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Thomas McDonnel’s print shop, where Mathew Carey served as an apprentice in the late 1770s, was variously situated at several locations within a cluster of lanes west of Christ Church and along both sides of the Liffey populated by many of Dublin’s Catholic printers.\(^1\) When the shop was headquartered on Pill Lane, it was close to the business of Philip Bowes and, to the south, Bartholomew Corcoran’s sign at the Inns Quay. Starting in 1779, when McDonnel moved to Thomas Street on the south side of the river, Carey worked only a few blocks from the shops of Richard Cross on Bridge Street and John Boyce on Merchant’s Quay. Patrick Wogan, who later became the most prolific of Dublin’s Catholic printers, contracted work with McDonnel and was also based on Bridge Street; it was Wogan’s apprentice who had been beaten in a skirmish with one of Carey’s fellow apprentices and whose subsequent demand of satisfaction—at Wogan’s urging—prompted Carey to write his first essay on the subject of dueling. By the early 1780s, Carey had formed a friendship with Patrick Byrne, whose shop was right across from the Irish House of Commons and who would later relocate his bookselling business to Carey’s Philadelphia at the end of the century. Even after Carey emigrated, he continued to correspond with his brother James back in Dublin, seeking, in one instance, a means to import religious titles produced by Wogan, Cross, and McDonnel to feed the American market.\(^2\) The fact that a number of expatriate Dublin printers—including Christopher Talbot and Bernard Dornin—chose
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1 McDonnel operated at four different addresses between 1775 and 1781, the period of Carey’s apprenticeship. See Mary Pollard, *A Dictionary of Members of the Dublin Book Trade 1550-1800* (London, 2000), 383.

Philadelphia as a destination says much about the strength of this network. These printers, engravers, binders, and booksellers constituted an intimate world defined in part by their shared dedication to producing a range of devotional materials, religious tracts, and political pamphlets, and in part by their ambiguous legal and social standing in relationship to the country’s protestant-dominated society. Given the expansion of printing in general in Dublin in the second half of the century, Carey’s choice of trade thus placed him in direct contact with an increasingly visible set of catholic publishers whose output of religious titles supplied a good part of the English-speaking world.

In the work of an early generation of scholars, Carey’s status as a producer of catholic religious material and as a product of this broader world of Dublin printing was often superseded by an emphasis on his ties to secular radicalism. Jane Hindman, for example, paused briefly to consider Carey’s legal status as a catholic printer before turning to what she saw as the true motivation for his radicalism—anti-imperial nationalism. Edward C. Carter carefully traced a variety of influences on Carey’s political views, including his time as an apprentice to McDonnel, but gave much greater weight to the impact of the American Revolution, the rise of the Volunteer movement and push for Parliamentary reform in Ireland, the inspiration provided by English radicals like John Cartwright and the members of the Society for Constitutional Information, and the time spent in the print shops of Benjamin Franklin and Didot le jeune while in exile in Enlightenment France. The emphasis on secular radicalism was evident in Carter’s description of McDonnel, too, whose work as a printer of the pro-American Hibernian Journal and of political tracts in favor of penal relief received more notice than his longtime status as a

---

publisher of devotional material.⁴ Among the contributing factors to this tendency were Carter’s sources: his account of Irish radicalism in the 1770s and 1780s drew heavily on the work of the Irish historian R.B. McDowell, whose study of major Irish political debates of the period focused on only a handful of pamphlets by catholic authors—all secular in content—and gave considerable weight to the influence of broader English, American, and homegrown Irish constitutional radicalism. McDowell consequently placed little stock in catholic influences on reform movements of the period, concluding that their contribution to the terms of debate had been muted, passive, and confined with few exceptions to apologetic statements of loyalty to the state.⁵

More recent work by Michael S. Carter, Margaret Abruzzo, and Martin J. Burke has modified this picture tremendously, and it is their findings that provide a framework for what follows. All have emphasized Carey’s catholic identity as an important component in his support for religious toleration and offer critiques of previous scholarship that downplayed or ignored this aspect of his life. Although previous work had acknowledged his opposition to the Irish penal laws, Carey’s other contributions to religious toleration in printing the first English-language quarto Bible—an edition of the Douai translation produced in 1790—and in the subtle critique he offered through the Vindiciae Hibernicae (1819) of the anti-catholicism embedded in William Godwin’s Mandeville had not received their due. Michael Carter argues that Carey took direct aim at American anti-catholic prejudice by printing a bible that undermined the notion that catholics were opposed to scriptural reading. This promotion of toleration, in turn, offered an
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alternate vision of catholicism as compatible with the Enlightenment and with republicanism, a
contrast to anti-catholic views of the religion as inherently hierarchical, disloyal, and irrational.
All three scholars have pointed to his activities in promoting religious liberty over either
sectarianism or irreligion during a brief break in protestant-catholic antagonism in the nascent
United States between the founding of the Republic and the reappearance of religious
controversy starting in the second decade of the nineteenth century.⁶

Carey’s use of the printing press to better educate his fellow Americans on the nature of
catholicism raises the question of how his later activities drew on his background in catholic
printing in eighteenth-century Dublin, and it is to this subject that this essay will turn. Two
historiographical issues are at stake in this topic. The first, already outlined above, concerns our
interpretation of Carey, the source of his ideology, and his identity as a catholic printer. Much
will be proposed here that will bolster the arguments for Carey’s notable merging of
Enlightenment, if not republican, ideals with catholic religious identity. A wider understanding
of his influences as encompassing not just secular radicalism but also the unique form of catholic
advocacy that took root in Ireland of the period will also be suggested. The second question
concerns the nature of that very same catholic activism in Ireland. Historians will often
summarize the stance of the Irish church hierarchy and of the Catholic Committee—the
organization most active, starting in mid-eighteenth century Ireland, in pressing the catholic
cause—as cautious or even conservative. The catholic upper and middle classes, as this narrative
goes, desired above all to demonstrate their loyalty to the state in hopes of earning relief from the
penal laws put in place ostensibly because catholics were deemed disloyal in the eyes of

