

**POPERY IN ALLIANCE WITH HEATHENISM:  
LETTERS PROVING THAT WHERE THE BIBLE IS  
WHOLLY UNKNOWN, AS IN THE HEATHEN  
WORLD, OR ONLY PARTIALLY KNOWN, AS  
IN THE ROMISH CHURCH, IDOLATRY AND  
SUPERSTITION ARE INEVITABLE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649676828

Popery in Alliance with Heathenism: Letters Proving That Where the Bible Is Wholly Unknown, as in the Heathen World, or Only Partially Known, as in the Romish Church, Idolatry and Superstition Are Inevitable by John Poynder

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**JOHN POYNDER**

**POPERY IN ALLIANCE WITH HEATHENISM:  
LETTERS PROVING THAT WHERE THE BIBLE IS  
WHOLLY UNKNOWN, AS IN THE HEATHEN  
WORLD, OR ONLY PARTIALLY KNOWN, AS  
IN THE ROMISH CHURCH, IDOLATRY AND  
SUPERSTITION ARE INEVITABLE**



**POPERY**  
IN  
**ALLIANCE WITH HEATHENISM:**  
**LETTERS**  
PROVING THAT WHERE  
**THE BIBLE IS WHOLLY UNKNOWN,**  
AS IN THE HEATHEN WORLD,  
**OR ONLY PARTIALLY KNOWN,**  
AS IN THE ROMISH CHURCH,  
**IDOLATRY AND SUPERSTITION ARE INEVITABLE.**

By **JOHN POYNDER, Esq.**



"..... Ubi passim  
" Palantes error certo de tramite pellit ;  
" Ille sinistrorsum, hic dextrorsum abit ; unus utrique  
" Error, sed variis illudit partibus....."

Hon.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON :  
**J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY ;**  
**SEELEY AND SONS, FLEET-STREET ;**  
AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1835.

779.

## C O N T E N T S.

---

LETTER	PAGE
1. On the Use of Incense, and Holy Water . . .	17
2. On the Lights burnt in Pagan and Papal Temples; and the Votive Offerings of Heathenism and Popery . . .	21
3. On the Votive Offerings of Heathenism and Popery. (Continued.) . . . . .	26
4. On the Alliance between the Deities of Paganism, and the Saints of Popery . . . . .	30
5. On the Conformity between Heathen Deification, and Romish Canonization . . . . .	34
6. On the Alliance between the Image Worship of Hea- thenism and of Popery . . . . .	36
7. A Refutation of the Papist's Assertion that Images are not Worshipped, but only used as Aids to Devotion . . .	42
8. On the Alliance between the Artifices of the Pagan and Papal Priests in supporting the Credit of their Idols . . .	48
9. On the Conformity between the Prodigies of Heathenism, and the Miracles of Popery . . . . .	54
10. On the Identity of the Refuge, or Protection afforded to Criminals under the Pagan and Papal systems—the similarity of the two Priesthoods, and of the Religious Orders and Fraternities of Heathenism and Popery . . .	59
11. On the Conformity between the Religious Processions of the Heathens, and those of the Papists . . . . .	64

LETTER	PAGE
12. On the Agreement between the Water Idolatry of the Heathens and the Papists . . . . .	67
13. The same subject continued . . . . .	72
14. On the Conformity between Purgatory and Transubstantiation . . . . .	76
15. On the Identity of Heathen and Romish Pilgrimages . . . . .	81
16. On the Alliance between the perpetual Sacrifices of Heathenism, and the perpetual Sacrifice of the Mass . . . . .	87
17. On the Agreement between Heathen and Romish Exorcism . . . . .	96
18. The Agreement between Heathen and Romish Exorcism further considered, with a Refutation of the pretended Continuance of this and other Miracles in the Church of Rome . . . . .	99
19. On the analogous Nature of the Expiation of Sin, by Money, in the Heathen and Romish Churches, and the Analogy between other Pagan and Papal Atonements for Sin—the Conformity between the Stories of the Pagan Deities and the Romish Saints—between the Ancient and Modern Idolatry in producing actual Vice—between Abstinence from Food in the two Systems—and between the supreme Power of the respective Priesthoods . . . . .	105
20. Concluding Reflections on the preceding Facts . . . . .	113

## P R E F A C E

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

IN sending a second Edition of this little work to press, the writer would gladly, in compliance with the suggestion of more than one friend, have altered the epithet of "POPERY," in the title-page, as designating the Roman Catholic religion, had he not deemed it, upon mature consideration, more correct to retain the former term, for the following reasons. First, that in employing that word, he only follows all those who have appeared on the side of the Protestant faith, ever since a protest was made against the errors of the Romish creed. Until, therefore, it can be shown that Cicero was mistaken, when he said, "Magister optimus est Usus," the value of precedent will perhaps be allowed its proper weight. Secondly, in turning to the definition of Dr. Johnson, we find that "Popery" is described by that accurate etymologist, as "the religion of the Church of Rome." Now, until the members of that church can shew that Popery is not the religion of the Church of Rome, but some other religion, it is clear that no wrong is done them by the application of the term; and if it be not competent to *them* to dispute this title, then how much less right have any members of our own church to suggest that injury is inflicted in the case in question! If the members of the Church of Rome



