

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

NOVEMBER 1838.

No. 11.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. VIII.

The Case of Maynooth College.—State of Education amongst the Irish Priests.

THE progress of the institution at Maynooth was at first slow. Fifty students were admitted in 1795. In 1800 an increase of fifty more took place. The number was augmented to two-hundred in the year 1802; and to two hundred and fifty in 1809. The establishment is now capable of accommodating four hundred students, together with the superiors and professors, who are all lodged within its walls. The college buildings form three sides of a quadrangle, containing a chapel, a refectory, a library, various lecture rooms, and apartments for the officers and students. The total expense at which they have been erected is £41,913, 3s. 1½d.

The following information respecting the college is drawn from the Appendix to the Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, printed in 1827.

The annual grants from Parliament provide for the support of the President, vice President, Deans, Librarian, Bursar, Professors, and two hundred and seventy of the students. Foundations or burses have been established by private individuals for the maintenance of twenty students. The remaining number, one hundred and ten, pay for their board; the full charge for which is twenty guineas per annum. But as it is frequently the case that a free studentship is divided between two persons, each paying half the expense of his commons, the number of those who maintain themselves without assistance from the college is much fewer than one hundred and ten. There were thirty-four of these "half pensioners" in the year 1826. Each student on the foundation pays eight guineas as an entrance

fee, to the general fund of the house. If admitted as a pensioner, he pays a deposit of four guineas, and a like sum in addition, whenever he is afterwards placed on the establishment. The money received for pensions and entrance money from the students, for the year 1825, amounted to £2,400.

The parliamentary grants have varied in amount from time to time. But since the year 1813 the sum of £9,673 Irish has been annually voted. The total amount of the sums thus given out of the national purse up to the year 1836, is £361,695, 12s. 1½d. The donations and legacies presented to the college, from its establishment to the year 1814, amounted to £4,436 14s. 3d. From that year to the 27th of November, 1826, when the account was furnished to the Commissioners of Education Inquiry, no additional donation had been received.

The entire income of the college for the year 1825 was as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Parliamentary grant, - - - - -	9,670	13	4
One year's rent of the Dunboyne estate, - - -	500	0	0
Rent of two farms, the property of the college - -	23	17	10½
One year's interest of foundation for professor of Irish,	42	7	3½
One do. do. of the O'Sullivan fund,	139	10	6
One do. do. of the Ivory fund, -	42	0	0
One do. do. of the O'Reilly fund,	22	8	0
One do. do. of the Sawey fund, -	35	9	0½
One do. do. of the Clogher, and Raphoe funds, -	136	12	0
(Variable) amount of pensions and deposits paid by students, - - - - -	2,420	13	10½
Total amount in Irish currency, - - -	£13,033	11	11

The power of nominating the free students on the establishment is allotted to the Roman Catholic Bishops; and the appointments are divided among them according to a scale laid down in the statutes, and adapted to the extent and circumstances of their respective districts. The provinces of Armagh and Cashel nominate each seventy-five students; the provinces of Dublin and Tuam fifty each. The students, whether free or not, are all recommended by their respective bishops; and each student continues connected with the district from which he has been originally recommended, and to which he is destined ultimately to return as a priest. Unless for some special reason he obtain leave from the bishop whose "subject" he was born, to "transfer his obedience" to another prelate. There is generally a meeting in each diocese once a year of the young men intended for the ecclesiastical state, at which the Bishop appoints examiners to inquire into their respective literary merits, for the purpose of selecting those who are best qualified to enter college.

Dr. Crotty, who was President in 1826, when the Commissioners of education visited Maynooth, stated in his evidence that the usual age at which persons enter, is seventeen. From the returns,

however, made to Parliament in 1808, it appears that out of 205 students then in the college, ninety-two (nearly half of the entire number) were above twenty years of age when they were admitted. The rank of life from which the majority of the students are taken is described by Dr. Crotty, as being that of comfortable farmers.— This account agrees with the official returns in 1808, which detail the name and age of each student, and the profession or station of his father; from which it appears that out of 205 students, 148 were the sons of farmers. But when Dr. Crotty states that “a good many” of the sons of the Roman Catholic “gentry” have from time to time become students at Maynooth, there must have been a very great change indeed during the eighteen years that elapsed since the list above mentioned was sent into Parliament, as among the students then in the college there was not *one* returned as being the son of a gentleman.

The *average* expenses incurred by a student, entering as a pensioner, are estimated by Dr. Crotty at about 69 pounds for the first year, and about 34 pounds in each succeeding year that he continues a pensioner. But he seems to have calculated some of the items of expenditure on a much more extravagant scale than the circumstances of the country, and the actual appearance of the students render probable. For instance, Dr. Crotty considers that 17 pounds may be taken as the average amount of their travelling expenses to Maynooth and the clothes purchased for the occasion. But when the extreme cheapness of travelling in Ireland is taken into account, and also the very shabby appearance which the students usually present to the eye of a visitor, one-half of the above named sum would seem to be nearer the average cost of travelling and outfit. Another item in the calculation of Dr. Crotty is £10 for the furniture of a student's room and for his college dress. A stranger visiting the establishment would certainly pronounce that there must have been great imposition practised on the simple youths, who could have been induced to pay £10 for the kind of furniture and academic gowns which are usually seen in the college. Poverty is no disgrace to a student. But it is ridiculous to attempt to make the public imagine, that the young men are not poor, who exhibit such decided evidence of a *res angusta domi*, as do the majority of students at Maynooth. The average expense which each student incurs for clothes, washing, books, &c. is estimated by Dr. Crotty at £12 a year.

About half the number that are annually admitted enter as pensioners, and continue so for one, two, or three years, before they obtain a place on the foundation; some few remain pensioners during the entire course. The majority of the students, according to Dr. Crotty, continue in the college for six years. Taking then the estimate made by Dr. Crotty as correct, the entire expense to which a student is put for his education in the college, if he be received at once on the establishment, is about £110; if he enter as a pensioner, and continue such for two years, is £151; and if he remain a pensioner to the end of his course, £273.*

* A sum immensely beyond the advantages conferred, and beyond that requisite to obtain better, in far superior institutions. The priests love money.

No one is admitted into the college unless it be his avowed intention to become a priest. So that the act under which it was founded might as well have had a title in conformity with the leave originally given by the House of Commons for bringing it in.

A letter from the Right Honourable Edmund Burk to his friend Bishop Hussey, (Plowden, vol. iii. Appendix, p. 293.) written in 1798, expressed great alarm at hearing that the Chancellor and three chief judges, who were Protestants, were named among the trustees of the college. This hint was taken, and an act was passed in the last session of the Irish Parliament, removing those persons from the board of trustees, and appointing them the visitors of the college, in conjunction with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Earl of Fingal and the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin. Stated visitations are required to be held every third year; and in matters relating to religion, those only of the visitors are to act, who are Roman Catholics.

The superintendance and instruction of the students are committed to the following officers and professors:—the President, Vice-President, Senior and Junior Dean, Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, Bursar, three Professors of Theology, a Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, one of Natural and one of Moral Philosophy, one of Rhetoric, one of Humanity, one of English Elocution and French, and one of Irish.

The college is goverend by statutes drawn up by the trustees and submitted to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. These were first compiled and published in the year 1800. They were afterwards altered and enlarged in the year 1820. The former are to be found in the parliamentary papers relative to Maynooth, printed in 1808. The latter are given in the Appendix to the Eighth Report of the commissioners above mentioned. There is also a "Rule of Piety and of Domestic Discipline," which is taken in a great measure from the laws of the Irish College at Rome, the *Collegium Ludovicinum*.

The course of study at Maynooth is arduous, and as laid down in the Report of the Commissioners of Education, very extensive. I was shewn this Report in answer to my interrogatories as to the course of education, and was greatly surprized to find it so varied and so liberal. But upon a little further questioning, I learned that this course is not adheared to, and that only as much of it is followed *as can be accomplished*; these were the words used, from which I infer, that the course of instruction is entirely optional with, and varies at the pleasure of, the heads of the college; and that whoever forms any opinion of the course of education pursued at Maynooth, from what he has read in the Report of the Education Commissioners, will fall into grievous error.

The full course of education occupies ten years. After four years passed in the classes of Mathematics, Rhetoric, Logic and the Humanities, the students are transferred to the class of Divinity, the most important in the course of their education.

In the class of Divinity, the students remain for three years. There are three professors of divinity; and nine hours in the week are occupied in their lectures. The text books consist of ten vol-

umes, five of dogmatic theology, compiled by Dr. Delahogue, who had been for many years a professor at Maynooth, and five of moral theology, written by Bailly, a French divine, and professor of theology at Dijon. The former are, vol. i. Treatise *De Religione*; vol. ii. *De Ecclesiâ*; vol. iii. *De Mystério S. S. Trinitatis*; vol. iv. *De Sacramento Penitentiae*; vol. v. *De Sacramentis in genere*. The latter five consist of, vol. i. *De Actibus Humanis, Te Conscientiâ, De Legibus, De Virtutibus et de Peccatis*; vol. ii, *De Præceptis Decalogi cum Appendice, De Præceptis Ecclesiæ, et De Obligationibus Clericorum*; vol. iii. *De Simoniâ, De Censuris, et Irregularitatibus*; vol. iv. *De Ordine, et De Matrimonio*; vol. v. *De Baptismo, De Confirmatione, De Extremâ Unctione, De Gratiâ Dei, et De Deo*.

These treatises the students are obliged to purchase on their entrance into college. The lectures are so arranged, that the entire course is read through once every three years.

The treatises by Dr. Delahogue are the substance of the lectures which he delivered while professor of divinity. The "dogmatic and moral theology" of Bailly was first printed in 1789. An edition adapted to the discipline established by the *concordat*, was printed at Lyons in 1804. A third edition, published at Paris, was the subject of a prosecution, which ended in its being *prohibited* in the seminaries during the reign of Napoleon, as a work *imbued with the principles of Loyola* (*Biographie Nouvelle—Paris 1820.*) For some extracts from these treatises the reader is referred to a pamphlet lately published, entitled, "Roman Catholic morality, as inculcated in the Theological Class Books used in Maynooth College." These extracts disclose a system of morality which it is to be hoped the public will never sanction, and the inculcation of which ought no longer to be allowed.

In Bailly's Treatise on the Decalogue, mankind are divided into four ranks, nobleman, independent gentlemen, artificers, and beggars; and it is laid down that a person may steal any sum under fifty or sixty pence from the first, under forty pence from the second, twenty pence from the third, and four pence from the last class, without losing the favor of God, or at all risking the salvation of his soul or its being even necessary to acknowledge the theft in confession to a priest. The stolen property need not be returned to the owner, nor any compensation made to him, if there should be difficulty in doing so without the offender being discovered. All that is required is to give the amount to the poor, or to expend it on some good work; and it is but a venial offence, even if this species of restitution be omitted. Further it is taught, that a wife may steal from her husband, contrary to his known and reasonable wishes a greater quantity of his property than is laid down in the preceding scale, without being guilty of more than a *venial sin*; and she may steal as much as will support any of her near relatives without being guilty of *any sin*, provided that after his death she deducts the amount from her Jointure. A servant, also may pilfer any common food in order to eat moderately of it, without incurring guilt. Such is a part of the Maynooth exposition of the divine commandment, "thou shalt not steal."

It so happens, that in the conferences which are held annually

by the priests, among the questions appointed by Archbishop Murray to be discussed in the year 1836, in the province of Dublin, are the following, "Daturne materiæ levitas in furto ita ut sit tantum peccatum veniale? Quid tenendum de furtis filiorum familias, conjugum et famulorum?" Whether the priests follow the instructions given in the Maynooth class books, or "follow Dominus Dens as their author," the resolution of these questions will be alike at variance with good morals. Yet so far from perceiving any thing improper in such an interpretation of the eighth commandment, the professor of Moral Theology told the Commissioners, "If there is any thing which is called lax principles of morality [among the Jesuits] I am sure Bailly is free from them." Let it not be alleged, that in re-printing the Frenchman's treatises for the use of the students at Maynooth, it would not have been allowable to have altered or omitted any part of the author's writings. No such deference was shewn in re-editing the Lyons *philosophy* for the use of Maynooth, as the reader will have already observed. Nor were Bailly's works on divinity received at Lyons without alterations.

In Dr. Delahogue's Treatise on Penance p. 168—9 it is laid down, that a woman is "unworthy of absolution," who, through modesty, shall hand in her confession in writing to the priest, in order to avoid speaking about certain species of sin. And the questions which a confessor is directed to put to a married woman are such as any man ought to be ashamed to utter. Bailly M. T. vol. iv. p. 483.

Immorality and indecency are not the only charges that must be brought against the theological text books used in Maynooth; narrow and intolerant bigotry is also inculcated in them. In Dr. Delahogue's treatise on "the Church," the second proposition, p. 17, is in these words, "schismatics, even though they err not in doctrine, by the mere fact of their schism are excluded from the church, and are *out of the pale of salvation*." By a variety of arguments, Dr. Delahogue endeavours to establish this position; and to shew that whatever may be said to the contrary, the schismatic, although he may not err in doctrine, is not a member of that one church "out of which [Catholics] believe that no salvation can be hoped for." He then proceeds to lay down his third proposition, p. 41, "The society of Protestants cannot clear itself from the guilt of schism," thereby excluding every individual Protestant from all hope of salvation; for a society, as distinguished from the persons composing it, is not capable of being excluded from the hope of eternal salvation. One might have thought that there was bigotry enough in condemning all who are not in communion with the Roman Catholic Church to perdition in a *future* state, but to this is added intolerance with respect to the present life. "The Church," asserts the Maynooth professor, "retains her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and *schismatics*, although they no longer appertain to her body; just as a military officer has a right of decreeing *severer punishments* against a soldier who deserts, even though his name may have been erased from the military roll." p. 404. One naturally is anxious to learn what are these "severer punishments" to which we are exposed. The commissioners inquired into their

nature from Dr. Slevin, who was the Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment. He assured them, that they were merely spiritual censures. But after having already *excommunicated* schismatics, one remains at a loss to discover any severer *spiritual* censure that the church can devise! Dr. Slevin, when asked by the commissioners what practical consequences attached to this jurisdiction claimed by his church, answered, "No practical consequences of a temporal nature can ensue from it; *at least* in countries that are not Catholic, and where the ecclesiastical laws are not *supported* by the arm of civil authority." p. 217. Should sufficient power ever be placed in the hands of those who may be inclined or compelled thus to *support* the ecclesiastical laws of the Roman Catholic Church, we schismatics will be enabled by experience to form a more distinct notion of those severer punishments which that church, as a commanding officer, inflicts upon deserters! Such are some of the doctrines taught in the class books compiled expressly for the use of Maynooth College, and authorized by the board of trustees.