⁶ Carter, “Douai Bible,” 443-4, 468; Margaret Abruzzo, “Apologetics of Harmony: Mathew Carey and the
Rhetoric of Religious Liberty,” The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 134:1 (January
2010): 6-9; Martin J. Burke, “The Politics and Poetics of Nationalist Historiography: Mathew Carey and
the Vindiciae Hibernicae,” in Forging in the Smithy: National Identity and Representation in Anglo-Irish
Ireland’s dominant protestant minority. Behind this synopsis, however, historians have long sought to understand the subtleties and diversity of catholic responses to legal disability.

Scholars acknowledge the sometimes divergent goals held by a catholic laity that desired, above all, political and professional recognition; a clergy caught between appeasing (or sympathizing with) their congregations and obedience to their bishops; and a hierarchy that benefited from their unique status as leaders of a religious community where traditional elites (i.e. landed upper classes) were seriously undermined by the workings of penal law. Dublin’s catholic printers, with their quiet production of hundreds of religious titles, might seem at first glance to have been more in line with the conservatism of the catholic leadership than a potential source for Carey’s radicalism. But this is to rely on a far too narrow view of the politics of catholic relief in Ireland, and in fact an argument can be made that the activities of Dublin printing community helped demonstrate the compatibility between Enlightenment thought and religious toleration in a way not often espoused by eighteenth-century thinkers, who often denounced catholicism as unenlightened. To make this case requires a brief examination of catholic advocacy and the history of catholic printers before turning to key devotional publications of the Dublin trade.

Printers and booksellers of all confessional backgrounds long possessed an ambiguous status in the eyes of the Irish administration. Officially, from the first printed book in Ireland in 1551 until well into the eighteenth century, only one state-sanctioned printer was recognized by
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7 See, for example, Patrick Fagan, Divided Loyalties: The Question of the Oath for Irish Catholics in the Eighteenth Century (Dublin, 1997) and Thomas Bartlett, The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation. The Catholic Question 1690-1830 (Savage (MD), 1992), 60-5.
the Crown, and it was under his monopoly (and to whomever he granted permission to print on his behalf) that all binding, publishing, or selling of books was to take place. This restriction was made official in 1604, when the first patents granting a monopoly to John Franckton were issued; aside from a brief period when the grants expired in the 1640s, Dublin printing was dominated by the king’s designee until the 1680s, while provincial presses were largely nonexistent. In practice, however, although the monopoly continued to be renewed in various forms for successive Crown printers up until 1766, by 1670 the community of Dublin printers had become large enough to found a stationer’s Guild of St. Luke the Evangelist. By 1680, petitions asking for a discontinuance of the monopoly were being made, and even before the monopoly was loosened in 1730 to permit printing of any works except official publications of the state and established church (including bibles, statutes, and prayer books), a lively trade in books and pamphlets had been established because the Crown failed to enforce its exclusive license.8 By the eighteenth century, Ireland’s print trade, now supplemented by burgeoning provincial presses, had grown so significantly that Dublin was challenging London in terms of craftsmanship and production.9

Restriction on freedom of the press was similarly ambiguous in that it was enacted through licensing by Crown and ecclesiastical authorities rather than through direct prohibitions, and it was unevenly enforced. This was particularly evident with regard to catholic material, initially one of its main targets. Control over printing in England and, by extension, Ireland, had been built in conjunction with the development of the Tudor state and continued to evolve under the Stuart kings; on both sides of the Irish Sea the seventeenth century had witnessed further renewals of control over seditious printing of any kind through statues and decrees in 1637,

9 Desmond Clarke and Patrick Madden, Printing in Ireland (Dublin, 1954), 11-14.
1662, and 1685. By definition, catholic books were considered seditious under a protestant sovereign because they challenged the state’s ecclesiastical hegemony, and English statutes during the reigns of Edward VI and James I specifically empowered authorities to seize and destroy catholic primers, missals, psalters, catechisms, and other devotional writings. Consequently, catholic booksellers were subject to sporadic crackdowns and censorship in England and Ireland alike in the seventeenth century.¹⁰ In the eighteenth-century, however, the Irish and English situations diverged. The decision to allow the English Licensing Act to expire in 1695 and the failure to extend the Copyright Act of 1709 to Ireland meant that Ireland’s printers experienced much less state supervision in the eighteenth-century than their English counterparts. Until the introduction of the Stamp Act in 1774, Irish printers were subject only to libel laws as a tool of censorship, resulting in arbitrary prosecution of printers only when authorities felt under sufficient threat. This freedom extended to Ireland’s catholic printers in that they, too, benefited from the loss of licensing control. To be sure, catholic books could still prompt seizure or prosecution for sedition, and, as will be seen shortly, catholic printers themselves operated under certain legal disabilities that helped staunch output of religious materials. But in practice the only notable case of anti-catholic censorship in the eighteenth century was the arrest of two catholic and two protestant stationers for printing prayer books in 1708. It was only in the 1780s that freedom of the press significantly contracted in Ireland in reaction to the radicalism of the pro-reform Volunteer movement—Carey’s Volunteer’s Journal, of course, had been at the heart of the new censorial Press Act of 1784—and again in 1793 as a

response to the activities of the United Irishmen. But even then, catholic religious printing was not the government’s primary concern and could proceed with minimal threat of censorship.\footnote{Pollard, \textit{Dublin’s Trade}, 16-30; James W. Phillips, \textit{Printing and Bookselling in Dublin, 1670-1800} (Dublin, 1998), 31; Brian Inglis, \textit{The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841} (1954; repr. ed. Westport (CT), 1975), 15-43, 82.}

