

844  
Trinity College

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

REMARKS ON SOME STATEMENTS

ATTRIBUTED TO

THOMAS WYSE, ESQ., M. P.,

IN

HIS SPEECH IN PARLIAMENT

ON

ACADEMICAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND,

JULY 19TH, 1844.

BY

JAMES HENTHORN TODD, D.D., V.P.R.I.A.,

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

DUBLIN:

HODGES AND SMITH, GRAFTON-STREET,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

MDCCCXLIV.

1844



DUBLIN :  
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,  
BY M. H. GILL.

THE following remarks appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal* for October, 1844. They are now reprinted, in the hope of giving them a more extensive circulation, and also because it has been observed, that some of the statements commented upon have since been repeated by Mr. Wyse in a speech delivered at a public meeting in Cork.

TRIN. COLL. DUBLIN,  
Nov. 30, 1844.



# Houses of the Oireachtas



## REMARKS,

&c. &c.

---

To those who are familiarly acquainted with any subject, false statements respecting it often appear so absurd, that it seems like waste of time to attempt any formal refutation of them. But a little experience will soon convince us of the folly of allowing any falsehood to go abroad without doing all that is possible to contradict it. The history of the Irish Church, for the last few years at least, is a striking proof of this. The statements so often made in and out of Parliament about the supposed abuses of the Church of Ireland, the overgrown wealth of its benefices, its rich sinecures, and multifarious enormities, were the staple of many a newspaper article, and many an eloquent speech. The Parliamentary returns demonstrated the utter falsehood of the great majority of such calumnies—the Clergy and laity all knew them to be untrue; but, nevertheless, they were received as the real foundation of Acts of Parliament, and even to this day noble lords and honourable gentlemen get up in their places, and forgetting the very existence of Church 'Temporalities' Acts and Ecclesiastical Commissioners, suppression of Bishoprics, and Rent-charge commutation,



become eloquent in declamation against abuses that never existed, and petty sinecures that have ceased to be.

Taught, therefore, by experience, it is our duty to endeavour for the future to refute such false statements as are put forth with a view to undermine or alter the constitution of our ancient establishments; and although there may be but little hope that truth will prevail in opposition to political expediency, still it will be at least a satisfaction to reflect that falsehood has not been suffered to go uncontradicted.

For these reasons it may, perhaps, be advisable to point out some of the gross errors into which Mr. Wyse has fallen, in reference to the University of Dublin, in his late speech in Parliament on the subject of academic education in Ireland.

The motion of which the honourable member for Waterford gave notice on that occasion, suggested three measures for the attainment of his proposed object. The first of these was, "to open the emoluments and honours, as well as studies, of the University of Dublin, to Roman Catholics as well as Protestants:" the second was, "to raise the College of Maynooth to the dignity of a theological faculty of the said University:" and the third was, "to found and maintain a Roman Catholic University, with equal rank, endowments, and privileges, with those of the University of Dublin."

It is to the first of these proposals only that the following observations are intended to apply.

It is worded in such a manner as almost necessarily to mislead those who are unacquainted with the facts of the case. Who is there, for example, who heard Mr.



Wyse's motion, that would not at once infer that no emoluments, honours, or studies, were at present open to Roman Catholics in the University of Dublin? It is true that the phrase "as well as studies" may imply that the studies, at least, are open to them; but what reader, out of five hundred, who is not previously aware of the fact, will so understand it?

It is necessary, therefore, to make known, although it might seem to be sufficiently notorious already, that the *studies* of the University of Dublin are as open to Roman Catholics, and other dissenters, as they are to members of the Church. Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Independents, Quakers, nay, even Jews, may and do study there, and take degrees in Arts, and all other faculties whatsoever, except Theology, the only test of any kind, on admission to any degree, except in Theology, being the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty.

Again; the *honours* of the University of Dublin are as open to Roman Catholics, and other Dissenters, as they are to members of the Church. The annual prizes and honours awarded at the Term Examinations, the gold medals at the Degree Examinations, the Vice-Chancellor's Prizes, and every thing that can be called an *honour*, are as open as Mr. Wyse could desire.