The Divinity class receives two lectures weekly, of an hour each, from the professor of Sacred Scripture. A chapter in the New Testament (or more than one if necessary) is marked out, and the students are required to be prepared to analyze and explain it. The class book used for this purpose is the commentary of Menochius, 3 vols. 4to. which the students are obliged to procure at their own expense. On one day in the week, the professor employs an extra half-hour in hearing the students comment on the gospels or epistles appointed for the following Sunday; and the senior members of the class, in succession, are called upon to preach a sermon on Sundays and holidays. The students are also further exercised by means of public disputation, once in the month. A chapter in the Bible is selected, and they are called upon to argue on it, one against another. At the end of the year a public examination is held, when, during three days, *all* are examined to ascertain the proficiency which they have made.

There is also a Hebrew class formed out of the Divinity students, and instruction given to them on one day of the week. All are at liberty to attend; but only a few find time from their other studies for the acquisition of a knowledge of Hebrew.

Many of the students of the Divinity class from Munster and Connaught, and some from the other provinces, attend the professor of Irish, from five to six o'clock in the evening, during the second year of their course; as without a knowledge of the Irish language, they cannot discharge the duties of clergymen in many parts of the country.

All the divinity class have access to the library from ten till two every day, except Wednesdays.

It has been already mentioned, that Lord Dunboyne's bequest produces to the College about £500. In the year 1813, on an application to Parliament from the trustees, an addition of £700 a year was made to the usual grant, for the purpose of enabling the Dunboyne fund to support twenty students, who after completing the usual course, and exhibiting more than ordinary talent, remain for three years additional, in order to qualify themselves better for

the duties of parish priests, and masters of conference, or to be professors in the college. The Dunboyne students receive £30 a year each, besides their commons. They are allowed more liberty than the other students; are distinguished by a particular dress, and dine at a separate table. They are under the instruction of a professor, who is called the Perfect of the Dunboyne Establishment. They attend four lectures in the week, two in Divinity, one in Church History or Canon Law, and one in Hebrew. The class books which they use are the treatises of Delahogue and Bailly, already described, and Cabasutius' Theory and Practice of Canon Law. On ecclesiastical history, there is no particular class book. They are also practised in composition. And four prizes are allotted annually to them, one for theology, one for ecclesiastical history, one for canon law, and one for an essay or exercise in composition. *In no part of the students' course, whether it last for seven or for ten years, are any of the writings of the Fathers of the Christian Church studied; with the neglect of which Roman Catholics generally reproach Protestants.*

The statutes direct, that six of the Dunboyne scholarships shall be filled up from the province of Armagh, as many from that of Cashel, and four each from Dublin and Tuam. Although the parliamentary grant of £700, was voted on the express condition that it was to be appropriated to the maintenance of twenty students, yet after the lapse of thirteen years, when the commissioners inquired into the state of the establishment, they found that there were but eleven individuals in this class; nor did it appear that the full number had ever been completed. The reason assigned for this paucity of students on the Dunboyne foundation was, that the demand for priests had been so urgent as not to admit of the students spending three additional years in the college. The estimate, however, was annually sent in to government, praying for a grant to enable the trustees to support twenty students, while they were unable to allow so many to partake of the privilege. The extra funds which thus came into the hands of the bursar were expended on building, and accounted for accordingly at the end of the year; but it would have been more straightforward to have stated the difficulty in which the college was placed when applying each year for the money, than to have received it for one purpose and habitually expended it on another, however laudable or necessary. It does not appear that the visitors institute any inquiry into the distribution of the funds of the college at their triennial visitations. The accounts are submitted to the trustees, who assemble twice in the year, in the months of January and June.

It is stated by the Commissioners, that "no minute is entered, or registry kept, of the students who are either removed or expelled from the house." p. 13. On this point they seem to have been misinformed; as the returns made to Parliament in 1808, give the names of all those students who were removed or left college without entering the ministry; of whom it appears there were 84 out of 376, that is, more than *one-fifth* of the entire number that had passed through the college previous to that year. Dr. Crotty states, that he thinks, on an average, about three are expelled each year,

and about six change their mind as to entering the ecclesiastical state; that is, about one-sixth of the number annually admitted.

There is an annual vacation of six weeks, in the months of July and August; during which, however, the students do not as a matter of course leave the college. Special permission to go home must be obtained from the superior; and few are allowed to visit their relatives more than twice in the course of seven years' study.

An ordination is held every year at Maynooth, when such persons are ordained as are presented for that purpose by the college. The students usually remain in the institution until they are upon the point of receiving priest's orders. The general rule is, to give the order of sub-deacon to such as have finished the first year of their studies in the divinity class; to give that of deacon to those who have finished the second year; and that of priesthood when they have completed the course. The college supplies about fifty candidates annually for priest's orders. The number of the secular clergy in Ireland at present is 2200; namely, 27 prelates, 982 parish priests, and 1191 curates.—(*Catholic Religious Directory and Almanac, for Ireland, 1836.*) To supply the vacancies in this body, between eighty and ninety are required every year. As Maynooth is not able adequately to supply the wants of Ireland in this respect, some of the Roman Catholic Bishops have established seminaries, the students of which are ordained without passing through Maynooth. Others receive their education on the continent. About 120 divinity students were in the ecclesiastical seminaries in Ireland in the year 1826; the greater number at St. Patrick's College, Carlow; others at St. Jarlath's college, Tuam; Birchfield College, Kilkenny; St. John's College, Waterford; and St. Peter's College, Wexford. There were about 140 students for the Roman Catholic priesthood at different colleges on the continent. Seventy of these are in the Irish College at Paris; about twelve at Rome; and the remainder at Salamanca, Lisbon, and various private French seminaries.

[To be Continued.]

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

SKETCHES AND RECOLLECTIONS FROM MY NOTE BOOK. No. III

The Parental Warning:—an authentic Narrative.

“Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old he will not depart from it”

“Know that for all these things God will bring thee unto judgement.”—SOLOMON.

OF all the concerns which claim the attention of parents, the care and nature of their children is incomparably the most important. They are objects so intimately connected with the happiness of a father and a mother—so literally “a part and parcel” of themselves in all their concerns, that no pains can be too great or too many which are spent upon their moral and mental and spiritual culture. They are destined too, to act important parts in society in relation to their parents; for whatever station children may occupy, their conduct in it is of indispensible moment, to hearts so much interested as a father's or a mother's. Solomon says, that “a foolish

son is a grief to his father, and a bitterness to her that bare him." But time with all its concerns—its weal or its woe is of trifling importance when brought into comparison with eternity. Eternity! with all its untried and untold realities is indeed a startling thought to any heart, but to a parent who has a whole household to inhabit it, and whose destinies are so intimately connected with his own, and in a measure so dependent upon his conduct, it is inconceivably important. To part with a child in this world, an object so lovely and so loved, produces a feeling so intense as to be conceivable only by those who have felt it; and yet this dispensation is tempered and this feeling allayed by the consoling reflection, perhaps, that we may meet with him again never more to separate or sorrow. If under all this consolation, earthly parting be such a rending of the affections, tell me, you who can form a thought of it, what must be that parting in eternity from each other or from God and happiness, upon the darkness and despair of which, not a single ray of hope can ever fall!

Although this subject is important, and freely and generally admitted to be so, yet it is as generally neglected. We can at a great expense of time and money educate the intellect in order to produce an influence upon the temporal destiny of our children, while the heart and conscience are permitted to be occupied by worthless and noxious weeds, which grow up under the darkness of sin and ignorance. We can labour with a laudable devotion to generate in our children a distaste for those things which may retard their progress in ascending the mount of wealth or honor, while we willingly permit them to remain in the bondage of beloved sins. I have often thought, sinful and savage as it was, that there was a sublimity and a majesty in the conduct of Hamilchar, when he brought his son Hannibal to the altar at the tender age of eight years, and made him swear eternal hatred to the Romans. But when a Christian father by the influence of a holy life and a pious education and prayer brings his child to Christ, and in the simple earnestness of a pious heart, makes him as it were swear eternal hatred to sin, the murderer of his Lord, he exhibits a scene as much more sublime as virtue in its majesty towers above vice. But to my narrative,

A few years ago, a boy of fourteen or fifteen years of age, was taken sick, in a family not very distant from my residence. At first, and indeed for some time, his indisposition produced little, if any, alarm to himself or parents. They lived in a settlement which had been long blessed by that gospel which speaks "peace to earth and good will to men," yet they were, if not ignorant, wicked. They perhaps would have been displeased to be called "heathen," and yet no courtesy could warrant the application of such a misnomer as "Christian" to them, for they respected neither the sabbath-day nor the house of God, while they were given to profanity both in speech and conduct. Their child sickened and grew ill, until life began to be in danger and they became alarmed, but in their fear and alarm they were as ignorant of what to do, as the builders of Babel after God had confounded them. Among those who visited this boy was one who talked to him of eternity, and

read to him out of the Book of Life, and prayed for him at a throne of grace. These pious labours were instrumental in awakening the boy to a sense of danger, but that only a very short time previous to his departure. As the individual alluded to, was a plain, unlettered female, entirely devoid of any thing approaching even to enthusiasm, and as she simply spoke to him a few common place words about death, it must not be thought that his feelings were mechanically aroused, or his fears unduly wrought upon. That the reverse was the fact I can testify. And this fact, together with the perfect composure and sanity of the boy's mind, I am the more anxious to substantiate on account of what follows. His symptoms gradually became more alarming, and with the decline of nature and the nearness of eternity, his fears became more aroused. At length, feeling himself in the cold arms of the king of terrors, he called his sorrowing parents to his bedside, and in the presence of some of their neighbours, charged them publicly and unequivocally with the loss of his soul. "I am now" says he, "going into eternity, and I have no hope; and which of us will answer for it on the day of judgment? You have taught me to *swear*—but you never taught me to *pray*. You have taken me to places of *sin* but you did not take me to the *church* of God; you instructed me in things of little consequence while you left me ignorant of the Bible and of eternity. Oh! Eternity! Eternity! Eternity"!!! And then he broke out into the most pitiable and distressing state of weeping and wailing, and asked his parents again and again, and besought them with the most unyielding importunity, to tell him who must answer for his sins. And when he found them silent, and could get no answer, except those bursting sobs which bespoke the awful agitation of their hearts, he turned round to one of the neighbours and besought her to tell him, who must answer in the judgment for his sins, himself or his parents? Again and again he declared that his soul was lost, and asserted over and over that his parents were the cause of it. The astonished and distressed friends who stood around him endeavoured to console him by promising hope, or to divert his thoughts into some other channel; but all was as utterly useless as to speak to the whirlwind, for neither the arguments of friends nor the burning and bursting anguish of his parents could have any effect upon him. The concerns of the moment were too big and important and real to be affected by motives of sympathy, or arguments of philosophy—he stood upon the brink of death, and he knew it; eternity was just before him, and he saw it distinctly; he was a great sinner and accountable to a just and a holy God, and he felt it tremendously, and as the few seconds which separated him from another world passed rapidly away one by one before his eye, he grew, if possible, more terribly in earnest, and asserted with a composed but horrible emphasis that his soul was *lost*, and that his parents were the cause of it—and then when his eyes became glassy and his tongue began to stiffen in the frosts of death, he made a final and a terrible effort, and charged his parents with his eternal death, and in that effort "the silver chord was loosed and the wheel of life was broken."

How will these parents meet this child in eternity! If through

their sinful negligence his soul has gone to hell, who can tell the amount of misery, which the presence of his lost soul, and the outgoings of his agony, will cause to his unhappy parents, should they die without repentance and divine acceptance!

Reader! art thou a parent? Are your natural obligations increased by a voluntary assumption of those which flow from the solemn promises made at the baptism of your children? Have these promises been made in sincerity or in mocking? Will God hold you accountable for their performance in eternity? If so, let me affectionately ask you, what have you *done* and what are you *now doing* to save yourself from the guilt of perjury and your children from the pains of hell? If a professor of religion, your obligations are stronger and more numerous;—but if not, recollect the *sin of not loving and professing Jesus Christ*, will not purchase for you an exemption from natural and assumed obligation:—ah no! the crime of withholding your own heart from God will surely not purchase for *you* an indulgence which *he* cannot have who obeys God in the surrender of his affections! This would be more monstrous and horrible still, than even the popish doctrine of *indulgencies*, for while they (papists) give that which is good (money) as a permission to sin, this would be offering sin to a holy God as a bribe for the privilege of sinning!—Recollect therefore, that *as a parent* you must stand before the “great white throne,” and that your own as well as your children’s everlasting destiny may hinge upon your present faithfulness or want of faithfulness to them! Recollect the dying question of this boy who felt he was going unpreparedly to meet his Judge. “Which of us,” meaning himself and his parents “Which of us will answer for it on the day of judgement?”

MEMOIRS, TO SERVE AS A HISTORY OF THE SEMI-PELAGIAN
CONTROVERSY IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

No. IV.

Pelagianism in the West. Introductory Article.

No efforts on the part of the General Assembly, nor labours of their historical committees, nor the publications of individuals, have as yet, produced a well digested history of the rise and progress of the Presbyterian Church in North America. Materials for such a history exist, but no well qualified man has appeared willing to undertake to collect, arrange and publish them.

While this delay has been long and painful to many who feel themselves incompetent to such a work, the enemies of truth and order have lost no time and spared no pains to forestall public opinion, by the publication of dark and dangerous misrepresentations, in regard to the character and policy of the church. To sustain this charge and stimulate the orthodox to collect and arrange out of the fragmentary mass, such facts as shall place the Presbyterian Church in her true light before the present and future generations,

I shall make a few extracts from a single number of a newspaper, Presbyterian in name, but anti-Prebyterian in character.

The editor, speaking of a party in New England, who were opposed to the civil and ecclesiastical institutions of Massachusetts, says, "here was the Presbyterian influence in New England, attempting to smother liberty in its cradle and to establish a consolidated government connected with a religious despotism." And then after professing much love to her (i. e. Presbyterian) system when properly administered, he adds—"It will be remembered, also, that this Presbyterian party were opposed to the civil government of the colony—they were anti-republican." And further,

"Here are the Congregationalists going forth as pioneers, through all the desolations and hardships of the land, to plant churches and spread the gospel:—In almost every instance the Presbyterian Church has entered into other men's labours, and now presumes to commence a war of extermination upon the Congregationalists, after having enjoyed all the advantages for reaping the fruits of their labours, for more than the third of a century, which the '*plan of union*' could give them."

"The strict Presbyterians were zealous for the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Directory, Presbyterian order, and academical learning in the preachers of the gospel; while they appeared to have *disliked* the close examination contended for by the Congregationalists, in regard to *personal piety*;—Here is the real difficulty. It was a cold, heartless orthodoxy; consisting in adhering to printed forms, taking 'mint and rue and anise and cummin' and opposing vital godliness in the ministry; *a party of foreigners*, charging their brethren, with heresy, who are promoting the cause of vital piety;—"They were for shaping the head of a candidate to the corners of the *triangle*, while the heart was left uncultivated and cold as the iceberg.—This was the cause of division in 1741.—It is the cause of division now in the church." Cincinnati Journal, August 16th, 1838.