More central to the production of catholic books in the eighteenth century was the standing of their printers and booksellers, and their fortune was tied to the Williamite-era penal laws. Enacted in the years after 1695 by a protestant-dominated Irish parliament, these laws either proscribed or severely curtailed clerical training, catholic education abroad and at home, catholic land ownership, catholic membership in the professions, and eventually, in 1728, the voting franchise. Historians have evolved considerably in their understanding of the impact of these laws, from a growing awareness of the gap between their enforcement and the letter of the law by scholars of the 1960s and 1970s, to a fuller comprehension starting in the 1980s of the tremendously complicated ways in which unintended consequences, regional variations, and hidden pockets of catholic wealth subverted a narrative of the penal laws once dominated by a binary conflict between protestant elite and subjugated catholic.\footnote{An outline of these issues can be found in Louis Cullen, “Catholics Under the Penal Laws,” \textit{Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an Dá Chultúr} 1 (1986): 23-36.} A few components of this scholarship on the penal laws are of particular relevance here. One is the critique that has been developed by Thomas Bartlett, James Kelly, and others of interpretations that see the dismantling of the penal laws starting with two relief acts in 1778 and 1782 as an outgrowth of increasing toleration of catholics fueled by Enlightenment ideals. The Enlightenment, Bartlett notes (citing Voltaire, Diderot, and d’Alembert), could be just as prone to dismiss organized religion, and especially catholicism, as contrary to reason, making it a poor candidate for easy explanation of rising toleration. Kelly, meanwhile, has highlighted the re-emergence of anti-catholic
sectarianism in response to the outbreak of agrarian violence in 1786, culminating in a vicious pamphlet war between, on one side, a number of catholic protagonists closely connected to the Dublin print world (among them Arthur O’Leary and Charles O’Conor) and on the other, the protestant Bishop of Cloyne and his backers.  

This is not to say that the spirit of religious toleration was entirely absent in eighteenth-century Enlightenment thought, but it does caution against a simplistic interpretation of Ireland’s penal laws as a two-step movement from an era of legal discrimination to an amiable period of toleration after 1778.

The other key aspect highlighted by historians was that catholics were not uniform in their response to, or experience of, the penal laws. The prohibitions on landholding, for example, may have prompted some catholic families to invest their capital in overseas trade, thus redirecting funds that would have been invested in estates into urban-based networks with Continental connections. This was especially true of catholic-dominated cities like Galway, with its longstanding mercantile ties to Spain, and in the south of Ireland, where intellectual and familial ties with mainland Europe had always been evident in Munster. Middle-class catholics in towns and cities benefited from these networks, and although Dublin itself featured near-absolute dominance of protestants in the ranks of merchants and master craftsmen, Jacqueline
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Hill has noted that catholics had come to numerically dominate both the ranks of journeymen and the overall population of the city by the end of the 1700s.\(^\text{15}\) Catholic responses to the penal laws, meanwhile, varied as different constituents of the community sought different ways of ameliorating their condition. Even the most visible of advocacy groups, the Catholic Committee (founded in 1756), was prone to internal division between its middle- and upper-class members over how best to approach obtaining penal relief. Those from the landed gentry tended to break with Committee members who advocated a more aggressive pursuit of both parliamentary and extra-parliamentary pressure on the administration to remove penal restrictions, as happened in 1774 over responses to the Parliamentary Test Act or in 1782-88 with middle-class catholic participation in the Volunteers.\(^\text{16}\) Bishops, in turn, had always to keep one eye on their canonical oath promising to uphold the interests of a church led not, in the Irish instance, by a catholic head of state, when negotiating their status with the administration, making it necessary that any steps taken in support of relief be marked by caution and triangulation.

The response to the oath enacted by the 1774 act provides a rich snapshot of just how complex catholic negotiations of penal law relief could be, as well as a case study in how the adage that catholics relied on expressions of loyalty has been inadequate to furthering historical understanding. To be sure, the act created a new oath of loyalty to the Hanoverian state designed to be acceptable to catholics, and the eventual support of a good part of the community for this development indicated an interest in expressing fealty to the Crown. But on a deeper level, the creation of the oath signaled the start of an ongoing process among protestants and catholics alike to negotiate the outlines of a society in which a religiously plural population could uniformly function as subjects of the state. This involved considerable disagreement and soul-\(^\text{15}\) Hill, *Patriots to Unionists*, 20.\(^\text{16}\) Kelly, “Inter-Denominational Relations,” 41-3.
searching, especially within the catholic community: Charles O’Conor, a minor gentry land-holder, antiquarian, pamphleteer, and leading member of the Catholic Committee, complained that the oath could not have been better designed to divide his co-religionists. The biggest issue was the insistence of the House of Commons that the oath specifically denounce the claim of the pope to secular authority anywhere, and not just in Ireland. This wording of the oath secured the passage of the 1774 act in a protestant parliament, but it antagonized the conscience of some Irish catholics unwilling to express loyalty to the Hanoverians in a way that denounced papal authority gratuitously. Reactions were resultantly mixed. Archbishop Butler of Cashel, who had been closely involved in the act, signed as early as 1776, but neither Archbishop John Carpenter nor Bishop John Troy signed until 1778 and 1779, respectively. Many lay catholics followed Carpenter and Troy in delaying, and O’Conor himself refused to sign until 1779. But the issue continued to be revisited, as in 1787, when, in response to protestant claims that the oath failed to counteract papal policies that heretics be suppressed by catholic (including, it was argued, Irish catholic) heads of state, Archbishop Butler was forced to author a pamphlet reasserting the 1774 oath’s assurance of protestant security.  