But, then, the *emoluments*—the emoluments are the great aim, the main object of all this flourish about honours and studies,—why are not they equally open to all religions? It will, perhaps, surprise some readers to be told that very many of the *emoluments* of Trinity College are as open to Romanists and Protestant Dissenters as its honours and studies: all its emoluments,



in fact, except those which belong to the members of the Corporation as such,—a Corporation founded for the express purpose of promoting the education of the Clergy and Laity of the Church. The sizarships, which hold out to a young man a free education, with commons, and rooms either free of all charge, or for a very small annual rent; all exhibitions, and many of the minor offices, tenable by under-graduates,—these are all open to Roman Catholics, and other separatists from the Church; and many Roman Catholic students have held and do hold these emoluments with the most uncontrolled exercise of their religion(*a*).

What, then, do Mr. Wyse and his party require? The system of the University of Dublin is surely as liberal as can reasonably be desired: Roman Catholics may there obtain a complete University education; they may proceed to degrees in Arts, Law, Medicine—they may graduate with honours; they may obtain prizes, premiums, gold medals, exhibitions; if poor, or of limit-

(*a*) Doubts have been expressed whether certain professorships in the University are or are not, in the present state of the law, open to Roman Catholics. Mr. Wyse, in his late speech at a public meeting in Cork, takes for granted that they are, and accuses the heads of the University of direct injustice to Roman Catholics, because no person of that persuasion has ever yet been elected. His words are worth quoting, as a specimen of what may be expected, if ever the Corporation of the College should be opened to members of that religion; he says: "The professorships in a very limited degree are open to [Roman] Catholics; but I understand that when a re-election does occur, every seventh year, the choice is always restricted to Protestants, and therefore a direct injustice, in so far, is done to [Roman] Catholics."—*Southern Reporter*, Nov. 14, 1844.



ed means, sizarships are as open to them as to any other students; they are entitled to a vote in the University, and exercise their franchise as freely as other graduates, —and yet Mr. Wyse has the assurance to tell Her Majesty that she has as yet made “no provision” for the University education of her Roman Catholic subjects in Ireland.

It is true the fellowships and scholarships of Trinity College are not open to Roman Catholics, nor to Protestant Dissenters; because they were founded for the education of our clergy, and to admit to them separatists from our communion, would be to defeat the object of their foundation. Yet it is quite evident that nothing will satisfy the Romish party but the possession of these offices, and *the power* which they may confer. Education, and the means of education, they already possess, as fully and as amply as we do—no attempt has ever been made to proselytize, or to interfere with their religious opinions in any way whatsoever(*b*),—but this will not

Does Mr. Wyse expect the University to elect Roman Catholics to any office that may be open to them, even though no Roman Catholic should happen to be a candidate? Can he mention a single instance in which a Roman Catholic was ever a candidate for any of the professorships to which he alludes? And are we to understand, that if any professorship or other office should hereafter be opened to Roman Catholics, the heads of the University are not to be at liberty to decide in favour of any other candidate, however superior in qualifications, without exposing themselves to the charge of doing “direct injustice” to “Catholics?”

(*b*) In justice to Mr. Wyse, it should be stated that this is admitted by him in the fullest manner. In his late speech, at a public meeting in Cork, he is reported to have said: “I was educated



content them, so long as the government of the University, and the administration of its funds, remain in the hands of Churchmen;—so long as this is the case, the University is not “*open*” to Roman Catholics in the sense, the only sense, which will ever satisfy Mr. Wyse’s party; whose real object, however it may be masked under a pretended anxiety for education, is nothing else but *power and spoliation*; a desire of obtaining possession of that which does not, and never did, belong to them.

For the pretence so commonly employed in the case of other Church property does not apply to the endowments of the University of Dublin. Our cathedral and parochial endowments, they tell the world, belonged to them before the Reformation; and this seeming argument has such an appearance of plausibility, that many who ought to be better informed, are carried away by its sophistry. But in the case of the University of Dublin such a pretence is not sophistry, but falsehood; the fellowships and scholarships of Trinity College had no existence before the Reformation; they were founded, and their endowments created, since the Reforma-

in that University [Dublin] myself—I find its recollections, in many instances, twine around my heart with the dearest remembrances of my earliest years. I have never forgotten the friendships of its Fellows, and of its students—nor can there be ever obliterated from my recollection the stimulus of honourable ambition that existed, and the feeling of generous rivalry that was inspired between student and student; and I feel here bound further to state, a Roman Catholic myself, that I never had to complain of any interference from the Institution with respect to my religious opinions.”—*Southern Reporter*, Nov. 14, 1844.



tion; they were founded in the *latter end* of the sixteenth century, for the express purpose of supplying the Church—the Reformed Church—with an educated and a learned clergy; and there is, therefore, no pretence, or allegation of their ever having belonged to Roman Catholics at all;—for the best possible reason, because it is notorious that they never did.