These are a few instances, out of many, of misrepresentations, by which public opinion is forestalled, and the hearts of the simple beguiled. It is a Bible truth, that, "when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, Satan came also among them." And it is also true that the present Christianity, the best religious revivals, the most scriptural displays of light and holiness, have been corrupted, marred and obscured by "Ministers of Satan transformed as the ministers of righteousness." Such were Hymeneus and Alexander, in the days of the Apostles—Arius and Pelagius before the dark ages of popery—Munzer and Arminius during the reformation—and if I might compare small things with great, till they come to a point of utter insignificance, I would name Thomas B. Craighead, Barton W. Stone, N. S. S. Beman, Alexander Campbell, Albert Barnes, Lyman Beecher, and the Editor of the Cincinnati Journal—all in our own times.

Many who obtained a memorial in church history, by their follies and their faults, have long since fallen under the sentence of truth and the stroke of death. But neither the force of truth nor the power of death could, as yet, eradicate their heresies from the

church militant. No, their ruinous errors, scathed and withered and uprooted in one place, or in one age, have sprung up in another, assuming new names and singular modifications.

An unscriptural reason is assigned by some for the existence and continuance of heresies in the church of God. It is said, "God permits seducing men to deceive many, as a scourge to the church for her unfaithfulness." This is not the reason assigned by the Holy Spirit. "There must be heresies among you that *they* which are *approved* may be made *manifest* among you." The church must suffer in such a state; but she suffers like Job, as an example of patience; and when he, whose fan is in his hand, arises for her purification, she herself arises to greater prosperity and peace, to show forth the grace and power of her Lord. When there are false teachers in the church, as there were false prophets among the Jews, the people of God are constrained to "buy the truth and sell it not"—"to try the spirits whether they be of God." All must be made to feel the *shaking power of reform* till the chaff is driven away and "the sanctuary cleansed."

Those who fancy that there is any thing *materially new* in the heresies which now afflict the Presbyterian Church—or, who imagine that all this New-Schoolism is the beginning of the "latter day glory," "know nothing as they ought to know." They know not that the minds of their mischievous leaders have first *marched* over the Confession of Faith and then *marched* over the Bible and then *marched* back fourteen hundred years, into the principality of Wales to collect the scintillations of Pelagius in the monastery of Banchor. Like their prototypes they "put darkness for light and know not at what they stumble."

It must be admitted, however, that there is something *new* in the *dramatis personæ*, the actors in this tragic-farce. Not indeed a single *new* error. Not a *new* perversion of the scriptures. Not one *new* sophistry. But *new* combinations of heterogenous agents—*new* modes of attack—*new* degrees of impudence—and above all a *new*, bold and systematic course of *lying*. On this point Dr. L. Beecher is good evidence. He says, "I do know, as incident to these *new* measures, there is a spirit of the most marvelous duplicity and double dealing and lying, surpassing any thing that has come up in my day." On this, Dr. Harvey remarks, "It is marvelous that Dr. Beecher should so soon be found making a league with the very men whom he accuses of practicing duplicity and double dealing." (Har. mor. agen. p. 156.) And the Rev. Samuel Crothers has shown that the Pelagian Assembly of 1838, deliberately made a false record. Dr. L. Beecher was a leading member in that assembly. So that Dr. Harvey's hope was vain, which he expressed in regard to Dr. Beecher's not having adopted the practice of those double dealers with whom he had formed a league. So true it is that he who walks in the counsel of the ungodly will soon stand in the way of sinners.

But what is this new-schoolism about which there is so much said? It consists of a few scraps and shreds of Calvinism mixed up with Arminianism, Pelagianism, and Socinianism. It is that select system which Dr. Skinner desired to be sent to the heathen,

having nothing in it peculiar to any Christian denomination—that system, which, Dr. Miller said, in reply to Dr. Skinner, “was like nothing in heaven above or on the earth beneath.”

This is the reason why no two new-schoolmen preach alike, except when they happen to hit upon one of their **THREE RADICALS**, *human ability, general atonement, and instrumental regeneration.*

In regard to Pelagianism itself, it is proper to state, that all who maintain that “man is by nature possessed of a power to comply with the call of the gospel” are followers of Pelagius. Or, “the assignment to men of an important agency in the application of redemption” is Pelagianism. Dr. L. Beecher has expressed the Pelagian heresy in a short sentence—“ability is the ground and measure of obligation.” (*Views in Theol.* p. 95.) Or, as I am informed, he expressed it to his theological class, in Lane Seminary,—“Utility is the rule—ability is the measure of man’s obedience.”

Having thus given its *quintessence*, I shall attempt hereafter to give some historical sketches of its rise, progress and expansion in the Presbyterian Church, particularly in the WEST, where I have resided for more than a

HALF CENTURY.

FRUITS OF THE BALTIMORE CONFERENCE ON UNIVERSALISM.

THE REV'D MR. EVERETT, has preached his *farewell* sermon, and removed finally from Baltimore. He left the city permanently in the latter part of September—about six months after the close of his public conference, with the senior editor of this Magazine.

We beg the reader to turn to the account given by us, in a previous number, of that conference—and its probable fruits; and then he will be more disposed to thank God, with us, for what he has done, in this extraordinary affair. Here is the first result—of this grand attempt to prove in a public discussion to our people, that *the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, teach that no one will be punished in any future state, for sins committed in this.* In six months, the advocate of such monstrous folly and impiety, gives up his charge, and leaves the city!

Now let it be remembered, that when this discussion took place, this individual seemed permanently, though but recently settled in a very large, and very handsome church lately erected, under his care, and in a sense for him; that he was preaching, as he boasted, to full houses; that his “*society*,” by his own account, was large, flourishing, and united; and that the general cause of Universalism was spreading rapidly through the city, as he boasted: let it be borne in mind, that the discussion itself, was one sought by them, declined by one after another of the ministers of Christ, forced upon us, and entered on by us, against our own wishes, contrary to the general advice of our friends, and amid some rebuke, even of a public character, from an orthodox source; let the whole case as it really existed, and has developed itself—be considered, and it presents an exceedingly clear and remarkable case of the interposition

of God's providence, for the glory of his great name. As such we devoutly record it.

The mere changing of a minister, it may be said, is no decisive indication, that a cause is declining. Certainly not as a general fact; but the driving off a *boastful champion* from his selected and victorious field—is a decisive event *to him*; and no mean evidence against his cause. Add to which, it is now generally known in this city; 1, that the *society* is greatly weakened; 2, that it is greatly divided; 3, that it was no longer able to support Mr. Everett; 4, that it was no longer willing to do for him as much as it had formerly done; 5, that it is no longer able to do for any new minister, what it was easily doing for him before the Conference.

The simple matter of fact is—that both Mr. E. and his "*society*"—saw the necessity of bending before an irresistible public sentiment; and however he may attempt to disguise the true cause of his removal—every body here knows what it was. Considering the impiety of this man's doctrine—the coarseness of his behaviour, and the vulgarity of his unparalleled pen; his departure from amongst us—must be looked on as a marked evidence of the existence of a sound and enlightened public sentiment in this community.

We deem it proper to say, and we trust we do it, with deep humility of heart—and with unfeigned thankfulness to God—that the church over which we have been placed in the Lord, in this city, has manifested—since the conference so often alluded to, a condition of things so diametrically the opposite of that which we have described above, that during no period for many years, has its income been so large, its seats so crowded, its permanent worshippers so numerous, or its members so perfectly and cordially united, on all the great points of doctrine, duty, and measures, which agitate the church of God in our day, as at the present moment.—Thanks be to God, he has heard and most graciously answered the prayer, with which we closed that debate! He has speedily and signally appeared both to uphold his blessed cause, and to confound his bold defamers!

Having said thus much as to the "*society*"—and its former teacher,—we proceed to some other testimonials, not less impressive of the ruin of Universalism in this city.

During the discussion, Mr. Everett stated that a remarkable case had occurred here within his own knowledge, in which a female had been converted to Universalism, by reading a former written controversy between himself and us; and that she had died happy, in her new faith,—as he was ready to prove by the oath of her husband (a Mr. Mason) then in the house.—This was no doubt considered, as not only a hard personal rap upon us—but a sort of trap not admitting a decent escape. We merely replied, that as to the dead lady—we had only to say, if the facts were truly stated—we felt unspeakable solemnity before God, in being unto him a savour of Christ "in them that perish." (2 Cor. ii. 15.) But that as to the living husband, we were not sorry that his prompt tender of *his public oath*, in a case where most men would use some reserve, had opened a point we desired to discuss. We then briefly proved by proper authorities, that according to the well settled law of the land,

the man, being a Universalist, was not to be believed on oath; nay, that he could find no tribunal that would allow him to be sworn, about any thing whatever!

This produced a great sensation, many threats, and some fears on the part of our friends, of personal violence to us. Nothing like this was ever before imagined by the people generally, in our good city; and many enquired with eagerness, how such things could be—and be so long overlooked?—Time rolled on. The week before Mr. Everett preached his farewell sermon, a Mr. *Cornine* of this city was called as a witness in a case between *Woodward* and *Robertson*; a man often allowed before to testify unquestioned—though known to hold some infidel and Universalist opinions. Now the question was made—and the man set aside (*Judges Purviance and Archer on the Bench*)—for only expressing a *doubt* as to the existence of a future *state* of punishment. For several days after this, the facts were published in most, if not all of our daily papers: and on the following sabbath, all the hearers of Mr. Everett's farewell sermon—might have had the benefit of retaining this commentary on his teachings, fresh in their memories, while he gave them a parting exhortation to steadfastness in winning the loss of all temporal privileges, and all social respectability—as well as all spiritual consolation, and all heavenly hope. Not long after his departure, a second, and perhaps even more striking case occurred. A Mr. *Spencer*, as the name has been repeated to us,—for several years a judge at our elections, was again appointed one, for the polls in the 6th ward of the city, for the general election, which occurred during the first week in October. He presented himself, as on former occasions, to enter on the functions of his office; but this time, he was questioned as to his capacity of being bound by an oath—before taking an official one; and being found not to believe in a *future state* of punishment, was set aside, as incompetent to swear at all!

Here, then, is the public attention fully turned to this important branch of the subject, and men will see and approve the universal verdict of all civilized states, that he who does not firmly believe that men will be punished in a future state, for sins unrepented of in this—are utterly out of the reach of all moral obligation towards their fellow men. Bring public odium and contempt to bear on religious belief, and from that moment, only the conscientious will adopt it through principle, or the dreadfully corrupt follow it, for its wages, in defiance of conviction. In other words—the *spread* of Universalism stops there.

There has been much difficulty, as our readers know, between us, and Mr. Everett and his "Society"—about the funds resulting from the sale of the tickets of admission to the discussion.—We have fully explained the nature of this, in our former article. At present we will only say, that till this hour, all attempts on our part to have the matter settled, have proved entirely ineffectual; although the original agreement between us was very clear on this part of the case, and although we have made repeated attempts to compromise and arbitrate the case. It may be proper hereafter when the matter is settled, to explain more fully these attempts, in order to show clearly, the moral character of the parties and their religion.

In the meantime, we observe that the difficulty is three fold: 1, we have never been able to get any fair statement of the money actually received by Mr. E. and the "society"—one or both; sometimes they have stated the whole amount of sales of tickets, at a little over \$1000, which was the amount reported to Mr. Lucas by them, and through him to us; while at other times, (as in their conferences with Mr. Giles,) they state the gross sum as being near \$1200; the truth perhaps being, that it fell little short, all told, of \$1400. 2. We differ entirely as to their demands on this fund—they charging rents, cleanings, &c. &c., up to nearly \$600 for eight nights of a church proffered rent free; while we limit the expenses to under \$200. 3. They wish, after reducing the amount received, as low as possible, and running up expenses, as high as possible—to force us to divide—glorious fellows! to divide the remainder—they pocketing one half, and we the other; while we insist on knowing the exact amount of the true surplus, on a just and honest settlement of the whole matter—and then require *all* this balance, to be given to some public charity to be jointly settled, by Mr. E. and us, according to our original terms; and to this end we have proposed all the general charities that exist in the city—and some new ones.

Thus stand the points of difference. So far from settling with us, in any way, or on any terms, that were fair or reputable to any of the parties; they threatened us constantly with suits, joint and several—all the time for three or four months. Suddenly, and by perfect accident, we were told, "Mr. Everett's sale occurs tomorrow—and he goes away next monday." So that apparently, the whole of this pretence of a suit—was a mere blind—in order to let Mr. Everett get quietly out of the reach of legal responsibility. So we judged it best, to sue them, as they would not sue us. And the whole case is now before the chancellor, first, to get a true account and a fair settlement of the money got by Mr. Everett and the "society"—one or both; and secondly, that the court may direct the proper application of the surplus, to some suitable charity. We took some pains to have Mr. Everett *informed* of this step before he left us, and have reason to believe that the matter was *explained to him "by authority."*

We await the issue and fruits of this application to the courts—before closing the subject. Thus far, it has been all guided by plain and singular providences; let the remainder be as shall seem good to the same wise and blessed master. How inadequately do we realize that God is in every thing; and that we ourselves not only have our being, but live and move, only in him. Sweet and sacred thought; and yet how full of grandeur!

D. D. THE FOURTH ESTATE IN THE CHURCH.

IN the constitution of England, King, Lords, and Commons, constitute the three orders of the State, as originally formed. The dealers in *public sentiment*, in modern times, have added a fourth order, commonly but very vulgarly called *printers*. A similar addition has taken place to the organic law of the Protestant churches generally, and especially, the Presbyterian Church, in this country: and to the three orders of Deacon, Elder and Bishop, a fourth more potent than all the rest, is added, under the title of *Doctors in Divinity*. We bow with reverence to both changes; and concern ourselves, just now, only as chroniclers of a few facts, regarding the signal and generally admitted improvement in the constitution of the church of God, which is effected by adding a fourth "*grade*"—(as the newspaper organ of Lafayette college, calls the D. D. lately conferred by its corporation) to its permanent officers.

There was indeed a time when portions of the church of God considered the office of *Doctor*, (or teacher) a separate and divinely instituted function in the body of Christ. They who will condescend to examine so trifling an affair as the doings of the Westminster Assembly of divines, will find something on this subject, which may perhaps tend to prove how much better it is, even if Christ established such an office, to let college trustees and faculties bestow it—rather than trouble the church courts with it. There was a period also, when the churches generally imagined, that the peculiar province of all bishops, was to *teach the public religion*; that is to be *Doctors of Divinity*; or more shortly, D. D. But since it has come to pass, that many bishops teach nothing, many teach errors, and many teach every thing and any thing *but* divinity; the colleges seem to consider, that as by a figure of speech men say, *Lucus a non Lucendo Dicitur*—that is briefly L. L. D.; so by another, they dub, *Doctor a non Docendo*, that is D. D. So they have worthily supplied the negligence of the church, and given us a *fourth power* from amongst the pastors—but alas! not *of* them: for whatever else they may be renowned for, they are not for the appropriate work of the ministry.