In sum, simple descriptions of the catholic community offering “expressions of loyalty” masks highly important moves to re-calibrate what it meant to be a British subject in the broader public and legal spheres, a transformation that inevitably required a variety of approaches from outright radicalism to subtle revisions of the character of domains that had become unmistakably protestant.

All of these issues can be traced within the microcosm that was the Dublin print community of the eighteenth century, and it is to this focus that the remainder of this essay will turn. Irish guilds first began moving toward barring catholic membership in the wake of

Cromwell’s invasion, when protestant control of the office of Dublin mayor yielded a push for confessional exclusion among both the artisanal community and the corporation’s freemen. After 1660, when local and parliamentary elites were, if anything, even more cautious about threats to Anglican control, the first laws were passed that attempted to prohibit catholics from possessing free civic status. Despite the success of Charles II and James II to temporarily reverse these moves, anti-catholic discrimination at the corporate level persisted and became fully entrenched after the accession of William and Mary, at least by the letter of the laws.\footnote{Hill, \textit{Patriots to Unionists}, 32-5.} These developments were mirrored in the guilds, who, after all, played a large role in the creation of freemen status. Thus, the 1670 Charter establishing the stationer’s Guild of St. Luke specifically prohibited catholic apprentices by stipulating that the master and wardens ensure that the apprentice “be of good conversation and of the protestant religion.”\footnote{Royal Charter of the Guild of St. Luke the Evangelist (1670), cited in Phillips, \textit{Printing and Bookselling}, 7.}  

Evidence suggests that this provision was not, however, strictly enforced, especially once a system had emerged by 1676 whereby stationers could become partial members of the guild by paying lower entry fees. This benefited catholic printers (and occasionally protestants who could not afford the higher fees in the early years of the guild), who paid the lower fees quarterly and thus attained a lower-status membership as quarter-brothers who did not have any say in the guild council. Catholics could pursue their business, albeit without corporate representation, in this two-tier system.\footnote{Phillips, \textit{Printing and Bookselling}, 9-11, 31.} The historical records indicate that for the most part, catholics accepted this status until the 1750s under the hope—kept alive by Jacobite movements until 1745—that a change in the Crown might reverse the guild disabilities under which they labored. Thereafter,
Dublin’s catholic printers began to challenge the quarter-brother system, as when the Catholic Committee weighed in against counter-efforts by the protestant-dominated city corporations to reinforce the system by seeking its recognition at the parliamentary level. Catholics in fact successfully opposed this protestant-led drive for statutory recognition of quarterage in 1778—helped by a British administration looking for catholic support during the American war, and by waning guild strength amidst the stirrings of industrialization. But despite this victory, the quarter system remained a part of the guild’s bylaws and the fees were even raised from one to four shillings in 1767. It was as a quarter-brother that Carey’s master Thomas McDonnel, as well as Wogan, Cross, and a number of catholic printers operated up until 1793 when all were empowered to attain full status in the guild as a result of the relief bill of that year.  

The result of these disabilities was the creation of a close-knit group bound by shared intellectual networks and blocked aspirations. As James Phillips has pointed out, catholic printers’ advertisements reflexively referred to the “Catholick Booksellers of Dublin,” and as a body the printers participated in a distinct distribution market based in the countryside.  

As catholic quarter-brothers, they were also aware that despite their business success their civic status remained restricted—a situation that, as for other ambitious catholic urban professionals, was even more apparent after relief acts in 1778 and 1782 effectively removed most restrictions on land ownership (a boon to catholic gentry) but retained those on guild membership, voting rights, and parliamentary representation.

Moreover, catholic printers were firmly entrenched in a wider world of catholic intellectuals who relied on them to publish their works defending the faith on both political and
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21 Hill, Patriots to Unionists, 38; Phillips, Printing and Bookselling, 11; Wall, Sign of Dr. Hay, 63; Wall, “Rise of a Catholic Middle Class,” 100-1.

22 Phillips, Printing and Bookselling, 30; Pollard, Dublin’s Trade, 190.
religious fronts. This world had many of the features of an eighteenth-century Enlightenment public sphere. Charles O’Conor, who had written *Seasonable Thoughts Relating to Our Civil and Ecclesiastical Constitution* (1753), *The Case of the Roman Catholics of Ireland* (1755), and a number of other pamphlets pleading the catholic cause, was the most visible. But he was joined by other members of the Catholic Committee, including Dr. John Curry, who wrote two attacks on protestant interpretations of the 1641 rebellion in the 1740s and 1750s, and Charles Ryan, an apothecary with connections to the English whig politician Charles James Fox.\(^23\) Though active through his leadership of the Committee in pursuing catholic relief, O’Conor believed that these advocates could do even more by taking up the pen to respond to aspersions cast on their loyalty and civil status by protestant pamphleteers, and at one point even suggested to Curry that an association might be convened consisting of “a select few” for the purpose of “refutation of the invectives and for the publication of our grievances.” Arthur O’Leary, a Capuchin priest from Cork who had written a defense of the test oath in 1776, was among the suggested potential members mentioned by O’Conor, as was Ryan.\(^24\) These authors had both personal and professional connections with the catholic printers who, especially in the 1770s and 1780s, began to handle the production of their pamphlets. Curry lived in Cow Lane, near the shops of many of the north side printers, while O’Conor sprained his ankle on the stairs of a coffee house located over the shop of bookseller and printer Thomas Cotter.\(^25\) O’Conor contracted with Wogan in 1777 to print five hundred copies of his *Reflexions on Our Present Critical Situation in a Letter from a Landed Proprietor*, and he planned to entrust his personal memoir to Carey’s friend