But Mr. Wyse, in his late speech in Parliament, is reported to have invented a sophism in order to meet this difficulty, and to furnish Roman Catholics with the same sort of vague hereditary claim to the endowments of the University, which they have so long sought to put forward to the endowments of the Church. In the report of his speech, published by the *Times* of July 20, 1844, the following words are put into his mouth :

“The University was generally supposed to have been founded by Elizabeth. Strictly speaking, it undoubtedly was; but that foundation was only an atonement for the destruction of the old University of Ireland. The old University of Ireland was founded in the year 1312, by John Archbishop of Dublin. After a few years that University became tolerably richly endowed. At the period of the confiscation of monasteries, this University, which was then established for the education of Catholics, fell, and Ireland remained without Universities till the time of Elizabeth, when, in consequence of the interference of Sir H. Sydney, Elizabeth was induced to found the present University for the education of the youth of Ireland, without reference to their creed.”

In answer to this singular tissue of mistakes and misstatements, it is only necessary to remind the reader, if he have any acquaintance whatsoever with Irish history, 1. That there never was any endowed University in



Ireland before the time of Elizabeth. 2. That consequently no such University was ever destroyed by Elizabeth or any body else, nor did any University, rich or poor, fall at the dissolution of monasteries. And 3. That the statement that the present University of Dublin was founded by Queen Elizabeth for the youth of Ireland, *without any reference to their creed*, is as false in fact, as it is absurd in history.

These are the historical errors upon which Mr. Wyse has rested his cause, and which, as the reader will perceive, have been wrought into the argument just quoted. The foundation of the University of Dublin by Queen Elizabeth (Mr. Wyse assures us) was only an atonement for "the destruction" of the old University of Ireland! Of course Mr. Wyse was not so ignorant as to imagine that Queen Elizabeth destroyed the old University, and erected a new one as an atonement; the words may seem to bear this meaning, but it is hardly fair to press a speaker with consequences drawn from the wording of a newspaper report of his speech. He goes on, however, to say, that the old University was founded in 1312, and "after a few years became *tolerably richly endowed*." That at the suppression of monasteries, these rich endowments were confiscated, simply because they were intended for the education of "Catholics;" and that then the University consequently "fell." It was Henry the Eighth, therefore, not Elizabeth, who, according to this statement, "destroyed" the old University, for it was by him the monasteries were suppressed; but Elizabeth, it seems, was seized with qualms of conscience for the sacrilege of her royal predecessor, and so, "as an



atonement," she was "induced to found the present University for the education of the youth of Ireland, *without reference to their creed.*"

It is difficult to know where to begin in attempting to point out the complication of errors brought together in this extraordinary piece of history. But the reader will not fail to notice what is the main drift and conclusion of the whole, namely, that the old University was established for the education of "Catholics," (i. e. *Roman Catholics*, as Mr. Wyse intends), and that Queen Elizabeth's University was founded for the education of the youth of Ireland "*without reference to their creed.*"

With this latter statement, therefore, let us begin, for its utter falsehood will be easily pointed out.

It is really marvellous how an educated man, as Mr. Wyse is, could utter such an absurdity, or an educated body, like the House of Commons, listen to it with common patience. The Roman Catholics in the reign of Elizabeth, considered as a *religious* body, conformed very generally to the Church; those who did not were considered by her, and by the law, in no other light than as *traitors*, who denied not only the Queen's supremacy, but also her legitimacy, and consequently her right to the throne. Will any one who has ever read a word of history, or who knows anything of Elizabeth's government, be made to believe, that in 1591 she could have established an University for the education of those who maintained that she was illegitimate, that she was actually deposed, and her subjects released from their allegiance, by Papal authority, and that she had, in fact,



no legal right to her crown. Yet these were the characteristic tenets of the Romish sect in Elizabeth's reign.