There is a singular propriety also, that a "*grade*"—in theology should be conferred by institutions purely literary. It is not usual for a medical faculty to confer literary degrees: nor for the colleges of mere letters, to confer medical degrees. But this is a mere oversight. And it is undoubtedly to be expected, that as all the colleges educe from a mere power to confer literary degrees—or as they are strictly called, degrees in the arts—a right to confer purely professional and scientific ones, on one hand; they will soon find that their modesty has caused them to underrate both their parts and their powers on others. Why might not the worthy corporation of AMHERST, as well prove their literary eminence, by honouring the Homoepathic system of physic in the person of some devotee to it, as the New-School theology in the person of Mr. Baxter Dickinson? It strikes us, that it is as fair a claim to a *literary* destinc-

tion in medicine, to discover that the infinitesimal part of nothing, is as much as any thing; as it is to a *literary* "grade" in theology—save the mark! to find a way, in which when a man says "*steebo*," he can be proved to mean "drive out the dogs." It is at least satisfactory to see, that Mr. Dickerson finds it easier to conciliate his northern friends, than to explain his letter about them, from the Assembly of '37.

Another propriety in the condition of the *fourth* "grade", is that it is invariably conferred by intuition. This is a peculiarity of our colleges in regard to all the degrees they confer, except the first degree in the arts. Ah! well do we remember, how our young heart was grieved when we saw, in the second class above us, at Princeton, in the fall of 1817 or perhaps 1818, a most worthy man refused the first degree in the arts; and leave the place, degraded in his own eyes and in those of all around him. And yet how many men have received there, and from all our colleges the second degree in the arts—merely because they had spent time enough in idleness, after graduating (three years) to forget what little they ever knew? Admirable device! made master of all arts—with a moral certainty that a man knows no one single art; and without a question asked—but what the calender answers. Admirable device! And admirably applied to the church of God, in which, by intuition, a college corporation creates a *fourth estate*!

We should do great injustice however, if we made the impression that these degrees are conferred blindly. Sometimes indeed, sad errors creep in. We heard Dr. THOMAS MCAULEY, who is both D. D. and L. L. D., and above the average of his compeers in both, quote bad latin, on the floor of the Assembly of 1837; yea with savage contempt for the weaker sex, transform an innocent noun substantiative, which ages upon ages have allowed to be feminine into downright masculinity—as Dr. S. Lugens Cox would say. Indeed it is rather odd to find any Doctor of a certain pattern in theology, who habitually quotes even English correctly—when a false quotation would suit a purpose as well. But in general, whatever the Doctors may be, the Doctorates are conferred with good discretion in some respects. For example—it will be found that no college performs this excellent service for the church, without an eye to itself and its own honour and benefit. Thus officers in all other colleges are peculiar favourites of colleges whose officers are yet to be "graded." So pastors of rich congregations, to poor colleges in their vicinity. So editors of widely circulated religious newspapers. So clamorous and obsequious friends of particular members of a faculty or a corporation.

Much injustice might also be done, if we did not distinctly exonerate the recipients of these honours amongst the clergy—from all suspicion of undervaluing them. So much is the contrary the fact, and so justly is this *fourth estate* valued—that if Dr. Junkin, or Dr. Carnahan, or Dr. Day, or Dr. Humphry, or [any other locum tenens of the forge of degrees, with four or five worthy persons round about their colleges, no matter who, or what, will just say, in black and white, that Mr. President, or Mr. Editor, or Mr. Agent, or Mr. Idler, so and so ought to be raised a "grade"—and be prin-

ted D. D. in the newspapers; forthwith that title supplants all others,—and being worn as a diadem through life, and printed under the engravings of them (all D. Ds; should be engraved; we recommend SARTIN of Phil.) is at last cut in decent capitals on their tomb-stones. “Here lies TAKEEASE HUMDRUM D. D..” How come he so titled? And by whom? Fie upon all impertinent questions. Dr. Carroll when president of Hampden Sydney—gave degrees that we have no doubt stick as fast, and smell as sweet, and sound as big—as if they had been worthily given and worthily received. So where is the difference?

Indeed there is something extraordinary and unaccountable, in the power of this *fourth estate*—upon the minds of men. A passing compliment, no matter how grateful or exaggerated, is upon all other subjects, by and by forgotten. People do not ordinarily suffix to their names, like the tail of a Hebrew or Italian compound, a memento of other triumphs and successes, no matter how remarkable. Nor do we any longer derive our appellations like Ovid from our noses, like Ziska, from our afflictions, or like Scipio, from our victories. But this grand degree in the *arts*, thrown pell mell into the bowels of the most peculiar and exclusive of all the *sciences*, creates such an effect on those it happens to light upon—that like the Greek fire it consumes whatever it touches, with inextinguishable energy;—and brands itself into the name, more effectually than the mark on the stock in the western prairies, is burnt into the hide.

The church of God has meekly bowed her head, and shouted, *Rabbi* and *Rabboni*, with the very loudest. Her duty to supply the world with *teachers of religion*—is still somewhat indifferently performed. On a rough estimate, we should say, that nearly one in six of all the preachers in all the Protestant Churches—are really engaged in preaching the gospel; and in our denomination—some-what a larger proportion, perhaps a third or fourth are so occupied. In 1838, the minutes of the General Assembly report 1690 ministers, of whom only 523 are pastors; while the remaining 1167 are,—alas what? But while the pastoral office—the real old fashioned, scriptural grade of *Doctor of Divinity*—is thus passed into neglect; this new and better doctorate adorns our records, flames over our colleges, flaunts in our newspapers, flutters around our agents, graces the repose of our professors of all arts and sciences *except* religion, embellishes the dignified idleness of our bishops at large, and adds elegance and grace to the laborious indolence of our secularised evangelists. Blessed church! to have fallen upon so fair a method of deliverance and renown!—Immortal honour to the forge keepers, of these thunderbolts of praise!—Glorious *fourth estate* in the church of Christ!—Illustrious grade of *Doctor a non Docendo*;—written in short —D. D.!

[Continued from 473.]

THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

No. II.

XXIII. The form of prayer used by the ancient church on the occasion of the eucharist is a witness for the truth. The author of the books of the sacraments (said to be Ambrose) says that the language uttered by the priest, was as follows : (*Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam rationabilem quod est FIGURA corporis sanguinis Domini etc.*) Cause that this oblation may be set to our account, reasonable, and acceptable, which is the *figure* of the body and blood of our Lord. These words, with the exception of the words *figure* &c. remain in the mass of the Roman church, but instead of the word *figure* &c., we have at present *ut nobis corpus est sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii* "that it may be made to us the body and blood of thy best beloved Son." The excuse given for the change, is that the sacrament is called *figure* on account of the accidents, which are the signs of the body of our Lord. But it is insufficient. The accidents (*viz*: the length, breadth, colour, roundness, &c.) cannot be called the oblation; but this ancient form of prayer asserts that the *oblation* is the *figure* of the body of the Lord.

The apostolical constitutions (written under the Christian Emperors, as is evident from book 6, chap. 24) furnish another testimony. By them it appears, that the act of giving thanks was connected with the reception of the sacrament. (*See lib. vii. chap. 26.*) We thank thee O our Father, for the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which has been shed for us, and for the precious body, the symbols of which we celebrate; himself having ordained, that we show forth his death. (*Et pro precioso corpore, cujus haec antitypa perficimus, ipso, nobis ordinante, ut annunciareremus ejus mortem.*) From this it appears, that the church gave thanks for the blood of Christ, shed, not in the Eucharist, but on the cross, and consequently for the body of Christ offered on the cross. They called the sacrament not only a commemoration of his death, but a symbol of his body.

If the church at that time had believed the doctrine of transubstantiation, would they not have given thanks for the body of Christ in the Eucharist? Besides, the custom of the ancient church of saying to the people at the communion (*Sursum corda*) "raise your hearts" reminded them to carry their affections beyond that which was in the priests' hands, up to the Saviour who is seated at the right hand of his Father in heaven. This custom has remained in the church.

XXIV. There are other proofs of the custom of the early church, but they may be introduced with more effect hereafter; we proceed now to show the sentiments of the fathers upon this subject.

Augustine (against Adamantus, chap. 12,) says, "The Lord did not hesitate to say this is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." (*Non enim dubitavit dicere hoc est corpus meum cum signum*

daret corporis sui.) In this passage Augustine declares that our Lord by using the words "my body" intended the sign or symbol of his body.

The same author, on Ps. 3, when representing the great goodness of our Lord, says, "Although he was not ignorant of the thoughts of Judas, yet he received him to the feast at which he commended and gave to his disciples the figure of his body." (*Cum ejus cogitationes non ignoraret eum adhibuit ad convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui FIGURAM discipulis commendavit et tradidit.*) Bellarmin (*lib. 2 chap. 24, § ex Tomo*) clips off the words *et tradidit* upon which the force of the passage depends.

XXV. The Decretum Gratiani (*part iii. de consec, dist. 2, canon hoc est (48)*) after declaring that the flesh of our Lord is covered with the form of bread, cites a passage from Augustin in proof of that position; but the passage proves the opposite. It is thus, "As the celestial bread, which is the flesh of Christ, is *suo modo*, called the body of Christ, although, in truth, it is the sacrament or sign of the body of Christ, that is to say, of that which was suspended on the cross visible, palpable, mortal." (*Sicut coelestis panis, qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum re vera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius videlicet, quod visibile palpabile mortale in cruce suspensum est, etc.*) Now the word (*cum*) although, expresses clearly that, *that* which is called the body of Christ in the supper, is not the body in *reality* but in *sign* or symbol. The passage proceeds thus, "The immolation of the flesh, which is made by the hands of the priest is called the passion, the death, the crucifixion, not in reality, but in a significant mystery. Thus the sacrament of faith (by which we understand baptism) is faith." (*Vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio: non rei veritate sed significante mysterio: Sic sacramentum fidei, quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est.*)

XXVI. But the 23 Ep. of Augustin to Boniface is very apposite to this subject, and we give the entire passage. "We often express ourselves thus, saying, when the time of Easter approaches, to-morrow, or the day after, is the passion of our Lord, although he suffered many years ago, and he suffered but once; so on Sunday, we say the Lord rose to-day, although many years have elapsed since his resurrection. Why is no one silly enough to accuse us of falsehood, when we thus speak, unless because we name these days, according to their similitude with the days on which these things occurred? So that this day, is called the same day, when it is not the same, but only similar to it, by the revolution of time. Was not Christ sacrificed in himself, once only? Yet in the sacrament he is sacrificed for the people, not only every Easter, but every day; and he, who being inquired of, answers that he is sacrificed, does not tell a falsehood. For if the sacraments had not some resemblance with the things, of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all. Now on account of this resemblance, they most frequently take the names of the things themselves; as therefore, the sacrament of the body of Christ, is in some sense the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood

of Christ, is the blood of Christ; so, the sacrament of faith, (*i. e.* baptism,) is faith.”*

This passage shews very clearly, and by several examples, in what sense, Jesus Christ is sacrificed in the sacrament, and how the sacrament of the body of Christ, is the body of Christ. Baptism is not faith in *reality*, but faith in signification or sign. By the word *sacrament*, in this passage, it is obvious Augustine means sign or commemoration. And so he explains it (in *Civitas Dei*, lib. 10, chap. 5.) (*Sacrificium ergo, visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum est.*) So in Ep. 5, to Marcellinus, “signs when they appertain to divine things, are called sacraments,” (*signa cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur.*) And so the Roman Catholic church understands it, as appears in 2 Dist. of Consecration at the Canon *Sacrificium*, (32.) That church, however, explains, by saying that the *accidents* (without subject) are the sign or sacrament. But this mode of explanation will not suit the expression of Augustine, “baptism is faith” which he says is the same mode of speech as that which we adopt when we say the sacrament of the body of Christ, is the body of Christ.

We cannot apply the abstraction of *accidents* without subject to baptism. Besides, Augustine says nothing of accidents without subject, and his assertion, that the signs are in a certain sense, the body of Christ, would on that view be false, for the accidents, (*viz*: the colour, shape, weight, &c.) cannot in any sense be called the body of Christ.

XXVII. Again, in his first tract upon 1 Epistle of John, we have this expression, “the Lord consoles us, who being seated in heaven, we can no longer touch with the hand, but we can touch him by faith.”†

Also against Maximin lib. 3. chap. 22, “These things are sacraments, in which we always attend, not to what they are, but to what they represent, because they are signs, which are *one* thing, and signify *another*.”‡ In this place *sacramenta* and *signa* are used in the same sense.

*Sæpe ita loquimur ut, Pascha propinquante, dicamus crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino, nisi semel, illa passio facta sit. Nempe, ipso die dominico, dicimus, Hodie Dominus resurrexit, cum ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierint. Car nemo tam ineptus est, ut nos, ita loquentes, arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies, secundam illorum quibus haec gesta sunt similitudinem nuncupamus, ut dicatur ipse dies, qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus. Nonne semel immolitus est Christus in se ipso? Et tamen in sacramento, non solum per omnes Paschae solennitates, sed omni die populis immolatur: Nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus, eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta, quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sunt sacramenta, non haberent omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo, secundum quendam modum, sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est; Sacramentum sanguinis Christi, sanguis Christi est, ita, sacramentum fidei, fides est.

†Ipsam jam in coelo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus sed fide contingere.

‡Haec sacramenta sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant semper attenditur; quoniam signa sunt rerum, aliud existens aliud significantia.

XXVIII. Beda upon 1 Cor. 10, cites a passage from Augustine, in these words. That which you see is bread and a cup. Our eyes inform us of this; but as to the instruction which your faith requires, the bread is the body of our Lord." (*Quod vidistis panis est et calix, quod nobis etiam oculi renunciant; Quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus christi.*) According to this passage, it is proper to refer to the testimony of our senses.

Still the author does not consider evidence of our senses a reason why we should not say, that the bread is the body of our Lord, for he replies to the question "how is the bread his body, and how is that which is within the cup, his blood" ?* In answering the question he would naturally, we might say certainly, teach the doctrine of transubstantiation, if that doctrine were true and he believed it, but he answers thus, "These things, my brethren, are called sacraments, for this reason, because in them, we see *one* thing, and understand by them *another* thing. What we see is a corporeal form. What we understand, is a spiritual fruit. If then, you wish to understand, in this place, the words *body of Christ*, listen to the Apostle, who says ye are the body of Christ."† It is very evident from this passage that Augustine did not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation.

XXIX. In lib. 3, chap. 16, of the Christian Doctrine, we have this passage, "If you do not eat the flesh of the Son of Man (says our Lord) and do not drink his blood you shall have no life in yourselves. He seems to command the commission of a crime; but it is a figure:—It is a figure which requires us to participate in the passion of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably preserve it in our memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."‡

XXX. In lib. 20, against Faustus, the Manichean, cap. 11, he ridicules the Manicheans who believed they ate the flesh of Christ in fruits, and in their common meats thus, "You expect with open mouth some one to put Christ down through your throat, as into an excellent sepulchre."§ If Augustine had believed the doctrine of transubstantiation, the remark would have been retorted upon him by the Manicheans; though it is true their error was different from the heresy of transubstantiation.

