiliations that would be disdained by his Bishop’s footman.

“The dissention of a doit”, a proud and haughty Rector’s envy of his rival popularity, a want of sufficient conformity to the never-settled standard of *Petticoat-divinity* or to the new fangled Christianity of some new-made Bishop, a breath an any thing is sufficient to cause his ejection from his curacy. Nor can another be obtained, without humiliations to which no Gentleman could succumb. For 1st, (his *high dignity of priest-*

hood passing for nothing) he must have also, a licence.—2nd, he must produce a testimonium from the Bishop whose Diocese he is about to leave, of his orthodoxy; and every Bishop has an orthodoxy of his own!---- Archbishop Magee tells us, that Archbishop Tillotson was in damnable heresy,—and if his compliant conscience can bend to right reverend opiniatry;—He has 3dly, to procure also a testimonium from three beneficed clergymen, certifying that they have known him for the last three years, and approved his life and ministry. But how can a Curate on £70 a year in a country parish, be possibly known to three beneficed Clergymen, who from the very pride of their superior rank, look on poor Curates, as fellows of no reckoning, nor worthy to be known at all. Nor are there so many as *three* Rectors in one vicinity, any where to be found, who *bona fide* could concur in judgment as to what a Curate's life and ministry ought to be. One will condemn him for being Evangelical, another for being Moral. He is too gay for this, too strict for that. *Here*, he is suspected of a rampant Fanaticism, there, of a latitant Deism. Till Magee arose however, there was one poor possibility left, in the *lenient* administration of discipline, for the re-establishment of an ejected Clerk. He might seek and find, some clerical friend to introduce him, he might become acquainted with a congregation, before he definitively undertook

to become its minister. He might in the discharge of the sacred function from which he is bound by his ordination engagements "never to surcease," some times relieve his necessity, by the hard-earned wages of his occasional labour.

But this *now* mighty man, this "Great Child of Fortune", to whom the faith of Archbishop Tillotson, is heresy of doctrine, to whom the generosity of Archbishop Beresford, is laxity of discipline, dashing away this, abolishing that, forgetting from what he himself arose, makes his poor clergy wait like beggars in his hall, and only admits them to his presence, to make them feel, and tremble at his power. The poor Curate shall not earn a pound, but with his appointment, shall not read a prayer but with his licence", and even when that was requested, the mighty TIMUR BEC screamed like a vulture, "you sha'nt have it, and you *never* shall."

Let young men therefore, before they embark into the most humiliated of all professions, "sit down and count the cost". Half the fortune that they expend in their Collegiate course, to purchase the honour of laying *conscience*, and all, under a tyrant's foot, or being shewn a Bishop's door, might establish them in the far nobler and more independent rank of shoemakers or butchers.

APPENDIX.

REV. R. J. HOBSON'S LETTER TO MR. TAYLOR.

124, Baggot-Street, 6th August, 1822.

DEAR SIR.—According to my promise, I wrote to the Archdeacon of Dublin on Sunday, an opportunity occurring of enabling me to send my Letter on that night—and I have this moment received the Archdeacon's answer. I will here transcribe from his Letter as much of its contents as relates to you:—“I wish Mr. Taylor to call on the Archbishop, and let his Grace judge whether he is a proper person to take charge of Rathfarnham or not. I have every reason to think that he is a fit person, and well qualified to do the duty. I have this day (Monday) written to the Archbishop, and fear this information proceeded from some enemy to Maclean—I understand that Mr. Taylor was well liked last year, and that he is a well regulated Clergyman.” So far from the Archdeacon. I have only now to express my hope that you do not conceive in any way ill of me for acting as I did last Sunday—as by mistake, the Archbishop's letter was not forwarded to the Archdeacon, I feared the latter might, though it could only be until an explanation took place, fall under the displeasure of his Grace for not paying attention to his Letter. If you please you may in your interview with the Archbishop mention to his Grace that I heard you go through the greater part of the service; and that I had every reason, as I am certain must all who heard you have, to be pleased with your performance. Hoping the matter will terminate to your satisfaction, I remain, dear Sir,

Your obedient, humble Servant,

R. J. HOBSON.

(THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE'S LETTER)

Kilmany, Thomastown, Aug. 25, 1822.

SIR.—In answer to your Letter of the 15th Instant, I must inform you that I have no authority whatever to redress any complaint of an Ecclesiastical nature; and if you have any thing of a temporal character to alledge against his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, I cannot hear it through a private correspondence, but only judicially in Court. I must therefore request you may not give yourself the trouble of writing to me again.

I am, Sir,

Your humble Servant,

CHAS. BUSHE.

To the Rev. Robert Taylor.

(MR. GOULBURN'S LETTER.)

Dublin Castle, 26th August, 1822.

SIR.—I have received the commands of the Lord Lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of your Memorial of the 19th Inst. complaining that a Consistorial and Metropolitan Court had been holden in Dublin, by the Archbishop, and has enacted an inhibition against you—and expressing a hope that his Excellency may cause a repeal of this injurious measure. In reply, I am commanded to acquaint you, that his Excellency possesses no power of interfering with the process of the Ecclesiastical Courts, or with the measures which may emanate from them.

I am Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servt.

HENRY GOULBURN.

The Rev. Mr. Taylor, 32, Camden-Street.

FINIS.