Other Roman Catholic politicians have always represented Elizabeth as the bitter enemy of their sect, the bigoted persecutor of their faith, and the originator of the penal laws, enacted for its suppression. It remained for Mr. Wyse to discover, that Elizabeth, on the contrary, was a very pattern of moderation; that she had anticipated even modern doctrines of toleration, and founded universities for the benefit of those who denied her legitimacy, and denounced her as an usurper.

But we are not left to any general presumptions respecting the intentions of Queen Elizabeth in this matter; for in 1560, the second year of her reign, an Act was passed in the Irish Parliament, in which it was enacted, that all persons holding ecclesiastical preferment, or "any temporal or laye office, ministrie or service" shall take the oath of the Queen's supremacy, on pain of losing their preferment or office(c); and in particular it was further enacted [sect. 10], that "all and every person or persons taking orders, and all and every person or persons which shall be promoted or preferred *to any degree of learning in any universitie that hereafter shall bee within this realm,*" shall, before taking such orders, or being preferred to such degree, take and receive the said oath of supremacy.

From this it appears, that in the foundation of the University of Dublin, the Queen and her advisers could never have contemplated the admission of all persons to

(c) 2 Eliz. cap. 1, sects. 7, *et seq.*



its studies and emoluments, without regard to their religious opinions, since, on the contrary, it was at that time distinctly provided by the Statute law of the land, that no Romanist, holding the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy, could be admitted to any preferment or office, or to any University degree.

It is manifest, therefore, that the Elizabethan University of Dublin was founded for the youth of Ireland, *with most special reference to their creed.*

But to return to the history of the older University, which Mr. Wyse tells us was richly endowed. It was destroyed, he says, by the suppression of monasteries, although he does not explain how the suppression of *monasteries* implies or requires the destruction of an *University*. Monasteries were suppressed in England as well as in Ireland, and yet the universities of England remain as they were before. All this talk, however, about the endowments of the older University, is a mistake. The University founded in 1311, by a Bull of Pope Clement V. (*d*), at the suggestion of John Lech, Archbishop of Dublin, fell entirely to the ground at the death of that prelate in 1313. In 1320, his successor, Alexander de Bicknor, revived the project, and procured another Bull from Pope John XXII., authorizing the foundation of a new University, and confirming the Statutes which the Archbishop had drawn up for its government (*e*).

(*d*) See the Bull, printed from Abp. Alan's Regist. in Mason's Hist. of St. Patrick's, Append. No. vii. Harris's Edit. of Ware's Antiquities, p. 242.

(*e*) See Mason, History of St. Patrick's, book i. chap. 14, note (*a*), and Append. vii. p. 243.



Nothing, however, can be more certain than that this University, also, instead of becoming "richly endowed," came to nothing very shortly after, for want of an endowment. Of this fact there is the most abundant and satisfactory evidence. John Clyn, a Franciscan friar of Kilkenny, who died about the year 1349, and whose testimony is therefore in every way unexceptionable, thus speaks of this University, in his Annals of Ireland :

"1320. Incepit Universitas Dubliniæ; *universitas quoad nomen, sed utinam quoad factum et rem.*"

From this it appears, first, that the University founded by Archbishop Lech in 1311, had so entirely perished in its birth, that it was not so much as mentioned by this annalist as having ever been in existence. The University of Dublin, he expressly says, *began* in 1320. And, secondly, that even Archbishop Bicknor's University, at a distance of less than thirty years from its foundation, was only a University *in name*.

Again, after the lapse of a century, we find this University in the same condition, if not absolutely extinct; for in 1465, at a Parliament held at Drogheda, an Act was passed to establish an University in that city, which also came to nought for want of funds. This Statute begins by declaring that there was then no University in the kingdom of Ireland :

"Item a la requisition des communes, *Que pour ce que la terre d'Ireland a nulle Université, ne Estude generale dans la mesme, &c.*"(f)

(f) See Ware, *ubi supra*, p. 245. The original of this Statute is in the Rolls of Chancery, 5 Edw. IV. cap 46.



It is clear, therefore, that at this time the University of Dublin, a century and a-half after its foundation, had not yet acquired those ample endowments which Mr. Wyse has assigned to it. The fact is, that it never had any endowments whatsoever. Consequently it does not appear that there was ever any great resort of students to it, or that any efficient courses of lectures were for any length of time kept up, notwithstanding two or three attempts to procure funds for this purpose(*g*).