XXXI. In the tract 45, upon John, Augustine compares the sacraments of the Old Testament, with those of the New; and he attempts to show how the fathers ate the same meat and drank the same drink as we. He closes his remarks thus, "They drank the same spiritual drink, but not the same corporeal drink. For what

* Quomodo est panis corpus ejus?

† Ista fratres idcirco dicuntur sacramenta quia in illis aliud videtur aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem; quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem. Corpus ergo Christi, si vis intelligere audi apostolem dicentem vos estis corpus Christi.

‡ Nisi manducaveritis (inquit) carnem filii hominis et sanguinem biberitis, etc. Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est, ergo praeicipiens passioni Dominicae esse communicandum et suaviter et utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.

§ Ore aperto expectatis quis inferat Christum tanquam optimae sepulturae faucibus vestris.

did they drink? They drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ. You see, then, that while the faith remains the same, the signs are changed. Then, the rock was Christ; now, that which is put upon the altar of God, is Christ."*

We remark on this passage, that Augustine teaches, that the drink we take is *corporeal*. The Romanists teach, that the drink taken at the mouth is spiritual. We remark, also, the antithesis between the signs; that rock was Christ—the bread on the altar is Christ.

XXXII. On psalm 98, he introduces Jesus talking thus, to his disciples; "understand spiritually, what I have said to you. You shall not eat this body which you see, nor drink the blood which they, who shall crucify me, shall shed. I have commended to you a sacred sign, which, being understood spiritually, will give you life"†

Bellarmino explains this passage thus, "You shall not eat this body which you see, that is, in the fashion or shape that you see it," which is as much as to say, "you shall not eat this body that you see; that is, you shall eat it in another shape or form."

XXXIII. In chap. 19, (Of the faith) to Peter the Deacon (a book which the Catholics ascribe to Augustine, and the stile of it shews it to be his) he says, "The universal church does not cease to offer a sacrifice of bread and wine."‡ Here he speaks of the bread and wine after the consecration, and it is of *bread and wine*, not of the *accidents* of bread and wine, which the Romanists admit cannot be made a sacrifice, and which cannot become a propitiation for us. But take the rest of the passage: "For in the carnal victims (viz: of the Old Testament) there was a representation of the flesh of Christ, which he, being without sin, was about to offer for our sins. But in this sacrifice, thanks are given and a commemoration is made of the flesh of Christ, which he offered for us, and of the blood, which the same God shed for us."§

Now the object of Augustine was to show the excellency of the Eucharist, above the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and here was the place to teach the doctrine of transubstantiation, if it were true and he believed it. But not a word of it.

XXXIV. In tract 50, upon John, we have the following, "Shall I take hold of him, being absent? How shall I reach my hand to heaven where he is seated, and take hold of him?" Augustine replies, "Send thy faith thither, and thou hast laid hold of him. Thy

* Bibebant de spiritali sequente petra, petra autem Christus. Videte ergo, fide manente, signa variata. Ibi, petra Christus; nobis Christus, quod in altari ponitur.

† Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi. Spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos.)

‡ Sacrificium panis et vini Ecclesia Catholica per universum orbem terrae offerre non cessat.

§ In illis enim carnalibus victimis figuratio fuit carnis Christi quam pro peccatis nostris ipse sine peccato fuerat oblaturus. In isto autem sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis quam pro nobis obtulit et sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit.

kinsmen (the Jews) laid hold of him in the body, but take thou hold of him with the heart."*

Again, in the same tract; "We have always Jesus Christ, according to the presence of his majesty, but in respect to the presence of his flesh, he truly said to his disciples, "Me ye have not always."† Bellarmine explains this to mean, me ye have not always *visibly*. But this is adding to the Scripture, and it supposes, that Christ is the less present because he is invisible. But to show that Bellarmine is at variance with Augustine, we have only to take up the text of this father a little before the passage cited. He explains very clearly, how he understands that the body of Christ is present; "Thou hast Christ in presence by faith; in presence by the sign of Christ;—in presence by the sacrament of baptism;—in presence by the meat and drink of the altar."‡

His body then is present in the Eucharist as it is present by faith, and by baptism, which is not a carnal presence. And it should be observed that Augustine is here speaking (not of the presence but) of the *manner* of his presence.

XXXV. In tract 46, upon John, Augustine speaking of this sacrament says, that we take a visible meat, and this expression occurs very often (tract 26) (*Nam et nos hodie accipimus visibilem cibum.*) He cannot mean the body of Christ, for that is not visible. He cannot mean the *accidents* (*i. e.* the colour, roundness, breadth, &c.) of the bread without the bread; for the accidents are not meat or substance. Besides, those who would so interpret the author, should show from his writings, that he has at least once made such a distinction.

XXXVI. The Romanists hold, that hypocrites and the wicked receive the body of Christ in this sacrament—that Judas seated with the apostles really ate the body of Christ, but to his condemnation. Augustine, however, has taught that no wicked person eats the body of Christ.

In tract 59, upon John, he says, "They ate the bread which is the Lord; but he (Judas) ate the bread of the Lord against the Lord."§ He could not more distinctly say, that Judas did not take the bread which is the Lord. Still, it is proper to remark, that Augustine is mistaken in the history of this sacrament; for in tract 62 upon John, it appears he thought our Lord gave the dipped morsel to Judas after the reception of the Sacrament, whereas it was before. But it is enough for us that he *thought* Judas took of the Eucharist with the others and that notwithstanding, he did not eat the bread which is the Lord. Thus in the 11th sermon, &c., "Did

* *Quem tenebo absentem? Quomodo in coelum manum mittam ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte et tennisti. Parentes tui tennerunt carne; tu tene corde.*

† *Secundum presentiam Majestatis, semper habemus Christum; secundum presentiam carnis, rectè dictum est discipulis; Me autem semper non habebitis.*

‡ *Habes Christum in praesenti per fidem; in praesenti per signum Christi; in praesenti per baptismatissacramentum; in praesenti per ataris cibum et portum.*

§ *Illi manducabant panem Dominum; ille panem Domini contra Dominum.*

Judas remain in Christ or Christ in him although he first ate and drank the sacred sign of his flesh and blood made by his hands, with the other disciples?"*

XXXVII. In tract 26 upon John, "the sign of the unity of the body and of the blood of the Lord is prepared in some places daily, upon the table of the Lord, and in other places at certain intervals and is taken from the table by some, to life, and by others to perdition. But the thing of which it is the sign, serves for life to every man, who is a partaker of it, and for perdition to none;" and a little after, "He who remains not in Christ and in whom Christ does not remain, certainly does not eat his flesh spiritually, and does not drink his blood. Although carnally and visibly he presses with his teeth the sign of the body and blood of Christ."†

Now this is altogether at variance with the doctrine of Romanists; for those who say that the body of Christ is spiritually present in the *hostia* must admit that the wicked partake of it spiritually; for a thing cannot be received, except in the manner in which it is presented. But Augustine says, the wicked do not receive the body spiritually, but only in sign.

XXXVIII. In his treatise *De Civit. Dei*, lib. 21, chap. 25, Augustine takes a distinction between *eating the body of Christ in sacrament only* and eating it truly,‡ and a little after, he introduces our Lord as speaking thus, "Let him, who remains not in me, and in whom I do not remain, neither say nor think that he eats my body."

XXXIX. In the book on Sentences, collected by Prosper, we read, "Whoever is at discord with Christ does not eat the flesh of Jesus Christ, nor drink his blood, although he takes the sacrament of so great a thing to his perdition."§ Still the same *hostia* is given to the good and to the bad, and therefore this *hostia* is not really the body of Christ. This passage, however, has been expurgated from some editions, and instead of the words *non manducat carnem ejus*, we have, *non manducat panem ejus*. But the word *carnem*, is preserved in the decree of the Roman church, at the canon *Qui discordat 2 de consecrat*, and Biel cites this passage in lesson 36, and Lombard, in lib. 4, dist. 9, at the letter A.

Bellarmino pretends (*lib. 2, de Euchar. chap. 24,*) that when Augustine says, the wicked do not eat the body of the Lord, we must

* Num quid et Judas quamvis primum ipsum manibus confectum sacramentum carnis et sanguinis ejus cum cæteris discipulis manducaret et liberet, mansit in Christo aut Christus in eo?

† Hujus rei sacramentum, id est unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi, alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in Dominicâ mensâ præparatum et de mensâ Dominicâ sumitur, quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium; res vero ipsa, cujus et sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ac exitium quicumque ejus particeps fuerit * * * qui non manet in Christo et in quo non manet Christus, proculdubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus nec bibit ejus sanguinem; licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi.

‡ Non sacramento tenus sed revera corpus Christi manducare.

§ Qui discordat a Christo nec carnem Christi manducat nec sanguinem bibit etsi tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sui quotidie accipit.

understand him to mean the mystical body of Christ, that is, the Church; but we can hardly believe Augustine was apprehensive that any one would commit the error of supposing that he ate the church in the Eucharist, and for that reason gave a caution.

XL. On Psalm 98, after having said that our Saviour gives his flesh to eat for our salvation, he adds an exception,* "That no one eats that flesh unless he has first adored it." But the wicked do not adore it, and Augustine here speaks of serious, true adoration.

These extracts are sufficient to shew that the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be proven from the writings of Augustine. They are the more important because this author has the highest repute in the Roman Catholic church, and the passages cited, prove that this doctrine must have originated in an age subsequent to his.—He died, A. D. 430, (Indict. 13,) at the age of 76 years, and in the 40th of his ministry, according to Marcianus Scotus. We proceed now to an earlier age.

XLI. Justin Martyr, in the dialogue against Trypho, says, "Christ gave us bread, that we might remember, that he was made body for those who believe in him, on account of whom he was made capable of suffering—the cup, that we might give thanks, remembering his blood." The cup, then, is not the blood, but given in remembrance of the blood. And note, also, that he says our Lord gave *bread* and discriminates it from the body of Christ.

In his second apology, speaking of the bread of the Eucharist, he says, "For we do not take these things as common bread, or as common drink, but, as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being incarnate by the Word of God, had our flesh and our blood for our salvation, so we are taught, that the aliment, over which thanks were given by him by the prayer of the word of God—by which (aliment) our flesh and our blood is nourished by the change—is the flesh and the blood of this Jesus incarnate."† This change, of which the author speaks, is the change of the bread into our flesh and not of the bread into the flesh of Jesus Christ. The stile of this author (and of all the fathers) is worthy of observation. He says, that this *bread* which nourishes our body is the flesh of Jesus Christ; thus admitting that it is still bread, while it is the flesh of Jesus Christ. Now he could not mean that the bread, remaining bread, was the body of Jesus Christ substantially, but only sacramentally.

In the same book we find the following, "After that, those who are called Deacons among us, give to each of the persons present, bread to partake of and wine with water consecrated by thanksgiving."‡ Then it was wine and water, after the consecration, and

* Nemo carnem illam manducat nisi puris adoraverit.

† Ου γαρ ως κοινον αρτον ουδε κοινον πομα ταυτα λημβανομεν· αλλα ου τροπον δια λογου θεου σαρκωποιοηθεις Ιησους Χριστος ο σοτηρ ημων και σαρκα και αιμα υπερ σωτηριας ημων εκκευ' ουτω και την δι ευχης λογου του θεου παρ' αυτου ευχαρισθησιν τροφην εξ ης αιμα και σαρκις κατα μεταβολην τριφονται ημων εκεινου του σαρκωκοιηθεντος Ιησου και σαρκα και αιμα ειδαχθημεν ειναι.

‡ Οι καλουμενοι παρ ημιν διακονοι διδοασιν εκαστω των παροντων μεταλαβειν απο του ευχαρισθηεντος αρτου και κοινου και υδατος.

the consecration was made by thanksgiving, and not by a certain form of words repeated in a low voice addressed not to God but to the bread.

XLII. Justin Martyr (it has been said) flourished about the year A. D. 150. The author to whom we shall next refer, is Ireneus who flourished under Marcus Augustinus (circ. A. D. 175) Ireneus had learned the Platonic philosophy, and in his writings as well as in those of Clement of Alexandria, of Justin, of Origen, the gospel is adulterated by a mixture of Platonism. It was a dogma of this philosophy that the world is an animated being, endued with the wisdom of God. This appears from Plato's *Timaeus* (*νοσμος ζωον εμχυχον εννομου*) and in the dialogue called *Philebus*, he says, this soul is understanding and wisdom, which proceeds from God.* According to this philosophy the whole world and all creatures are the body of this soul and wisdom of God. Ireneus was imbued with this error. And because Jesus Christ is the word and wisdom of God, by whom all things were made, he held that creatures are the body of Jesus Christ; thus in his 5th book (*contra Haereses*) he says, "Because we are his members, and are nourished by the creature, and he supplies the creature, making his sun to rise and making the rain to fall, according to his will, he affirmed that the cup which is a creature, and by which he makes our bodies to grow, is his body; when, then, the mingled cup and the broken bread receives the word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the blood and body of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh takes its growth and is composed."†

The argument is briefly this, the bread and the cup are the body and blood of Christ, because they are his creatures. As if all creatures were the body of the Creator. It appears also, that he considered the corporeal aliments of our flesh, the body of Christ. He does not say, however, that the mingled cup and the broken bread become the blood and body, but the Eucharist of the blood and body of Christ—*Eucharist*, that is, thanksgiving for the blood and body of Christ. Besides, he does not say, simply, that our bodies are nourished by the body of Christ, but that they take their *increase* from it and are *composed*.

XLIII. The same error is more clearly discernable in lib. 4, chap. 34. He is speaking of the sacrifice, and in the church, and after having repeatedly said, we offer the first fruits of his creatures, viz; bread and wine, he goes on to prove, against certain heretics, that God, who is the Father of Jesus Christ, is the creator of all things, as follows, "How shall they be certain, that the bread over which

*Virgil alludes to this opinion in the 6 *Aeneid*, *Principio coelum ac terras, camposque liquentes lucentem que globum Lunæ, Titania que astra Spiritus intus alit totam que infusa per artus Mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet*, etc.