Byrne, whom he referred to in 1784 as “a good young man in College Green who will take care 
to have it printed correctly.”

The intellectual community shared by authors and printers extended beyond just O’Conor 
and his circle, however. Dublin booksellers were in contact with catholic stationers in London, 
for example, with whom they traded titles so that books could be printed in Ireland and sold in 
England, or vice versa. This was true of James Coghlan, the most active of London’s catholic 
printers, who produced Catholic Committee pamphlets for English readers. Coghlan was also, 
it should be noted, indirectly connected to Carey in that they shared a mutual friend in the form 
of John Carroll, the first American catholic bishop; Carroll contacted Coghlan to inquire about 
subscriptions for Carey’s Douai Bible in 1790. There were also points of contact between 
Dublin printers and the Irish Catholic Church, including prominent members of the hierarchy. 
Wogan and Cross served as printers of church manuals and clerical conference materials 
sanctioned by Archbishops Carpenter and Troy, and they aided in a production of the New 
Testament (1783) commissioned by Carpenter that was initially printed by the protestant 
stationer Daniel Graisberry, but later reissued by Wogan in 1789. The editor of the New
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26 O’Conor to Charles Ryan, 10 September and 15 October 1777, O’Conor to Thomas O’Gorman, 17 

Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, 


185, 188, 201; Fenning, “Dublin Imprints of Catholic Interest: 1783-1789,” *Collectanea Hibernica* 44/45 
Testament project was the Dublin priest Bernard MacMahon, who also edited a number of religious works published by Wogan, Byrne, and Cross.\textsuperscript{30} The lines of continuity between printer, booksellers, author, and church officialdom were thus strong and helped enable the type of devotional publishing that sought to address the status of catholics in Irish society. To be sure, many of these individuals would go on to join the United Irish movement in the 1790s, but the networks that underlay their connection were forged long before in the milieu of a Dublin catholic community confronting the shared nuisance of religious disability. In this sense, the social context of Carey’s catholic colleagues encompassed much more than a taste for producing political tracts on the question of penal relief. It involved a much wider sociability than is suggested by visions of a narrow klatch of secular radicals, and a broader form of catholic advocacy seeking not just the removal of legal disabilities, but a wider acceptance of catholic cultural presence in the public sphere.

The Dublin printers of the eighteenth century produced a wide range of devotional material encompassing a spectrum of authors, theological positions, and methods of piety. Among the titles were those classics of Christian reading practices, such as Kempis’s \textit{Imitation of Christ} or Francis de Sales’s \textit{Introduction to the Devout Life}, that one would expect to occupy a place on any printer’s list of religious publications, protestant or catholic. The majority of

devotional works published by Dublin’s printers, however, were the products of the English-speaking catholic world, particularly the English catholic authors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Ever interested in reaching as wide a consumer audience as possible, these included everything from works by the more conservatively-minded Bishop John Milner, who had translated writings of St. Theresa of Ávila, to the reform-minded James Archer. The works of the English bishop Richard Challoner, given their absolute popularity among all catholics of the English-speaking world on both sides of the Atlantic, were of course the most frequently published titles in Dublin as well. Within this corpus, it is possible to identify two fundamental ways in which the devotional works produced by Dublin printers could be said to have combated anti-catholic sentiments in Irish society while at the same time reconciling catholic religious practice with Enlightenment ideals. The first can be found in the physical creation of catholic texts, especially those that enabled better-informed worshippers. This heightened the visibility of the catholic community while proving its dedication to the creation of knowledgeable congregations—both echoes of the Enlightenment mandate to educate individuals and to explore, explain, and justify social practices by exposing their history. The second lies in the actual content of several key works that drew on Enlightenment ideals such as religious ecumenism, scholarly investigation, and liberalism to defend catholic practices.

With penal laws still on the books and rampant anti-catholicism an integral part of protestant identity in the eighteenth century, any decision to print catholic devotional works necessarily made a statement in support of the religious characteristics of the faith and its community. Hugh Fenning, in a recent bibliography of the period, has counted more than 100 editions of such works produced between 1760 and 1782 alone.31 Controversialist pamphlets and

apologetic tracts may have defended catholicism against protestant attacks, but devotional literature more subtly helped to clarify and justify the features of catholic religious practices for those—including protestants—whose judgment had been clouded by anti-popery. Among the most persistent anti-catholic claims of the period were the accusations that priests kept their congregations in ignorance, a belief that stemmed from larger concerns that the clergy wielded too much power over their flocks by privileging dogma, relics, pilgrimages, and institutional authority over religious reason and knowledge. With scriptures central to revelation and worship in protestant belief, the accusation that the catholic hierarchy refused to sanction bible reading was frequently offered as proof of the ignorance of catholic congregations. Against this, the production of devotional material suggested that, in fact, reading-based acquisition of the precepts of the church were a feature of the Irish catholic community.