Certain, however, it is, that in 1475 this University had so entirely ceased to be, that its very memory seems to have well nigh perished; for in that year the mendicant orders besought the Pope's license for founding a University in Dublin(*h*). Their request was granted, and the Bull which they obtained from Sixtus IV., the then reigning Pontiff, is still extant(*i*). It recites, as the ground of the petition presented by the religious orders, that at that time there was *no University* in Ireland:—"quod in dicta insula . . . *nullum* viget studium generale, in quo magistri et doctores legere, et scholares proficere possint;" and then goes on to decree the foundation of an University in Dublin, to have all the powers and privileges, and to be governed by the same Statutes, as the University of Oxford.

(*g*) Thus Lionel Duke of Clarence, in 1364, granted a rent-charge on an acre of land at Stackallan, in the county of Meath, and the advowson of the church there, for the maintenance of a divinity lecture; Dublin Univ. Calendar for 1833, pp. 14, 15. Harris's Ware, p. 245.

(*h*) In Bullario Ord. Prædicatorum, tom. iii. p. 525, and tom. viii. p. 462, as quoted by De Burgo, Hib. Dominicana, p. 193.

(*i*) De Burgo, Hib. Dominicana, p. 85.



At present, however, we are only concerned with the fact, that this document, which is dated "5 Kal. Maii. 1475," declares that there was then no University in Dublin, and proceeds to erect one, without any allusion whatsoever to any former similar institution. We may conclude therefore, with certainty, from all these considerations, that Archbishop Bicknor's University was long before extinct, and consequently could have had no such ample endowments as Mr. Wyse has imagined, at the time of the suppression of monasteries by King Henry VIII.(j)

(j) See additional evidence of this in Mr. Hardiman's Statute of Kilkenny (published for the Irish Archæological Society), where he says, p. 129, note <sup>k</sup>, speaking of an Act of 1410: "From this and the last Act of the present Parliament [1410], ch. 24, it may be concluded, that the University projected by John Lech, Archbishop of Dublin, in A. D. 1311, and established in Dublin by Archbishop Bicknor, in A. D. 1320, had been extinguished at the time of passing these Acts, in A. D. 1410. This may account for the concourse of Irish scholars to Oxford in A. D. 1422, as appears by the English Act of that year, before quoted, p. 24, note <sup>n</sup>. The subsequent attempt to found a University in Drogheda, A. D. 1465, also failed (see the Act for that purpose, in Harris's Ware, vol. ii. p. 245), and Irish students were again obliged to resort to Oxford. In the Parliament held at Dublin, A. D. 1475, 15, 16 Edw. IV. was passed the following Act. 60. 'Likewise at the prayer of Richard, abbot of the House of St. Thomas the Martyr, near Dublin, and James Aylmer: Whereas John Walter, parson of Mullahudart, hath given and granted to the said abbot and James, all manner of tithes and alterages belonging to the said parsonage, by his deed, bearing date the first day of November, in the thirteenth year of our Sovereign Lord that now is, to have and to hold to the said abbot and James, for a term of twenty years then next ensuing, in perfect confidence that the said abbot and James should give,



The University of Pope Sixtus shared the same fate. His Bull provided it with no endowments<sup>(k)</sup>; and we have the testimony of the learned De Burgo, titular Bishop of Ossory at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and author of the *Hibernia Dominicana*, that no buildings were ever erected, and that this University, in fact, never had any other existence than the *vox et præterea nihil* of a Papal Bull.

It is unnecessary to pursue any further the history of these transactions, since it must be now sufficiently obvious that the whole story of an endowed University, —or any University at all, endowed or not endowed,—which was confiscated and destroyed at the suppression of monasteries, is an absolute fiction; and consequently, that the argument, if it be an argument, which Mr. Wyse would found upon such a misrepresentation of history, must fall to the ground.

yearly, to one James Maddock, six marks, until the said James should be promoted to a competent benefice, who is at *Oxford* studying at the University, and by the grace of God purposes to be a Doctor of Divinity; whereupon the premises considered, *forasmuch as there are but few in this land who are able to teach or preach the word of God*, it is ordained, granted and adjudged, by authority of the said Parliament, that the said James Maddock shall have the said six marks yearly, of the said tithes and alterages, until he be promoted to a competent benefice; and that the incumbent, for the time being, shall have the residue of the said tithes and alterages, any resignation or change of the said parson notwithstanding.'—Orig. Roll."