† Quoniam, membra ejus sumus, et per creaturam nutrimur; creaturarum autem nobis praestat, solem suum oriri faciet et pluens quemadmodum vult; eum calicem, qui est creatura, suum corpus, confirmavit, ex quo nostra auget corpora. Quam ergo et mixtus calix et fractus panis percepit verbum Dei, fit Eucharistia sanguinis et corporis Christi, ex quibus augeatur et consistit carnis nostrae substantia.

thanks are given, is the body of their Lord, and that the cup is his blood, if they do not acknowledge that he is the Son of the Creator of the world, that is, his word by which the tree fructifies, and the fountains flow, and who gives first the stalk, then the ear, and then the full grown wheat in the ear."*

XLV. Now observe the argument of Ireneus. He does not say that the bread becomes the body of Christ by consecration, (as Bellarmine alledges,) but he says that the bread is the body of Christ because Christ is the Creator who causes it to grow from the stalk to the ear. He does indeed say, that by the invocation of God, the bread ceases to be *common* bread and that it is made the Eucharist, *i. e.* thanksgiving; but he does not say that the bread is no more bread, nor that it is made the body of Christ by transubstantiation. It would be exceedingly inapt to alledge the transubstantiation of bread into his body, as a proof that Jesus Christ is the Creator. Such an argument would prove with equal conclusiveness that Adam was the Creator, because the earth was changed into his body. Nor does Ireneus say that the bread becomes the body of Christ after the thanksgiving. Nor does he say that the bread becomes his body at all, nor that the change is made by the power of Jesus Christ. But he says the bread is the body of Christ, because Christ is the Creator; proceeding upon the Platonic notion that the Deity is the soul of the world and of creatures, and that all creatures are his body, and that the bread began to be the body of the eternal Word from the instant it began to germinate in the seed.

It is obvious from these remarks that Ireneus, although in error, did not hold to the error of transubstantiation.

XLVI. We come now to Clement of Alexandria, who flourished in the times of Commodus and Severus. (circ. A. D. 200.) In the lib. 1 chap. 6. of his Pedagogue he employs two pages to prove that to eat the flesh of Jesus Christ, must be understood as an allegory. He says, "the wine allegorically signifies the blood." *το αιμα εις αλληγορειται.* It is worthy of remark too, that Clement in this chapter explains these words of Paul: "I have given you milk to drink" as an allegory, and to prove the position which he takes, he produces as a parallel passage the words of our Lord, "Ye eat my flesh and drink my blood."

XLVII. In book 2d, chap. 2d. he censures the Eucratites (or the Continents,) who condemned the use of wine, and among other things says that Christ drank wine and blessed it when he said "take, drink, this is my blood," *to wit*, the blood of the vine: Then he adds, this sacred liquor signifies allegorically, the Word which shed for many his blood in remission of sins: and a little after he says "that which was blessed or consecrated was some wine." Now if the liquor allegorically, signifies our Lord, then it is not our Lord himself. He does not say that what our Lord took was wine

* Quomodo constabit eis eum panem in quo gratiae actae sint corpus esse Domini sui et calicem sanguinis ejus, si non ipsem fabricatorem mundi filium dicant? id est verbum ejus, per quod lignum fructificat, defluunt fontes et dat primum foenum post deinde spicam denique plenum triticum in spicâ.

before the consecration, but he says expressly that it was wine after the consecration, and he proves it by the same argument that we would use, viz., that our Lord said to his disciples "I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine" &c. And he adds the passage, in which the Pharisees accuse our Lord of being a wine bibber, as another proof.

XLVIII. Tertullian is the next author to whom we shall refer. He flourished in the time of Severus (circ. A. D. 200). In book 2, chap. 40, against Marcian, he combats the notion that the body of Christ was fantastical, or unreal; and one of his proofs is that bread is the *figure* of his body, and *figures* can only represent *realities*. He says, "Jesus Christ having taken bread and distributed it to his disciples made it to be his body, saying, this is my body, that is to say, the figure of my body. Now this would not have been a *figure* if he had not had a real body."* Rhenanus in his notes to Tertullian puts this down as one of the errors of that father.

XLIX. In book 1, chap. 14, he says, Jesus Christ represents his body by bread. (Panem quo ipsum corpus suum repraesentat.) It is true that the word *representare* in latin sometimes signifies *to exhibit in presence*; but in that sense it does not stand connected with the ablative, and the Romanists do not hold that our Lord is present *by* the bread, nor *with* the bread; but they say there is no bread present in the sacrament, but the body of our Lord really, and only the *accidents* of the bread.

L. In book 3, chap. 19, against Marcion he says, "God has so revealed him in your gospel, calling the bread his body, that thereby you may understand, that he has given it to the bread, to be the figure of his body, which already before by the prophets had been figured by bread."†

LI. Pamelius and Rhenanus (two Catholic annotators) find it impossible to explain away this passage. They suggest therefore that the text has been corrupted. But all copies (those even of Catholic editions) contain this passage, and Pamelius says it is contained in the manuscript copy in the Vatican. The passage is certainly directly against the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[To be Continued.]

*Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei: Figura autem non fuisset nisi veritatis esset corpus.

†Sic Deus in evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut et hinc jam cum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem prophetae figuravit etc.

[Continued from page 480.]

DEFINITION OF LEADING TERMS—JUST, RIGHTEOUS, &c.

Chapter IV.

On the terms Just, Righteous, Righteousness, Justify, and Justification.

DUE weight has perhaps never been given to the common remark, that much controversy would be saved by an accurate definition of terms. Words, with all the pains that have ever yet been taken to settle their meaning, are still very imperfect representatives of thoughts. It becomes therefore necessary to advert to the leading terms in this discussion, that their import being accurately determined, we may be protected from the vexations attendant upon vacillation.

But here it is necessary to premise, that, although I have placed the English words at the head of this chapter, yet it is really the meaning of the original terms of the sacred writings, after which we must inquire. Our ultimate appeal is to the language used by the Holy Ghost; and the true and correct sense of that must be attached to the words of our English translation, however unsuitable these may be to express that sense. The translation is admirable, but in hundreds of instances, it is not possible to express the exact meaning of a word by any one word in another language. Such are the changes incident to human affairs, that language too must change. The merely English scholar will perceive the difficulty of translating the words, *colton gin, steam engine, republican*, into the language of a people who have no such things, and consequently no words to express them. So in morals, the shades of meaning often cannot be expressed.

This remark is true in reference to the word *justification* and its affiliated terms. *Justify*, though not strictly and purely a latin word, yet has a latin origin, and means, *to make just*. So sanctification is, *the making holy*. Hence, viz: from the similarity of the terms and their composition, the Romanists, ignorant of Hebrew and Greek literature, and building up a system of self-righteousness, maintain, that justification includes the same things in a good degree with sanctification, that is, it comprehends the making of the person upright; so that personal rectitude, inherent, infused grace belongs to it and is the ground of it. And this notion, if I am not mistaken, has not a few advocates at the present day in some Protestant Churches of our country. It is therefore the more important for us and imperative upon us, to derive our ideas from the inspired sources of the Bible, and to attach to the half latin, half English word *justification*, exactly that meaning which the Spirit of God attaches to the words for which it stands. Our inquiry is therefore continually after the meaning of those words in the original scriptures, for which the terms *justification, righteousness, &c.*, stand in our English Bibles.

As to the manner of prosecuting the inquiry, it may be observed, that no satisfaction is attainable in such a case, without a patient examination of many places where the words in question occur. Use alone is the law of language. Words—mere sounds or marks have no fixed meaning in themselves; they are *conventional* signs of thought, and we must inspect their actual use to ascertain what sense men have agreed to attach to them. By this means criticism even in a language which men do not understand, may be made intelligible to them, in a considerable degree. How this is, will be best explained in practice. Let us therefore proceed to the detail, and the mode I propose, is to quote a large number of passages and to number them 1, 2, 3, &c, for convenience of reference: then state the true meaning of the terms, referring by number, to the passage for proof.

1. Gen. xlv. 16. And Judah said, What shall we say unto my Lord? What shall we speak? or how shall we *clear*, (*justify*) ourselves?"

2. Exod. xxiii. 7. "Keep thee far from a false matter: and the innocent and righteous, slay thou not: for I will not *justify* the wicked."

3. Deut. xxv. 1. "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them, then they shall *justify* the righteous, and condemn the wicked."

4. 2 Sam. xv. 4. "Absalom said moreover, O that I were made Judge in the land, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, and *I would do him justice*"—*justify* him.

5. 1 Kin. viii. 31, 32. "If any man trespass against his neighbour, and an oath be laid upon him to cause him to swear and the oath come before thine altar in this house: then hear thou in heaven, and do and judge thy servants, condemning the wicked, to bring his way upon his head; and *justify* the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness."

6. 2 Chron. xix. 5, 6. "And he set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judah, city by city; and said to the judges, take heed what ye do: for ye *judge* not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgment."

7. Psal. cxliii. 2. "And enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be *justified*."

8. Prov. xvii. 15. "He that *justifieth* the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord."

Prov. xxiv. 23, 24. "It is not good to have respect to persons in judgment. He that saith unto the wicked, thou art righteous; him shall the people curse, nations shall abhor him."

9. Isa. v. 22, 23. "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to drink strong drink. Which *justify* the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him."

10. Isa. xliii. 26. "Put me in remembrance: let us plead together: declare thou that thou mayest be *justified*."

11. Isa. xlv. 23, 24, 25. "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be *justified* and shall glory."

Rom. xiv. 10, 11. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God."

12. Isa. liii. 11. "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant *justify* many; for he shall bear their iniquities."

13. Math. xi. 19. "Wisdom is *justified* of her children."

14. Math. xii. 37. "For by thy words thou shalt be *justified*, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

15. Luke, vii. 59. "And all the people that heard him, and the *Publicans, justified* God, being baptised with the baptism of John."

16. Luke x. 29. "But he, willing to *justify* himself, said unto Jesus, and who is my neighbour."

17. Luke xvi. 15. "Ye are they which *justify* yourselves before men, but God knoweth your hearts."

18. Luke xviii. 14. "This man went down to his house *justified* rather than the other."

19. Acts, xiii. 39. "And by him all that believe are *justified* from all things, from which they could not be *justified* by the law of Moses."

20. Rom. ii. 13. "For not the hearers of the law are just before God; but the doers of the law shall be *justified*."

21. Rom. iii. 4. "That thou mightest be *justified* in thy sayings."

22. 1. Cor. iv. 4. "For I know nothing by myself; yet I am not here-by *justified*; but he that judgeth me is the Lord."

I cite all the remaining cases in which the word is used in the New Testament. Rom. iii. 24, 26, 28, 30. iv. 2, 5. v. 1, 9. vi. 7. viii. 30. 1. Cor. vi. 11. Gal. ii. 16, 17. iii. 8, 11, 24. v. 4. 1. Tim. iii. 16. Tit. iii. 7. Jas. ii. 21, 24, 25. Rev. xxii. 11.

With these passages before us, we affirm,

1. That the original words of scripture, for which the word *justify* is used in the Bible, are forensic terms; that is, they are used in connexion with the proceedings of courts—they imply a process, more or less formal of investigation and of judgment. Their proper application is to judicial matters.

2. That they, the Hebrew word, particularly (from which the Greek borrows its meaning, so far as the New Testament is concerned) signify, to pass a sentence of judgment in favour of a person—to declare him just—that he has the righteousness of the law—his conduct has been as the law requires it to be.

Both these will appear true by a reference to the above quoted texts.

1. Judah and his brethren were arraigned before the governor of Egypt, on a charge of stealing the silver cup. It is a judicial business; and he asks, how shall we clear ourselves? How shall we *justify* ourselves? How shall we procure a sentence in our favour?

2. This case is a rule prescribed to the judges in Israel, and God supports it by warning the judges that He will not *justify*—pass a sentence in favour of the wicked.

3. Here are mentioned "a controversy between man," "they come to judgment," before "judges," who are appointed for this express business; and who are bound to pass a sentence according to right; that is, in favour of the man who has done right, and against the man who has done wrong. The former is to *justify*, the latter is to *condemn*.

Let us take in connexion with this the 5th case, where Solomon speaks of condemning the wicked, and justifying the righteous, and also the 8th, where Solomon again contrasts the two kinds of sentences, viz: for and against, and calls the former a justifying and the latter a condemning, and 9th, Isaiah speaks of justifying the wicked as an enormity on which a woman is denounced, and by contrast, of taking away the righteousness of the righteous, or not giving him his just reward; and 14th, where our Lord in like manner, uses the terms *justify* and *condemn*, as expressing the opposite judgments.

Here we have five instances of this contrast. Now it is undenied and undeniable, that the plain meaning of condemnation, is, the passing of a sentence against a person, by which the punishment prescribed by law is awarded to him, and ordered to be inflicted upon him; therefore, justification is the passing of a sentence in favour of a person, by which the reward prescribed by law is ordered to be given to him. Nothing can be more conclusive than the evidence of these two positions. If then the term to *justify* is judicial, and means simply to pass sentence in favour, it follows,

that to infuse grace, to make the person just or holy, to change his moral character is no part of justification. It is simply and solely a declarative act, and only affects the legal relations of the person. Before the judge pronounces the sentence against a man, he is wicked and deserves to be punished, just as much as after; yet there is no person entitled to inflict the punishment, until the judge hands him over. But in condemning him the judge does not infuse wicked principles into him, he does not make him deserving of punishment; but simply declares the fact. So, before the judge pronounces in favour of a man, he is, as the law requires him to be, upright; the judge simply declares the fact, he does not at all alter the moral qualities of the man. *Justification* therefore is entirely distinct from *Sanctification*, which describes the whole operations of the Spirit of God in changing a sinner into the holy image of God. The one refers simply and only to the legal relations; the other to the moral qualities; the former is the work of the judge, the latter is the work of the Creator; that gives me legal security forever; this qualifies my heart for its enjoyment.

Another inference from this settlement of the term justification, is, that the idea of pardon is not included in it. Pardon, as we shall see more fully hereafter, is the passing by of a condemned person, so as not to inflict just punishment on him; it releases him from the bonds by which he was bound to suffer. It changes his relation to the penal sanction of law; it does not at all suppose the person's fulfilment of its preceptive claim. "But this we may lay aside," says Dr. Owen, (*Justification* p. 118) for surely no man was ever yet so fond, as to pretend that *δικαίωσις* did signify to pardon sin; yet is it the only word applied to express our justification in the New Testament."

Having determined the sense of the principal terms, it remains to examine the other two; viz: *Righteousness* and *Just*.

Righteousness is simply straightness: and figuratively expresses the correct notion of the thing. It suggests the idea of the law being a right or straight line, and accommodation of a person's conduct to the law is *righteousness*. But the original expression in the Old Testament, which, be it remembered, must ever determine the meaning of the phraseology in the New, is very nearly allied to the word, to *justify*. It is indeed the same, or rather, there are two words, or two forms of the same word, translated *righteousness*. And I venture the criticism with diffidence, not having full time for a sufficiently extended examination; that one of them (*tsedek*) signifies all that which the law requires of positive compliance with its precepts, in order to secure a sentence of justification; the other (*tsedaukau*) all that which the subject of the law has done, how far soever it may fall short of the full requisition. My diffidence refers to the latter; as to the former I feel confident. *Tsedek, righteousness*, is all that to which the promise of the covenant is made; the entire required sum of positive obedience to the precept. So in Jeremiah xxiii. 5, speaking of the Messiah, the prophet says "This is the name whereby he shall be called, **THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.**" The Lord our Redeemer is to us the fulfilling of the whole law; he is made of God unto us wisdom and *righteousness* and sanctification and redemption. Therefore he replied to the Baptist's objections against baptising him; "thus it becometh us to fulfil all *righteousness.*" The Mosaic law, in reference to the high priest, required him to be washed previously to his entering upon the duties of his office. *Exod. lx. 12.* "And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water." Hence as Christ came to fulfil all law, as he is the end of law for righteousness, he must be washed. Hence some, ignorant by the blinding zeal of party, suppose that Christ submitted to Christian baptism, which was not yet instituted and that he was submerged. Were Aaron and his sons submerged in the

wash bowl? But we may not digress. The Saviour's reply shows, that to do what the law requires, is righteousness.