This educative objective was also evident when it came to addressing the mass, a favorite target for protestants because of catholic use of Latin and dedication to a sacrament (the Eucharist) that displayed strong doctrinal differences with protestant teaching. The subject of the Eucharist also offered a fruitful subject for discussion because it enabled catholic authors to encourage readers to better prepare themselves to receive communion through understanding of its meaning. In other words, as a subject it offered the devotional author the chance to kill two birds with one stone. As John Hornyold wrote in his *The Sacraments Explained: in Twenty Discourses*, printed by Bowes in Dublin in 1747, catholics “are bound to have a practical knowledge” of their sacramental duties, an obligation that could be fulfilled by his exposition on topics like the real presence and the Eucharist as a sacrifice under the new law. By treating of

this subject, Hornyold could simultaneously encourage catholics to receive sacraments
“worthily,” that is, with a contemplative sense of one’s own faith so as to put oneself in a state of
preparedness to receive them, while also reaffirming a key doctrinal difference with protestants
on issues like transubstantiation. The English Franciscan Pacificus Baker, agreed, claiming, “it
is very necessary they [the faithful] should be instructed in the nature of the Holy Mass, what it
is, and how they ought to assist at it; as also to understand the meaning and signification of the
various ceremonies prescribed by the church in the celebration of it.”

At the same time, catholic displays of sophistication in their understanding of the liturgy
set up a strong contrast with prevailing stereotypes of the ignorant mass-goer. Dublin printers
produced works by Hornyold, for example, that offered readers a detailed overview of the mass
and its meaning in accessible formats intended to educate adults. Among these were his The Real
Principles of Catholicks, or a Catechism for the Adult, printed by Bowes in 1750 and by Wogan
in 1773. Arranged in an easy-to-follow catechetical format, Real Principles set out to
systematically explain each aspect of the liturgy, its meaning, and its justification in church
teaching. In doing so, Hornyold had his eye not only on catholics who needed a path to
meaningful worship, but also on those who caricatured catholic practices as idol worship and
superstition. He observed, “It is not only the topic of private, but even public, nay, even pulpit
discourse, to represent Roman catholics as idolaters, worshippers of stocks [sic], stones, and
wooden Gods,” leading him to respond:
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34 Pacificus Baker, Holy Altar and Sacrifice Explained: In Some Familiar Dialogues on the Mass, and
what may appertain to it: for the more easy information and instruction of those who desire to hear Mass
well, and to assist at that great Sacrifice, according to the spirit and intention of the Church (London,
1792), iii.
I therefore presume, in like manner, to address all whom it may concern, by the following sheets, as a summary of more copious expositions, of the faith, doctrine, and practice of the Catholic Church and her members; and also to answer some late ungenerous proceedings practiced, and endeavours used to improve popular prejudice . . .

To make the rejection of protestant claims even more explicit, Hornyold began his work with a statement reiterating catholic condemnation of idolatry, pope-worship, and the attribution of any powers of redemption in figures other than Christ. To address the complaint that catholics used Latin in the service, Hornyold reminded his readers that the use of the language was not meant to obscure worship, but to ensure uniformity across language communities and to reaffirm the link with the historical origins of the church. The printing of vernacular translations of missals also helped dispel caricatures of the mass by making clear the components of the liturgy transparent to those (including protestants) who could not read Latin. While it does not appear that a translation of the entire missal was printed in English in Dublin in the eighteenth century—a first Latin edition was not even printed in Ireland until 1777, according to its editor—portions of it appeared in a frequently printed guide to its Easter services throughout the last decades of the century, and in a work edited by Bernard MacMahon entitled The Key of Paradise, Opening the Gate to Eternal Salvation and published in 1782, 1794, and 1796.

Beyond the liturgy, Robert Manning’s A Plain and Rational Account of the Catholic Faith, first published in 1721 but reprinted in a fifth edition by Richard Cross in 1794, sought to

35 John Hornyold, The Real Principles of Catholicks: or, a Catechism for the Adult (Dublin, 1773), ii, iv.

36 Hornyold, Real Principles, 236.

counter anti-catholic aspersions with clarifications of wider catholic beliefs. Manning’s preface compared the lot of eighteenth-century catholics at the hands of protestant writers to the persecution of the first Christians:

> If the faith and morals of Catholics had really those deformities, under which they are but too often painted even from the pulpit, and in those very books which are put into the hands of people as necessary preservatives against Popery, I freely own it were better to be of no religion at all than to be a Papist.\(^\text{38}\)

Against this, Manning offered not only a “rational” defense of catholicism, as his title suggested, by making a point-by-point explanation of how catholic doctrines on topics like transubstantiation, the mass, the saints, and sin differed from anti-catholic claims, but he even turned protestant intolerance on its head by framing its most zealous attacks as a failure to exhibit a calm, rational discussion over religious differences.\(^\text{39}\) On the issue of catholic genuflection, bowing to the altar, and other outwardly pious signs that were criticized by protestants as violations of the second commandment, Manning proposed that it was an “inbred principle of nature” for individuals to give due honor to images of respected notables, including heads of state. By analogy, it was no more than “common sense” that what is allowed by natural law, namely, the honor accorded to venerated individuals, was not intended to be forbidden by the second commandment. Therefore, “a Christian is no more forbid to bow to a crucifix, than he is forbid to bow to the chair of state, to the altar, or communion table, to the Bible, to the name of Jesus, or to one another in common conversation.”\(^\text{40}\)