(k) In 1496, in a synod held in Christ Church, the bishops and clergy of the province of Dublin taxed themselves for the support of this University; but this was insufficient; Harris's Ware, loc. cit.



The Elizabethan University of Dublin was a new foundation, established for the express purpose of promoting "learning, civility, and loyalty(*l*)," and of providing the Reformed Church with a learned and efficient ministry. The design was first proposed in the Irish Parliament, under the government of Sir Henry Sydney, who offered a donation of £100 in money, and an endowment of £20 a-year in land, as a contribution towards the foundation. But this came to nothing. The excellent plan also, which was next suggested by Sir John Perrott in 1585, of endowing the University out of the revenues of St. Patrick's Cathedral, was also defeated, through the influence of Archbishop Loftus, who had other views, it is said, for the disposal of the Cathedral lands(*m*).

Queen Elizabeth, therefore, is the real and only founder of the University of Dublin. To her we owe the charter which incorporated the College of the Holy Trinity, enabled it to confer degrees in the several faculties, and licensed the grant of a site which was made to it, at the instance of Archbishop Loftus, by the mayor and citizens of Dublin. But still it must be confessed, that very little progress was made in Elizabeth's reign towards the permanent establishment of the University, and its real efficiency as a place of education. The Queen's endowment lay in Ulster, at that time the seat of Tyrone's rebellion, and consequently

(*l*) These are the words of Sir John Perrot's proposal for the foundation of an University in Dublin. Dub. Univ. Calendar for 1833, p. 23.

(*m*) See Dublin University Calendar for 1833, pp. 21-23.



the lands there produced no rent, and were *for upwards of a century of no value whatsoever*. An attempt, indeed, was made to raise funds, soon after its foundation, by asking voluntary contributions from the gentry; and a letter was issued from the Privy Council, authorizing proper persons in all parts of Ireland to receive subscriptions for the purpose(*n*); but this attempt was a signal failure; the contributions produced but an inconsiderable sum, and the greater part of what appears to have been promised was never paid. Accordingly, in 1601, the College was "in danger to be dissolved" for want of funds, and was only kept in existence by a concordatum of £200 per annum granted it by the Queen. Her successor also, King James I., gave lands out of the forfeited estates for the further endowment of the College; but these lands were also of but little value for a considerable period, and more than one instance occurs in the annals of the University in which the election of Fellows and Scholars was deferred, in consequence of the poverty of the College(*o*).

The Charter of Elizabeth, however, has since been confirmed by a subsequent Charter and body of Statutes granted by King Charles I.; which must be taken as the true exposition of the will of the founder, as to the admission of Roman Catholics and other Dissenters to the corporate rights of the College. If, therefore, there could be any doubt of the real intentions of Queen

(*n*) See this letter in the Dublin Univ. Calendar for 1833, pp. 29–31; and Harris's Ware, Antiq. p. 248.

(*o*) See Dublin Univ. Calendar for 1834, in the list of Fellows and Scholars at the years 1664, 1666, 1694.



Elizabeth in this matter, it would be removed not only by considering who the Provosts and Fellows appointed during her reign were, but also by the fact, that the Charter and Statutes granted to the College by her successor have fully interpreted her meaning, and must be considered in law as the expression of the founder's will. Now, in Elizabeth's time not a single Roman Catholic was admitted either to a fellowship or scholarship in the College, which could hardly be the case if, as Mr. Wyse hints, she had intended to admit them; on the contrary, the University was filled by her with those whose opinions were most violently opposed to Romanists, and the first Provost and Fellows were of the party known by the name of Puritans(*p*). In the reign of Charles I. the Act of 2 Eliz., already referred to, which excluded from University degrees all who refused the oath of supremacy, still continued in force; and Statutes were drawn up in 1637, which leave no doubt as to the intentions of the Crown respecting the admission into the College of Romanists or Dissenters from the Church.

(*p*) It may suffice, in proof of this statement, to mention, that the first Provost of the College, elected by the votes of the then Fellows, was Walter Travers, the well known opponent of Hooker, and a noted leader of the Puritan party.—See *Strype, Life of Whitgift*, p. 173. Travers was succeeded in the Provostship, A. D. 1601, by Henry Alvey, who was also elected by the Fellows, and was also a zealous Puritan.—See *Brooke's Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 85. In Alvey's Deed of Appointment, which is still extant, these words occur: "Noverint universi, &c., . . . . quod . . . . Magister Henricus Alvey, votis Sociorum Collegii publicisque regni literis vocatus et invitatus fuit, nobis ejusdem Collegii sociis et Prælectoribus consentientibus suffectus sit." By which it appears, that his appointment had the full sanction of the government.