Deut. vi. 25. "And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Action according to the requirement of law, doing the commandments is our righteousness.

Psalm cvi. 3. "Blessed are they that keep judgment, and he that doeth righteousness at all times." Active compliance with the rules of right, is always accounted the sum and substance of righteousness.

Prov. xiv. 34. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Here, as in multitudes of cases, righteousness and sin are brought into contrast; and therefore the one, becomes expository of the other. Now "sin is the transgression of the law"—the action of the moral being in opposition to the law. For even in those which are denominated sins of omission, there is mental action. Because when the law's requisition is pressed upon the mind's attention, by the incidents of providence, and the man does not act according to it, this not acting of the hand is a result of a decision of the mind not to direct the hand to act, in which decision the mind itself is active. So that sins of omission, are so called, only in reference to the overt or external bodily action; not in reference to the mind. If therefore sin consists in action contrary to law; and if it be the opposite of righteousness, this must be action according to law.

It does appear to me superfluous to dwell upon this branch of the subject. All men, one would think, must at once admit the correctness of our definition. Let us then account this question as settled: its practical value will appear hereafter.

The term *just*, must be accounted in our discussions, equivalent to *righteous*, for the very cogent reason, that they are used interchangeably as a translation for one and the same word. For example, Noah is called a *just man*, Gen. vi. 9; and in vii. 1, God says to him, "for thee have I seen righteous before me," whereas in the original, the same word occurs in both places; and many more such cases might be selected. The equivalency of the terms is therefore indisputable.

Nor can the general meaning detain us. The original expression is the same on which we have dwelt so long. It is here, what grammarians would call a participial adjective: that which expresses the quality of the verb, as existing in the person who performs the action which the verb describes. He is a just or righteous man who has done only the things required of him by the law under which he exists. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous."

To sum up the whole matter--there is a law given, which prescribes to man what he ought to do: it requires the active use of all the talents entrusted to him. But the prescription of duty, the investment with a talent, implies a day of reckoning for its use: and a judge to agitate and decide the question whether it has been used aright, whether the actions required by law have all been performed. This judge is to pronounce upon the case and declare the facts as they really are. If he find the person to have acted in all respects as the law prescribes, he simply declares the fact. This declaration of the fact is *justification*. The ground of it is the upright conduct of the man, to which upright conduct the reward is promised. This is the man's *righteousness*. His being in possession of this, in other words his having acted rightly, makes him a *just* or *righteous* man: and the judge's declaration, makes him a *justified* man, and as a matter of mere justice and right may and must claim rewards of obedience.

In conclusion let us remark,

1. The identity of the very terms, and also of the things signified by them, in this great question of human destinies for the world beyond the grave and for the life that now is. All human jurisprudence, and the ap-

plication of its principles in the judicial affairs of men on earth, rest on the broad basis of God's eternal truth. How dignified then the study of the law? What a noble science it is, when not prostituted to the law of money? It has its moral rules of right; its rational agents; its accountability; its judges and advocates; its justification or condemnation. It borrows its principles from religion and its sanctions from God; whilst it lends its terms to theology and leads its subjects from reflections upon an earthly and fallible, to a heavenly and infallible tribunal in heaven. For

2dly. The whole of our ideas about justification must have reference to a process of judgment. From this the language is borrowed, and is well adapted to carry our thoughts forward toward that grand assize—that awfully solemn and magnificent scene, when the universe shall stand before the great white throne of our Redeemer and give in their last account. Oh what a vast assemblage! What a stupendous scene!! How all the pageant of earthly tribunals sink into insignificance before its dazzling splendours! How all bosoms become transparent in that light, and all the secrets of all hearts lie open to public view. You my dear friends will be there, and I. How important then, that we have the righteousness of the law! "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that doeth these things shall never be moved."

BULL OF PIUS V., AGAINST QUEEN ELIZABETH.

The Damnation and Excommunication of Elizabeth Queen of England, and her Adherents, with an addition of other punishments.

PIUS BISHOP, SERVANT TO GOD'S SERVANTS,
FOR A PERPETUAL MEMORIAL
OF THE MATTER.

HE that reigneth on high, to whom is given all Power in Heaven and in earth, committed one holy, Catholic and Apostolic church (out of which there is no salvation) to one alone upon earth, namely, to *Peter* the Prince of the Apostles, and to *Peter's* successor the bishop of *Rome*, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build, that he may contain the faithful that are knit together with the band of charity, in the unity of the spirit, and present them spotless, and unblameable to their Saviour.

Damnatio et Excommunicatio Elizabethæ Regiæ Angliæ, eique Adherentium, cum aliarum panarum Abjectione.

PIUS EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM DEI,
AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

REGNANS in excelsis, cui data est omnis in cælo et in terra potestas, unam sanctam, Catholicam & Apostolicam Ecclesiam (extra quam nulla est salus) soli in terris, videlicet, Apostolorum Principi *Petro*, *Petrique* successori Romano Pontifici, in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam. Hunc unum super omnes gentes, & omnia regna principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, dissipet, disperdat, plantet, & ædificet, ut fidelem populum, mutuæ Charitatis nexu constrictum, in unitate spiritus contineat, salvumque & incolumem suo exhibeat Salvatori.

§. 1. In discharge of which function, we which are by God's goodness called to the government of the aforesaid church, do spare no pains, labouring with all earnestness, that unity, and the Catholic religion (which the Author thereof hath for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment suffered to be punished with so great afflictions) might be preserved uncorrupt: But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, there is now no place left in the whole world, which they have not assayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines: Amongst others, *Elizabeth*, the pretended Queen of *England*, a slave of wickedness, lending thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a sanctuary, the most pernicious of all men have found a refuge. This very woman having seized on the kingdom, and monstrously usurping the place of Supreme head of the church in all *England*, and the chief authority and jurisdiction thereof, hath again brought back the said kingdom into miserable destruction, which was then newly reduced to the Catholic faith and good fruits.

§. 2. For having by strong hand inhibited the exercise of the true religion, which *Mary* lawful Queen of famous memory, had by the help of this See restored, after it had been formerly overthrown by *Henry VIII.*, a revolter therefrom: and following and embracing the errors of heretics, she hath removed the Royal Council consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men, being heretics, oppressed the embracers of the Catholic faith, placed impious preachers, ministers of iniquity, abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, choice of meats, unmarried life, and the Catholic rites and ceremonies. Commanded books to be read in

§. 1. Quo quidem in munere obeundo, nos ad prædictæ ecclesiæ gubernacula Dei benignitate vocati, nullum laborem intermittimus, omni operâ contententes, ut ipsa unitas, & Catholica, religio (quam illius auctor ad probandam suorum fidem, & correctionem nostram, tantis procellis conflictari permisit) integra conservetur. Sed Impiorum numerus tantum potentia, invaluit, ut nullus jam in Orbe lucus sit relictus, quem illi pessimis doctrinis corrumpere non tentârint aduente inter cæteros flagitiorum servâ *Elizabeth*, prætensâ *Angliæ* Reginâ; ad quam, veluti ad asylum, omnium infestissimi profugium invenerunt. Hæc eadem, Regno occupato, supremi Ecclesiæ capitis locum, in omni *Angliâ*, ejusque præcipuam autoritatem atque Jurisdictionem monstruose sibi usurpans, regnum ipsum jam tum ad fidem Catholicam & bonam frugem reductum, rursus in exitium, miserum revocavit.

§. 2. Usu namque veræ religionis, quam ab illius desertore *Henrico VIII.* olim oversam, *Claræ Mm. Maria Regina* legitima, hujus sedis præsidea reparaverat, potenti manu inhibito, sequitisque & amplexis hæreticorum erroribus, regium concilium ex *Angelicâ* nobilitate confectum diremit illud que obscuris hominibus hæreticis complevit, Catholicæ fidei cultores oppressit, improbos concionatores, atque impietatum administratos reposuit, missæ sacrificium, preces, jejunia, ciborum dilectum, ritusque Catholicos abolevit. Libros manifestam hæresim continentes, toto regno proponi, impia mysteria, & instituta ad *Calvini* Præscriptum à se sus-

the whole realm containing manifest heresy; and impious mysteries and institutions, by herself entertained, and observed according to the prescript of *Calvin*, to be likewise observed by her subjects; presumed to throw bishops, parsons of churches, and other Catholic priests, out of their churches and benefices; and to bestow them and other church livings upon heretics, and to determine of church causes, prohibited the prelates, clergy, and people to acknowledge the church of *Rome*, or obey the precepts and canonical sanctions thereof compelled most of them to condescend to her wicked laws, and to abjure the authority and obedience of the bishop of *Rome*, and to acknowledge her to be sole lady in temporal and spiritual matters, and this by oath; imposed penalties and punishments upon those which obeyed not, and exacted them of those which persevered in the unity of the faith and their obedience aforesaid, cast the Catholic prelates and rectors of churches in prison, where many of them, being spent with long languishing and sorrow, miserably ended their lives. All which things, seeing they are manifest and notorious to all nations, and by the gravest testimony of very many so substantially proved, that there is no place at all left for excuse, defence, or evasion.

§. 3. We seeing that impieties and wicked actions are multiplied one upon another; and moreover, that the persecution of the faithful, and affliction for religion, groweth every day heavier and heavier, through the instigation and means of the said *Elizabeth*; because we understand her mind to be so hardened and indurate, that she hath not only contemned the godly requests and admonitions of Catholic princes, concerning her healing and conversion, but also

cepta, & observata, etiam à subditis observari mandavit. Episcopos, ecclesiarum rectores, & alios sacerdotes Catholicos, suis ecclesiis, & beneficiis ejicere, ac de illis & aliis ecclesiasticis rebus, in hæreticos homines disponere, deq; ecclesiæ causis decernere ausa, prælatis, clero, & populo, ne Romanam ecclesiam agnoscerent, neve ejus præceptis, sanctionibusque canonicis obtemperarent, interdixit; plerosque in nefarias leges suas venire, & Romani Pontificis auctoritatem atque obedientiam abjurare; seque solam, in temporalibus & spiritualibus Dominam agnoscere jurejurando coegit; pœnas & supplicia in eos qui dicto non essent audientes, imposuit, easdemque ab iis, qui in unitate fidei, & prædicta obedientia perseverarunt, exegit. Catholicos antistites, & ecclesiarum rectores in vincula conjecit, ubi multi diuturno languore & tristitia confecti, extremum vitæ diem misere siniverant. Quæ omnia cum apud omnes nationes perspicua & notoria sunt, & gravissimo quamplurimorum testimonio, ita comprobata, ut nullus omnino locus excusationis, defensionis, aut tergiversationis relinquatur.

§. 3. Nos multiplicantibus aliis atque aliis super alias impietatibus, & facinoribus, & præterea fidelium persecutione, religionisque afflictione, impulsu & operâ d. *Elizabeth* quotidie magis ingravescente, quoniam illius animum ita obsiratum atque induratum intelligimus, ut non modo pias Catholicorum principum de sanitate & conversione, preces, monitionesque contempserit, sed ne hujus quidem sedis ad ipsam hac de cusâ nuncios in *Angliam*

hath not so much as permitted the nuncios of this See, to cross the seas into *England*; are strained of necessity to betake ourselves to the weapons of justice against her, not being able to migrate our sorrow, that we are drawn to take punishment upon one, to whose ancestors the whole state of Christendom hath been so much bounden. Being therefore supported with his authority, whose pleasure it was to place us (though unable for so great a burthen) in this supreme throne of justice, we do out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid *Elizabeth*, being an heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ.

§. 4. And moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever.

§. 5. And also the nobility, subjects and people of the said kingdom, and all others, which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do by authority of these presents absolve them, and do deprive the same *Elizabeth* of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things abovesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her monitions, mandates and laws: and those which shall do the contrary, we do of anathema.

§. 6. And because it were a matter of too much difficulty, to convey these presents to all places wheresoever it shall be needful; our will is, that the copies thereof under a public notary's hand,

trajicere permiserit; ad arma justitiæ contra eam de necessitate conversi, dolorem lenire non possumus, quod adducamur in unam animadvertere, cujus majores de republicâ Christianâ tantopere mercuere. Illius itaque auctoritate suffulti, qui nos in hoc supremo justitiæ throno, licet tanto oneri imparis, voluit collocare, de apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine declaramus prædictam *Elizabeth* hæreticam, hæreticorumque faultricem, eique adhærentes in prædictis, Anathematis sententiam incurrisse, esseque à Christi Corporis unitate præcisos.

§. 4. Quam etiam ipsam prætenso regni prædicti jure, necnon omni & quocunque Dominio, dignitate, privilegioque privatam:

§. 5. Et etiam proceres, subditos, & populos dicti regni, ac cæteros omnes qui illi quomodocunque juraverunt, a juramento hujusmodi, ac omni prorsus dominii, fidelitatis, & absequii debito, perpetuo absolutos, prout nos illos præsentium auctoritate absolvimus & privamus eandem *Elizabeth* prætenso jure regni, aliisque omnibus supradictis. Præcipimusque & interdicimus universis & singulis proceribus, subditis, populis, & aliis prædictis, ne illi ejusve monitis, mandatis, & legibus audeant obedire. Qui secus egerint, eos simili anathematis sententiâ innodamus.

§. 6. Quia vero difficile nimis esset, præsentibus quocunque illis opus erit perferre, volumus, ut eorum exempla, notarij publici-manu, & prælati ecclesiastici, ejusve curiæ sigillo obsignata ean-

and sealed with the seal of an ecclesiastical prelate, or of his court shall carry altogether the same credit with all people, judicial and extra-judicial, as these presents should do, if they were exhibited or shewed. Given at Rome, at St. Peters, in the year of the incarnation of our Lord, 1570, and of our popedom the fifth year.

dem illam prorsus fidem in iudicio, & extra illud, ubique gentium faciant, quam ipsæ præsentēs facerent, si essent exhibitæ vel ostensæ. Dat' Romæ apud sanctum Petrum, anno incarnationis Dominicæ 1570. 5, Cal. Maij pontificat' nostri Anno 5.

WHEREWITHAL SHALL WE BE CLOTHED? MATTHEW VI. 31.