---


\(^{40}\) Manning, *Plain and Rational Account*, 127.
This dedication to putting devotional manuals in the hands of catholics was not by any means confined to the eighteenth century, of course. The Reformation had unleashed a broad mandate to better educate church-goers and to reaffirm central doctrines on the sacraments and the source of revelation that had been called into question. Even if a slight shift can be detected between seventeenth-century catholic investment in sermons as a means of reaching the faithful and eighteenth-century concerns with private devotional reading, such a change would be subtle and highly qualified by the desire to use both approaches over this 200-year period. But there is another way in which the specific Enlightenment context of Dublin printed material can be discerned in the tone of their content and in the background of many of the authors chosen for printing. While all devotional works relied on traditional sources for justification of catholic faith, notably scriptural pronouncements, papal bulls, and the writings of church fathers, a more ecumenical and practical justification for faith can also be discerned. A case for the overlap between some devotional writings and Enlightenment-influenced movements within the Church can even be made, although the exact nature of these ties has yet to be fully explored by historians (particularly in the Irish context) and can only be speculatively treated at this point.

One might consider as a case study the reference manual on the church calendar assembled by Alban Butler (1710-1773), one of the most prolific catholic devotional writers of the period, entitled *The Moveable Feasts, Fasts, and Other Annual Observances of the Catholic Church*. First printed posthumously in London in 1774 with Challoner possibly serving as editor, this work was printed in Dublin in 1775 and again in 1795. Although at first glance a simple summary of the liturgical year with extended descriptions of each major feast of the calendar, its history, and its meaning, Butler’s manual went well beyond catholic authorities to justify

---

elements of the calendar. Muslim and protestant sources made their way into his prodigious footnotes, as did the practices of non-Christian worshippers in Goa, Guinea, and Japan, to validate catholic teachings on keeping the Sabbath.\textsuperscript{42} Manning, too, in his \textit{Plain and Rational Account}, had drawn more widely on non-catholic sources to justify the use of Latin, citing reliance on the Greek, Ethiopian, and Armenian languages in the eastern churches and Syriac rather than Arabic in Egyptian, Syrian, and Indian liturgical services as a validation of Roman catholic policy.\textsuperscript{43} The casting of such a broad net by Butler and Manning in amassing sources was reminiscent of similarly structured global religious worldviews of the eighteenth century that have been the subject of recent scholarly inquiry,\textsuperscript{44} and, in its marshaling of footnoted evidence, exemplified the quest to acquire and collate information and knowledge that was a hallmark of the Enlightenment project.\textsuperscript{45} Such comparative approaches to interpreting doctrine and devotion to well-documented evidence were also pursued by a number of English catholic intellectuals of the time, inculcated through the anti-scholastic curriculum on offer at the Douai college in Flanders. It is this intellectual current that has been identified by Joseph Chinnici as a component in a liberal pro-Enlightenment movement within the English church, and it is notable that both Butler and Manning had attended and taught at the Douai college.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{42} Alban Butler, \textit{The Moveable Feasts, Fasts, and Other Annual Observances of the Catholic Church} (Dublin, 1775), 10.

\textsuperscript{43} Manning, \textit{Plain and Rational Account}, 158-9.

\textsuperscript{44} Lynn Hunt, Margaret Jacob, and Wijnard Mijnhardt, \textit{Bernard Picart and the First Global Vision of Religion} (Los Angeles, 2010), 1-21.


Even more closely tied to this Enlightenment strain was Archer, a London priest who had come to the attention of Challoner for his abilities as a preacher, and who was educated at Douai before returning to become a noted writer of sermons in the 1780s and 1790s. Archer, as historian John Bossy has described it, provided one face (along with Challoner and the historian-priest John Lingard) of an English catholicism of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century that increasingly saw itself as “one of a variety of more of less equivalent communities,” and was therefore apt to downplay doctrinal differences within Christianity in what has been called a “secular” catholic outlook.47 This liberal strain of catholicism had both political and religious dimensions, especially as it played out amongst the English laity. On the first count, it was a response to the long-delayed shift from Stuart to Hanoverian loyalty, a move that encouraged closer attention to the negotiation of the place of catholics within a religiously plural English society. These concerns lay behind the founding of the Cisalpine Club in 1792, an organization dedicated to engaging with issues central to catholics such as penal relief and oaths of loyalty; among its founders was Alban Butler’s nephew, the lawyer Charles Butler (1750-1832), a member of the English Catholic Committee and yet another graduate of Douai. As to the religious dimension, a fluid but discernible movement to downplay certain doctrinally divisive issues like papal authority, saint veneration, and focus on the Virgin Mary emerged in the writings of a generational cohort of Douai-educated priests, among them Lingard and Archer.48 Archer’s sermons, for example, placed a primary emphasis on catholic responsibility to uphold Christian morality and charity, ideals shared by their protestant co-religionists. As to devotions, Archer reaffirmed traditional catholic practices, but urged his listeners not to build them up into


extraordinary and zealous pursuits. Rather, he encouraged his listener to integrate devotions quietly into a properly-conducted domestic life.\textsuperscript{49}

Archer’s works found a home in Dublin: his signature work, \textit{Sermons on Various Moral and Religious Subjects}, was printed by Patrick Byrne in 1788 and 1799. This title was in many ways suited to Dublin’s busy middle-class catholic community. Among the subjects addressed by Archer, for instance, was the place of saints in catholic theology, one of the topics constantly used by protestants to attack catholic religious practice. Saints, he argued, should not be given honor as part of catholic worship. Rather, they should be used as models for daily life by those whose “days and hours are so filled up with a business, which is necessary to [one’s] own support and to that of [one’s] family; with attendance on [one’s] connections, and other unavoidable hindrances and incumbrances,” so that “we might become saints ourselves after their example.”\textsuperscript{50} In Archer’s view, the saints, like his audience, had once been ordinary humans with the usual daily concerns but had nonetheless achieved their status in heaven through their dedication to the devout life. To be sure, such an interpretation served as a riposte to protestant claims of idol worship in the same manner as Hornyold’s careful clarification of the meaning of saint veneration. But Archer’s formulation also took this dimension a step further, softening the sharp edges of devotional practices by embedding them within secular concerns while rationalizing their application to the construction of a benevolent life.