In the oath of a Fellow, prescribed by these Statutes, there is the following clause :

“ Ego G. C. electus in numerum Sociorum hujus Collegii, sancte coram Deo profiteor, me Sacræ Scripturæ auctoritatem in religione summam agnoscere, et quæcunque in sancto Dei verbo continentur, vere et ex animo credere, et pro facultate mea omnibus opinionibus, quas vel Pontificii, vel alii contra sacræ Scripturæ veritatem tuentur, constanter repugnaturum. Quod ad regiam auctoritatem attinet, serenissimi nunc regis *Caroli*, eam secundum Deum summam in regnis Angliæ, Scotiæ, et Hiberniæ esse agnosco, et *nullius externi principis aut pontificis potestati obnoxiam.*”

Such an oath, it is presumed, no Roman Catholic could *honestly* take; and the same may be said of the Scholar's oath, in which there is the following clause :

“ Ego N. N. electus in numerum Discipulorum hujus Collegii, sancte coram Deo profiteor, me regiam auctoritatem serenissimi nunc regis *Caroli* secundum Deum summam esse in regnis Angliæ, Scotiæ, et Hiberniæ, et *nullius externi principis, aut pontificis, potestati obnoxiam.*”

Where it is to be observed that the Scholars, being all in *statu pupillari*, are not required to take the oath declaring the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, nor are they made to pledge themselves to resist heretical opinions : but (in strict accordance with the Act of 2 Elizabeth) both Scholars and Fellows are required to take the oath against the Papal supremacy(*q*).

(*q*) These oaths are still both in force. It should be mentioned here, that by the Statutes which were in operation prior to the year 1637, Scholars and Fellows were required to take the same oath, in which they declared their faith in the supreme au-



In the Statutes of Charles also there is the following clause, which, it is presumed, will be sufficient to satisfy even Mr. Wyse that Romanists were then inadmissible :

“ Porro Præpositi et Sociorum seniorum erit videre, ne qua *Pontificiæ, aut hæreticæ religionis* opinio intra Collegii fines alatur, aut propugnetur, sive privatim. Quod si acciderit, volumus, ut quam primum impiæ opinionis progressus intercipiatur. Præterea nemo in Sociorum numerum eligatur, qui *Pontificiæ religioni*, quatenus a Catholica et orthodoxa dissentit, et Romani Pontificis jurisdictioni per solenne, et publicum juramentum non renuntiaverit(*r*).”

By the Statutes of 1637, therefore (which in this respect are only a transcript of the older Statutes), not only were Roman Catholics excluded from fellowships

thority of Holy Scripture, and renounced the Papal supremacy, in the very words of the oath now required of Fellows only, as quoted above. Both were also required to swear, “*Studiorum finis erit mihi Theologia, ut Ecclesiæ Dei prodesse possim, obeundo Ministerio verbi;*” which clearly shews that, by the original foundation of the College, scholarships as well as fellowships were intended exclusively for those who were afterwards to take holy orders in the Reformed Church. This is a further proof, if further proof were needed, of the falsehood of the statement, that the foundations of Trinity College were intended “for the youth of Ireland, *without reference to their creed.*” The clause making it the duty of the Provost and Senior Fellows to banish from the College Popery and heresy, occurs in the old Statutes *verbatim* as in those of Charles I., with the difference of but one word : “ Porro Præpositi et Sociorum Seniorum erit videre, ne qua *Pontificiæ aut alterius hæreticæ religionis,*” &c. A copy of these original Statutes, in the autograph of Bishop Bedell, is preserved among the MSS. of the College.

(*r*) Statut. cap. ix.



and scholarships, but they were excluded from the college itself; they could not be admitted *even as students* without a full conformity to the Church. *All* students were assumed to be members of the Church, and were, therefore, required to attend Divine service in the College chapel; “*Si quis studentium a precibus abfuerit, puniatur, quemadmodum aliis deinceps statutis præscribetur.*”

It is true an Act of Parliament, long subsequent (1793), has authorized the admission of Roman Catholic students to receive an university education, and to proceed to the usual degrees: but the very same Act has continued their inadmissibility into the *corporation* of the College, and particularly declared their ineligibility to fellowships; nor has the king's letter, which released the Provost and Fellows from their former obligations to exclude Roman Catholic students from education, made any relaxation of this part of the Statutes, further than to admit Roman Catholics to take degrees without the oath of supremacy(*s*).