ACCORDING to the common proverb, apparel makes not a Monk. Yet this question hath been sometimes handled with great contention and diversity of opinions, which endured nigh fifty years amongst the Friars, because they could not accord upon the colour, greatness, wideness, and form of their habits. For the Glorious *S. Francis*, amongst other articles of his rule, had placed one, whereby he ordained, "that all that were of his order, for apparel, should clothe themselves with the basest, vilest, and of the lowest price that could be; that they should only have one coat with an hood, and another without an hood; and that they should wear no shoes, nor ride on horseback." Upon the intelligence and interpretation of this article, arose great and marvelous altercations and disputations in the order of Friars: insomuch that they held a general Chapter, to accord these disputations, and to rule themselves all by one sort of habits. For some wore habits of one colour, some of another, some short, and others long; insomuch, that they seemed not to be of the same order. In this Chapter then was there a great disputation, about the intelligence and interpretation of the said article. About the last two points they were easy to agree: for seeing they were forbidden by the said article to ride on horseback, they resolved to *ride on asses and mules, or go on foot*, as commonly they do. They considered also, that asses were fittest for them in their convents, for being kept with least charge. As for shoes, they resolved, that they would take away the most part of the leather, leaving only a sole, with a thong, to go over the foot, to make the sole fast to the foot, and so should they not be shoes but soles. But the greatest difficulty and strife were about the fashion of the hood, and of the coat or jacket. For in the said chapter were moved three principal questions, by certain subtle and cunning Friars. The first, upon the colour: the second, upon the quantity: and the third, about the form. But to handle these three questions in order, you must understand, that about the colour there were divers opinions, upon which they could not accord. For the blessed *S. Francis* had spoken nothing of the colour in his rule: but only ordained, that they of his order should wear habits of a low price. Then fell out a great question, what colour was of least price, and thought to be

most vile. Some reasoned, that the green colour was the vilest, and might be bought cheaper than any other: and that it was ordinarily seen, that people of most vile condition (as carters, mariners, and other mean people) did wear that colour, in lining to their doublets, as the worst colour of all. They said also, that the matter wherewith a green colour is made, is cheaper than any other: for with herbs and leaves, green may be made, to die both woollen and linen. Others said, the murky or smoky colour was the worst and best cheap: for to make that colour, there need no more, but to take white wool and soot. But the third opinion seemed to be best taken with reason and equity. And that was they which said, that there was no viler colour nor more mete for their order, than that which came from the beast's back itself. But it is so, that both white and black came from the beast's back: and it is evident, that the blessed *S. Francis* did so understand it, they should wear the colour of the beast in token of humility and patience; saying further, that all other colours cost something, and if it were but labour, but the colour of the beast cost nothing. Therefore they concluded, that all the order of Friars ought to wear their garments either of white or black colour, and not of green, smoky, or any other colours, and that this was their opinion. Assuredly these reasons of the first disputers were so pregnant, that they shaked all the rest of the company: yet, notwithstanding they which had disputed for green and smoky colours, thinking it not good to be overcome at the first blow, replied more. They which have disputed of the colour of the beast (say they) do show, that they hold something of the beast (speaking under the brotherly correction of their superiors, and the chapter) for that their conclusion is alternative and indeterminate. For they concluded upon white and black, without resolving either upon the one or the other, and that such a conclusion implied evident contradiction. For (say they) there is nothing more contrary than white and black. Moreover, they said, that if so be the colour of the sheep should be worn of them, men would judge it to be a token of their pride and presumption, which is the greatest of all mortal sins, because for pride *Lucifer* fell from heaven into hell, for the world may say of them, that they cover themselves with the colour of the sheep, and notwithstanding are ravening wolves: seeing it is written, that men must take heed of them, that make an outward countenance to be sheep, and yet are wolves, and by that similitude are they noted to be false prophets. They showed also, that already other orders of beggars or mendicants have taken possession of those two colours, black and white. For the Jacobins wore white under, and black above. And the Carmelites contrary, black under and white above: and generally all sorts of other Monks, which held the rules of *S. Augustine*, *S. Bernard*, and blessed *S. Benet*, and others were all Monks, either white or black. And that it should not be well done to take from them their colours, or to enterprise upon them: for so they might oppose themselves against them, and that that was not the way to draw unto them the devotion of the world. Finally, they showed that if their order of Friars took black, there are some countries where there are no black sheep, or very few, as in Berry, Limoges

and Languedoc ; then in these countries must they be forced to dye their wool, so would it become dear, and then directly should they do against the rule of the blessed *S. Francis*, that bids them wear clothes of the vilest and cheapest price ; this should also be to go against their liberties and privileges, to pay the least they can : for by their rule they are forbidden to handle any silver. And by the contrary, if the order chose a white colour, there are other countries where there are no white sheep, or few : as in Tuscany and many other places, so that the Friars there must have their white clothes out of far countries, which will be to their great cost, and so will be directly against the said rule and their liberties: And therefore, these disputers persisted still in their first opinion for green and smoky colours. The others which had reasoned for the colour of the beast, finding themselves pinched and pricked, replied, that that opinion of green and smoky colour was the most sage opinion of the world, and according to the reason they had which maintained it. For (said they) green is a colour fit for fools. Moreover, in countries, where they say there is nothing but cole black wool, how can they dye that black, green, or smoky? Finally their disputation became so hot, that it was greatly to be feared they would have fallen to fists, if certain ancient fathers sitting in the highest places, had not imposed silence to the brethren, and made them understand, that truly, they had well and learnedly debated the matter, both of the one part and of the other, and that they thought the question was weighty, high, and hard, and such as merited the advise and resolution of the holy Father, the Pope, and that therefore, they would reserve unto him the determination thereof. As soon as the Friars heard speak of the Pope, each one held his peace.

¶ After this, the senior Fathers caused to propose the second question of the three, for which the Chapter was assembled, touching the quantity of habits, that is, if they should be long or short, wide or straight. The first disputers (in great number) were all of advice, that their garments of order ought to be short and straight, for many good reasons, which they alleged: for said they, habits short and straight, are more vile and better cheap than long and large, because they have not so much stuff in them. Therefore, since the glorious *Saint Francis* our founder, would, and ordained that we should wear habits of vile and little price, we cannot better observe that holy rule, (wherein consisteth the estate of perfection) than in making our habits as short and as straight as is possible. Moreover, (said they) our father and good founder, *S. Francis*, hath he not appointed that we should be Mendicants, and live upon the alms of good people? Therefore we must make account to gather our alms to live, and to seek it sometimes far off, upon pain, to endure hunger and want, for we shall have little brought into our convent: then must we trot hither and thither at all times, rain it or hail it, be it hot, cold, dry, or wet, yea, in Lent and Advents, to preach: but no kind of habits is more mete to overthrow the fields, than such as are short, for the long are unfit. Contrary, such as reasoned after, said that the same opinion was strange and ridiculous, because if Friars should wear short habits, they would seem more like millers than Friars: and it is ordinarily seen, that in

those countries where Friars use short habits, the order was much despised and mocked of the world, and men called them curtail Friars: and therefore long and large were most convenable and fit for them; and that (the blessed *S. Francis* rightly understood) they should wear long habits: for in the said article he useth the word *tunik*, which signifieth a long robe or garment. Moreover, long habits are more seemly for religious men, and short garments for lay men: and that a long garment makes religious men the most reverend and honoured in the world. They said, further, that all other sorts of Monks wore long and wide habits, and it should be a great novelty, if the order of the glorious *S. Francis* should take a short habit. Likewise, (said they) when we go into the pulpit to preach, or when we go to say mass, oh, it is a goodly sight to have our garments like millers. Therefore, they concluded, that their habits should be long and large. But the first reasoners replied to this, saying to the first point, that the good *S. Francis* had taught them the way of humility, and that therefore, they ought not to seek to wear long garments, to be therefore honored and revered of the world; for that tasted of pride, and not of his humility; and that they which are mocked and despised of the world, are esteemed of God; because the wisdom of the world is folly before God: and so contrary. As for the second point, they said, that this word *tunik* in *S. Benet's* rule signifieth not a long robe, but a little cloak or cassock: and so it is found in Frier *Ambrose Calepin's* dictionary (who was of our order) not a long robe, but *toga*; and that therefore the rule makes for them in that point. So it is best that Friars wear short habits, as little cloaks, and cassocks, or jerkins. And as for their objection, that other Monks do wear long and wide garments; so much the better, said they, and the rather should we wear short and straight; that there may be a distinction betwixt us and others. As for their reason, that to wear short and straight garments, would make us like lay men: we answer to that, (say they) that the hood will make a difference betwixt us and lay men, for the length of garments cannot distinguish us from lay people, for they also wear long robes, as Proctors, Advocates, Counsellors, Huishers, Physicians, yea, even merchants in their shops. We confess (said they) that at the beginning it will be a novelty to see us wear garments short and straight with an hood, but time and custom will take away the strangeness thereof, for in all things there is a beginning.

The chief and ancient fathers, rulers of this disputation, seeing their Friars (who came in place to accord) to enter and grow further into contention and contrariety of opinions, imposed them silence as they had done before upon the first question, and said unto them, that they would remit to the holy Father, the decision and resolution of this high and hard question, touching the largeness and length of habits: but yet they must advise, if at the least in this Chapter we may resolve upon the third question, touching the form and fashion of these habits.

So they began to demand voices, to know whether their habits ought to be single or double; if it be lawful to have some fine and goodly fashion on them, or not; if they should have collars, or none; or skirts, or none; or sleeves, or no sleeves; or if sleeves, whether

hanging sleeves ; if there must be an hood, whether it were not best to be pointed and sharp, as the Carthusian Friers have, or round, as they of other religions have. Upon all those points, there was great disputation, and all matters were well and subtilly disputed of in this Chapter. It seemed to some, that it were not best to have hanging sleeves, for they were not comely ; but rather wide and open sleeves, that they might serve for a scrip or pouch. For (said they) since our good father *S. Francis* hath commanded us to beg and live of alms ; and that by an article of his holy rule, he hath forbidden us to carry with us poke, bag, or scrip, as also is forbidden us in the gospel, it followeth well, that he would have us to understand, that we should have great and wide sleeves for to put our alms in. To this some answered, that wide sleeves were dearer than straight ; for that they had more matter and stuff in them, and therefore such sleeves are contrary to their rule. And as for the difficulty found out upon the forbidding of bags and scrips, and of the inconvenience that might follow therefrom, for want of something to put their alms in : they said for this, there was an help, viz : to take a man with them, (which we may call a Judas) who may carry a bag or scrip for that use, yea, he may take silver, if any will give it us.

Yet were there made many other great arguments and subtle allegations upon this question of the fashion of habits : and some thought it best, that that fashion of hoods which the Charterhouse Friers used, to be well, and best to be imitated. For that that sharp point above, might allegorically signify, that they had sharp and quick spirits ; and having a fame and reputation to be so, their sermons would be more accounted of. But the good Fathers considering, that nothing could be resolved in that Chapter ; and that it was as expedient to send to Rome for three questions, as for two ; they made the company privy to their advise ; namely, that it were best to send to Rome to have the holy Father's opinion and counsel upon these three questions ; and that some of them present should go for that purpose.

Certain time after, delegates of their order took their journey to Rome, unto Pope *Nicholas*, the third of that name, who reigned in the year 1280, which made him understand all the said disputation, and the great disorder that was in their order about the said three points. The Pope and his Cardinals were as much troubled to resolve those high and subtle questions, as the said Friers had been in their Chapter. Yet the Pope by the advise of the said Cardinals, made them upon this matter this resolution, and ordained and commanded, that upon all those questions, that should be straightly kept and observed, which should be concluded and determined in a chapter general, or else in provincial Chapters, which to those ends should afterwards be convoked and assembled : upon condition, notwithstanding, that always there might be seen shine in the Friers, and in their works, an holy poverty, according to their holy rule. But this was to make them fall into a far greater contention and disputation, than ever : so as also in their Chapters which they held afterwards, they could never accord, following that ordinance of the Pope ; but resolved yet again to return to the Pope, which they did, but it was about one and thirty years after

the former time, during which time they held many Chapters to handle that matter.

Coming then to no end in their Chapters, they again sent delegates to Rome, to Pope *Clement* the fifth, who then held the counsel at Vienne, *anno Dom.* 1311, who gave him to understand, how, according to the ordinance of Pope *Nicholas*, his predecessor, they had done all that which they possibly could, to overcome the aforesaid difficulties, which at length they recited unto him, but they could not accord upon any resolution. But contrary, that as they disputed, there arose always new difficulties and doubts in the Friars' spirits, and that therefore they came unto him, as to a very oracle of truth, who could and knew how to resolve all those doubts, and many others. The Pope having heard them, put the matter unto the determination of the cardinals, prelates, doctors, and others, assembled in that counsel; you must think, that this whole counsel was greatly troubled, as before Pope *Nicholas* and his Cardinals had been. Yet that the said Friars might not go away as they came, without having answer from the Pope's oracle, there was delivered unto them indeed, a true oracle, that is to say, an ambiguous and obscure answer, whereby the Pope, by the advice of the said counsel, commanded the guardians and other chief ministers of that order, to judge the vilitie, colour, length, wideness, and fashion of their said order: the consciences of which commissaries and guardians he burdened, and commanded all the Friars, that they should obey what their said guardians and ministers should resolve, without seeking out so many scruples and doubts, and without desire to know more than needed, by inventing so many subtilities. These delegates returned home with a fair bull, yet was it not possible by any virtue thereof, to set down a rule in habits. For always the Friars found to speak against the advice and resolutions of their guardians, saying they understood nothing, and that they had not read the text of the rule of blessed *Saint Francis*, and that they were but beasts. In this contestation of Friars against their guardians and superiors, remained their affairs by a long and great space of years.

Finally, in the year 1323, in the time of Pope *John*, the two and twentieth of that name, who held his seat at Avignon, the guardians and superiors of that order went to complain to his Fatherhood; showing him, that they could not be obeyed upon the resolution they had made by virtue of the power which had been given them by the said bull of Pope *Clement*. So they humbly prayed his said Fatherhood, that he would vouchsafe to do some good therein. The Pope, to proceed in this matter more juridically, or rather judicially, would hear the parties, and therefore sent to those Friars who refused to obey their guardians and superiors, that they should either come and make their reasons, or send the causes in writing, why they refused obedience. They sent them. The above said Pope caused to assemble his Cardinals; and being in the conclave, the allegations of the Friars pretended disobedience, were read, and no doubt found so great and admirable, so doubtful and sharp, that a fly could not there have placed her foot, and indeed they could never give a resolution thereof. True it is, that the Pope could do no less for his honour, than to ordain something. There-

fore caused he to expedite a bull, wherein he exceedingly praiseth the bulls of his predecessors, Pope *Nicholas* and *Clement*, and saith, that he marvelleth how men cannot be contented with the resolution contained in them. After he makes declaration, that the vility of habits should be measured, according to the custom of every country. After that, he giveth commissions to the guardians and superiors of every order (as did Pope *Clement*) to make a rule for the longitude, latitude, thickness, colour, fashion, and vilitie, as well of the tuniks, as of the hood, and upon all other accidents, circumstances, and dependences; willing and commanding them to obey the rule that should be made, without any more framing so many objections, arguments, and fantastical contradictions.

Behold in substance, the content of Pope *John's* bull; whereby it appeareth, that neither he nor all his predecessors could ever give a law or a well determined resolution, upon the matter of the dispute of Friers' habits.