Perhaps the best example that gathers the various threads of Enlightenment, catholic advocacy, religious toleration, and the Dublin print world, however, was the publication of Alban Butler’s \textit{Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Others Principle Saints} by Hugh Fitzpatrick


\textsuperscript{50} James Archer, \textit{Sermons on Various Moral and Religious Subjects, for All the Sundays, and Some of the Principal Festivals of the Year} (Dublin, 1799), 317, 323-4.
and Richard Cross in 1802. The origins of this edition lay in the efforts of Charles Butler. After an initial edition of this martyrology had been published in a multi-volume set in London in 1756-59, Alban Butler had begun preparing a second revision that remained unfinished at his death in 1773. Charles had then taken up his uncle’s manuscript revisions and turned them over to Archbishop Carpenter, who left them to Bernard MacMahon to assemble and secure publication. This edition emerged in 1779-1780 from the Dublin press of the protestant printer John Exshaw, on behalf of John Morris, a catholic publisher who had worked with Carpenter previously.\(^{51}\) Exshaw then sold the copyright to Cross, who prepared the 1802 Dublin edition of the work, published in a large, six-volume quarto edition.

Martyrologies were, of course, standard fare for catholics, but what made Butler’s edition notable was some of the appended material that belied its multiple purposes. The author’s preface, for example, specifically advocated reading as a central practice in one’s religious life, noting that, “As in corporal distempers a total loss of appetite which no medicines can restore, forebodes certain decay and death; so in the spiritual life of the soul, a neglect or disrelish of pious reading and instruction is a most fatal symptom.”\(^{52}\) In handing the copyright over to the Irish, the initiative had been taken by Carpenter to add an appendix listing key Irish martyrs that had not been present in the original work, making a previously anglocentric cast into one more balanced between the two nations. This, in turn, enabled Carpenter to use the occasion of the \textit{Lives} to defend Irish—and specifically, Irish catholic—standing against David Hume’s claim in


his *History of England* (1754) that “the Irish from the beginning of time had been buried in the most profound barbarism and ignorance.”\(^{53}\) By exploring the world of the early Irish saints and thus reaffirming the Christian roots of the country’s history, Carpenter repeatedly contradicted Hume’s claims that invasion had brought only improvement to Irish civility. On the contrary, he noted:

> Here, in the extremity of the West, in a sequestered island, God was pleased to kindle lights which illumined pagan nations, who took possession of the greater part of Europe, on the demolition of the Roman empire.\(^ {54}\)

As support for his case, Carpenter appealed to the works of antiquarian scholars—among them, Charles O’Conor—that had proven the disruption of a deeply rooted Irish catholicism caused by outside conquest. Finally, against protestant claims to an unbroken link between the modern Anglican church and the early Irish Christians, Carpenter specifically reaffirmed the connections between Ireland and the Roman Church, further bolstering catholic counterattacks against those who would question its claims to Irish history.\(^ {55}\) In short, the editors and printers of Butler’s work managed to transform a quiet martyrology into a major defense of Irish catholicism in a way that transcended its conventional devotional format to partake in a contemporary debate over history, conquest, and national origins.

The devotional works produced by Dublin’s printers thus served as far more than simple manuals for catholic living. Rather, they provided a broader vision for the place of catholicism in a protestant-dominated society. This vision featured an educated religious community whose practices contradicted the ill-informed stereotypes of anti-catholic polemicists. In some cases,


This devotional production could even venture into strikingly liberal concepts of catholicism informed by developments in England tied to Cisalpinism and a generation of Douai graduates. Aside from their content, moreover, the mere production of many of these materials, with their ecumenically assembled sources and educational intent, allowed them to exist comfortably within the information-driven mandate of the Enlightenment. Undoubtedly, printers were motivated by a variety of factors in choosing to produce certain titles, not least being the chance of profit. Many works, especially those by Challoner, were sure bets in the booksellers’ marketplace. But at the same time, the authoring, printing, and purchasing of devotional works also reaffirmed the multiple ties linking members of Irish (as well as American and English) catholics, including bishops, priests, lawyers, artisans, doctors, and printers, who were increasingly emboldened to renegotiate their standing in the eyes of the state and society. This activism was far from passive.

There can be no doubt that this Dublin context in which Carey had served his apprenticeship influenced him as well. It is certainly notable that among the first titles that Carey put to press on his arrival in Philadelphia were a laundry list of devotional works: Challoner’s *The True Principles of a Catholic* (1789), *Think Well On’t* (1791), and *Garden of the Soul* (1791); Bishop George Hay’s *An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine* (1800) and *The Pious Christian Instructed* (1800); Vincent Huby’s *The Spiritual Retreat* (1795); and, of course, the Douai Bible. These were all works well-known to Carey’s Dublin cohorts that had been produced throughout the eighteenth century in response to consumer demand, but also as a statement of the standing of Ireland’s catholic community.

---