It is hoped, therefore, that these observations will suffice to convince the reader that neither Elizabeth nor Charles ever intended to foster by collegiate endowments a religion which imposes upon its followers an allegiance to a foreign power, and therefore was then regarded as necessarily inconsistent with a full and unconditional loyalty to the crown of these realms(*t*).

(*s*) 33 Geo. III. c. 21, sect. 13, and Lit. Pat. 34 Geo. III. (Statutes of Trin. Coll. Dublin, new edit. pp. 206, 270).

(*t*) To the foregoing considerations it may be added, that the constitution of the College is of itself a sufficient proof that its



It would be quite at variance with the design of the foregoing observations if anything that has been said should be interpreted as charging Mr. Wyse with intentional unfairness or dishonesty. On the contrary, the writer is willing to give him credit for the best and purest motives. But Mr. Wyse is carried away by his zeal for promoting the interests of the political and religious party to which he belongs, and has received, perhaps from others, but certainly without due examination, the gross historical mistakes on which he is reported to have built his arguments. It may be quite fair in Mr. Wyse to ask for endowments for his own religion, and to seek the advancement of his party by all *lawful* means. No person could very much blame him for this, however

Royal Founders could never have contemplated the possibility of Roman Catholics being admitted to fellowships. For the whole government of the College is vested in the Provost and Senior Fellows; to them belong the patronage of the College livings, and other places of trust and emolument, the admission of students to degrees, and the whole management of the property and funds of the College. Now, if Roman Catholics were admissible to fellowships, they must necessarily become Senior Fellows, because they could not go out on livings, and therefore would naturally remain in the College. Hence, if there should happen to be many Roman Catholic Fellows, the Board might, and most probably would, become wholly or in great part composed of Roman Catholics; and therefore the University patronage, as well as the management of the funds of the College, would come to be vested in Roman Catholics—an evil that could not fail to have been guarded against, had it been possible, under the original constitution of the College; and we find a similar evil provided against in the case of lay Fellows, by limiting their number to three. It is manifest, therefore, that fellowships were not intended for the youth of Ireland “without reference to their creed.”



much one might fear his politics, or dislike his religion. But he has no right to lay claim to the endowments which were intended by those who originally created and bestowed them, for the education of *our* clergy, and the maintenance of *our* Church; still less is he justified in attempting to support his claims by arguments based on pure fiction, misrepresentations of history, and a distortion of the plainest facts.

At all events let us hope that the Legislature of this country will never be persuaded to consent to so gross a violation of all the rights of property. Such a measure, let them be assured, will be a fatal blow to all charitable and religious foundations, if not even the will of our pious Sovereigns is to be held sacred from future alteration. Such a measure will shake the security of all landed property in Ireland: for what title is secure, if arguments like those of Mr. Wyse are suffered to have weight? Such a measure will be a prelude and a precedent for similar claims on the endowments of the Universities of England, and will most certainly and speedily be followed by the advancement of such claims. If the corporate offices and government of the University of Dublin are thrown open to Romanists and other Dissenters, it will be monstrously unjust and impolitic to refuse them admission to the corporation and government of Oxford and Cambridge. In Dublin they have not a shadow of pretence to make such a claim. Here there are no endowments which once were in the hands of "Catholics," and were transferred by Act of Parliament to "Protestants." If these endowments, created since the Reformation, and for the promotion of the



Reformation, are now to be handed over to Roman Catholics, on what grounds can the endowments of Oxford and Cambridge be defended from a similar alienation? The argument, so far as it is an argument, will apply to the English Universities with infinitely greater force; and the minister of the Crown, who should dream of advising Her Majesty to open the fellowships and scholarships of the University of Dublin to Roman Catholics and Dissenters, must be prepared to open the fellowships and scholarships of Oxford and Cambridge to Dissenters also. The one must be the necessary consequence of the other: *principle* can be no longer pleaded, the question must then become one of time and expediency only.

THE END.