be any thing else than Papists, they then renounce, *ipso facto*, the authority of the Pope, but so long as they continue to acknowledge him, either for their civil or ecclesiastical head, so long are they Papists, and so long is Popery their religion, as Dr. Johnson expressly defines it to be. Thirdly, if, in compliance with modern liberality, or rather with the affectation of it, Protestants were now to change this designation, it is obvious that such circumstance would not affect any existing fact, or alter the nature of things, since it would be still as true that the members of the Romish church either acknowledge allegiance to its temporal head, or are found in alliance with its spiritual head, notwithstanding that certain members of our own church may prefer to suppress all recognition, both of the one and the other connexion. For these reasons, I cannot but prefer the original term by which our Protestant ancestors (who were at least as well informed on this subject as ourselves) agreed to designate the religion of the church of Rome.

It is still, however, with the most anxious and sincere desire for the best, and highest, interests of the Romish laity, that I would entreat them to consider how far the unqualified deference paid by them, not merely to a man like themselves, but to one whom the Holy Scriptures characterise as eminently "the man of sin," and whom all history agrees in proving to have remarkably deserved that title, from the beginning—how far, I say, such implicit deference to human authority can consist with the allegiance due to the only Lord and Saviour, who is the head over all things to his church; how far the erection of tradition into an equal rank with the express revelation of God, can consist with the exclusive reverence, which is claimed by the Almighty for the inspired oracles of divine truth; and whether the single fact of these records of eternal life being kept from the people at large, to this very hour, by the authority of any man, or set of men, does not, of itself, demonstrate, beyond all dispute, an unsound and indefensible state of things, which dreads and deprecates inquiry,

as depending for its continued existence upon the extent of the darkness and ignorance which may prevail in the world, reminding us of a passage in that accurate observer of human nature, Shakspeare—

—————“ We of th' offending side  
 “ Must keep aloof from strict arbitrament,  
 “ And stop all sight-holes, every loop from whence  
 “ The eye of reason may pry in upon us.”

Unwilling to offer the slightest offence, by any single term, or phrase, which it might be possible, consistently with truth, to expunge, or modify, I beg unequivocally to assure my fellow-subjects, of the Romish laity, that I feel the most sincere affection for their persons, while I entertain no respect for their system—that I view, with the deepest commiseration, that spiritual bondage in which they continue to be held; while I can entertain no such sympathy for those “blind guides” who presume to exact an obedience for which they can shew no warrant from Scripture, and no justification, on the ground of right reason, or common sense. Let them only once resolve to judge for themselves, and to take the Scriptures of truth as their guides, and they will at once throw off the yoke from which it was the glory of our own Reformation to deliver us. It is evident that there is no extent of doctrinal error denounced by our blessed Lord as upholding the spiritual dominion of the interpreters of his law in the Jewish church, which does not, with equal, or greater, force apply to the ecclesiastical professors of his gospel in the church of Rome; and if this fact required confirmation, the late complete exposure by the Irish Protestant clergy, in the British metropolis, of the anti-scriptural casuistry long taught in the United Kingdom, with the sanction of episcopal and sacerdotal authority, would abundantly establish it.\*

\* I allude to the two celebrated meetings at Exeter Hall, in London, on the 20th of June, and 11th of July, 1835, at which Lord Kenyon presided.

It is really painful to reflect, that notwithstanding the boasted light of the present age, so many persons who are respectable and amiable in all the relations of life, should deliver themselves up, as if divested of their eyes and ears, to the usurped dominion of the Papal hierarchy, when the slightest attention to the primitive institution of Christianity, would reveal to them the Saviour of sinners in all his fulness, requiring no mediators by whom he is to be approached, but able and willing—as the one only mediator between an offended God, and his guilty creatures—to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them—inviting all, without exception, or restriction, to take of the water of life freely, and proposing to our faith that single sacrifice, and those transcendent merits, as alone atoning for sin, and justifying the offender, which all the institutions and ceremonies of the papal church, tend only to obscure, and invalidate.

Nor let it be supposed that this attempt to be useful to the laity of the Romish church, is the act of an enemy, rather than the intention of a friend. It is not, indeed, reasonable to expect that truth can always be told, without offence, when even an apostle found it necessary to appeal to his readers in that remarkable expostulation—“Am I your enemy, because I tell you the truth?”—“It is not easy” (says Hooker) “to speak to the contentation of minds exulcerated in themselves, but that somewhat there will be always which displeaseth.”

To those who think that every thing in the form of controversy should be avoided, I would observe, in the language of Lord Bacon—“Neuters in contentions are either better, or worse, than either side,” leaving it to themselves to consider to which class they belong—while to those who may be disposed to cavil at some strength of expression in the conduct of my argument, I would add, in the language of the same illustrious writer—“Earnest writing must not hastily be condemned, for men cannot contend coldly, and without affection, about